

Bridges

Mr. Howard: May I express another thought on that, Mr. Chairman. Until this particular investigation started, in so far as the fishermen of British Columbia are concerned, was not that section of the act—I forget the precise part of it—the section which states that any six citizens in Canada can—if they make a statement of evidence to the effect that because of the conditions existing they think there is a combine existing—start the ball rolling in so far as an investigation is concerned, and the director then is duty bound to proceed with such an investigation, as was done in this case. There is the possibility but I do not say it will arise. Suppose the Newfoundland fishermen decided to establish a union, I think it would be a commendable thing for them to do there—

An hon. Member: It would be outlawed.

Mr. Howard: If they decided to do that and if they commenced bargaining under the same process with a company there as was done in British Columbia, could some six citizens—I hope they are not all Liberals—decide to start the ball rolling toward an investigation, and the director would then be duty bound to proceed in so far as the conditions existed at that particular moment. They might fall within this two-year period. Just to cover the possibility I think the minister should undertake to remove the words “British Columbia” which appear in this clause.

Mr. Fulton: I still think, Mr. Chairman, it is sounder to confine the exemption only to those situations that demonstrably require to be covered by the exemption.

I want to reassure my hon. friend that, although he is perfectly correct, if there should be established another union similar to the one in British Columbia and if negotiations between it and fishing companies should take place and if six people formally made representations to the director, he is quite right, the director would then have to institute an inquiry.

We discussed this matter on my estimates in the light of some criticisms then made. These inquiries take a long, long time between the first step taken by the director and the final disposition by the courts, or indeed even by the restrictive trade practices commission. That is quite true. I think, therefore, I am quite safe in saying to my hon. friend that in the situation he envisages we could count on the final disposition of the British Columbia case before an inquiry in some other part of Canada had produced any prejudice to any party who might be involved.

Mr. Howard: One other point. I guess I did not try hard enough. I am going to get

a change made in this clause somehow or other. I think I had better do it in a formal way and the minister will see how necessary it is to have some watchdogs over on this side of the house. I would point out to the minister that the last word on the fourth line of clause 1 is “Colombia”. It is misspelled. It should have a “u” in there. Accordingly, I would like to move.

That clause 1 be amended by deleting in line 4 thereof the misspelled word “Colombia” and substituting therefor the word “Columbia”.

Mr. Fulton: I shall be glad to accept the amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time, by leave, and passed.

BRIDGES

AUTHORIZATION OF CONSTRUCTION ACROSS
NIAGARA RIVER

Hon. Donald M. Fleming (for the Secretary of State for External Affairs) moved the second reading of Bill No. S-30, to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Niagara river between the province of Ontario and the state of New York.

Mr. Benidickson: Is that a toll bridge?

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Sevigny in the chair.

On clause 1—*Approval of bridge.*

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): Mr. Chairman, this bill has nothing to do with the maintenance or operation of the bridge. There will have to be legislation next year dealing with that. This bill has two purposes and two only. It is based on the urgent request of the province of Ontario. The first purpose is to permit the construction of a new bridge across the Niagara river between Queenston on the Canadian side and Lewiston on the United States side. The second purpose is to enlarge the powers of the Queenston Heights Bridge Company to make it quite clear that it had the power to sell the present bridge to the Niagara bridge commission.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The Leader of the Opposition suggests that I ask this question. Can the minister explain why in clause 3 the lieutenant governor is given the power to designate an authority that might not be a resident of Canada? Indeed, the authority might be an American authority. Would the minister, knowledgeable as he is on this and on so many other matters, give me a reply that would be adequate to the occasion?