

Columbia River Treaty

by the Lloyd government. Has the minister or the government received the views of the new Saskatchewan government? I would appreciate an answer to that question, also.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): In reply to that further question—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Perhaps I could direct the hon. member's attention to the fact that we are not in committee at this time and that if the minister speaks he will close the debate. I suggest that the minister reply to questions put by hon. members in the course of his closing remarks.

Mr. Pascoe: Thank you. That is the course I thought would be taken. Would the minister take note, then, of those two questions to which I would appreciate an answer.

Mr. Charles J. M. Willoughby (Kamloops): I hope to put on record one of the briefest speeches on this subject, though I hope it will not be the least pertinent, with regard to the resolution before us. I spoke on this matter on March 5, as recorded in *Hansard* on pages 585-588, and hon. members who recall that speech will recognize that as a member of the committee on external affairs which considered this treaty I entered the committee with a definite prejudice in favour of that treaty.

I did so because I had complete confidence in those who negotiated the original treaty. In particular, I had complete confidence in my predecessor, the former member for Kamloops, Hon. Davie Fulton. I had complete confidence, also, in the results of the 18 years of study which had preceded the negotiation of this treaty by the engineers, the legal advisers and the economists who helped prepare it on Canada's behalf. I had complete confidence, too, in the Department of External Affairs which negotiated the protocol, and complete confidence in the ability of the engineering staff led by Mr. Gordon MacNabb who looked into all the details of the negotiations.

For these reasons I entered the committee with prejudice. The question was studied during the hearings—there were probably 48 or 49 sittings through which I sat—and I came away more confident than ever that this treaty is in the best interests of Canada, of British Columbia and of everyone concerned. We studied it from the point of view of power, flood control and diversion. I do not intend to go into all these details; they have been adequately dealt with by other speakers. If any hon. member is still in doubt after

[Mr. Pascoe.]

listening to the speeches already made on this subject, I suggest he refer to the large volume containing the records of our hearings where he will find that the matters I have mentioned are thoroughly gone into.

As I have said, I came away more confident than ever that Canadian rights are protected, that our sovereignty is protected and that this treaty is in the best interests of everyone concerned. So I stand here as the representative of one of the constituencies in the interior of British Columbia, thoroughly endorsing the treaty because of direct interest as well as national interest. I conclude by saying to the house once more: Let us get on with the job.

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Before proceeding with the main portion of my remarks I cannot resist commenting on the observations made by the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Willoughby) with respect to his confidence in the terms of the original treaty—his confidence in the actions of the present government and in Mr. Fulton's magic. Does he not remember that when Mr. Fulton appeared before the committee and was asked if he still confirmed his previously expressed opinion that this was the biggest sell-out in history since Manhattan island was sold by the Indians, he did not withdraw those remarks?

Mr. Willoughby: May I ask the hon. member a question? Would he tell the house how those remarks originated? They were entirely in connection with the downstream benefits—the benefits being sold rather than returned to British Columbia.

Mr. Herridge: Quite right, and they are being sold today in the very circumstances about which the former minister of justice complained.

Mr. Willoughby: Different circumstances.

Mr. Herridge: I am not answering any more questions. I have a lot to say. The only answer the former minister of justice had to make to the committee with respect to his change of view is that there was an election and it was the second time this tragic figure in Canadian political history, the former minister of justice, bowed his head to the premier of British Columbia in defeat. Certainly, there had been an election, but the election in British Columbia was not on the Columbia question throughout the province.

Mr. Macdonald: On a question of privilege. Obviously, I hold no brief for the former