

Columbia River Treaty

evidence, as found on page 29, volume 2 of the reports of the standing committee on external affairs:

In my judgment the treaty and protocol represent the best possible arrangement from Canada's point of view. I believe that this agreement, this arrangement, will serve well the national interest. At the same time I think it is important to emphasize that it reflects the wishes of the province of British Columbia where the river is located. It is also far better for Canada than anything we could do on our own without United States co-operation. In fact, one engineering report after another has indicated that without co-operation with the United States the economics of developing the Canadian stretch of the Columbia would be doubtful indeed. Whatever else may be said in these hearings, I hope that these basic facts will be kept in mind.

Further, on page 40 he comments as follows on article XIII of the treaty, the provision which permits diversion, and again this is the particular point I want to make:

Now, there is not any doubt in my mind that under article XIII of the treaty there is a clear right of diversion for consumptive uses, and what has to be read with this is the fact that the province is the owner of the resource.

I would suggest that, in saying that, he thinks that whatever is to be done has to be done with the consent of the province. Later, in commenting on the protocol to the treaty, which he was mainly instrumental in negotiating, he re-emphasizes this view by saying, as found on page 65 of the same report:

Doubt was also expressed whether article XIII (1) of the treaty in a positive enough way gave Canada the right to make diversions of Columbia waters for consumptive uses such as irrigation, domestic and municipal needs. Argument will be prevented on this point by this item's re-affirmation of Canada's right to make such diversions. In connection with the definition of "consumptive use" in the treaty it should be pointed out that the fact that water being diverted for a consumptive use such as irrigation also produces hydroelectric power en route either as an integral or incidental part of the total operation—

Again I should like to emphasize these final words.

—does not result in that diversion ceasing to be a diversion for a consumptive use.

I should like to re-emphasize that last idea. The water may be used for the development of electric power on its way, if its prime use is for irrigation or other consumptive use. Since the prairies will want the water for consumptive uses primarily and not mainly for power, there should be no trouble at all with diversions.

None of us in this house can fail to respect the intelligence and capacity of Mr. Davie Fulton and the Secretary of State for External Affairs and their interest in the future of Canada, and in this instance I am compelled to agree with their opinions. Saskatchewan's opportunity to use the water they want in the future is in my view established in the treaty. This being so, I intend to support it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the house ready for the question?

Mr. Colin Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Since the government members who are so enthusiastic about this treaty are so coy about taking part in the debate, I will proceed now. I have no illusions about the outcome of this treaty. I am well aware that it is going to be ratified. I am quite well aware that the opinions and attitudes displayed in the external affairs committee will be reflected in the House of Commons. One may perhaps ask, why take part in what is essentially an exercise in futility, in butting one's head against a stone wall? I feel it is the responsibility of those who have been members of the external affairs committee during these hearings to place on the record some of the story as to the manner in which this treaty was brought before parliament and before the external affairs committee, and some account of those who gave evidence to that committee. I think also it is as well to put on the record some account of the manner in which the government of Canada has protected the rights of the Canadian people for whom they are responsible.

I should like to deal first of all with the nature of the government's presentation to the external affairs committee. Without in any way implying even the slightest suggestion of incompetence on the part of these witnesses called by the government, I think it is only right to point out that all three engineering firms, who were described in the proceedings of our committee as independent witnesses, are involved in the construction program of the British Columbia hydro and power authority on the Columbia project. Each one of them is a *parti pris* to the treaty plan and to call them independent witnesses is, I think, stretching matters rather badly.

Then, we had another technical expert brought before the committee by the government. He was a young man, I am sure of great intelligence, who in the course of time will undoubtedly become an eminent figure