

*Columbia River Treaty*

must have been influences operating today which affected the normally steady course which he takes in the house.

I have paid my tribute to the chairman and vice chairman of the committee. But because of things that have been said today and things that were implied earlier,—as this is the final statement before we vote—I should like to say that we have reason to be grateful not only to the members of the committee. All of us in the house and in this country have an obligation to recognize the contributions made by public servants in Canada's service and in the service of British Columbia over a long period of time, because this matter has been before the Canadian people in one way or another for 20 years.

Having in mind what I know about the work that has been put into the matter by devoted public servants, I would be failing in my duty if I did not pay tribute to those who have done so much over the years to enable us, the legislators, to form a judgment on this matter. I am sure members of the opposition who formed the last government will agree with me that we have every reason to be proud of our public servants, and particularly of those in our public service who advised this government and the former government in the consideration which they had to give to this matter. Because some names have been mentioned today, I want to say that we in this country owe a great debt to the clerk of the privy council, Mr. Gordon Robertson, a former deputy minister of northern affairs, to Mr. Gordon MacNabb of the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources, as brilliant an engineer as will be found in this country, who made such an impression on every member of the committee; to Mr. Ed. Ritchie, the assistant under secretary responsible for the economic division of the Department of External Affairs; to Mr. Olson of the Department of Justice; to Mr. Parkinson of the Department of Finance; and to Mr. Kingstone of the legal division of external affairs. While he was not here, there was a young Canadian engineer from British Columbia, Mr. William Chin, the son of a Chinese, a very brilliant young engineer, who spent ten years working on this project. These are the men to whom we have every reason to express our gratitude. I have mentioned their names only because, in the course of debate, I regret to say there have been suggestions of incompetence, which I believe were very unjustly applied. Canada has never been served more ably than by

these men and perhaps by one or two other public servants whose names I have not mentioned. The same thing is true of a number of engineers in the service of the government of British Columbia who had much to do with the negotiations long before I had any responsibility for them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to cover all of the arguments that have been advanced in this particular debate. The evidence, as the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) pointed out, is before this house, some 1,500 pages of it. This evidence deals with every point that has been discussed in the debate today and yesterday, as well with many more. I believe that every point made today, and others not covered today, have been answered and, according to the majority of the members of this committee, adequately answered.

One cannot expect full agreement on a matter so complicated and so vital as this. But I think one should, after the careful study that has been made, at least be prepared to recognize that the majority are entitled to the same consideration as those of the minority who take a dissident position. This has not been the viewpoint, however, of some of those who have criticized the treaty and protocol. The critical arguments that have been used against the treaty and protocol in this part of the debate were not those, for the most part, that were used when this matter first came before the house on March 3.

The hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas) said that the members on this side have not taken part in this debate at all. He tried to imply that there were no members on this side interested in the subject. My hon. friend knows this is not the case. He will recall that there was a debate on March 3 when I made a very extensive statement, the length of which was criticized by one of my hon. friend's own supporters. Many hon. members, whose interjections today represented their enthusiasm if not always their full appreciation of the way to get things settled, took part in that debate and were very active members of the committee.

There are members in the official opposition who did not speak in this debate but took part in the debate when the matter first came before the house. Some of them were very active members of the committee. There are one or two of them sitting before me in the official opposition now who have not taken part in this debate but who applied themselves energetically in the committee to the