

The Address—Mr. Herridge

the years 1949, 1950, and 1951. Neither navigation locks nor fishways are provided, but provision is made for transferring salmon from the downstream side of the dam to tributary waters in the United States.

Now, it appears that, regardless of article II of the Oregon treaty, no representations of any kind whatsoever were made by any Canadian government to the government of the United States to protect Canadian interests. In this connection I wish to refer to *Hansard* of June 13, 1935. This matter was first mentioned in the house by the former member of New Westminster, Mr. Thomas Reid, who took a great interest in it because of his general interest in the Pacific salmon fisheries. He has always been interested in wanting to find out the effect of the building of dams, the damming of waters, on the spawning of fish, so far as the salmon industry is concerned.

I would ask the house to bear with me while I quote from page 3590 of *Hansard*, June 13, 1935:

Navigation of Columbia River

Mr. Reid: "According to a treaty entered into in 1846 between the United States of America and Her Majesty on behalf of Canada for the settlement of the Oregon boundary, in clause 2 thereof, it was expressly agreed that the Columbia river and its branches were to be kept open for the free use and navigation of all British subjects from the 49th parallel of north latitude to the Pacific ocean,—

1. Is the government aware that the provisions of this clause have been violated?

2. If so, what steps have been taken to protect the interests of the Canadian people so as to keep inviolate the provisions of the treaty and particularly clause 2 of the agreement?

3. If not, will steps be taken to see that the terms of the treaty are lived up to in every particular?"

Mr. Bennett: The question does not quite correctly state the terms of the treaty of 1846 for the settlement of the Oregon boundary. The second clause of the treaty reads as follows:

"From the point at which the 49th parallel of north latitude shall be found to intersect the great northern branch of the Columbia river, the navigation of the said branch shall be free and open to the Hudson's Bay Company, and to all British subjects trading with the same, to the point where the said branch meets the main stream of the Columbia, and thence down the said main stream to the ocean, with free access into and through the said river or rivers; it being understood, that all the usual portages along the line thus described, shall in like manner be free and open."

The government is fully aware of the development which is taking place in the lower Columbia river, in the United States of America, and of the possible relation of that development to article II of the treaty. It would not be in accordance with public policy for the government to state at this stage whether or not they are of the opinion that the treaty has been violated or may be violated by the completion of the construction plans which are under way. The question will continue to receive the attention of the government.

Although Mr. Bennett replied in that manner at that time I do not think any one can find evidence that the Conservative govern-

[Mr. Herridge.]

ment headed by Mr. Bennett of that day or the Liberal government since, has made any representations to the United States in respect to the violation of article II of the Oregon treaty and with respect to Canadian interests and rights.

The objections to the effects of the dam are two. There is interference with the salmon coming up to the upper reaches of the Columbia for spawning purposes, and there is interference with navigation to the sea. I realize that the direction of development has changed since early days, even since 1914, when there was considerable discussion concerning navigation on the Columbia; but I do not think that, in view of the fact that we surrendered a right which had been extended to us forever in article II of the Oregon treaty, the government of Canada should have attempted to protect our rights and to obtain some reasonable compensation.

I submit that all governments of Canada have failed to realize the immense developments that are possible in the Columbia river basin on the Canadian side of the boundary. In the past they have failed to give attention to the potential value of that rich and productive area. A satisfactory development of the Columbia river basin depends upon joint action by the governments of the United States and Canada. I am quite certain that if the government of this country approached the government of the United States our claims would receive reasonable consideration. I know personally that officials of certain departments of the United States government were quite surprised when no protest was made by the Canadian government about the violation of the Oregon treaty and the interference with fish coming up to the upper reaches of the Columbia.

This matter is important to the constituency which I represent, and to the surrounding constituencies, as well as to the people of British Columbia and the Canadian people generally. I submit that under the circumstances we are fully justified in making a claim for adequate compensation for the surrender of those rights.

The residents of my constituency are much concerned about the continuance and improvement of steamship service on the Arrow and Kootenay lakes. We realize that for many years the Canadian Pacific Railway operated a splendid service on these and other interior lakes, but since the building of the new lines traffic has lessened and the service has gone downhill because it is being operated at a considerable loss. In view of this situation with regard to the Oregon treaty, the loss of our right of navigation and other rights, I should like to make two or three suggestions.