

*Columbia River Treaty*

problem of diversion, and the treaty was specifically negotiated to take care of all matters with regard to diversion with the exception of diversion for power purposes. Obviously this reservation had to be made because this was, after all, a treaty for the development of power, and there had to be a reservation of this character. There is no restriction on diversion for consumptive purposes—

**Mr. Herridge:** That is pure hypocrisy.

**Mr. Dinsdale:**—and that includes irrigation and all ordinary domestic uses.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is just one other aspect with which I want to deal before my time expires. We must take into consideration the fact that this treaty was not negotiated in isolation. It was the hon. member for Greenwood who said that we wondered why he, a Torontonian, was taking part in this discussion. He has every right to take part in this discussion. The Columbia river treaty was part of a broad policy of national development of the former Conservative administration. A new policy enunciation to permit the export of power, was a break-away from the old, outworn Liberal policy which had operated since after world war I. There was a decision to go ahead with plans for a national power grid which would make it possible to build, first of all on a regional and provincial basis and then on a national basis, long distance high voltage transmission lines which would make it possible to shunt power back and forth across the country. This makes power a basic consideration in relation to this treaty.

I have one final word, Mr. Speaker. I feel I should utter a word of caution about the importance of emphasizing the wise management and multiple use concept in any resource development. Critics of the treaty have indicated that there has not been sufficient provision for the intangible values in the treaty. I agree heartily and enthusiastically with this viewpoint. This is something that comes under the jurisdiction of the province of British Columbia. We have had repeated assurances from the B.C. hydroelectric authority and from the representatives of the provincial government that these matters are being taken into consideration. This subject, of course, lies within the responsibility of that province. I am sure that if we look at this objectively, if we look at this without any narrow political bias, if we look at this in terms of the long term economic importance of the development of this resource,

[Mr. Dinsdale.]

we will all agree that the Columbia river treaty is a good treaty. It was negotiated, as will be revealed by a close examination of the evidence, with the new concept of the development of renewable resources, the wise management and multiple use concept, in mind.

I am not going to venture into the realm of prophecy as to how history will judge this treaty. This is beyond my ken and the ken of anyone. I think, having had the privilege of listening to such a large amount of evidence, I can safely say that within our capacity, within the capacity of the former government and the present government and the parliament of Canada, we need have no hesitancy in giving our approval to this treaty.

**Mr. Pascoe:** I have a few words to say on this subject. May I call it one o'clock?

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** Could we go on for a few minutes and complete this speech?

**Mr. Herridge:** One o'clock.

At one o'clock the house took recess.

---

**AFTER RECESS**

The house resumed at 2.30 p.m.

**Mr. J. E. Pascoe (Moose Jaw-Lake Centre):** Mr. Speaker, as I indicated at one o'clock I have a few remarks to make on the Columbia river treaty and two questions to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin), before this very important international agreement passes through the house.

I represent an area of southern Saskatchewan that is vitally interested in assured, adequate water supplies for future development. Other hon. members have emphasized Saskatchewan's situation in this regard and it is not necessary to repeat their statements except to say—and say it very forcibly—that the Saskatchewan river basin is the only significant source of surface water for the settled portion of the prairie region. In the foreseeable future the south branch of the river, the South Saskatchewan river as we call it, in its present drainage basin will not fill all the demands that will be made on it.

My concern over the Columbia river treaty, and I know this concern is shared by my colleagues, is in regard to Saskatchewan's prospects for diversion of additional water where feasible, and when needed. In this