

*Columbia River Treaty*

The day has passed when any government or executive should feel that they should take it upon themselves, without the approval of parliament, to commit a country to obligations involving any considerable financial outlays or active undertakings.

In all cases where obligations of such a character are being assumed internationally, parliament itself should be assured of having the full right—

I underline those words:

—of approving what is done before binding commitments are made. I would not confine parliamentary approval only to those matters which involve military sanctions and the like. I feel parliamentary approval should apply where there are involved matters of large expenditure or political considerations of a far reaching character.

I know the Secretary of State for External Affairs will say, "Oh, well; we have submitted this to parliament"; but it was submitted to parliament under conditions in which parliament could have no opportunity, unless it wished to throw out the government, to do anything more than rubber stamp the treaty. I suggest it is time serious consideration were given to deciding whether or not, before the final details of a treaty of this sort are negotiated, this treaty should be submitted to a committee for external affairs and examined, so that, the evidence having been taken, parliament and its representatives would be free to suggest changes and would have some meaningful participation in that treaty. This is the situation, of course, in the United States, where the Senate can attach riders. We think there should be the same situation here.

I think I have only a very few minutes left, Mr. Speaker, and I do not propose to go into any detail in describing this particular treaty. As a matter of fact, it has been described very much better than I could describe it by the hon. member for Coast-Capilano and will see if I can find the words that he used in speaking of this particular treaty. Because he was a little sensitive and said I did not quote him correctly before, I will try and get the exact words that he used.

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** This was before the protocol, was it not?

**Mr. Brewin:** Yes.

**Mr. Orlikow:** And before the election.

**An hon. Member:** That is more important than the protocol.

**Mr. Brewin:** If the Secretary of State for External Affairs will be patient, I will deal with the protocol.

20220—250½

**An hon. Member:** The protocol was as a result of the election.

**Mr. Brewin:** I entirely agree with the hon. member who suggested that this was before the protocol and before the election; that is absolutely true. I am having a little difficulty finding the particular reference that I have in mind, Mr. Speaker, but I can remember what the hon. member said with perfect clarity, and he can tell me later if I have not quoted him exactly. What did he say? First of all he said this treaty was a fiasco; second, he said that the treaty was one of which no government could be proud; third, he said the treaty was a sell-out; fourth, he said it was an embarrassing treaty. Those are the words he used. I think I can give him the exact reference later, but I do not seem to have it in front of me at the moment.

**Mr. Davis:** Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) accept a question—just one question?

**Mr. Brewin:** My time is nearly up.

**Mr. Davis:** Would the hon. member say that a treaty which involved obligations and no conceivable source of revenue was other than a fiasco, a sell-out, and so on?

**Mr. Brewin:** I will say this to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, that the points to which he objected have not been in any way changed by the protocol.

**Mr. Davis:** And the sale.

**Mr. Brewin:** The only difference in relation to the sale is that instead of getting power we are getting cash; but the basic objections the hon. member had—and I think they were good objections—have not been altered by the protocol at all. I say that even though his words were used in different circumstances, they are absolutely applicable today. We accept them and we ask this house to reject a treaty which has been described by one whom I think is the best qualified member on the Liberal side of the house to deal with this matter as a sell-out and a fiasco. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, this treaty is one that should be renegotiated.

I just wish to conclude by moving, seconded by the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge), the following amendment:

That the resolution before the house be amended by adding thereto the following words:

"Subject to the negotiation of a further protocol or an exchange of letters clarifying the right of Canada to divert up to 6,000 c.f.s. or 5 million