

*International Rivers*

The federal authorities apparently did not, and do not now, consider this a good proposition. I checked the speech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce rather carefully. I do not remember the number of times that he used the expression "in the national interest" or something comparable to it. From the number of references I cannot help but conclude that he must construe some proposition, and I do not know of any proposition which he may have in mind other than the one in British Columbia, to be opposed to the national interest. I repeat that we have not had placed before us sound arguments to substantiate that position. We are still waiting for them.

The minister also has referred to the undesirability, if there is such a word, of the short-term benefits. No one has established the fact as yet that these benefits may be short-term. I see substantial benefits over a considerable period of time. If my understanding of the proposed agreement is correct, after a specified period of time the works become the property of British Columbia. The minister used the term now and again, "inconsistent with the longer national view". I should like to know what he considers to be inconsistent. He used a broad, general expression which might refer to one thing or everything. If he believes that the Kaiser proposition is inconsistent with the longer national view, then I would suggest the minister is under an obligation to show us wherein it is not in the interests of Canada for the indefinite future.

The minister also has used the expression in his speech, "not the most advantageous development of a water system." We have not yet been given any clear-cut definition of what he means by the so-called advantageous development of the water system. Reference is made in the bill itself to this expression. I should like to know just exactly the type of proposition that the minister would lay alongside the Kaiser dam proposition which would be a more advantageous system for British Columbia and for Canada. It may be, but I want to hear what it is. We have not yet heard that.

The minister also referred to any scheme having to fit in with the general picture of water and power requirements in Canada. Well, the hon. member for Peace River asked the minister to give us the picture of the over-all national policy in this field. Until we do have such a picture it is virtually impossible for anyone, including the minister, to say that a certain proposed project does or does not fit into the so-called national picture of water and power requirements in Canada.

[Mr. Shaw.]

The minister also referred in his speech to certain works which do not include appropriate safeguards to protect the national interest. That expression also cropped up. But did he or did anyone point to this project and establish the fact that it does not include appropriate safeguards to protect the national interest? During the course of this debate I have heard no one undertake that.

What exactly is required by way of safeguards? We are waiting for an announcement concerning those safeguards. In what way and to what extent does the proposed project in British Columbia not fit into such a pattern? If it does not fit into such a specific pattern it is because of the fact that no pattern exists at this time.

The minister also referred to the fact that the rights of individuals in both countries must be protected. In what way and to what extent does this proposed project fail to protect individual rights? If it does not give that protection, then I am waiting to hear someone point out wherein it fails to do so. I understand—and I refer to what was said by the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Herridge)—that where damage may be done to property along the Arrow lakes, and where flooding may be caused, compensation is provided, as it is provided in all such projects. I took it from what was said by the hon. member for Kootenay West that if any project in Canada interfered in any way with one house or one acre of land, then a project such as that should be damned and not proceeded with. And I am not using that word in the sense of the holding back of water.

**Mr. Herridge:** That is not only the opinion of the hon. member for Kootenay West; it is the opinion of people in the Arrow lakes district.

**Mr. Shaw:** I would assume that the hon. member was quoting with approval. I could not help understanding, from his observations, that he was in agreement. Certainly he did not say, "My people say this, but I disagree with them".

**Mr. Herridge:** I am representing my people.

**Mr. Shaw:** I think it is assumed that if I rise in the House of Commons and advocate a certain proposal, either I am in agreement with it myself or I make it clear that I am not.

The minister brought out a number of points with which I should like to deal. However, I have an amendment, and I am sure the house would like to hear it before ten o'clock so that hon. members may reflect upon it over the week end.