

Mr. DINSDALE: Perhaps it is somewhat reassuring to point out that the chief Canadian negotiator for this treaty, the Hon. Davie Fulton, did state to this committee that full and complete recognition of the needs for the diversion of the Columbia river to meet the so called consumptive needs was given during negotiations. He stated to this committee a few days ago that consumptive needs were considered and that after the expiration of the treaty complete diversion could be taken into consideration to look after the potential needs on the prairies. Are you aware of that statement made by Mr. Fulton?

Mr. CASS-BEGGS: Yes. Our only objection is that this is not in some way or other incorporated in the treaty or the protocol. A practical proposition would be to have the sentiments that have been reported embodied in clear words in an exchange of notes.

Mr. DINSDALE: We have had a long discussion in respect of the legal aspects of that problem and I do not think we were able to come to any conclusions as a result of that discussion. I would say that a statement of that type made by the man who is most concerned should be a reasonably reassuring point.

Mr. CASS-BEGGS: The document Mr. Strayer was quoting from which sets out the principles on which the treaty was negotiated, was approved and signed by Mr. Fulton. This is the document which gives us our cause for alarm.

Mr. DINSDALE: Mr. Chairman, I think this is a matter of interpretation only.

Mr. CASS-BEGGS: Perhaps I may make one further comment. It seems to me that the main grounds for misgivings on the part of the government of Saskatchewan result from the fact that there is no documentary evidence or reference in the protocol to permit the kind of power development that is economically necessary for a diversion for consumptive uses. The treaty, so to speak, provided a pound of flesh but not a drop of hydro, and a pound of consumptive use, but by ruling out the hydro developments there is no possibility in fact of the Columbia river being diverted for consumptive use. If what is said has any meaning in terms of diversion for consumptive uses, surely there should be no objection to making this clear at this time so we will know that water can be diverted for consumptive uses in a multiple purpose project, which is the only method of making such a diversion feasible.

Mr. DINSDALE: I think that is all I wish to say, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you have any questions to ask Mr. Haidasz?

Mr. HAIASZ: I have asked all my questions Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands*): Mr. Chairman I have several very short questions to ask Mr. MacNeill.

Mr. MacNeill, would you turn to page 30 of the Montreal Engineering Company brief, which I think is on the table before you? You will see at the bottom of that page that there is a section dealing with the diversion of the Columbia river waters, and at the top of page 31 in reference to this diversion the brief states:

The need for such diversion in the foreseeable future, however, is improbable and should not be allowed to impede the development of power on the Canadian Columbia river.

As director of the South Saskatchewan Development Commission would you concur in that sentence Mr. MacNeill?

Mr. MACNEILL: No, and I think that should be obvious from our presentation this morning and our forecast of the needs of the prairie provinces for water in the next 30 to 40 years. I have glanced at the Montreal Engineering