

*Columbia River Treaty*

of operation of Canadian storage the optimization of benefits for the entire system and by requiring joint approval of any operating plans that depart from system optimization.

This gives the United States a veto over anything we do in our storages, Mr. Speaker:

3. The recompense we are to receive under the... treaty is far from equitable either for flood control or power. For power, we receive only 40 per cent of the downstream benefits and even this amount declines over the years while the actual value of our storage to the United States actually increases. For flood control, \$64 million (in United States funds) is the payment for a service that would cost the United States \$700 million to perform itself.

The next question is, "Has the protocol done much to improve upon the treaty", and General McNaughton said in this regard:

The servitude on Canada was serious under the treaty, as I have been at pains to point out and explain to Mr. Martin, and he has admitted the cogency of the warning I have given, but in the protocol he has indeed, in fact, made our position very much worse—

I was going to make a reference to Mr. Fulton on this subject, but the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Willoughby) provided me with an introduction along those lines. Once again let me say I have a great deal of sympathy for Mr. Fulton, who himself made this the issue in the provincial election, but that it was not the issue is clearly indicated from the results of his efforts.

We listened to the evidence presented to the committee by Hon. Paul Martin, Secretary of State for External Affairs, and I pay him a tribute as a great political engineer. I notice from the minutes of the committee proceedings that we heard evidence from the Secretary of State for External Affairs, officials of the various branches of the federal government, the government of British Columbia, with Hon. R. G. Williston, minister of lands, forests and water resources, Hon. R. W. Bonner, Q.C., attorney general; A. F. Paget, deputy minister of water resources, and Gordon Kidd, deputy comptroller of water rights. From the government of Saskatchewan we listened to one of the finest briefs that came before that committee. I am sorry that more hon. members have not read that brief thoroughly, or they would not be adopting the arguments of the Secretary of State for External Affairs with regard to the question as to whether the rights of diversion into the South Saskatchewan river are preserved. Certainly they are, for consumptive uses, but they should ask the minister whether they can at the same time produce the hydro-

[Mr. Herridge.]

electric power necessary to make this economical. That is the complete question.

Then we had evidence from David Cass-Beggs, general manager, Saskatchewan Power Corporation; J. W. MacNeill, executive director, south Saskatchewan river development commission; Barry Strayer, associate professor, college of law, University of Saskatchewan. Then, from the British Columbia hydro and power authority we heard from Dr. H. L. Keenleyside, chairman of the hydro authority, and other officials. In the report of the committee there is also mention of special witnesses, General Hon. A. G. L. McNaughton, C.H., C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., former chairman, Canadian section, international joint commission; Hon. E. D. Fulton, P.C., Q.C., former minister of justice and chief negotiator, Columbia river treaty. He gave what I would term his political sunset address before the committee.

Then we had engineering consultants and firms and many other interesting witnesses, including Mr. Larratt Higgins, Mr. F. J. Bartholomew, Mr. Richard Deane, and numerous representatives of labour and other organizations. I just want to mention in this respect, before passing on, that the great concern of many people who have been interested in this treaty has been from the water aspect of it. Power can be produced in other ways in years to come, but the evidence indicates that water is becoming more and more valuable. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I want to quote from the *Globe and Mail* of Tuesday, June 2, 1964. The article is headed, "Water distribution feared crisis of future", and it says:

The problem of distributing fresh water to the people of the world has not yet reached the crisis stage but it must get priority attention if a serious emergency is to be avoided, a U.S. waterworks engineer told the American water works association in Toronto yesterday.

W. R. LaDue, who lectures foreign engineers at the University of Akron, Ohio, said 75 per cent of the world's people live in communities with contaminated water.

He told his audience of waterworks engineers from most parts of the United States and Canada that the total of all the world's water does not decrease through use, but, as world population increases, the amount per person falls off. Distribution is becoming a major headache, he said.

Since yesterday I have had brought to my attention as a result of the excellent remarks on this aspect of the question by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) a report entitled "Natural Resources in 1984" by Mr. Michel Batisse, chief of the natural resources research division, UNESCO, Paris.