

Columbia River Treaty

minister of justice, but what I do say is that the hon. member for Kootenay West is misrepresenting the situation. The former minister made it clear to the committee that he had changed his opinion on this matter, because with Peace river power going into the British Columbia system there would be no market for the downstream benefits of the Columbia project. That was his reason; not what the hon. member said.

Mr. Herridge: The former minister of justice said he had not changed his opinion or the reasons for his previous remarks. He said there had been an election, and he mentioned the Peace power development.

An hon. Member: There was an election.

Mr. Herridge: There was an election, but the election was not on this issue; the election was on the issue of highways, home owner grants and so on. Where there was an election on this issue, let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, was in Kootenay West in the federal election of 1963; and the only candidate of the four running with me who came out in full support of all aspects of the Columbia river treaty was at the bottom of the poll, the Social Credit candidate, with something over 4,000 votes. The candidate from the hon. member's party came out against the treaty; he stood on the platform with me and that Liberal candidate and I were both denouncing this iniquitous treaty. That was an election where this was an issue, because I represent a constituency which is greatly concerned with this matter. I must get on, Mr. Speaker, or else the hatchet man from Rosedale will be taking my time, and I hope that if he does, Your Honour—

Mr. Macdonald: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member said I will be taking his time. I can assure him it would be much better used, if I did, than any use he would make of it.

Mr. Herridge: That is a matter of opinion; but that represents the quality of the hon. member's remarks to the committee. I would ask him to wait till I have finished what I have to say this afternoon.

Mr. Douglas: He has been very quiet throughout this debate, you will notice.

Mr. Macdonald: Why don't you follow my example?

Mr. Douglas: That is the worst thing I could do.

Mr. Herridge: I rise this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, to express our complete opposition

to this treaty as a very bad treaty for Canada. I say that from a completely non-partisan point of view, which point of view is supported by prominent Liberals, by prominent Conservative and some members of the Social Credit party in my own constituency, plus a large number of my party fans who have continued to support me throughout the vicissitudes of 19 years of political life. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I want to quote one of General McNaughton's recent statements which was supported and endorsed by Mr. Larratt Higgins, Mr. James Ripley, Mr. F. J. Bartholomew and other engineers. I am doing this, Mr. Speaker, in order to save my time and present in as few words as possible my basic argument. The question is, "What are the basic objectives for Canada?" In this connection General McNaughton said the following:

—too many people have overlooked the basic purpose of the treaty, which, for Canada, is to secure the best possible development of the Canadian section of the Columbia basin. The United States has developed its section in its own way. Our essential objective must be to develop our section in our own best interest, then share with the United States the added benefits that stem from co-operative use of the water.

No treaty on the Columbia can serve Canada effectively, unless it satisfies the following three principles:

1. As much of the water which is stored in Canada as possible must be stored at as high an elevation as supply permits. This allows the best physical use of this resource for both countries and provides the most flexibility for all time to adapt to changing needs as these needs develop.

The first of these will be an increasing need for irrigation.

2. Control of the waters stored in the Canadian part of the basin must remain in Canadian hands, just as the United States insists, rightly, on complete control of its flows.

3. Over and above the development that each country does for itself, the further benefits that can be achieved by co-operative effort must be shared equitably.

The next question, Mr. Speaker, is, "Does the treaty meet the basic objectives for Canada?" General McNaughton said:

The...treaty offends...in almost every article.

1. Storage at the highest elevation means the fullest use of reservoirs at Mica and Bull river-Luxor. The...treaty does precisely the opposite by placing most of the storage along the United States border in high Arrow and Libby, which are at the lowest possible points available.

2. Control of the Kootenay flows is placed entirely in United States hands because Libby is in United States territory and Canada has no right under the treaty...to control the outflow. Control of the Columbia river flows is placed effectively in United States hands by...physically locating high Arrow at the border where it is of little use to Canada, and...making the criterion