

Columbia River Treaty

in his profession. However, when we discovered that this young man had graduated from university only ten years ago and since that time had been exclusively employed by the water resources branch of the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources and had no experience at all as either a consultant or an assistant in the planning of a major complex scheme of hydroelectric power such as is involved in this treaty, then we were forced to ask ourselves some questions as to why he was brought before the committee as the government's sole technical witness. We were faced with two alternative interpretations, Mr. Speaker. Either the government was treating the committee with contempt and not producing the most important of their technical advisers before that committee or this young man, brilliant no doubt but with very scant experience, was in actual fact the chief technical adviser to the government of Canada and to the negotiating committee. I lay no claim at all, Mr. Speaker, to any knowledge or expertise in the field of engineering. However, as the son of a man who was of considerable eminence both in Europe and North America in that field, I have some idea of the length of experience that is required before an engineer can be considered as a competent adviser to a government in connection with a scheme of this magnitude and complexity.

When in the course of examination it came out that this young man, brilliant no doubt as I say, was in actual fact the chief technical adviser to the government of Canada and to the negotiating committee, one could only have very grave misgivings as to the adequacy of Canada's representation in these negotiations. When we find that this is the only engineer brought before the committee, then one can only be dismayed at the attitude of the Canadian government, at the care that the Canadian government has exercised in performing its functions in protecting the rights of the people of Canada.

Now there were, sir, some independent witnesses of technical competence who came before the committee about whom there can be no possible doubt of either their special interest or the pressure from their employers. I have in mind two of them in particular, one of them an economist and the other an engineer. They came before the committee at their own expense and in defiance of the disapproval of their employers. I have no hesitation in placing their names on the record because I think their conduct was ad-

[Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands).]

mirable, an admirable display of courage and public spirit that should earn the admiration of everyone who sat in those hearings. I refer to Mr. Larratt Higgins, an economist of the Ontario hydro authority, who came to Ottawa at his own expense, prepared a brief at his own expense for the use of the committee, and came here in defiance of the disapproval of his employers, who finally made it a condition that he only come here as long as he made it clear he was not representing the Ontario hydro authority who had, understandably, misgivings about being involved with affairs concerning another provincial hydro authority. The other is Mr. Richard Deane, the chief hydroelectrical engineer for the West Kootenay Light and Power, a subsidiary of the giant Cominco concern, supported as my colleagues have said by 23 other engineers in that district, who came here at his own expense and again in defiance of the disapproval of his employers. I think, sir, the status of these men in the eyes of their employers is signified by the fact that they were able to insist on their right to do their duty as they saw it as citizens, no matter how much their employers may disapprove.

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I hear that the government members are very anxious to have this carried before they hear something said about it.

There was a third witness with whom I shall deal because I feel very disturbed about the treatment that witness received from the various committee members. This was an elderly gentleman from Vancouver, a man who for many, many years has enjoyed a reputation in the engineering field second to none. I happen to have met Mr. Bartholomew many years ago in my father's office in Vancouver when I was a very young man newly returned from the war.

I can recall the high opinion my father had of this engineer who, at this time, was also a comparatively young man. I am sure Mr. Bartholomew would not object if I suggest that due to his age he was unable to withstand—and I am going to use the word "harry," because it was—the harrying tactics of some government members in their cross-examination; but no one should run away with the idea that Mr. Bartholomew, 79 years of age though he be, is not an extremely intelligent, well trained and experienced engineer with experience not just in