

*Columbia River Treaty*

instructions given me this is a very good illustration of the following; that answers to questions—and this would include questions too—should be as precise as possible, should deal with the matter raised and should not provoke debate. I think, in order to be strictly impartial and fair, it should apply to both parties.

**NATIONAL DEFENCE****CANADIAN PARTICIPATION IN UNITED STATES  
MILITARY EXERCISE**

On the orders of the day:

**Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Associate Minister of National Defence whether he has an answer to a question which I put to the Minister of National Defence on May 26, and to which I have received no answer up to date.

**Hon. Lucien Cardin (Associate Minister of National Defence):** I am not aware of that particular question.

**LABOUR RELATIONS****BRITISH COLUMBIA—FREEDOM OF WORKERS TO  
JOIN UNION OF CHOICE**

On the orders of the day:

**Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni):** I have a question for the Minister of Labour, of which I have given him notice. I view of the fact that MacMillan, Bloedel and Powell River Limited, the largest industrial concern in the province of British Columbia, is currently trampling upon the principles of the I.L.O. convention respecting the right of workers freely to enjoy the protection of the union of their choice, will the minister use his good offices with Mr. J. V. Clyne, the head of that company, to alter the course of action presently being pursued by his company?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. This is a question for the order paper.

**AIRPORTS****DORVAL—ALLEGED RESTRICTION ON ACCESS BY  
TAXIS**

On the orders of the day:

[*Translation*]

**Mr. L. J. Pigeon (Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Trans-

Does the government intend to allow taxi drivers of the Montreal area to have access to Dorval airport, thus taking away that monopoly from the Murray Hill Company?

[*Text*]

**Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Transport):** If the hon. gentleman will put his question on the order paper I will be glad to seek an answer.

**POWER****COLUMBIA RIVER—APPROVAL OF RATIFICATION  
OF TREATY**

The house resumed, from Wednesday, June 3, consideration of the motion of Mr. Martin (Essex East):

That it is expedient that the houses of parliament do approve the ratification of the treaty between Canada and the United States of America relating to co-operative development of the water resources of the Columbia river basin, signed at Washington on January 17, 1961, and the consequent coming into force of the protocol thereto annexed to the exchange of notes signed at Washington on January 22, 1964, and that this house do approve the same.

**Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood):** When the debate was adjourned last night I was discussing the right of diversion for consumptive use—

**Mr. Davis:** On a question of privilege. A few minutes last evening before the hon. member for Greenwood remarked that it was five o'clock, he referred to a statement which he attributed to myself. He said that with respect to rights of diversion from the Columbia pursuant to the treaty there was ambiguity. He used the word "ambiguity" and chose, also, to attribute it to me. May I say I have never used the word in that connection.

**Mr. Brewin:** I will, of course, accept what the hon. member has just said. He did not use the word "ambiguous". However, he used a similar word having the same meaning.

What I was discussing when the debate adjourned last night was the view which we hold that the right of diversion for consumptive use provided for in article XIII of the treaty and paragraph 6 of the protocol was illusory as far as any practical diversion to the prairie provinces was concerned because any such diversion, to be economic, would have to be for multiple use including the generation of power, which is explicitly excluded under the terms of the definition