

mimeographed copies of their full report on which this summary is based may be obtained at a cost of \$1 per copy at 300 St. Sacramento Street, Montreal 1, Quebec. This is just an extract from that, but it is a very interesting extract or summary of it.

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): Thank you.

Hon. Mr. MacKenzie: There is another article here from the *Canadian Bar Review* for September 1959, entitled "The Columbia River Controversy." This article also was written by Professor C. B. Bourne. Incidentally, he became something of an authority on this subject because of the little meeting that we had with our American confreres in Washington at the time I spoke of.

The extract I propose to read from the letter in hand is from the head of the Department of Economics at the University of British Columbia, Professor A. D. Scott. He reminds me in his letter that he had been discussing this question of our fresh water resources with another friend and colleague who had been one of the legal advisers of the British Columbia Electric Company before they were taken over.

He said:

In discussing this suggestion with him, I was reminded of the great contribution made by Senate committees of the recent past on manpower, the drug traffic, and land use. All of these full-scale investigations have borne fruit in subsequent years in federal re-organization of federal policy. Doubtless you know of other and better examples.

Two or three of us in this Department take a personal interest in this subject—That is, our fresh water resources.

—although I would not like to suggest to you that research is now proceeding. We would like to assure you, however, of our backing and enthusiasm if you should find it possible to persuade your fellow senators of the worthwhileness of an investigation of this type.

The value of such an investigation is indicated by the recent parliamentary committee enquiry into the Columbia River Treaty. Its only defect was that it took place after the main lines of the Columbia River Agreement had been set, so that short of a massive resistance by

parliament no change could be made on the basis of a committee report.

Those of us who were interested in the Columbia River discussions realized that whereas most of the American groups had done their homework well before the agreement was signed, Canada was getting around to doing its homework only after the event. We are, I think lucky that we came out so well.

I have one or two other similar statements from people in important places in the life and Government of this country, but I do not propose to take any more of your time this evening in reading them to you. All I would do in conclusion is to say that I hope that at some convenient time in the future, either just after the New Year or even next autumn, we might come back to this topic and see if it, as perhaps our most important natural resource, does not deserve further study by this Senate.

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): As honourable senators are aware, there will be a Royal Assent tonight at approximately 9.45. I would therefore suggest that the Senate take recess now to reassemble at the call of the bell at approximately 9.40.

The Senate adjourned during pleasure.

ROYAL ASSENT

The Honourable Robert Taschereau, P.C. Chief Justice of Canada, Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General, having come and being seated at the foot of the Throne, and the House of Commons having been summoned and being come with their Speaker, the Honourable the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to give Royal Assent to the following bill:

An Act to amend the Bank Act and the Quebec Savings Banks Act.

The House of Commons withdrew.

The Honourable the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to retire.

The sitting of the Senate was resumed.

The Senate adjourned until tomorrow at 3 p.m.
