

Trade with Caribbean Federation

its hydro engineer, Professor David Cass-Beggs, a very well known engineer in this field, and whose view I support, was that any practical form of diversion could not be exclusively for the purposes of consumption alone—for irrigation and other related purposes—but in order to be practicable it would have to involve within it the generation of power, not only to pump the water over the Rockies but in order to make the whole development economical; and as the water flowed through the South Saskatchewan river, from which it could be diverted in Alberta and Saskatchewan for irrigation and other purposes—industrial purposes that are becoming growingly important in those provinces and to the development of those provinces—it would inevitably flow through the power plants erected on that river, and must therefore from the beginning be contemplated as for the generation of hydroelectric power. But the definition of “consumptive use” exclusively excludes its use for the generation of hydroelectric power. The real thing therefore is that the use is not merely for consumptive purposes. It is not a use merely for the generation of electric power. It is a multiple use, and that is the only practical use involved.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs, and others putting forward the argument for the government, kept on repeating that if the main purpose is for consumptive use, if this is the real purpose, the primary purpose, or some other sort of clarifying purpose, then Canada has a right to this diversion, but they produced no single opinion to back that up. They refused to inquire from the representatives of the United States whether they agreed with this interpretation, and I challenge that interpretation as being inconsistent with the evidence given, the clear meaning of the words used, and the definition of the words in the treaty.

If perchance I am wrong, if perchance my own view of the clear meaning of these words should be in error, at the very least there is an ambiguity. I see the hon. member for Coast-Capilano (Mr. Davis) sitting in the house, and he put this very frankly in the debate. He said there was an ambiguity in the use of these words. Of course there is an ambiguity, if not worse than an ambiguity.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): But after he heard the Secretary of State for External Affairs he changed his view on that point.

Mr. Brewin: I think his opinion, when he spoke in this house just a few months before

he heard the siren tones of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, was a little better and nearer to the facts than any change of opinion he may have had since, although I do not know whether he has changed his opinion since then or not.

I frankly confess, myself, to be shocked by the fact that when a treaty of this consequence was being negotiated, dealing with a matter so vastly important as the use, the diversion for consumptive purposes, for the benefit of the people of the prairie provinces, no satisfactory legal opinion was prepared, presented or ever put in writing at all so as to guide the government and the negotiators.

We have heard a lot about the 50 sittings which the committee had. I now tell the house and the country that during all those 50 sessions only one reasoned legal opinion was presented, and that was by Mr. Strayer of the University of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon, who gave a reasoned exposé, with authorities and analysis of the treaty, to indicate that in his view, and I share it, there was no provision for the diversion for multiple purposes.

But, Mr. Speaker, let us assume for a moment that there is some doubt about this. What we say is that that doubt should be cleared up before any treaty is ratified. Before I conclude my remarks I propose to move an amendment which will clarify that matter, so that the people outside the province of British Columbia can be assured that what the minister asserts, namely that he has secured this right of diversion for these multiple purposes, which is the only practical diversion, is in fact acceded to by their fellow negotiators in the United States signing this treaty.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it five o'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being five o'clock the house will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely notices of motions and public bills.

TRADE**PROMOTION OF TRADE WITH EASTERN CARIBBEAN FEDERATION**

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Queens) moved:

That, in the opinion of this house, the government should consider the advisability of establishing free trade between Canada and those West Indies islands comprising the proposed eastern Caribbean federation.