

Columbia River Treaty

on a very large scale. I just mention this to indicate possible reasons for the withdrawal of these names.

The people of Canada do not know what has gone on in connection with this treaty. I have had some experience with a professor at the University of British Columbia who sent a letter stating he was all for negotiation; that he wanted to see Canada get a better deal from the United States. Then, there was a communication to him from a certain person and he withdrew that paragraph of his letter. We have, too, the chancellor of Queen's University withdrawing his name from those who opposed the treaty. I wish I could tell this house what some of the employees of B.C. hydro and other organizations have told me in British Columbia. There has been a deliberate effort on the part of both governments to muster their forces in order to, shall I say, dampen down any technical opposition to this treaty.

Now before proceeding to deal with some of our objections to the treaty, I wish to emphasize the fact that while the government witnesses were either devoted civil servants or the representatives of mercenary institutions, all those who opposed the treaty were volunteers. In a good many cases, they were willing to serve Canada by giving consideration to this problem over a period of several years, and in some cases they spent their own money to inform the people of the circumstances surrounding this treaty. I wish to pay a particular tribute to the members of the trade unions, farmers organizations, chambers of commerce, women's institutes and rod and gun clubs in British Columbia, who have taken such an interest in this problem and in the various aspects of the treaty.

In contrast to that, I just want to make a short reference to a statement made to the press yesterday by Hon. James Sinclair, who is the leader of young Liberal thought in British Columbia. I never read such political cynicism in my life. I quote from this article:

James Sinclair, the dynamic go-go-go backbench Liberal M.P. who staged parliament's only "sit-out strike" to win his way into cabinet, was back on his old parliament hill political stamping grounds yesterday.

And with news.

To wit:

"Nobody, but nobody, believe me, on the west coast gives a damn about the flag."

And this is strange, he admits.

For only so very recently British Columbia was actually, as he describes it, "British British Columbia," almost rather an outpost of the old empire, or at least the commonwealth, than a Canadian province.

But as British as British Columbia may have been, people out there on the Pacific, to hear

Jimmy Sinclair tell it, have more to occupy their time than arguing over flags.

"We're all too busy making money to be bothered by that flag jazz," he reported.

"You can't beat a boom as a box office attraction, and we've got a dandy going for us."

"Nobody's seeing maple leaves or even union jacks, their eyes are too full of dollar signs."

Did you ever hear so cynical a statement from a Liberal, one of the leaders of young Liberal thought in British Columbia? Now, you see what is behind this treaty, the thinking behind it, in some respects. That is the dollar sign and not the welfare of Canadians as a whole, not the welfare of this and future generations. I say this statement is completely untrue. This is a libel on the people of British Columbia. I respect anyone's view. He may want a distinctive national flag or may wish to retain the red ensign or see some other national flag. I respect the views of these people as Canadians so long as they are sincere and they believe in these things. When people take these views, it means they are not thinking of the dollar as the only sign. They have devotion to this country and loyalties that stir their sentiments and their motives. What Mr. Sinclair has said is not true of British Columbia in respect of flags, whichever side the people take, or on this question.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I am sure we all want the hon. gentleman to give his views on the Columbia treaty and not to confuse them with any other subject.

Mr. Herridge: The minister is trying to divert me. I have the river of criticism flowing in the right direction.

I mention this statement by Mr. Sinclair because I want to contrast that with the devotion of hundreds of thousands of trade unionists, members of farmers institutes, women's institutes, chambers of commerce and labour organizations, in B.C. and in Kootenay West. I want to mention the time they have spent dealing with this treaty, the meetings they have had, the literature they have published and the money they have donated to carry on a campaign against this infamous document, and I want to compare that with the cynicism of the leader of young Liberal thought in British Columbia. These people were not thinking about dollars, they were thinking about Canada and that is why we are objecting to this treaty at the present time.

I wanted to refer to something the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) mentioned. He criticized Mr. Ripley in quite harsh terms, and Mr. Higgins. He made some