

Supply—Northern Affairs

same procedure was followed later, I think in 1951, when an agreement was made and signed by representatives of the province of Ontario and the federal government which again made possible the implementation of an international agreement regarding the St. Lawrence waterway.

That is not the situation at the present time. There is no agreement between British Columbia and the federal government in that sense. We therefore cannot consider this treaty in this house until such an arrangement or agreement is signed between the province and the federal government. That is why, when I talk about undue haste being shown in the signing of the treaty, I am not thinking of the years that were required to negotiate it. Of course it takes a long time to negotiate a treaty of this kind. However, I am thinking of the haste to sign an agreement at that particular moment in the negotiations without having a signed undertaking or commitment from the province of British Columbia which would enable that agreement to be carried out if this parliament approves of it.

Mr. Payne: May I transgress on the committee's time for just a moment or two. At the outset I think it would be most fitting to offer congratulations from fellow members from British Columbia to the Minister of Justice for the able and splendid way in which he has conducted negotiations and has successfully brought about an arrangement between the United States and Canada with respect to the Columbia river.

There are two points I wish to discuss. I deeply regret that at this time the hon. member for Kootenay West is not present in the chamber, for he earlier today endeavoured to bring to this committee the view that the people of British Columbia were opposed to the ratification of the treaty which has been successfully negotiated with the United States.

The position he takes is one which I feel he rather poorly defined. I understand he has no quarrel with any part of the proposed development arranged for under the treaty with the exception only of the High Arrow dam. He has taken the position for parochial and local reasons, and not for reasons which are basically of interest to British Columbia as a whole. In doing so I think I should correct one misstatement of his, namely that the only benefit that would accrue to the province of British Columbia by virtue of the High Arrow dam consists in downstream power benefits. This is fundamentally wrong. A large cash sum is arranged to be paid by the Americans in view of flood control provided by the High Arrow dam. I believe the amount involved

is a cash payment of some \$64 million and I think this committee should be aware of these facts so that they are fully understood.

The hon. member for Kootenay West dived deeply into his mail bag in order to find support for the position he took. I believe he quoted from certain alleged distinguished Canadian authorities resident in California. I am sure they must have a pronounced and profound interest in the welfare of British Columbia.

In this case he reminds me very much of the story that is told about the hon. gentleman from Kootenay West as a result of discussions in the coffee shop of the house recently. He was impressing everybody with regard to the volume of protests that were pouring in upon him daily from the people of British Columbia relative to the position then taken against the ratification of this treaty. I believe he made the statement that "his phone had been ringing all morning". One of the wags of the House of Commons retorted, "Well, why didn't you answer it?" I think perhaps this story alone can be fairly well transposed to him in the realm of incoming mail. This will indicate the breadth of protests and the extent and number of protests received by the hon. gentleman.

Being a member from British Columbia I also receive mail as, I am sure, do other colleagues who join me from that province. I have yet to see one single indication of protest from people of many political faiths. Members of organizations who are endeavouring to serve the interests of their province to the best of their ability and who are giving of their time and service, write and say they trust that we shall get on with the ratification of this treaty. They further state very clearly—and these are people from all political parties—that in the interests of the people of British Columbia and in the interests of the welfare of the people of Canada as a whole they trust that Mr. Bennett will co-operate, will act in good faith and will quickly come to an agreement with the federal government in order that in this very important and very great undertaking, the multiple establishments of facilities required by this treaty, may enter the planning, and construction phase along the Columbia river immediately.

On behalf of many people in British Columbia I express the hope that the treaty will shortly be referred to the committee on external affairs for consideration. I express the further hope that after giving the matter a proper review, and after giving the Minister of Justice an opportunity in detail to set the record straight, this house may ratify this treaty without delay and see one of the greatest works projects ever undertaken in