

Inquiries of the Ministry

cent? In addition, I should like to know what agreement there was between the province and the dominion as to the period of time for which these benefits should be sold. The minister is no doubt aware that, to date these were the main sticking points so far as British Columbia was concerned.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The agreement, of course, does not deal with the subject matter in the manner and in the context referred to by my hon. friend. The duration of the sale of downstream benefits is obviously a matter for negotiation, and I cannot at this time disclose that information to the house.

Mr. Harkness: I ask the minister if this is not the very matter that was to be negotiated with British Columbia? If not, what was to be negotiated?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): If my hon. friend will be good enough to look at the agreement, he will see it does not cover that question.

Mr. D. V. Pugh (Okanagan Boundary): May I ask a question of the Secretary of State for External Affairs? In the talks on the Columbia river treaty between the province of British Columbia and this government, was there any discussion of the increase in the cost of the project as a result of the 4-8-11 per cent sales tax on construction and production materials?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The hon. member may be disappointed in my answer, but the answer is no.

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): I have a question to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs arising out of his earlier statement today on the Columbia river treaty. My question is this. Is the government prepared to take action to have the present draft treaty on the Columbia river, together with the agreement between Canada and British Columbia which was tabled today, referred to the external affairs committee of this house prior to the resumption of any negotiations with the government of the United States?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, this was one of the questions with which I should have liked to deal earlier, but I am glad to deal with it now. The British Columbia-Canada agreement will not be complete until we are able to attach to it a protocol of adjustment in the treaty on the proposed sale, if satisfactory terms can be secured, of the downstream benefits. This agreement will not be complete until these schedules have been agreed upon. Similarly, the treaty will have to be supplemented or amplified by the proposed protocol.

I have already made clear in this house that after the government has had an op-

[Mr. Harkness.]

portunity of viewing the results of the negotiations between its representatives and the government of the United States, and has arrived at a decision as to the treaty, before ratification takes place the treaty and agreement will be submitted to this house for consideration by it.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE**REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF BENEFITS TO AGRICULTURAL WORKERS**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Reynold Rapp (Humboldt-Melfort-Tisdale): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour concerning unemployment insurance coverage for employees in agriculture. Since the minister informed the house yesterday that there is an interdepartmental committee of senior officials engaged in continued study of the Gill commission report, would the minister direct their attention to the problem as to whether ways and means could be found to overcome the administrative and procedural difficulties to which reference was made in the Gill report, in order that farm labour could also benefit from unemployment insurance coverage?

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to respond to the hon. member's representations and ask the committee to pay special attention to this problem, if it has not already done so.

EXTENSION OF BENEFITS TO WORKERS IN U.S.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Megantic): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour arising out of the answer he gave the hon. member for Compton-Frontenac on July 8 concerning Canadians working across the border. He said that this matter had been under negotiation for the past 20 years. I would not want to rush things, but would it be possible for the government to have a definite answer or a definite agreement concluded before the next 15 years have gone by?

FINANCE**CONSULTATION ON BUDGET WITH VARIOUS ECONOMIC ELEMENTS**

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of his statement to the press yesterday that he is giving consideration to bringing business and industry into closer relationship with the government in the planning of future