

Supply—Northern Affairs

as he put it, or intended to convey the impression that he was trying to lecture Canada. The situation is simply this: The United States proceeded expeditiously to ratify the treaty. I give them full credit for that. They were in a position to do so. They did not have to deal with the government of a state. I think it only fair to remind the hon. member, particularly when he talks about the St. Lawrence seaway, that in that particular case a treaty entered into in 1932 was not ratified by the United States senate for over 20 years, or something like that.

Mr. Pickersgill: It was never ratified.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): It was never ratified and the agreement of 1941 was not ratified either; and I do not know that anyone said that this besmirched the good name of the United States. The fact is that the Columbia river treaty will not become final, in a binding sense, in Canada until ratification; and the efforts that have been made on behalf of the federal government are designed to bring about the necessary understanding and agreements with the province in order that by ratification and all other necessary steps this great beneficial project may be undertaken.

Mr. Chevrier: The minister has referred to something having been said by me about the St. Lawrence seaway. I did not raise the question of the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): I am sorry; it was the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate who made reference to the part that the hon. member for Laurier had played, the course he had taken in the fulfilment of that treaty, and the steps that had been taken in negotiations with the government of the province party thereto.

Mr. Pickersgill: With great benefit to Canada.

Mr. Chevrier: The minister is in error in stating what had been done in regard to the treaties of 1932 and 1941. The minister did not say that the treaty of 1932, which was signed by Canada and the United States, was first submitted to the United States senate where it lacked the necessary two thirds majority. It was therefore never approved by the government of the United States, and so this treaty cannot be compared to it. So far as the 1941 agreement was concerned—

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): Will the hon. member permit me to point out that the comparison was in the delay on the part of one of the contracting parties in proceeding to complete ratification?

[Mr. Fleming (Eglinton).]

Mr. Chevrier: I shall come to that in a moment, but I think that on reading the record one could come to no other conclusion than that I have come to. Before speaking of delay I would also remind the minister that the 1941 agreement was submitted to the United States congress in many different forms on several occasions, and it was neither rejected nor ratified by the United States congress.

So far as the delay is concerned I would point out to the minister that this project was studied by any number of international commissions and it was not until 1952 that a new approach was brought into being, namely a joint application to the international joint commission. That was submitted by the governments of Canada and the United States, and it admitted that the two governments were really seized with the problem. Also, before the joint application of Canada and the United States was submitted, an agreement had been entered into and signed between Canada and the province of Ontario and was approved of by this house.

Mr. Herridge: I wish to say briefly that I think the government of Canada acted in good faith. It accepted the word of the negotiators from British Columbia, and unfortunately accepted the advice of the water resources branch as to this being a good treaty for Canada.

Does the minister know that Premier Bennett has said that this treaty was signed by Canada when it did not even know for certain where it could build the dams? Premier Bennett has also said that it has cost him \$500,000 a month for the last 10 months to determine the sites for the dams mentioned in the treaty. Does the minister know there has never been a survey or assessment made of the value of land and forests to be destroyed, or an assessment made of the compensation to be paid to industry, farmers and residents, or of the cost of rebuilding roads? None of these estimates have been made. I am quite sure the federal government was misled in this respect, and I do not blame the federal government at all.

Does the government know that other engineering firms have estimated the cost of these dams at \$100 million higher than was first thought, and that for the High Arrow dam there is an estimate of \$25 million capital cost for putting close to one million feet of logs over the dam every day, either \$25 million in one lump sum, or \$3 million to \$4 million with the provincial government having to pay \$500,000 a year to the companies for the cost of moving these logs? This is something the water resources branch knew nothing about.