

Supply—Northern Affairs

agreement would be signed with the Americans until public hearings had been held. Another contradiction.

The Minister of Justice also states that the treaty with the United States was signed with the full understanding, knowledge and agreement of the government of British Columbia. However, it is generally known that the storage of 8 million acre feet of water in the Arrow lakes will make possible the irrigation of additional thousands of acres of land used for the production of fruit and vegetables in the United States. This development has caused some concern in the Okanagan valley. Mr. Perrault, leader of the Liberal party in the provincial house, later dealt with this action and said that British Columbia is already feeling the impact of farm produce from the Columbia valley in Washington state, where taxes and water rates are lower than in British Columbia. Mr. Perrault said that British Columbia now imports \$125 million worth of farm produce a year, and that the total annual income from agriculture in British Columbia is lower by \$5 million than in 1951.

What did the minister of agriculture of British Columbia have to say? We must remember that he comes from the Okanagan valley and fully appreciates the danger of this further competition from the United States. I now quote the minister of agriculture of British Columbia:

Competition from the United States farm produce is likely to be assisted by the Columbia development and will affect other parts of Canada besides British Columbia.

He further said:

I think it would be a matter of tariffs that we will have to consider.

He said the matter should be discussed at the national level, and that he would take up the whole issue at a conference of the provincial ministers of agriculture later this year. What does this mean? It means that in order to overcome the damage done British Columbia agricultural producers the minister of agriculture for British Columbia proposes to ask the federal government to increase the tariffs on fruit and vegetables. When you think of all the implications of this situation you will realize that this is another contradiction in the approach of the different ministers of the different governments.

Again, we have been told repeatedly that there is a shortage of power in British Columbia, yet in the March 11 issue of the *Canada Gazette* I note an application by the B.C. Electric Company to the national energy board to export surplus power for a period of 25 years to the United States. This appears to be another contradiction. The Minister

of Justice hopes that this project will start in 1961. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has published some literature saying that it will start in 1961. There is no sense of certainty or similarity of approach in these statements.

These contradictory statements by federal and provincial cabinet ministers clearly indicate that the Columbia treaty has been signed hastily, without a knowledge or understanding of all the facts and without an agreement in writing between the two governments. In order to indicate the situation and the benefit of this project to the United States, I want to quote briefly from the *Victoria Colonist*:

Before the Columbia river treaty was signed last January its U.S. sponsors unleashed a veritable barrage of information in the Senate and around the election hustings to show that the harnessing of the Columbia river for hydroelectric development was a magnificent deal for the United States.

There is the booklet that was sent all over the United States. It was issued to every senator and representative. It was distributed all over the United States, and it clearly indicates the benefits to that country. I continue the quotation:

In the Senate where the treaty was up for approval, one speaker assured Senators that "The United States has driven a hard bargain—a very hard bargain—with Canada." Even President Eisenhower campaigning for Mr. Nixon declared on more than one occasion that the Columbia development was extremely favourable to the United States.

I must say, Mr. Chairman, that as the member for Kootenay West I have, like a good many others, given this question most careful consideration. After listening to General McNaughton in the external affairs committee and the Minister of Justice and reading all the evidence available, I am convinced that I am representing the views of my constituents when I say that the treaty in its present form is not in the national, provincial, Kootenays' or local interest. Recent developments strengthen my conviction in that regard. A nation wide interest in this matter is developing. The newspapers are interested. One only has to refer to the articles in various papers, and there are going to be more. There was one in the *Family Herald* of April 27, another in the *Western Producer* of April 20, and others are appearing in various national magazines. I have heard recently that one national magazine has sent representatives into the area.

Here is the sort of thing one sees. I have here the *Kimberley News*, a newspaper owned by a Conservative and financed by Conservatives. The heading of the article is "Kootenays May Be Sold Out". This is the sort of opinion we are getting from all