

Supply—Northern Affairs

Mr. Chevrier: Is there likely to be an accord soon and is that what the minister said a moment ago?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): No, what I said in that regard was said concerning the negotiations with the government of Manitoba. When I said we look forward to an agreement soon, I was speaking of negotiations with the government of Manitoba.

Mr. Chevrier: What is the position with reference to British Columbia?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): The hon. member has heard the reports I have given to the house on the series of meetings I have held with Premier Bennett and, as I repeated in the house yesterday in reply to a question from the hon. member for Kootenay West, I expect to have further meetings with Premier Bennett.

Mr. Chevrier: Is there any possibility of the minister telling the committee whether an agreement might be reached in the near future and can he say whether or not the agreement he hopes to achieve will be different from that contained in the treaty?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): I do not know how soon agreement can be reached. I know I have been applying the best efforts of which I am capable in that direction and I have no doubt it is the wish and hope of Premier Bennett that there may be an agreement soon. But the question is, on what terms or on whose terms; and among other questions is the fundamental one as to the manner in which and the party by which the obligations to be assumed by Canada under the treaty with the United States are to be carried out.

Mr. Chevrier: I take it from what the minister has said that the agreement will be on terms different from those contained in the treaty, and that raises the question—

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): I did not say that.

Mr. Chevrier: No, I am saying that arising out of what the minister said, and if I am wrong the minister can correct me. If that should be the case, and there is a probability of it, does that mean that the government will have to renegotiate the treaty with the United States?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): No, I do not think the hon. member has correctly interpreted what I had to say. I was pointing out that we are discussing the questions of terms and the implementation of Canadian obligations under the treaty, because these are obligations in relation to various matters which would normally be discharged by the provincial government. I have emphasized that the government of the province was a party to all negotiations leading up to the treaty and all of the

[Mr. Fleming (Eglinton).]

decisions which were taken from time to time and which culminated in the terms of the treaty.

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Chairman, did the minister's officials in the water resources branch in arriving at the cost of the High Arrow dam make allowance for \$25 million which the Celgar Corporation says it will cost to put in the equipment to take their logs over the dam if it is to be automatic?

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): The answer is no.

Mr. Pickersgill: I should like to say a word in addition to what the hon. member for Laurier said. He was obviously too modest to make this point. The minister said that there had been no bungling about this matter.

Mr. Herridge: One dam, \$25 million.

Mr. Pickersgill: That is only a detail. Here, there is a transaction involving the good name of Canada. When my hon. friend negotiated with Ontario hydro prior to the signing to the St. Lawrence arrangement, the whole agreement with Ontario was drawn up and signed in the Prime Minister's office before the agreement with the United States was signed. There was no doubt about it. It was not some assumption resulting from civil servants taking part in negotiations with a province, that the province was going ahead with it.

Mr. Lamberi: What about provincial cabinet ministers?

Mr. Pickersgill: Provincial cabinet ministers? Judging from what some of the cabinet ministers in this house say when they get out at large, I am sure the Prime Minister would hate to be committed, for example, by the Associate Minister of National Defence when he acts as secretary of state for external affairs and talks about our relations with other countries.

The right way to have done this thing would have been to have an agreement signed between British Columbia and the federal government so that the people—

Mr. Herridge: And the facts known first.

Mr. Pickersgill: The hon. member for Kootenay West says, "And the facts known first". They could hardly have signed an agreement unless the facts were in it. In any event, the good name of Canada should not have been put to a treaty with the United States until there was a signed and sealed agreement with the province that would be carried out. If that had been done, it might have taken a few more weeks or a few more months, but at least when it was done it could have been proceeded with instead of having this unseemly wrangling between the provincial government and the government of