

Supply—Northern Affairs

that our own engineers as well as the provincial engineers will give due to consideration to this aspect of the matter.

Mr. Pickersgill: May I make one more brief observation on this point. I just wish to point out to the minister, in case this matter has not been fully considered, that I understand—and the minister probably has far more information about this than I have, or at least his officials may well have—there are many engineers who feel that this problem could be dealt with most effectively simply by removing the St. Andrews locks and dredging the river where that obstruction is located. I am sure this point has been considered a good many times before, but if the minister has any views on the subject—I know it is a subject of controversy among engineers—I think the committee would appreciate hearing them.

Mr. Dinsdale: I am assured, Mr. Chairman, that this point has been considered thoroughly by the advisory group of engineers, and they have come up with the firm report that this would be no substitute for the floodway. If there is a difference of opinion on the part of engineers, the engineers would appear to differ as much in their respective opinions as do politicians, although I think they are a little more definitive.

Mr. Pickersgill: I am not so sure.

Mr. Herridge: At the request of a number of organizations in southeastern British Columbia and a good number of individuals, I have been asked to make a few remarks on this item to indicate the many contradictions among statements of federal and provincial government officials and other important persons with respect to the proposed development of the Columbia. I must explain, Mr. Chairman, that this will be a strictly non-partisan speech. I have the support of prominent C.C.F. people, members of the legislature, the support of well known Conservatives, well known Liberals and well known members of the Social Credit party. Therefore I can say I am speaking without any suggestion of bias but in the interests of the people of British Columbia and particularly of those of the Kootenays.

In order to be accurate, and unless I otherwise state, I am quoting from a text because this speech will go out to thousands of people when it is published, you know. Are these developments in the national interest? Well, let us have a look first of all at what General McNaughton has to say concerning it, with his obvious devotion to the development of the Columbia on the basis of equity to all governments and people concerned. I may say that the people of my district and of the Kootenays as a whole have a great respect

for General McNaughton. I get dozens and dozens of letters saying "We support General McNaughton; we do hope the government will listen to him finally". This is what he had to say in the external affairs committee last year.

Mr. Payne: What page?

Mr. Herridge: I have not the page number here, but this is correct. My stenographer omitted the page number, but I never quote anything unless it is exact.

Mr. Payne: Are we not entitled to the page reference, Mr. Chairman? I have General McNaughton's remarks before me, and I should like to follow what the hon. member is quoting.

Mr. Herridge: This is taken from the record itself, but I notice my secretary omitted the page number. With respect to the building of this proposed High Arrow dam General McNaughton said:

It has become evident, I think, that from the point of view of power production, Canada would obtain no advantage whatever from flooding out the territories along the Arrow lakes to give the increased storage represented by the High Arrow project. The advantage powerwise in that project goes entirely to the United States. The only advantage which could come to Canada would be in recompense for power produced in the United States.

Later the same day General McNaughton said:

Of course, I will grant you that I may be looking at this whole business through tinted spectacles, but I cannot reconcile myself to the thought that people would be thrown out of their homes for an advantage which is transient.

What does the Minister of Justice have to say about the treaty that provides for the building of the Libby and High Arrow dams? I quote from the text of his speech delivered to the Canadian club in Montreal on February 13, 1961 of which I have a copy:

We are proud of the treaty we have negotiated for British Columbia and for Canada and I am satisfied that you will agree with me that the outline I have given you of its advantages and its tremendous potential as a stimulus to the economy of this province justifies the effort that has gone into it and the desire to get on with the job at the earliest possible moment.

What does the *Milwaukee Journal* have to say about this proposed development?

The vast amount of additional cheap hydroelectric power will be shared equally with Canada. Canada will also be paid in cash for flood control at the rate of one half of estimated annual savings. If this seems to be extreme liberality on our part, it should be remembered that Canada could have chosen an all-Canadian project which would have meant more and cheaper power for that country. So Canada is being a good and generous neighbour in the deal.