

*Supply—Northern Affairs*

group of officers which will regulate the discharge of water is all to the good. I trust that it will have the effect of protecting the downstream interests at Montreal, the power interests at Beauharnois and the other navigation interests upstream.

**Mr. Herridge:** I just wish to make one other comment. I wish I could use the name of the senator to whom I shall refer. However, I discussed this question with a very well known senator in the United States and he said this to me, "Mr. Herridge, we were amazed at the developments in the negotiations. The Canadian negotiators threw General McNaughton's ace away all in the first throw".

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** I have explained the difference in points of view on this matter. Anyone can take a particular point of view and say, "This is right". It is probably only natural for each individual to hold firmly to his own point of view. However, when you come into the field of negotiation where different interests are involved and consequently different points of view, it does not follow that the point of view of a particular individual is bound to prevail. All of these points of view were carefully considered. Canada was represented by an extremely competent negotiating team, including the highly competent officials of the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources and others. I must take firmly the position that Canada was ably, competently and sufficiently represented in these negotiations. The treaty itself is one which, if implementation may follow, we believe to be of definite and clear advantage to Canada. That is not to say that, had we had our own way in all respects we could not have done something a little bit different. However, the fact is that after extended negotiations, with three governments involved, the treaty represents the one basis upon which agreement could be arrived at.

**Mr. Herridge:** I have one more question. Before ratification occurs in the house at some future time, will the government refer the treaty to the external affairs committee? If so, will the committee, if it wishes it, have the opportunity to hear General McNaughton?

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** I think that is a question that might more properly be asked on some other occasion. It does not relate to this particular item which, after all, is an item dealing with payment for services of a particular engineering firm who wrote the report. The hon. member will have ample opportunity to ask his question or to press his point of view on this matter.

[Mr. Chevrier.]

**Mr. Pickersgill:** I am really rising to say something about another matter, Mr. Chairman. However, before doing so, may I say that I think this whole business illustrates how unwise it was for the government to enter into a treaty with the United States before reaching a really ironclad undertaking with the province of British Columbia. If they had followed the excellent example given them by my hon. friend from Laurier and by the Leader of the Opposition when they were in charge of the St. Lawrence treaty, they would have had everything signed, sealed and delivered by the province before they pledged the word of Canada. I must say that for this unseemly haste and bungling at the end of this whole matter they seem to be reaping the reward that such ineptitude properly deserves.

However, it was not for that purpose I rose to speak. It was to speak about the negotiation that has been going on ever since the present government of Manitoba came into office—I was going to say ever since the present government came into office—with regard to the Winnipeg floodway. On the orders of the day I asked the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources a question about when this agreement is likely to be reached. I pursued the matter as far as I could pursue it on the orders of the day. I had hoped that the minister would be here because, as a Manitoban, he would probably be more familiar with the matter than would the Minister of Finance, although I think there are many people who believe that the Minister of Finance is the real log jam in this transaction. Rightly or wrongly, I believe that is the general view in Manitoba.

I have in my hand a clipping from the *Winnipeg Tribune* and I took it advisedly from the *Tribune* and not from the *Free Press*, containing an account of what took place in the legislature about this matter the other day. This is from the *Winnipeg Tribune* of March 27. I do not wish to waste much time on this matter; I just wish to get some information. This report states as follows:

No written, final agreement has been made with Ottawa, Premier Roblin said. But he assured the house that official agreement would be wrapped up before a federal election, even if it is held in June.

I must say that it is refreshing to find how much more the premier of Manitoba knows about what this government's intentions are than does the House of Commons itself or perhaps even by this government itself. However, Mr. Roblin spoke with great conviction that agreement would be wrapped up. By