

Supply—Northern Affairs

feasible that Mica dam could be further implemented by the construction of the low Arrow which economic effect on the valley would be reduced to a minimum.

We agree with that:

The following resolution was unanimously adopted by all visiting delegates.

The mayor of Kamloops was present, and that is the riding of the Minister of Justice.

Resolution passed by meeting or representatives from southern interior municipalities and chambers of commerce, Tuesday, April 26, 1960.

Whereas it is the responsibility of the governments of Canada and British Columbia to provide for the present and future energy requirements of our country through the development of the Columbia river for power production in Canada, and

Whereas the construction of the High Arrow dam does not contribute to this vital requirement, and

Whereas this meeting is opposed to the construction of High Arrow dam for the following reasons:

(a) The unnecessary destruction of 40,000 acres of our very limited agricultural resources.

(b) The downstream benefits from High Arrow dam would progressively decrease.

(c) The High Arrow dam practically eliminates civilization on the Arrow lakes and destroys 20 communities including the city of Revelstoke, involving a population of more than 7,000 people.

General McNaughton told the committee that the High Arrow dam practically eliminates civilization on the Arrow lakes:

(d) The net balance of revenue over costs on the High Arrow dam would show an annual deficit of approximately \$3 million when all losses chargeable to High Arrow are computed.

Therefore be it resolved that this meeting go on record as urging our governments to proceed with the construction and early completion of Mica dam, as the first step followed by the construction of Downie creek, Revelstoke canyon and Murphy creek dams, all producing power within Canada.

Carried unanimously.

These are the representatives of a number of municipalities and organizations in south-eastern British Columbia. In addition, to indicate the attitude I want to read a resolution of the Okanagan-Revelstoke Progressive Conservative association. This association has written several letters, just as many Conservatives have in my riding. This is a resolution that was passed in respect to proposals to build the High Arrow dam:

Be it resolved that the Okanagan-Revelstoke Progressive Conservative association vigorously protests the proposed construction of the High Arrow dam in preference to the Mica creek dam for the following reasons:

1. The full benefit to be derived therefrom will accrue to the United States except only the remuneration payable to Canada in power delivered and payment for flood control.

2. The High Arrow dam will materially reduce the potential power development on the Canadian side of the border.

3. The High Arrow, without flow control from Mica creek, will create untold devastation from the south end of Lower Arrow lake to and including the city of Revelstoke and is a potential menace to the lower levels of the city of Revelstoke.

4. Flooding of Arrow lakes will completely destroy one of the four main valleys in British Columbia.

I have received numerous letters from very prominent members of the Conservative party, the Social Credit party and the Liberal party in British Columbia who are not going to be directly affected by the proposal to build this High Arrow dam. That is why I say I have every confidence in stating I am speaking on a completely non-partisan basis.

Mr. George Hobbs, member of the legislature for Revelstoke, who is a C.C.F. member, and Mr. Randolph Harding, M.L.A. member for Kaslo-Slocan, represent the two provincial ridings that will be seriously affected by the building of the proposed High Arrow dam. They expressed their complete opposition recently in the legislature of British Columbia, and they were supported by other members of the legislature.

This is a very important step so far as the governments of Canada and British Columbia are concerned. On behalf of the people I represent I do urge the governments of Canada and British Columbia to utilize this delay to reconsider this question, the consequences of which without doubt have not been completely considered. I urge upon these governments to take the opportunity to use this time to reconsider it and see if they cannot accept the proposals put forward by General McNaughton.

I have held meetings throughout the district and I have received letters from Kootenay East. I held a meeting in Invermere with the Invermere chamber of commerce. The majority of the members of the chamber of commerce at that meeting agreed with me, because when you compare the flooding of the Arrow lakes with flooding in the upper Columbia you bring into production four times as much land as you flood in the upper Columbia, if it is necessary—and it is not necessary at this stage, so far as we see it—whereas in the Arrow lakes area you flood for all time 40,000 acres of land, and forest.

There has been inadequate consideration given to the consequences. Do you know, Mr. Chairman, we have competent foresters working with us who point out that we are going to flood something more than 30,000 acres of first class forest land which provides an annual revenue from growth of \$15 an acre? We are going to flood some 11,000 acres of the finest agricultural land in British Columbia. Some of that land at the present time is producing up to \$1,500 an acre gross, per annum. I can speak of a small community in Renata where there are just over 81 acres under cultivation producing apples, plums, peaches and pears, and these growers have