

International Rivers

I went into that yesterday; I shall not go into it again. I thought I explained it so that anyone who runs can understand it.

All of this material in the letter is supposed to be a reason why British Columbia would be foolish to allow an American company to come in and build a low-level dam, pay every cent for it and put in a service; why British Columbia would be foolish to allow them to store 3 million acre feet of water in the Arrow lakes and allow the water to go down into the United States to firm up their productive capacity in their plants. How can these reasons have any conceivable bearing on the wisdom or non-wisdom of what the British Columbia government proposes to do in relation to Castlegar? That must be quite clear.

The Murphy creek site is presently under investigation by federal authorities under the Columbia river reference.

There is no evidence that the matter will be thoroughly investigated in less than six or seven years. According to the British Columbia plan, if we allow them to go on with the Castlegar project they will have made about \$3 million by that time to pay off \$3 million of the great debt the Liberals created and left to them, and that is very important. I know this \$1 million is just peanuts; but it was not peanuts when an Alberta bond issue of \$1 million came due and was defaulted, and it would not be peanuts if British Columbia defaulted on a \$1 million bond issue. It would be a mighty serious thing then to any responsible government.

British Columbia must be looking to these matters because, as I pointed out before, that was not so long ago. We have no assurance that we are not going into a depression; and if we go into a depression I will wager that the federal government at Ottawa would be meticulously careful that they did not infringe on provincial responsibility to look after unemployment. That will be the responsibility of British Columbia then. They left all the burden they possibly could on the other provinces. They left debt that was accumulated in Alberta by reason of the depression, just about \$67 million as a result of the depression alone. Seemingly that could easily happen in British Columbia. Surely any responsible government should be looking for means to guard against that, to accumulate money to pay off the provincial debt and save interest which they could use for building roads and for other desirable things.

We now come to pillar No. 3. I think I have shown that there is not very much

[Mr. Blackmore.]

substance in the two pillars thus far considered. Let us take the third pillar which is offered by the department in their approach to this bill. I read from No. 3:

The carrying out of the Arrow lakes project at this stage might delay . . .

There is no proof. Why, dear me, the sun might not rise a year from today, for all I know. I continue:

. . . might delay for quite a number of years the realization of other alternative projects—

What ones?

—more important to British Columbia and Canada.

What ones, for example? In my speech yesterday I dealt with Waneta No. 1, Waneta No. 2, Murphy creek and Mica creek, but not one of these is in the same class as this dam, because they are proposed to be power-generating dams, while this one is merely a water-storing dam with the object of firming up power generated in the United States. Therefore this statement is just pure childish nonsense in its application to this project at Castlegar. Now, see the powerful reasoning that this bit of nonsense is supported by. I read on under No. 3:

It has been asserted that the Arrow lakes storage reservoir would not affect the development of the Mica creek project.

Yes, you can hear that bright young thing right out in British Columbia:

This assertion should be treated with considerable reservation—

Pretty nearly any assertion needs to be.

—since under operating conditions it is doubtful that the most effective use of the proposed Mica creek development, of the proposed Arrow lakes storage and of the Grand Coulee project could be made without interference between them.

All vague. No evidence to support them whatsoever. No sign of any evidence. As matters stand at the present time it is the proposal of this government to get this house to endorse this bill, to put its rubber stamp on it before the house gets a chance to learn any of the underlying facts at all. That is pretty clever strategy, is it not? It sounds very much like the strategy that was worked on us in connection with Bretton Woods.

Mr. Howe (Port Arthur): The same kind of filibuster.

Mr. Blackmore: Just the same high-sounding, beautiful phrases that we had before. People believed them and were lulled off to sleep.

Careful co-ordination might minimize this interference but the last project in would have the lowest priority.

How do we know? There is no evidence. One purpose we had in making this motion was to give the minister and the Minister of Trade and Commerce a chance to come and