

*International Rivers*

What is the guarantee? Where is the guarantee? Where do we go? The whole thing is up in the air. I never saw anything so childish: there is no guarantee at all. And, moreover, supposing Bonneville decides to provide 10 per cent of the power to Kaiser, the only amount Kaiser is obligated to supply is 50 per cent of that 10 per cent, which is 5 per cent.

It is perfectly evident that the minister did not have the detailed information that he could have had if he had been willing to negotiate on a reasonable basis with the British Columbia government. He did not even try to get information which would have enabled him to make accurate statements, both in his speech last night and in his letter. In both instances there are serious errors of omission.

Here are some of the things the minister could have found out if he had made the slightest effort to put himself on speaking terms with the British Columbia administration, which he did not. As the minister knows, the present Kaiser agreement is mainly exploratory. It does not pretend to be final in all respects. Before it is finalized there will be a contract between Kaiser and Bonneville which will be assigned to the government of the province of British Columbia. Guarantees with respect to the delivery of power, and the posting of the performance bond to guarantee delivery, are all part and parcel of a conditional water licence which can contain any terms and conditions which the province may wish to impose.

The performance bond will be issued by a reliable bonding company and will guarantee either the delivery of the stipulated amount of power in British Columbia or, in case of bankruptcy or failure of the company, a cash payment equal to the value of the electricity over the entire 50 years.

The minister knew there must be something of that kind; yet he stood up here and attempted to belittle and ridicule rather than try to get information. That information was available. The hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch) was able to see for himself when he went into the office of the minister of mines in Victoria evidence of a contract of that kind. He mentioned it in his speech yesterday—a very fair speech, by the way. The minister could not understand. That is something for which the minister is going to have to answer, the fact that he would make statements without any foundation whatsoever because he did not go and try to get information directly from the government concerned.

In the debate thus far hon. members on the government side of the house have offered severe criticism of the Kaiser deal, but up to this time not one of them has

[Mr. Low.]

come up with a better proposal for an agreement. We have heard about a 50-50 deal. The Minister of Trade and Commerce says he did not say that. I have heard mention of a 50-50 deal.

**Mr. Howe (Port Arthur):** When did I say that I did not mention a 50-50 deal?

**Mr. Low:** You said that yesterday.

**Mr. Quelch:** Read *Hansard*.

**Mr. Howe (Port Arthur):** I recall what I said. If one party furnishes the flow and somebody else furnishes the head it rather suggests a 50-50 split of the benefit.

**Mr. Low:** I think the minister did say that he did not mention a 50-50 deal. Even if he did I point out to him that a 50-50 deal would not give the province of British Columbia anything like the net return the present deal will give. I say that if they sit back and criticize and belittle and ridicule a deal which the government of the province of British Columbia has made and then fail to come up with a better proposal, then by George I think they should either put up or shut up.

**Mr. Blackmore:** They have no proposal at all.

**Mr. Low:** They have no proposal at all. This matter cannot just be laughed off or ridiculed away, because it is too serious. The government ought to begin to learn that that is true. I should like to stress that. I think this thing can easily be proved. I stress the fact that the only way the water at the point involved in this matter, at the Arrow lakes on the Columbia system, will ever be used for any purpose will be by way of United States generation of power. Laying down that general proposition, I should like to have one minister get up and debate it and show that it is not true. They cannot. Under those circumstances the only conclusion anyone can reach who looks at this thing in all seriousness is that they are prepared to let this water go to waste for generations rather than have it made use of.

Liberal spokesmen have used scare tactics and extravagant statements to try to convince the people of British Columbia and other parts of Canada that if the Kaiser deal is consummated it will place a serious restraint or perhaps at worst have a destructive effect on the eventual full development of the Columbia river system. I say that Liberal spokesmen who make that claim cannot possibly bring evidence to support it.

While they talk that way in an effort to bolster the flimsy arguments they have to put forth in support of this bill, they ignore completely the fact that if the bill is passed it