

required is something along the line of what they do in the United States where they have what they call the integrated project. In the United States, particularly in the Tennessee valley at Grand Coulee dam and other tremendous projects, they do not just put in a dam and block up the river for the purpose of irrigating the land lying below the level of the reservoir which is created, but build a project so as not only to irrigate the land but at the same time to make tremendous sources of power available to these areas. If you have the power available it follows that you can irrigate not only the land below the level of the reservoir but the land above the reservoir, by pumping water up there. This is particularly important in the central section of the area which I have described, because a good deal of the arable land would lie above the level of the reservoir which would be created by damming one of the rivers, but if water power were made available the harnessing of that power could pump water from the reservoir or from the river itself up to the benches above the level of the reservoir. That area is abundantly supplied with potential water power. Dams could be constructed in the Adams river, the Shuswap river, the Thompson river, the Fraser river, and their tributaries. The country lends itself admirably to these integrated projects, which is the principle which I feel should be followed in any extension of the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act to British Columbia. We have a combination of soil and potential water supply to make that area one to which the words of ex-president Hoover of the United States are especially applicable, when he said that "every drop of water that runs to the sea without rendering a commercial return is a public waste."

I would close this portion of my remarks by saying that such a scheme or series of schemes would undoubtedly be costly. History has proven that, whenever it has been attempted to charge up the initial capital cost of these schemes against the land which the irrigation project serves, the scheme is doomed to failure because you have to charge too high a rate. You have either to sell your land at too high an initial price or you have to charge much too high a rate for irrigation for the land to be able to bear. But if you put in your project on a long-term basis, perhaps do not even make it a special charge upon the public revenues, but float a loan which would be regarded as self-liquidating over a period of fifty years, it has a chance to succeed because you would not have to charge these tremendous rates for irrigation itself. Over that period

of years you would recoup the initial capital cost because your intangible results would be so tremendous. You would have an influx of population, and increased agricultural production. The settlers would pay income tax; the railways and secondary industries would all develop; the project would expand, and the profitable community which would be created would of itself in an indirect way more than pay the initial capital cost of installing these schemes. But the history of the projects which we have had in British Columbia such as the British Columbia Fruit Lands at Kamloops and the Walhachin project some thirty miles to the west, where Lord Anglesey put in over £250,000, is that they go bankrupt when an attempt is made in a period of a few years to recoup the original capital cost from the operation of the land immediately served.

These are the two principles which, I submit, should be followed in extending the P.F.R.A. to that province: first, that it be regarded as an integrated project in the creation of water power as well as irrigation resources; second, that the project be put on a self-liquidating basis and the costs spread over a period of years.

With regard to pensions, the remarks I have to make follow very much along the lines of those made at the close of his speech by the hon. member for Hastings-Peterborough (Mr. White). What I should like to do is to renew a plea which was made in the veterans affairs committee in the fall of 1945, that the principle be established that pensions payable for wounds which have occasioned a disability should be fixed and awarded to the pensioner as of right and free from deductions, revisions or variations one way or the other for various reasons. The basis of this principle is as follows: that the object of the pension is to restore to the pensioner, as far as money alone can do it, the position which he would enjoy if he had not received his wound. It is realized that money alone cannot put the pensioner back in the position which he would be in were he not disabled, but so far as money can do it that should be the basis of the principle. It might be said that this recompense to which he is entitled as the result of loss which follows from his wound is the minimum that the country owes him and that as such, it should be an irreducible minimum. In that respect I think we might even consider a change in name. We might call it a compensation for disability, or a disability compensation, rather than a pension. Perhaps that would clearly establish the fact that it is paid as of right in regard to the disability suffered. It has been established in