

International Rivers

their power production—I say why in the world they would have to go into all that is something that I think is quite beyond the ability of anyone to understand. Well, that is the support behind the second great pillar upon which rests the whole position of the government. Here is another classical paragraph. Probably this letter was written for the minister by some of the London school of economics experts in his department. I continue to read under No. 2:

There is another and even more important aspect to this question. The fall from the Castlegar site to Murphy creek above the city of Trail is about 40 feet.

What on earth would that have to do with it? I continue:

At the latter point, there are possibilities of dam sites.

When I spoke yesterday I spoke on two or three dam sites. I pointed out that it would be idle to contemplate the development of those sites until Waneta No. 1 and Waneta No. 2 were developed to the limit and electricity generated therefrom sold to British Columbia. Therefore to talk about Murphy creek in relation to the construction of the Castlegar dam site is just nonsense.

Mr. Lesage: Does the hon. member know where that creek is?

Mr. Blackmore: There is enough right here.

Mr. Lesage: Does the hon. member know where it is?

Mr. Blackmore: The Murphy creek site is in southeast British Columbia. That is about all we need to know. I could give more details but I have more important things to talk about. I read on under point No. 2.

At the latter point there are possibilities of dam sites.

I ask what conceivable bearing would that have on the building of the Castlegar dam? The letter goes on with No. 2:

The available head taken alone may not warrant a power development. If it is combined with the head at Castlegar, it would afford an opportunity to add 250,000 kilowatts of on-site power in British Columbia—

There is no sale for it in British Columbia at the present time because they already have a surplus of 75,000 kilowatts. I continue:

—while permitting the same or more production of downstream power as the Arrow lake storage project.

Maybe I ought to stop right here.

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Lesage: Would the hon. member read the next sentence? Since a letter which has been written and signed by me is being read

in this house, I believe the house is entitled to have the whole of the argumentation. The next sentence of the letter is obviously the most important part of that paragraph and I am afraid that is why the hon. member does not wish to read it.

Mr. Blackmore: I intend to read it. It is too rich for me to leave out. Every statement in this letter is an accumulation effecting a climax which is not good for the bill. Now, before I read on I just want to stop and explain why there is a great difference between a dam site which is built for the generation of power and a dam site which has to be built—

Mr. Knowles: Hear, hear.

Mr. Blackmore: We will leave off the "site". The dam—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Blackmore: There is a great difference between a dam which is constructed for the generation of electricity and a dam which is constructed purely for the storage of water. This dam which is contemplated at Castlegar is to be constructed purely for the storage of water, not for the generation of electricity in Canada whatsoever, which puts the two types of dams in altogether different categories. Now, a dam which was constructed in this area for the purpose of generating electricity would be supported by nobody while the Waneta No. 1 site is not developed and the Waneta No. 2 is not developed at all, and there are 75,000 kilowatts of power surplus in the area. Surely it must be clear that there is a tremendous difference between a purely storage dam and a power generation dam and that has a tremendous bearing upon one's conclusions.

Let me go on to what the minister wanted me to read. I am happy to do it. I proceed with point No. 2:

According to expert advice, however, the realization of this last project may make the Murphy creek development economically unfeasible which would mean that 250,000 kilowatts of on-site power would be lost for British Columbia.

Note carefully how it is worded:

According to expert advice, however, the realization of this last project may make the Murphy creek development economically unfeasible . . .

The information I gave in my talk yesterday showed that when the potential production of Waneta No. 1 and Waneta No. 2 was achieved and the power all sold, and the time came for the development of the Murphy creek project, then the Castlegar dam site and the Arrow lake could be made to supplement the head of Murphy creek to the extent that Murphy creek would become much more effective as a producer of power.