

International Rivers

absolutely clear. As a matter of fact, in his address in reply to the speech from the throne Mr. Sommers had this to say about these developments. He was referring to a map which had been placed in front of the members, and he said:

The map before you shows the location of known major potential power sites and developments in the Columbia basin in British Columbia as well as the hydro-power installations which have been constructed. The at-site power development should be in an orderly sequence following creation of the necessary storage and regulated flow. Such storage can be adequately provided in the Arrow lakes and behind the proposed Mica dam. The orderly sequence of at-site power development may then be undertaken in the following order, and in point of fact in some instances could be developed concurrently:

This is the order that was laid down:

1. Bring Waneta No. 1 up to its full capacity of 500,000 h.p. by the installation of two additional generators.
2. Waneta No. 2 to be developed giving an additional 500,000 h.p.
3. Mica at-site power 800,000 h.p.
4. Downie creek at-site power 500,000 h.p.
5. Little Dalles at-site power 300,000 h.p.

This is an interesting and important fact.

6. Murphy creek, valueless without the Mica and Arrow lakes storage, however with this storage it will give at-site power of 130,000 h.p. without any loss of head at Brilliant.

So that, far from endangering any future power developments this low-level dam on the Arrow lakes can ensure future power developments below that site which they could not possibly have otherwise—or without installations at Mica creek, one or the other.

So, in spite of the assertions of the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources (Mr. Lesage) and the hon. member for Kootenay East (Mr. Byrne), this thing can be of tremendous value, so far as future installations are concerned. And I think that is a fairly important consideration.

Those who are opposed to our view, those who favour the bill, have mentioned without exception what would happen if the federal government in the United States refused to export power into British Columbia. It would be simply this: If the United States government refused to allow the export of power into British Columbia, then the British Columbia government could take cash.

And that brings up another point. Speaking on this subject yesterday the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources said this, as reported at page 1038 of *Hansard*:

Moreover this 20 per cent, which is supposed to come from Bonneville, would be an export of power from the United States to Canada. What would happen if the federal power commission refused a licence to export that 20 per cent from the United States to Canada? Where does the

British Columbia government stand on that deal? Nowhere. The only guarantee it has is a guarantee of moneys.

And that brings up an interesting point. What does it bring into British Columbia?—nothing but money! That is a typical Liberal outlook on money. They have no realization of the value of money put into provincial or federal coffers, unless it comes from taxation. But we certainly have. And it is high time the government of Canada came to realize that we can get money for the welfare of the people without taxing the daylights out of them. And this is one way in which the British Columbia government is going to obtain a million dollars a year or a little more, without adding to the taxation carried by the people of that province. And they are not losing anything by it.

What kind of thinking can the members of this government and their back-slapping backbenchers be doing when they think that the only place money can be obtained is out of the pockets of the taxpayers?

An hon. Member: Who said that?

Mr. Thomas: It is just the same as if the Imperial Oil company were to say that the only place they can get gasoline is out of the gasoline tanks of the consuming public.

And I quite understand, too, the hon. member for Kootenay East interjecting so often, because he feels that his speech yesterday in support of the bill was so weak that he has to get in his afterthoughts by way of interjections during the speeches of other members.

Mr. Byrne: After all, I had only 40 minutes.

Mr. Hansell: And you did not take all of it.

Mr. Thomas: Probably he gave up because he realized he did not have much of a case, and that in that respect he was in the same position as the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources. The only way he had of supporting his stand in the matter was by bringing in misrepresentations.

Mr. Byrne: Who is she?

Mr. Thomas: I will give you her phone number after I have finished.

Mr. Fulton: What a high-level debate!

Mr. Thomas: At no time has any of the members who have spoken in favour of the bill considered the fact that water is going through that area anyway, and that probably it always will. The Social Credit government in British Columbia is the only government, not only in the history of British Columbia but also of Canada, that has realized the value that can be derived from the flow of that water.