

The Dorr cost is somewhere in the order of \$45,000,000, while Libby, including the flowage cost, is about \$350,000,000, as a general figure.

Mr. DAVIS: The conflict I have in my mind is that there are better schemes than the Dorr scheme as far as Canada is concerned, and moreover the report distinctly states that the least costly increment of power in the United States derives from the Dorr scheme.

Mr. HIGGINS: That is probably true because they did not have to build Libby.

Mr. DAVIS: So we can select other alternatives that are better for Canada, under the treaty arrangement?

Mr. HIGGINS: I would say that the Dorr scheme, the full diversion scheme, is, from Canada's point of view, the only one which will solve the agreed problem which is flood control in the United States, and will preserve Canadian control of the river. That is really what is at issue here.

You see, one way you can interpret these cautious proposals of the United States—pardon me, of the international Columbia river engineering board—is that the Columbia can be developed in any number of ways. And therefore, because they ignored the boundary, you must look at, perhaps, other things than just economics.

Mr. DAVIS: That is my main point. Your argument is not now economic, or largely one of economics.

Mr. HIGGINS: No.

Mr. DAVIS: It is more political and legal in a sense.

Mr. HIGGINS: I think that all that needs to be shown is that within the terms, if Canada can build and finance the Dorr scheme right now at the same cost, or with the same sort of operating results as it can build the treaty scheme, then I would say that the results indicate that it is the sensible thing. But take other grounds; suppose the answers came out identically equal, and we had to make a choice. We would choose the maximum diversion scheme simply because we did not have to give up our rights in any way, shape or form, or restrict them so far as diversion is concerned, and that is one of the things we must do in order to permit Libby to be built.

Mr. DAVIS: Montreal Engineering has stated that the detailed cost would show the maximum diversion to be appreciably more expensive.

Mr. HIGGINS: I have interpreted that question here as "more expensive than what"? Is it more expensive than an alternative which does not solve the problem?

Mr. DAVIS: It is a political problem.

Mr. HIGGINS: No, it is an economic problem or a physical problem, and it does not resolve the flood problem until 1988, and I submit that is too late.

Mr. DAVIS: I do not follow you, because the alternative is the treaty plan which does resolve the probable flood problem.

Mr. HIGGINS: Building Dorr earlier? All right, that resolves the flood problem.

Mr. LEBOE: We are talking about one diversion, and we are talking about protecting the rights of Canada in respect of diversion. Is that not the statement you made a moment ago? Are we not overlooking the fact that we have a similar problem in the Pend d'Oreille river here and on some of the rivers in the province of Alberta? Is that not a fact?

Mr. HIGGINS: I think the problem of the Pend d'Oreille is different because, to my knowledge, there is no flood problem on the Pend d'Oreille except for those two acres.