

THE SENATE

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

The Senate met at 3 p.m., the Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers.

DOCUMENTS TABLED

COLUMBIA TO FRASER RIVER DIVERSION PROJECT REPORT, 1956—STATEMENT

Hon. John J. Connolly: Honourable senators, I have thought that on occasion when important Government statements of general interest are being made in the other place it might be a service to the members of this honourable house to have those statements made at the same time here. So far as it is possible to do so—it will not always be possible or perhaps appropriate—I would like to follow this practice, and I have a statement of that character today.

From time to time there have been requests for the tabling of a report that was commissioned in 1955 on a possible diversion of water from the Columbia River to the Fraser River. As the report was related to the negotiations which had been undertaken with the United States relating to the Columbia River Treaty, it was the policy of the previous Government not to make the report public. The present Government has also felt that the report should not be released before negotiations by the Government were completed relative to co-operative development of the Columbia River in Canada.

Now that these negotiations have reached successful completion with the signing of the agreements on January 22, 1964, I desire to table one copy of the report which bears the title "Report on an Investigation of Columbia to Fraser River Diversion Project, 1956," which was prepared by the B.C. Engineering Company Limited. I also table a copy of a paper which summarizes the findings contained in the report.

Shortly put, the report is not optimistic with regard to the cost at which power could be produced on the Thompson and lower Fraser Rivers—either with or without a diversion from the Columbia. Without such a diversion the production cost is estimated at 9.7 mills per kilowatt hour for firm energy, and 6.75 mills for firm plus secondary energy. With the Columbia diversion the cost is estimated at 8 mills for firm energy and 6.95 mills for firm plus secondary energy. The increment of energy actually provided by the diversion is estimated to cost 7.1 mills per kilowatt hour when delivered to loads in Vancouver. In arriving at this cost the report

does not charge the diversion proposal for any portion of the cost of dams on the Columbia River which are required for the regulation and diversion of the water. The report does not go into the fishery problem, which is a major one, although it does deal with the cost of fish passages at the proposed dams.

As the report is a very bulky one, I regret that it is not possible to provide copies of it to individual members. However, they will be able to have access to it among the papers of the House.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: I wonder if the honourable leader could give us some idea of the comparison between those costs per kilowatt hours and those of the St. Lawrence River project?

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): I regret I cannot answer that; but I will try to get the information for the honourable senator.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Thorvaldson: The honourable leader referred to a summary in the statement he made. I understand that summary is being made available to members of the other house, and I am wondering if it—not the report—could be made available to the members of this house.

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): The answer, of course, is yes. I am looking at it now to see if there is something which might be added to the report of our proceedings today. I notice that it contains several maps which might make reproduction of the summary difficult. However, I will make inquiries, and I am sure that a copy of the summary and the maps can be made available to all honourable senators.

Hon. Mr. Thorvaldson: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Brooks: Will a copy of the summary and the maps appear in the Commons *Hansard*?

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): I am unable to answer that question. I am in doubt about it because I do not think there is any provision for reproducing a map, even as an appendix to our *Hansard*.

Hon. Mr. Brooks: The reason I ask is that the Commons *Hansard* is available, of course, to all members and senators, and to reproduce this in our *Hansard* would duplicate what may be available in the Commons *Hansard*. I think that is a point that should be considered.