

International Rivers

agree with us in everything; he may even join some of his colleagues and vote for the bill. I do not know what he will do, but when he knew this thing was in the air did he shoot off his mouth? I do not say he has never before shot off his mouth, but this time he did not. He did the reasonable thing. He even went to Victoria and spoke to the premier of the province and the minister of lands and forests. He said that he went there to get their view of the situation. Then he investigated the other side of the picture.

He is a private member of the house. What he did was what the federal government should have done. The hon. member urged that a conference should have been held and should be held today to see whether these differences cannot be ironed out if there is such danger. That is the sane approach to take to the thing. The hon. member for Okanagan Boundary (Mr. Jones) did not go to Victoria but he looked at the matter in what I thought was a reasonable fashion.

Mr. Blackmore: Rather statesmanlike.

Mr. Hansell: Rather statesmanlike. That is the thing to do when we have to deal with a measure that affects provincial autonomy. I listened to the hon. member for Kootenay East (Mr. Byrne). It is a little hard for me to listen to him but I exercised some degree of self-control. When he talked about co-operation he lifted in the air a document that was supposed to have come from the British Columbia government. He showed how he had interleafed the document to indicate where they were talking about co-operation and so forth, and he urged co-operation. Let me ask him: Does this bill savour of co-operation?

Mr. Byrne: Yes.

Mr. Hansell: In what respect does this bill talk of co-operation?

An hon. Member: Give him a minute to answer.

Mr. Hansell: I cannot afford a minute, but silence reigns. Let me ask him: Has he analysed the speech of the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources (Mr. Lesage) yesterday? Let me ask him how that speech can ever give any indication of co-operation.

Mr. Blackmore: Silence again.

Mr. Hansell: Silence again. The minister when speaking yesterday—

Mr. Byrne: May I answer now?

Mr. Hansell:—attempted to reply to some of the arguments of the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore). I am not going

to dwell too much on this point because the hon. member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Thomas), who preceded me, dealt admirably with it. As found at page 1036 of *Hansard* yesterday, the minister had this to say:

And when we think how young our country is it will be realized that I am using the right expression when I say that a deal like the Kaiser one is equivalent to selling down the river or giving down the river the possibilities of power development in this country at this time.

The hon. member for Wetaskiwin has already challenged the minister to say what we are giving down the river. How can we be giving something down the river when the dam is to be built to hold the water back? It is a storage dam for the purpose of regulating the flow so that the water is not lost at flood season.

Mr. Lesage: To the United States.

Mr. Hansell: Of course, to the United States, where it would flow anyway.

Mr. Low: It is flowing.

Mr. Hansell: It is flowing there right now.

Mr. Thomas: And has done so for centuries.

Mr. Hansell: And has done so for centuries. When the flood tide comes it will still flow in abundance. What the government of British Columbia is doing is preventing it from flowing so fast at flood time. That is all they are doing. The minister also said, as found at page 1041 of *Hansard* of yesterday:

In order that no sacrifice of our all important water resources may be made through too much emphasis being given to a short range view, such as advocated by the hon. member for Lethbridge...

I ask the minister to say in what way are we sacrificing our all important water resources when the dam is to be built to hold the water back?

Mr. Blackmore: Silence again.

Mr. Hansell: Silence again. There is a lot of silence when they are challenged to come up with the real argument and the real evidence. What power would we lose, what water would we lose when we will hold back by means of the dam some three million acre feet of water in this country?

The Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources spent a good deal of time talking about the deal that has been made. He spent more than half his time dealing with whether or not the present agreement reached between the Kaiser interests and the British Columbia government was a good deal. As he tried to prove that it was a bad deal he waved his hands in the air like an old clucking hen in a chicken coop.