

of the Waneta plant takes place. I would like to get this clear. I notice that the Waneta and Duncan lake plants have been included in a number of briefs. Somehow it conveys the impression that in some way they are connected with the benefits to be derived from the treaty project. Would it be right to say that the Waneta plant, even though it is on the stream in the Columbia system, is in no way dependent on the treaty plan, but is separate?

Mr. ANDERSON: It is a project which is entirely separate.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands*): It is not one of the benefits to be derived from the treaty? The treaty will not benefit it?

Mr. ANDERSON: I cannot see that there is any connection.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands*): It was just the inclusion of it here that interested me, and I suggest that at page 12 you have also included the Duncan lake project.

Mr. ANDERSON: That is upstream of the Kootenay river.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands*): Yes, and that also is a project which is not affected by the rest of the plan under the treaty?

Mr. ANDERSON: Well, Duncan would be a benefit to the Kootenay river plan.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands*): Oh yes; but I mean it is not dependent on any particular development for the rest of the area?

Mr. ANDERSON: No, it is a separate storage reservoir in a separate area.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands*): Yes, it is not to be considered as one of the benefits to be derived from the treaty plan.

Mr. ANDERSON: Well, it is in the benefits.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands*): It is in the reference, I know; but technically it is not dependent on the rest of the development.

Mr. ANDERSON: I am not quite sure that I understand. It is producing a benefit which is a flood benefit, and a downstream energy benefit under the treaty project.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands*): It could have that under any circumstances, under any plan adopted.

Mr. ANDERSON: Cominco looked at Duncan lake storage at one time for its own operation, but the cost of that project alone for our own particular operation was not economic. However, to apply it to the treaty in the downstream benefits is a different matter.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands*): Thank you. Now, on page 9 I would like to have a little explanation. I am sure there is an explanation which escapes me owing to my ignorance of these matters; but in paragraph (3) (a), in the last sentence, you refer to Cominco operation and diversion and you say:

As a general principle, Cominco opposes the diversion of the Kootenay river into the Columbia since it would alienate present or potential power resources from an area that is already highly developed industrially to a location that is presently remote from any major centre.

Would you please elaborate and explain where the alienation would take place?

Mr. WADESON: The treaty contemplates three possible diversions, but let us look at it in a general sense. Any diversion from the Kootenay alienates power from the plants on the west Kootenay route and transports that power in the form of generation to Mica, Downie creek, and Revelstoke canyon. That is all we mean by alienation. It is moving it away from the load centre which