

it back, I mean dams. How do you reconcile that part of the treaty with the imputed benefits for Canadian storage for the allegation of floods on the lower Columbia?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Well, sir, I have never been happy even about the actual principles of the treaty. I look at the flood storage, and while we were to get \$1.38 per acre foot allegedly for what is known as first added flood storage, it does not cost the United States a bean. We have to build it, and may keep half the profits, and we also get one half the profits. There is nothing to complain about in that. But what I do complain about is that we do not get the flood storage credited that was recommended in September 1960 report, when the negotiators made their reports to the two governments. Instead, between that time and the treaty they downgraded the treaty, and the protocol has downgraded the treaty except for the cash payment.

Every time they get a go at us, they take another couple of candies out of our candy bag.

Mr. DAVIS: You said that primarily flood control did not cost the United States a bean. I thought it cost the United States \$69 million?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Yes, but that represented less than half their savings.

Mr. DAVIS: Yes it was \$69 million.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Yes, it was half their profits. They get the same payment, and we have to build the structures. If they paid for half the cost of the dams and got half the benefits, I would go along with it. I say we should both go it fifty-fifty.

Mr. DAVIS: Your statement that flood control does not cost the United States a bean is obviously incorrect.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: All right. I am sorry. They did not have to spend any money in their own country. They do pay us one half the profits that they get out of it, yes, but we have to build the structures, and we get only half the profits. They do not have to build any structures, but I do not make much complaint about that. However I do complain that there is degradation of the Canadian interests between the treaty recommendations and the treaty, and at a later time between the treaty and the protocol.

Mr. KINDT: I am just about finished with this particular section. There are still other benefits such as recreation? Is that true? You mentioned recreation, navigation, and other benefits which will come about as a result of storage facilities in Canada. Have all these been computed in, and is Canada getting its rightful recognition of these dollar benefits out of the treaty?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: The United States in this book here analysed all their own projects and they included all these considerations in the evaluation of the storage project.

Mr. KINDT: Yes. Now then, coming to this evaluation work, how many people would they have employed on a survey on the Columbia river, such as the one you have in front of you?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: You mean the people who made up this book?

Mr. KINDT: Yes.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: I would say that over a thousand people worked on it for ten years. That is purely a guess, but I do not see how they could do it in very much less time than that.

Mr. KINDT: In other words, would you say then that they have the whole gamut of technical people on the payroll either on the Columbia or on some other watershed, such as civil servants, and that they spend their lives at doing watershed development?