

Calgary. He is now retired and he has, with me, expressed grave concern regarding what we are apparently in danger of doing with the Columbia river treaty. Mr. Bowness—I regret, sir, that this hearsay—and I do have exactly the same opinions.

Mr. GROOS: May I ask a supplementary question?

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Groos.

Mr. GROOS: When did you have these discussions with Mr. Bowness? Was it before the protocol?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Yes. I have not seen Mr. Bowness since the protocol came out. I think it was in about October or November of last year that we met and had lunch together in Vancouver.

Mr. TURNER: Mr. Bartholomew, has Mr. Bowness made any specific study of this problem?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: I would not say that Mr. Bowness had made the same amount of study as I have made, no.

Mr. TURNER: Less than 200 hours?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: I do not know. I have spent thousands of hours studying this, but just 200 hours in trying to assemble some of the information I had on file. However, I have at least two or three thousand hours behind me in my studies of the Columbia river since 1957-1958.

Mr. PUGH: What is the age of Mr. Bowness?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: I suppose Ernie Bowness is 67, 68, 69 or perhaps even 70; I am not quite sure.

Mr. HERRIDGE: Mr. Bartholomew, are you familiar with the circumstances surrounding the letter written by the Vancouver board of trade on March 23, 1964, to the Hon. Paul Martin?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Yes. I was the one who succeeded in getting that letter written. It was prepared by the engineering committee of the board of trade and it was sent to Mr. Williston and to the Hon. Paul Martin. The minister was good enough to reply; he replied to the board of trade on April 8, 1964.

I had a mimeographed copy of the letter which the board of trade sent out to the council and members of the engineering committee responding to the letter which we had sent to Mr. Martin.

Mr. TURNER: May I ask if this letter was submitted to the whole membership of the board of trade before it was sent to Mr. Martin?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Yes. The engineering committee cannot do a thing without doing that. If we could, we would have had resolutions out that would have raised the House of Commons.

Mr. HERRIDGE: Go ahead, Mr. Bartholomew.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: What do you want me to do? Shall I read the letter?

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you would answer the question.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: I know it; I have it. Am I to read you the contents and the reply?

Mr. HERRIDGE: I would like to know the circumstances surrounding it, Mr. Bartholomew.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: When the protocol first came up the engineering committee gave it preliminary consideration and we advised the council that the payment of \$274 million—or whatever it was—averted an economic disaster under threat of which Canada was sitting until that time. We told the council that we had not had an opportunity to appraise the rest of the protocol and we promised to undertake further studies and advise council.