

generations, I respectfully recommend that the standing committee on external affairs recommend to the House of Commons that the Columbia river treaty and protocol be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you Mr. Higgins.

I have names of three members on my list for questioning the witness: Mr. Davis, Mr. Stewart and Mr. Leboe.

Mr. DAVIS: Mr. Higgins, I would like to address a few short questions to you, and my first question is in regard to your experience and training. Are you an engineer?

Mr. HIGGINS: I am not an engineer.

Mr. DAVIS: Are you a lawyer?

Mr. HIGGINS: I am not a lawyer.

Mr. DAVIS: Are you an economist?

Mr. HIGGINS: I am an economist.

Mr. HERRIDGE: Have you had any legal experience and/or training?

Mr. HIGGINS: I studied international law under Professor Lauterpacht.

Mr. DAVIS: I will concentrate my questions primarily on the economic area.

Would it be correct to say that the plan which you back for the development of the upper Columbia in Canada might be characterized as the maximum diversion of the Kootenay plan, a plan involving the construction also of the Dorr project?

Mr. HIGGINS: Yes.

Mr. DAVIS: The Dorr diversion?

Mr. HIGGINS: Yes, that is correct.

Mr. DAVIS: The maximum diversion? This would place the main burden, if not the entire burden, of providing storage in the upper Columbia on Canada?

Mr. HIGGINS: That is right.

Mr. DAVIS: The capital costs, then, would be higher than presently contemplated by the treaty?

Mr. HIGGINS: You mean the capital costs of the entire development?

Mr. DAVIS: I mean in Canada. I am referring to the capital costs in Canada and saying that they would be higher.

Mr. HIGGINS: I would say for elements which are considered as part of the treaty, excluding elements which can be developed entirely at the option of Canada, the comparison in these 1973 dollars is in the order of, for the treaty, \$477.7 million and, for the alternative plan, \$456.2 million.

Mr. DAVIS: You are saying that if Canada also performs the function which Libby performs under the treaty, the storage which Canada would then build would be cheaper than under the treaty plan?

Mr. HIGGINS: It depends on what you mean by cheaper. The total storage would cost less.

Mr. DAVIS: We would presumably be performing more of a storage function?

Mr. HIGGINS: Yes. There would be no Libby and therefore we would be performing the entire storage function.

Mr. DAVIS: So the capital outlays must be higher?

Mr. HIGGINS: I think this does not necessarily follow because Libby is an extremely expensive project. The figures that I have quoted are of the same order of magnitude; and the reason they are of the same order of magnitude is that the Libby dam is so expensive. You see, we can meet the constraint of