

only 7½ per cent over the annual 6.7 billion. As based on the factual increase at High Arrow, the increment looks to be only 100 million kilowatt hours, owing to the extension of the term. So I do have difficulty in reconciling these figures. And it is also stated that the Canadian capacity benefits have increased by 5 per cent to 7 per cent through certification of the irrigation payments at Coulee as being part of the United States load. One thought that they were always part of it, and now I am not at all clear on the significance of it, because it was never referred to before. Perhaps there was some agreement made after the treaty which has not been made manifest to Canadians. Those are some of the arithmetical calculations which I found to be difficult to understand.

Mr. BREWIN: You have been dealing with the statement in the protocol.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Yes. These statements appear in the protocol.

Mr. BREWIN: Yes. I take it that you have collected in your brief at pages 29 to 35 at any rate instances of what you feel or what you believe to be examples to justify your statement that there were errors in these press releases.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Yes, sir. The figures I have given you appear to me to determine that. By the same token I consider that the statement that the United States kilowatt hours cost 5.3 is a misstatement. I give the United States cost as 3.6, but Mr. Davis has shown that I was quoting too high a figure, and that I should have said about 3.4 kwh. I have not checked out this figure.

Mr. BREWIN: On page 4 of your brief, paragraph 1-17, you say:

This is illustrated by letters written by ministers of the crown both in Ottawa and Victoria, wherein statements were made contrary to facts, and contrary to reports which the governments had received. Speeches and press reports were issued (undoubtedly written for ministers) incorporating serious errors and misinterpretations of the treaty. It was obvious that the ministers did not understand what they were stating and one must assume that their advisers were similarly uninformed.

That is a fairly severe indictment of those ministers. I wonder if you have some details to support it.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: I would say, sir, if you go back to the statements made by the Minister of Justice in 1961 after the Montreal engineering report came out, you will see he stated in speeches which he had printed—and I have not brought them with me, but I do have copies of them—that Montreal Engineering had declared that cost of the treaty power would be from 4 mills to about 4½ mills; whereas Montreal Engineering, in the clearest terms, explicitly state that the figures they were using in that section of the report were theoretical figures in order to enable them to make a comparative analysis of various developments; they finally summed up the matter and said that the probable cost of the treaty power would be 5.4 mills. The Minister of Justice without question made a complete misstatement of what the Montreal Engineering Company said. I have letters from the minister in Victoria telling me that the treaty had followed the International Joint Commission recommendations. I think I dealt with them rather extensively today. But the treaty did not follow the recommendations, and the minister was misinformed. Those are two very specific statements which are not in accordance with the facts.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that all?

Mr. BREWIN: Yes, if the witness has finished.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Now, Mr. Kindt. Is Mr. Kindt here? No, he has gone. All right, Mr. Groos.

Mr. GROOS: I shall be very brief. I should make just an observation and say while I am not an engineer or a lawyer on this committee, I believe that all