

Mr. HERRIDGE: Mr. Chairman, I object to officials of the northern waters resources branch being at the tables advising members directly. Mr. MacNabb was advising Mr. Stewart.

Mr. MACDONALD: I object to Mr. Herridge's objection; it is nonsense.

The CHAIRMAN: I did not see anyone sitting at the table. I did see Mr. MacNabb leaning over for a moment. Do you object to that?

Mr. HERRIDGE: Yes, it is quite improper in committee procedure.

Mr. MACDONALD: That is nonsense.

The CHAIRMAN: Please proceed. We have 25 minutes left.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: In Annex B, clause 7, it is stated that the Pacific northwest area for the purposes of these determinations shall be Oregon, Washington, Idaho and Montana west of the continental divide but shall exclude areas served on the ratification date by the California Oregon Power Company and Utah Power and Light Company.

In step 1 they say:

The installations included in this system will be those required, with allowance for adequate reserves, to meet the forecast power load to be served by this system in the United States of America, including the estimated flow of power at points of inter-connection with adjacent areas, subject to paragraph 3, plus the portion of the entitlement of Canada that is expected to be used in Canada.

In one place we exclude them; in step 1 we include them. Of course, in the protocol we go hog wild and we include the whole United States power system.

Mr. BREWIN: Have you finished dealing with this particular press release?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Yes.

Mr. BREWIN: The other press release to which I take it you are referring when you say there are errors which will be corrected is the press release of January 22, 1964, which appears at page 124 of the white paper. I take it that you have dealt with that in your report at some length?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: There was one point that I was including there, I think. It is stated in this press release on page 126 that among the improvements to the treaty through the protocol is an increase in Canada's downstream energy benefits by 14 to 18 per cent by using a longer period of stream flow in benefit calculation.

I have made a study if the stream flows past Mica, past High Arrow and Grand Coulee, and I can only find, as I mention in my paper here, one or 1½ per cent increase in water flow. As we can already recover in Mica some 95 per cent of the treaty water flowing in the 20 year and the 30 year period—we do not get another critical period in the last ten years—I do not know where they get that 14 to 18 per cent. I have the figures here. I have checked them as carefully as I can and perhaps there is some explanation with which I am not familiar, but there is certainly no increase in power.

I would also like to point out that the incremental kilowatt hours estimated were 500 million. These appear to be straight arithmetical errors.

I am sorry, gentlemen, just give me a moment. Oh, here we are. I find in the 28-48, the average flow at Mica, taking these water tables, is specified as 20,100, and by extending the period to 1958 I get 20,500 cubic feet per second average flow, an increase of 2 per cent; and I get the figures at High Arrow of 38,450 as against 39,000 cubic feet per second, an increase of 1.4 per cent. Now, then, going from 14 to 18 per cent mystifies me. We see here—oh—the total downstream increment of kilowatt hours owing to increasing the period to 30 years is stated to be 500 million kilowatt hours, which is however,