

require the printing of several thousand additional pages and I personally do not favour this motion.

Mr. LEBOE: I am not in favour of the motion, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BYRNE: Mr. Chairman, I honestly believe that the question of deciding on the lucidity of these briefs is a personal matter, and any one of us may determine that we feel certain briefs are clearer and more articulate than others. Yesterday I asked to have a brief presented by the people who have been in the business of hydro development for over 60 years put on the record, but it was not considered necessary. Others we have been hearing are more theoreticians than actual practitioners. This is simply a matter of opinion and I see no reason to deviate from our present course.

Mr. LEBOE: I just wanted to register my opposition to this course.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, are you ready for the question? These in favour? Two. Those opposed? Eight.

I declare the motion lost.

Mr. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, before I start my remarks this morning I would like to echo the reminder that you gave us and say that although I am employed by Ontario hydro, the Ontario hydro as such is neutral in this matter and therefore I am speaking entirely on my own initiative as a private citizen.

Mr. BYRNE: Do I gather, from your statement Mr. Higgins, that it is a statement of fact that Ontario hydro are neutral, or are they just not expressing an opinion?

Mr. HIGGINS: That is a statement of fact. Ontario hydro produces and distributes electricity in the province of Ontario, and therefore it can have no official position on developments in British Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, the members have had copies of my presentation distributed and therefore there is no necessity to read it into the record. There is also the fact that this is a fairly long presentation. However, there are certain points in it which I would like to emphasize, and if it is agreeable to the members I propose to go through this brief in the same manner as the Secretary of State for External Affairs went through the government's presentation; in other words, picking out relevant passages as I go along. There is no necessity at this point for me to deal with any of the geographical features of the Columbia basin because I am sure the members of the committee are as familiar as anyone in Canada with that at this point of the proceedings.

The argument in the presentation begins on page 9 where there is a discussion of the various storages which were discovered in the upper Columbia river basin following the reference to the International Joint Commission in 1944 at the initiative of the United States. The idea behind this particular presentation is to try to explain what the purpose and function of each one of these storage reservoirs discovered in the upper Columbia basin was on the one hand from the point of view of Canada and on the other hand from the point of view of the United States. I think this gives a useful background into how the conflicting positions of Canada and the United States arose, which of course made it necessary for us to negotiate for a solution.

As far as the Libby dam is concerned, this is the one major storage in the upper Columbia basin where the dam is located in the United States but the reservoir would flood the boundary to a depth of 150 feet and the surface area of the reservoir in Canada would be some 17,600 acres, stretching some 42 miles into Canada. The Libby dam is not an economic proposition without this incursion into Canada, and in order to build it the United States would require, under Article IV of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, the consent of Canada.