It is understood that the Crippen-Wright proposals were analogous to Seq VIII with 1.5 maf in place of 2.6 maf. Thus in these proposals, the average head at Mica would be less well maintained for a given discharge.

I would observe further that the average annual release from storage at Mica is 3.93 maf while under the treaty, if the average annual release may be 7.0 maf, this would nearly double that contemplated in the ICREB report. If so, the average head at Mica in Seq VIII under the treaty will be much less than I have indicated above.

Re your Para 7

In regard to irrigation in the East Kootenays, the Department of Agriculture report states that some 300,000 acres of irrigable land could be substituted for 26,000 acres of bottom land of no better quality which would be submerged by the reservoir. In Sequence IXa these new lands are adjacent to the reservoirs, which will be high in the early summer and thus facilitate local pumping.

The report in question was obtained by the then Minister of Agriculture at my request, and at the time I had the opportunity to discuss the proposal with the technical officers concerned in the Department of Agriculture and in P.F.R.A., and I am assured that the project has merit. I believe that this would be confirmed by competent engineering consultants if the matter is referred for advice before committments are made to the ratification of the treaty or the protocol.

Re your Paras 8 and 9

Re your reference to further studies by Montreal Engineering Company during the fall and winter of 1961, which you say give strong support to the treaty projects, I have not had access to these studies. I would be pleased to have an opportunity to study these reports.

Re your Paras 10 and 11

In Para 10, why unavoidable?

I appreciate your recognition that the views I have expressed are based on conviction. These views are derived from long study over many years and I believe that what I have been stating is correct. I certainly have endeavoured to be entirely objective in my presentations of the deficiencies which I am convinced exist in the present proposed treaty. I express the very sincere hope that you will be able to correct these matters or in cases of doubt that these will be resolved and Canadian rights not left open to dispute.

I can assure you that the results you obtain will be examined with the closest and most sympathetic attention to the best interests of Canada, which I am sure is your intention also, even if we may differ in the method to be adopted.

I am obliged to you for:

(a) The paper giving revised Benefit/Cost storage studies in various combinations, dated Sept, 1963

(b) The NA and NR paper on possible diversions from the Columbia to the Eastern slope of the