

Mr. DAVIS: I do not know.

Mr. LEBOE: The figures are not relevant to the question because the estimates did include the lower level; they were estimated on the level.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: To which are you referring now?

Mr. LEBOE: The Peace river dam.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: I have the report of the Peace river engineering in my office. I have forgotten whether it was 500 feet or 550 feet, but it had been reduced by 50 feet below the estimate which British Columbia Engineering Co. prepared. I think I am right there, Mr. Davis?

Mr. DAVIS: I was not following, I am afraid.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: The height of the dam has been reduced by 50 feet.

Mr. DAVIS: That is right.

Mr. LEBOE: But that was not included in the \$99 million. The figure was estimated at more than that before they reduced the level of the dam. You have to keep it relative and in its context.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: I do have all the original estimates in my office, but I cannot remember them now. You may be quite right.

Mr. LEBOE: Dr. Keenleyside made the point that it was due to the fact that they were using a new conveyor system and were therefore able to bid at a lower price. This may apply in the Columbia river.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: We have been using conveyors for years. The bigger the job, the bigger the conveyor. We have been using conveyors for moving rock, coal and dirt for a long time. In Egypt they are putting in a fabulous conveyor for the Aswan. Each one has to be specially designed.

Mr. LEBOE: It is the design that they are using in this particular case that is the critical point.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: It will be one of many scattered throughout the world.

Mr. DAVIS: I have the impression, Mr. Bartholomew, that you believe there are substantial irrigation benefits in the state of Washington, for example, which should be shared with Canada but which are not discovered by the treaty. You believe we do not get these benefits; is that so?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: I agree that the benefits are there. I never claimed that they should be shared with Canada. As far as irrigation is concerned, it is a very small thing anyhow, and I was not prepared to argue about it. I would say we ought to be able to get something more or less equivalent. Have I answered your question?

Mr. DAVIS: Can irrigation benefits not be achieved with the river in its present state? In other words, can the United States not irrigate with those waters coming down in the summertime without Canada doing anything?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Of course they can. The only time when irrigation water becomes important is when the river is fully developed in a critical period, and you are not going to waste a drop of water. Whether you take it out for irrigation, for navigation, or for anything else, it is lost power. But that would only happen once in so many years. Generally speaking this is about the only importance that irrigation can achieve in the picture, and it is very small.

Mr. DAVIS: If you were rewriting the treaty, you would not include irrigation benefits as payment to Canada?