

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: This is headed "Comments on 'A Critique on the Columbia river treaty and protocol' by the subcommittee on power, Vancouver board of trade". This is what it says:

Article 5:

Whereas article XII of the treaty required Canada to request the United States to vary its operation of Libby to assist Canadian generation downstream, paragraph 5 of the protocol provides a commitment on the part of the United States that they shall "co-operate on a continuing basis" to co-ordinate the operation of Libby with Canadian plants.

Do you want any comment, or shall I read the whole thing?

Mr. HERRIDGE: I think it was understood that you should read it.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: I continue:

Under both the treaty and protocol, the United States has the right to deviate from such a co-ordinated operation to protect its own generating potential. This is understandable in a situation where Canada receives the whole of the downstream power and flood control benefits occurring in Canada from Libby without having to pay anything towards the cost of Libby except for the limited part of the reservoir in Canada. However, in spite of this freedom on the part of the United States entity, the commitment made to co-ordinate should be of value to Canada. The United States system is continually increasing in size, and therefore becoming more flexible in its operation (this is a major reason for the decreasing nature of Canada's downstream benefits—a decreasing need on the part of the United States for a specific operation of a Canadian storage). As the system becomes more flexible, it is less likely that co-ordinated operations of Libby will reduce the potential benefits to the United States. This co-ordination will not have to be on a daily or weekly basis, only seasonal, as Kootenay lake can re-regulate any daily or weekly flow fluctuations.

You may be interested in knowing that studies run for an average year of stream flow and including consideration of the treaty restriction on Libby operation have indicated in a limited dependence by Canadian Kootenay plants on co-ordinated operation at Libby. The normal operation at Libby will suit most of the requirements on the Canadian side.

Article (6):

The treaty will not present diversions of water by Canada for consumptive needs even if the water is used for power generation en route to this consumptive need. In this regard, you may be interested in my correspondence with premier Lloyd of Saskatchewan on the subject of diversion. A copy of this correspondence is attached.

I do not have that.

Mr. HERRIDGE: We have.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: It continues:

Article 7(3):

As noted above in my comment on article 5 one of the reasons our downstream benefits reduce is because the United States system becomes larger and more flexible and therefore less dependant upon Canadian storage.