

and, without that agreement, well, I will go along. But, I want to point out that the principle which was enunciated by the International Joint Commission was that provision should be made for a co-ordinating agreement. That is one of the most serious things that has been left out of the treaty.

Mr. MACDONALD: It has been suggested to us by several of the witnesses who appeared here—and I hesitate to misquote General McNaughton—that one of the parallels of a co-ordinating agreement is that it would be run for the benefit of the system as a whole, of which the United States should have the lion's share.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Mr. Macdonald, I do not think you are familiar with the nature of a co-ordinating agreement. I have with me a co-ordinating agreement which is being made between Bonneville and the various American utilities developing power in the Columbia basin. I do not suppose you want to have this as a part of the presentation, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: No.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: This is an agreement, sir, which defines and protects the rights of all the contributors of storage and power, integrated with the supply to loads, and unless a co-ordinating agreement is properly drawn and protects your interests it is worse than useless. I am quite certain if you consulted the Ontario Hydro they would show you how to define the principles of a co-ordinating agreement which would produce optimum power from a hydro thermal system without anyone getting anything less than the best. That is why it is so necessary to define the principles which must be followed in a co-ordinating agreement.

Mr. MACDONALD: Do you advocate acceptance of sequence IXa or which is otherwise referred to as the McNaughton plan?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Sequence IXa, as a development plan, is the one which eventually should be adopted, and I rather think you gentlemen will come to agree with that opinion.

Mr. MACDONALD: When you say "eventually", do you mean—

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: If I may interrupt, I mean not today.

Mr. MACDONALD: Assume we start over again, are you suggesting the implementation of this right away, soon after appropriate arrangements are worked out with the United States?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: An agreement should come along those lines. The logical thing at the present time is to do what I suggested here; we should forget the auxiliary storages. There are only two storages which people are agreed upon, namely Mica and Duncan, and we could revert to the scheme of building Mica. Mica will give the United States 12 million acre feet of potential storage or, shall I say, will share 12 million acre feet with us. It will give them essential major flood benefits.

With Duncan it will very nearly add up to the 7½ million or, perhaps I should say, between them they will give you 6 million acre feet of flood storage to control floods at Dallas to 800,000 cfs.

I quote a report here issued in 1955 or 1956 by Jack D. Stevens of Seattle. This gentlemen might be well known to some of you. I think Mr. Davis knows him. I would like to make excerpts from his report. He presents what appears today to be a new point of view of the Columbia River development—although it is 7 or 8 years old. Semi-official approaches were made in 1955 or 1956 to British Columbia by the Puget Sound utilities group,—which, incidentally, is made up of the following: Seattle City Light, Tacoma City Light, Puget Sound Power and Light Company, Snohomish county public utility district number one, and Chehalan county public utility district number one—to determine whether British Columbia was prepared to allow a dam at Mica to be