

without restriction. Canada thus lacks an assured plan on which to base firm power output at the West Kootenay plants or to give flexibility as would be provided by Dorr-Bull River-Luxor in the operation of the great plants at Mica, Downie, Revelstoke Canyon, and Murphy.

Moreover, under the proposed treaty, with the East Kootenay supply reservoir in the U. S., the U. S. at any time, in any amount, is free to divert these flows probably by way of Bull Lake to the Grand Coulee reservoir for onward delivery to California for consumptive agricultural purposes. I submit that it is a real responsibility of the Government of Canada to prevent such a disaster to Canadian interests.

Subsequently, this best international plan developed by the ICREB has been studied by the IJC in its national aspects in regard to interest rates and in regard to the principles which should be adopted for the equitable sharing of the immense benefits which the U. S. will receive from the operation of the Canadian storage to power and flood control. I believe that these subsequent studies have confirmed the superior merit of ICREB plan Sequence IXa in all aspects.

Re your Para 3 (cont.) and also Paras 4 and 5, quoted from Crippen Wright interim report No. 2.

Since this report is labelled interim and is No. 2 in that series, I would think it is among those which were received in the summer of 1959 and, as stated in my letter to you of 23 Sept 1963, found not to justify modifications in the ICREB Report of March 1959. Certainly I would not be prepared to subscribe to these generalizations until the reasons for the conclusions advanced have been received and considered and this I will be glad to do if a copy of the full report can be provided. However I would think it evident that this report was made before the recent studies on High Arrow in which the investment cost has been increased from the ICREB preliminary figure of \$66.4 million to \$124.0 million, with probably further increases to come. In consequence of this, it would seem that the basis of the statements attributed to Crippen-Wright have been out-moded.

On engineering problems as complex as those we have under study it is manifestly wrong to base conclusions and discussion on summarized statements of opinion taken out of the context of the reports without a full understanding of the bases and parameters of the reports in question.

Re Your Para 6

The developed and average heads on the Columbia in the Copper Creek and Dorr plans are stated or estimated as follows:

	Gross Head	Estimated Average	Diversion (MAF)
Copper Creek			
Seq. VIII	1299 ft	1143 ft	2.6
Dorr			
Seq. IXa	1279 ft	1165 ft	5.8
Difference			
Dorr increase	-20 ft	+22 ft	