

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Yes.

Mr. PUGH: There has been a good deal of talk about American engineers. I do not know. I have been sitting here and listening to some of our own engineers and of their qualifications, and what they have had to say about the Columbia, and I find it hard to agree that American engineers are any better in any way, shape or form.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: I did not say that.

Mr. PUGH: Oh!

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: I said that they had a large team of very capable engineers, economists, and lawyers working on this whole project over such a long time that they had accumulated a wealth of knowledge and information that overshadows us.

Mr. PUGH: Do you discern that the hand of the United States has been shown up in this treaty?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Yes, it is in their handwriting. Seventy five per cent of that treaty is written by United States personnel, because I am perfectly certain that no Canadian would have been so acute and clever as to put in these funny little regulations which you do not recognize at first, but which leave Canada out in the cold. No Canadian would do that.

Mr. PUGH: That is the tenor of your submission?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Yes, it is.

Mr. PUGH: Has your examination of the Columbia basin taken in the various United States head waters, such as the Snake?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: This treaty takes in the entire Columbia basin from the Snake, the Flathead, the Pend Oreille and the Kootenays.

Mr. PUGH: The treaty?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Oh, I am sorry. The United States work makes a study of the entire watershed of the Columbia including the Snake, the Pend Oreille, the Kootenays, the Columbia, the Flathead, and Spokane.

Mr. PUGH: Do you agree with the statement made here that the headwaters of the Columbia basin and river, even the lakes in there, the reservoirs and the storage waters vary so much, that at this point they have got completely out of hand so far as expense is concerned?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Well, sir, I can explain to you the difficulty that has arisen there. Five or six years ago a Columbia river treaty was going to provide—and the United States knew it at that time—the most economical source of storage and power. If you have read the treaty interpretation by the United States negotiators that was issued in October, 1960, you will find in this the statement that it would cost the United States \$711 million to get the same storage in the U.S. as provided by Canada, and the amount of power they got out of that was substantially less.

Mr. MACDONALD: On a point of order, the witness said October, 1960. The treaty was not signed until January, 1960.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: No; but the report of the negotiators came out in September, 1960. The interpretation was not intended for Canadian circulation, but it got out. Immediately after the report of the negotiators came out, then the United States negotiators issued this which I believe was intended to be a private document for circulation. It did get out and I have had some copies made. It came out nearly three months before the treaty. In this interpretation, the United States points out that it would cost them \$711 million to get the storage which otherwise they get from the Columbia treaty, and actually they get more storage, although the treaty pretends they do not.