

It is much less expensive than the Columbia, except on the initial development and before transmission. The payment by the United States of \$250 odd million lifts the Columbia development out of the impossible. The initial power would be cheap here. As they get it to its ultimate development, it still will cost more than the Calgary Power Company energy.

Mr. LEBOE: May I ask a supplementary question? You said they could produce thermal power at three mills delivered at Vancouver from Hat creek?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Yes. I have a report here.

Mr. LEBOE: How many years ago would it be that those figures were taken?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: It is a 1960 report.

Mr. LEBOE: Four years ago.

Mr. KINDT: Then, it is a question of cost in respect of which source of energy you use, water or coal, and you are in an area there where you have an abundance of both. We often discuss the possibility of using coal and Calgary Power has given a good deal of thought to the development of electric power down in those parts in the Crowsnest pass, but has been reluctant to do so because of the hydroelectric development which may be in the east Kootenay. You have heard of those discussions?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Yes. The Calgary Power has made several developments on the Bow river. Today, as I have mentioned, they are putting in 300,000 kilowatts of thermal power and have 250,000 KW running now. They will have another 300,000 running inside of two or three years at Wabamun, a few miles west of Edmonton.

Mr. KINDT: What possibility is there of development; in your view as an engineer what is your opinion concerning hydro compared to coal for the generation of electricity in that area.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: In which area?

Mr. KINDT: In east Kootenay or in the Crowsnest pass.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Well, I think they will get it by thermal means—if they want it—just as cheaply as they can from hydro.

Mr. KINDT: But it will need to wait on the growth, and all the rest.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Yes. It has to be analysed. I should not have attempted to generalize. I would like to withdraw that answer, because I do not know enough about the circumstances. If you give me all the facts and figures concerning it, by geography and all the rest, I will give an answer to you, but I would like to withdraw what I said.

Mr. KINDT: I have appreciated you as a witness, Mr. Bartholomew, and you have helped me clear up some points. Thank you very much.

Mr. BREWIN: Mr. Bartholomew, you discussed with Dr. Kindt the question of diversion for irrigation purposes. I would like to follow that up with you a little bit more fully. The right of diversion, of course, is for consumptive purposes which include irrigation.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Yes.

Mr. BREWIN: I would like to ask whether I have this straight in my mind. Both Canada and the United States—subject to the stated exceptions in article XIII of the treaty—are restrained from diverting in any way which would affect the natural flow at the boundary.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Unless—

Mr. BREWIN: Yes; with the exception of consumptive uses and certain other provided things. I just want it clear in my mind to what that prohibition, in effect, would apply, leaving out exceptions for a minute. What are the rivers