

River System as prescribed in the instructions to the IJC of 28 and 29 Jan 1959, there is a wide and ample opportunity to provide additional benefits in power and flood control which may be shared equitably with the U. S.

In connection with the Dorr Plan, I would mention further that the Department of Agriculture has reported that the development of the East Kootenay storages will have a beneficial effect on agriculture. This advice was given in a letter signed by S. C. Barry, Department of Agriculture, addressed to the Secretary, Canadian Section, IJC, dated 14 June 1960, and I mention it in case this communication has not been brought to your attention.

In your Para 4, you make reference to the Crippen Wright report dated 9 July 1959 and comprising, you mention, "nine substantial volumes". I received this report direct from the government of BC the day before I left for Washington to commence the negotiations of the IJC Principles. The general part of the report proved useful to me in making my presentation to my U. S. colleagues and later I was able to peruse the whole report which provided a mass of information relative to a multiplicity of possible sites and alternatives for power dams and storages, including tentative schedules of construction, installed capacities and the like. This was useful in checking the physical proposals made by the ICREB, and I think served to confirm the selections which had been made of the individual projects. However I do not recall that any of the volumes I have seen contained any comprehensive summary or comparison of the relative merits of these projects when combined in the several IJC sequences.

If there is such a report as you mention, I would be grateful for a specific reference, or a copy, when I will at once discuss it with Mr. Crippen, with whom I have the pleasure of being acquainted.

In your Para 4, you make reference also to the report made to the Federal Government by Montreal Engineering in 1957. I recall that a number of the sites proposed for development by this report became eliminated in the course of the ICREB and IJC discussions. Certainly I do not recall that it contains any proof that we should depart from the Dorr Plan with its manifest advantages to Canada in cost-saving, power production, flexibility of regulation for Mica and the other great Canadian plants, and in what, it now turns out as a result of experience, is the paramount necessity of maintaining Canadian jurisdiction and control over waters of Canadian origin.

I notice that nowhere have you mentioned the 1961 Report of the same company. I raise this matter to say that I have re-read this report recently. I find it was commissioned by letter from the Deputy Minister NA and NR, under date of 15 April 1961, and that it was presented on 15 May 1961, that is, one month and two days later!! The letter of transmittal evidences close participation by an officer of NA and NR. The report is confined to the Treaty projects and there is no mention whatever of Dorr-Bull River-Luxor.

So this report also provides no basis whatever for comparison of the Copper Creek and Dorr plans. It is however of particular interest because it makes three important specific criticisms of the Treaty of 17 Jan 1961, namely:

1. In regard to Article X of the Treaty, on Page 15 the following appears:

"...under the design assumptions...the downstream benefits...could be transmitted on a firm basis to the load centres over the 345,000 volt system without necessity of the standby transmission in the United States specified in Article X of the Treaty. Hence payment by Canada for standby transmission would not be necessary if an inter-connection agreement could be negotiated with the United States".

I made some reference to Article X in my CI of IA article and elsewhere I have described it as a device to impose on Canada the cost of transmission of Canada's half (?) share of the downstream benefits from the point of