

of record of flow they have available to them. It is their risk. They may take a short period of record and decide to go ahead with the development. Then they might find, after operating for a few years, the period of record upon which they based their studies was a period of high flow, above average flow, and they are not actually getting that amount of water. But the urgency to develop at the time was such that they did not delay the decision to go ahead, and they may not get the return they expect in later years, or they may get a greater return.

Mr. PAYNE: The normal experience of the branch is that a corporation does look for a reasonable period of chronological history and records, to some extent, before entering upon decisions?

Mr. PATTERSON: That is right. We maintain that until you have at least ten years of record you are working on pretty sketchy information.

Mr. PAYNE: You are speaking of ten years of records, which are fairly conclusive? They cover the potential within that proposed area of development? It is not just a hit-and-miss station; it is an extensive study in a ten-year period?

Mr. CÔTÉ: Mr. Chairman, I think I should say at this point that the branch likes to see a long period of records. That is quite so, but to answer Mr. Payne's specific question regarding the Ghost river, in the book here which was referred to—The Arctic and Western Hudson Bay Branch Surveys, water supply of Canada—regarding the Ghost river, near Cochrane, there the period of record was from 1911 to 1920, which is nine years, and then from December, 1928 to date. As I recall it, they built the Ghost river dam in the late 1920's or early 30's, after about ten years.

Mr. PAYNE: It was completed around 1932, I believe.

Mr. CÔTÉ: The decision was taken before then, so the period of record—the broken period of record—was something in the order of ten years.

Mr. PAYNE: You went back to 1911?

Mr. CÔTÉ: 1911 to 1920, a broken period of record; no record from 1920 to 1928; then from 1928 to the date of construction in 1930-32; and then to date.

Mr. PAYNE: You have covered quite a bracket of years in the study?

Mr. CÔTÉ: A matter of nine years' continuous record, and from 1928 to the date of construction, another three or four years.

Mr. PAYNE: But you regard that as a reasonably short period, this bracket of almost 18 years, with nine years' continuous study?

Mr. CÔTÉ: Mr. Chairman, I think that if any engineer had his say, he would like a very long period, as mentioned earlier by Mr. McLeod, because of the variations which may be century variations or variations within a millennium.

Mr. PAYNE: Have you, within the last 18 months, been called upon extensively for the brief period of record you have in this area, by a company anticipating development in the Rocky Mountain trench? Those limited records you have made available to them?

Mr. McLEOD: Of course, in the first place, all of the records we have up to, perhaps, three years ago were already in publication, and the company had copies of those immediately available.

Mr. PAYNE: Have you had reciprocal information from them, to any extent at all?

Mr. McLEOD: No.

Mr. PAYNE: None?

Mr. McLEOD: No.