

Mr. DAVIS: Mr. Higgins, you place a good deal of faith in the report of 1959 of the international Columbia river engineering board. A good part of your reasoning is based on that. Is that not so?

Mr. HIGGINS: The international Columbia river engineering board is a very useful source of facts and a lot of detailed analysis has been done in the international Columbia river engineering board report, and certainly I believe everybody has relied on this for facts. I believe it is necessary to have facts which are agreed before one can really have a valid difference of opinion on those facts.

Mr. DAVIS: You would agree, therefore, that it is a useful reference in terms of major alternatives?

Mr. HIGGINS: I think it should be borne in mind that the international Columbia river engineering board's terms of reference instructed them to proceed as though the boundary did not exist. Therefore, as has been stated several times in the presentation and elsewhere, the international Columbia river engineering board report, is a useful source of facts, and to some extent it does reflect the competitive engineering approach to this problem. I think you need to bear in mind the assumptions underlying this.

Mr. DAVIS: It did not study a simple diversion at Canal Flats as one of the alternatives; is that right?

Mr. HIGGINS: No, I do not believe it did.

Mr. DAVIS: The contention that that may be the most economic is neither borne out nor disputed in this engineering report?

Mr. HIGGINS: That is right.

Mr. DAVIS: I would like to draw attention to your page 21. At the bottom of that page you reiterate some of the statements which appear in this report. I think the conclusions which this report reaches are important, namely the 1959 report of the international Columbia river engineering board. You say at the beginning of the third paragraph:

Conclusions of the international Columbia river engineering board stated on pages 102-103 of their report bear repeating—

And so on. The conclusions actually appear much later in the report; they appear at the end.

Mr. HIGGINS: Yes.

Mr. DAVIS: They appear on page 109 of that engineering board report. I think I might just read in the relevant paragraph from those conclusions as reached by the Canadian and United States engineers:

Three possible methods of developing the Kootenay and upper Columbia rivers produced potential benefits nearly equal in terms of total effect in the basin. The results of the power studies indicated that on the basis system power production and under the given assumptions—

That would include no boundary.

—The Copper creek diversion plan—

And the Copper creek diversion in your view is a partial diversion.

—would provide the highest level of development of the water resources of the basin. However, the apparent superiority of this plan takes into account only physical and economic factors and the margin on which this superiority rests is small.

In view of these factors, and having regard to the practical limits of the accuracy of the studies, no one plan of development can be selected as representing the optimum use of sites and water resources.