

I have never seen Canal Flats diverted, but I can imagine it would not be anything but disastrous. Furthermore, if you push that water into Mica when it goes during the flood season, you lose some of the effectiveness, because in years when you have spill—and you do have some—you merely increase the spill, so you do not get the full utilization of the water you push in during the flood season.

Mr. DAVIS: Why would you make the diversion in whole in a high water year? It is only the low water years you would worry about.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Mr. Davis, I will give you the story. The Mica dam at the present time is able to control the water to 19,500 cubic feet per second with an annual flow of 20,500 for the 30-year period. We wasted water in 1957. We wasted water, even with this rate of control, in 1956. We wasted water in 1955. We wasted water in 1954.

Mr. WILLOUGHBY: Mr. Chairman, I will forgo the rest of my questions except one short one. On page 45 you made the statement that at the town of Revelstoke the water will go right back to Revelstoke, and the town itself will be in danger. My understanding is that the problem at Revelstoke, or one of the problems, is the undermining of the banks there by the fast water. Will not the slow water help to maintain the banks instead of having the fast water?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: No, sir. The experience of engineers who have been up there is that the high water will settle that silt. You see, Revelstoke is very largely on Columbia river silt which is bad material for building on. The opinion up in Revelstoke is that there will be a considerable area which will have to be vacated.

Mr. RYAN: I would like to ask Mr. Bartholomew to turn to page 14 of his brief, the second paragraph from the top of the page where he says:

Canada is given the right at the conclusion of the treaty term, namely 60 years, to divert approximately nine tenths of the average flow of the Kootenay river at the boundary northwards into the Columbia.

I would direct his attention to article XIII, clauses (3) and (4), at pages 67 and 68 of the white paper, which is the green book.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Is that this one?

Mr. RYAN: Yes. It would appear to me from clause (3) the Bull river diversion comes in after 60 years, between 60 and 80 years, and takes about 75 per cent of the flow of the Kootenay across the border, and that the Dorr diversion does not come in until 80 years and then it takes 9/10 of the flow at the border. Is that correct?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: That is what the treaty says. We can divert 1½ million acre feet in 20 years and more in 60 years and 80 years.

Mr. RYAN: But, my point is it should read that Canada is given the right in 80 years to divert approximately 9/10 of the average flow of the Kootenay river at the boundary northward into the Columbia.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Are we looking now at page 68 of the treaty?

Mr. RYAN: Starting at page 67, at the bottom, where it says in clause (3):

Canada has the right, exercisable at any time during the period commencing 60 years after the ratification date and expiring 100 years after the ratification date, to divert to the headwaters of the Columbia river any water which, in its natural channel, would flow in the Kootenay river across the Canada-United States of America boundary, provided that the diversion does not reduce the flow of the Kootenay river at the Canada-United States of America boundary near Newgate, British Columbia, below the lesser of 2,500 cubic feet per second or the natural flow.