

of the Columbia river treaty and protocol. Five of those engineers who assisted the treaty negotiators participated in the work of the international Columbia river engineering board. Earlier in these hearings I introduced a statement made by General McNaughton in March, 1960, before the external affairs committee, in which he said that the engineers of this board—that is to say, the international Columbia river engineering board—consisted of—and now I use the general's words—"gentlemen whom we regard as the best experts in the North American continent on these matters. Do you agree with the general's assessment of their professional qualifications?"

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Not knowing them I do not agree or disagree. You see, you started this by telling me of the people who were employed in preparing the principles. If those principles had been applied to the treaty, you would have an acceptable treaty. It is the abandonment of the principles in the treaty which has ruined this whole situation.

Mr. TURNER: Those are all the questions I have for the moment.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Macdonald, and then Mr. Herridge.

Mr. MACDONALD: Mr. Bartholomew, I refer to your brief at page 13, at the bottom of the page, where you say:

From the Canadian point of view, any diversion at Canal Flats as permitted by the treaty is highly undesirable. The first diversion should be at Bull river some miles further down, to be followed by a final diversion at Dorr on the river near the boundary.

Firstly, I should ask you, are you aware that in addition to the studies carried out by the engineers referred to by Mr. Turner, both the Montreal Engineering Company Limited and Crippen Wright Engineering Limited conducted detailed engineering studies of the site prior to the commencement of negotiations.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: And then what?

Mr. MACDONALD: As a result of which they reported in 1957 and 1959 respectively. Do you consider those studies adequate?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: I do not consider the diversion of the Kootenay river at Canal Flats a proper diversion to make, if that is the question.

Mr. MACDONALD: I said, do you consider adequate the studies made by those two engineering companies?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: I have never seen the reports. I endeavoured to obtain them from the water comptroller in Victoria. There was only one copy and I could not go there to read it and therefore could not obtain access to it.

Mr. MACDONALD: I am advised both of those documents have been available for some time.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: I applied for the Crippen Wright report several times and was told it would be available, but the final advice I received from Mr. Paget was there was only one copy and I could come to Victoria and study it. I have been unable to do that.

Mr. MACDONALD: Montreal Engineering reported in 1957 with regard to the diversion at Canal Flats and said:

This is probably the only project proposed in the Columbia basin in Canada which can be described as simple.

The same company, in testimony last week, indicated that the treaty plan with the Canal Flats diversion was better than the Dorr-Bull river-Luxor plan. Do you think their judgment is to be accepted in that light?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: I think they made a mistake. I do not think you can divert the Kootenay water into the Columbia at Canal Flats. First of all you