

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: The long term growth in power demand in British Columbia has been in the order of 7 per cent, possibly a little higher. The British Columbia Electric shows, I think, a little lower figure. The long term growth of Canada is under 7 per cent. The long term growth predicted by the Bonneville power administration is between 5 per cent and 6 per cent. The base planning for long terms ahead with higher rates of growth is very dangerous. The Montreal Engineering made a forecast for 6 per cent, 8 per cent and 10 per cent. They had no idea which it would be. However, when a system becomes heavily developed and when utilization is large, the rate of growth becomes slower.

Mr. WILLOUGHBY: In view of the large population increase in British Columbia and the possibility of an even more rapid increase, would it not be considered that the suggested rate of power increase that will be developed both by the Peace and the Columbia, in progressive stages, will not be consumed, probably, at the time of the development.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: I shall not live to see it fully used, of course. I hope you will; I do not think you will.

The CHAIRMAN: You look pretty fit.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: You are speaking of 30 years. I am 79 years old.

Mr. WILLOUGHBY: The graph shows that the consumption of power would keep up to the gradual development, especially in relation to the Columbia.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: I would not like to forecast a greater growth than 7 per cent. About four years ago Mr. Williston made a speech declaring we had to prepare for a 10 per cent rate of annual growth. Looking over the experience of the whole world—and we have these past statistics for Europe, the United States and for the rest of Canada—I cannot see any likelihood of our rate of growth exceeding  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent, which causes doubling in about ten years. It is faster than the growth in the Bonneville area and much faster than they are forecasting.

Mr. WILLOUGHBY: Thank you.

On page 12 in your brief for you make the statement that the water of the Libby dam will back up into Canada for 80 miles. I presume you mean 40 miles?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: I knew that error was in there and I went through this basically this morning to find it. I knew it was in there and I knew it was wrong. I apologize.

Mr. WILLOUGHBY: On page 13 you make the statement that the diversion of the upper Kootenay into the Columbia at Canal Flats would not be justified. Luxor does not enter into the treaty at present, but I understand that is such an economical project that it could be done at very little cost.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: It could; but the trouble is the Windermere valley would have to carry an additional flood of 5,000, 6,000, 7,000 or 8,000 cubic feet per second for a week or a month in the year. Now, that has to go into the Columbia where the Kicking Horse meets it at Golden. I do not know whether or not you have seen the floods at Golden in high water years. In a high water year, if you put more than 5,000, 6,000, 7,000 or 8,000 cubic feet into the river at that time you certainly will have Golden under water. The other factor is that the Windermere valley itself has land which could be—and it is so stated by the Department of Agriculture—used for agricultural purposes but for the flooding and the cost of diking which is prohibitive. That is north of Luxor. The amount of flooding that would take place if you injected the Canal Flats water into the Columbia without retaining control of it would create a lot of trouble there.

I cannot agree with the Montreal Engineering Company Limited in their statement. I know that valley, and I have seen the waters in flood. Of course