

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: I have met Mr. Kidd.

Mr. TURNER: What is your claim?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: I have never made any reflection upon him.

Mr. TURNER: Do you consider him to be a good engineer?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: I think he must be. He has been on the job for a long, long time.

Mr. TURNER: And Mr. A. W. Lash, formerly of the British Columbia Power Commission (now retired). Do you know him?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Yes.

Mr. TURNER: Do you know him in his professional capacity? Do you know him as an engineer?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: I cannot say that I have had any engineering association with him. I cannot remember having had any engineering association with him.

Mr. TURNER: What is your view of his professional competence?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: I feel quite sure that he has filled the position in which he was placed to their satisfaction.

Mr. TURNER: I have one more name, Mr. P. R. Purcell, now chief engineer of the British Columbia energy board and formerly a member of the international Columbia river engineering board. Do you know Mr. Purcell?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Yes.

Mr. TURNER: What is your opinion of his professional competency?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: I have not had any engineering association with him. I presume Mr. Purcell in his own field is quite competent.

Mr. TURNER: In view of these statements, would you be prepared to withdraw the words you have used on page 4 in which you challenge their experience and competence, and speak in terms of the seeming inadequacy of Canada's technical advisers?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: I regret, sir, that the treaty and protocol do indicate that Canadian interests have not been adequately looked after.

Mr. TURNER: On page 3, item 1-11, you say:

—a team should have been set up at least two years before negotiations started—

In other words, I take it to be your criticism that Canada only set up a team after the negotiations started. I am just wondering whether you are aware that a team did, in fact, exist for more than two years before negotiations started?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: You know, I made a mistake there. Two years is not nearly enough. I was going to mention this earlier today, but I overlooked it. I think it is a five year job. Look at this. The U.S. Army Engineers report it is the production of five, six, seven, eight years work. I believe it cost millions. We have not been able to show in our Canadian reports any appraisal of the Columbia river basin that compares with it. It is the absence of these published reports which constitute the evidence of what has not been done. When one virtually has let the United States write the treaty, one cannot help but think that the Canadian engineering—I am thinking not only of the engineering, but also the Canadian preparation of the treaty—was inadequate.

Mr. TURNER: Of the engineers whose names I have mentioned to you, some of them were involved in the work of the international Columbia river engineering board which, as you know, advised the International Joint Commission on the proposed principles. They were all involved in the negotiations in respect