

Mr. HERRIDGE: Can we not get on with the point?

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps Mr. Bartholomew could comment succinctly and permit us to go on to the other questions.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Basically, sir, these conditions in the treaty and in the protocol state what is expected. If it was the intention that these characteristics should exist, there is no reason why they could not have been so defined, and the failure to define them cannot help but rouse suspicions. I cannot tell you the whole story but you must have read in the newspapers the difficulties that arose in Mexico concerning the Colorado river. The Mexicans claimed that the United States is supplying Mexico with salt water that has been pushed out of the salt lands by Colorado fresh water, and the Mexicans claimed that this is destroying their irrigated lands to the south. I read in the papers that the Mexicans have protested and the United States have said that there is no obligation in the treaty to give fresh water. All that had to be done in that case was for the treaty to state that they should return fresh water. You and I will be dead long before this thing works out, and someone will come along here, and will say, "That is what it says", and if it suits the United States in 10 or 20 years' time to use up the Libby water in the months of December, January and February because the United States are expecting a big run-off later on, there is no reason why the United States cannot do it. This will destroy Canadian firm power in the lower Kootenay. If Canadians are going to get firm power, I say, sir, that we should have it defined.

I return again to this question of consumptive use. I do not know whether we will ever need to divert water from the Kootenay to the prairies. Heaven knows what the water situation will be in 10, 20 or 30 years' time. The condition might arise, but as the treaty reads, consumptively diverted water may not be used for power. Yet, if we do divert it, we have to use it for power. The minister says that there will be no objection to the use of consumptively diverted water for incidental power generation. The treaty does not say so, nor does the protocol. If it is going to be there, why do we not modify the protocol, and put in what we think it means?

Mr. HERRIDGE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Mr. Bartholomew this question, and it covers the broader field and brings the discussion into focus—I usually do that, you know. Will you explain, Mr. Bartholomew, where the principles enunciated in the report by the International Joint Commission were deviated from in the present treaty.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: I have made one or two references to that. They have been deviated from in a very serious manner. For one thing, the I.J.C. report stated that consideration should be given to the difference in the nature of the loads of the two countries in determining downstream benefits. The loads of the two countries are treated exactly on a par. In the principles it was recognized that the Canadian load would be one of firm power for many years, whereas the United States load would tend to become one where peaking and thermal displacement were going to be the principal requirements for the use of water. The principles recommended determination and apportionment of power benefits to provide for equitable arrangements, taking into consideration the changing conditions expected. No heed has been taken of that whatsoever.

It was stated in the principles, and I have referred to this before, that there should be a principle providing for interconnection and co-ordination of the major power systems in the Columbia basin. The absence of that is going to leave Canada at a most serious disadvantage in the future. If you go ahead and build your plants, which are intended to be operated in a co-ordinated manner, and you have not your co-ordination agreement in advance, you are really at the mercy of the United States because their system is so large and