

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: It is my opinion that either one or the other of your suggestions is correct.

Mr. DEACHMAN: In other words, you are not now sure that the United States technicians had a preponderance of technical knowledge?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: You have not allowed me to answer the question. In respect of a project of this type what is needed is a comprehensive understanding of the entire situation of the Columbia basin in the United States and in Canada. You are never going to accomplish anything by knowing something of the Canadian situation only if you do not know something of the United States situation. When you are negotiating a treaty of this kind you must know the situation in the United States and the situation in Canada extremely well, and I do not think we knew as much about the Canadian situation as the United States technicians knew about the United States situation. I do not think we knew much, comparatively, about the United States conditions in the Columbia basin, and I am sure the United States technicians had an extremely good idea about the Canadian conditions in the Columbia basin.

Mr. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask a supplementary question. Is Mr. Bartholomew of the opinion that this inadequacy of which he speaks resulted from incompetence?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Yesterday we were given some information about the four members of the Canadian team. We were told that they all had jobs other than working on this Columbia river treaty. This was a very small team. One man was a water controller, one man was a water recorder, and the other men were doing other jobs. This group was considered to be the Canadian team. They did not have a ghost of a chance of competing with the United States technicians. It cannot be expected that men on half time employment in respect of a project of this type will accomplish as much as men on full time.

Mr. STEWART: Would you say that Mr. Gordon MacNabb worked half time in this regard?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Actually Mr. Gordon MacNabb was working on a coordinating committee in respect of a Quebec-Ontario use of dam created storages. He did not confine his entire efforts to this job. I think that is right, is it not, Mr. MacNabb?

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Deachman, have you completed your questions?

Mr. DEACHMAN: No, I have not quite completed my questions.

Mr. Bartholomew, I think we have established that you are now not at all certain that it was the preponderance of technical assistance available to the United States technicians which resulted in their superior knowledge of the Canadian operation?

What in effect the witness now said is that the United States knew as much as we did but they also had a knowledge of their own side of the river which was of inestimable value in drawing up this treaty. What is it precisely that they knew about their own side, or what is it that must be known about the United States side of the river in order to conclude a treaty relating to installations on the Canadian side? I think I can suggest to you something we would want to know: We would want to know the amount of water we were delivering across the border, and we would want to know the amount of power that would generate on the other side through existing equipment, in order that we could come to some equitable decision. I submit that all this data were not only available but that computers were available, owned by the United States, to run out data for any answer we might want to have. Is this not so? We could run by computer any test we wanted in relation to what that flow would do to the existing installations relative to the treaty and the proposals which were under discussion.