

from four factors. First, it is a very winding river; the current is very strong and it hits one bank, reaches that bank and turns and hits the other bank. Secondly, another reason is the flooding in the spring, which causes bank erosion. Then there is the question of navigation—the waves lapping on the shore when the boats go through. This causes erosion. The fourth is the locks at St. Andrews. When they are lowered in the fall the difference in the water level causes erosion. I have a lot of people down my neck in regard to this, because a lot of their houses are practically falling into the river. Who is responsible? Is that the responsibility of the federal or provincial government?

Mr. HAMILTON (*Qu'Appelle*): I think that is a clear case of complementary responsibility. The fishing interests are not so very large on the Red river, but there is this interest in navigation which the federal government has. And then also the federal government has this interest in agriculture which along the Red river suffers from very disastrous floods.

There is a city called Winnipeg, in the path of that river, and that is where the maximum damage occurs in the flooding.

There is another argument which you have not mentioned, that most of these waters which come down and flood the river do not originate in Canada. That is one of the unsolved problems that is presented. Now, just what is the position?

I might give you a precedent for this, but I do not think it would work out in the case of the Red river because the effect has been going on for too long. But in the matter of building storage reservoirs on the Columbia river, we hope to collect payment from the United States for preventing flooding in downstream flows. So this is a cooperative deal between the two countries.

It has not yet been posed, to my knowledge, on the Red river. So I think the answer to your question is that it is a complementary responsibility. That was, I think, the main reason the federal government accepted the same financial responsibility in relation to Manitoba flood control measure, as was recommended in the report of the royal commission of 1956, I think it was.

Mr. SLOGAN: The Manitoba government made it clear that it would be very economical to build a dam across the Red river at Emerson, but that it would flood out Minnesota and North Dakota. So I think the federal government has a certain responsibility in it.

Mr. KINDT: Might I ask the minister about soil conservation, just to clarify the thinking on responsibility. For instance, on farms you have soil erosion and the need for water conservation. Well, soil erosion leads to damming streams, and all the rest of it. Might I ask if the practices which are needed on farms to control soil erosion are federal or provincial matters?

Mr. HAMILTON (*Qu'Appelle*): I always qualify my remarks with the fact that I am no authority on this subject: but generally speaking I think that flooding and irrigation fall within the local areas of the province, and that the agricultural area could be looked at as a provincial responsibility.

Two acts were passed by the federal government, I suppose under the provision relating to the best interests of the national well being, the first of which is called the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act, which deals with the lower part of the prairies and part of the rivers only, and the second called the Maritime Marshland Rehabilitation Act. These are one-hundred-per-cent federal activities which do carry out certain practices which, first of all, store water for the use of farm families, and secondly, do preserve water from passing downstream. The main reason for them is to supply and provide water for irrigation, the watering of cattle, and so on. That in substance is about the limit of my knowledge on that question. But generally speaking most of the provinces have conservation acts which deal with flooding and with the damming up of water in the provinces.