

*Columbia River Treaty*

dislocation and that new conditions of living would be imposed in that region. However, there had to be the assurance in the minds of the negotiators, both federal and provincial, that although these changes were necessary the benefits would be far greater and sufficiently great to justify the changes both in the land and in the lives of numbers of people. There had to be the assurance that no one would suffer loss, that there would be alternative programs of settlement and redevelopment on available lands, that there would be redevelopment of communities affected together with compensation to those who would suffer loss sufficient to provide them with a stake to re-establish themselves.

All of these assurances had to be given. All of these factors had to be in the minds of the negotiators throughout the period of preparation that led up to the signing of the treaty, and the submission of the treaty and the protocol to the external affairs committee for a recommendation.

In the immense volume of testimony before that committee assurances were given on all of these points. In my view some of the statements by the government of British Columbia do not go far enough yet. Their plans have not yet been revealed in sufficient detail. But Dr. Keenleyside did go into some detail in his submission. On page 15 of the brief he submitted to the committee he referred to the special organization established within B.C. hydro which has been working on the over-all redevelopment plan, the additional plans they have in mind and the path which they will follow. We have also been given the assurance by the provincial minister of lands and forests that these matters are of first consideration to the government of that province.

Having secured these assurances, we in this house have gone as far as we are able to go. We have gone as far as we have a right to go in regard to these questions which affect primarily the rights and responsibilities of the province. If answer are still to be secured they must be secured in British Columbia from the provincial government, and the B.C. hydro and power authority. I believe we have arrived at the point where we must be prepared to accept the assurances of men of distinguished public service such as Dr. Keenleyside, and a man such as the minister of lands and forests of that province who has consistently been returned by the people of British Columbia to positions of high authority. We must be prepared to accept the assur-

[Mr. Fleming (Okanagan-Revelstoke).]

ances of these people that they are going to provide for these essentials. I think it remains for the people of British Columbia within British Columbia to secure from the government of the province and B.C. hydro the details of how they are going to undertake to fulfil their commitments to the people whose lives and property will be affected by this development.

A relatively new factor has been injected into the consideration of the treaty during the past year. It has to do with the possible diversion of water to the prairie region. A submission was presented by the previous administration of the province of Saskatchewan. It was an interesting one, not one that could be thrust aside and not given proper scrutiny and examination. But as a British Columbian who lives in the dry belt where a great part of the area is totally dependant upon the utilization of water in irrigation systems, as one who knows something of the cost of bringing water to the land and of the low cost that must be maintained in moving water so that it is economically feasible to use it when you get it to the point where you need it, I have had considerable doubt throughout with regard to diversion over the main range of the Rockies as a means of securing additional water for the prairie region at this particular time. Some evidence was submitted to indicate that there are other rivers more readily accessible from which water can be drawn.

There may come a time when it will be necessary to exert our right of diversion in order to move water over the main range into the South Saskatchewan and on through Alberta, Saskatchewan and possibly into Manitoba. This day may come. In my view article XIII of the treaty provides that this may be done. It does not say so specifically, but I believe it is far better that the right be provided in the treaty and that we leave the specifics to negotiation when the necessity arises. Do not tie the hands of the government of Canada at this point, but leave it with the freedom of movement that it will probably require when specific diversions are to be made. But diversion for consumptive purposes is guaranteed and assured under the treaty, and the principal reason for diverting water from the Columbia basin to the prairies or to another part of British Columbia would be for consumptive purposes or, as it is defined, domestic or agricultural purposes.