

While it is true that the Crippen Wright report did not study plans of development identical with those investigated by the I.C.R.E.B. report, the developed head on the Columbia River in most cases exceeded that considered in the I.C.R.E.B. studies and therefore would give an added incentive for the larger diversions. In spite of this fact the report favoured the more limited diversions.

I note that your letter refers to a Department of Agriculture report which you feel indicates that the maximum diversion plan would have a "beneficial effect" on agriculture in the East Kootenays. This one-page report is one of many papers that have been included in briefing documents prepared on the Treaty proposal. The report notes that among the 91,000 acres of land which would be flooded by the maximum diversion dam there are 24,000 acres which, if reclaimed, would be arable without irrigation, and 26,000 acres which have "some agricultural potential" and could support "low priced crops" if irrigation could be provided. The value of the crops obtainable would be so low that apparently irrigation would be impractical. The report then notes that there are 3300,000 acres of land above the proposed reservoir level which, if irrigation could be provided, would be as potentially arable as the previously mentioned 26,000 acres. While it concludes that the agricultural potential of the area could be increased if irrigation water could be provided from the diversion reservoirs (just as it could if irrigation could be provided without the dams), the report makes no suggestion that irrigation water could in fact be economically provided to the high land after the construction of the dams. Whether or not the diversion dams would have a beneficial effect would seemingly depend upon the practicability of irrigating the increased potential acreage.

Finally, dealing with the third point under consideration, that of Canadian control over the Treaty projects, my letter of the 10th of September did not refer to the 1961 Report of the Montreal Engineering Company because that report did not involve a study of possible conflicts in operation under the Treaty but was requested solely as a means of double checking on the accuracy of the many calculations carried out during the negotiation of the Treaty. The report involved slightly more than two months of concentrated effort on the part of the Company.

In answer to your question as to how I can justify the repeated assurances of adequate protection for Canada, my reply is that further studies were carried out by the Montreal Engineering Company during the fall and winter of 1961 and these studies provided very strong support for not only the Treaty provisions for Canadian operation, but also for the High Arrow dam.