

or tributaries of the Columbia or, for that matter, any of the rivers we discussed which cross the Canada-United States boundary from the United States into Canada? There is the Mica and the Pend Oreille.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Yes.

Mr. BREWIN: Those are the two main ones.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Yes, in the west.

Mr. BREWIN: Is there any likelihood of any substantial diversion at either of those two places? In other words, let us take them one by one; you told us last night, if my memory serves me correctly, that there is no likelihood of there being a diversion in respect of the Pend Oreille because of the works constructed at the boundary.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Yes.

Mr. BREWIN: Therefore, whatever may be the legal reinforcement of that there is no likelihood of that diversion occurring.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: There is no practical likelihood.

Mr. BREWIN: Is that equally true of where the west Kootenay or east Kootenay goes into the United States?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: The east Kootenay goes around the bend and back up into Kootenay lake.

Mr. BREWIN: Is there any practical likelihood for diversion other than for consumptive purposes at that stage by the United States? I am referring to a major diversion.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: I am not sure. I heard this subject discussed some months ago. The possibility of putting some of the Kootenay water into the Spokane river was discussed. Do you remember that, Mr. Davis?

Mr. DAVIS: I am afraid I do not.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: There was some talk of putting it into one of those streams but I did not look to see how they were going to get down the valleys and through the tunnels they would have to build. But, as I say, there was some talk and a semi threat to the effect the United States could divert Kootenay water in its own bend into one of those other watersheds. Perhaps it was the Flathead. But, I cannot remember. I never studied this and I do not know what the feasibility is. However, technically, I suppose it is possible.

Mr. BREWIN: Then, on the other side of the picture there are quite a number of potential diversions on the Canadian side where the Canadian part of the rivers are upstream. We have discussed a diversion into the Fraser.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Yes.

Mr. BREWIN: And, a diversion by means of pumping across the mountains. Are there any other diversions which are practicable? For instance, is it practicable to divert into the Okanagan river?

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Well what is not practicable today may be a totally different story tomorrow; in 10, 20 or 30 years this question of water is going to become almost a crisis for the whole of the human race, certainly on this continent. I suspect in 20, 30 or 40 years you will see a most astonishing development in water diversion on a scale we do not think about today. It is purely a guess on my part but I think most engineers will agree with me in this respect.

Mr. BREWIN: Mr. Bartholomew, you did talk about the right of diversion for irrigation when Dr. Kindt was questioning you.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Yes.

Mr. BREWIN: Of course, you were not giving any opinion whether the treaty preserved the right of diversion out of the basin into a multiple purpose project which would include both irrigation and, to some extent, power.