

each country will have to determine, according to the laws prevailing in their respective areas, how best to develop the water resources to meet the domestic, irrigation, flood control, water power, fishery, wildlife and recreational requirements of the region.

If one looks now at the Saskatchewan-Nelson system to the east of the Rockies, one will find a whole new set of problems. When that basin was under the administrative control of the federal government together with the adjacent Northwest Territories region, there was unified control of development. The development may not have been perfect. It probably kept pace with the needs of the area. Since 1930, a new situation has developed. Now Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba each own a segment of that basin. This may create serious problems in the basin unless the provinces concerned take concerted action to solve them. The prairie provinces water board, consisting of representatives of the three prairie provinces and of the federal government, has made some useful preliminary recommendations on allocations. These have been, to date, accepted by the four governments.

It does seem, however, that the population pressures are mounting on the prairies. Water being far less abundant than in other parts of the country, bitter quarrels can develop over this staff of life unless the provinces can solve the incoming problems. No permanent solution can be found, however, unless the basic facts are ascertained. How much surface and ground water is there available? What level of population, agriculture and industry can this water support? What are the best uses to which this water can be put? Have domestic uses of water, sanitation uses, irrigation uses, priority over power? What provision should be made for future navigation? These problems are unique only in their geographical context. They have arisen in adjacent areas of the United States. They have arisen in other countries of the world. However, it is only the people of the area, the people of Canada, who can solve these problems by first getting to know them and second by applying good sense in solving them.

Once you move eastwards from Manitoba, the streams do not cross the international boundary as they do, by and large, in the west. From Manitoba eastwards, streams and large bodies of water form the boundary with the U.S.A. They become, generally speaking, "boundary waters" and the rules regarding their use have been clearly set forth in the "boundary waters treaty of 1909" between Canada and the United States. Broadly speaking, each country has, in the words of the treaty, "equal and similar rights in the use" of boundary waters. Rules are set forth for disposing of these matters either by international agreement or through the International Joint Commission.

At this point, I should like to say that, over the years, we Canadians have sometimes tended to underestimate the invaluable work of this commission. We have sometimes begrudged the time it takes to solve problems. If time is necessary, it is in order to avoid arbitrary decisions. The commission has an outstanding record of achievements over many decades. Problems have been solved by giving people a forum to air their complaints, for studies to be made and for reasonable solutions being advanced. I should like to pay a warm tribute not only to General McNaughton and Messrs. Lucien Dansereau and Donald Stephens, the Canadian commissioners, but their distinguished United States colleagues, Messrs. Eugene Weber and Francis Adams. All these men devote long hours to the solution of problems which would otherwise be left to bedevil the good relations between the United States and Canada. The commission, as a quasi-judicial, recommendatory and fact finding body, has played a far greater role in settling grave water problems between two nations than most Canadians or Americans would be prepared to believe.