

*Canadian Centennial*

In any event, he said there were deceptive implications in the resolution. I do not know why these suspicions should arise because the resolution is on the highest possible plane, having a noble objective, and I could not understand why he thought there were deceptive implications. Then he said that for the government to accept such a resolution would be an abdication of responsibility. Members on the government side of the house use the word "abdication" as if they had some particular connection with royalty. They are always talking about abdicating this and abdicating that. They are simply government members of the House of Commons and I think they should use language that corresponds with their present importance, which may be much less in a few months.

The point of the resolution is that it asks for a committee to make recommendations over a ten year period with respect to the proposals contained in the resolution. We all know that these recommendations would have to be approved by parliament and by the provincial legislature concerned. But the resolution is a challenging conception. It is an appeal to the imagination. I have always had great admiration for Conservatives as being good, solid citizens.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** They are solid all right.

**Mr. Herridge:** But I have always noticed that they have a tendency to lack imagination. This afternoon the hon. member for Halton said that the resolution was not a practical one. You know, Mr. Speaker, when the members of this group brought up the question of family allowances it was not a practical suggestion. When they brought up the question of old age pensions it was not practical. When they brought up the question of floor prices and things of that sort, even before the bill was introduced, it was not practical. But the present members on the government side of the house have to some extent learned from experience. After 22 years in the wilderness they realize that they must adjust their thinking to some extent to the thinking of the people as a whole so as a result, shall I say, of their recognition of what the people wish, require and demand they have passed some legislation which we have all been very willing to support. But it is a bits and bobs affair. They always fail to see the need for over-all planning, for an over-all approach, because it requires an imagination that they lack the capacity to exercise.

I must get on, Mr. Speaker, or else I will not be able to proceed very far with my

[Mr. Herridge.]

subject, and I am going to relate my remarks very closely to the resolution. The hon. member for Halton said that the resolution was not a practical one. We are the most practical of people. In dealing with this resolution we arranged that different members would speak on different topics, members who can not only talk about their subject but whose life experience qualifies them to speak about it.

If there were time this evening the hon. member for Humboldt-Melfort (Mr. Bryson) would speak about irrigation and water usage because he has spent a lifetime as a farmer concerned with irrigation, the development of water resources and things of that sort. Another hon. member who is a very learned gentleman, a librarian and a sportsman was going to speak on the sports aspect. Another was going to speak on mining because he has worked in the mines. We are all practical people in this group. They were going to take a practical approach in support of an imaginative resolution.

I am going to speak on a subject tonight about which I have some knowledge. I refer to conservation and conservation is one of the major objectives in the resolution. I have spent 50 years in the practice of forest conservation so I want to say a few words in that connection. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that you will not rule me out of order. I saw you looking at me. Anyway, members of the house know that for some years we have been urging the necessity of the federal government taking action by calling a dominion-provincial conference and utilizing the committee that would be formed to develop a national conservation policy for forest, land, soil, water, wild life and so on.

The committee proposed here could undertake the same thing. If it were endorsed by the house and established by the government it would possibly have several subcommittees dealing with various problems but all working toward the one objective. That is why I am going to take this opportunity to suggest that we need dominion-provincial co-operation in the development of a national conservation policy. I continue my advocacy of the necessity of such a policy because many organizations and persons know that action on all levels of government is necessary to prevent the exploitation of natural resources and to establish nationwide methods of use in perpetuity.

I want to say that a future based on exploitation and wasting of natural resources rather than on conservation is the sure road to disaster regardless of how luxuriant our prosperity may be in the meantime. This is one aspect