

Rural Development

we have called it up until now and probably will continue to call it. It is a most imaginative piece of legislation which some of us have long felt has been languishing, and if a change of name will bring it greater fame and emphasis, I will go along with that.

Of all the things that were brought before the house in the years when our party was in power, this was one of our finest contributions, and if the present administration wishes to change the name in order to make it a more imaginative and attractive policy, that is fine, although I do have reservations on the word rural.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am happy that here in legislation we have underscored what is a Dominion initiative in agriculture. I am speaking in the broad sense of agricultural jurisdiction, which is a concurrent jurisdiction; and here we have underscored, in section after section, a dominion initiative, with the dominion co-operating with the provinces. This is very important and most welcome. If there is anything I have noted in recent days that has disturbed me, it was the statement of the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson), as reported in the press a few days ago, that the problem of opting out would be no longer very important because the Dominion would not be opting in. In this country, with its great diversity, especially in economic fields, the initiative of a dedicated, concerned, and informed Dominion government is of the essence.

If there is anything we can do to support the minister in making this legislation more meaningful, in making the Dominion initiative more meaningful and in supporting his efforts to elicit the co-operation of the provinces, I am sure we are all for it. We do not want to see the Dominion opting out of programs which are of benefit to the whole country. To the extent that this legislation reflects the Dominion's desire to stay in, to pioneer, to initiate, then I commend it, and commend the minister, and will support him on the suggested amendments.

● (9:30 p.m.)

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Speaker, I will not take up very much of the time of the house this evening. However, I wish to express my interest in this act and the purpose for which it was founded several years ago by the former Conservative administration. I, of course, was not a member of this house at that time; but we looked on it with interest and favour, especially in our part of the country, because

[Mr. Macquarrie.]

at that time I happened to be the mayor of the town of Napanee when we were faced with a very acute water shortage, and just such a scheme as this was put into effect by the federal, provincial and municipal partnership. This turned our dearth of water into a plentiful supply, the most important thing that mankind needs.

I have a clipping here from the *Napanee Beaver* which I thought I would have time to bring to the attention of the minister because I know he would be interested in this illustration of what can be done when three authorities unite in such a scheme as this to increase a municipal water supply and to reforest these watersheds, of which we have many across Canada, which are in a condition which is a detriment to our country today. Development is needed in these areas. What a wonderful opportunity we have now. I speak from experience, because I am one of the political fathers of the Second Depot Lake dam in the upper reaches of the Napanee River which is living proof that ARDA and conservation will work and that our country's resources which have long been latent can be developed.

Let us all get together and make this work. I have a few more remarks, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry to see the government attempting to change the name of this act. ARDA is a byword across the country already, because it did make significant progress under the other administration. It probably has been marking time since then, but I hope in due course it will make as much progress as it started out to do.

The letters ARDA represent what one might term a mellisonant acronym. I ask the minister, why now change that acronym, that handy term ARDA. I do not know any reason for change. Some say it is retaliatory action on the part of the government. This reminds me of the great rivalry between Rome and Carthage that we learned about in ancient history. The Romans hated the Carthaginians and their policies so bitterly that by the time they did overthrow them they tore every building down in Carthage and then plowed the ground, so that never again would there be any identity with the name Carthage. It looks to me as though that is what the Liberal government is attempting to do here; that is, to eradicate all that stands of the title of the good legislation which was put through in the period from 1957 to 1962.

Again I reiterate my profound and active interest in this act and what it will do. Of