

Water Resources Programs

ing this year, they hired Canadians to measure the water level, the snowfall and rainfall. These people were paid \$3 a month to report to the American army engineers.

If the waters of the Great Lakes were diverted, it is possible that enough water from Lake Michigan could be diverted through the canal which connects Chicago with the Mississippi River basin to clean it up and again make that a fresh waterway. The amount of water the International Joint Commission allows into that canal does not permit the Americans to correct this pollution problem. The matter of ownership, and the responsibility of the federal government to maintain the water resources of Canada, are essential to the implementation of this bill, as is the interplay that will take place with the provinces.

For years a plausible and feasible scheme has been advanced in northern Ontario and northern Quebec to divert large quantities of water from the Arctic watershed to the Atlantic watershed. Those people in British Columbia who see huge mountains when they look out their windows may not realize how simple this is. The elevation of the land in northern Ontario when travelling west on highway No. 11 is 1,060 feet. In some areas, it is considerably below that level. Diverting water from the Arctic watershed to the Atlantic watershed involves a difference of only 400 feet.

The matter of water diversion in British Columbia is a possibility. If we were to agree to water diversion, the American government would immediately finance it and would probably pay a pretty penny on a short term basis for that resource. I am surprised at the government introducing this kind of legislation. Considerable legislation of this nature has been passed that only toys with the facts rather than facing up to them.

I agree with previous speakers that if this section of the bill is passed by Parliament it will go a long way to establish a total water resource control for many years. If not, successive governments will have to face the same problems as previous governments had to face. As one member pointed out, this resource belong to the provinces. The provinces can do whatever they wish with this resource.

I hope the government will consider these amendments, the over-all problems of this legislation and the desire for the legislation to produce certain results. I hope the govern-

[Mr. Peters.]

ment will go much further than they have in this legislation so that in another year or two we will not have to amend it. This is true also of other fundamental changes that are being suggested. This bill is by no means complete. Unless a number of these amendments are accepted, this being one of the major amendments, this bill will only partially meet the needs of today. It will not meet the needs of the future to control all our water resources.

• (5:10 p.m.)

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): I am dismayed, though not surprised, to note that on a day when this House is discussing a national resource question we should find a grand total of ten Liberal members present. This does not surprise me when I recall that the Liberal party has been in power during a period in which we have seen major control over our resources pass into foreign hands. The party which has governed this country for the larger part of this century will be seen as the major agent in what will be regarded by historians of the future as the great sell-out. To trust a Liberal cabinet with decision-making authority in connection with water resources, as this bill would do unless amended, would be analogous to leaving a sex fiend of some sort as a baby-sitter with an attractive 16-year-old girl.

As one who wishes to see brought about the civilized and full development of our country, the results of this bill concern me very much, and for this reason I am pleased to note that members of the Official Opposition support the amendments before the House. The Liberal party has vacillated according to the temporary whims of some kind of nationalism in this country between jingoistic statements of the kind made by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) the other day and the blatant continental policy of the late C. D. Howe. It is my distinct impression that all but a small minority of members opposite do respond in a very quick, unthinking, political way to serious political and historical questions and it would be a sad mistake for this House to decide that the future of our water resources should be left to the decision-making authority of the cabinet.

It has been noted by several speakers today that water resources are not like other resources; one has to consider the use to which they will be put. If we were to decide to divert a stream to the United States, the water would be used in the main for one of two purposes, either to provide a source of