

Columbia River Treaty

Mr. Macdonald: Where is the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) now?

Mr. Herridge: What is the hon. gentleman saying?

An hon. Member: Why don't you keep quiet?

Mr. Macdonald: I said, where is the hon. member for Greenwood today?

Mr. Herridge: I expect he is busy in his office.

Mr. Macdonald: He has not been in the house all day.

Mr. Douglas: Where have you been most of the time?

Mr. Macdonald: Unfortunately I must listen to your colleague.

Mr. Herridge: The hon. member has the opportunity to leave if he wishes, but he seems to be leaning over his desk with both ears flapping in my direction. Mr. Batisse has this to say:

Leaving aside the need for hydroelectric power production, for inland navigation and for recreation, where no significant withdrawal or pollution of water is involved, the amount of water used, per capita, for domestic, industrial and agricultural purposes varies enormously from country to country. It ranges, at present, from ten gallons per day in some underdeveloped areas, to the impressive figure of 1800 gallons per day in the United States, where only 6 per cent of this is for domestic uses, the rest being shared by industry and agriculture.

Then Mr. Batisse goes on to mention the tremendous crisis which is developing on this continent with respect to water and how water will cost more and more. He continues:

As a result, there will be many progressive changes in our habits of thinking about water, about its value, about the interrelation between its uses, about the interdependence of the people living in the same basins with all the legal and political implications this involves.

That is the situation in the Columbia river basin, and on the prairies.

There will be no shortage of water. It will just cost more. And man will begin to realize clearly how much he depends on it. This will not be new in history, since the ancient Egyptians, the Romans and the Arabs knew the value of water. But for the first time, and forever, modern civilization will become water-conscious.

That is one of the reasons we are taking a close look at the treaty.

I also have an article which has been extracted from the *Portland Oregonian* of April 18, in which a former senator, Len B. Jordan, said, dealing with water resources:

The best source of more water for the lower Colorado river basin is the Columbia river.

They realized that this is the great source of water for the future, and I do not blame them for their point of view.

I want to say that I wholeheartedly support the arguments advanced by the hon. member for Greenwood and the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Cameron), and I will not repeat, as far as I can avoid it, any of those arguments because this is a complicated and complex question but quite often one's argument goes from one aspect to another. However, I want to bring to the attention of the house something which happened during the committee meetings and which has come to my attention, because I see that the minister of northern affairs is now in his seat. Let me say that he was noticeable for his absence as head of a department which has control over water resources. But we overlooked that, Mr. Speaker, and I will tell you why. Whenever his absence was noted—and I do not remember seeing him attend one meeting of the committee while it was discussing the Columbia river treaty—even some of his own members said to me: "Well, I will tell you why it is; he is out praying for rain, so don't bother him at this time".

Then I noticed that Mr. Patterson, who is the director of the water resources branch, the man in charge, came in on occasion, but tiptoed out again. He peeped in to see what was going on, but left the defence of this treaty entirely to that young man whom I admire for his contumacy, Mr. Gordon MacNabb.

Anyway, during the hearings Dr. Keenleyside criticized the right of members of parliament to criticize civil servants. I raised this question in the house. He said that it was constitutionally improper, which is of course a lot of rot. I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that you sustained my right as a member of parliament to criticize civil servants. We have not criticized the ability of our civil servants. We have not criticized their integrity. We have only criticized the fact that they had not sufficient funds or staff, and there is not sufficient planning which springs from adequate funds to permit them to compete with United States army engineers in planning over-all basin projects, the development of hydro, and so on.

I might say in passing that this question was raised in the British house a week or two ago because some prominent members of the Labour party criticized some of the