

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR
THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE

Science serves its readers as a forum for the presentation and discussion of important issues related to the advancement of science, including the presentation of minority or conflicting points of view, rather than by publishing only material on which a consensus has been reached. Accordingly, all articles published in *Science*—including editorials, news and comment, and book reviews—are signed and reflect the individual views of the authors and not official points of view adopted by the AAAS or the institutions with which the authors are affiliated.

Editorial Board

ROBERT L. BOWMAN	WILLARD F. LIBBY
MELVIN CALVIN	GORDON J. F. MACDONALD
JOSEPH W. CHAMBERLAIN	EVERETT I. MENDELSON
FARRINGTON DANIELS	NEAL E. MILLER
JOHN T. EDSALL	JOHN R. PIERCE
DAVID R. GODDARD	COLIN S. PITTENDRIGH
EMIL HAURY	KENNETH S. PITZER
ALEXANDER HOLLAENDER	ALEXANDER RICH
ROBERT JASTROW	DEWITT STETTIN, JR.
EDWIN M. LERNER, II	EDWARD L. TATUM
	CLARENCE M. ZENER

Editorial Staff

Editor

PHILIP H. ABELSON

Publisher

DAEL WOLFLE

Business Manager

HANS NUSSBAUM

Managing Editor: ROBERT V. ORMES

Assistant Editors: ELLEN E. MURPHY, JOHN E. RINGLE

Assistant to the Editor: NANCY TEIMOURIAN

News and Comment: DANIEL S. GREENBERG, JOHN WALSH, ELINOR LANGER, MARION ZEIGER, ROSEMARY GALLI

Europe: VICTOR K. McELHENY, Flat 3, 18 Kensington Court Place, London, W.8, England (Western 5360)

Book Reviews: SARAH S. DEES

Editorial Assistants: ISABELLA BOULDIN, ELEANORE BUTZ, SYLVIA EBERHART, GRAYCE FINGER, NANCY HAMILTON, OLIVER HEATWOLE, ANNE HOLDSWORTH, MARCIA JODLBAUER, RUTH KINGERLEE

Advertising Staff

Director

EARL J. SCHERAGO

Production Manager

RAYMONDE SALAMA

Sales: New York, N.Y., 11 W. 42 St. (212-PE-6-1858): RICHARD L. CHARLES, ROBERT S. BUGBEE

Scotch Plains, N.J., 12 Unami Lane (201-889-4873): C. RICHARD CALLIS

Chicago, Ill., 6 W. Ontario St. (312-DE-7-4973): HERBERT BURKLAND

Los Angeles 45, Calif., 8255 Beverly Blvd. (213-653-9817): WINN NANCE

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE: 1515 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20005. Phone: 202-387-7171. Cable: Advancesci, Washington. Copies of "Instructions for Contributors" can be obtained from the editorial office. ADVERTISING CORRESPONDENCE: Rm. 1740, 11 W. 42 St., New York, N.Y. 10036. Phone: 212-PE 6-1858.

Water for North America

The United States currently uses about 1.25×10^9 cubic meters (350×10^9 gallons) of water per day. Consumption is growing, and water shortages are becoming more serious in areal extent as well as severity. One answer is desalination of sea water (*Science*, 18 December). In large-scale projects, in which nuclear reactors were used, fresh water perhaps could be obtained at about 6 cents per cubic meter (22 cents per 1000 gallons) at sea level and at the plant. Distribution of this water to points distant from the sea would entail very large additional expense.

An alternative approach is that of effectively utilizing part of the continent's natural water supplies. For example, in the northwestern section of North America, more than 800×10^9 cubic meters of water flow almost unused to the sea each year. Use of the potential supplies would solve most of the continent's water problems for as long as 100 years.* Unit cost of the water, delivered inland, would be a small fraction of that of desalted water even at sea level. Through a series of dams, lifts, tunnels, and canals, water from Canada and the northwestern United States would be conducted to the Great Lakes and to the southwestern United States and Mexico. By this means, the level of the Great Lakes would be regulated and maintained, and the amount of power generated at Niagara Falls and related sites would be increased. The canal conducting the water to the Great Lakes would be navigable, and huge blocks of hydroelectric power would be generated en route.

In the West, large areas in Utah, Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, and other states, as well as three states in Mexico, could be irrigated. In Mexico alone, eight times more area could be served than will be supplied in Egypt by the Aswan High Dam. The needs of southern California also would be met. In all, 33 states would obtain some form of benefits from the plan. Canada would receive the equivalent of about \$2 billion a year. The cost of the development is estimated at \$100 billion; 20 years would be required for construction, after authorization.

Much of the water would be drawn from the Peace and the Yukon rivers. One of the features of the plan is a large storage lake in the Rocky Mountain Trench, just west of the continental divide; the lake would extend 800 kilometers northwest into Canada from the vicinity of Libby, Montana. A large storage basin is crucial, since most of the river flow of the region occurs during spring and summer. This projected flooding of Canadian territory could prove to be a major point of friction, even though the region is sparsely settled. In any event, past experience suggests that there would be long delays before the necessary international agreements were formalized.

However, many of the benefits for the United States could be obtained in a way not mentioned in the report. A substantial fraction of the flow of the Columbia River could be intercepted, near Hanford, Washington, and at other points, and lifted and caused to flow eastward and also southward through tunnels and canals. Very cheap electric power furnished by huge nuclear reactors could be used. The present NAWAPA concept is grand and imaginative. It is to be hoped that the Canadians will join us in this great project, but alternatives should be studied.—PHILIP H. ABELSON

* A conceptual plan for accomplishing this objective, NAWAPA (North American Water and Power Alliance), has been prepared by the Ralph M. Parsons Company, a large engineering and construction firm. The scheme is presently under study by a Senate subcommittee headed by Senator Moss of Utah.