Water Resources

race, the whole animal kingdom and even, perhaps, the trees and the grasses of the planet on which we live.

This water bill at least opens up the subject. That is about all it does. I shall not spend much time criticizing the bill itself because there is nothing in it which comes to grips with the real problem. The real problem is the destruction of the water resources of the planet and I suggest we are not thinking big enough, if hon. members will pardon the pun, when we try to tackle it. It is an international problem of immense proportions. I understand the nations of the world intend to hold an international conference on water pollution in 1971. That is just a year and a half too late.

We have no need to be modest about water in Canada. We are one of the nations which is still blessed with vast reserves of pure water. But we are going about destroying this great resource at an alarming rate. The old excuse is trotted out that we do not have the money to control pollution. I shall not run down the list of directions in which we have been wasting money. The number is legion. I maintain that money does not need to be an obstacle in this case. If we attack this danger with half the enthusiasm with which we attack lesser matters, such as putting out new medals or building art centres, we should get to the root of it.

The root of this menace is international, and its solution lies through international cooperation. There is no sense talking about international co-operation unless we are first willing to set our own house in order. We are destroying Canada's lakes and rivers. Not only that, but we are destroying the land which surrounds these water resources. I do not think we can entirely separate one form of pollution from the other because if we pollute the land in Canada with insecticides and detergents it is obvious that the rain will wash this material into our rivers which, in turn, will carry it to the lakes and to the seas.

• (2:20 p.m.)

The first thing to do to solve the problem is immediately to outlaw pollution of our streams, rivers and lakes. I do not think there is any constitutional problem involved, and not only can it be done but, if we are to survive, it must be done. As I said before, Canada has what is probably the greatest fresh water supply in the world, and consequently it is our duty to conserve it.

If we take quick action that is successful, then we might even have the answer to the problem of finances. After all, we have a resource that is saleable. If we plan properly and do not give away our water to some other country in perpetuity—in other words, if we sell it by the gallon rather than give concessions—then we can finance the whole deal.

In this regard we cannot escape our duty by passing the blame on to the provinces. Nor can we expect the provinces to handle the prevention of pollution piecemeal because it is too big a job for them to tackle. I started by saying that this problem is an international one that affects all mankind. However, we cannot wait for all mankind to become alerted to the danger. Those who have no fresh water left are too late to solve the problem, but we are not.

I suggest as a fair and concrete proposal that the federal government call now a conference with the provinces to inform the provinces what the federal government is going to do and the standards it is going to insist upon to conserve our fresh, pure water, not in 1971 or 1981 but as of January 1970. I can assure the government that it would receive no opposition from us if this were done.

In light of the speeches so far in this debate, it seems to me that all the prodding is coming from members on this side of the House. I am very disappointed that my colleagues on the other side of the House are not rising to their feet to flay their own government for the inadequacy of this bill. I know there are many talented members on that side, and I should like them to tell us their ideas with regard to taking effective steps not only to protect the water of Canada and North America but the water resources on this planet.

If this sort of thinking is too big for them, then let them resign their seats and abdicate their responsibilities. They have abdicated practically everything else already; the only thing remaining is for them to move out. I suggest there is a vacuum in this respect that must be filled; and if hon. members opposite have not thought about it till now, then it is time they did.

If hon. members do their homework, they will discover a great deal of thought has already been given to this subject. A magnificent article, which arrived in the mails yesterday, has been written outlining the horrors