

Alleged Lack of Action to Combat Pollution

at international boundaries. If the opposition is really serious about tackling this problem, they must agree with this. They are telling us that it has taken a long time to bring in the water bill. This bill is the result of co-operation and co-ordination among many governmental bodies. Anyone who has dealt with many agencies at one time is fully aware that it takes much longer to get business done in such a situation.

The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken), and I pay him a compliment by referring to so many of the items he mentioned, talked about what the United States had done and the strong measures the United States government had taken. Surely the hon. member is not trying to confuse the issue. The United States federal government has been granted substantial powers to deal with these situations. Constitutionally speaking, the state governments of the United States are much weaker than the provincial governments in Canada. There is really no great comparison between the powers of the federal government in Washington and the federal government in Ottawa. I wish our constitution gave the federal government of Canada the strength and powers the government of the United States has today.

Matters of this type emphasize my concern over the jurisdictional conflict. We cannot fight modern problems with constitutional powers, some of which would be applicable to the days of the horse and buggy. I stand firmly in favour of constitutionally strengthening the federal government in Canada. Meanwhile, it is irresponsible to ignore the constitution and barge ahead holus-bolus. Such a procedure cannot help but create internal problems, and we have enough of those already.

Reference was made today in this debate to the peace, order and good government clause of the B.N.A. Act or the Canadian constitution. The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) stated this provision was not workable. We realize this has been used in wartime and periods of crises, but if we are going to wait until there is a crisis to amend the Canadian Constitution, a crisis great enough to use the peace, order and good government clause, then it is a mistake and it is wrong for the future of Canada. If we are not going to strengthen the powers of the federal government, and if we are not going to use the elastic clause to a certain extent, then we have no other choice but to deal with many bodies. If this happens, it will take a lengthy

[Mr. Hopkins.]

time to pass legislation in this house respecting interprovincial-federal bills.

I wish to read again from the report of the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works:

Your committee also recommends that a centre or centres similar to the Canada Centre for Inland Waters be set up to centralize all existing and future federal research in air and soil pollution and to extend and speed up such research so that codes of standards may be drafted to protect the air and soil from pollution.

There is a lot of work involved in setting up these centres. The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka, who started off this debate today, said that nothing had been done about these recommendations to date. Our report has been in this house for three weeks, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. member is complaining because no research centres have been set up. This government is swift in action, but projects of this magnitude cannot be brought in overnight. However, I gratefully acknowledge the indirect compliment to this government by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka in thinking we are so speedy in action.

Mr. Aiken: That was so indirect I did not understand it.

Mr. Barnett: Is the hon. member not aware recommendations along those lines were put before the government at least three years ago?

Mr. Hopkins: This is a good report, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Barnett: Yes, it is a good report.

Mr. Hopkins: This is a good report and we commend it to all hon. members of this house. As I stated previously, it was compiled without bias. All that glitters in this report is not gold. There is one thing that concerns me and that is that part of the motion which refers to "other estimates relating to this department". Since Atomic Energy of Canada reports to the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, it is related in that way to that department. I wish to again quote from the report of the committee:

During its study of the estimates of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, your committee was informed that there would not be any "Canadian Produced" heavy water available in Canada this year. Your committee recommends therefore that the words "Canadian Produced" be deleted from vote L20 thus enabling the company to purchase heavy water from non-Canadian sources.

Why is there no Canadian heavy water being produced or available in Canada this