

*Water Resources*

Now suddenly a floodtide of public concern is out-dating the plans of all governments before they have even taken effect.

It appears that the only time any government will act is when the public demands that something be done, regardless of which government is in power. In the following paragraph, Mr. Western states:

In addition, the government, following the Swedish lead, has clamped down on the use of ddt. It is under pressure to take similar action against other polluting products.

Again, Mr. Speaker, when I asked the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) about pollution and DDT on children's toys, I got the stock answer, "we do not know but we will look into it." Mr. Speaker, that is not good enough. This government must take positive action today, not tomorrow, about pollutants which the scientists tell us exist, the facts about which are well documented beyond any reasonable doubt. The government could pass legislation or enforce the present legislation to ensure that the people of this country are not subjected to complete contamination by all pollutants. In another paragraph, the article reads:

Unhappily, we are constitutionally handicapped as compared with other countries in committing ourselves to international co-operation. We have not ratified the 1962 Convention on the High Seas, which dealt with ocean pollution, and we have been unable to take advantage of the opportunities for co-operation in interstate and international waters created by the U.S. federal water pollution control act of 1956.

The reason is the inability of the federal government to enter into treaties which impose obligations on lower levels of government in Canada.

While we talk about being constitutionally handicapped, I again emphasize the fact that this government has the backing of the people of this nation. If the government of any province suggested that it would not agree to strong antipollution measures, it would never be re-elected.

As one citizen of Davidson, Saskatchewan, Mr. E. Laird, said:

My first concern is to have enough money to eat and my second concern is to be able to stay alive or survive in this pollution-riddled world.

Most people in this nation today, Mr. Speaker, are positive they will no longer be able to survive in this polluted atmosphere. The provincial governments of this country are still prepared to use petty arguments on a political basis in order to try to substantiate their condemnation of federal legislation. I think it is very very important that we find out at an early date what these provinces will

do, and if any of them object to strong federal legislation this House and the Country should be well aware of it.

I cannot understand why, as far back as 1962, the Convention on the High Seas was not ratified. As we look at the provinces standing in the way, it makes us wonder where we are going and how we are going to get there.

In the October, 1969 issue of *Reclamation*, there are comments on the new Canada water act as follows:

Toronto: Ontario's Energy and Resources Minister J. H. Kerr yesterday welcomed the proposed Canada Water Act and said Premier John Robarts is even more determined than I that we are going to co-operate with Ottawa in this. He hoped there would be no jurisdictional problems.

I will add "Amen" to that, Mr. Speaker.

Victoria, B.C.: Ray Willison, British Columbia's Minister of Resources, said the province would co-operate with Ottawa but, in the manner one would "when someone points a revolver at your head."

That is a disgraceful statement by the minister in British Columbia and one typical of a defendant of the status quo. Any minister who stands up in the provincial legislative assembly and says, "We will co-operate when someone puts a revolver at our head" is not too concerned about pollution control.

Winnipeg: Natural Resources Minister Sid Green called the federal government "a move to dramatize the seriousness of the pollution problem." However, he expressed concern that the administrative body set up to govern pollution would be unwilling to enforce strictures against pollution.

At the same time, Health Minister Leonard Evans commented, "The federal government's intention is good, there is no doubt." Of course, intentions are not good enough, Mr. Speaker; it is action that the people of Canada are concerned about. Then, we move to Edmonton where Health Minister James Henderson said:

Ottawa's proposed Canada Water Act will not solve the problems of water pollution.

Here again, we can ask who is the Edmonton Health Minister concerned about? Is it the people of Canada and their health or is he concerned about sticking up for the status quo and making sure that the industries polluting the water in Alberta are not affected by antipollution measures?

Medicine Hat News: Alberta's Health Minister threw some cold water on Ottawa's proposed Canada Water Act. His grounds were poorly chosen. The minister, James Henderson, said the act will not solve the problems of water pollution because the major generators of pollution are population cen-