

*Government Organization Act, 1970*

sweep. They are generally from west to east. Coming in from the Pacific and sweeping down across the Prairies, they lose moisture and pick up moisture. Crossing along over Ontario and Quebec, they may also pick up fumes from thousands of factories and millions of automobiles. These outpourings, along with those emanating from great American centres like Chicago and Detroit, are bound to affect the quality of our atmosphere. They are bound to affect the quality of the air we breathe in the area of the St. Lawrence and in the Atlantic region as well.

Air, even more than water, is indifferent to man made boundaries. It sweeps from province to province and from nation to nation. It can weave its way across the international boundary line and back again. It can be upgraded by plankton in the ocean and young trees on land. It can be quickly downgraded again by industrial man at work and at play. Renewed by plant and animal life our worldly air mantle has great recuperative powers. But these powers, like those of our rivers and streams, are finite. They are by no means unlimited. They can be over-taxed, much as Lake Erie has been over-taxed by the outpourings of the main industrial heartland of North America. They can be over-taxed by industry and municipalities alike, and they can only be brought back again at great cost to others, some of whom may live hundreds and even thousands of miles away.

I would like to make an important point here. I am opposed to a patchwork approach to pollution. I am opposed to different standards in different places. I am opposed to pollution havens. I am opposed to big industry picking on our weaker provinces and our weaker municipalities. I am opposed to sloppy housekeeping anywhere, because it is bound to hurt the local citizenry in the end. I am prepared to argue against those who say that each industry and each municipality should be able to rely on the so-called "assimilative capacity" of its local waters and its air. If they are allowed to do this the effects are bound to be cumulative. What do they say to the next industry that comes along? And to the next and the next? What do they say to a doubling and a trebling of the output of the initial industry? When does the regulatory authority cry halt? And when does it begin to discriminate against late comers saying that the rules of the game have to be changed after all?

Why not insist on the best clean up procedures at the outset? And why assume that we must really spoil our environment before we begin to clean it up again? Why act as if we know all about the assimilative capacity of our surroundings in the first place? The scientists, and you and I, Mr. Speaker, do not know very much about assimilative capacity at all. Those who take the patchwork approach to pollution do not know much about ecology. They do not know much about living things. Perhaps they have never heard about the synergistic effects of one pollutant piled on top of another. Individually, they might not have much of an effect, but in combination several pollutants can kill several times over, and who knows what combinations and permutations will result from several industries and several municipalities dumping their wastes into the same local environment?

[Mr. Davis.]

So, why run the risk of losing everything when uniform national standards can provide us with all the protection we need? Why run this risk when recycling within the factory fence is possible in most cases? And why settle for anything less than the best when new industry can be made to take every precaution as long as everyone is being treated the same everywhere in the country?

Earlier in my speech, Mr. Speaker, I took a swipe at the Science Council of Canada. I took a swipe at the technocratic gobbledygook which it published recently about oil drilling in the Strait of Georgia. But I should add, Mr. Speaker, that the recommendations of the Science Council of Canada are not all bad. Some of them are excellent, and many of them we have already acted upon. Others we intend to adopt in the very near future. The Science Council says that we should have a federal-provincial review board. We already have a forum for consultation on these issues. We have the Canadian Council of Resource Ministers, and I might loosely refer to it as the Council of Renewable Resource Ministers. The Canadian Council of Resource Ministers met recently in Winnipeg. It discussed forestry for three full days. In previous years it had discussed fisheries, recreation, and the development of river basins. It has concentrated on pollution at times, and on land use at others. Frankly, I think it is more than a review board. It has the ability to look ahead as well.

The Science Council says we should set up special advisory committees and consult frequently with the top brains in industry and in our universities. It says this with particular reference to forestry. But we, in this department, have already asked Mr. T. N. Beaupré of Domtar to chair our new Forestry Advisory Council. Its first task is to review our forestry research priorities. Later it will concentrate building a two-way bridge of ideas between our Canadian Forestry Service and the companies themselves.

The Science Council believes that we should contract out more of our research work. Less development should be done "in house" and more should be done in company plants and graduate schools. I agree with this. We in Ottawa have tended to be too inbred. Too much of our work has been done behind closed doors, and too many studies have been filed away without being read by people who could make some practical use of them. The Science Council says that we should concentrate on certain areas of research and avoid spreading ourselves too thin. I agree with this also. I agree that more of our work should be mission oriented. I agree that it should be tailored to suit Canada's particular needs. I agree that our environmental endeavours should fit our own Canadian situation. Let me give you a particular example of what the Science Council means and of what I mean.

The Science Council says that we should build a big new environmental centre on the west coast, dealing with the marine-atmospheric interface and employing biologists as well as oceanographers and climatologists. It would be located facing the Pacific. Already we are developing a tidy nucleus in West Vancouver but more, much more remains to be done on the air side, and it is