

*Supply—Industry*

Third, a guiding principle should be that polluters should bear the cost of treatment and of pollution damage inflicted upon resource users. I found general agreement with that third guideline.

The fourth guideline was that there should be financial incentives to industry to improve its anti-pollution measures and to encourage research. I understand that we have some legislation which provides for this at the present time, and I expect that there will be further study of this legislation to see whether something can be done to promote more interest in this problem on the part of industry.

Fifth, the opinion was expressed that there is a shortage of trained experts in this field, and this is correct. I have discussed this matter since the conference with other persons, and I understand that it is quite a problem to get competent persons to undertake this work.

Sixth, the best unit for pollution control is a region or watershed. I attended one or two meetings on this subject. The attack against it should be on a multifunctional basis. There were a lot of interesting discussions on this aspect of the problem. Some rivers are international in character, some are interprovincial but all, have watersheds. It is obvious that in order to have some satisfactory administration some watershed authority will have to be established.

As a result of these guidelines and of listening to the discussions, I propose—when I say that I propose, I am sure there is general agreement on the part of many members in this house—that federal funds should be used to launch a Pollution Research Institute under the jurisdiction of the National Research Council, staffed by engineers, biologists and medical and sociological experts. I do not think there is any time to lose in dealing with this problem effectively, or in commencing to deal with it effectively.

When I asked the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources the other day what action was being taken by the government with respect to these guidelines, I was glad he indicated the government was proposing to take immediate action. To illustrate this need, let me quote an article which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* for November 1, 1966.

If you have a water pollution problem, tackle it now.

It doesn't matter whether you are a primary or secondary industry, a resource of a manufacturing industry, a municipality or a village, it makes eminent good sense in dollars and cents to curb water pollution today—and not wait for tomorrow.

That's the advice of Dr. A. E. Berry, secretary-treasurer of the Canadian Institute on Pollution Control and president of the Conservation Council of Ontario. Dr. Berry also is former general manager of the Ontario Water Resources Commission, and often is called Mr. Water in the United States.

"The difference in cost between tackling pollution control now and putting off a decision for a few years is likely to be high," he said, "a most costly business. It can mean millions of dollars in the long run."

Then, he concludes this interesting article with this paragraph:

"Society is no more and no less than a collection of individuals—you and I. If we don't face up to this problem, no one will. If we are inactive, nothing will be done—but you can be sure that we will pay a heavy price for this inactivity."

Without a doubt, Mr. Chairman, in the final analysis the deciding factor is money to conduct the necessary research and to provide co-operation between all levels of government, federal, provincial and municipal. Then, industry should accept clearly defined fiscal responsibilities to give effect to the policies that result from sound research into this problem. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I once again urge that federal funds be used to launch a Pollution Research Institute staffed by engineers, biologists, medical and sociological experts in order to conduct research into this problem at the earliest possible date.

● (5:20 p.m.)

In concluding my remarks, Mr. Chairman, in support of my argument I want to quote a paragraph from a speech made by the parliamentary secretary to minister of mines and technical surveys on water pollution. This speech, I understand, was made at the conference on united action for clear water, at the U.A.W. Hall, St. Catharines, Ontario, on June 18, 1966. The speech is of fairly recent date. This is what the parliamentary secretary had to say on this particular problem:

Ottawa has a vital role to play. It must take the initiative on our international rivers and streams. It should concern itself with schemes which are inter-provincial in scope. More than that...it must backstop and even complement the efforts of those individual provinces which wish to make the most of their own resources. It can make grants to municipalities. And it can do research and frame tax laws which encourage industry to do for the rest of society what they would not always do for themselves.

I trust this government makes every effort to secure the co-operation of municipal governments, industry and all those organizations concerned with this matter, and tries to get as many interested persons as possible in this country to assume some personal responsibility to deal with something that is of great consequence to this and future generations.