

*Policy Statement on National Resources***AIR TRANSPORT**GRANT TO TRANSAIR COMPANY OF
CHARTER RIGHTS IN U.S.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. L. B. Sherman (Winnipeg South): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Transport. Does the granting of new charter rights into the United States to TransAir of Winnipeg indicate a change or readjustment in the terms of the present bilateral air agreement between Canada and the United States?

Hon. Paul Hellyer (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, may I take that question as notice.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCEINQUIRY AS TO INTRODUCTION OF
AMENDING LEGISLATION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Michael Starr (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, since certain categories of people are speculating about whether they are to be included under the Unemployment Insurance Act, will the minister advise the house when he expects to have the bill amending that act on the order paper?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the matter is still under study. I cannot give a definite answer today. It is an item on our priority list. I thought I had assured the house that no extension of classes of coverage is contemplated in the proposal that I hope to lay before the house later this year.

Mr. R. E. McKinley (Huron): A supplementary question to the Minister of Labour. Does this mean that the government has no intention of including teachers under the Unemployment Insurance Act?

Mr. Nicholson: Mr. Speaker, I thought I had answered that question some weeks ago. Even if the trend toward universality should continue the teaching profession would be pretty well down on any such list. For that reason the answer to the question is no.

● (3:40 p.m.)

SUPPLY

The house resumed, from Monday, October 23, consideration of the motion of Mr. Benson for committee of supply, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Hamilton (p. 3378) and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Douglas (p. 3383).

[Mr. Nicholson.]

REQUEST FOR POLICY STATEMENT ON
NATIONAL RESOURCES

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, when the house rose at ten o'clock last night I had been dealing with the activities of the federal government in the field of pollution control as revealed by answers which had been furnished to questions that were placed on the order paper in March, 1966. I had said that we ought to know whether there has been a change in the situation that was revealed to exist at that time.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Would hon. members kindly continue their conversations outside the chamber. It is difficult for interested members to follow the speech of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni.

Mr. Barnett: I suggested that the government's answers revealed that the activities of its various departments and agencies were miniscule, scattered and fragmented.

In this connection I wish to refer to an editorial which appeared in the *Ottawa Citizen* on July 3, 1965. It referred to the recent federal government budget and to the fact that the government had provided for tax incentives to industry in relation to the control of the pollution of our lakes and rivers but had not provided for anything with respect to the discharge of gases into the air. The editorial reads:

At a recent conference on air pollution in Toronto, a businessman was reported to have said privately that "we need a kick in the pants." He admitted he could do more to eliminate the discharge of gases and dust into the atmosphere, but his competitors were not doing so and he did not feel inclined to prejudice his share of the market by increasing production costs when he did not have to.

This is an appalling admission. The authorities—federal, provincial and/or municipal—should establish proper standards and insist that they are maintained. They should be empowered to enforce severe penalties against offenders. The Canadian Council of Resource Ministers will be holding a conference next fall on pollution in all environments—water, air and soil. It is to be hoped that they will recommend vigorous action immediately.

I had occasion to draw this editorial to the attention of the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. Gordon), who was then minister of finance, and remind him of a contention I had earlier advanced during the debate on the budget that the federal government should offer the same incentives to reduce air pollution as were being offered to reduce water pollution even though, as I indicated at the time, the administration was making only a very minor effort in that field.