Request for Environmental Council

seems to me that indirectly the cost will be passed on to the consumer who ultimately is the taxpayer. I think this should be a shared responsibility. When we say that the polluter must pay, I believe we are abdicating a certain responsibility. We might consider how the province of Ontario is growing and the density of the population. There are about 18 persons per square mile. In the urban industrialized areas the population increases dramatically. As I understand it, there are 5,000 people per square mile in Sault Ste. Marie, 6,000 people per square mile in Hamilton and 2,000 people per square mile in the city of Toronto. Here in Ontario there are 4,000 major industrial sources and at least 10,000 minor industrial sources of air pollution.

This is why I say we must be very concerned about our urban growth. A member on the other side asked whether an hon. member did not know there is a 25 per cent forgiveness under NHA. I think the member knows this. However, we are saying that if there is any sincerity on the part of the government, perhaps the forgiveness aspect of the bill should be increased.

I have had a bill on the order paper for some time. What I am trying to point out in it, without going too deeply into the matter, is that right now the act confines loans made to municipalities to trunk sewage collector systems and central treatment plants. My bill proposes that we not only look into this area but also permit loans for trunk water mains and trunk storm sewage collectors. Surely if the government is sincere in its attitude toward pollution they will agree that my bill makes sense. It makes even more sense when you consider that for a considerable length of time there has been only a 25 per cent forgiveness provision.

In the bill that I have proposed—perhaps there is some difficulty in this regard because it gets into spending power—there is provision for increasing the forgiveness amount from 25 per cent to 50 per cent and at the same time for providing a 100 per cent forgiveness if the projects carried out under NHA are carried out in the wintertime under the winter works program. We know that there is a 25 per cent forgiveness, but perhaps it is time we did more. I am concerned that in the areas which need attention—I am talking about our urban areas—the attention does not seem to be directed to the problems of the cities. I wonder why not. Surely we are all aware of the fact that section 92 of the BNA Act is not the end-all. We are no longer concerned with the constitutional hang-up in this regard because we have a Minister of State for Urban Affairs.

Mr. Rose: But he is busy running the campaign.

Mr. Alexander: All I say in conclusion is that the motion before the House is certainly worthy of our considered attention. It is a motion brought forward sincerely, one that comes as a result of a growing concern about pollution problems which have gone unattended. I hope the many suggestions that have been placed before the government this evening will be given considerable attention. Government members can give me the whole list of bills that have been passed, but I suggest they have still missed the boat by not setting any standards and by including an archaic act such as the Hamilton Harbour Commissioners

Act which was passed in 1912 and amended in 1951 and in 1957

Since the government is not taking any action to assist the municipalities further in this respect, which is within the government's power, by increasing the forgiveness powers in the act I say that the government is not sincere when it indicates that it is concerned about pollution. I have mentioned several areas where improvements can be made and I hope the government will take action. I repeat that if the minister brings in any amendments to the Hamilton Harbour Commissioners Act which relate only to an increase for the commissioners sitting on the board, then I will do my best to see that the bill does not get third reading because I believe it will have missed the boat. What we need is a bill expressing the feelings of the people of the city of Hamilton with regard to industrial growth and the protection of the environment.

• (2130)

[Translation]

Mr. Maurice Dupras (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, I feel under a moral obligation to take part in the debate on the motion of the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Harding) for several reasons, one of them being that a major part of the constituency I have the honour to represent in the House has tourism as its main industry.

The raw material of the tourist industry is environment, rivers, mountains and lakes.

After hearing the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) speak with such eloquence, praising the beauties of her province, I felt I also could stress the beauty of my constituency in "la belle province" of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, I truly believe that we all recognize ourselves to be trustees of ecology, of our environment. We share joint responsibility to protect it. We must ensure that our descendants—

[English]

An hon. Member: What are you going to do about it?

Mr. Dupras: Listen and you will find out.

An hon. Member: Get on with it.

[Translation]

Mr. Dupras: —that our descendants will inherit as healthy an environment as we received.

The Canadian government, jointly with the provinces and the United States government, has already taken steps in order to protect the ecology. Those who have studied the problem of pollution and are familiar with it know very well that this is not a problem which can be solved by one government alone, be it municipal, provincial, or federal. Co-operation of all governments concerned is required to find a solution in order to protect the patrimony which we inherited from our forefathers.

Let us examine, Mr. Speaker, what some countries have done to protect the ecology—and I am thinking in particular of some European countries like Switzerland, for instance, which banned the use of snowmobiles. I do not think we are prepared to go to such extremes and ban use