

**Mr. Comeau:** The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken) says that it is not there. I have not seen it.

**Mr. Aiken:** And the minister said twice that it is in there.

**Mr. Comeau:** He has lots of explaining to do. He knows darn well that that language is not in the bill. The word "national" appears in lots of places; the bill is polluted with that.

**Mr. Corbin:** We will give the hon. member another ten days.

**Mr. Comeau:** It appears that everything is based on agreement with the provinces.

**Mr. Davis:** That is not correct.

**Mr. Comeau:** The minister says that is not correct. I repeat the challenge I gave to him when he was talking to the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Perrault) and trying to obtain information. When he replies at the end of the second reading debate, I challenge him to point out where in this bill there is provision for the establishment of national air quality standards. I submit that that provision is not in the bill.

**Mr. Davis:** Does the hon. member want the page?

**Mr. Comeau:** The minister must look at the bill again. Perhaps he has not had the time to examine the bill, because we have spent very little time on this matter.

**Mr. Davis:** Perhaps the hon. member ought to read the bill.

**Mr. Comeau:** May I turn to another point? There will be difficulty in obtaining convictions, and the penalty on conviction is a fine only, so far as I can see. I wonder whether fines will mean very much to industries that have been convicted. Is it contemplated, for example, that jail sentences will be meted out in certain circumstances? Perhaps we ought to discuss that in committee. Also, the legislation makes no provision for citizens to sue air polluters or for individuals to sue the government or to sue inspectors who have failed to do their job. The *Ottawa Citizen* of February 1, 1971 reports an interview with the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. Near the end, the article reads in part:

Mr. Davis said the question of citizens' pollution rights was under consideration.

'We're hoping to come forward with a piece of legislation within 12 months which will deal with this respect to all kinds of pollution within federal jurisdiction,' he said.

Apparently, therefore, Bill C-224 is not the total legislation that we can expect with regard to air pollution. That is what the article means. If the government is not ready to proceed with legislation in this area, why does it not wait until it is ready? Before the establishment of these objectives or initial standards no public hearings are to be ordered, if I understand the bill correctly. All

### Clean Air Act

these things will have to be taken into consideration and I hope some answers will be forthcoming from the minister with respect to provincial agreements and the other points I have raised.

● (12:50 p.m.)

An interesting editorial appeared in the *Montreal Gazette* of February 15. The writer had been in a position to study the bill for four days. It reads:

The federal government's clean air bill is a slight step forward. It promises, essentially, to set standards of air quality. Standards are fine. Standards are needed. But what do they accomplish by themselves?

Montreal already has standards. They do not prevent hazardous situations of the kind which existed here several days ago—

**Mr. Pepin:** What do you suggest? Bring back the death penalty?

**Mr. Comeau:** I hope the minister will make a speech on this subject. He is affected by it and we should like to hear more of his interventions. As a rule he just comes out and smiles at us. Even when he is serious, he smiles. If the minister responsible for this bill is correct, and these standards are national standards, and it is desired to make them effective, how can we ensure that something will be done with respect to preventing air pollution?

**Mr. Davis:** Pass the bill.

**An hon. Member:** You are not used to that.

**Mr. Comeau:** Oh, the hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. McBride) always makes his usual comment. He sits there in the back row and that is the sort of comment he makes. That is how effective he is. They even kicked him out of—well, I will leave it at that.

We can pass all the regulations and all the pollution measures the minister wants us to pass. We have been dealing with all kinds of pollution bills in the last couple of years. But you cannot enforce a lot of these damn things.

**An hon. Member:** That is a four-letter word.

**Mr. Comeau:** Not as bad as the ones used by the Prime Minister. I do not degrade myself.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh!

**Mr. Comeau:** Anyway, money is needed in order to comply with these regulations. The government's attitude with respect to all these pollution programs has been "Kick industry around". I am not saying industry should not be kicked. Industry has to be kicked around. But we have to accept our responsibilities, too. Toronto, Ottawa, Montreal—these are not industries. They are municipalities, and they must have money if these regulations are to be enforced.

What happens around the Detroit-Windsor area? Large sums of money will be needed to clean up pollution there