

Water Resources Programs

changing its name within the past two years. Over the last ten years they have spent \$2 million on pollution control, and it is suggested that in the next five years they will spend another \$3 million on pollution control. Compare the large amount of money that a corporate oil company is willing to spend to change a name on a sign, with the small amount of money it is willing to spend on pollution control. I am sure all of us in this House feel that if they knew that pollution control meant more than just changing the name on the sign or more than just paying a fee to pollute, they would be more likely to spend that money on pollution control instead.

I would also refer to the situation wherein we use pesticides, herbicides and chemicals of all types that are known pollutants. We have the situation where in this House this afternoon questions were asked about 2-4-5T and 2-4D inquiring whether they were dangerous to human and animal life. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that if the law as we refer to it here, that "No person shall deposit or permit the deposit of waste in any waters," were adhered to and recognized, those ministers who allow that type of chemical to be used in this country would be subject to prosecution the same as any individual or corporation.

An hon. Member: You mean, arrest them?

Mr. Skoberg: I suggest that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson), the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) and the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) will be held suspect if these chemicals contribute to the death or injury of humans or wildlife. If our federal people deliberately allow this type of chemical to be used, they cannot say they were experimenting to find out. Why did they not take it off the market, Mr. Speaker? But if they knew they were liable to prosecution, possibly they would take it off the market. In all sincerity I say that a government minister should be charged if he knows that this type of chemical is liable to cause damage to human and animal life. I say, drunk driving is an offence so why isn't pollution an offence? I am sure the amendment introduced by my colleague would make it an offence under the Criminal Code, and as such those responsible would be duly charged.

I suggest that this amendment will eliminate effluent and outlaw the deposit of any waste, as defined in this act, in any waters. Surely the people of this nation would not disagree with this. Without this amendment,

[Mr. Skoberg.]

Mr. Speaker, the act is completely useless and I am sure the minister is well aware of that. If there are no teeth in the act, what is its purpose?

We talk about each water quality management area setting up its own fees. I know areas in Canada that would love to set the fees, making them so low and the quality of the regulations so low—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

SOCIAL SECURITY—INQUIRY AS TO TABLING OF WHITE PAPER

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 16, I put a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) which is recorded at page 5933 of *Hansard* in these words:

In view of the fact that action in so many fields, including old age pensions and veterans' pensions and allowances, depends upon the appearance of the government's white paper on social security, can the minister say whether the writing of this paper has yet been completed?

The answer of the Minister of National Health and Welfare was "No, Mr. Speaker." I tried a supplementary in these words:

Will the minister use his good offices to expedite this work so that we can soon have this paper, which was promised last October in the Throne Speech?

The reply of the minister was as follows:

I can only advise the hon. member that the government's position has not changed. As formerly stated, we expect to have the white paper before Parliament prior to the end of this session.

Up to that time, Mr. Speaker, most of us thought that the promise to have the white paper in our hands before the end of this session meant before we rose for the summer recess. A few days ago, however, it was made clear that this is not now the situation. All we now have is the promise that it will be tabled before the session legally ends, which may be some time in September or October. This is a far cry from the promise of a year ago that we might see the Willard Report, and if not we would see a white paper fairly soon.