

In conclusion, I once more urge all my fellow citizens, municipal authorities and above all provincial authorities to stop merely discussing the damages wrought by pollution and to follow the example set by the federal government, i.e., finally resort to action.

[English]

**Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West):** Mr. Speaker, I want to become involved in this debate primarily because, as many hon. members know, I represent a significant constituency, Hamilton West, which of late has been plagued with a profound concern about pollution. Earlier I listened to the minister. As I reflected on what he said I wondered whether it was the same Minister of the Environment and Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Davis) who in January, 1970, said:

I don't believe all that I read about dying lakes and sickening seas. Most of it is poppycock-written by novices who are reaching for headlines—

In the Speech from the Throne debate in the same year the minister said:

The evidence of past failure to rehabilitate our water resources is there for all to see—befouled water, despoiled beaches, rotting marine vegetation, and diminished fishing.

• (2120)

That is the same man, holier than thou, who spoke today. This is one minister for whom I have a great deal of respect because I believe he is sincere. At the same time, I have my doubts when I reflect on the statement he made in January, 1970. Now that we have a Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Basford), I believe this is the time when it is absolutely incumbent upon us to become involved in tri-level conferences in order to receive some input and acquire direction concerning where we are going.

I know we have passed many bills, some of which have been improved because of the tenacious attitude of opposition members. It is not necessary for me to mention all of them. They include the Canada Shipping Act, the Navigable Waters Protection Act, the National Harbours Board Act, the National Parks Act and the Canada Water Act. What I wish to concentrate on is an anomaly which exists in the city of Hamilton, a city governed by an act which was passed in 1912. This is what has brought the attitude of the city of Hamilton, its citizens, the city council, the province of Ontario and the federal government into focus.

Here we have an act which as a result of legislation gives us three individuals, two appointed by the federal government and one appointed by the city council, who have the right to look into the problems regarding Hamilton harbour in terms of future development. But suddenly it seems to me we have found that here we have an act which is archaic and fit for the horse-and-buggy days. It has been disregarded so far as the federal government is concerned. What concerns me is the fact that the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) is interested in seeing that there are more commissioners appointed to the Hamilton Harbour Commission without giving any indication as to whether this act is to be updated and brought into focus in terms of being meaningful legislation for the 1970s and the future.

#### *Request for Environmental Council*

I think such an attitude on the part of the minister leaves a great deal to be desired. We have a situation in which the city of Hamilton, its council and its citizens are very concerned about who has jurisdiction over development and land use. It is in this area, as a result of having an archaic act, that there are men—and I say this with a great deal of respect—who are more interested in their duties in respect of the harbour commission than in exercising reason as citizens of Hamilton. These men have perhaps missed the boat. This may be the reason there is now a great conflict before the Supreme Court of Ontario. If the Minister of Transport intends to bring in an amendment to this act, I will not give my consent to an increase in the number of commissioners until he gives me some indication that simultaneously there will be an amendment or amendments to the act to make it more meaningful in terms of the development of Hamilton.

I think we must arrive at a balance between industrial development and the protection of our environment. This act does not seem to fit the bill at the present time. I am very concerned about why this government believes it has done all it can. The moment we say to the government that what it has done is good, though questionable, and more must be done particularly in respect of standards which should be set, members of the government indicate that the opposition, particularly the NDP and our party, is not sincere in its motives.

Surely air and water must be preserved and protected from misuse and abuse. Air and water are our most precious natural resources. In the past ten years we have found an excitement among people, ranging from children of kindergarten age to high-powered lobbyists, who point the finger at us and tell us to take whatever action is necessary. This is what we are saying in the motion. Earlier I brought in a motion in respect of the disposal of solid waste. We are now considering a similar motion.

We must continually remind ourselves and the government that it is necessary to focus attention on the problem of pollution and give it very high priority, because unquestionably if we do not we cannot be saved. That is not simple rhetoric; it is fact which has been researched and brought before the nation and the world. As we bring more people into Canada, particularly into Ontario, we find that population and industrialization increase. This means of course, an increased demand on our water and air resources. This also means that manpower is required for our industries, and the industries provide employment. Therefore, we find industry and population contributing together to air and water pollution.

The demands on air and water and the amount of waste discharged have grown simultaneously. It is not necessary to remind you, Mr. Speaker, of the home-heating, the automobile transportation and the industrial manufacturing which is accelerating the pollution of the air and water which we find so necessary in terms of our daily lives. I wonder whether it is fair to say that as a result of the increase in population there are more demands on industry in order to provide necessary goods and services.

I wonder whether it is fair to say that the polluter must pay. I wonder whether we should be looking for an approach which calls for incentives whereby the responsibility is shared. When we say that the polluter must pay, it