

The Budget—Mr. Badanai

● (9:00 p.m.)

Pollution has existed from time immemorial. As a problem, however, its impact has only been felt since localized population densities have produced more waste than our lakes and streams can assimilate.

Pollution comes from three major sources: from human and animal waste, from industry and from erosion carrying soil and debris into our lakes and streams.

In spite of the excellent past and present work by some municipalities and industries, many of our lakes and streams are still polluted—

Water pollution has become a national problem.

One clear trend that emerges from a look at the economics and politics of water pollution control is that the politics are fast becoming more important than the economics.

"The public hue and cry," says the *Pulp and Paper Magazine of Canada*, "will pressure Canadian industry into cleaning up its streams over the next decade despite the cost." The only slim hope is that industry can succeed in educating the public and government to adopt reasonable water quality standards, stringent enough to keep the water clean but not so expensive that they will force industries out of business. As one industry executive put it: "A pristine pure stream would be of small consolation to a man deprived of the means of earning his living"—

Many companies have made extensive investments in waste control systems during a period when there was little if any legislative pressure on them to do it. In many cases there was some financial return on the investment. But now that governments are stepping up their requirements and introducing stringent standards, considerable outlays will be required to meet these new conditions, and there will be little or no financial return.

Money is one of the keys to solving many problems in the pollution field. The technology is advancing and with enough money much can be done to improve our environment. However, we are still searching for means that will give the desired result that the country can afford based on economics. As federal justice minister John Turner said: "The physical solution is available. The problem that remains is an economic one, and perhaps, an administrative one. It costs money to treat water before discharging it into a stream."

In the nine-year period from 1960 to 1969 inclusive, Canadian pulp and paper mills representing 75% of the industry's total production spent more than \$95-million on pollution control facilities—

In Ontario alone, it is estimated that primary treatment for all mills would cost \$28 million and even this amount would not reduce suspended solids to the required OWRC regulations. In Quebec, the water board estimates mills in the province will have to spend \$100 million to meet the board's recently announced requirements.

Looking at the industry as a whole, some estimates have placed the further capital cost of pollution control in excess of \$250 million, with an annual operating cost of \$40 million, to install primary and secondary treatment in every mill in the Canadian pulp and paper industry.

On a former occasion, Mr. Speaker, I indicated in this chamber what the pulp and paper industry is doing in its efforts to control this menace. The Great Lakes Paper Company in Thunder Bay, for example, is spending millions of dollars to curb the pollutants which infest the air over the Kaministikwia River, and they are to be congratulated on their successful beginning. Of course, the most desirable condition would be a pollution-free environment, but this ideal state is only possible in a completely sterile environment in which there is no life.

It would be most desirable to have both the housing to accommodate the increasing population and the facilities

[Mr. Badanai.]

for work and recreation in a pollution-free atmosphere. But in our growing urban and industrial community we must learn to live with change. We must also recognize that people create pollution. The fact that we cannot achieve perfection is no excuse for not doing as much as we can, but we still have to be practical and realistic. The fact that the government, in co-operation with the provinces and the United States, is deeply concerned about the problem of protection of the environment on the borders of our Great Lakes is shown by their seizing every opportunity which new technology is bringing into the control of pollution.

I am also concerned about the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority, which is reported to be seeking higher tolls on the Seaway and the imposition of tolls on the Welland Canal, which would adversely affect the economy of Thunder Bay and northwestern Ontario. Cheap transportation has always been vital to Canada's success as an exporter. Owing to the vastness of the country, this factor must be kept alive if we are to export surplus wheat, iron ore and other goods and supplies economically. In reverse, the price of imports would probably soar if rates were scaled up. The shippers would just foist increased fees on the consumer in the form of higher prices for goods purchased.

Ontario manufacturers, basing their business on export, are already facing fantastic competition from countries which possess a number of advantages. The Seaway Authority is running the risk of putting Canadian industry out of competition if it raises user charges and increases export costs. The result would not help to reduce unemployment. I would therefore urge the government to reconsider any proposals for raising fees on a transportation system because the net effect of such an increase would be increased prices of food and services.

In the matter of housing, every community has its problems. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) has recognized the need to boost the capital budget of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. Under the capable leadership of the minister responsible for housing and urban development, these problems are being tackled with vigour and intelligent application in an effort to give every family in the land a decent home.

The budget, Mr. Speaker, reflects the goals of the government: the reduction of unemployment, the control of inflation, the promotion of social justice, and it seeks to encourage a prosperous economy.

● (9:10 p.m.)

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): In discussing this motion and amendment, Mr. Speaker, one wonders what the main purpose was in presenting this minibudget. Some people have been unkind enough to suggest that the purpose of the budget was to retain the 3 per cent surtax. That may have been the prime objective. The whole tenor of the budget creates the impression that the government is unsure about where it is headed. It is not sure of the means to get there and does not know what it wants to accomplish. Is the main commitment to correct