

which I referred a little while ago. The accelerating congestion of human and industrial activity is threatening our existence. Little thought has been given to the dumping of waste. Water is the final receptacle for most waste materials resulting from human, industrial and agricultural activities as well as from transportation.

Therefore, why should we not discuss at this time questions such as these, notwithstanding the rules of the House which, I submit, do not apply in this area? As I have said, nothing can happen until such time as the House of Commons approves an appropriation act that will earmark funds for the purpose. I say that until that happens we are in order in discussing the bill.

May I go on record as saying that since the regenerative capacity of water is limited, the dumping of wastes directly or indirectly into water tables, rivers, lakes and oceans can—as it is today—overload the medium. The overloading of our water supplies will destroy our recreational facilities, wipe out our fisheries and drastically reduce the supply of water. This will pose direct health hazards, such as typhoid.

I am still not dealing with the expenditure of money, Mr. Speaker, even though it may appear that I am. In the final analysis, I am not asking for money to be spent right now.

Mr. Paproski: Not at this time.

Mr. Alexander: My colleague from Edmonton Centre helps me in this regard by saying, not at this time. I do not wish to belabour my point of order. I think that the Speaker in his wisdom, and in his ultimate compassion, will show me some mercy in this regard by ruling my bill in order so I can submit further arguments in support of the proposition that I have advanced.

If I may refer directly to the bill, the present section 36E(b) of the National Housing Act confines loans made to municipalities to trunk sewage collector systems and to central treatment plants. The proposed amendment permits loans for trunk water mains and trunk storm sewage collectors.

Then, the bill becomes involved in the aspect of forgiveness. My proposed amendment raises the forgiveness provision from 25 per cent to 50 per cent of the loan. Note that I am talking about forgiveness, Mr. Speaker, not about the spending of money. By the new subsection (3) the bill provides for 100 per cent forgiveness for works constructed during the winter months. The additional forgiveness is shared 25 per cent by the federal government and by the provincial government. The five month period may commence, at the option of the province, either on November 1 or December 1 to allow for regional seasonal employment; however, this option does not apply in 1974 since the assistance under the act expires in 1975 and a period commencing in December would extend past the expiry date of March 31, 1975.

I am very grateful for the indulgence that Your Honour and hon. members have exhibited, and I close by saying that the provisions of clause 3 of the bill are a negation of an appropriation. In this regard I hope Your Honour has followed my argument and will render a judgment in my favour.

National Housing Act

Mr. Ian Watson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State for Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, we all appreciate the initiative of the hon. member and the painstaking labour that I am sure he has expended in bringing forward his bill. It is a generous bill that has much to recommend it. I should have liked, in reply to this rather expansive enlargement of the discussion of the point of order, to go into detail on the newest federal initiatives taken in the area of sewage disposal systems which will have a beneficial effect on municipal pocketbooks, but I shall try to avoid that temptation.

However, I should like to mention that the new communities program, which is part of the measures that have been introduced into this House to amend the National Housing Act, and the neighbourhood improvement program, both include features that will allow for new forms of assistance from our level of government, in collaboration with the provinces, to be given to the municipalities by way of making available these extremely expensive services at the lowest possible cost to municipal taxpayers.

A number of discussions are now going on with the provinces and are contemplated to continue throughout 1973 in the area of sewage disposal systems and the means of financing such systems; and also, perhaps more importantly, it is contemplated during the year having discussions with the provinces in the whole area of public financing of services and how improvements can be made in this domain. This is a domain which over the years we have found—

• (1720)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Order, please. While I allowed fairly extensive time to the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander), I should remind the hon. member that he should speak to the point of order. The Chair has not put the question as yet.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Just as the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) did.

Mr. Watson: Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw your attention to the two points relevant here. The first is Standing Order 62(1) which reads:

This House shall not adopt or pass any vote, resolution, address or bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue, or of any tax or impost, to any purpose that has not been first recommended to the House by a message from the Governor General in the session in which such vote, resolution, address or bill is proposed.

Clauses 1 and 2 clearly represent a charge upon the Crown and there has been no recommendation from the Governor General. The only person who could introduce such a bill in this House is a minister on recommendation from the Governor General.

Although I realize it is unnecessary to bring this to your attention, let me point out that Citation 249 at page 214 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fourth Edition, reads in part:

"No cases can be found of any private member in the Canadian Commons receiving the authority of the Crown, through a minister, to propose a motion involving the expenditure of public money. No principle is better understood than the constitutional