

Proposed Committee on Pollution

cities in North America, three collective conglomerations of cities, which will have total populations of something like 140 million. These will be between Boston and Washington on the east coast, between San Francisco and San Diego on the west coast and between Chicago and Pittsburgh in the centre of the United States. We in Canada may not have cities of the same size but we will have the same problems. In the Vancouver area of British Columbia it is quite possible that the entire lower mainland will become one urban area. It is certainly possible that the enormous population surrounding Toronto will be linked up in one large urban area, and we may well have a city there which will be as large as New York city is now. I think, therefore, we should not say that because we have space in this country we will not be faced in the future with the same problems the United States faces today. We should realize that these problems do exist and we should do what we can now to prevent the change of our environment from radically altering our environment for the worse.

I do not want to belabour this particular point. We have with us in this house, by great good fortune, the hon. member for York West (Mr. Givens) a former mayor of Toronto, who is an expert in the urban field. I am sure he will have much of interest to say on this subject in future debates. I should like to leave you with the thought that in 30 years time, I certainly hope well within your lifetime, Mr. Speaker, and within mine, we will be having urban centres in North America with populations from 40 million to 50 million. Even now, with population centres much less extensive, we find that in North America, in Canada, there are lakes which are dying, bays and rivers which are becoming nothing more than open sewers.

I think we are very fortunate that the people of Canada have become aware of this problem. Perhaps they are well ahead of political leaders in this house, in the provincial legislatures in municipal politics. The people of this country are concerned. We can tell this from the correspondence we receive and from the representations that are made. There is a great demand for clean soil, for pure air and for pure water. They know that these things are vital to our way of life, to our enjoyment of our natural environment.

Every year there are more organizations and more and more individuals who realize that in order to preserve the standard of life we enjoy, we Canadians must take steps to preserve our natural heritage. The problem is

extremely complex. It cannot be solved, as I mentioned earlier, simply by spending a lot of money in one area or by following one single program. The solution of the problem will require time; it will require patience and certainly it will require large sums of money. If I may digress let me mention for a minute this question of money. In the United States today, in one way or another, \$10 billion is being spent on pollution control. When we compare that with our entire Canadian budget of \$12 billion, we realize there is a fantastic amount of money already being spent for this purpose, but from all appearances without any great success. This I think emphasizes that the whole problem of pollution control is expensive. Ultimately the people who will pay will be the public, either through taxation or through higher prices for industrial products.

I should like to quote Dr. W. R. Drynan of the research institute of the University of Waterloo, who said:

Pollution control is a matter of establishing priorities, but first we have to establish the goals of society. Technology exists for an acceptable level of pollution control, but a value judgment has to be made and then society has to decide whether or not it is worth while to spend the money.

It is perfectly clear from this statement that money has to be spent and that a great deal will have to be spent. I suggest to the members of this house that if it is not spent now, if we do not set our sights high enough now, if we worry too much about costs today and too little about the bill for pollution tomorrow, we will not have much of a legacy to pass to future generations in this country.

The question of pollution embraces a great number of disciplines. The obvious ones are biology, physics, chemistry and engineering. There is also agronomy, ecology and even acoustics, as the people living near the Toronto airport know. Bacteriology and thermodynamics are also involved. Similarly, we have a great number of government departments involved in pollution control. One is the federal Department of Fisheries. The Department of Transport is also involved, as is the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources. Another department that comes to mind when we consider pollution control is the Department of National Health and Welfare. I have just given these four examples from the federal field. The provinces are involved in this area because the constitution gives resource management to them. On this point I believe it would be worth while to