

Supply

Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Hon. Member. Before I ask it I would like to say that I come from the City of Windsor. I must say that while I have heard discussions concerning the environmental problems of my home town in the counties of Essex and Kent, I have rarely heard such an outline so well put with such perception. I would like to congratulate the Hon. Member.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard): I would like to ask the Hon. Member if he could explain to us how it is that the federal Government has not chosen to fight the Detroit incinerator further. Its construction is virtually an act of war against a friendly country. It certainly is against the friendly City of Windsor. I must say that it is the first time in this House that a Member has stood up and with such eloquence raised the issue. In light of that it is a disgrace when I look at Members opposite.

Mr. Crawford: Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to reply to the question. When the incinerator was discussed it was at the planning stages. My municipality was the first to send a resolution to the Government asking it to intervene and to put a stop to this incinerator.

• (1630)

We did not receive a reply to the resolution we had sent to the Government asking them to put a stop to this incinerator. As I stated earlier, it is the largest incinerator in North America. The wind currents are across my municipality, across my friend's municipality of Windsor, and across Essex. All the toxins from that incinerator are coming across our part of Canada. Yet the Government that sits in this House today did not have the courtesy to reply to a resolution from a municipality that was interested and knew that problems were going to happen.

The next year, as warden of the county, I still had not received a letter from the Government to the County of Kent.

Some Hon. Members: Shame, shame!

Mr. McCurdy: Having heard the comments from those of dubious residency in my riding, the Member for Kent claiming priority with respect to a virtual flood of correspondence from the County of Essex, I have to agree that the Government's total disregard of all correspondence with respect to environmental problems in the Essex-Kent area can certainly be substantiated by this Member. I do not know, I arrived late, but it is not only with respect to the incinerator, it is with respect lake levels, with respect to the Fermi II incinerator and

to any number of environmental issues that plague our area.

I would just like to add one more on which I hope Kent county will follow Essex county, as it usually does, and that is with respect to the imminent cancellation of VIA Rail. This, I suppose, is a part of the Government's policy with respect to sustainable development and to ensure that our highways will be filled with more cars, buses, smoke, and more nitrates, sulphides and mercury to contribute to acid rain.

I hope that Kent county, and the Hon. Member across the way who was accused of being eloquent, would also add to the battle to ensure that there is a balanced transportation policy in this country which will at least pay some modicum of attention to sustainable development.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Member for Kent if he would like to reply.

Mr. Crawford: Mr. Speaker, I did not know whether that was a statement or a question. The only thing I can answer is that we certainly recognize the great County of Essex and Windsor. We always have. On your position, Sir, it has always been number two to Kent. We are certainly fighting for VIA Rail.

I thought this was on the environment and that is why I am speaking on the environment. However, I certainly agree with my hon. friend.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Questions and comments are now terminated. Debate. The Hon. Member for Rosedale.

Hon. David MacDonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, in my nine year absence from this House, and more recently in the last election, I always knew it was difficult to get into this place but I never realized how difficult it might be to get on my feet to be able to make a speech in. I am grateful for the opportunity to participate in this debate this afternoon.

If, in the final comments of the Hon. Member for Kent (Mr. Crawford), there is some confusion in his mind in wondering whether it is a debate on the environment, transport, or on the Budget, he is in good company. Anyone who has even looked briefly at the motion that has been presented to us by the Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent) would immediately understand that this is not one of his better efforts.

In fact, I knew the Member for Oshawa, even before he became a Member of Parliament in 1968. My recollection is that he was a university professor. In my now far-off university days, when university professors assigned you a topic to write on, you had really two options. One was to put down as much as you possibly could in