

Suggested Lack of Urban Policy

do that, but will merely say that the Toronto airport situation illustrated the need for the type of consultation of which I spoken.

With some of my colleagues, I visited Hamilton last week. We heard that many people of that city are disturbed by the same sort of problems I have discussed here. In particular, we discussed with them the possibility of a new international airport in the Toronto-Hamilton area being built either in Beverley township or Mount Hope. In the view of those who spoke to us, one is objectionable because of its interference with areas needed for parks and recreation and the other is unacceptable because of its proximity to Hamilton and the danger of noise pollution. I will be asked the minister to meet and discuss these issues with representative groups of concerned citizens from that area.

I should like to say in conclusion that we are faced, in this question of urban development, with the important question of control over our environment and ability to co-operate with various levels of government. The question we have to ask ourselves is how far we can allow economic progress to justify the destruction of the environment in which we have to live. I contend that there is more and more shifting of values and the preservation and quality of urban living should have priority.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): Mr. Speaker, in taking part in the discussion of urban affairs and regional affairs tonight, and in supporting the motion of the New Democratic Party which criticizes the federal government's lack of action in meeting the problems of urban Canada, I shall emphasize that part of the urban problem which is pollution—pollution of air, water and sound. As has often recently been said, Mr. Speaker, we live in a new world. Science and technology have revolutionized our way of life. We live in a new Canada, in a Canada of great cities, of great metropolitan and regional areas. For good or ill we have departed from the rural Canada, the old Canada of 40, 30 or even 25 years ago, the countryside Canada.

Today there are 17 metropolitan areas in Canada with populations greater than that of the province of Prince Edward Island. Our

[Mr. Brewin.]

three largest metropolitan areas are each larger in population than any one of the four Atlantic provinces. Of our ten provinces only Quebec and Ontario have populations exceeding those of Montreal and Toronto. In this new, urbanized Canada we are forced to live and work close together. It follows that we must plan and act together so we may together meet the problems which confront us all.

• (8:10 p.m.)

May I touch on the several areas of pollution that trouble most Canadians, since three-quarters of all Canadians now live in urban centres. I submit that the government should be more active in controlling water pollution than it has been to date. The NDP attack on the government's bill dealing with water pollution focused attention on four critical weaknesses in that legislation. First, there is the lack of national water quality standards; second, the bill will fail to stop polluters from polluting water because pollution is not to be included as a criminal offence under the Criminal Code; third, it neglects to provide for the massive funds needed to clean up water pollution; fourth, it has failed to establish workable federal, provincial and municipal machinery to co-ordinate the fight across the country against water pollution.

While almost every Liberal member on the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works last year voted in favour of national water standards, the Liberal party now has endorsed a plan which will create pollution havens from one end of the country to the other. Under what is proposed, province will be set against province and area against area in the competition for industry and the provisions of jobs, and this will be brought about as a result of reducing control with respect to water pollution. The pollution control system planned now by Ottawa under the Canada water act throws another ten federal-provincial consultative committees and a host of local water quality management boards into the water pollution control jungle. Already there are involved in this general area of discussion and control ten different federal departments, nine agencies, four commissions, three international boards, 30 sub-boards and 40 acts of Parliament, plus agencies responsible for water in the provinces. The problem is real and growing, and the remedy is weak and diffuse.

I shall now say a word about air pollution. Statistics in the United States show that motor vehicles are responsible for 60 per cent