

Mr. Harding: It is obvious that this amendment will add to the area over which the minister has jurisdiction. I want to say the minister should be proud that we are trying to give him firmer control over environmental problems in Canada. We are not trying to cut down the work of the department. We want to make it more effective, and we think this amendment will enlarge the scope of activities of the department.

Again, I say that we have covered this before. I point out to members of the committee that it makes common sense, if we set up a department of the environment, to let it do the job for all of Canada. One of our big troubles in the past has been divided jurisdictions, one department doing one job and another department doing another. There has been a lack of co-ordination and a host of legislation on the statute books which has never been enforced or only to a very limited degree. This is what we are trying to avoid and this is why I am suggesting that the new department of the environment be all embracing. This, in effect, is what this amendment will do and I am going to suggest that the House accept it.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Question.

Amendment (Mr. Harding) negatived: Yeas 10, nays 28.

The Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Shall clause 5 carry?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

The Chairman: The hon. member for Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo.

An hon. Member: Oh, come on.

Mr. Howe: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member who interjected is one of the members who should be on his feet talking about this problem in relation to Lake Erie. The municipalities in that area are going to be in trouble because they have to find the \$30 million with which to buy the nutrient removal equipment that has to be added to sewage disposal plants. There are several members in this House who should be on their feet speaking about this question and I do not know why they are not putting more pressure on the minister to do some of the things that I feel he should be doing.

An hon. Member: Give us the bill.

Mr. Howe: Let's put some formula in the bill which will make it worth while. Mr. Chairman, the last time I spoke on this bill the minister in charge of housing was in the House and I asked him this question: In the new estimates for CMHC, how much of the budget is going to be directed towards helping the municipalities improve sewage treatment facilities? I understand that since then an announcement has been made, but I have not been able to find it. I wonder if the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry could tell me just how much of this budget for

Government Organization Act, 1970

CMHC is to be spent this year in assisting municipalities to improve their sewage treatment facilities. Have there been discussions on what the figure is for this year?

Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to answer because I do not know whether an announcement has been made. I have discussed it with the minister in charge of housing and also the minister for the province of Ontario. A larger sum of money is allocated both nationally and to the province of Ontario. We are also looking at the possibility of mounting a special program, yet to be delineated, which could follow from recommendations of the International Joint Commission for the cleanup of Lake Erie. I have asked the Hon. George Kerr of Ontario to come up with a set of cost estimates. These additional requirements might be considered as additional to anything that has been announced so far by the minister responsible for housing.

Mr. Howe: Mr. Chairman, do I take it that, over and above the amount that is going to be given for local sewage treatment programs, the federal government is willing to help with that \$30 million that is going to be required to put in the nutrient removal equipment?

Mr. Davis: I have asked the Hon. George Kerr for the figures, Mr. Chairman. When these are received I will take the matter to the government and it will be given serious consideration.

Mr. Howe: Now, Mr. Chairman, the question I keep asking in connection with this water development program is, what is the formula going to be. The commissions and the authorities looking after these river basins should have some idea when they start to plan how much assistance the federal government will provide. I think it is essential that there should be some indication of this by the federal government, as there was in the old water conservation assistance program. These people know what is needed for the Grand River and the Speed River, and all the areas that have problems.

In his speech the minister mentioned the necessity of private industry doing more for itself in this area. But private industry is not able to, Mr. Chairman. The time is now. By increasing the flow in a lot of these rivers and using other proper water management methods, we will be able to carry forward until the time when these companies can recycle their effluent and disposable waste. At the present time they do not have the technical knowledge to go forward. They do not know how to go about recycling their waste.

Probably some members read a suggestion in the *Globe and Mail* this morning outlining how paper can be made into cattle fodder with molasses and minerals added. Then, compost can be made from the manure. These things are important, Mr. Chairman, in relation to these particular environmental problems. I have a book here entitled "Garbage As You Like It". It has some very outspoken and new ideas on composting and things that can be done with garbage. Garbage will also come under the clean air bill because part of the air pollution of cities comes from the burning of garbage.