

do as we say; we make decisions such as this which will affect the Toronto area.

Mr. Leonard Hopkins (Renfrew North-Nipissing East): Mr. Speaker, in beginning my remarks on Bill C-12 I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Goode) for bringing forward this matter. The explanatory note of the bill says that the purpose of the bill is the establishment of an environmental council of Canada which would be charged with the responsibility of advising and recommending the means by which Canada can achieve the highest possible standards of environmental quality and the lowest possible levels of pollution. When we think of pollution of the environment, we think of the air and emphasize forestry, land and water. The end result about which we are concerned is the quality of life of the people themselves.

About one year ago the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta introduced Bill C-25. That was during the third session of this Parliament. That bill sought to establish a Canadian environment week during October. The bill was considered by the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works which I chaired. It was indeed a pleasure to co-operate with the hon. member at that time.

Mr. McCleave: He is a good boy.

Mr. Hopkins: I enjoyed the co-operation of the opposition, including that of the hon. member who said the hon. member is a good boy. I must emphasize one thing when we talk about national parks and the cleaning up of the major water basins of this country. Some time ago this House passed the Canada Water Act. Mr. Speaker, I will continue speaking on this subject until we get some action.

Mr. McCleave: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hopkins: There must be additional funds for the cleaning up of our water basins. What the Canada Water Act says is good. It is one of our best pieces of legislation. However, something must be done in addition to what the act prescribes. The act says that the polluter must pay. As I said before, in many areas of this country the polluter no longer exist, but pollution remains. Therefore, it behooves the various levels of government of this country to come forward with funds to assist in the cleaning up of the environment and to allow the citizens of Canada to enjoy a better quality of life.

I wish to speak specifically of water basins which are covered by the Canada Water Act. This subject is pertinent in discussing the bill before us. There are, in many of the water basins of Canada, deadheads; they are left-overs from the old logging drives of the past 125 to 150 years. We are looking back in Canadian history. The Ottawa River is a perfect example of what I mean. Many hon. members of this House have asked questions about pollution of the Ottawa River emanating from the E. B. Eddy Company across the river. Yet I have not heard many questions or speeches in this House that deal with the hundreds of miles of river beyond Ottawa.

Few in this House have dealt with the hundreds of miles of waterways in this country which could be developed

Environmental Council of Canada

into excellent tourist areas. Some groups are interested in lifting logs out of our rivers. These logs could be used for commercial purposes. To back up my statement, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I know of a small group of people who lifted a birch log out of the river. Obviously, it was to have been used for the manufacture of birch veneer 86 years ago. It turned out to be a very profitable piece of timber for it produced, I think, 1,000 board feet of lumber. Normally about 20 logs would be needed for such a quantity.

This program is not being backed at the present time by any government department. I contend that funds ought to be allocated, either through the Department of the Environment and Fisheries or through the Department of Manpower and Immigration under its manpower programs, for assisting companies to begin operations on such waterways in order that we may clear them and promote the tourist and recreational industries of Canada.

Why should there be government assistance for such programs? The answer is very simple. It takes a large amount of capital to start a company which could operate in this area. First, it would need to buy equipment and hire men, and even though men might be paid \$100 a week it would still take time to lift these large logs out of the water and transport them to sawmills or veneer plants and manufacture them into wood products. Then, these products are shipped to the market and the company has to wait 30 or 60 days to realize a return on its capital. During that time there are wage and operating costs to meet. This has proven to be a helpful measure, and once these companies are on their feet they can operate on their own.

• (1720)

If we are going to discuss the environment, we should give serious consideration to cleaning up our waterways. We talk a lot about pollutants from various chemical substances, but there are certainly more practical things that have to be done on our waterways. As well as improving the quality of life by cleaning up our waterways, we should create parks. Many people can get very emotional about this, but we must approach this idea rationally, without emotionalism. We must go about it in a factual and well-planned manner.

You will recall that about three years ago there was a Sunday night CBC program which alleged that Algonquin Park in the upper Ottawa valley was being raped and destroyed by the forest based operators in that area. I personally visited that area and the local people took me to the spot where the CBC had their cameras set up, which was in the bottom of an old gravel pit that J. R. Booth dug some time in the 1880's or 1890's to supply gravel for the bed of his railway line through Algonquin Park. I also found out that the producer of the program was the past president and director of the Audubon Society of Canada and a former employee of the CBC. The people of Canada deserve something better than this if they are to contribute to the costs of such programs. If we want to promote the improvement of the environment in Canada let us put the facts before the Canadian people, not our personal, biased views.