

## Water Resources

to advise us as to how we shall avoid the pollution of our neighbours' environments. The highly creative private economy should be more than sufficient to the task of providing the answers, as the belatedly active automobile industry is now ably demonstrating.

The people who subscribe to the private enterprise theory should take a good look at what some areas of North America have become. If they are going to respond it is high time they did so. Let me read another paragraph from this editorial:

Let us simply hope that we who pollute will recognize our obligations under the social contract, so that the potential harshness of the police power will be unnecessary. Let us take advantage of the huge technological creativity that the private economy is, more than any other power, capable of supplying to solve a problem we have left unsolved—excuses aside—for just a little too long.

I agree with the writer in this respect. It is high time we did something. If private industry will contribute from its own resources and initiative, more power to it; but I suggest that it get on with this. If it does not, then the police powers which the writer spoke of should be used to enforce regulations whether they pertain to private industry, government or municipalities.

This editorial also referred to the expense of cleaning up the pollution from which we suffer in Canada. I grant you there is a considerable expense involved. We never paid too much to get rid of our sewage. We do pay at the city level, but anything we do costs money and it is high time we started to spend money in this respect. We have used what nature has given us and we must now look after our own problems.

I read another item which appeared in the *Christian Science Monitor* and which contained a picture of mountains and water with the caption "U.S. Flourished on a water-rich continent". The United States has now used up many of its resources and is looking to Canada for some of our water. The United States has squandered its inheritance and now wants some of ours. We have argued this party's point of view that the minister should not barter away Canada's good water for a pittance. If the United States wants to squander its water, that is fine; but let us not squander ours. Let us insist that we get at least adequate compensation and make sure that Canada's future needs will be met before we commit ourselves.

Let us consider for a moment the cost of getting rid of our wastes. As a farmer, I raise beef cattle. The cattle are put in a corral for the winter and I have to clean out that corral

at my own expense in the spring. I suggest this is one cost of raising beef cattle. It represents part of the price per pound or unit for the production of beef. Why should industry not pay the same charge on the same basis? Industry should include this cost of disposal of waste as part of the cost of production. I must do this so why should someone else be allowed to pollute the water, air or surrounding land?

In all fairness, I should admit that some industries take care of their own pollution problems by spending large sums of money, and it is not fair to them when others do not do the same. I suggest we should enforce the regulations in this regard.

In this day and age, when provinces and municipalities are competing with each other for various industries, it seems to me that the province which is willing to offer cheap labour and allow industry to ignore pollution clean-up is the one which will get the industry. This is not right and these provinces should not be shopping around for industries which in turn are looking for areas in which they can dispose of waste products. We should insist that industry take care of pollution wherever it is situated.

Some industries are contributing much toward pollution control. I have before me a feature article which appeared in the *Dofasco Illustrated News*. This is a very well-written and illustrated article. I do not know whether it has accomplished its entire goal but the article reads well and I want to commend the people who published it. The article refers to the production of steel, galvanizing and tin plating. I understand there is a considerable amount of waste as a result of this production. The article states in part:

Unfortunately, during these processes many undesirable by-products are produced. As steel productivity is increased by improved technology to meet the market demands, the quantities of these potential pollutants increase accordingly. Dofasco is keenly aware of this potential threat to the public welfare and realizes this problem must be met and dealt with.

• (3:30 p.m.)

This is why, over the last decade, Dofasco has spent \$14,000,000 on air and water pollution control installations. Eight million dollars of these expenditures have been made since 1963.

I would compliment this particular steel company for the effort it has put forward. If the effort is not yet adequate, hopefully it will be continued until it is adequate. As a leader in this area, I think this company should be complimented for doing something in a field of which we should all be more