

ment could pay more important and essential attention than this area. There is no other area in the whole of this country in respect of which the government has been more negligent in taking action.

Mr. William Rompkey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, my minister answered the question earlier, and I would like to elaborate on it to some degree now. The acquisition of any property which might be developed as a waste disposal site is solely a matter between the vendor and the purchaser—in this case, private property owners in the Port Hope area and Canadian Pacific Railway. I understand that Canadian Pacific now owns the land in question. Control of the development of the lands for waste disposal purposes can be exercised at the local level by municipal bylaws and in particular zoning bylaws passed under the provisions of the Ontario Municipal Act. Use of land, contrary to the provisions of any bylaw, would be illegal and if the bylaw is to be amended it would require the approval of the Ontario Municipal Board. This will be required in this case.

Approval for the development of lands for waste disposal sites comes under the direct control of the ministry of the environment of the province of Ontario. Before a certificate of approval can be granted for a waste disposal site, a formal application must be received by the ministry and a public hearing before the environmental hearing board must be convened and completed. The environmental hearing board will hear arguments for and against the proposal and report to the executive director, air and land pollution control division, who will then decide whether a certificate should be issued and, if so, under what circumstances and with what conditions.

For a certificate to be issued, the acceptability of the area will have to be proven to the ministry of the environment, which will also specify development and operating procedures. In the event that the executive director refuses to issue the certificate, the applicant can appeal the decision to the pollution control appeal board which will hear evidence supporting the proposal and in support of the refusal. This board can direct that a certificate be issued.

The present status is that the province of Ontario has recently received an application for a certificate, but no date has yet been set for an environmental board hearing. The position of the municipality of metropolitan Toronto is that the Canadian Pacific Railway is the sole agency responsible for acquiring and developing the waste disposal site subject, naturally, to receiving approval of site from the provincial ministry of the environment. The initial commitment between the two parties is for Canadian Pacific Railway to transport and dispose of 400,000 tons of refuse per year, representing approximately 25 per cent of the waste generated in the metro Toronto area, in accordance with provincial regulations and at an agreed unit cost of \$6.35 per ton. There are two fundamental points to be recognized. The management of waste comes under the jurisdiction of the province of Ontario, and the proposal by CPR will be subjected to close scrutiny both in the public forum and by professional staff in the provincial government. The socioeconomic and environmental concerns will be fully examined.

Adjournment Debate

• (2210)

The CPR is making an effort to expand the type of service available to potential clients. The concept of rail haul is new to Canadian waste management practices and comes at a time when large urban centres are facing serious problems in providing waste disposal facilities. This problem is probably most acute in the metropolitan Toronto area.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. I regret interrupting the hon. member, but according to Standing Order 40 he is limited to three minutes. I see from whatever notes he has that he might go beyond one or two minutes more, and I cannot allow that.

AGRICULTURE—FEED GRAIN—SUGGESTED ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION TO WESTERN PRODUCERS

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I want to speak briefly on the question which I asked the minister in February regarding the method of pricing feed grains domestically in the eastern market and in British Columbia. I was concerned with the eastern market.

This matter arose out of questions which I asked, in the committee on miscellaneous estimates, of Dr. Perreault of the eastern feed board regarding prices at that time. According to the information he gave me, for example, we were selling barley at \$1.53½ at eastern ports and at \$1.63 at Thunder Bay. When you put it on a tonnage basis, we were selling barley to the Montreal market at \$65.54 a ton whereas U.S. corn in Montreal at that time was selling at \$68.93 a ton. I am interested in asking the minister what policy is being followed and what policy will be followed in arriving at a price that is fair and equitable.

It is significant that at the same time as I asked these questions in the committee, I was told that previously we had charged the domestic market more than the export market. This information came out also at a seminar of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture held in Ottawa in the winter. It seems to me that if we are going to be fair and practical, we must adopt a method of pricing in the eastern feed market that is more consistent than heretofore. One yardstick that has emerged as being reasonably good is the price of U.S. corn in Montreal. That is the competitive product. The other could be the export market which we could use. But in my view the main thing is to adopt a policy that is known to the western farmer who is the producer, and to the eastern farmer who may choose to buy.

I think we will probably need a good benchmark much more in the future than we have needed in the past. The European market is changing, with Great Britain entering the Common Market. This means a single market for practically the whole of western Europe so far as pricing procedures are concerned. Freight rates may again come under review, but that is another matter. The main thing I am concerned about in raising this question with the minister is the pricing method which it is proposed to follow, while at the same time leaving the Canadian Wheat Board free in exercising its judgment as to the day to day pricing. This factor has to be borne in mind.