

Criminal Code

result in pollution in any way, shape or form of an interprovincial stream or of any other interprovincial waterway, that he would be entirely responsible for the consequences of any consequent pollution.

At present we have a medley of laws and regulations. We have regulations made pursuant to the Fisheries Act, regulations under the Department of National Health and Welfare, under the Department of Transport, and particularly under the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources. Although all of these regulations relate to one aspect or another of water pollution, very few relate to the whole subject of pollution, and none make pollution per se an offence if it endangers the health and comfort of the public. This is what this bill seeks to do.

● (5:40 p.m.)

I do not want to belabour it indefinitely because I think other hon. members of the House may have a few words to say on this, while I hope other hon. members will not say anything, in order that we might refer the bill to a committee before the six o'clock deadline. All I should like to say is that the intent of this bill, from what we have read in the newspapers, meets with the approval of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. No harm surely, can come from sending this bill to a committee. This is precisely what we should do this afternoon.

In view of the fact there are 18 minutes left for other people to express their views, I will resume my seat after once more urging hon. members of this House that just as we have been successful this afternoon in sending the excellent bill of the member for Waterloo, to the committee on health and welfare, so should we send this one to a committee this afternoon.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, it is obvious from the applause with which this bill was greeted by hon. members on all sides of the House that the Canada Water Bill which we are presently considering and which is still before the House, is not deemed to be an adequate answer to the problems of pollution control in this country. We should support this Bill because it does one of the things I have already mentioned in connection with the Canada Water Bill. It assumes some authority on behalf of the federal Parliament on a national scale, and therefore purports to make it an offence to pollute waters anywhere in

[Mr. Anderson.]

Canada. It also provides a very severe penalty for doing so.

I am not sure I would agree in every respect with this Bill, because it is very short. It is a bill by itself and not part of any other proposal or water act. Perhaps it should be extended to make it a more effective anti-pollution measure. However, I do think that referring it to a committee for consideration together with the Canada Water Bill when it arrives there, would be a very worthy objective. I do not intend to talk this bill out. I merely want to say that I support its principle. I do not say this unkindly, but it does bear out some of the criticisms that have been made of the Canada Water Bill as it now stands. The main one is that the federal government, under the Canada Water Act—

Mr. Barnett: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Aiken: Yes, certainly.

Mr. Barnett: As I listened to the hon. member I understood him to say he was in favour of the bill as proposed. I noticed when the hon. member rose and was recognized, the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis) was also on his feet. I am wondering whether the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken), if we can reach an understanding with the hon. member for Ottawa West, would agree with me to dispense with our remarks if that hon. member suggests to the House that we vote on the Bill after he has concluded his remarks.

Mr. Francis: In order to make the situation clear, Mr. Speaker, let me indicate that I wish to make a number of remarks to the House.

Mr. Aiken: I think that was hardly a legitimate question; nevertheless, I accept the spirit in which it was offered. If the indirect suggestion was that I should sit down and shut up, let me say I am going to do that in just a moment.

Mr. Peters: It was only suggested if the Liberals agreed to a vote, but apparently they will not.

Mr. Aiken: Nevertheless, I was about to conclude my remarks. I think this bill would strengthen the water bill as it has been presented. The two reasons I was in the process of giving were, first, that this measure would make pollution a national offence and, second, it would assume some of the federal powers which do exist; they would be put into the