

Water Resources Programs

authority established. I would also point out that motion No. 1, in the name of the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Harding), purports to define a federal pollution control board. The wording is a slightly different from my amendment, a national pollution abatement commission, but the intent is the same.

We have both made an effort to include this in the bill without the expenditure of money. Motion No. 1 merely defines a federal pollution control board, and does not require the establishment of the board. Therefore, adoption of the amendment does not require the expenditure of money. I went a little further than that in my amendment and proposed that the commission be set up, but there is no provision in my amendment for the expenditure of money by the commission. I have not proposed that salaries be paid, and if the amendment is accepted it is quite conceivable that the commission could be a voluntary agency.

Right now there are many people throughout Canada who are most interested in the environmental pollution of the country and who would be pleased to sit *ex officio* on the commission. I could pick five persons right now who would be happy to serve on the commission without remuneration. While inferentially there may be the possibility that the commission might spend money, nevertheless the amendment does not provide for that. For this reason, I submit that motion No. 5, about which Your Honour had some reservations, is not out of order.

● (3:40 p.m.)

Motion No. 4, in the name of the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau), is along similar lines. Frankly, I think his motion might more readily be considered as being in order than mine. He is merely trying to co-ordinate the federal jurisdiction and define the responsibilities of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. He merely says that the duties, powers and functions of the minister ought to extend to all matters not exclusively assigned to the legislatures of the provinces. His amendment goes on to state that in this legislation, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources is the minister responsible for matters pertaining to environmental pollution. Therefore on these two motions, as well as on No. 1, there can be no real objection to putting the question and taking a vote. We always hope that some members on the government side will relent

[Mr. Aiken.]

and see the light. That did not happen too often in committee, although one or two amendments were accepted. Still, there is a proposal here. It is a major proposal but I submit it does not go beyond the scope of the bill. Neither does it require the expenditure of money. For these reasons, although these particular matters may be borderline cases, they ought to be put to the House so that the House may have the opportunity of expressing itself on the government's efforts to co-ordinate the control of pollution. This has not been done up to this time.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I thought perhaps that I ought to deal with these points seriatim. First, I think the point raised by the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave) was probably answered by the remarks of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) who pointed out that the first preamble relates to water quantity and the second to water quality. In addition to his observations I would include a reference to section 2 (1) (1) which reads:

"water resource management" means the conservation, development and utilization of water resources, and includes, with respect thereto... planning and the implementation of plans... and regulation of water quantity and quality.

The hon. member doubted whether there were words in the recommendation to cover the situation. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre pointed out, I think quite rightly, that conservation applies to the preservation of the quality of water.

Mr. McCleave: The quality and quantity.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I suggest that the word "utilization" also applies to the preservation of the quality of water. We have an example of utilization of a certain sort in the Ottawa River close by here. In this utilization, certain manufacturers are dumping waste into the river. Quite clearly, the question of quality is involved in regulating that type of utilization.

May I now deal with specific points raised by the Chair? May I make the point, which I believe to be the basis for Your Honour's observation, that motions 1 and 3 both involving the recommendation of the creation of a body which could involve public expenditure, would offend procedurally in the sense that the establishment of these bodies has not been preceded by the recommendation of the Governor General in Council. The hon.