

Again, we agree. Yes, we agree. Pollution havens were what we feared during the debate on the Canada Water Act. Pollution havens were what we feared when we moved our amendment to establish national water quality standards. Those amendments were turned down in committee, voted down during the report stage and again voted down on third reading. Now, the minister has come along and said, "But I agree."

I am not trying to make the government look ridiculous—which it is. I am trying to point out that it is faced with a technical and difficult problem. It adopted a policy, as did Parliament, in connection with this matter. How are we to get out from under and reverse ourselves? We could reverse ourselves; the House, of course, could do that. It is the gentlemen who are in the majority who must reverse themselves, because they have already cast their votes and voted down our amendments. I say that not only is this ridiculous, but it makes the job of the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry extremely difficult.

Before sitting down, I should like to twist his arm a little more, and rub his nose a little in what has happened. I sympathize with the minister. He has said what we, sitting here, have tried to encourage the government to say. We are glad that the minister has now said the proper thing. But where does that leave him in the light of the views he has expressed and the way he has voted?

I want to talk now about what is called the factory fence rule. I am glad the minister mentioned it today, because I do not think I need go any farther than I am about to go in my explanations. This is one of the things we pressed for throughout the hearings connected with the Canada Water Act. Although the act is foggy in general, one of its provisions permits an industry to dump pollutants into water, upon the payment of an effluent fee. The degree of effluent discharged may be open to argument; nevertheless, the principle is there. We, on this side, were trying to establish the principle that polluters should clean up pollution within their own boundaries, within their own factory fences, and that they should not be allowed to pollute by paying a fee for polluting.

Here, again, the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry has been promoting exactly what we have been promoting, the factory fence rule. However, it did not tie in with the principles of the Canada Water Act. I pressed, as did my party, for the recognition of this principle: that factories, and particularly new factories, should be required to contain within their boundaries their own pollution. We recognize that there are problems with some existing plants but see no reason why new plants should not be required to contain within their own boundaries their own pollution. I moved an amendment to the relevant section which would have prohibited new plants coming into operation, after the Canada Water Act became effective in any area from dumping pollutants. It would have required them to maintain the pollutants within the factory fence. Again, the government rejected our amendment, using its majority both in the committee and in the House. Here I must say this for the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry: although he was present for the first three

*The Address—Mr. Aiken*

votes, he was not present for the last one on this matter. It is fortunate that he was called out of the House, because this point is the one that he himself has been pressing so strongly.

On September 26, 1970, which is not very long ago, after having had his colleagues vote against this particular rule, the minister said:

Perhaps I should make my own position clear at the outset. It is in favour of recycling within the factory fence. It is on the side of treatment before discharge.

...I believe that modern industry wants to clean up. I know that our pulp and paper industry, for example, is prepared to build new plants which incorporate the best anti-pollution devices known to mankind. These should be a requirement in any new plant. They should be a requirement regardless of location.

The minister again today repeated this position, which we support. He mentioned it in several other speeches of which he has been kind enough to send me copies. So, this is the position: most of the amendments that the opposition moved in the first part of the last session were justified and correct. We wanted to consolidate the department and make sure somebody was in charge of pollution control. The Prime Minister, while resisting this for a time, has now accepted it, and for that I give him credit. Secondly, the minister has adopted most of the major program that our party put forward in its proposals on the Canada Water Act last year. I suppose we should not object to that. We are certainly glad that the proposals we have made are now being accepted.

● (3:50 p.m.)

I raise the question, where does this leave the minister? This is my main point. Where is he going to get the necessary money? It is all right to say the polluter must pay. We agree in principle with this, but it is not realistic to say that the federal government does not have to spend any money. This is the position the government has taken for the past year. The government says it will spend no money, the polluter must pay.

I hope the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry is able to pry a little money from his colleagues the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) and the Prime Minister because he is going to need it. If the minister wants support from our side of the House, we undertake to give it because we think he needs some funds. There must be a new approach by the government to pollution control. I hope the minister has been successful in persuading his colleague to accept the point of view he has been expressing for the past two weeks. If he has, it is a good start because it is a complete adoption of the policies that we have been proposing.

In conclusion I wish to point out that pollution control will not be achieved, and I am sure the minister realizes this, by shuffling offices around in Ottawa for the next six months, as necessary as that may be. I know that he will be hamstrung for some period of time until he can get his new organization completed.

The minister, after reorganization, unless the government moves to pull him out of the situation in which he