

industry—and particularly new industry—to meet truly national standards. We want these industries to design their plants and run their operations in such a way as to meet national norms. We want them to meet our national standards at all times. We want to prevent big industry from exploiting the economic weaknesses in some parts of the country. We want to stop pollution havens from being created in the less fortunate and less affluent parts of our nation.

I have already used several terms which require further definition. I mentioned national air quality objectives, national air quality emission guidelines and national air quality emission standards. I should like now to say what I mean when I use the words “objectives”, “guidelines” and “standards”, and to do so before I go on to discuss some of the major powers and institutions referred to in this bill.

Air quality objectives relate to the great outdoors. These objectives are standards writ large. They are—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I apologize to the minister but I understand that the hon. member for Comox-Alberni wishes to rise on a question of privilege.

**Mr. Barnett:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. Some of us are really quite interested in what the minister is saying. I am wondering whether he could be given the courtesy of a less noisy background in this chamber.

**Mr. Davis:** Mr. Speaker, I began by saying that air quality objectives relate to the great outdoors. These objectives are standards writ large. They are standards applied to large volumes of air over large areas of Canada. When we talk about objectives we are talking about ambient air. We are talking about large quantities of air. We are talking about the quality of air in general. We are talking about air in which there may be a number of pollutants. These may be widely dispersed. They will be dispersed as they are in the air we breathe, whether it be downtown in a major city like Toronto or out on a mountain peak in the Rockies.

Air quality objectives, then, relate to the big air and to the average air sample in a sizeable area, zone or region. Objectives, to repeat, relate to ambient air or air in general. They do not relate to particular points of emission—points of emission such as the top of a smokestack or the jet pipe of an aircraft taking off from Malton airport near Toronto.

Air quality emission standards do relate to points of emission. Standards, in other words, apply at the source of the pollution itself. They are measured at the outlet point. They are measured at the top of a smoke stack or at the tail end of a jet pipe of a DC-8. So standards are definite as to location. They nail down the quality of the effluent at its source. They are more precise. They are enforceable by regulation.

I have left the word “guidelines” to the end. Guidelines are standards of a sort. They also apply at the point of emission, at the top of a smoke stack or at the end of the jet pipe of a DC-8. But they are not enforceable. They

### *Clean Air Act*

are recommended standards. They are standards that we should like to see enforced. They are standards which may well be enforced in the future. They are a guide to future action. They are an indication that, sooner or later, we may be declaring these same guidelines to be standards and enforcing them at the source of the pollution itself.

● (12:00 noon)

I referred earlier to air monitoring. Bill C-224 enables the federal government, to quote the bill, “to establish, operate and maintain a system of air pollution monitoring stations throughout Canada”. It will permit the federal government, in other words, to flesh out our present national air sampling network. Federal and provincial efforts in this direction will be further integrated and the data flowing from this improved network will give us a comprehensive picture of the incidence of air pollution, not only in urban centres, but also in the great Canadian outdoors. This data from the air monitoring network will be used not only for spot purposes in particular locations, but also to give us a better idea of long term trends. We will be able to forecast what is likely to happen over a period of time. We will be able to trace the effectiveness of special abatement programs aimed at improving the quality of the ambient air in our big and great outdoors.

Referring again to our proposed air quality objectives—the objectives which apply to the big air outdoors—I should like to say this: these objectives will apply to individual pollutants. Take sulphur dioxide, for example; we will have uniform ambient air quality objectives established for the entire country. These objectives will name the concentrations in terms of hard numbers, indicating what is desirable, what is acceptable and what is tolerable in this country. These objectives will be developed using all the scientific data we can gather from domestic sources and from other countries. We already have a considerable expertise of our own. By using all this data and all this expertise in respect of sulphur dioxide, for example, we will come up with a framework of air quality objectives regarding one pollutant after another.

The framework to which I refer is described in a position paper on air pollution which I will shortly be distributing to hon. members opposite, if I have not already done so. It will be made available in quantity to members of the Standing Committee of the House of Commons on Fisheries and Forestry which, I hope, will be reviewing Bill C-224 on a clause by clause basis. Our framework for national air quality objectives postulates three ranges; they are “desirable”, “acceptable” and “tolerable”. The desirable band of the range describes the lowest range of concentration of a pollutant which is desirable in this country. The next describes a middle range or less desirable range of concentration of a pollutant. This is the acceptable range. Finally, there is the tolerable range which reports the highest concentration tolerable in this country. To go beyond the tolerable range, by definition, gets us into the intolerable. Once a situation becomes intolerable, in so far as an individual