

*Water Resources*

hope we will yet come up with something that will pass muster with the Chair or with the chairman of the committee, whereby some teeth can be added to this particular venture.

Then, Sir, another body makes its appearance on the pollution scene through this bill. He is an inspector. He has power to traipse about on land, and in the water too if he gets aboard a ship, and he may make certain inspections. Perhaps this gentleman can replace those various other people I noted earlier. But looking at the powers set forth in the bill for him, I am not sure that in all cases he can replace all of those others I have mentioned. It would be a good thing if these powers were very carefully examined, so that what now exists within the empire of the Department of Transport and what now exists within the empire of the Department of Fisheries, could be brought under one roof when we are dealing with problems of water pollution. If that does not happen, then I suggest we are going to face the same proliferation when we get into the problems of dealing with land or soil pollution and when we deal with the problems of air pollution.

I believe we should be building up one authority that can tackle these problems instead of adding a new body that would be engaging in a tug-of-war, or rather the reverse of a tug-of-war, resulting in some gentlemen in the government of Canada saying to each other, "It isn't my problem; it's your problem," and thus keep on passing the buck. If the minister thinks this is not a serious problem or that I am being facetious, I can tell of an actual case that occurred some years ago in Halifax. Whilst a ship was being fuelled, some oil escaped and the question was whether the breakage in the line feeding the fuel into the ship occurred on the land jurisdiction or on the water jurisdiction. Was it that part of the line which was out from the oil refinery itself which broke or was it that part of the line attached thereto which was on the ship? If it were the former, one fellow from the Department of Transport had responsibility for investigating and, if there was a criminal offence, taking court action. If it was another part of the line that broke or the coupling, then it was up to our old friends from the steamship inspection service to take action.

● (4:00 p.m.)

While great debate raged as to who was responsible for investigating where this break had actually occurred, and whether any fault

[Mr. McCleave.]

was involved, the time for action passed and another great example of pollution went unpunished. I think the case actually went to court, and the poor magistrate had to give the defendant the benefit of the doubt because responsibility for the break that poured hundreds of gallons of oil into Halifax Harbour could not be clearly established. The harbour suffered, but no penalty could be applied at that particular time.

So I am pointing out, Sir, that we should recognize we have a serious duty in dealing with water pollution or any kind of pollution, and it is up to us to draft the best legislation possible. I am suggesting that a bill which causes proliferation of the established bodies rather than drawing them together into a cohesive authority with fairly wide powers should be replaced after a new look at the problem. Unless we can weld these organizations together in a form which can be more easily dealt with, we will simply add to the confusion which exists in the field at the present time.

**Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway):** Mr. Speaker, I am sure that if the people of Vancouver and the lower Mainland could see what a very thin House we have this afternoon when the matter of pollution is being discussed, they would be astonished. It is thin all around. When I was at home at Christmas time there was no topic as much discussed as that of water, air and soil pollution. However, I am very glad that the minister is present because it may well be that during this debate he will be brought to consider changes which would make this legislation really effective.

My colleague, the hon. member for Kootenay West, (Mr. Harding) who led off this debate on the Canada Water Act, for the NDP, went over its shortcomings. I shall merely enumerate what these were, under headings, but I intend to deal with only one of them. In the first place, the act falls short in not setting Canada-wide standards for water quality, leaving various areas to set their own standards. This is not good enough in a country with such mobility of population. If we want to make the country unified we should do so in the matter of water standards. Water, too, is mobile; it does not stop at provincial or other boundaries and quality in one area affects the quality in another. Secondly, the legislation fails in that it does not spell out the cost-sharing federal-provincial arrangements for the \$3 billion or \$4 billion which the Minister of Energy, Mines