

*Water Resources Programs*

la is necessary for all three. We are taking the first initial step today here but it would be retrograde to oversimplify the process, in my view, and extend this legislative measure to cover the whole environment, for it would have doubtful constitutional validity. Moreover, the management elements, so vital to success, are not the same for water as they are for air. For example, water courses are defined and so are their interjurisdictional aspects, but air sheds have fluid, ill-defined boundaries.

● (3:40 p.m.)

On the same vein, much has been said in this recent debate about the relationship between the Canada Water bill and the Fisheries Act. Let me repeat that they are each, in their own way, an assertion of the federal jurisdiction carefully phrased to be compatible with respect to the areas of application and to the time sequence in which they would be employed. The Canada Water Act is a very broad legislative vehicle for managing water for all uses, based upon full provincial co-operation. It will provide the entrepreneur with very explicit effluent standards fixed by approved water quality management plans, for optimum benefits of the entire river by all users. We leave it to the entrepreneur to devise the most efficient methods to meet those standard, but meet them he must or face heavy penalties.

The Fisheries Act, on the other hand, is the assertion of a single head of the constitution. It does not require extensive planning nor does it rely on provincial co-operation to the same degree. It is immediate, but at the same time it is based on one single use. It does not set optimal standards and it relies on negotiations with major industrial plants to make "in plant" changes. We propose that the Fisheries Act be our immediate weapon against water pollution everywhere in Canada where there are fish, and we are strengthening that act for that purpose. But the management approach, which is admittedly slower to implement, will reap greater net benefits through its joint planning process and its greater use of the ingenuity of the entrepreneur in a free market economy. As quickly as possible, we shall employ that broader approach in every major river basin across Canada. Together, these are realistic and practical assertions of our jurisdiction and our responsibilities.

There have been frequent jibes thrown at us, Mr. Speaker, for using these two acts in this war against water pollution, but in our

[Mr. Orange.]

view this is an eminently sensible approach to gain both short-run results and long-term benefits. Together, these two acts provide a federal strategy that will protect our waters within the provinces everywhere now, and provide for their optimal development in the future. Other new acts will provide a similar safeguard for waters, in the Northern Territories and the Arctic Seas under exclusive federal control.

Not everyone in this House, Mr. Speaker, has fully agreed with the proposed employment of economic forces to add to the compulsive force of the prohibition. We have said, and we repeat, that effluent discharge fees added to effluent standards will provide a strong incentive for a constant improvement. Finally, we believe the experience in Germany and France and the advice of experts must be heeded on this score and we intend to do so.

There have been one or two areas of substantial but not total agreement. We believe that it might be useful to experiment with labelling of detergents to encourage voluntary control on phosphates until a near total ban on the manufacture of such detergents is fully effective. But we think that the provisions for labelling are more appropriate to legislation on consumer products. We also heartily concur that consultation is essential to the success of this bill. Rather than simply state that consultation must be undertaken when appropriate, we have made consultation and co-operation a basic characteristic of the entire bill. Co-operation with the provinces is mentioned in the preamble itself. The first operative clause, No. 3, is devoted entirely to the establishment of consultative arrangements with the provinces. All of the planning and implementation provisions are framed to ensure co-operative ventures.

The determination of water quality standards and effluent discharge fees by regulations are co-operative federal-provincial undertakings. We have provided for the use of provincial agencies whenever appropriate and we have said that all plans must be fully advertised before being approved. We have in addition provided advisory committees in clause 23 so that we can get advice from the private sector and universities as our policies and program are being developed. In fact, so extensive is the involvement of the provinces, the private sector and the public generally in all processes of this act that we have been criticized for having tied our hands. But in