

sion has done a better job in pollution matters than any similar body under any jurisdiction in North America.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Aiken:** Perhaps the job has not been perfect; perhaps it can be improved on. But let us not say that Ontario does not know what it is doing. Every time the federal government in Ottawa wants to know something about pollution matters, it goes to the Ontario Water Resources Commission to find out what is going on in the pollution field. That commission uses the most sophisticated equipment for research and has available to it the best enforcement provisions to be found in any jurisdiction in Canada. I will not answer the hon. member's question directly; I merely tell him that that system has worked as well and even better than any similar system in Canada.

Without straying from the bill too far, I say that the water basin system the minister is proposing in this bill has worked in only one country in the world, Germany. They use it in Germany in the Ruhr valley, where industry is heavily concentrated. Conditions became so bad in the Ruhr that it was necessary for the Germans to set up a water authority. They turned one of their rivers, the Emscher, into an open sewer. All the effluent goes down one river. The banks are nicely cultivated; they look nice. The effluent is treated so that it does not smell too badly. But the river cannot be used. This is their answer to the problem. Fortunately, we do not yet have this problem. Our industrial development has not reached the proportions that it has in Germany and our population ratio is nowhere near that of Germany.

• (9:00 p.m.)

I say that this water basin approach will not work in Canada. I say that without fear of contradiction. It may work in one or two small basins in Canada which are heavily industrialized; however, as far as the rest of the country is concerned it is not a practical move. I know of only one area in the world where it has worked. It has not worked all over Germany or all over Europe, only in the Ruhr Valley where it is so heavily industrialized that it was necessary to do something drastic. I do not think it will work in the rural and semi-rural areas of Canada, only in the very highly populated and highly industrialized areas. Perhaps it will work in the same way as it has worked in the Ruhr Valley.

#### *Water Resources Programs*

My amendment would change the clause which the minister has proposed. The minister proposes that only in water quality management areas shall these penalties for degrading the waters apply. I am trying to steer what might be called the middle course between that which the hon. member for Greenwood proposes and that which the minister proposes in the bill. I propose that the penalty should apply in those places where a water quality management area has been set up. It should apply in accordance with the standards set by the area. My amendment proposes that outside those areas where there are no regulations under this act, no person shall be permitted in any part of Canada to deposit waste in any waters which would have the effect of degrading those waters below their current standards. That is the intent of my amendment.

The idea is that we will have what most people think we have and need, that is, penalties for polluting and degrading the waters in this country, starting the moment the bill is passed. That would include all of Canada the moment the bill is passed. The only changes would be where the water quality areas are set up. I have made two changes in clause 8 by my amendment. I have removed the words which would limit the operation of the act to a water quality management area only. I have merely omitted those words. I have also omitted the words which would permit the discharge of effluents into any waters upon payment of a fee.

In another amendment which I have before the House, amendment No. 11—which I will not anticipate at this time—I have dealt with the second part to which I am now referring, that is, the effluent discharge fee. On this one I am also taking a middle course. The bill provides for an effluent discharge fee. The minister has said over and over again that it is necessary to clean up pollution. It is my opinion that permission should not be granted to discharge effluent after the act comes into force.

Amendment No. 11, which I will be moving later, will remove the possibility of any new company or plant setting up facilities, after this act comes into effect, which would cause pollution. This is what I might call the "factory fence" amendment. The intent is that after the bill comes into effect, no person shall be allowed to build a new facility which does not eliminate its effluent within the confines of its own property. I think that is reasonable.