

*Water Resources Programs*

province indicated that unless there was strong federal co-ordination those provinces which applied adequate anti-pollution standards would be placed at a decided disadvantage in the competition for industrial development. This emphasizes the fear of all the provinces of losing industry and the need for national standards and national enforcement.

The Ontario government also expressed concern that no agency or province should employ unrealistically low water quality standards in order to create an undue advantage over other jurisdictions for the attraction of industry. Here is another province asking the minister and his department to watch this point. Ontario felt that a major criterion that must apply to the quality of water anywhere in Canada was that it should not endanger human or animal life. The province felt this was a minimum health requirement and the standard agreed upon after relevant research and consultation must be adopted throughout the nation. It felt that the provinces or agencies should adopt sets of standards in excess of this absolute minimum, taking into account the economic uses which recreation, agriculture, fishing, harbour activities made of water in particular areas or localities. Ontario also expressed deep concern about the provisions in the bill which give water quality management areas authority to permit the discharge of waste into provincial waters in return for payment of a fee by the polluter. Ontario is opposed to this concept. They found it would not work and their present plan is that everyone must treat waste adequately before disposing of it. I feel that this is the right approach and the one which should be taken on a national basis.

The province of Quebec believes that except for federal waters, it is the task of the provincial governments to decree minimum quality standards, to define pollutants, and to take decisions concerning offences, set fines and carry out the inspection and analyses required. In view of the recent election in that province, there may be some change in their over-all approach to the pollution problem. In the maritime provinces there is also a great concern over pollution problems and they call for more federal assistance; however, here they do not specifically ask for national standards.

There is no doubt that generally throughout Canada the provinces, organizations and individuals have been expecting leadership from the federal government in establishing a

[Mr. Harding.]

code of standards that would apply all across Canada and would be uniformly enforced. This is one of the keys to a successful fight against our pollution problems and I regret that the minister and this government have not seen fit to move in this direction.

If the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) and his advisers do not see the advantages of national standards, there is at least one member of the Cabinet who, up until recently, has been advocating such a stand. I refer to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis). For the last two years, he has been pressing vigorously for national standards in the Fisheries Act to cope with our grave pollution problems. Lately, he has been tempering his speeches and avoiding references to national standards, but let me quote several of his speeches in which I think he has properly outlined the need for the establishment of national standards if we are to be effective in our fight against pollution. This minister feels that the most effective weapon Canada can use to fight water pollution is the Fisheries Act, and at this stage I am inclined to agree with him. He has waxed lyrical about the need for broad national standards and the need for national enforcement. It amazes me that the government, and the Cabinet in particular, have not listened too carefully to this particular minister.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer to part of the campaign carried on across Canada by the Minister of Fisheries over the past two years in the fight against pollution and the fight for national standards of enforcement. There are one or two paragraphs of an article which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* of August 7, 1969, which I think should be put on the record. The second paragraph of the article contains the Minister's definition of pollution which reads:

Pollution, in other words, must be stopped at the factory fence. It must be confined to our industrial plants themselves. It must not be allowed to spill out into our rivers or to pollute our seas. Instead, it must be limited to the scene of its own beginnings. It must not be allowed to get away. It must not be allowed to contaminate the whole-some environment in which we live.

So what does the government do? They set up water quality management areas in which they will allow industry to pay to pollute—to pay to pollute—the very opposite to the position taken by the Minister of Fisheries who says that pollution must be stopped at the factory fence. That is where Canadians want it to stop, at the factory fence.