

*Water Resources Programs*

of Northern Affairs. It is in this area that a committee of the House could make a great contribution. We could also take other steps. The hon. member for Vancouver East referred to a statement submitted to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) on the use of animals for scientific research. This area of concern has been mentioned here today. That submission suggested four steps which could be taken by this House to improve the situation referred to in the motion of the hon. member for Vancouver East. The suggestions are—

1) to give the Canadian Council on Animal Care, or an equivalent body, a status independent, financially and administratively, of the university institutions it supervises, and to make it more representative of the public interest.

2) to make the inspectorate responsible to the Minister of Agriculture and to extend its supervision to the premises of those government departments and industrial companies using animals for research or testing purposes.

3) to restrict the purchase of laboratory animals by research and teaching institutions to sources of supply approved by the inspectorate.

I think that is a most important recommendation. Many animal lovers in Canada have been victimized by having their pets dog-napped by people in the business of providing animals for research.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard):** Order, please. The hour appointed for the consideration of private members' business having expired, I do now leave the chair until 8 p.m.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

---

### AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### WATER RESOURCES

#### PROVISION FOR MANAGEMENT INCLUDING RESEARCH AND PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAMS

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-144, to provide for the management of the water resources of Canada including research and the planning and implementation of programs relating to the conservation, development and utilization of water resources, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works, motion No. 7 (Mr. Comeau) and motion No. 14 (Mr. Harding).

22375-44½

**Mr. Doug Rowland (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, I heard this afternoon that the minister himself was to come into the House to give us the benefit of his wisdom on the subject of the amendments proposed to the Canada water bill by the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Harding) and the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau). Therefore, as a new member, pristine pure, hardly having had a chance to put a shine on the seat of my pants through sitting on these comfortable chairs, I dashed down to the House—because to my mind the opposition of the government front benches to these amendments was inexplicable—and hoped the minister would explain why he and his colleagues in the government would not accept what seemed to me to be an entirely sensible approach.

After listening to the minister, I was totally confused. I felt as I did when reading T. S. Eliot for the first time as a young student—perhaps I did not understand the archetypes; perhaps I did not grasp the imagery and needed to do some more studying. Listening further, however, I was forced to the conclusion that rather than attempting to enlighten the members of this House as to the reasons for the government's opposition, the minister's primary purpose was to obfuscate and confuse.

In light of the minister's remarks I should like to say two things. First, the purpose of these amendments is to establish national standards for various classes of water. Neither of the amendments demands that the national standard should be the same for all bodies of water; rather, it is proposed there should be national standards which would apply to the various types of water and their uses. This point was made most effectively on Thursday by the hon. member for South Western Nova and others, and I shall not belabour it.

I have in mind one particular fear of the possible adverse effect of the lack of nationally established standards. I refer to the potential for the creation of pollution havens should the management of our water resources be too greatly decentralized. As the Canadian Water Resources Association has noted, there are now 10 departments, 9 agencies, 4 major commissions, 3 international boards, 30 sub-boards and 40 acts of Parliament having to do with water, plus the regulations of various provinces, plus the regulations laid down by municipalities. And to all this the legislation before us would add ten consultative committees.