

done do not hold water. Let us read the beginning of the clause. Anyone who can read and understand English will understand what clause 6 (a) says. It reads in part:

initiate, recommend and undertake programs, and co-ordinate programs of the government of Canada—

This is the government of Canada.

**An hon. Member:** We are the government.

**Mr. Harding:** The hon. member says that he is part of the government?

**Mr. Mahoney:** The members on this side make up the government of Canada.

**Mr. Harding:** As I say, this is the government of Canada.

**An hon. Member:** The hon. member may not like it, but this is the government.

• (3:30 p.m.)

**Mr. Harding:** We are initiating programs of the government of Canada. If we are to have national standards in these programs, they should be included in the legislation. That is all we are asking. We do not want to hear gobbledygook about affecting the provinces and municipalities. It is crystal clear to anyone who reads the legislation that it applies to programs of the federal government. This is what we are pressing for. We want national standards. The people of Canada want national standards in federal programs. Let us include it in the legislation and decide once and for all. Again I want to make it crystal clear that there is nothing in here to indicate that the federal government will dictate standards to the provinces. It is their own affair whether they have pollution control legislation. We could try to put pressure on them, but when it comes to this type of program we must be strong and courageous and insist that national standards be written into the legislation.

**Mr. Howard (Skeena):** Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few comments apropos what the hon. member for Kootenay West has said about national standards. He stated that this is national legislation and if there is a constitutional obstacle it does not and cannot override the position of the provinces. The provinces will still be free to work within the areas of their jurisdiction. I and others to whom I have spoken briefly wonder why there is a distinction and a different approach. I wish to refer to Bill C-224, an act relating to ambient air quality and to the control of air pollution. Although this bill is not now before us I think it bears looking at because it will presumably be administered by the department of the environment. Clause 2(i) contains the words "national ambient air quality objective". It uses the word "national".—Further on there is reference to national ambient air quality objectives established pursuant to other sections of the bill. Clause 4(2) of the bill reads:

The Governor in Council may from time to time prescribe as national ambient air quality objectives any objectives formulated by the minister pursuant to subsection (1).

#### *Government Organization Act, 1970*

It gives the cabinet the authority to establish national ambient air quality objectives. Clause 7, regarding national emission standards—provides:

—the Governor in Council may prescribe national emission standards establishing the maximum quantities, if any, and concentrations of such air contaminant—

Clause 8 reads:

The Governor in Council may publish or cause to be published national emission guidelines indicating quantities and concentrations in . . . air—

Because the bill before us is federal or national legislation, it would contain the same or similar phraseology with respect to air pollution. If this principle is followed in establishing national objectives and national emission standards with respect to air pollution, it should be contained in the overriding legislation, namely, that which establishes a department of the environment. The objectives should be national standards in the broadest possible sense. That is all we are asking. Any argument which states that the use of the word "national" would narrow the matter is spurious. If that argument is accepted, the use of the word "national" in the air pollution bill will also narrow that bill. That is not the purpose. The government should accept the objectives of the minister and declare them as national. What is harmful about that?

**Mr. McGrath:** If the minister were here, Mr. Chairman, I believe he would subscribe to the arguments which have been made. The minister has stated on a number of occasions that this is one of the objectives he has in mind. This is one of the over-all objectives in establishing the new department of the environment. A few months ago we debated the Canada Water Act. At that time we advanced arguments to indicate why we felt the Canada Water Act could not work. We said it could not work because it depended upon federal-provincial co-operation; it depended upon establishing water management boards across the country that would have varying standards influenced by the special interests of the province or the municipality involved. Following an interview with the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry, the January 3 edition of the *Sunday Express* stated:

"The Canada Water Act requires federal-provincial-municipal co-operation to work. The law is already there in the Canada Fisheries Act to force clean-ups, and industry is being fairly co-operative"—

Where did we hear that before? That argument was advanced by members of this House during the examination of the Canada Water Act. We said the Canada Water Act was not necessary to provide the government with legislative authority to clean up our waters, rivers and inland lakes; the authority was already contained in the Fisheries Act. The Minister of Fisheries and Forestry is now saying the same thing. We felt, and still feel, that the Canada Water Act was bad legislation because it set up varying standards across the country which would be dictated by the special interests of the provinces and municipalities. In other words, we will end up without a national standard for water in this country.