

Water Resources Programs

To summarize the foregoing, may I reiterate that I have difficulty about motions Nos. 1 to 5 inclusive, and motion No. 16.

On the other motions, eight separate debates might arise, as follows: first, motions Nos. 6 and 7; second, motions Nos. 8 and 9; third, motions 10, 12 and 13; fourth, motions Nos. 11, 14 and 15; fifth, motions Nos. 17 and 18; sixth, motions 20, 21, 22 and 23; and finally, a debate in each case on motions 24 and 25.

I realize that this is extremely complicated, but if hon. members would take a look at all of the proposed motions they would see that the matter is complex. We will at least have a record on *Hansard* which hon. members might like to consider overnight.

Divisions might occur as follows: one each on motions 6 and 7; a division on combined motions 8 and 9; a division on combined motions 10, 12 and 13; then three divisions, one each on motions 11, 14 and 15; three divisions, one each on motions 17, 18 and 19; one division on combined motions 20, 21 and 22; and three divisions, one each on motions 23, 24 and 25.

Again, I apologize to hon. members for having to make these suggestions to them. These are, of course, suggestions for the guidance of the House. It may be that hon. members would like to consider the whole matter between themselves and decide whether we are embarking upon a proper and orderly consideration of all of these motions. I gather that the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) might have some suggestions to make in this regard.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I have one suggestion. I wonder whether Your Honour would take under consideration, for ruling at a later date, the question whether motion No. 25 does not also go beyond the scope of the bill, and therefore in a procedural sense should not be received.

● (3:10 p.m.)

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, may I raise what I believe to be a serious point of order. I believe it really goes to the heart of much of what is contained in the bill. It is a point that I think I can say has been raised by me at least in private conversation with the Parliamentary Secretary. Had some action been taken on what I raised privately, I would not be raising it at this time when we are back in the House

[Mr. Speaker.]

of Commons. The very neat point I raised concerns the lack of use of the word "quality" and as it relates to water quality in the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor General. I believe this strikes at the heart of the proceedings. I did not want to raise it in the committee because, while I thought the Committee proceedings were probably out of order, none the less I felt we should complete the study of the bill and try to make the best of it. Probably I was too reticent in that regard, and should have raised it at the first opportunity and every opportunity thereafter. However, I make the point now because I believe it is important, especially since the House Leader for the government raises the point that my amendment may be out of order.

The original recommendation contained in Bill C-144 is as follows:

His Excellency the Governor General has recommended to the House of Commons the present measure 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; to provide also that all expenditures for the purposes of the Act, including any expenses or allowances of any advisory committee, shall be paid out of moneys appropriated by Parliament therefor.

The amendments are contained at page xi of the Notice Paper before us today. I would read them into the record, except that I know Your Honour will look at them when considering my point of order. Nowhere is there any approach to the question of the quality of water. My point of order is neatly put in this way. I shall not spend a lot of time on this, but I say there really are two parts to the measure before us. One part deals with water management and the second part deals with water quality. I suggest there is a great deal of difference between the two. No matter what state water is in, it can still be managed. It can be allowed to pour down this way, it can be dammed up that way or it can be sent off in another direction. Perhaps I have a humble mind, but as I see it the management of water means its physical control. The quality, however, in my opinion, is quite another thing.

I think my friend the Parliamentary Secretary would agree with me when I say that I did ask him why in heaven's name the government would not sanctify all the process we have gone through and slip in a reference to the quality of the water we are supposed to manage. There are two very important aspects of this problem. I am not ashamed to