

Water Resources Programs

Kingsway also used the word in parts (ii) and (iii) of her motion which states:

(ii) no waterway should be designated as having as its principal use the transportation of waste,

(iii) no standard should permit waste to be discharged untreated into a waterway.

For those of us living on the east coast, the word "waste" has a definite connotation, a definite meaning. It applies to a substance used generally by engineers on large ships, fishing trawlers, druggers or by merchantmen. Waste is a substance which they use for wiping oil from the engine. When they require waste, they order it by stating that they require five boxes of waste. In return they receive five 10-pound boxes of material which has been washed, dry cleaned and put in cartons to be utilized as a specific substance.

I question the use of the word "waste" throughout this entire bill. It can be interpreted to apply only to waste rags thrown overboard into any water containing fish. I ask the President of the Privy Council for his interpretation of this word.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will recognize that the Chair will not allow the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) to answer the hon. member's question. I remind the hon. member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse) that we are now dealing strictly with a procedural point as to whether certain specific sections are acceptable from a procedural standpoint, as to whether or not they are in order.

I respectfully suggest to the hon. member that this is the point to which we should address ourselves. I do not think the hon. member will help the situation by a debate on the definition of the word "waste". I do not think the point is all that material in so far as I can understand the situation. I do not want to interrupt the hon. member. I simply invite him to limit his remarks as much as possible to the strictly procedural aspect of the debate. Eventually, I hope I will be in a position to make a ruling which will be satisfactory to all hon. members.

• (4:00 p.m.)

Mr. Crouse: I thank Your Honour for your comments. I do not wish to delay our proceedings unduly. However, I would like to point out that this question was raised in another place when discussion on amendments to the Fisheries Act was in progress. It was considered by the Minister of Fisheries

as well as by other members of the committee, that the word "waste" in the act was unacceptable and unsatisfactory and it was replaced by the phrase "deleterious substance". I raise the point now because the word occurs in several of these amendments, and since it was found necessary to amend it in connection with a related act I submit it would not be consistent to allow it to remain in this bill, or at least, that I should bring the matter to Your Honour's attention.

Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova): I intend to be brief, Mr. Speaker; this is the first occasion on which I have taken part in a procedural discussion in two years. It seems that objection has been taken to one of the motions in my name, No. 4, and Your Honour appears inclined to rule it out of order. The President of the Privy Council read parts of it only and said it would make the minister responsible for dealing with soil and air pollution. I say this is so only to the extent that such pollution damages the water of Canada. We are, of course, studying a bill concerned with the pollution of water, and I maintain that anything which contributes to pollution of the environment generally might be considered as having the effect of polluting the waters. But this is only to the extent that pollution of the other elements affects the waters of Canada.

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): I do not wish to prolong the debate, but I should like to support those hon. members who feel that some of these motions should be allowed. I should like to consider first of all the motion which deals with water quality standards. I would point out that standards can be set by regulation and that to do so would certainly not involve the expenditure of money. A number of regulations will in fact be made, not by this House but by the minister's department, once the bill has passed through Parliament. This alone indicates that a discussion of this important amendment should be allowed.

May I say a word or two about the other amendments which according to the leader of the House are out of order because they would involve the expenditure of money? The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka has outlined the case in general terms; similar arguments were used in the committee. The clause concerned is an interpretive clause, and the setting up of a control board certainly does not involve expenditure of cash. Whether the government proceeds to establish