

Water Resources Programs

plants established themselves where the water is cleanest, that would be fine as far as I am concerned; it would cost them less to establish in those areas. But this should not prevent attempts to maintain the quality of water at a certain level.

□ We maintain that these standards should be set before industries or municipalities decide to discharge waste into the waters. Every witness we heard in committee on this subject wanted the government to establish certain criteria, although certain groups hedged when they were asked to endorse the idea that standards should be established for different classes of water. But this is precisely the point. The quality of all water is not the same. The cost of anti-pollution measures will vary. We do not disagree with that, but we say that certain criteria should be established before anyone is allowed to move into an area and discharge waste. The quality of water should remain unchanged.

The minister may have convinced industry of the value of his ideas about the lower cost of anti-pollution equipment in some areas as opposed to others. That is fine. But if industry deposits waste in any waters which fall below the minimal standard which has been established for those waters, then under my amendment it will have committed an offence punishable under clause 22, a clause for which the minister himself was responsible.

I have read the reports of all the hearings which were held. The evidence given by representatives of many groups bears out my point of view. The representative of the Canadian Wildlife Federation was asked, as reported in committee report No. 11, page 9, whether he saw any reason to preclude a water quality code of some kind being established in the bill. The witness, Mr. Passmore, replied:

No, we do not, sir. On the other hand we think it is imperative that there should be uniform standards across Canada.

The Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) wants standards to be established and his standard is very simple. Let the fish live, is his standard. A similar view is taken by Pollution Probe, which I believe to be a responsible group. The Parliamentary Secretary (Mr. Orange) evidently thought so because he said at the time that this group had thought-provoking ideas and he was interested in what they had to say. This is what its representative, Dr. Brinkhurst, of the University of Toronto, had to say on the sub-

ject as reported at page 14:13 in answer to a question by the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Harding):

I think there have to be standards to prevent that very trouble—

The trouble he referred to was the possibility that industries might seek "pollution havens" in particular geographic locations. The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) talked about standards when he was considering clean air legislation. The city of Montreal, for example, has different standards in this respect. It has to do so because it must think in terms of different locations. We want different standards because we recognize there are different classes of water.

A committee of this House recommended on May 30, 1969—supported by the Parliamentary Secretary who, incidentally, argued the other way just recently—that the government approve a code of standards for cleaning up all Canadian waters. So this idea has been recommended by a committee of the House as well as by many other groups, yet it was rejected by the committee considering this bill. I hope hon. members of the House are a bit wiser than the members of that committee and that they will see fit to support the amendment I have moved.

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I could say what I wish to say equally well on motion No. 7 or motion No. 14, both of which have as their purpose the establishment of water quality standards for all classes of water in Canada. We on this side believe this to be one of the most essential features of any legislation dealing with the prevention of pollution of our waters. Nevertheless, it has been omitted from this bill. Those of us who were fortunate enough to be members of the committee and to visit the Bedford Institute of Oceanography were deeply impressed with the careful, painstaking and broad scope of the work which is being done there.

● (8:20 p.m.)

I believe that the people of Canada have the idea that this Canada Water Act will provide water to this country that will not be allowed to deteriorate in quality from its present standard; that in the case of water that has so deteriorated the objective of the bill to clean it up and gradually restore it to a much higher standard. I believe that is what the people are expecting from this bill. How-