

Northern Inland Waters Bill

substances". Then, the northern inland waters bill also contained a definition of waste, but it was not changed to comply with the recommendations of the Fisheries Committee. So now, in fact, the Senate is catching up with the mistake that we all made. The Fisheries Act was in the Committee on Fisheries and Forestry. At the same time, the government had the northern inland waters bill and the arctic waters pollution prevention bill before the Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development. These bills were supposed to achieve roughly the same purpose as the Canada Water Act and the Fisheries Act amendment, that is, moving toward anti-pollution measures and better water management under the federal jurisdiction.

The Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development did not know exactly what was going on in the other two committees, except that some members of our party were doing their best to run between each of the three committees studying the water bill, the fisheries bill and the northern waters bill. However, they could not manage that because often the committees were all sitting at the same time. Whether this was intentional on the part of the government, I do not know Mr. Speaker. If so it was deplorable, because it did not give one committee an opportunity to consider what the others were doing. If it was unintentional it has backfired. That is why I am turning the prod a little now. If it was accidental that is even worse, because it shows a lack of management in this whole problem.

• (12:30 p.m.)

I rise to speak this afternoon because in spite of the efforts of many of us to tell the government to have one person control what was going on in all these departments and in connection with all these bills, there has been no action. We are going to have an amendment to the Canada Shipping Act later this year which will also deal with oil pollution. This undertaking has been given by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson). We are to have a clean air act, and that will be under the administration of the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro). Both these measures have been promised to the House.

Where will this jockeying back and forth lead and who will give some thought to the need for federal co-ordination in these matters? That is what I ask in speaking on what seems to be a very minor amendment made

by the Senate. I shall be surprised if this is the only mistake that was made in the four bills that were put through simultaneously. Actually I see that Bill C-219, the Fisheries Act amendment, is to be further amended. The proposed amendment is not that of the minister but of a private member. I will be surprised if there are not a good many overlappings or gaps in the bills which have been simultaneously considered.

There is one more important matter I ought to raise with the minister. We are considering an amendment to the Northern Inland Waters bill which was passed by the House and sent to the Senate. The Senate looked at the bill and sent it back to us saying, "You fellows in the House of Commons overlooked something." The Senate was quite right. The problem confronting us at the moment is that this bill is being amended to comply with the Fisheries Act amendments which are still before the House. There is a great, long list of proposed amendments to be considered at the report stage with respect to that bill.

Mr. Chrétien: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. May I clarify the statement I made before? Probably I did not use the right words. This amendment is made because something was overlooked and not because the wording of this bill does not comply with the amendments to the fisheries bill. This terminology is the same as that used in the old bill. It is not in the new fisheries bill. It was in the old bill, but was overlooked. The amendment is brought, not because of the wording of the new fisheries bill but because this new bill is to include some of the old bill's terminology.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, I accept the minister's statement. It is my understanding that there was something wrong with the Northern Inland Waters Bill and that it had to be sent back from the Senate. The fact of the matter is that there was some discrepancy between the definitions, and that must now be corrected. Actually, I do not think we ought to be proceeding with our consideration of this bill until we have passed the amendments to the fisheries bill, because the fisheries bill amendments must still be considered at third reading. I have read this bill. On line 11, page 8 of the bill we are considering there is a specific reference to the Fisheries Act. This reference is contained in clause 10(3)(b). I submit that we are amending the Northern Inland Waters Act to comply with the Fisheries Act, despite what the minister has said,