

*Fisheries Act*

Of course, if a pollutant is discharged into Canada's fisheries waters the offending party may be prosecuted. If we are dealing with an industry, it may be prosecuted without warning. Up until the present time, the maximum fine has been \$1,000 under the Fisheries Act. The passage of this bill will increase the fine to \$5,000. It could be \$5,000 a day if the pollution continues after a warning has been given to the plant owners by our departmental officials. Hon. members will please note that the nature and amount of the fine will also be the same as under the Canada Water Act. Again, the Fisheries Act and the Canada Water Act are in step. They are in step in respect of the definition of waste and they are identical when it comes to the maximum penalty which can be levied under our new legislation.

The administration of both acts will also be dovetailed. Officials from my department will be serving on the consultative committees and regional management boards set up under the Canada Water Act. They will do their best to make these consultative committees work and these over-all, federal-provincial management boards work. They have every reason to do so. Organized discussions and organized planning of this kind is likely to be much more helpful to our fishery than the catch-as-catch-can processes of the past.

When developments proceeded, willy-nilly, the fisheries were usually ignored. Power dams were built without regard to salmon runs. New industries were brought in without regard to pollution and its effect on our fish. The environment suffered and the ecological balance in our waters was upset. "Hard" industry has flourished. But living organisms have frequently been destroyed. Our scenery has been blemished and our recreational potential has been wiped out.

The Canada Water Act should change all that. In our new water quality management areas, all parties will be brought together. All interests will be consulted. Provincial government departments will be involved and so will federal departments. Provincial water resources people and Federal fisheries people will sit down together. They will work out their differences in an organized way and the end result will be a better over-all scheme of development for all concerned.

• (3:20 p.m.)

Various techniques have been developed for dealing with these multi-faceted situations. One is benefit-cost analysis. Benefit-cost analysis was first developed in the planning of

whole river basins. There, power dams and irrigation, navigation and flood control, fisheries and recreation, forestry and aesthetics all had to be reconciled. Also some of them could be reduced to dollar terms and others could only be referred to as "intangibles". The technique is still imperfect. But we know that the "intangibles", like recreation and aesthetics, are being given much more credence than in the past. Sports fishing and tourism have been moving up the scale. They have been given higher priority with the passage of time. They have been weighing more heavily in the balance of things. So it is with our fisheries.

It is for these reasons as well that I favour the establishment of water quality management areas in various parts of the country. Ottawa and the provinces will be brought closer together. We will also tend to avoid head on confrontations between single and individual federal departments administering federal laws in the same waters. It will provide a forum for resolving these differences. It will also give our own fisheries people, and our forestry people, a greater say in the over-all scheme of things. Using the Canada Water Act in this way, we can make sure their voices are heard. They were not always heard in the past—far from it. Often the opinions of our fisheries biologists were ignored to the detriment of our fishery in particular, and our aquatic environment in general. Often the voices of our fishermen were ignored as well.

I might go even further. I might insist that our fisheries scientists and our development engineers must continue to be the pace setters. They must be the pace setters in so far as the protection of the living resources in our aquatic environment is concerned. They must insist on the highest possible standards of water purity. They must insist that the same high standards are put into effect locally, and regionally, in the new water quality management areas which result from Canada Water Act agreements between Ottawa and the provinces. We, in this department, clearly have a vested interest in the success of the Canada Water Act. We want it to work because it can also help us to do our job in Fisheries and Forestry more effectively.

I have been talking as if regulations made under the Canada Water Act will apply immediately and in all areas of Canada. This will not be the case. The setting up of basin wide plans covering major rivers and streams will take time. Large sums of money will also have to be voted as well. In the interim, at