

*Northern Inland Waters Bill*

It has been suggested that perhaps this bill is a reflection on some kind of a power struggle in the cabinet between the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) and the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien). This, of course, is only conjecture. No one really has any knowledge of the motivation behind these things. We cannot look into the inner recesses of other people's minds to find out what is going on.

It was also suggested that perhaps the bill is a gesture by the minister to let the territorial governments participate in pollution control after their disappointment over the constitutional changes suggested by the government last fall. If this is the case, I do not think it amounts to very much because there is no real power accorded to the Territorial Council. Both these water boards are to be appointed by the minister. There are to be several members on the boards. There is to be at least one nominee of each federal department concerned with northern water management. That is a lot of people, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for Simcoe North pointed out during the debate on the Canada water bill that there are at least seven departments concerned with water pollution in general. These did not include the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, which has added itself to the list.

● (8:10 p.m.)

The point which was raised this afternoon by way of the amendment moved by my hon. friend from Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) represents the principal objection we in this party, at least, take to the bill before us. As the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau) said—and my hon. friend from Peace River as well as the hon. member for the Northwest Territories (Mr. Orange) on the government side referred to this—we do not like the proposition that all the members of the proposed boards should be civil servants. They will all be members of the so-called establishment, and it has often been suggested by members of this House that these people tend to have a frozen state of mind.

It would be a little better, I believe, if persons outside the civil service were also appointed to these boards. This is a shortcoming the government might correct at a later stage. I hope provision will be made for the appointment of at least one member on each board who is not a member of the civil service and who has knowledge of local condi-

tions. The minister might get one of his colleagues to propose such an amendment at the appropriate time.

The main fear we have is outlined in the amendment before the House. It concerns the diversion of waters from water courses. This appears to be the one item in this piece of legislation which really differs from the terms of the Canada Water Act which, we contend, covers what is proposed in the major part of the bill before us. It leads to a conclusion that a plan for the diversion of water has only to be approved by the board; it does not have to become a matter of public knowledge. An advertisement will be placed in the *Canada Gazette*—who reads that?—and there will be an advertisement placed in one newspaper: it might be in the newspaper of an obscure town in the north, and nobody would notice it.

There is a genuine concern on this side of the House stemming, in part, from what seems to be deep division within the cabinet as to our water policy. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) made some remarks at Carleton University the other day. This afternoon in the House during the question period he indicated he was not averse to selling our water in certain circumstances. Water flowing into the oceans was not of any use to us, he seemed to be saying. On the other hand, the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) has implied that not one drop of Canadian water will go to the Yanks, or to anybody else for that matter.

I do not like to use the term "weaseling" here, so I shall say that to judge from the variety of words used there does seem to be some disagreement in the cabinet as to what our water policy should be; whether we should sell it and get a price when it is not being used here, or whether there should be a complete assessment of the water we are likely to be using in this country in the foreseeable future before taking any such step. In any case, there seems little doubt from what has been said that there is indecision or even dispute within the cabinet as to our policy regarding the sale of water.

This being the background, we feel serious concern about clause 2(2) of this bill. I realize we should not refer to specific clauses at this stage but I am doing so merely to illustrate my point. The clause provides—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I invite hon. members to exercise discretion as to the consideration of individual clauses at this time. The hon. member has himself acknowledged