

*Water Resources Programs*

waters of this particular basin is now underway. As the months pass, it is hoped that the management agency, as it will be known once this bill becomes law, will be able to make recommendations on the best use of the waters of this particular basin. There is the Prairie water agreement act with the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. An agreement has been entered into to examine some of the major water systems of the Prairie provinces.

I suggest that this particular amendment, laudable as it may be, really adds nothing to the import of the bill. Although I am not a lawyer, and I may have limited knowledge of the interpretation of the law, when an amendment states that a minister shall do something he deems appropriate, no teeth are put into the bill.

There was concern expressed in the committee discussions as to whether there would be consultation before the waters of a designated area were used for a particular purpose. Every member of the committee indicated his concern. At one stage, it was suggested that there could be a change. If my memory serves me right, the committee accepted an amendment advanced by a member of the opposition which would ensure that before a plan was adopted it would be published in the *Canada Gazette*. I believe the amendment was suggested by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken). Section 13(2) now reads:

Where the agency recommends a water quality management plan to the Minister, it shall forthwith cause the plan to be published in the *Canada Gazette* and shall publish a concise summary of the plan in a newspaper of general circulation in the area affected by the plan at least once a week for a period of four weeks; a plan shall not be approved until the expiration of seven clear days after the publication last required.

While this deals with water quality management agencies, it is obvious that the intent is to ensure that there is sufficient consultation with persons in an area, be they the provincial government, industries, conservation groups or others. We believe that the amendment as suggested does not meet with the requirements of the bill. In many ways it has no relevancy at this stage of our discussions.

**Mr. Barnett:** Will the Parliamentary Secretary permit a question? I will divide my question into three parts, a, b and c. In what way is part III of the bill subject to part II in those respects in which the Parliamentary Secretary referred to the requirements for consul-

[Mr. Orange.]

tation? I ask whether the phrase in the amendment, "deems appropriate" refers only to the matter of the organization of citizens. Also, does the Parliamentary Secretary agree that when we are legislating we are dealing not only with the present minister but with future ministers who will be in office long after the discussions we are now having will be reposing largely unread on the library shelves?

**Mr. Orange:** Mr. Speaker, I recognize the hon. member's point. I was attempting to say that the whole concept of the bill is based on this matter of consultation. I was giving specific examples where consultation will take place because of the nature and organization of the management agency. I am afraid I do not understand or I may have missed the third part of the question.

**Mr. Barnett:** Does the Parliamentary Secretary recognize that in legislating we are dealing not only with a situation that may prevail with the present minister, but with ministers who may be in office long after this debate we are having will be reposing on library shelves largely unread?

• (5:10 p.m.)

**Mr. Orange:** Naturally, as long as this party is in power one would expect the same treatment from other ministers as from the present Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. One of the major objections to this proposal is that it has no relevancy, because it says the minister can do something if he feels like doing it.

**Mr. Barnett:** The amendment says the minister "shall".

**Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris):** I have followed the words of the Parliamentary Secretary very carefully. In my opinion he made a most eloquent plea for the support of the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken). On the basis of his remarks I fully anticipated he would conclude by saying the government intended to support the amendment. He rightly pointed out that consultation and co-ordination are the essence of any successful program for the conservation and development of our renewable resources, particularly in the light of the purposes of Bill C-144. Unfortunately, having made the argument in support of the principle of consultation, the Parliamentary Secretary reached the conclusion that the amendment was not necessary.