

moves on a national scale would not only encourage the world community of nations to tackle global problems but would convince them that we were sincere in calling for a global approach to pollution.

The Stockholm Conference calls for international standards. Why, then, does this government not insist on national standards within our own country? Why do we pass legislation which in effect has fragmented standards from one end of Canada to the other? Why do we allow land use regulations in the northern 40 per cent of our nation to be so watered down through pressure from major economic interests that these regulations cannot adequately do the job of protecting the delicate ecology of the north? Why is the only major portion of Canada where all resources are under federal jurisdiction, namely, the area north of latitude 60 degrees, not included under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Environment?

We talk about international standards and control, but the Minister of the Environment does little when major ecological problems face us such as in the James Bay area. Why did his department not insist on full ecological surveys being made before the project commenced? What about the St. Lawrence River where the water is so badly polluted that it is not safe for bathing? Have we no jurisdictional rights in this area, or are the department and the government afraid to move?

There is one point I would like to raise in connection with the Stockholm Conference, and I will be brief. The tendency of this government to pussyfoot in the face of pressure from powerful lobbies was made clear in Stockholm. A \$1 million offer to contribute to research on low pollution alternatives to petroleum sources of energy was withdrawn. The international press claimed that it was due to pressure from powerful oil interests. These same economic interests have forced this government to downgrade its land use regulations needed to protect our northern areas. We find that oil exploration is going on in a large portion of northern Canada without adequate controls.

May I say in closing that we welcome the accomplishments of the Stockholm Conference and the part played in it by Maurice Strong and our Canadian delegation. We are looking forward to seeing this expression of leadership in the international field translated into action. We are going to ride herd on the minister to see that this action is taken.

• (1420)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, we have listened with a great deal of attention to the statement of the hon. Minister of the Environment (Mr. Davis). I thank him for sending me a copy of his statement around one o'clock, but I must point out that I did not receive the French translation until 2:17 p.m. exactly. I would have liked one of my colleagues to comment on this statement, but because we did not receive the French translation soon enough, I was forced to select myself to make comments on it. When the minister has statements to make, I wish he would send us the translation soon enough for my colleagues and myself to read them before hand.

25319—25

Environmental Affairs

Mr. Speaker, we are proud of the role played by Canada at the United Nations Conference on the Environment at Stockholm where the delegates agreed, often unanimously, to a set of principles, an action plan and an organizational structure which will help mankind fight pollution on land, in the sea and in the air.

Mr. Speaker, we are in complete agreement with the minister on these basic principles which will help all mankind but, nevertheless, we must not forget that in Canada, in the provinces and in the municipalities an action plan must also be established to fight efficiently sea, air and land pollution.

Some municipalities and some provinces are asking the central government for help in depolluting the lakes which supply some cities with their drinking water. For example, in Rouyn-Noranda, help has been requested for many years to clean Dufault Lake in order to build an adequate water system. But they always get the same answer that funds are not available, notwithstanding the fact that the government has the financial means to go to Stockholm to decide what will happen on the shores of the United States, of Africa, etc. We are not against this and we are happy that the government's participation is very efficient and that it draws the attention of the world to these problems. However, Mr. Speaker, I would like the government to pay as much attention to the municipalities and provinces in Canada in order to help the population in its fight against pollution of any kind.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS

REQUEST THAT ST. JEAN-BAPTISTE DAY AND DOMINION DAY HOLIDAYS BE OBSERVED ON MONDAYS—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O.43

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I should like to submit a motion under Standing Order 43, with the request that hon. members kindly listen instead of saying "No" as usual. Since the national holiday of French Canadians and Dominion Day both fall on a Saturday, I should like to move, seconded by the hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton (Mr. Scott):

That the Mondays following these two holidays be proclaimed holidays for Parliament and all the personnel of that institution.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the motion submitted by the hon. member for Joliette. Under the provisions of Standing Order 43, this motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is no unanimity. The motion therefore cannot be put.