

*Government Organization Act, 1970*

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** Mr. Speaker, I ask the minister whether his thinking is that we would have to follow the procedure he has suggested, in view of clause 29 of this bill. Apparently this House is being asked to give permission to have funds allocated to an agency, along with its duties, transferred to the minister of the environment or reallocated to that department when and as the Governor in Council may decide. I suggest that the ruling of the Chair last year in connection with Bill S-3 absolutely precludes such transfer. Perhaps the minister would explain clause 29 to the House in order that we may better understand the thinking of the government.

**Mr. Drury:** I must confess that I did not understand the entire question, particularly the reference to Bill S-3. When we come to clause 29 I will endeavour to deal with it.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. Members:** Yea.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. Members:** Nay.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** In my opinion the yeas have it.

**Some hon. Members:** On division.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Honey in the chair.

**The Chairman:** Hon. members may agree that since clauses 1 and 2 are short title clauses, in accordance with section 1 of Standing Order 75 the committee should now proceed to the consideration of clause 3 of the bill. Is this agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

On clause 3—*Department of the Environment—Department established.*

**Mr. McCleave:** Mr. Chairman, I think the course adopted is technically correct, but I think it also points out the dilemma I referred to earlier when I raised the point of order that a bill having so many things in it would be extremely difficult for the House to consider and, now, for this committee to consider. Let me now deal with the division we face in respect of the creation of the department of the environment. I will do so on the presumption that the discussion will be on the clause the Chair has called.

It is difficult to deal with some of the points raised by the President of the Treasury Board at this time while

[Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West).]

they are fresh in the public's mind. If we had a regular clause 1 debate we might be able to impress these points on the minds of the members of the press gallery who are present. For one thing, Sir, to confuse a unitarian government such as exists in the United Kingdom with a federal system such as we have in Canada is like trying to equate oranges—I hate to say this about the Canadian government—with lemons.

• (9:50 p.m.)

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McCleave:** Mr. Chairman, obviously that was a fitting remark in a debate such as this. After all, the original scenario comes from the gang responsible for having horses on the payroll, and now we have the great sequel—the Grits will have their own gravy train. This is the best I can do this evening, but I advise the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs that my best this evening eclipses anything the minister has been able to do for a number of years.

The point I want to make about this clause arises from a problem that has hit pretty hard the fishing industry in my province and which I presume will be hitting other industries as the department of the environment swings into operation. The problem has been presented to the House by the hon. member for South Shore and the hon. member for South Western Nova. It concerns the fact that because of mercury pollution, the swordfish industry in eastern Canada has been pretty well laid flat on its back. When questions are raised in the House, the minister points out that some assistance will be given in the way of retraining these fishermen, I presume to catch other types of fish, and that an effort will be made to find employment for them in other directions.

This may seem to be the solution to a substantial problem, but I suggest it ignores two very fundamental facts. I bring these to the attention of the President of the Treasury Board, his colleague from Nova Scotia who is with him, and the new minister of the environment. First, I would point out that these people have lost their livelihood through no fault of their own. They had nothing to do, except in a very small and inconsequential way, with any mercury pollution of the swordfishery. So they have by happenstance come upon this problem.

The serious thing is that nothing that has been suggested as a remedy takes into account the fact that sword-fishing boats are of a specific types; they are large and have their own special equipment. In short, they represent a substantial capital investment. The people who are thrown out of the swordfishery are to be given some help through retraining and the like, but this would not seem to be as helpful as other methods might be. Through no fault of their own they are in very serious difficulty.

I think in committee we might give consideration to the problem of what happens when pollution controls, standards and measurements have the effect of taking dozens or hundreds of people and suddenly knocking them out of work and placing them in the position of