

can attempt to promote internationally pieces of legislation which we are imposing nationally in this country. He at least urged the inclusion of the word "international" with the word "national" in his amendment. I would prefer, however, to leave this matter open in the terms of reference of the department and make it quite specific in particular pieces of legislation such as the clean air bill.

The hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster asked about over-reacting to the problems posed by pollution, the tendency to hold back job producing industries and to discourage perhaps economic growth in the guise of protecting the environment. Personally, I think with more care and more attention, we can have both economic growth and a clean environment. I know of a number of cases where properly designed plants have been more economic, more profitable and better able to pay high wages than others which were designed a few years earlier without any regard to the environment.

New pulp mills meeting our national standards and regulations under the Fisheries Act, for example, are perhaps faced with an increase of 2 per cent in the cost of new plants and less than 1 per cent in the cost of the product, but these costs are common to all new mills across Canada and, increasingly, to new mills built in other countries such as the Scandinavian countries which are beginning to adopt our new techniques. Eventually, the rules governing this industry will be the same the world over.

So, while these costs may be significant, though not large, they will be common the world over. They will not affect our competitive position. They will help preserve our environment and make other industries feasible in the nearby localities. In other words, we can have what the Minister of Transport envisaged as the best of both worlds, economic growth and a clean environment as well.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Chairman, in my view it is incumbent on every member of this House to become articulate and vigorous in supporting this proposal. Irrespective of where we sit in this House, it is our duty to do so. I am glad that these two ministers are in the House. The Minister of Public Works also took a position of this kind when he held another portfolio. I think there is a responsibility on the members of this House, and on the people who report what is said in this House to arouse, not inflame, public opinion in a reasonable way in respect of support for the proposal contained in this communiqué. That is the reason I spoke as I did. I am convinced members of our party will support that particular aspect—other members may debate other aspects—of the proposal and what is contained in the communiqué. There will be co-operation to the fullest extent, and I seek the same co-operation from all parties in the House.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Chairman, since I was absent attending another committee meeting, perhaps this question has already been put and, if so, it need not be answered. Does the minister foresee any difficulty in respect of jurisdiction? I am thinking now of the fact

Government Organization Act, 1970

that some provinces have set up their own legislation. I know the province of Newfoundland established a clean air and water authority with appropriate legislation. Will there be any duplication of effort and are there any jurisdictional problems? If so, have these jurisdictional problems been resolved? Is there any working mechanism to be set up within the department so that both the federal and provincial authorities may work harmoniously toward a common objective?

Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the simple answer is that with divided responsibility in a federal country there are bound to be some difficulties. I think in this area of pollution control there are fewer difficulties than in other areas where there have been old disputes and a host of vested interests. In my travels across the country and in my discussions with ministers in the provinces having responsibility for the environment, there has been a willingness to talk about these matters and a willingness to work out standards which would apply right across Canada and project outside Canada. There has been surprisingly little concern about local problem areas, about constitutionality, about provincial boundaries, jurisdictions and old department names in our effort to start afresh in this field.

I could perhaps give an example. Currently, we are developing a national standard under the Fisheries Act. Representatives of the provinces have joined us in a national task force. The pulp and paper industry has supplied several experts. The task force has travelled to Scandinavia and the United States. It is developing one set of standards for pulp mills. A draft of the regulations will be sent to the provinces for comment. We will publish them nationally. We will listen to critical comment, but co-operation is the rule and the tendency is to enforce the highest standards. The various mills which have already put these standards into effect are having no trouble operating, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Harding: Mr. Chairman, I have one or two brief comments to make on the amendment before us. It is obvious to me that the minister and the government are prepared to leave the objectives and standards in respect of pollution open to negotiation. No other interpretation can be taken from the legislation which is before us. The mere fact that the government has refused to accept the amendment is a clear indication that we will have different standards in different parts of this country. It is the same old story we had last year when the Canada water bill was before the committee. We could not get national standards. Now, apparently the minister accepts the view that the national standard issue should not be established in this bill. I am disappointed. However, we have had a good discussion on the amendment and I should like to see it come to a vote. I am disappointed in the minister and his approach to this particular amendment. This legislation is meaningless. It can mean a lot or nothing. This is not the type of legislation we should be placing on the statute books of Canada.

The Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?