

fisheries is a slightly different concept. Perhaps they are so much so that one should really not be submerged in the other. I have not dealt with that aspect up until this time. This is the point in reorganization.

The minister is being told now to take his portfolio of fisheries to the new department. Because he happens to have a lot of experts in that department who have dealt somewhat with the war on pollution, this is the logical place to set up a department of the environment. There is no other department which has so much expertise in it as the department of fisheries to form a department of the environment. I say that, but one year from now, or two or three years from now, what sort of computer approach will be used to form government departments? For the life of me I cannot figure it out. When you have illogical processes at work special attention from the House of Commons is demanded. It is illogical, and other persons are agreeing with me that it is illogical, that on the one hand you should have a person who is interested in the exploitation of renewable natural resources, that is, fish, and on the other hand you have been saying that the water resources of this country should be treated in such and such a way or that there is a war going on against pollution. I say it is a tug of war within the mind of any one person to have to accept what, to me, are conflicting duties and responsibilities. That is why we are making no apologies for doing our best to at least get the "environment and fisheries" into this name, to recognize that there are in essence two departments involved here. Then, hopefully, in good time, we shall do something to carry that measure of achievement a lot further.

• (5:50 p.m.)

**Mr. McGrath:** Some of the concern we have expressed is apparently well-founded. I refer members of the committee to what are supposed to be the estimates of the Department of Fisheries and Forestry in the new blue book tabled today for 1971-72 under "environment". It appears to me that the downgrading process has already begun. We find it difficult at first glance to say exactly what the position of the Department of Fisheries and Forestry is with respect to government plans for the coming fiscal year.

The reason is that the primary responsibilities of the minister in his proposed new department of the environment will relate to pollution and related subjects—clean water, the management of the Canada Water Act, the setting up of water management boards and so on. All these activities will be the primary task of the minister who, if this legislation passes, will become the minister of the environment. This is what the present debate is all about. This is what my amendment is all about.

We are not asking the government to change the act in any way. On the contrary, we support what the government is doing. We support the creation of a department charged with protecting the environment. We repeat that the logical minister to be given this responsibility is the minister of fisheries because he already has the expertise within his department by virtue of the provisions of the

### *Business of the House*

Fisheries Act. All we want to do is ensure that our fears as to the downgrading of the fisheries responsibility will not be borne out as a result of the establishment of the new department. We are trying to take out insurance by putting the word "Fisheries" into the name of the new department. I fail to understand why the government cannot accept this amendment. It does not change anything, but it satisfies us that the government's intentions with regard to the department of fisheries are honourable. Among the many folksongs of Newfoundland there is one which is known as "I'se the boy that builds the boat." I am sure the minister is familiar with it. The first verse goes:

I'se the boy that builds the boat  
I'se the boy that sails her  
I'se the boy that catches the fish  
And brings them home to Lisa

It is poor Lisa that I am concerned about. I am concerned lest there be no fish for Lisa and no fishermen to catch the fish. The minister knows we are concerned about conservation. This is a matter which has been earnestly and honestly dealt with by my hon. friend from Gander-Twillingate on many occasions. We are concerned about the depletion of our fish stocks and the overexploitation of our fisheries resources. We have urgently called attention to the need to obtain a meaningful agreement with the countries which fish off our shores on a sustained yield basis. But we fear that when this new department of the environment is set up the fisherman fishing off St. Mary's, or the bill of Cape St. George, or off the west coast of Canada, will be lost in the shuffle. There will be no one to look after him or to take a special interest in the difficulties he faces notwithstanding the fact that the Parliament of Canada under our constitution has a special responsibility with respect to the administration of the fisheries. It is not a provincial authority. The authority which the federal government and Parliament has given to the provinces is a designated one. This field is really under the sole jurisdiction of the government and the Parliament of Canada and it is in the exercise of this responsibility that we have put forward our amendment.

May I call it six o'clock, Mr. Chairman?

Progress reported.

\* \* \*

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. McCutcheon:** May I ask the leader of the House what goodies will be served up to us tomorrow?

**Mr. MacEachen:** We shall remove the current menu. We shall interrupt the filibuster and give hon. members opposite a little rest. Tomorrow, we shall call the bill dealing with veterans affairs and the bill dealing with