

*Government Organization Act, 1970*

of this deep-sea fishery as we had with respect to some of our lakes in Western Canada. In that case, we had to ban fishing altogether and find ways of supporting the incomes of the commercial fishermen affected.

**Mr. Barnett:** Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister a question before he concludes his remarks? At the same time, may I be permitted to join in the sentiments expressed by the minister and by the hon. member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse) with regard to our retiring Deputy Minister of Fisheries. Since the minister did not really touch upon this matter in his remarks, could he tell us what is to happen to our Department of Fisheries, which heretofore has been primarily responsible for the maintenance and enhancement of our commercial fisheries. What is to happen to the department, and how will that be related to the new department about which the minister has been speaking so eloquently?

**Mr. Davis:** Mr. Speaker, the responsibility for fisheries is most important. That is one of the major responsibilities given to the federal government under our constitution, the British North America Act. We must do our utmost to make sure that the fishery is maintained and nourished as effectively as possible. We shall be identifying various fisheries services. They will use the badges, letterheads and so on which formerly were used by the department. The functions of these services will be paralleled by the functions of the forestry services and the wildlife service. In other words, we shall have the Canada fisheries service, and it will use all the designations which formerly were used by the department. That also applies to the Canada forestry service and the Canada wildlife service.

**Mr. McGrath:** Mr. Speaker, with the indulgence of the House, may I be permitted to ask a question of the minister? In order to allay our fears over the future of the minister's fisheries responsibilities in Atlantic Canada, may I ask whether it is intended in future to appoint two deputy ministers, one to be responsible for fisheries and the other to be responsible for environmental pollution matters?

**Mr. Davis:** The answer is no, Mr. Speaker. We shall have one deputy minister who will bring about effective co-ordination within the department itself. In addition, we shall appoint several assistant deputy ministers, one of whom I believe will be an assistant deputy minister of fisheries.

**Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West):** Mr. Speaker, I must say that I listened to the minister this afternoon with a great deal of interest. May I thank him for his courtesy in letting me have a copy of the speech he intended making. It is always easier, if one sees a copy of a speech before it is made, to follow the minister's remarks and to note the various points raised.

Before proceeding with the main part of my presentation, there are one or two comments I wish to make about the minister's remarks. I wish to talk about standards. The minister indicated that standards were being

[Mr. Davis.]

set up. I presume that they will be national standards. We should like to know whether they are being set up under the Fisheries Act or under the Canada Water Act, or whether they are to be established under the new wildlife services branch which is to be set up. I think all members will be interested in knowing that. Possibly I ought to have directed a question earlier to the minister on this matter.

The minister made a good point by indicating that he is very much opposed to the patchwork approach to pollution legislation in Canada. I am delighted to hear that. Nevertheless, in looking at the particular bill we are debating, it seems to me that it constitutes a patchwork approach to pollution problems. I say that for the simple and sole reason that it has not taken into account all aspects of pollution, and I think it ought to have done so. I intend to deal with that matter later in my speech.

The minister also said that he is opposed to pollution havens. Again, I think this is good news. I know that the minister has advocated this on numerous occasions. This shows me that at long last the truth of what we said when debating the Canada Water Act has come home to the government benches. Under the Canada Water Act, if water quality management areas as outlined in the legislation were set up, pollution havens would be created in Canada. If the standards are not equalized throughout the length and breadth of the country, pollution havens could be established in various provinces. The minister mentioned that we are to have uniform and national standards. I endorse this statement 100 per cent. This is a sound approach to the over-all problem. Of course, we do not think that the same standard ought to apply to every little patch of water in Canada. That was not our intention, and the minister knows it. So far as I am concerned, the mere fact that the department is to move in the direction of imposing national standards shows that it is wise and sensible. Its action will indicate to industry all over Canada that we shall not allow pollution havens in any province or any part of any province. Again, I wish to make clear to members of the House that that was the precise point we tried to put across last year when debating the Canada Water Act.

Before coming to the bill itself, I wish to make one or two other observations. We understand that three new services are to be created, services dealing with fisheries, forestry and wildlife. I wish to leave this thought with the minister. We are going to have a wildlife service. When are we going to have a Canadian wildlife act? There must be a revision of all the ideas connected with wildlife. It will be necessary to study international agreements and hold discussions with representatives of other countries. We must move quickly along this line.

• (4:50 p.m.)

I wish to make a few comments about the bill we are currently debating, Bill C-207. I feel this bill is an example of poor legislation. There is no doubt about that. This bill encompasses several major principles, many of which have no relation to each other, apart from the fact that some slight change in government organization is taking place. A new department of the environment is to be