

But this afternoon I want to make a critical examination of the situation in which the minister finds himself and of some of the problems which he is facing in assuming these new responsibilities. I will be pointing out that the minister has been hobbled and hamstrung by the votes and actions of his own colleagues and of the government itself. He is going to have great difficulties in carrying out his objectives. It is with this in mind that I will point out to the minister some of the problems that I see before him and that I hope he can overcome.

First, I should express my congratulations to the mover (Mr. Trudel) and seconder (Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia)) of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne and to say it is always a privilege to be nominated to make these addresses.

The government has made three proposals in the Speech from the Throne and in the Prime Minister's (Mr. Trudeau) comments which followed: first, to re-organize the government structure to create a ministry concerned with the environment and to bring into the Department of Fisheries and Forestry several sections from other departments; second, to bring in a clean air act or some similar legislation described in the list of legislation as "air pollution legislation"; third, to propose amendments to the Canada Shipping Act with relation to pollution.

I must say at first that I agree with the necessity for such legislation. With regard to the creation of a department through which to consolidate pollution control efforts, we on this side have been pressing for this for some time now without too much response from the government or the Prime Minister until pressure from all sources began to build up. For example, on April 29 of this year, as recorded at page 6411 of *Hansard* I asked the Prime Minister the following question:

• (3:30 p.m.)

May I ask the Prime Minister if he intends to designate a minister to co-ordinate pollution control activities?

The reply was:

—we do assure co-ordination of pollution activities in a variety of ways, cabinet committees being one of them.

Immediately following that, the hon. member for Gander-Twillingate asked the Prime Minister if consideration would be given to having the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry "co-ordinate all activities relating to pollution control, which is now under four or five different ministers." I quote *Hansard*:

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member very much for the suggestion which I must say is not very helpful.

There was a very definite answer, that he did not really intend doing anything about the consolidation of pollution control efforts.

Early this year, it became obvious that there were two views within the government on how to approach the question of water pollution. One was proposed by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) who was tied to the Canada Water Act, and who rejected absolutely the principles of adopting national water quality standards, of requiring internal pollution control

#### The Address—Mr. Aiken

inside the factory fence, and of placing parliamentary restraint upon the export of water. I will deal with these aspects of the problem later in detail.

At the same time, the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry was making speeches around the country, in which he seemed to be of the opposite view. He seemed to be accepting those views which the Opposition was then presenting, and I must say that the public was indeed confused. I would hope that some of the confusion has been reduced, but I doubt it and I intend to show why.

On April 13 of this year, I asked the Prime Minister if he could clear up some of the problems within his government, and which appeared to be coming out to the public, by asking him, as recorded in *Hansard* of that date:

In view of the provisions of Bill C-204 which was given first reading on Friday and which effectively passes control over to the Department of Fisheries and Forestry, has a policy decision been made that administration of water pollution control in Canada should be given to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry?

The Prime Minister replied:

No, Mr. Speaker. Control is divided between the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, who is responsible for the application of the provisions of the water act and the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry.

I then asked:

Might I ask the Prime Minister which of these ministers is responsible in the case of a conflict between inspectors under the two acts?

The Prime Minister replied:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will give us an example of a conflict I will answer his question.

Of course at that time I could not engage in an argument, but I am doing it now. At that time the Prime Minister did not seem to know that there was a conflict, and apparently he did not intend to do anything about settling the conflict. Now, apparently, the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry has won the struggle, and the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources will have the administration of the Canada Water Act taken away from him. I do not say this is basically bad because I do not really think the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry will be inheriting anything very helpful when he gets it. However, that is the situation now.

Following the Speech from the Throne and the Prime Minister's statement, the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry wasted no time in repudiating the policies adopted by the government and, I may say, Parliament as well by virtue of a majority of votes in the last session. As I have already said, I have a great deal of respect for the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry and I incline more to his views than to those of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources on some of these basic issues.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask, where does the government stand as a government responsible for making policy decisions on these issues? It is not good enough that the Prime Minister supports one view today and another tomorrow, or that he supports one minister today