

It has not been satisfactorily explained to me yet why the National Energy Board itself could not be the single regulatory agency in this instance. It has the skills, the expertise, the historical experience in matters of this nature; it has dealt with it for years. If the National Energy Board does not have sufficient personnel at present to cope with the added responsibility, no one has explained that.

I know the Deputy Prime Minister in his press release thought that it would be staffed by 200 personnel at peak—I think that is what he said. But having regard to the track record of this government in keeping the lid on the growth of bureaucracy in this country, I am afraid I do not have much confidence in that statement of the minister's. The bill does not make any provision for a maximum number that will serve on this proposed new board. If the Deputy Prime Minister's estimate is wrong, and I am sure that it will be, instead of 200 there will be 1,000 bureaucrats working for that agency.

There is a further provision. The bill provides for the setting up of advisory councils. The number on these councils is limited to ten, but there is no limit to the number of advisory councils which can be set up. It could be one or it could be 100. What a refuge for goodness knows how many friends of the Liberal party that will be, having regard to their track record lately. I think I speak on behalf of my party on this side of the House when I say that the government must give some consideration to limiting the numbers required in the regulatory agency.

If the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) would like a pillow I will be happy to provide it. Perhaps I can call it five o'clock in order to allow the hon. member for Nickel Belt to have a nap.

* * *

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Temiscamingue (Mr. Caouette)—Public Works—Date of establishment of post office in Rouyn, Quebec; the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie)—National Defence—Building of defence research centre in Winnipeg; the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Roche)—Airports—Edmonton International—Government position on improvements.

It being five o'clock the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely notices of motions and public bills.

Environment

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order No. 4, the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis). Stand by unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order No. 5, the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald). Shall the item stand by unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order No. 11, the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Gillies). Shall the item stand by unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order No. 12, the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Roche). Shall the item stand by unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

● (1702)

THE ENVIRONMENT

SUGGESTED INSTITUTE OF HUMAN ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of setting up, in co-operation with the provinces, an Institute of Human Environmental Studies to determine, among other matters the (a) degree of air, soil, water and noise pollution the human species can tolerate without serious effects on physical and mental health (b) type of environment which stimulates the most desirable qualities of physical and mental health in the human species (c) type of national development which would give satisfactory environment to the greatest possible number of Canadians (d) minimum of modifications to the present day indiscriminate and largely unplanned growth of our metropolitan areas necessary to put within reach of the inhabitants of these areas a quality of environment which would provide adequate (i) housing (ii) recreational facilities, including parkland (iii) social infrastructure, such as transportation, education, hospital and recreation facilities.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this motion there are two things I should like to make clear at the outset. First, I would point out to you, Mr. Speaker, and to members of the House, that the original drafting of the motion is not my own.

The original drafter of this motion is a former colleague of ours in this House who represented the constituency of Malpeque, a minister of fisheries for many years in a former government who is now leader of the opposition in the Prince Edward Island legislature. I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I have spoken to our former colleague about this matter; I had the privilege of being in the House on the last day he took part in the discussion of this motion, which was on October 18, 1974. I was impressed by the spirit of the motion and by what