

dealing with the establishment of the department of the environment. He actually said, and I quote:

—I welcome the establishment of the department of the environment.

Then he stated, after having admitted that he had always considered the Department of Fisheries and Forestry as a full-time occupation, and I quote:

Now, if this is so, I can only conclude that the minister designate for this new conglomerate will be bogged and overburdened, so something is going to suffer.

Let us face the facts.

With a department of such magnitude, ministerial responsibility is no longer possible, because of the sheer amount of work.

It becomes impossible to look after all those matters, according to the honourable member. But what solution does he suggest to reduce the burden of the minister? He objects to the appointment of five Ministers of State. He stated:

This is a preposterous recommendation.

—a political piracy of the public purse by this Liberal government.

The minister will be too busy, but the honourable member does not want him to have a parliamentary secretary to help him.

I do not understand what the hon. member is driving at, Mr. Speaker. In my opinion, his story does not make sense. We might learn something more at the committee stage.

I also want to say that I did not intend to pick on the member for South Shore for whom I have much esteem as a fellow citizen of the Atlantic provinces. I merely quoted his words to show the confusion other members of his party share with him, because they approach the bill from a much too partisan viewpoint. Yet, they do not have the monopoly of truth.

Fortunately, the member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau) who is carefully listening to me this afternoon and whom I also like very much, is a little more understanding. Therefore, there is a little hope for that side of the House.

We must be wise enough to change with public opinion, with the sometimes upsetting turn of events. We must not fear to help make history. To keep what is good, to preserve and to improve our environment or some parts of it, to wisely develop our resources, considering the quality of the environment, to seek man's happiness, to ensure our future and the future of generations to come, such is the difficult task of the new Department of the Environment.

I shall limit my remarks on that particular subject, Mr. Speaker. I might have more to say at the committee stage or at the third reading stage.

In conclusion, I would like to quote an excerpt from the *Christian Science Monitor* of December 11, 1970, a newspaper distributed free of charge to all members—in fact I do not know why—that contains many editorials on pollution, ecology and all that.

This newspaper tells us that the Americans are as much concerned with this matter as we are.

Government Organization Act, 1970

The article I mentioned is entitled:

[*English*]

"Silver lining seen in pollution cloud". The article, in part, reads as follows:

America's crackdown on pollution is proving to be a blessing in disguise for some businessmen. Widespread concern about environmental spoilage and destruction is inspiring invention and creating a wide new field of private enterprise as well as thousands of jobs and career opportunities.

So, instead of fighting the antipollution wave, often directed at industry, many smart industrialists are taking advantage of it.

How much and how fast this new business grows may depend on how tough cities, states, and the federal government are on environmental polluters and how much money the taxpayer is willing to spend to clean up the sky, earth, and water around him. Only a few firms will spend money for pollution abatement without being forced to.

A little further on, the article reads:

Much of the new environmental concern by industry is obviously the direct result of state and federal antipollution legislation. Local governments generally have been much slower to respond.—

Dr. Robert W. Cairns, vice-president for research for Hercules Corporation of Wilmington, Del., predicts that industry can solve this nation's pollution problems 'with proper environmental and economic incentives.'—

H. D. Doan, president of Dow Chemical Company, another industrial giant, recently spoke in a similar vein. He chastised industrialists for complaining about the financial burden of antipollution legislation and told them to turn the situation into business and profits by providing 'new ways of thinking and new technical answers.'

Industry, he said, can make money in the vast environmental cleanup.

I am not opposed to that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Comeau: Would that not raise the cost to the consumer?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Corbin: This, I submit, is a progressive—not conservative—attitude worth mentioning during the study of this bill.

It would be unfortunate if some politicians were to lead the public to believe that the responsibility for eliminating pollution rests entirely with the government. In this fight against environmental pollution, our primary objective is sound balance between those resources which could be exploited for the benefit of the Canadian people and mankind in general and preservation, conservation and restoration. There should be balance in the distribution of efforts in order to wipe out pollution, and these efforts should be exerted equally by the various levels of government and industry. The time has come for our businessmen and our industrialists to join forces and attune their efforts and expenditures to those of the governments.

Finally, I will say that young people who are still undecided as to their future career should give a thought to the wide field of activities related to this fight against pollution.