

## OIL

## POSSIBLE STOPPAGE OF OFFSHORE SUPPLY—CONTINGENCY PLANS FOR EASTERN CANADA

**Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Mines, Energy and Resources. Will he indicate whether the government has any contingency plans for supplying oil to eastern Canada in view of a possible stoppage of supplies from the Middle East and Venezuela?

**Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, the National Energy Board has had the situation under very close surveillance since the commencement of the negotiations between the OPEC producer countries and the oil companies, and I am satisfied that all possible steps are being taken to assure the maximum emergency supply by reason of full use of storage and pipeline facilities in the event of a shortage.

**Mr. Speaker:** Orders of the day.

● (3:30 p.m.)

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

## GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION ACT, 1970

## PROVISIONS RESPECTING DEPARTMENTAL REORGANIZATION, MINISTRIES OF STATE, PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES, ETC.

The House resumed, from Tuesday, February 2, consideration in committee of Bill C-207, respecting the organization of the Government of Canada and matters related or incidental thereto—Mr. Trudeau—Mr. Honey in the chair.

**The Chairman:** Order. When the committee rose last evening Clause 3 of the bill was under consideration. Shall Clause 3 carry?

On Clause 3—*Department established.*

**Mr. Harding:** Mr. Chairman, Part I of Bill C-207 deals with the establishment of a Department of the Environment, and during second reading we had some very interesting debate on this matter. I, myself, made some suggestions to the government but I am quite sure they have received little attention from the minister. Nevertheless, I hope that if I reiterate some points, consideration will be given to them by hon. members and by the departments concerned.

I think that the name "department of the environment" is a misnomer. Everybody would like to see a department of the environment set up. I do not want to be misunderstood on that score, but it seems to me that such a department should be able to deal with all environmental problems all across our nation, and that the environmental aspects of work being done by other departments should come under its scrutiny and control. Unless we

*Government Organization Act, 1970*

get that type of control in one department, which will co-ordinate our attack on pollution problems, we will not get the job done that should be done.

During the debate on second reading I said that a department of the environment should not be responsible for any specific resource. Once you have a resource department established, its work is primarily directed toward the economic development of that particular resource. If resource development and environmental problems are mixed too closely, there will be major conflict between those in the department who are anxious to see the exploitation of a resource and those who insist that its development be strictly controlled in the interests of the environment.

A real department of the environment should be able to set national standards and co-ordinate enforcement activities. For that reason, I think the government has made a blunder with respect to its proposals in this part of the bill. I repeat that I am not objecting to the establishment of a department of the environment. We should have such a department but it should supervise all the activities of government connected with environmental matters, including fisheries and forestry, water resources and our Arctic areas. To exclude supervision over our Arctic areas from the responsibilities of this department does not make sense.

Only recently we passed an Arctic pollution bill, but responsibility for it is not being transferred to the proposed new department. Our northern territories comprise over 40 per cent of our land mass, but control in this area will still rest with the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. A better name for the new department proposed in this bill would be the department of renewable resources. While I am critical of the fact that we are not moving far enough, I must say that in this legislation we have moved further toward pollution control than we have in any other legislation on our statute books.

Canada has an opportunity to take a worldwide lead in dealing with environmental problems. Again, I repeat that we will never adequately solve our pollution problems, or those of the world, until we realize there are three main things linked closely together and which cannot be separated. We may make some progress in some fields, but we will never do a thorough job of pollution control unless we look into these three aspects and their relation to environmental pollution.

● (3:40 p.m.)

One deals with population planning. I am thinking not only in terms of Canada but of the world. We can cut the worldwide pollution rate in half, and yet if the population doubles, there will be as much pollution as there is today, and possibly more. We have to tie our plans to the plans of the United Nations and of other international agencies.

Then, we come to resources. Again, exploitation of resources is linked extremely closely with pollution problems. In the future, I foresee a department of environment coping with this type of resource development and the allocation of our raw materials. One matter which