

adequately the type of speech that my colleague for South Shore will make.

● (8:10 p.m.)

As I say, there is perhaps an advantage in taking some of the cooks away from the pollution broth and putting one minister to work on it, but we in the official opposition, largely through the speeches and work of the hon. member for South Western Nova, will seek to strengthen the provisions in this omnibus bill. One thing that is obviously needed is money. We have all sorts of programs with glittering titles going around in the pollution field, but when you look at them you realize there is nothing with which to make the programs work. I hope the minister of this new department will be given money with which to work in the field of pollution. The suspicion grows in my mind that by setting up a new department and by putting an old department within it, the money from the old department may mislead the public into thinking that a new war on pollution will be waged, whereas nothing will be done about it at all. That will be a matter for my hon. friend from South Western Nova to develop.

There is some satisfaction on our side that this approach is being taken by the government, that is, the establishment of one department. This is something we have suggested. The first position paper put out last year under the auspices of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) dealt with the question of pollution and one of the policies set forth in it advocated the following:

Stepping up the flow of interdepartmental, federal-provincial and international activity and co-operation by creating a Department of Resources and Environmental Management through which all major environmental federal statutes will be administered, and which will become the central core of the federal anti-pollution program.

That day may have come. We hope it has come with the establishment of the department of the environment. Let there be no misunderstanding about this, though: we want not only a department of the environment; we want a body that will get in and do battle with pollution. We shall not be satisfied if we simply engage in a semantic exercise which does not tackle one of the great problems confronting Canadians today.

As I say, my hon. friend from South Shore will be dealing with the swallowing up of the Department of Fisheries by the new department, lamenting, I suspect, the loss of identity of one of the long-established departments of government and pointing out that many fisheries problems are still without solution affecting both inshore and offshore fishermen whose fishing grounds are raked by those vacuums of the sea, the great foreign trawlers. It seems odd that in a measure which creates five ministers of state there should be no room, apparently, for a minister of fisheries, one of our time-honoured Canadian posts. This seems strange to me, especially when there are a multitude of fisheries questions crying out for solution and when we consider that the new minister of the environment will have his hands full fighting the pollution battle and little time to spend dealing with fisheries questions.

#### *Government Organization Act, 1970*

I suspect, too, that the new minister of the environment, the present Minister of Fisheries and Forestry, will find himself in a strange position. Part of his attention should be given to the question of the output of renewable resources. At the same time, he is expected to deal with pollution. It seems to me there is some conflict between production on the one hand and control of pollution on the other, so the poor gentleman may develop schizophrenia regarding his duties.

I have mentioned that it is Conservative policy to develop a federal department whose main concern would be environmental control and management. May I point out to the minister—I am sure this will be followed up by my hon. friend from South Western Nova—that there is no power which will give the department of the environment authority to enter into agreements with the provinces. The bill speaks of dealing between the federal government and the provincial governments, it is true, but it does not go so far as to enable agreements to be made between them, as I understand the legislation. I believe the new minister may co-operate with the provinces or agencies thereof as set forth in clause 6(b). This, to us, is another weakness of this measure.

Another portion of the bill provides for the setting up of ministers of state. We have considerable reservations about this part of the legislation. I assume, for example, that a ministerial post could have been established to oversee the operations of Information Canada if the necessary authority were there at the time Information Canada was established. Under the legislation the governor in council would be empowered to appoint the ministers and to assign duties to them.

It is true Parliament gets on the scene when it comes to voting the minister money to carry out his work, but that is something like holding a post mortem; the corpse is laid out before you and you are simply asked to approve what was done or put the best possible face on what went wrong. You do not have the opportunity in such a set-up to say, "This is a good thing and should be encouraged", or "This is a bad thing and should never have been allowed to get off the ground."

My hon. friend from Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), who is away on parliamentary duties at the present time, will I am sure be speaking later on the rather intricate relationships between the Crown, ministerial appointments and Parliament in general. I am sure this will be part of the topic he will tackle.

Then we come to the question of appointments not only of ministers of state but of Parliamentary Secretaries, whose number is to be increased. It is calculated, believe it or not, that in the run of a four-year Parliament 138 members supporting the government could have a paid position of some kind with the exception of committees chairmen. This is almost 90 per cent of the strength of the present crowd supporting the government of the day. This is a figure that makes the mind reel. Twenty-eight of these would be members of the cabinet. Ten would be ministers of state, five being appointed for each of the two-year periods in a Parliament lasting four years. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has already