

where even now fishing is banned? If any fish are caught in those rivers they have to be destroyed. We have to buy that product and destroy it. How are we going to go about cleaning up this mess which we have allowed industry to create over the years?

I move, seconded by the hon. member for Regina Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin):

That clause 6, subsection (a) of Bill C-207 be amended by adding thereto on page 3, line 1, the word "national", so that line 1 will read "or adoption of national objectives or standards".

**The Chairman:** It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair.

At one o'clock the committee took recess.

#### AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 2 p.m.

**The Acting Chairman (Mr. Richard):** Order. When the committee rose at one o'clock we were considering clause 6, with an amendment thereto proposed by the hon. member for Kootenay West.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Chairman, may I ask the President of the Treasury Board if the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry will be here this afternoon? If we are going to approve the granting of certain powers to him, including authority to prepare certain programs, it seems we ought to have some information from him as to what those programs are.

It is true that the minister made an excellent speech in general terms on the question of pollution. But it was one of those speeches about motherhood and apple pie with which everyone agrees. No one likes pollution, and everybody thinks the environment has to be protected and the quality of life ought to be improved. Surely, the committee is entitled to some information as to what programs the government has in mind, what standards the minister proposes to set, and what general objectives he expects to attain. This kind of information can only be given to the committee by that minister.

May I also say that when we come to deal with Part II of the bill dealing with the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources we will certainly insist upon that department's minister being here, but that is merely an aside. Have we any hope that the minister of fisheries will be here this afternoon to deal with some of the questions raised by my colleague?

**Mr. McGrath:** Before the minister responds to that very important question, Mr. Chairman, may I say I think it is impossible for us to discuss this part of the bill or any proposed amendments without the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry being here. We experienced the same situation a few days ago, and at that time the President of the Treasury Board accepted a very useful

#### *Government Organization Act, 1970*

suggestion to defer discussion of the amendment until the minister was present. I would ask him to take the same suggestion under consideration today. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, we could defer discussion on this part of the bill until the minister of fisheries returns, because I do not see how we can usefully discuss this part of the bill without him, and I say this with great respect to the President of the Treasury Board.

**Mr. Drury:** Mr. Chairman, obviously the passage of the bill would be very great assisted, and hon. members would be better informed, were the minister here. Unfortunately, I learned during the lunch hour that it will not be possible for the minister in question to get here this afternoon. If it is the feeling of the committee that it is important to have him here, then perhaps we should stand the remaining clauses of this part of the bill.

However, in respect of the requests for an indication of the standards that the minister proposes to set and the kind of programs he is going to have, I might just comment that this may not be an orderly way to proceed. What we are examining here is a structure within which the minister will be able to perform his duties, and we should be looking at the appropriateness of the structure rather than undertaking an examination of the programs.

The purpose of the legislation is to enable the minister to formulate, and present in the usual way, programs for dealing with the problems we face. The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands has said that the minister has already given a speech in which he indicated his convictions and beliefs generally. This legislation, coupled with the putting forward of programs in the usual way in the estimates, subject to review by a standing committee in detail, seems to me to be the orderly way in which to proceed toward the programs and an examination of them. If, however, it is felt that the committee could be substantially assisted by having the minister present, perhaps we could stand these clauses rather than waste time.

• (2:10 p.m.)

I might say in respect of the amendment now proposed, and I do not think, perhaps that the minister concerned needs to speak about it, that the present purpose of clause 6(a) is to initiate programs and to seek the adoption of standards and objectives in relation to pollution. A number of aspects of this environmental problem are exclusively matters for provincial jurisdiction. By adding the word "national" as has been proposed by the amendment, we should, in my view, considerably narrow the field of activity of the minister concerned. As the wording now stands, he is instructed by Parliament to concern himself with an endeavour to promote objectives and standards relating to provincial jurisdictions as well as to the federal jurisdiction. In my view, adding the word "national" would pre-empt or remove him from that particular field. I am not sure if the hon. member had that in mind. I gathered from his remarks that he wished for an extension of responsibilities in relation to jurisdiction rather than a narrowing.