

The minister may direct payment from the relevant fund of the reasonable costs of such environmental studies of Canada lands as he determines are necessary in order to decide whether or not to authorize exploration or development under this act or any other act of Parliament.

One of the most jarring notes is that the environmental fund is to be administered, not by the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Roberts), but by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde) and by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Munro). Such a provision perpetuates the truly stupid or, if I may say so, even malevolent approach taken by this government as far as the environment is concerned in other areas.

Funds for environmental purposes must be allocated to those who are designated by Parliament to be responsible for environmental matters. The Department of Energy, Mines and Resources is no such agency, nor is the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Clearly, if an environmental fund is to work, it should be allocated directly to two departments. The first is the Department of the Environment. Under the Government Organization Act, 1979, section 14, Parliament directed in part that the powers of the Department of the Environment should extend to and include "the co-ordination of the policies and programs of the Government of Canada respecting the preservation and enhancement of the quality of the natural environment".

The second department which should receive funding for such environmental purposes is the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. The energy initiatives envisaged by the government's recent "energy budget", including Bill C-48, will accelerate activity in the Arctic. Based on current information, much of that activity will impact directly on marine areas. That is the area which Parliament directed the Department of Fisheries and Oceans to handle. Yet, there is no mention of funding for that department either in the budget itself or in Bill C-48.

In the event the government wishes to brush this aside too quickly, let me cite one example of the perilous situation now faced by that department which might well bring them to their collective senses. The Arctic biological station at Sainte-Anne-de-Bellevue is the only government lab doing major Arctic marine biological research. Staff at the station in the fiscal year 1979-80 was reduced by over 20 per cent from the previous fiscal year and there is a further 20 per cent reduction slated for the fiscal year 1980-82.

The initial allocation of funds to the Arctic Biological Station for 1980-81 was \$270,000. However, after discounting the costs for Atlantic programs, building maintenance and services, the station was able to devote a meagre \$40,000, only \$40,000 in total, to Arctic biological studies. This represents about 17 per cent of what was available for the same Arctic projects in the fiscal year 1977-78, the last "normal" year of funding for the Station.

Last spring, just a few months ago, after questions in the House and various front-page exposés in the press, the government did manage to make an additional amount of money available, but that was only \$100,000. Arctic marine research

Canada Oil and Gas Act

in government has been eroding at an alarming rate since 1974. The Arctic research which has occurred has largely been facilitated by industrial proponents interested in oil and gas development. Such support must be commended, but it underlines federal avoidance of responsibility, both nationally and internationally, to govern development activity in the Arctic.

● (2050)

Channelling environmental funds to the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources and the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, as contemplated by Bill C-48, would serve only to further strangle the federal agencies in the execution of their major responsibilities in these matters.

The territorial governments in the north are responsible for wildlife and that responsibility carries with it the need to maintain all wildlife resources upon which native people are so dependent. So they must also be guaranteed sufficient funds to fulfil their mandate—a mandate that will surely get lost in the energy urgencies and development mentalities of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources and the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. In my view, the role of those two departments in environmental areas needs to be greatly reduced as a matter of general principle. The fact is that whole chunks of environmental policy under federal jurisdiction are within the authority of departments other than the Department of the Environment, to the point at which that Department is a secondary player and, in some cases, not even a player at all.

In no place is that more clear than, for example, the Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act, passed in 1972. It was introduced in large part to assert Canada's sovereignty north of the 60th parallel, or at least to exercise Canada's extra-territorial jurisdiction there. The main legislative purpose was to control the use of technology in the north so as to maximize the benefits and prevent a disaster. The principal thrust of that particular act was to prevent the pollution of Canadian Arctic waters from shipping, from land-based installations and from commercial activities such as oil drilling carried out on the continental shelf.

I do not want to go into detail about that act; I only want to draw a parallel between the Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act and Bill C-48 to illustrate my general point. In essence, the act prohibits, under prescribed conditions, the deposit of waste in Arctic waters, on Arctic islands and on the mainland. It emphasizes prevention, for example by providing for the appointment of pollution prevention officials and so on. It also contemplates the possibility of pollution from accidents or unforeseen causes; it provides for civil liability for damage resulting from the deposit of waste and addresses the question of clean-up costs and damages.

Even that sketchy description shows clearly the parallel between the Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act and clause 49 of Bill C-48 which deals with environmental studies. Both are, first and foremost, environmental in their purpose and thrust. Yet neither acknowledges the existence of the