Government Organization Act, 1970

ly limited. What we need is legislation under the Criminal Code of Canada, making it a criminal offence to pollute the air, the water and the soil of Canada. What we need is a national pollution control commission with power to set national standards, with power to work through local pollution control boards and to see that those standards are enforced. We need a national pollution control fund to provide grants and loans to municipalities and to industry so that the treatment facilities can be installed at the earliest possible time. Unless the government is prepared to put teeth into this legislation, teeth which are notoriously absent from the Canada Water Act, the new minister of the environment will find himself just as helpless and just as ineffectual as has the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources in dealing with this job.

May I deal with another department that the minister referred to this afternoon, that is, the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources.

Mr. Hogarth: What about the constitutional problem? Tell us about the constitutional problem with regard to pollution control.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member was here when the debate was taking place on the Canada Water Act, he heard this question dealt with very adequately by my colleague, the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin). No one doubts for a moment that this Parliament has the right to deal with legislation referring to the Criminal Code.

Mr. Hogarth: Yes, but that will throw men out of work.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) has the floor and he should be permitted to make his contribution.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, whenever the Liberal party are caught in a jam for doing nothing, their first excuse is the Constitution. When you chase them out of that bomb proof shelter, then they say you are going to throw men out of work. You will not throw men out of work; you will put men to work. If men are employed installing the necessary treatment facilities, that will provide employment. There is no need to put people out of work. Installing sewage treatment facilities and affluent recycling equipment in the factories will put people out of work. The trouble is that hon, gentlemen opposite want to fight pollution with rhetoric and loquacity instead of with action. This is typical Liberal policy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): If fancy words, task forces and reports would solve problems, hon. gentlemen opposite would have solved them long ago. But whenever they face a problem all they do is trot out excuses. They must have a factory in the Liberal party for manufacturing excuses. Excuses are the only thing they have produced in abundance to date.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): This afternoon the President of the Treasury Board made reference to the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, which is referred to in this legislation. Again I insist that setting up and defining the areas of activity for this department will not achieve any worth while results unless we get a clearcut statement of policy. If the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources has a policy, it has certainly been kept under wraps. I think we have a right during this debate to hear a statement from the government as to the rationale behind the development of our resources.

• (9:10 p.m.)

Is the sole purpose of denuding ourselves of both renewable and non-renewable resources the supplying to other countries of raw material to feed their factories? If it is, we have only to look at our own financial picture for the last 12 months. In 1970 we broke all records for exports, yet the per capita income of Canadians hardly moved upward. In the last half of the year it declined slightly. With all our production and all our sales overseas, we have not enriched our own people, for the very obvious reason that the price of raw materials on world markets has lagged behind the price of durable goods, and because the primary extraction industries are highly capital-oriented. They have a low labour content; jobs are to be found not in the extraction industries but in the processing and manufacturing industries. Is it the policy of our Department of Energy, Mines and Resources to export our raw materials as soon as possible and in as raw a state as possible, or have we a policy of progressively processing more and more of our raw materials in this country? If we have such a policy, it certainly has not been outlined by this government.

This afternoon the President of the Treasury Board said that we have been able to obtain access for greater amounts of oil to the United States market. Yet we have heard no statement of policy as to the relationship between our gas and oil exports. There has been no clear policy statement as to the energy requirements for Canadian development and growth and what is surplus to our need.

It is rather interesting to note that almost every American who makes a speech, whether it be the Federal Power Commissioner or the Secretary of the Interior, keeps talking about a continental energy policy between Canada and the United States. Yet when I ask the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources about this, he says that there is no continental energy policy. The Americans seem to know about this policy, but the Canadians do not. Even when they attended the conference here in Ottawa, the secretary of the interior said, "We are pressing for a continental energy policy between Canada and the United States." It is strange that only the Americans knew about this continental energy policy and that Canadian participants in the discussion have never heard about it. Last Thursday, when I asked the Acting Prime Minister about this continental energy policy, he said there is no such policy. He said, of course, that there is co-ordination between Canada and the United States on energy matters.