

*Government Organization*

that I heartily endorse the two amendments. I should like to speak about them together in order to save time.

**Mr. Laing:** The Yukon is not going to like you either.

• (4:00 p.m.)

**Mr. Dinsdale:** Mr. Chairman, I should like to speak to the two amendments because had I had the opportunity last evening to speak on clause 15, I would have pointed out that under the terms of the omnibus bill now before us the ministerial responsibilities which come under the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources now are rapidly withering away. As the Prime Minister himself has indicated, the responsibilities of the minister of northern development will be those of a provincial premier. This means that the former important responsibility for national planning of resource development, which was emphasized by prime minister Louis St. Laurent, has been left out in no-man's land to a certain extent. Therefore I heartily agree with the hon. member for Kamloops that in view of the transition taking place under this legislation it should be spelled out in no uncertain terms that the minister of energy, mines and resources should carry on the responsibility for national planning in the resource area which under the former act was delegated to the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources.

I say this because I think the minister of resources has not realized he is assuming a very important responsibility which only recently has been assumed by the federal government. In a speech in Toronto over the week end the minister of resources dealt with national resource planning in the realm of water resources. My attention was drawn to a significant editorial in the *Toronto Star* of yesterday, May 30, under the heading "Stand Up and Lead, Mr. Pepin". This article scored the minister's speech on national responsibility for water resources for failing to demonstrate the initiative and leadership which is required if Canada is to continue to cope with the crisis in renewable resource development which is now on our doorstep and has been for the past decade or so. So, contrary to what the minister of northern development has said, I heartily support the viewpoint expressed by the hon. member for Kamloops.

Others have given consideration to the anomalies and discrepancies which appear with reference to the administration of the

[Mr. Dinsdale.]

continental shelf and, to use the learned phrase of the hon. member for Kamloops, the bifurcation of responsibility in this regard. Mr. Maurice Western, writing in the *Winnipeg Free Press*, has drawn attention to this problem in precisely the same terms as the hon. member for Kamloops did this afternoon. Here is how this distinguished journalist points up the problem:

Mr. Pearson's original idea, evidently, was that Mr. Pepin would be concerned with matters national in character and not relating to any particular province or territory. The 60th parallel would be a convenient dividing line and Mr. Pepin would take over the controversial business of resources on the continental shelf.

But the problem was not so simple and Mr. Pearson ended with a "purely pragmatic" solution, which he explained in his somewhat laborious speech of Tuesday. He seems to have thought at one point that Mr. Laing might function as a "dry land" and Mr. Pepin as a "wet land" minister. But nothing is much wetter than the north, especially the Arctic archipelago. It was decided that Mr. Laing would have charge of this area on the theory that it is land "interlaced" with water while Mr. Pepin, incredibly, would be responsible for the islands of the bay because they represent "exactly the opposite situation."

Thus "to avoid confusion" the line is to run "substantially along the south coast of Southampton and Baffin island." In fact, however, the islands south of the line are part of the Northwest Territories. This is a ridiculous situation.

So others are concerned with the problem we are attempting to solve through this amendment this afternoon. A short time ago the minister interjected a suggestion that the hon. member for Yukon would not be in sympathy with the sentiments of this amendment and that the present comments I am making would not go down very well with the people of the Yukon Territory. It already has been spelled out that the administration of the mainland in the north would not be disturbed at all by the amendment. What we are endeavouring to do is to rationalize the anomaly outlined in the comments made by Mr. Maurice Western in his article in the *Winnipeg Free Press* of May 25.

If it would serve the minister's purpose that he assume total responsibility for the continental shelf, that would get around the difficulty in precisely the same way as the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Kamloops; in other words, he would have the total responsibility. I am sure my hon. friend from the Yukon would be heartily in sympathy with this viewpoint. What we are asking is that the confusion which is obvious at least to most members of the house and to distinguished members of the press gallery shall be ended in one way or another. Either