

On the other hand, if it is intended to include the area, let us make absolutely sure about it and do so specifically. If the government does not like my amendment, let it bring in some other appropriate amendment to cover the point I have been trying to make. Will the government bring in an amendment to cover the point I have been trying to make?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Chairman, if the purpose of the amendment is to ensure that jurisdiction in matters of pollution in respect of the Yukon and Northwest Territories is covered by this wording, the answer is, yes it is. If one says explicitly that this must include the Yukon and Northwest Territories, one would also have to say yes to a plea on the part of the representatives of Newfoundland for that province to be mentioned. And, if you are to include Newfoundland explicitly, what about Ontario?

Mr. MacEachen: Why not include Cape Breton?

Mr. Drury: I have received a representation about Cape Breton. Unless the hon. member feels that the Yukon and Northwest Territories are excluded, he perhaps will accept my assurance that they are included. They are not excluded, and the fact that they are not excluded does not seem to me to be a good reason to mention them explicitly.

Mr. Harding: Mr. Chairman, may I ask another question? If the minister does not want to mention the Northwest Territories and the Yukon area by name, will he include the land use regulations in the schedule which assigns environmental problems to the jurisdiction of the department?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I did not get the exact significance of the question. Unquestionably, under this statute the co-ordinator, the man who has responsibility for pollution control, will have authority vested in him except in those areas where it is expressly vested in another minister.

Mr. Rose: Mr. Chairman, may I speak to that point, which is of concern to all of us. Responsibility for fighting pollution in various areas of Canada is vested in different ministers. The government gained much ground in dealing with Arctic sovereignty on the ground that the environment of that part of our country was particularly sensitive to the threat of pollution. Yet I see that responsibility for this particular area, according to the schedule, is not to be under the minister designated but will remain under the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. This is the kind of splitting up of jurisdictional responsibilities that worries us. We are concerned because it may mean buck-passing and people never really being certain who has responsibility for control in this very vital area. If the ecology of the area of the Arctic over which Canada has declared sovereignty is particularly sensitive, it follows that the ecology of the lands immediately south of that where a great amount of development will take place, often in the absence of any control, is equally sensitive. This area should also be covered by this bill. This is the whole point of the exercise.

Government Organization Act, 1970

The Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question? The question is on the amendment.

Amendment (Mr. Harding) negatived: Yeas, 17; nays, 39.

The Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

• (3:20 p.m.)

Mr. McCutcheon: I wish to ask the minister one question. Why is meteorology included in subclause (d) of clause 5?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member is as well aware as I am that meteorology, in the present state of the art, is principally concerned with the measurement of air movement and, to a lesser degree, air quality, as well as an attempt to forecast the weather. In this sense, it is merely a measuring rather than a control device. The apparatus we now have is not for the purpose of regulating, but merely measuring and forecasting. One of the agencies which will be largely concerned with these measurements and forecasts is the department of the environment. I hope it will be able to undertake measures designed to improve the quality of the air. In order to do this, there must, of course, be some great familiarity with the operation of the medium in which the department is interested.

Mr. Harding: Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment to clause 5. I move:

That clause 5 of Bill C-207 be amended by adding thereto next after line 37 on page 2 a new sub-section (h)
(h) pollution prevention and control

This is a new subclause, pollution prevention and control. The President of the Treasury Board objected to knocking out some of the phraseology in the bill presently before us. One way of partially getting around this problem would be to add this new subclause. The legislation would then directly state that pollution prevention and control would be under this department.

Perhaps this amendment will be more acceptable to the government. There is certainly nothing wrong with it. This is the reason for the establishment of the new department. The amendment will cover a lot of the sins omitted in the present legislation. I urge members of all parties to seriously consider this amendment. We need this provision in the legislation. We have enough trouble now with pollution. There is absolutely no reason why a simple amendment like this should not be accepted by the government.

Mr. Drury: Mr. Chairman, it will be seen from examining the bill that the words "pollution" and "pollution control" are not used. In Canada and elsewhere we are faced with the problem of precisely understanding what is meant by the term "pollution". It means different things to different people. In order to avoid this difficulty and still give effect to the purpose to which this amendment is allegedly directed, clause 5 (e) expresses this purpose, but in perhaps more precise terms. Clause 5 (e) reads:

the protection and enhancement of the quality of the natural environment, including water, air and soil quality;