

*Canadian Position on Environment*

approach to preserving a healthy and proper environment for living creatures.

The international aspects of this problem are very clear. For example, Canada is faced with the problem of pollution of the Great Lakes and the Pacific, while to people living in Europe the need for cleaning up the Rhine River is obvious. This presumably explains the interest NATO has been taking in recent times in problems of the environment. It is obvious that the concern is world-wide. It is not only confined to our relations with our neighbours, to our polluting our neighbours or our neighbours polluting us. It is obviously a world-wide problem.

The minister did not say anything about what he hopes will come out of the conference by way of an ongoing institution, if anything. Will this conference be the end of the matter so far as a global effort is concerned, or does the government of Canada have some other expectation? Is Canada going to push for a continuing institutional arrangement? The minister did not mention this.

**Mr. Guay (St. Boniface):** You tell us.

**Mr. Stanfield:** With all due respect to the hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Guay), I have not yet got myself into the position where I can speak for the government, although I expect to be able to do so very shortly.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** Are you planning on crossing the floor?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Mr. Speaker, I promise you I will not touch on any other sensitive areas. The minister did not say anything about the make-up of the Canadian delegation. I have heard reports about this. I will be disappointed if the Canadian delegation does not contain some representatives of the various parties in the House. I think it is of considerable importance that the Canadian delegation include some all-party representation.

The minister expressed hope that we can achieve both economic growth and preservation of our environment. I accept that. I believe we must have both if we are going to make any meaningful attack on poverty in our country and in the rest of the world. It does not really take us very far simply to say this because, as the years go by, we will have to ask ourselves increasingly how much growth there should be and what balance we want to have.

The minister mentioned some problems that are difficult enough themselves but are relatively simple, such as the management of forests on the basis of continuing yield and so on. These are goals which we have not yet achieved. They are important but relatively they are child's play compared with some of the world-wide problems relating to economic growth and preservation of the environment that we will have to face more and more in the future.

There have been suggestions that the conference in Stockholm may be disrupted, either by some of those in

[Mr. Stanfield.]

attendance or by others visiting Stockholm at the time. I express the hope that this will not take place and that the conference will proceed in a very constructive way.

In addition to expressing the hope, as the minister has, and that we can make progress in achieving international standards, it is important we recognize what we can do on our own by way of setting standards. In this respect I think we might make a much more determined effort than the government has made to achieve, determine and announce national standards with regard to air and water in our own country. When we do that our words will carry a little more conviction when we talk about international standards.

**Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, having read the minister's statement at about the same time as he was making it here, I came to the immediate conclusion that the hon. gentleman, representing the government of Canada, is really engaged in the practice of establishing double standards in relation to the environment. He talks in glowing terms about hopes for the future, but when one weighs these words against the abysmal record of his own department in its activities here in Canada, they sound pretty hollow.

I am sure we all hope that valuable results will flow from the Stockholm conference next week. I do not decry it in any way. But I point out that concern about the environment is not the monopoly of any one group in this House, and some provision should be made for representatives from all parties in this chamber to attend, if not as participants, then as observers at that conference.

Regrettably, in Canada—this is why the minister's words ring hollow—we approach this subject on the basis of how much pollution the environment can stand instead of determining to control and restrict pollution to as great an extent as possible. The government establishes standards, to the extent it has established them, and then says: let us pollute as much as we possibly can up to that limit.

**Mr. Davis:** That is not our approach.

**Mr. Howard (Skeena):** During the question period the minister can ask me questions about anything I have to say and I will be glad reply to him.

The minister says it is necessary to argue strongly in favour of international standards while at the same time rejecting the concept of national standards within Canada, as he did vehemently when, for example, the Canada Water Act was being debated in the House. He says, for example, that we must not kill fish or destroy vegetation or wildlife. That is good propaganda. But on November 3 of last year the same minister put into effect pulp and paper mill effluent regulations which permit a kill of fish in waters into which pulp mills pump their effluent up to 20 per cent. How can one hold such a concept here at home while expecting people on the international scene to endorse the programs the minister is advocating?

**An hon. Member:** Stick to the facts.

**Mr. Howard (Skeena):** Hon. members may not like what I am saying, but please listen. I am trying to reflect the