

*Government Organization Act, 1970*

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

**The Chairman:** The question is on the amendment to clause 6. I will read the amendment because it is now three or four days since the committee last dealt with it.

• (4:00 p.m.)

The hon. member for Kootenay West moved:

That clause 6, subsection (a) of Bill C-207 be amended by adding thereto on page 3, line 1, the word "national", so that line 1 will read "or adoption of national objectives or standards".

The question is on the amendment.

Amendment (Mr. Harding) negatived: Yeas, 11; Nays, 34.

**The Chairman:** I declare the amendment lost.

Clause agreed to.

**Mr. Harding:** Mr. Chairman, I think clause 5 has been stood. I am wondering whether you intend to go back to that clause now.

**The Chairman:** If hon. members agree, we might deal with clause 7 and then go back to clause 5. There is an amendment to clause 5 before the committee. Is it agreed that we deal with clause 7, and then go back to clause 5?

**Mr. Crouse:** Before clause 7 is carried, may I ask if it is the intention of the committee to go back not only to clause 5, to which there is an amendment, but also to clauses 1 and 2 which have been stood? The hon. member for St. John's East has an amendment that he wishes to move to clause 2 of the bill. So, from a procedural point of view I should like to have some guidance as to whether we will deal with that amendment this afternoon or whether it is the intention of the committee to proceed with the entire bill before going back to clause 2.

**The Chairman:** It has been the Chair's understanding that once we dispose of clause 7 we might go back to clause 5 to which there is an amendment, and then proceed to clause 2. We would then have completed that part, subject to returning to clause 1 later. I understand that, in the normal course, we would complete the other parts of the bill and return to clause 1 at the end.

**Mr. Baldwin:** Has not clause 2 been stood?

**The Chairman:** The suggestion I am making to the committee is that we deal with clause 5, when clause 7 is carried, and then go back to clause 2. Clause 1 relates to the whole bill, so we would deal with it as the last item. When we dispose of clause 2, we will have disposed of this part of the bill. Is this course agreeable?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

On clause 7—*Annual Report*.

**The Chairman:** Is clause 7 agreed to?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Clause agreed to.

On Clause 5—*Duties of Minister*

[Mr. Harding.]

**The Chairman:** An amendment was moved to clause 5. The hon. member for Kootenay West moved:

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

**Mr. Harding:** When the clause was stood several days ago, the President of the Treasury Board indicated that the government wished to see whether or not it could accept the amendment. Possibly the minister could indicate whether or not it is acceptable, and if it is, I do not think there will be much more discussion on it. This is the position in which we found ourselves last time the clause was debated, and possibly we should hear from the minister now.

**Mr. Davis:** The proposed subclause (h) adds an additional responsibility of the minister of the environment, namely, pollution prevention and control. I believe that this, in more restrictive words, repeats much of the intent of the preceding and presently worded subclause (e), the protection and enhancement of the quality of the natural environment, including water, air and soil quality. Subclause (e) is couched in broader terms. I might also describe those terms as clearer. We talk about quality in subclause (e). In the amendment, which would add a subclause, reference is made to pollution prevention and control. I think the words "environment and quality" are more generous, more positive, than the words "pollution prevention and control". I suggest that to add this subclause is redundant and also restrictive. For that reason, I urge that the proposed amendment which would add a subclause with the words "pollution prevention and control" be rejected.

**Mr. Harding:** I moved this amendment and I will briefly outline again my reasons for doing so. I think members of the committee should realize that the bill before us, which sets up a new department of the environment, does not cover all environmental problems in the nation. I believe that this is wrong. If a department is going to deal with environmental problems, nothing should be excluded. I gave as an example a large portion of northern Canada, which is 40 per cent of the total land mass of our country. We have land use regulations for that northern area which are going to be administered by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. We have the Arctic Waters Pollution Act which establishes a pollution control zone in the Arctic area. This zone is not included in this bill. Does the minister mean to tell me that the protection of this area is not part of the job of protecting the Canadian environment? Just how nonsensical can we become? If we are tackling environmental problems, let us tackle them with a central organization about which a number of members have spoken in this debate.

We are trying to make sure that the minister has the right, for example, to move into our northern territories if pollution control and prevention are needed.

**Mr. Davis:** How does the hon. member's amendment do that?