

weeks but as a result of debate in the committee both on this bill and previously when the committee presented a report on the question of the Arctic and the preservation of its ecology. In the same committee only last night during discussion of the bill which has to do with territorial lands in the Arctic, the whole question of the necessity for protecting the delicate ecology of the north was once again to the fore. So, for a number of reasons, the bill would be strengthened and improved by the inclusion of this particular provision in it. I would like to point to one or two of them.

• (4:30 p.m.)

One of the factors that has influenced me in considering this to be an appropriate amendment to put forward is that this bill does not, as is usually the case with bills, designate any particular minister of the government as the responsible minister. We know that the bill was introduced by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) and, in some respects, I assume he will have responsibility for its administration. However, as the discussion developed in the committee, it became apparent that in effect this is a bill involving multiple jurisdictions. It was made apparent that not only the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development but the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Davis), to name only two others, will be involved in certain aspects of the bill's implementation. This makes it evident that there can be some confusion with regard to the direction of any appropriate research programs that are required to implement the purposes of the bill.

It was argued in the committee that the government is doing research in various fields relating to the Arctic, and some members in the committee suggested that this amendment was not necessary. But I suggest this amendment would simply give a direction to the cabinet as a whole, which is responsible for this bill in a way that it is not responsible for the administration of many bills, that it should so arrange the research programs of the federal government as to make sure that an adequate proportion of them are specifically directed to the various aspects of the problems that will arise from the dangers of pollution in the Arctic as our exploitation of its resources increases, and as the number of people travelling over its land, waters and ice, increases.

That is one very legitimate reason for having this kind of proposal mentioned in the

*Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act*

bill. It is drafted, and it was deliberately put in this way, so as to enable the government to use not only all of the research facilities that are directly under the jurisdiction of the federal government but also those that are available in universities and other institutions across the country. I am sure the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development cannot quarrel with that aspect of the proposal because he, himself, has indicated to us, in connection with the bill we have currently under discussion in the committee, the fact that he did draw a team of researchers from various universities to advise him in setting out the ecological boundaries of the various regions of the Arctic.

I could mention that the standing committee, in its report to the House, specifically recommended that an appropriate program of research be undertaken by the government in connection with Arctic problems. This has been referred to a number of times in discussions and debates in this House. I will not go into the details of the committee's recommendations because I am sure the minister and other members are well aware of what they are, but I do think this is another reason why it is appropriate to propose that a specific reference to research be put into the bill.

We have a number of research agencies within the ambit of the federal government. I think the existing body which is most pertinent, when one considers the question of maintaining the ecology of the waters of the Arctic, is the Fisheries Research Board. There are other areas, such as the transportation aspects of the bill, where this Board would not be appropriate. But none the less, Mr. Speaker, I mention this because I think we have in existence a long-standing example of what a specific research body, attached to a certain aspect of the activity of the government, can accomplish. More than once in this House I have made reference to the kind of effective work that has been done by the Fisheries Research Board, and how it has increased our knowledge of what is required for the proper management of our fisheries resources. This I suggest, Mr. Speaker, provides a very good example of what is required in respect to the effective implementation of the aims and purposes of this bill.

I have proposed the insertion of this clause in the bill in this particular place for a particular reason. If this amendment carries, it will immediately precede the portion of the bill which has a heading "Pollution Prevention Officers." These will be the people in the