

be done. At page 8 of the committee report there appears the following paragraph:

The committee was unimpressed with efforts made to pinpoint the exact location of the Pan Arctic barge sinkings which might have permitted ascertaining any subsequent oil pollution and would have provided useful scientific data on the dissipation rate of substantial quantities of diesel fuel in low temperature water and more important, information on the effect of the oil on the marine life of the waters affected.

Note this passage, Mr. Speaker:

The interdepartmental committee which was established by the government, to deal with water pollution disasters after the Santa Barbara incident, did not bother to send a representative north to investigate the extent of the oil pollution resulting from the barge sinking. In your committee's view, the attention which the interdepartmental oil pollution emergency committee gave to the barge sinking incident was totally inadequate and unsatisfactory.

I cite this as the view of the committee as to how inadequate is the present activity of the government in this area in relation to the kind of responsibilities that will be imposed upon pollution prevention officers under the terms of this bill. At page 9 of the committee proceedings the report of the committee reads:

Your committee is of the opinion that there is a serious lack of knowledge, worldwide, as to the destructive effects of hydrocarbons and particularly as to the effect of hydrocarbon pollution in Arctic waters.

The committee goes on to recommend that appropriate agencies of the government move immediately to conduct research in the Arctic to gather information on the whole question of dealing with hydrocarbons in cold waters, on the toxicity of various hydrocarbons to plant and animal life, and on methods for control of oil spills.

• (9:20 p.m.)

It may be true that we are garnering a certain amount of knowledge and information from the emergency situation at Chedabucto Bay, but this certainly was not in the minds of members of the committee as the sort of thing that should be involved in the research they proposed. If we are to move seriously toward enabling ourselves to control pollution from possible spills of waste from ships or as a result of economic resource exploitation either in the petroleum field or, for that matter, in the mining field in the Arctic, I feel the government should heed the recommendations contained in the committee's report.

The committee goes on to say that it recommends continued research by the Department

Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Bill

of Fisheries and Forestry to establish the extent of the fisheries potential of Arctic waters. This matter was raised by some members of the Committee on Fisheries and Forestry the other day when we had before us officials of the Fisheries Research Board. The questioning by members of the committee made quite apparent that the Fisheries Research Board of Canada has a mere pittance allocated to it for research work on marine life and the whole potential of the Arctic fisheries resources.

I submit that if this bill is to mean anything, if on its passage it is to result in something that will gain recognition of Canada in the international community, if it is to contribute to the evolvement of international law of the sea, and if Canada is to enhance rather than weaken its position in the international community as a result of pioneering this type of legislation, the government of Canada will have to take seriously the recommendations the committee put forward unanimously in its report and will have to bring before this Parliament suitable proposals for the spending of necessary funds in order to carry out this type of work.

If this is not done, I suggest the passage of this bill will be a mere echo of fine words. If that should be the situation it would be highly desirable that the Arctic go back to sleep for another 50 years, as the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin suggested it might. Unless we are prepared to tackle this job, the Arctic would be much safer asleep than awake, with the kind of activity the industrial age and the industrial attitudes of the inhabitants of the North American continent will impose on it.

I am inclined to share the hope expressed by the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin that the Arctic will not go back to sleep. But unless the government of Canada is prepared to put much more muscle into its activities, in the fields which have been highlighted in the committee's report, than so far it has indicated it is prepared to do, I submit that perhaps we might as well forget about all this talk of pollution control in the Arctic.

Mr. Nesbitt: I am glad to see you finally agree with me.

Mr. Barnett: I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by referring to the remarks of the hon. member for Oxford, who is so interested in my remarks, when he implied that as a solution we simply develop a large Canadian navy and