

Environmental Affairs

Canada also tabled, well before the conference, a declaration on the human environment consisting of legal principles analogous to the UN declarations of principles on outer space and human rights. We were the first country to do so. Some states opposed the introduction of legal principles into the Stockholm declaration, but we persisted.

• (1410)

The declaration on the human environment approved at Stockholm last Friday contained the principles introduced by Canada, based on the Trail Smelter case, namely, the duty of every state not to pollute the environment of other states, the duty not to pollute the sea, the air and outer space beyond the jurisdiction of any state, and the duty to develop the law concerning liability and compensation in respect of such damage.

A further consequential principle flowing from these three, the duty of states to consult with or notify states of activities which may have an environmental impact on them, received close to unanimous support but was referred to the twenty-seventh United Nations General Assembly for further consideration.

If I had to identify the area in which I believe our delegation made the greatest contribution, Mr. Speaker, it would have to be on the marine side. Freedom of the high seas must not include the freedom to pollute. That freedom, or licence if you like, has been shaken by the Stockholm Conference. Further deliberations at the international level, including the Law of the Sea Conference in 1973, will be necessary in order to spell this principle out in some detail. But the basic theme is there. Thanks to Canadians, it has been expressed in legal language. Its elaboration in actual practice now only seems to be a matter of time.

Rather than take up further the time of the House, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask your permission to table two documents. One lists, in some detail, the marine principles which Canada initially proposed and which were subsequently endorsed by the conference at Stockholm. The other is a copy of the statement which I made at the opening of the conference and which summarizes the position our delegation took throughout its deliberations. Could I please have permission of the House to table these two documents for inclusion in today's *Hansard*, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: For text of documents referred to above, see Appendices A and B.*]

Mr. Davis: That completes my statement on motions.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, perhaps the best summary of the outcome of the Stockholm Conference appeared on the editorial page of the *Christian Science Monitor* on Monday, June 19. The lead editorial concluded with the words:

To rally all the participating nations in support of the conference proposals at a meeting lasting only 11 days was something of a tour de force. Much of the conference's success was due to the

[Mr. Davis.]

extraordinary skill and untiring energy of its chief organizer, Maurice Strong of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Aiken: The editorial continues:

But the conference could only have succeeded if the desire to succeed was universal.

The measure of universality achieved at Stockholm is a measure of man's new concern for the future of his planet and of the whole human family.

It was heartening to know that efforts to use the conference for advancement of side issues which might have wrecked it were unsuccessful. The nations of the world have recognized formally the prime concern about global pollution of the oceans, the atmosphere and the earth. The United Nations Organization has not often been able to bring about joint and universal declarations on a major world problem. We can all join with the minister in this brief glow of satisfaction in a successful conference.

But, of course, agreements on principle are a long cry from successful action. We have learned that here in this Parliament where we have had ringing declarations of principle on environmental matters, followed by hopeful legislation and then inability or failure to carry it out. It is even more difficult in the world body where so many divergent interests are involved. It will require constant and continual pressure to carry out the principles agreed upon and we should continue to support Maurice Strong in these efforts.

It was unfortunate that our delegation brought some adverse criticism on its initial abstention on the issue of nuclear testing. However, the subsequent change of position rectified our international standing on the final vote, and the Canadian delegation is generally reported as contributing actively to the conference. While we are glad that our delegation was in evidence, Canadians would really have accepted nothing less.

In conclusion may I say that in view of the activities of Canadians at the Stockholm Conference, outlined by the minister in his statement, it is incumbent on him to enlist the support of his colleagues in an active anti-pollution effort in Canada. We cannot preach abroad with any reality unless we act at home.

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, we welcome the minister back from the conference in Stockholm and we congratulate him for the good press he received. The members of this House are very eager and anxious to hear and see how the minister's successful diplomatic manoeuvring will be translated into action at the international level.

We welcome the statement of accomplishments and the apparent accord of the United Nations on many important aspects of our global environment. Our party fully endorses and applauds the general position taken by the minister and the Canadian delegation on a number of important international environmental issues. We wish, however, that this apparent leadership would extend to those major environmental problems facing us in our own nation. The leadership, planning and action required to implement positive programs are sadly lacking at the federal level in Canada. In my opinion, sound and positive