

some really substantial points to criticize in respect of this bill, mainly because it does not really say that much. This is stange when there is so much that ought to be said by Canada in the explosive world of today.

I now come back to our position at the Law of the Sea conference and what actually is happening there. That conference today is breaking down in that it cannot come to a package agreement because it cannot agree on the concept of revenue sharing beyond 200 miles. It cannot agree to sharing in that international zone, and one wonders why. One reason, among others, is that Canada is opposing it.

Canada is today, and I want to make this point very clear, killing the idea of a common heritage of the sea by its conduct in Geneva right now. Canada is killing that concept. I would only indicate one remark made at the Law of the Sea conference by a representative of Kenya, who said just over the weekend:

If the Canadians would only offer revenue-sharing as a trade for their claim to the margin then there might still be a chance for agreement.

What does he mean by margin? He means our continental margin extending out in some cases 640 miles. He is talking about that area over which we want total economic control beyond the 200 miles. If we had total control of our continental shelf in both oceans we would expand the acreage of Canada by 40 per cent. I would ask hon. members to remember that Canada is the second largest country in the world, having 7.6 per cent of the land mass of the world today, even though we have only one-half of 1 per cent of the population of the entire world. To this we are now asking in Geneva that we add the right to total control over that amount of land beneath the oceans which would add 40 per cent. I would ask if that is a reasonable position for Canada to take. I would certainly listen to anybody who stands up and says that is a reasonable position, but I do not think it is, and I do not think there are many members of parliament who will get up and say it is reasonable.

The conference at Geneva today is breaking down because we are adhering to that idea, and because there is a lack of acceptance by developed nations of the whole idea of the common heritage of mankind. I only suggest that Canada should develop much more cognizance of its international responsibilities.

I support the Prime Minister in his speeches in this regard, as I support the Secretary of State for External Affairs in his two most recent speeches on Canada's role internationally, made in the months of March and April of this year when introducing his estimates to the Committee on External Affairs and National Defence. When the Prime Minister was in London he made a speech that has been noted around the world. I have seen it quoted in the international press in several countries. I want to align myself with the thoughts of his speech as reflected in the position taken by the Secretary of State for External Affairs. The Prime Minister said:

The human community is a complex organism linked again and again within itself and as well with the biosphere upon which it is totally dependent for life. This interdependency demands of us two functions: first the maintenance of an equilibrium among all our activities, whatever their nature; second, an equitable distribution, worldwide, of resources and opportunities.

Dumping at Sea

He referred to an equitable distribution, worldwide, of resources and opportunities, but you simply cannot square these comments, laudable as they are, with our conduct at the law of the sea conference, or with our posture here tonight in talking about anti-dumping legislation to protect Canadian shores. This will simply not wash in a world today torn between the growing disparity of rich and poor nations.

This concept will not wash either in a world that is having a series of United Nations conferences on population, on food, on resources and on the Law of the Sea, culminating with a special session on development at the United Nations this fall. When all these problems come into sharp focus this position will not wash. We cannot have it both ways. We cannot make fine speeches on what we feel is our international role and then go into this Law of the Sea conference with the position I know that Canadian technocrats are taking there, mainly with the object of protecting our own interests first and foremost. I have not been at the Law of the Sea conference but I have been at others, and I know this will not wash in the kind of world we are living in today which is lacking leadership from countries like Canada.

I feel very badly that when we get into conferences the position of Canada seems to be confined to technical positions. Our position in this House is confined to pieces of legislation that are of marginal significance when there remain outside this House, and away from parliament, tremendous questions regarding Canada's relationship to the world population explosion.

I only plead with the government to reconsider its position at the Law of the Sea conference before its delegates come to the final conclusion that Canada is among those countries that killed the common heritage idea of the seas, and before we lose one of the greatest opportunities we have had in the 20th century of establishing an international authority with some teeth in it, based on the concept of revenue sharing in respect of mineral exploitation in that part of the world which has not yet been claimed by any national authority.

We must be able to think beyond our own self national interest for every moment of every day. I am not selling out Canada or saying it does not have the right to protect its development. Certainly we have that right, but we do not have the right to be overly concerned with the total economic control of an area equal to 40 per cent of our land mass, when that very attitude will be responsible for killing the concept of common heritage of the seas.

Finally I would conclude with the thought offered by my colleague, the hon. member for Rocky Mountain. I too do not think the Minister of the Environment is the one to handle this matter, and I say this in context with my arguments so far. I think it is far too big and involves far more than environmental questions. If we are to take that into account and think of who is to control this and how Canada fits in, surely we must feel that this ought to be a matter for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. He is a minister to whom I give full credit as I think he is increasingly conscious of all these problems. I think he is aware that we, as Canadians, must have a greater participation in these matters, and therefore, if we are to talk