

Dumping at Sea

saying very plainly to you, Madam Speaker, that it is futile for us to have a narrow concern regarding anti-dumping, however important that be, if we do not join with that concern a much more active role of leadership in regard to protecting the high seas and the 200 mile zone, of which I will speak in a moment. We must show a determination to use the seas and their fabulous wealth for the good of mankind.

I will enter evidence in a moment indicating that Canada is not doing that. Hence my argument is that it is rather pointless for us to be introducing this bill in the expectation that it is going to be sufficient to protect our seas from dumping, whether by Canadian vessels or foreign vessels that come close to our territorial waters. We must, as I say, play a much more active role in leading the way.

I want to suggest that the threat to the oceanic ecosystem, including the threat to the food chain and the very air that we breathe, is the question that is before us tonight. This threat comes not only from oil installations in the sea but, even more, from land based pollution, from conscious ocean dumping, from rivers polluted with lethal substances, and from pollution of the atmosphere by the burning of petroleum and other fuels. The world's oceans are one, and pollution respects no national boundaries.

Therefore it is not for Canada alone to take any kind of unilateral action in regard to protection of the seas or the seas adjacent to us; we must win the respect and co-operation of other nations. This is partly what the Law of the Sea conference is all about. I suggest to the parliamentary secretary that this bill should not be discussed, and that when it gets to committee the committee should not discuss it without reference to Canada's role today in the Law of the Sea conference which is now being held in Geneva.

The Law of the Sea conference resumed in Geneva three or four weeks ago, the first session having been held in Caracas last year. There was a clear trend toward the acceptance of what the government itself has called a three tiered concept of the Law of the Sea. The first is that there be established an economic zone out to 200 miles from the coasts of nations, over which those nations would have control of the fishing and mineral rights within those 200 miles; secondly, that there be established an international area beyond the economic zone reserved for the common heritage of mankind; thirdly, that there be the application throughout the oceanic space of sound management principles for the use and preservation of the sea.

When the conference resumed in Geneva, attended by the majority of the nations of the world, an attempt was made to produce what has been called a package agreement by which there would be brought into one general agreement all those factors concerning pollution, navigational rights, fishing rights and, most important, mineral rights. This package agreement is to open the door or lead the way to a common heritage fund that is to be administered under international authority. This international authority will take the first significant step that has been taken since the United Nations came into being in sharing the wealth of the world in a planetary sense.

No one has been concerned until now about the kind of wealth that can be produced from the high seas, other than

[Mr. Roche.]

fishing wealth. This is because it has not been technologically possible to produce from the high seas mineral wealth in great quantity and of great value. We know there is immense wealth in the seas. To show how important this subject is—I am not talking here of the international zone beyond 200 miles but only of the economic zone within 200 miles of the shores of coastal states—within that relatively small area of 200 miles there is \$20 trillion worth of exploitable oil and gas.

There are many nations that went to the Law of the Sea conference wanting an international authority established that would share revenue derived from the exploitation of the mineral resources of the sea within a 200 mile zone. Most of the developed countries vetoed this proposal, Canada included. If I had to, I could establish an argument that the developed countries of the world should agree to the establishment of an international authority to share such revenue on a global basis in order to close the gap between the rich nations and the poor nations of the world, which is the cause of the social dilemma that we are facing today. However, I am not going to establish that argument because at the moment I want to concentrate upon that part of the high seas beyond the 200 mile zone—the high seas.

I know that mineral exploitation is not yet technically advanced sufficient to realize this fantastic amount of wealth that is rather immediately recoverable from within this zone of 200 miles. What I am concerned about is that part of the high seas beyond the 200 miles which is most open to the argument of international authority since it gets away from the first 200 miles.

● (2130)

Now we come back to Canada and this bill. Sometimes I wonder, as I look around the House, whatever happens to speeches made here. I only hope somebody reads them. I know there are lots of meetings and things going on which the ministers have to attend, but hon. members of the opposition try to present positive suggestions, some in support of government measures that come before this House, in an effort to move Canada ahead and in recognition of our international responsibility. One only hopes that some of the ideas that spill out on this floor gradually find their way at least into consideration by the government.

The Minister of the Environment (Mrs. Sauvé), the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen), his deputy and his assistant, and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) are all away. No one is ever here to hear these things. One wonders about the usefulness of this exercise, and one is not surprised that so many members of the public are disillusioned about the political process today. I will not deviate too long on that.

The important thing is that today Canada is taking part in this Law of the Sea conference at Geneva. We are not debating it here in the House. No one is standing up in the House each day asking what we are doing at this most important United Nations conference. We are not doing that. We are dealing with a rather narrowly focused bill which is a nice piece of motherhood. My friend, the hon. member for Rocky Mountain (Mr. Clark), had some legitimate criticisms, but even he had some difficulty in finding