

*Government Organization*

matter for the future generations of this country.

I say that the minister in charge of the continental shelf who will deal with the Russians, or the British, or the Japanese, or the Americans, or the French in France—because this is what his responsibilities will entail—must be a federal minister, not a junior minister in charge of one of the regions in the Northwest Territories. The continental shelf is not three miles off our coast, or six miles, or 60 miles, or is not 300 feet or 600 feet deep. The continental shelf goes half way across the Atlantic, half way across the Arctic and half way across the Pacific.

The land underneath those three oceans belongs to the countries which front those oceans. Therefore Canada has potential resources in a great part of the world lying at the bottom of the sea which are just as valuable as any on dry land. That has been agreed upon, through action taken by the government of which I was a member, by the unanimous decision of 105 nations meeting at Geneva in 1958. Those of us who fought for so long as a government to get recognition of claims upon these resources at the bottom of the sea now see the possibility of them being frittered away, with one minister looking after those resources above a line which has been drawn, those below that line being subjected to another type of policy.

I want to know from the minister who has charge of the area south of Southampton and Baffin islands how tough he is going to be with Premier Roblin of Manitoba, the premier of Ontario and the premier of Quebec. These men will naturally fight for their provinces to acquire everything they want from the federal government; I suppose they would be kicked out of office if they did not do so. But the minister in charge of this land on behalf of the federal government must fight for all people in Canada. The Hudson bay property belongs as much to the people of Newfoundland as to the people of Quebec, Manitoba and Ontario. That is one of the issues I am concerned about, Mr. Speaker. I see an abdication of federal leadership.

I should like to conclude by referring to a matter to which I will have to return on committee stage. In the old act which set up the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources, the prime minister of the day, Mr. Louis St. Laurent, in introducing the bill to the house, used the expression that apparently we have been administering the north with a complete absence of minds. He

outlined an act which would not only bring the north under the direct public responsibility of one minister, but went on to emphasize that this new minister was to be not only in charge of the north but was going to be in charge of the national resources of Canada. Then he deliberately explained why he chose the expression "national resources" instead of "natural resources". To him natural resources meant only the trees, the energy, the minerals, the natural things. He said that to him Canada was composed of people, human resources, and that he wanted some minister in his government—quoting, in effect, the terms of the act—who would be responsible for formulating plans in co-operation with other governments, other departments, private and public agencies, not only for the development and maximum use of our natural resources but also our human resources.

Where has this fundamental and primary purpose of the old resources department gone, Mr. Speaker? Which one of these departments is in charge of it now? It has been said that it was not necessary to bring in a resolution in respect to the department of forestry and development because no money was involved. Here we have taken one of the best means for initiative and leadership by the federal government and thrown it up into the air, having it disappear into the upper atmosphere. Where it has gone no one knows. The power to plan on the part of the federal government for the best use of our natural resources and human resources is now dispersed, and no one knows where it has gone.

I agree with what many people have written, that this is the day of a weak federal government and ten strong provincial governments. Perhaps with a minister of a new provincial government in the north there will be 11 strong provincial governments, all of which are overwhelming this federal government. Therefore I think it behooves us in all parties to remember that our basic job when we come to Ottawa is not to speak for our parishes, our municipalities, or even on occasion for our provinces. Our fundamental job here is to speak for all the people of Canada.

I believe the people of Canada are being sold down the river. Not deliberately; I could not accuse anyone of doing that bad a thing. But I fear that all this confusion and chaos of the last three years has become a way of life with this government. People rush in with ideas which look good, and the government announce them. But no one thinks them through. If someone had really thought