

ritories, the Inuit or whoever say they are concerned with." The oil companies will say: "We have to have this routing. We have this window for accessing those ice conditions and we cannot go with all the other stuff." The Minister has taken all these powers upon himself. Knowing the man it surprises me. I think the bureaucracy have channelled this legislation up to him and they have decided that since it cannot get 8, 10 or 12 Bills through, which is how many it should be, it will push Bill C-75 through.

The Bill is all over the ballpark. It goes from air cushioned vehicles to very basic sovereign questions. It is similar to the backing down we saw from the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I complimented him in the House. I honestly meant it with respect to the moves he was taking. He said: "We will construct a \$500 million world-class state-of-the-art ice-breaker." Some two days later at a press conference the Minister spoke about an ice-breaking tanker. He practically read the press release of Panarctic. In the House he said that he would strengthen various pieces of legislation. The first matter I expect we would have learned in the world of international law from the Georges Bank experience is what type of laws we should be putting in place. Not only should we strengthen the demarcation lines in the high Arctic so that those would be internal waters, but we should strengthen the Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act, so that should a vessel like the *Polar Sea* re-enter Canadian internal waters, there could be a sufficient penalty. How many Members of the Government know that if the *Polar Sea* goes in after we pass this piece of legislation, the most we can do as a country is impose a \$100,000 fine? What an outstanding piece of legislation this is. I expected some really tough-minded legislation which included a shell clause which not only allowed, but required, a Canadian Coast Guard to bring vessels back into port which attempted to enter Canada's internal waters without full open agreement and the accompaniment through Canadian northern waters by a class 10 state of the art ice-breaker.

● (1510)

I believe that I, as an Hon. Member, at the very least, misunderstood what direction the Secretary of State for External Affairs was taking. I had great expectations that we were going to see sovereignty and the high Arctic protected. The Minister planted the Canadian flag on the back of the Inuit and said the reason we have sovereignty in the high Arctic islands is because of the presence of aboriginal people who have been there since time immemorial. However, there has been no movement on that front. At the very least, in terms of debate and legislative committee time, we should be looking at how to complete the comprehensive claim process and how to realistically and properly deal with the important scientific components which were properly raised by my friend, the Hon. Member for Cochrane-Superior (Mr. Penner). We cannot now simply run head long into industrial projects after all the effort of public process. I see the Hon. Member for the Western Arctic (Mr. Nickerson). He probably thinks that it was just an interesting exercise in public relations to have the Beaufort

### *Canada Shipping Act*

panel, to have that many Canadians volunteer their time to address the very real and sincere interests of this globe.

A large-scale oil blow-out in the high Arctic could change the entire weather patterns of this entire globe. We are not just talking about a few dribs and drabs of oil washing ashore, a few seals getting their skins dirty, a few fish dying or a few hunters being displaced. Some of the most serious global atmospheric questions have to be answered. As it stands now, this kind of legislation would certainly receive a good round of applause in the boardrooms of the oil companies in Calgary. They would say, "Right on. You finally put in place what we need to expedite at the lowest possible cost". I think the surveys which have been taken in this country over the years demonstrate that one of the highest priorities there is among Canadians is the protection of the environment and its utilization. Canadians are prepared to see certain higher costs in order that plans can be implemented with some kind of long-term forward thinking vision so that those areas of great sensitivity are not unduly and unnecessarily damaged.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I found interesting the comments from the Government side on the powers to make regulations in relation to hazardous cargoes. One would think that after all of the studies done by this Chamber on the transportation and management of hazardous materials in terms of rail and rubber, surely we would see the implementation of them as legislation rather than regulation.

I have raised many times in this House the fact that we still have very large tonnage quantities of military explosives being loaded on the Prince Rupert waterfront. There have been many requests for some kind of proper handling and management of those military explosives or in the alternative, shipping them in U.S. military bottoms from the southern U.S. north, but do we have it in this legislation? No. We find once again the Governor in Council may make regulations, and that is throughout the Bill. When we talk about parliamentary reform and when the Government brings legislation forward to be turned into law, we in this Chamber should not be asked to simply vote for or against these kinds of Trojan horse Bills which are scattered about.

The Governor in Council may make regulations to implement the pollution convention. What is that going to mean to northerners if and when there is a spill? What about people on the West Coast if a ship is to break up? What about Newfoundland? There are many questions which must be answered by the Government.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I regret that the Hon. Member's time has expired. There are questions and comments for 10 minutes.

**Mr. Penner:** Mr. Speaker, just before the Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton) rose to give his excellent speech, one of the Government supporters was exercised about the fact that we were debating Bill C-75 in principle. We have not been debating it very long. I just wonder if the Hon. Member is really suggesting that there should not be a second reading debate? I think it was a curious intervention on his part.