

remain in the hands of the Canadian people, and that it is Canada's responsibility to prevent an ecological disaster that could affect the people of this country and indeed the people of the world.

• (4:00 p.m.)

I spoke on this bill when it was first introduced in this chamber. I attended the joint committee sittings. The bill purports to deal with pollution control on the one hand and with Canadian sovereignty on the other. We are now aware from studies of other bills, for example Bill C-203 and Bill C-204, that the government is not asking Parliament to assert sovereignty over any waters beyond 12 miles in our Arctic. However, these are waters over which most Canadians thought we had claimed sovereignty for many years.

I ask the government, why have we now changed position? I ask, what waters are we now claiming as our own? What waters will be classified as high seas? Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, we on this side are not critical that the government has gone too far with this legislation; we are critical that the government has not gone far enough. How will these proposals, as spelled out in the bill, be enforced without declaring sovereignty? For example, under this bill will we be prohibiting tanker voyages in the Arctic? The bill calls for a line measuring seaward from the nearest Canadian land a distance of 100 miles. I wonder why the government selected 100 miles? Why didn't it take 50 miles or 150 miles? In spite of all the questions that were raised in committee about this 100 miles, I submit we have never received an adequate answer. Perhaps the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald), or the minister guiding the bill through the House today, will give us some explanation.

This bill, like the amendments to the Fisheries Act, gives permission to pollute. That is right, Mr. Speaker. It gives permission to pollute since its terms do not apply to any water quality area designated under the Canada Water Act. By fragmenting authority between this bill and the Canada Water Act, by amending the Fisheries Act plus the Canada Shipping Act, I submit we so divide authority that we make effective pollution control in Canada next to impossible. At the same time, we place a bureaucratic nightmare on the shoulders of our hard-pressed industries who find themselves unhappy partners with the federal government in pollution control, with the industries paying the bill.

Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act

When it comes to declaring sovereignty, I cannot help but wonder what happened to change the views of our Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) on this matter. The *Globe and Mail*, in September, 1969, carried an article headed "Ice Pack Defined as Land in Canadian Bid for Rule." It began with these words:

Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau said yesterday Canada will seek to persuade other nations to accept the ice pack of the Northwest Passage as land for the purpose of establishing Canadian sovereignty in the area.

The Prime Minister told students at a high school forum that the proposal, first advanced by External Affairs Minister Mitchell Sharp, was one of several Canada would advance in seeking to establish its sovereignty in the Arctic.

Later, on his return from that trip, the *Globe and Mail* carried another article which read in part:

In a press conference, after a three hour cabinet meeting, Mr. Trudeau declared that his government was giving "a high priority" to the sovereignty statement, which is expected some time this fall.

Those are our views, Mr. Speaker. We believe sovereignty should be declared over the islands in the Arctic. We believe sovereignty should be declared over the water between those islands. Obviously, the Prime Minister shares our views, although he referred in his statement to this water as the ice pack; but whether it be ice pack or water the logic is the same. It is this vast area of ice and water and land which we claim should be established without any doubt in the minds of all Canadians as Canadian territory.

We must be mindful of our responsibility to the native people of the north, the Indians and the Eskimos, who stand the risk of being exploited by commercial plunderers before they can be said to have even benefited from today's enlightened society. Their living conditions, if we are to listen to the proposals and representations they are making to us from time to time, are wretched. They have the highest mortality rate among Canada's native people. Infant mortality in the north is four times the Canadian average, and the death rate of Eskimo children up to the age of four is 13 times the national average. Even in 1964, the average age at death of the Eskimo was 32.3 years.

If Canada does not assert its claims to sovereignty, then these people are exposed to the risk of being bulldozed out of existence, or left with the scars of exploitation that already disfigure the permafrost of their land and threaten to eliminate the northern wildlife upon which they depend for existence. I ask