

*Canada Shipping Act*

That northern region of the Canadian Coast Guard exists already in embryonic form. It is under the very able directorship of an individual by the name of Carol Stephenson. It is my hope that this will continue and that it will become a full region within the operations of the Canadian Coast Guard.

Thank you very much for your kind indulgence, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Are there questions or comments? The Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton).

**Mr. Fulton:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the Hon. Member a similar question to that which I put to the Hon. Member for Cochrane-Superior (Mr. Penner), and it is this: does he not agree that comprehensive aboriginal claims north of 60 should be resolved and that there should be a delineation of those zones where there should either be no access for freight traffic or access under limited conditions because of the biological nature of those areas?

Does he not think that those two steps should be completed before some of the operational potential that is contained within Bill C-75 is put into play?

The reason I ask the question is that the comprehensive claims process is one that has dragged on for many years. A great deal of effort has been expended by many Canadians in evaluating the sensitive zones north of 60. Some of the studies are not yet completed. The reason, of course, is to ensure that those shipping routes that are used in the future are those which result in the absolute minimum impact on those areas.

Does he not think that those two matters should be addressed and implemented before we see the kinds of routings that would be operationally possible under this Bill put into play?

**Mr. Nickerson:** If the Hon. Member, Sir, has looked at the Bill, he will know that contained within it is the concept of Vessel Traffic Service Zones, and that will in part, if not in total, address the concerns he has raised.

If he is asking me whether second reading of the Bill should await the settlement of all aboriginal claims, or the aboriginal claims in that part of the country in which he is most interested at the present time, my answer is "no".

Shipping in all regions of Canada is important. I do not think we should delay the second reading of this Bill until there is an answer to every outstanding little problem. What is contemplated in the Bill is a provision to make regulations on a zone-by-zone basis, and certainly that will eliminate some of the problems.

It should be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that the people who are pushing hardest for a settlement of the land claims in the Arctic, particularly in the Inuit area, are the very people who use the petroleum products shipped into that region for use in their ski-doo's and for heating their houses.

Those people tell me that while they want those petroleum products shipped into the region—they like to live in warm houses as opposed to cold igloos—they want it done in a

manner that minimizes the danger to health and the danger of the environment.

It is for that reason that the people who live in that region, I am sure, would like to see us proceed with this legislation in a speedy manner.

• (1450)

**Mr. Penner:** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the same Member. The Hon. Member will be aware that the previous administration halted between two opinions, whether there should be enhanced oil tanker shipment or whether there should be more pipeline construction. A policy was never developed one way or the other. The waiting game was being played by acquiring more data and information. Now we have a clearly delineated policy. In Arctic waters and through the Northwest Passage, there will now be increased year-round oil tanker shipment. That is the policy of the Government as enunciated by the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) and supported by this Bill.

The leaders of the Inuit people in the North have put forward the proposition that they have not been involved in this major policy development. As my hon. friend just reminded the House, there are some very major issues still outstanding, among them the settlement of those claims and political rights in the North. Perhaps the Hon. Member could advise the House if he as a northerner is satisfied that every effort to have a full measure of consultation has been made.

**Mr. Nickerson:** Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Cochrane-Superior is undoubtedly aware of the great number of consultations that have already taken place. In his opening remarks, he referred to the Lancaster Sound studies. I do not know how many public meetings took place while that study was being compiled. The Beaufort Sea environmental impact group has spent months and months soliciting views on oil and gas development in the North. There has been a lot of opportunity for consultation and public input. Much of what was said in those public hearings was that people wanted better shipping regulations and better environmental protection measures. The people were concerned with compensation aspects arising out of possible spills and this is precisely what is contained in this Bill.

I am not saying that there could not be improvements of a technical nature made to the Bill. That will undoubtedly occur when we get to committee. I know that the committee will call as many witnesses as possible.

I would like to make one comment with respect to the policy enunciated by the Secretary of State for External Affairs. It is not quite the way the Hon. Member for Cochrane-Superior puts it. There is no way that any Hon. Member can say that there will be more oil traffic through the North. It is likely that a bigger population will lead to more oil traffic. It is also likely, as a result of what appears to be a very successful exportation of oil from Bent Horn this summer, that there will be more crude oil coming out. However, the Government cannot say that that will happen. That will depend upon the