

have always assumed, even if the hon. gentleman has not, has always belonged to Canada. I have always felt that the islands in the archipelago and the waters between those islands belonged to Canada.

Mr. Borrie: That isn't what you said.

Mr. Crouse: That is exactly what I said in my speech.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I assume that is what the hon. member meant to say. I will read his speech with interest, and I suggest he should, too.

Mr. Crouse: Mr. Speaker, I hope these points will become clear. I hope that the division which obviously exists between the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs will be resolved, so that there will not be one statement made in this House and another one outside it on television, which is totally misleading to the Canadian people. This is why I am asking for clarification, simplification and a little bit of the truth so that all can understand the situation.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The truth of the matter is that you do not have any answer to my question.

Mr. Paul St. Pierre (Coast Chilcotin): Mr. Speaker, in the past few days I have been reminded of history under totally different circumstances at the beginning of the First World War.

I refer to the situation in which Britain found herself when she had an agreement with France and the British cabinet was hesitating, after the German invasion of France and Belgium, as to whether it would adhere to that agreement. The French government sent notice after notice to the British government asking whether it would adhere to the agreement.

I think at that time Sir Edward Grey gave a classic answer when he said, "Britain will act in what she conceives to be her national interest." This, Mr. Speaker, is the reality of international politics, and this has been said many times since. I am sure some hon. members have read the book of Mr. Dean Acheson, the respected, long-time Secretary of State of the United States, who put the same thing in another way in saying that the object of foreign policy is the national interest. That is only common sense.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Canadian government is acting unilaterally. It is acting in advance of international law. It is acting in

Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Bill

what it conceives to be the national interest, and this is what it has a clear right and duty to do.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. St. Pierre: Mr. Speaker, I hope that this government and all governments which succeed it will work for international harmony, will work to be on good terms with our neighbours and with all nations, and will work for the rule of law in international affairs.

But in all things, as has been said many times in this House, there are priorities. There is one priority which must apply to every Canadian government and it must override all others; that is, its first duty is to the Canadian national interest. On this legislation we are so proceeding. I welcome it.

I consider this legislation to be bold, to be imaginative, and to be progressive—not regressive but progressive. I predict that it will win the support of the world in the great forum of public opinion, informed public opinion, and in that respect later in these remarks I have a recommendation which I shall make to the government.

What is our reason? Our reason has been very clearly stated. International law in relation to the sea, made largely by shipping nations for shippers, has ignored and overlooked the rights of the third parties, the coastal states, and until international law develops to the required level this country is obliged to act unilaterally. The prime reason is the new and unexpected threat of massive pollution.

Yesterday, in company with a number of other members of this House, I was at Chedabucto Bay where a rotten old tub of Aristotle Onassis' sank and spewed more than half of her 3 million barrels of bunker fuel over some 1,200 square miles of Canadian waters and over approximately 80 miles of beaches.

I think we were all impressed, those of us who travelled the route yesterday, with the ingenuity that is being shown by those who are cleaning up the mess under the direction of Dr. Patrick McTaggart-Cowan. We saw a great deal of ingenuity exercised. We saw some remarkable co-operation among Canadian government departments, the Canadian armed forces and the American navy. In fact there was co-operation from almost everyone except, I understand, the shipping company involved.

Mr. Speaker, what appalled me there yesterday was not the extent of the mess. The