

Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Bill

claims. This has been the course followed by most countries on international problems ever since World War II: agreement rather than state practice has become the accepted norm.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Crouse: Yes, when I have finished my remarks, Mr. Speaker. When you consider the firmness of the U.S. position, you realize there is a very real possibility of a head-on clash the first time the Canadian Coastguard interferes with U.S. ships in what the United States considers are international waters.

The Arctic ocean has remained a great mystery until recent times, but the last two decades have witnessed considerable progress: the unknown ocean has become one of the most studied in the world and it is gradually revealing its secrets to scientists. The voyages of the submarines *Skate* and *Nautilus* have proved that the ice in our northern archipelago is neither uniform nor permanent. These submarines blazed a new, submerged northwest passage and when and if nuclear-powered cargo submarines are built the new route will cut 4,900 miles and 13 days off the route from Japan to Europe. There are, of course, certain problems involved in operating submarines under the ice, but these are gradually being solved.

So we need pollution control authority in our northern waters because obviously they will be used more in the future than they have been in the past. But I believe that in order to be effective we must have some international agreement to our proposals as outlined, if we hope to be credible in world courts. Unfortunately, Canada's official attitude toward the status of our Arctic waters has never been altogether clear. Over the years a number of government ministers, including two prime ministers, have stated that Canada claimed jurisdiction right up to the North Pole. In 1956, however, the Minister of Northern Affairs made it quite plain that Canada's sovereignty in the Arctic was limited to lands and territorial waters and that we have never subscribed to the sector theory in application to ice.

Except for an occasional rather vague statement to the contrary since that time, it appears that the official position expressed in 1956 by the minister responsible still represents the government's view. However, it is somewhat surprising to note that the official maps prepared and issued by the government

[Mr. Crouse.]

continue to show the boundary lines of Canada as extending to the North Pole.

I believe it is time to end this anomaly. This can be done by the government issuing a clear statement indicating we have sovereignty over the Arctic archipelago, thus terminating many years of indecision on this important matter. By this action we would have nothing to lose and everything to gain.

We have a responsibility to our native peoples, the Indians and Eskimos who stand the risk of being exploited by commercial operators, before it can be said they have in any way benefited from today's enlightened society. If Canada does not assert its claim to sovereignty over the Arctic, these people will be exposed to exploitation which already disfigures the permafrost of their land and threatens to eliminate the northern wildlife upon which they depend for existence.

In my view, northern development must remain in Canadian hands and Canadian sovereignty over this area will guarantee our claims to these resources. There are many who say that the future of Canada lies in our northern areas, and if there are vast resources of oil, as exploration indicates, it is up to Canada and to Canadians to regulate the growth of this development. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the government will do everything possible to make this Canadian development a reality.

• (8:20 p.m.)

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, before the hon. member resumes his seat may I say that I was interested in his remark that since the war the international community had proceeded to establish international law only by way of mutual agreement. Does he recall the Truman doctrine which the United States used in making a unilateral claim over the continental shelf, and which ultimately led to agreement? How does that fit his theory?

Mr. Crouse: I am not sure I have followed the minister's question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The United States asserted a unilateral claim to the continental shelf. How does that fit in with the hon. member's theory that they proceeded only by mutual agreement?

Mr. Crouse: At the present time we are talking about Canadian sovereignty over our own territory, the northern archipelago, a section of this country which Canadians generally have assumed and which I certainly