

tion a report which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* of April 16. This follows the text of Wednesday's *Hansard* reproducing the bulletin put out by the United States Information Service:

If Canada had the right to claim and exercise exclusive pollution and resources jurisdiction on the high seas, other countries could assert the right to exercise jurisdiction for other purposes, some reasonable and some not, but all equally invalid according to international law.

Some of the submissions which were put on record this afternoon by my leader makes it clear that what is valid and invalid under international law is not so lightly to be summed up as it is assumed in this statement from the United States. The hon. member for Coast Chilcotin (Mr. St. Pierre) referred to this during his speech and it is pertinent also to the question asked by the hon. member for Oxford. In the long run, whether or not we can assert the jurisdiction which this bill proposes to assert will depend on whether, in the eyes of the world community, this is a reasonable extension of our authority or not.

I submit it is a reasonable extension of our authority. This is a view already expressed by the standing committee of this House particularly charged with the subject matter which has been brought before us today in the present bill. This is really the area of debate in which we are engaged with the United States at the present time. I maintain the government has leaned backward in seeking not to go beyond the bounds of reasonableness in asserting our jurisdiction. The posture taken is much less positive than that taken by the committee and reflected in the report which was unanimously adopted by its members. I should like to quote from page five of the committee's first report, where it is stated:

Your committee is unimpressed with arguments that adequate pollution safeguards could be effected by international agreement. Not only has progress towards international accord on maritime pollution control been extremely slow, but serious doubts are now being expressed by reputable scientists that present proposals for such international pollution control are adequate even for the world's temperate waters. As desirable as international maritime pollution control would be, the delicate balance of nature in the Arctic can only be protected by a more stringent set of pollution controls than anything that has been proposed internationally to date.

Your committee rejects the suggestion that an international waterway exists through the Canadian Arctic archipelago.

22218—32

Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Bill

In other words, the committee asserted our sovereignty over these waters in advance of the government. Further on, the report reads:

The waters of the Canadian Arctic archipelago lie over the continental shelf; the Arctic Islands and the continental shelf are a geological extension of the Canadian mainland and the North American land mass.

I submit that the report of the committee and the position taken by the Canadian government are so eminently within the bounds of reasonableness that the United States, even though it may at the moment be adopting an attitude contrary to the one we have chosen, will eventually recognize the logic of the Canadian position and recognize that it is not only in Canada's interests but, in the long run, in the interests of the United States as well.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to spend the rest of the time available to me dealing with what I have called the internal debate, speaking as a member of the committee, as one who was concerned with the drafting of the report and also as one who has spent some time examining—as have many other hon. members—the terms of the bill before us. I should like to refer to the clause which is entitled “The application of the act”. Earlier this afternoon I asked the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) whether he would make available to us maps or charts outlining in graphic form the area encompassed by this bill. I should like to quote briefly from the definition in the clause to which I have referred.

• (9:10 p.m.)

—the area enclosed by the sixtieth parallel of north latitude, the one hundred and forty-first meridian of longitude and a line measured seaward from the nearest Canadian land a distance of one hundred nautical miles; except that in the area between the islands of the Canadian arctic and Greenland—

That is not the part with which I am concerned. It goes on:

—where the line of equidistance between the islands of the Canadian Arctic and Greenland is less than one hundred nautical miles—

I note that at no point in this definition is any reference made to what might or might not be done about the establishment of base-lines. The hon. member for Coast Chilcotin, I think it was, referred to something of this in his remarks and it does raise the question as to what kind of area we are going to enclose. If one measures 100 miles from the nearest Canadian land, just what does that mean