

*Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act*

5943 of *Hansard* for April 16. The hon. member said in part:

...it is quite apparent that Bills C-202 and C-203 complement each other. Therefore, I think they must be considered together when the basic principles underlying this legislation are under discussion. I want to begin by congratulating this government on introducing this legislation. Any reservations we may have about some aspects of this question should not detract from our wholehearted endorsement of the legislation contained in these two bills.

Although these two bills have been introduced by different ministers, and although following second reading they will go before different committees of this House, I hope we will not lose sight of the fact they are inter-related. Indeed, if I may just interpolate here, I hope that those in charge of arrangements for committee meetings will see to it that the committee meetings relating to these two bills will be scheduled in such a way that interested members from either of the committees involved will be able to attend the committee consideration of both bills. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the questioning that will be involved, and the evidence to be given by some expert witnesses, will be of such a nature that this will be a most desirable procedural arrangement for us to follow.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp), when speaking to the second reading of this bill, mentioned four specific reasons the government had in mind in introducing the legislation. A little later on in his remarks the minister added what I consider to be a fifth, and in some respect perhaps the most important, consideration involved in this bill.

● (4:20 p.m.)

I do not intend to enter into any extensive discussion of it, but it should be noted the minister did make reference to the impact of the proposal to extend our territorial waters to a 12-mile limit upon the Northwest Passage across the northern part of Canada. I wish to refer at the outset to what the minister said. I quote from page 6015 of *Hansard*:

Since the 12-mile territorial sea is well established in international law—

I find that a very interesting assertion by the minister. I hope at the committee stage additional information will be put on the record to support that statement. Certainly, it is one with which I will not quarrel.

—the effect of this bill on the Northwest Passage is that under sensible view of the law Barrow Strait, as well as the Prince of Wales Strait, are subject to complete Canadian sovereignty. Whether

[Mr. Barnett.]

or not those who disagree with us wish to allege that other waters are not Canadian, they cannot realistically argue any longer concerning these two bodies of water.

That statement raises many interesting questions to be explored at the committee stage. If I understand it correctly, territorial waters are not really under the complete sovereignty of a nation. The minister should give some further explanation of what he had in mind when he said that this bill, and the territorial law of the sea, would give Canada complete sovereignty over these two particular passages. He should relate that statement to some of the assertions made in the debate on Bill C-202 concerning Arctic pollution control and the general Canadian position of sovereignty in the Arctic. I am intrigued by the remarks the minister made prior to the portion of his speech I have quoted.

If I understand him correctly, the declaration or assumption of a partial sovereignty by a state has been construed in international law not to lessen its claims to a wider extension of sovereignty. This has been upheld in a judgment of the international court. This matter was dealt with briefly the other morning when the minister appeared before the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry. Because of the imminence of today's debate, some questions in this general area were raised. I hope in the committee stage this whole area will be further explained and amplified. One or two of my colleagues may have something further to say about this whole question from the standpoint of international law before this particular stage of the debate is concluded. I welcome the information from the minister that the impact of this bill will strengthen Canada's control over any actual attempts at navigation through the Northwest Passage. We in this party fully agree with the intention of the government in this regard.

Another important question raised in the minister's speech is the impact of this bill on the matter of pollution control. The minister indicated it will provide adequate control over pollution on our east and west coasts. In that sense, it is a companion approach, although not identical, to the measure for pollution control in the Arctic. I feel that any real understanding of some of the aspects of the minister's assertion that this bill will protect the full range of Canada's vital interest in our coasts and provide the comprehensive jurisdictional base which Canada requires to enforce anti-pollution controls outside the