

*Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Bill*

**Mr. Nesbitt:** I am trying to.

**Mr. St. Pierre:** As the hon. member undoubtedly knows, Canada is not a signatory to the convention which requires us to provide free Decca service. We can charge ships for providing icebreaker services. Without it, ships may be left stuck, such as was the case with the *Manhattan* yesterday or the day before. It had to be broken free by the *John A. Macdonald*.

**An hon. Member:** The *St. Laurent*.

**Mr. St. Pierre:** I am sorry, the *St. Laurent*. This is a part of the exercise of sovereignty.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. What does the government plan to do if a ship of one of the major powers of the world, such as the Soviet Union or the United States, said it would not pay any attention if one of our pollution officers wished to go aboard? What will we do? Will we shoot at the ship? That is a very practical question, and I should like to know the answer.

**Mr. St. Pierre:** What would the hon. member suggest we do if American troops marched into Saskatchewan? That question is about as sensible as the hon. member's.

**Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni):** Mr. Speaker, I do not propose at this stage of the debate to enter into the area of the question just asked by the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt). However, I overheard a suggestion that we have had a little bit of experience in the matter of enforcement of our authority on the sea with respect to our fisheries legislation. If the hypothetical situation which the member is trying to provoke in his line of questioning does develop, undoubtedly this Parliament will be convened. If such a major emergency as the member is trying to conjure up does develop, we will debate the situation when it ceases to be hypothetical.

At times I am rather surprised at members of the official opposition, such as the hon. member for Oxford and the hon. member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse). I intended to make reference to him in my remarks. The member for South Shore, for whom I have great admiration and who is a hardworking, diligent member of this House, seems to get cold feet and the jitters at certain stages of important and crucial discussion in the House.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** We just want to know what they are going to do.

[Mr. St. Pierre.]

**Mr. Barnett:** An example of this was the attitude taken by the hon. member for South Shore during the debate on the territorial sea and fishing zones. I thought at the time that the Canadian government was being far too timid and afraid in exercising its proper jurisdiction in being responsible for the welfare of the Canadian nation in the world in which we live. As the matters stand at the moment, I am much happier with the stance the government has now taken than I was at the time of the debate on the fishing zones and straight baselines in 1964.

There are two aspects of the debate in which we are engaged. I feel this is one of the more significant debates that will be entered upon in the Canadian Parliament for some time. This bill is merely one facet of a debate which will carry into two or three other pieces of legislation that are either on the Order Paper or which have been announced by the government. There is the international debate and the internal debate as to the actual content and substance of the bill we have before us, regarding which we can only touch on a few highlights at this second reading stage.

• (9:00 p.m.)

At the present time, the international debate appears to be confined to exchanges between ourselves and our neighbours to the south: we all regard them as our friendly neighbours. It is important that we examine the bill in the terms of the attitude which the Canadian Parliament, on the one hand, and the government of the United States on the other, are taking toward it. As hon. members know, the subject matter was discussed in advance by the committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development. The discussion is summarized in the committee's report which is still awaiting disposition; a motion with regard to it is at present on the Order Paper.

I felt that in participating in this debate I should discuss the bill in both its international and its internal aspects in relation to the report which the committee has placed before the House. The motion that the report be placed before the House was made, in its present form, by the hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Simpson), perhaps a bolder colleague of the hon. member for Oxford, and the hon. member for South Shore.

I should like to draw attention to the contrast between the comments made by the United States and the views expressed by my leader this afternoon. I will use as a founda-