

*Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act*

has been done to establish the unchallengeable supremacy of our sovereignty in the area. This is very important. Consequently, the bill leaves more questions unanswered than are answered.

The Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development, an all party committee, brought down one of the finest reports that the House has seen during the present session. It went north to study the situation, heard witnesses and heard legal opinions. It established beyond doubt something that all Canadians know: that Canada now has and always has had sovereignty in the area, a sovereignty established by every possible test of occupation and usage. We have provided services for the people. Also, since that area is contiguous to and part of the continental shelf of North America, it belongs to that part of North America which constitutes the closest national state. I submit that international law says that our sovereignty cannot be challenged. Former Prime Minister Lester Pearson, an expert in his own right in international affairs, made this categorical assertion in Edmonton a few months ago.

The purport of our amendment is clear. I think the government would have been much more successful if it had not attempted to be so devious. I think the present course was forced on the Prime Minister and the government because they waited too long. They were too timorous. Only when they were finally goaded into acting did they come forward with this legislation. If the government had brought forward a resolution one year ago asserting our claim to sovereignty in the area, we could have avoided the problems that I envisage will haunt us.

I like to think that this country will gain and hold the respect of others; that it will become a leader of nations by setting an example that the use of force is not necessary, and in this way more and more people in the world will live in peace and in harmony with one another. I think the ultimate settlement of this problem must be through an international conference, a conference of the nations which are involved in the Arctic particularly, but which would not exclude other nations. Because of what has happened and is happening in the Arctic, special and unique problems have arisen.

I know that discussions are going on with regard to meetings, but I do not know how far they have progressed. I think that the Soviet Union, the United States, the Scandinavian countries, including Iceland, and this

[Mr. Baldwin.]

country must necessarily be parties to such conference. I do not think we ought to exclude other parties, because the future promises great things as a result of a co-operative method of developing and using the north. I should like to bring something to the minister's attention. Perhaps he could comment on it when he participates in the debate. Beginning on June 28, there is to be a conference in Malta under the chairmanship of Mrs. Elisabeth Mann Borgese, the daughter of the famous novelist Thomas Mann, entitled "Pacem in Maribus". It is not a conference which, as I understand it, is being sponsored by nations; it is being sponsored by individuals, which I think will be very useful. It will clarify certain complex matters relating to the oceans. If ever there was an important matter to which the public's attention ought to be directed, I submit that this is it. The conference hopes to establish some kind of continuing body which may feed information to the United Nations committee on peaceful uses of the seabed.

• (3:20 p.m.)

I wish to quote from an interesting article which appeared in the June 3 issue of *The Christian Science Monitor*:

It is not practical, says Mrs. Borgese, to think of handling these questions separately—for example, to start out with a single problem, such as pollution.

"A group of nations, of course, could go together on a specific pollution issue," she says, "and every move in this direction is welcome. But if you take the pollution issue as a whole, on a global basis, it divides the developed from the developing nations."

(The role of the third world, or underdeveloped nations, is the biggest political issue confronting the United Nations seabed committee.)

"In fact," says Mrs. Borgese, "we don't have a strong East-West ideological division here. The Soviet Union and the United States see eye to eye on the problem. It's really between the developed and the developing nations."

I presume that this country will be represented. If there are no plans for representation now, I hope that steps will be taken to see that we are represented. I do not know whether there is an intention to send a parliamentary delegation. A small group from the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development could participate in this meeting. Such participation might have some useful purpose and aid the deliberations of this House.

I do not know what tomorrow holds. Your Honour does not know what tomorrow holds.