

*The Address—Mr. Davis*

and to other nations if we manage wisely and well, if we fish more economically and harvest more species, and if we use the latest techniques for raising the income of our fishermen.

We have barely scratched our offshore wealth in so far as minerals are concerned. We have the world's biggest continental shelf. We are bound, knowing the geological structures which are favourable, to find a great deal of oil and natural gas close to our shores. So we gain in this area, the area of non-renewable or mineral resources as well.

We are taking over these great resources, making them ours from the management point of view and, indeed, an ownership point of view, with very little effort and very little attention. Most Canadians are oblivious to these important developments because most of them live in half a dozen large cities which are concentrated along the United States boundary. They are not aware of what is going on in our outlying areas, along our coast, in the north Atlantic, in the north Pacific and in the Arctic area as well. Here is where the action is in terms of the extension of our boundaries; here is where we are increasing our resource base fantastically and in a remarkably short period of time.

We have done well to stake our claims early. We have led the charge in establishing the rights as well as the responsibilities of the coastal state. The United Nations has been unable, so far at least, to insist upon the wise management of offshore resources. Until the United Nations, or a regional body, involving many nations, can shoulder this task of wise management of resources, it is up to the coastal state, the nation with the most obvious current interest, the most intimate interest in those resources, to make sure that they are preserved, that they are conserved, that they are managed on a sustained yield basis, that the stocks of fish are not depleted, that the minerals offshore are not ripped quickly from their beds and too much left wastefully for posterity to try to recover.

We have pushed out our limits. In the early sixties our seaward limit was three miles; in the late sixties our fisheries lines were extended 12 miles seaward from our shores and in 1970 we began to draw straight base lines from headland to headland, from major promontory to major promontory. We also drew fisheries closing lines which enclosed all of the Gulf of St. Lawrence and made it Canadian, enclosed all of the Bay of Fundy, all of Queen Charlotte Sound and Hecate Strait on the west coast. By drawing the straight base lines and measuring 12 miles outside, we increased Canada's area of responsibility by more than 15 per cent.

● (1250)

I have said our area of responsibility will be extended by 40 per cent. When our limits are extended to the edge of the continental shelf we shall, physically and economically, be 40 per cent larger than we are now.

Members who are familiar with the needs and problems of our fishing communities will want me to refer briefly to the concept of the 200-mile fisheries limit. Most of the nations, the members of the United Nations which will be convening in Venezuela in August, 1974, will be arguing for a 200-mile fishing limit. Canada's approach, of course,

[Mr. Davis.]

will be that it favours a 200-mile limit but that our limit should be more than 200 miles wherever the limit of our continental shelf, the extent of our continental margin, is more than 200 miles offshore. The principal area where our continental shelf reaches out more than 200 miles is the Grand Banks. There, our continental shelf, in places, extends as much as 400 miles seaward from Newfoundland. Our basic fisheries policy, therefore, calls for a limit of 200 miles from shore and for more than 200 miles where the edge of the continental shelf is more than 200 miles from land.

This big reach seaward by Canada casts shadows in many directions. By controlling oil drilling rigs, we will be able to control pollution from gas and oil operations near our shores. By controlling our fishery, that is, the operation of fishing vessels as well as processing plants, we will not only be able to maintain our fish stocks in a healthy state but, as well, discipline those who sail through our fisheries waters and discharge pollutants—I am speaking of pollutants discharged from freighters and tankers—of various kinds. Ocean dumping will be easier for us to control. Oil spills will be less frequent because we will insist on Canadian standards. Ships passing through our more ecologically sensitive areas will be better built, better managed and better operated than ever before.

While I am on the subject of shipping I should add a cautionary note. Ours is a big country. Distance has always been a major problem. It is a big cost factor both from a transportation and a communications point of view.

We must encourage mobility wherever possible. We do not want to hold up shipping unnecessarily. We must not badger our neighbours who sail their ships close to our shores on their way across the Atlantic or across the Pacific. So, we must be reasonably flexible in our thinking. We must push out our limits, especially our resource development limits, limits connected with the fisheries, oil and gas, but we must also conduct our affairs in such a way as to minimize the hindrance to shipping, a hindrance which our laws and regulations would otherwise bring about. Limits applying to the resources and their exploitation, relating to the edge of the continental shelf, to the 200-mile concept with respect to fisheries, and mining must not be seen as applying necessarily to shipping. We must make sure that the shipping industry is careful in its operations and that it is non-polluting. On the other hand, we must not introduce policies, laws and regulations which hinder mobility, which hinder shipping unnecessarily. I am speaking not only of ships visiting Canadian ports but going into United States ports and ports of other countries as well.

I am all for zoning. We are busy zoning our sensitive offshore areas. We are not only securing our outer limits of control, and here I am speaking of the continental shelf, but we are also identifying those parts of the shelf which are unique from the biological point of view. We are pinpointing the sensitive spots. We are describing on detailed maps many thousands of square miles in which offshore drilling must be banned, where certain kinds of fishing should be outlawed, where shipping must either be slowed down or, indeed, prohibited, and where land-based