

Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Bill

ritorial sea bill. Let us be sure that we retain in that bill the advantage which geography gives us. Let us extend the territorial waters across a portion of the Northwest Passage. And one gate in that passage, Mr. Speaker, is worth as much as ten gates when ships want to pass through from one side to the other.

As to the requirement that we permit innocent passage, I do not think Canada has anything to fear from adhering to the rule of innocent passage. Innocent passage is not extended to a ship which offers a threat to the peace or good order of the coastal state involved. A supertanker in the Northwest Passage, carrying 25 times the amount of oil we have been cleaning up in Chedabucto Bay as a result of the spill,—25 times, Mr. Speaker,—which is in a dangerous condition would clearly, in any international court, be treated as a threat to the good order of this nation.

Yet the United States' position is that we should not have this. The United States position has been stated quite recently by Hon. John R. Stevenson, who is the legal adviser to the Department of State. I will not read the whole of his remarks; there is not time and my time is running out. In essence he states that the United States position is that through any archipelago there ought to be a high seas passage. In terms of our Arctic archipelago, Mr. Speaker, this simply does not make sense. Can any hon. member of the House conceive of our permitting a high seas passage through the Northwest Passage of a piece of junk like the *Arrow* which sank in Chedabucto Bay?

• (8:50 p.m.)

I wish to refer to a couple of the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition—one in particular. He asked what the intentions of the government are with respect to enforcement of our Arctic pollution control zone. That is a good question and I wish to deal with it briefly. We may not do anything. We must recognize the possibility that Panarctic may never discover oil in the Arctic, the Baffin iron ore deposits may never be open, or the nickel deposits on the mainland or numerous other deposits. The Arctic may go back to sleep for another 50 years. It slept before and it may sleep again. But I do not believe this will be so. Personally, I believe that the Arctic maiden is finally awake. Our duty is to ensure that she is not raped.

In answer to the question raised by the Leader of the Opposition, I suggest there are three things that can be done immediately. One is research. We are gaining some valuable

data from Dr. Cowan's work at Chedabucto. We need research in the Polar pack. We need knowledge as to what the perils are and how they can be overcome. It is the primary duty of this nation to carry this out. In accepting and claiming new responsibilities in the Arctic, the Canadian nation must accept new duties. That is one of them.

Navigational aids are another matter. We should look forward to that, assuming that passage proves economically feasible for either ore carriers or oil carriers. At the very least we should install a Decca system. Five Decca stations can be built at an estimated cost of \$10 million—a very modest amount. We must provide these and other services.

I assume that the Arctic is going to continue to grow. I believe it is going to become an extremely important and productive part of this nation. Even though it will involve considerable expense, we must build a modern ice-breaking fleet. At the moment half a million dollars is being spent by the government on the design of one such ship. I do not know what the total cost would be of building ships far above the class of the *St. Laurent*, ships with at least 80,000 horsepower which would be capable of handling the Polar pack even in the open Beaufort Sea. Possibly a fleet of two or three would cost an estimated \$200 million or \$300 million. We owe a duty to ourselves and to other nations in the Arctic to be prepared to spend this amount of money. Let us do it cheerfully.

In conclusion, I congratulate the government without reservation on the principles which are expressed in this legislation. I thank hon. members for their attention.

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member who has just spoken will permit a question. Just before the hon. member concluded his remarks he said he was going to deal with the question of how the government would enforce the new pollution regulations inasmuch as we have declared ourselves as sort of outlaws, outside the field of international law in this regard. I was listening attentively to what the hon. member had to say, but he dealt with another subject. I wonder whether he forgot to continue his remarks as to how we would deal with a country or a ship that would not obey our regulations.

Mr. St. Pierre: I suggested we provide the services in the case of the Decca system. As the hon. member knows, Canada is not a signatory—is the hon. member listening?