

We have had such debates on previous occasions when fisheries bills were up. The desire of most fishermen in Canada is understandable, that our territorial waters be extended out as far as possible to preserve the inshore fisheries.

There have been suggestions about extending it to 12 miles, and even to the continental shelf. There was some discussion upon it in the debates of 2 or 3 years ago when a declaration was made by the President of the United States at that time, President Truman. His action was debated. It had a statement which was sometimes misunderstood, that the Americans would exercise legal authority over fisheries out to the continental shelf. My recollection was that this was very quickly followed by such action on the part of South American countries, and there was violent protest by many countries as to these restrictions by certain South American states, saying that they were interested in conservation out to the continental shelf.

The second development, however, in recent years, has been the decision of the International Court on the dispute between Norway and Great Britain as to where the line should be drawn. The Norwegians in general claimed that it was from headland to headland, not following the contours of the shore. The British challenged this in the case, and the Norwegians won.

This was immediately followed by action taken by other countries, notably Iceland, and it is easy to see how unilateral action taken by one country can have effects which are not dreamed of when that action is taken.

Iceland, in general, decided to outline her boundaries from headland to headland, the main corners, so to speak, of the country. Iceland is rather horseshoe shaped and they decided to run their territorial lines around the country in as simple a line as possible, including very large areas as part of their territorial waters.

The British, I think, have not yet taken that matter to the International Court, but the British trawlers have removed themselves from that area. The repercussions were immediate. While the British Government has yet to take any action, the port facilities in the principal fishing ports have been denied to Icelandic fishing boats, and some of the long shoremen's trade unions have refused to unload Icelandic boats. As a consequence, Iceland has been cut off from a major market for its fish, namely, the British market.

This has been reflected even as far as Canada, because Iceland had to look elsewhere for markets, and in their search they included the American market in which they had very little interest up to this time, up to the time this situation developed. But in the last few years, exports of fresh and frozen fish from Iceland to America have increased from 5 million pounds to about 35 million pounds a year. Normally our fishing fleets would expect to get the bulk of that increase. However, while we have held our own in the American market, we are finding the competition of this Icelandic fish very difficult.

I have used that as an example of what happens when one country, by itself, tries to alter international law.

As British people, we have long experienced the freedom of the seas, which has meant freedom up to 3 miles from the other countries' shores. Now, if arbitrarily, and without any international discussion, we were to extend our limits out to the continental shelf, we would be in the position of having to try to enforce such a law against the people who may have historical interests in such waters. That is especially true of the eastern coast where, since 1498 at least, the peoples of Britain, France, and Portugal have been fishing.

I have, actually, a formal statement which sums the thing up.

Definition of territorial waters is a complex question, affecting as it does, many interests at home and abroad. Last year's judgment of the International Court of Justice in the fisheries dispute between the United Kingdom and Norway, has provoked a study of this question and re-examination of the