

Later, in 1960, we campaigned very actively for the six plus six formula. We made representations in capitals all over the world through our diplomatic representatives there. Might I point out parenthetically that our efforts then and the exercise in which we are now engaged require the existence of a well trained foreign service and the presence of Canadian representatives in capitals all over the world, for many reasons, but particularly when we are seeking the support of the international community, as now, for a Canadian initiative. The hon. member for Coast Chilcotin (Mr. St. Pierre) called yesterday in his very able speech on the Arctic waters pollution prevention bill for such representations by Canadian representatives. Mr. Speaker, we are very fortunate in having a foreign service generally accepted as one of the very best in the world, and our representatives are already engaged in making representations of the sort referred to by the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin.

It will be recalled that in 1960 our proposed six plus six formula fell short of success by a fraction of one vote. We did not, however, even then, abandon the multilateral approach. We joined with the United Kingdom in canvassing countries around the world to ask them if, in spite of the failure at Geneva, they would none the less join with us in a multilateral agreement based on the six plus six formula. We pressed the U.S.A. to join with us in these representations, but the U.S.A. declined.

Subsequently, when as a result of our extensive and protracted canvassing efforts we and our British friends found that we had the support of over 40 countries for such a proposal, provided the U.S.A. and other major powers would agree, we approached the U.S.A. again with this evidence. Unfortunately, we were told, after waiting a further period of many months for the U.S.A. reply, that the U.S.A. did not consider it timely or appropriate to join with us in our efforts. Mr. Speaker, I hope it will not be taken as a sign of anti-Americanism but merely as an affirmative sign of Canadianism for me to say that we really are not prepared, in light of these developments, to accept the proposition that it is always desirable to proceed multilaterally instead of unilaterally.

I mentioned yesterday that we decided in 1964 that it was necessary to do it alone, and so we did, we passed the Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act laying down the legislative basis for delimiting the territorial sea from

Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act

straight baselines rather than from the sinuosities of the coast, and established a 9-mile fishing zone contiguous to our 3-mile territorial sea. Subsequently, we established straight baselines over long stretches of our coast. The United States, while expressing its disagreement with our legislation, followed suit in 1966 in establishing its own 9-mile fishery zone. It is, however, a reflection of the close and friendly relations between our two countries that it was agreed from the outset on both sides that the fishermen of either country would be allowed to fish freely in the contiguous zones of the other. This remains the Canadian position with respect to any new Canadian fishing zones.

There are now in process discussions in many capitals concerning the desirability of a third Law of the Sea Conference, the agenda for such a possible conference and many other difficult and delicate questions. The United States has made known, as has the Soviet Union, that it would be willing to support an agreement providing for a 12-mile territorial sea, a high seas corridor through international straits and certain limited rights to coastal states over offshore fisheries. As I have stated previously, we will participate actively in any such conference. We cannot, however, accept the notion that a coastal state's fisheries conservation and protection jurisdiction must cease at 12 miles from shore.

The developments since 1960 have proved that there is no magic in the 12-mile limit. Unlike the deer and bears in national parks, who become aware after a period that they are safe when they enter the sanctuary of the park, the fish do not seem to know that they are safe—except of course from Canadian fishermen—when they enter the 12-mile limit. Massive fishing expeditions by other states covering the surface of the sea with trawlers and mother-ships are rapidly depleting the living resources of the sea. We cannot wait longer for the international community to realize the danger and move to meet it. Once again, Canada, after long and serious deliberations, has decided to go it alone.

I shall now turn to the question in which all parties have expressed great interest, namely, the implications of the establishment of a 12-mile territorial sea for Canada's Arctic sovereignty. I should like to emphasize that there is no difference of views concerning Canada's sovereignty over the islands of the Arctic archipelago nor Canada's sovereign rights to explore and exploit the mineral