

*Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act*

claiming fishing rights in our waters. I referred to the fact that this phasing-out phase had been going on for six years. At that time the minister described these negotiations as delicate. Perhaps this House should be so indelicate as to put a deadline in this bill stating when these so-called rights will automatically expire. Had such a deadline been put in the 1964 bill, these nations would have been warned not to build ever-increasing, ever-larger fishing fleets with which to ruin and destroy our vastly diminishing fishing resources.

As I listen to the questions put to the Secretary of State for External Affairs and to his replies, quite frankly sometimes I wonder what is happening between his department and his counterpart in the United States. It seems that friendly discussion, which was the rule in the past, no longer exists. We have the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) going down to Denver and making a speech which certainly did nothing to improve relations between Canada and the United States and perhaps alienated our friends in that area. This is the minister who will have to negotiate pollution control measures, which must be international to be effective. This is the minister who will have to negotiate a new oil policy and a new gas policy. Therefore, he should be on friendly terms with his counterpart in the United States. There is an old saying in Atlantic Canada that you catch more flies with molasses than with vinegar. He certainly poured the vinegar on in Denver.

• (9:30 p.m.)

I wonder if that attitude has carried over to our Department of External Affairs, Mr. Speaker. I say this because of an article I read a week ago in the *Christian Science Monitor*. It was entitled "Sharing the Ocean's Wealth" and I should like to read part of it. The article states:

President Nixon has proposed a world treaty in which nations would give up all claims to most of the riches of the world's seabeds. But that is not all. He also has proposed giving 90 per cent of the seabed to an international agency—with royalties going "for international community purposes."

There are many details to his proposal, but generally speaking it is a breathtaking plan. Its potential can only be estimated in billions of dollars.

There are obviously some provisos in it. Coastal nations would have to accept it, and that may not be easy. The U.S.S.R. is a large coastal nation. So is Communist China. Also, Japan and Britain. Experience in getting agreement among the world's

[Mr. Crouse.]

powers, particularly any involving Moscow and Peking, suggests there are many nearly insurmountable problems to be resolved.

Then there are likely to be loud cries from interested parties in the United States, as well as elsewhere. The U.S. petroleum industry, for example, is not likely to take kindly to the President's plan that the U.S. waive claims to the ocean floor beyond the continental shelf. The President's idea is that all the riches beyond the shelf, unquestionably greater than any "wealth of the Indies," should be preserved as "the common heritage of mankind."

The article continues:

President Nixon at the same time firmly backed a proposed Law of the Sea treaty that would set a 12-mile territorial waters.

These are important proposals by the President of the United States, Mr. Speaker. While he was making them did we hear anything about this matter from our Secretary of State for External Affairs? Did he at any time indicate that the President of the United States was thinking along similar lines and apparently would be happy to co-operate in conservation and pollution control in matters which are obviously of vital importance to that country, according to this article? The answer is no, Mr. Speaker. We heard nothing from the Secretary of State for External Affairs about American proposals similar to our own. All we hear whenever a statement is made is that we are not getting agreement with these people, that we must take unilateral action.

It is getting to the point where we are a lone wolf in international affairs. We take action without consulting the International Monetary Fund, we withdraw from NATO and tell all our friends that we are no longer going to co-operate, and we take unilateral action all the time. We are becoming a lone wolf, but I wonder if Canadians are willing to follow this line. I think we should be following the other course if we wish to put people back to work and make this nation grow and prosper.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, another question comes to mind. Why were not the sovereign rights of Canada, or the provinces of Canada, as the case may be, over her continental shelf embodied in the bill? These rights are acknowledged in the 1958 Geneva convention on the continental shelf and extend to exploring and exploiting the natural resources of the shelf. Why were they not embodied in the bill, if for no other reason than to include our territorial water rights, our fishing zone rights and our continental shelf rights in one and the same statute? I ask