

remains silent. It is all very well for the Prime Minister to speak today in glowing terms of the survival of mankind. The time to speak out was when the whole question of the ABM system was being debated. The Prime Minister said that if the government disagreed with the system, we would condemn it and tell the United States government we disapproved of it. What has the government done? Has it condemned it? Has the government approved it, or is it merely remaining silent and acquiescing?

Another example arises directly out of the ABM system, namely, the nuclear tests at Amchitka in the Aleutians. These tests were announced many months ago but not until September 19 did the government get around to sending a note to Washington. When it did, it was such a mealy-mouthed statement that there was little hope anybody would pay any attention to it.

Two more tests of much greater magnitude are planned. What action does the government propose to take? I suggest to the Prime Minister that after all his fine words today and his expressions of hope for the abolition of nuclear armaments, he has a responsibility to tell this house, the country and the United States the stand we are going to take in respect of the two further increased magnitude tests which will be taking place at Amchitka—and to do so before the installations are in place or preparations even begin.

Another example of our acquiescence in respect of international policies concerns the question of sovereignty over Arctic waters. The discovery of large reservoirs of oil in the Arctic means that this area is now up for grabs, and that countries which looked upon it as a few thousand acres of snow and ice have now become very interested in the area. Canada is in danger of losing its sovereignty and ownership of those Arctic waters by default and by its failure to assert its basic rights. There can be no doubt about our rights.

Mr. Ivan Head, who is one of the Prime Minister's advisers, wrote of our Arctic waters a few years ago:

—surrounded on all sides by Canadian territory they possess the character of Canadian waters.

Maxwell Cohen, dean of the law school at McGill University, points out that on the basis of the Norwegian fisheries case, decided by the International Court of Justice in 1951, Canada has a just claim to the Arctic waters as being internal waters, though subject to peaceful navigation rights from one part of

the high seas to the other. Dean Cohen further points out that since 1958 the world has generally accepted the right of a coastal state to have exclusive jurisdiction over the continental shelf that extends seaward—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I thank the house for its kindness and I shall not trespass on hon. member's patience much longer. I am just about finished. Dean Cohen has pointed out that since 1958 the world has generally accepted the right of a coastal state to have exclusive jurisdiction over the continental shelf that extends seaward from the mainland to an average depth of 600 feet.

Canadians have no desire to deny peaceful passage through the Arctic waters. However, any mishap to oil tankers passing through these waters could create serious pollution problems. If we are to be the victims of any mishap, surely we are entitled to exercise proper control of these waters. To do this Canada should assert its sovereignty, lest its silence be construed as indifference.

The Prime Minister said this afternoon that legislation would be introduced in respect of the pollution of Arctic waters. We will know better, when we see the legislation, how far Canada intends to extend its sovereignty. The fact remains that a few weeks ago the *Manhattan* sailed through these waters with instructions from Washington not to fly the Canadian flag. This indicates that our great neighbour to the south is questioning Canada's jurisdiction in that area. It is time the government and this House of Commons—indeed this entire parliament—made its position clear not only to the Canadian people but to the nations of the world. Let me close by saying that the failure of the government to deal vigorously with some of the most pressing social and economic problems facing the Canadian people requires most vigorous action by the parties in opposition.

We listened this afternoon to the very eloquent statements made by the Prime Minister as he delineated the plight of people in various sections of Canada; but we listened in vain for any concrete or specific programs which the government has in mind to improve the conditions of the people for whom the Prime Minister shed such eloquent tears.