

*Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act*

true is it of the waters off the east and west coasts of our country?

There is in existence now off our east and west coasts a clear and present danger of great damage being done to Canada's marine environment and coastline from pollution by oil from ships. The danger far exceeds that in the north, despite the special ecological conditions which apply in the north, and despite the additional navigational hazards represented in the north by Arctic ice, because of the immense volume of traffic in the waters off Canada's east and west coasts. The danger confronting us has been emphasized by the director of the Science Council of Canada, Dr. Patrick McTaggart-Cowan, who is heading the task force charged with the responsibility of cleaning up the oil spill from the tanker *Arrow* in Chedabucto Bay. Dr. McTaggart-Cowan said, in somewhat unparliamentary language but very expressively:

This flag of convenience business is one of the sloppiest damn things I ever saw. If the commercial airlines ran their business like the tankers do, you'd be crashing a DC8 every week and the world would say "stop it".

The dangers confronting us have also been emphasized by such maritime disasters as the wreck of the *Torrey Canyon* off the coast of the United Kingdom and the wreck of the *Arrow* off Cape Breton Island. Therefore, the practical situation confronting us, the obvious dangers inherent in the operation of large numbers of inadequately constructed and equipped tankers off our east and west coasts, demands that Canada, for her own protection, take the same action off the east and west coasts as she is contemplating for her Arctic waters in the legislation now before the House. Indeed, the danger to her marine environment off her east and west coasts is greater and more immediate.

Moreover, it can be argued that because of the greater and more immediate dangers constituted by the shipping traffic off our east and west coasts, failure to establish claims to a pollution control zone extending one hundred miles off each of these coasts may very well weaken our claim to the establishment of such a zone in our Arctic waters. Those opposed to our action in the Arctic may very well say to us, should we not act in a similar manner off the east and west coasts: "If you were really serious about the danger to your environment represented by the operation of shipping in your Arctic waters, why have you not taken some similar action in Canada's coastal areas where shipping now operates?" I submit to the government that that is a very

[Mr. Rowland.]

real danger should this legislation ever be disputed, and I would commend to their attention the desirability of establishing pollution control zones off our other coasts similar to that contemplated by this legislation for our Arctic waters.

In conclusion, I should like to express once again on behalf of my colleagues in the NDP our wholehearted approbation of the legislation as it now stands, even though we would have liked to have seen some of its provisions extended to other areas of this nation.

**Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore):** In rising to speak on third reading of Bill C-202, it is not my intention to delay the passage of this legislation. Since the introduction of this bill, the official opposition has carried on a vigorous campaign in the House of Commons urging the government to make a clear, unqualified declaration of Canada's sovereignty over the lands and waters of the Canadian Arctic. The campaign was mounted when it became clear that the government itself had sown the seeds of doubt in Canada and the international community by procrastinating and by refusing to take a stand on this issue. The Arctic region, so long regarded as Canadian, is in our view about to be lost through default by this government.

We expressed our concern over Canadian rights in the Arctic at the time of the experimental voyage through the Northwest Passage by the giant Humble oil tanker, the *Manhattan*. This concern came to a head when the Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development, comprised of Members of Parliament who had made a close study of the issue, recommended that the government claim sovereignty over northern land and waters which traditionally had been considered as belonging to Canada. The government resisted efforts to have the committee report brought before the House for discussion, and although the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) eventually won the fight on a motion that the House concur in the committee report, it is a matter of record that the motion was talked into adjournment by the government.

Some Liberal members have asked why the official opposition takes such a strong stand on the question of Canadian sovereignty. I might say it is because of a threefold concern we have which cannot be brushed aside by the government's arrogance. We believe, first of all, that the Canadian citizens of the north must be protected from exploitation, that development of the Canadian north must