

*Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Bill*

**Mr. Sharp:** But well justified.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Bill C-202 is designed to exercise control of pollution in Arctic waters. This, of course, is a very urgent problem. I think we have been lucky. We were lucky with regard to the first voyage of the *Manhattan*, because the ship entered our Arctic waters subject to no regulations of ours with regard to anti-pollution matters. It suffered damage; yet, fortunately, the north apparently incurred no pollution damage as a result thereof. We were lucky.

If we are to believe many scientific experts, time is running out for the people of this earth. Everything possible must be done to halt the pollution menace facing mankind. For this reason, I cannot quarrel with any anti-pollution measure adopted with regard to the Canadian Arctic, unless it be on the grounds that it is not enough or, for some reason, cannot be enforced. I say now that the government proposal to declare a pollution zone in the Arctic may not have the teeth to effectively ensure pollution control in this delicate environment. Canada has already been exposed to endless danger by the government that has, at the least, been extremely haphazard in its approach to this pollution menace.

Scientists have long been warning us of the danger of pollution—pollution of the land, air and water—and serious doubts are being expressed as to our very future unless we show some respect for nature and the environment in which we have been given the privilege of life. The risk of a *Torrey Canyon* disaster hangs over us all, and the best insurance policy in the world would not and could not compensate for the damage to our environment if anything of that magnitude were to take place in the north, as the minister indicated to us this afternoon. A disaster of that proportion would upset the delicate balance of nature in the Arctic and might lead to a complete ecological breakdown. It could reach out to every man, woman and child on this earth. So, we feel that not only are we defending Canada's interests when we fight pollution in the north, but that we are serving in a very real sense the interests of the world.

Pollution control is urgent but it is important also to Canada that we maintain our claim to the sovereignty of the waters between the islands and that we do not abandon that claim. The two bills taken together, Mr. Speaker, will have a very profound effect upon Canada's position in the north for all

[Mr. Stanfield.]

time. We cannot foresee now, in any precise way, the manner in which the north may be developed. I think it is fair to say that even the best informed people can only visualize this now in a rather dim way.

We thought that the waters between the islands, the sovereignty over which this government is abandoning, were our waters, Mr. Speaker. The Prime Minister has said that there is a lot of sentiment about the north; nevertheless, I suggest that it is not for the Prime Minister or any minister of the government to abandon what Canadians have regarded as theirs simply because the Prime Minister or other ministers cannot see that there is any particularly useful purpose in maintaining the claim of Canadian jurisdiction over these waters. Instead of asserting in a clear fashion the Canadian claim of jurisdiction over the waters between the islands and also the waters around the islands through use of the base line technique, which all Canadians expect their government to do, the government of Canada has introduced these two bills which, taken together, imply the abandonment of our assertion of sovereignty over much of the waters that we regarded as ours.

As to pollution control and the bill specifically before us this afternoon, it is clear of course that we are accepting a large responsibility. I hope that the Secretary of State for External Affairs will perhaps give us a little more information as to why the figure of 100 miles was selected, instead of 125 miles or 150 miles, in connection with pollution control.

**An hon. Member:** That is a magic number.

**Mr. Stanfield:** We have accepted this responsibility. The government has decided that it cannot wait, that it cannot take the time to work toward an international agreement, and that we must accept this responsibility by ourselves. I can accept that point of view with regard to pollution control. I said, and I say again, that we are the only ones who are going to accept this responsibility. We are accepting it and we have decided to go it alone. We are exempting ourselves from the jurisdiction of the International Court. That will prevent our being interfered with by that court, but of course it will not in itself help us to enforce our laws with regard to the control of pollution.

Having accepted the responsibility of controlling pollution in this area, and I agree that we should accept the responsibility, we must