

*Supply—Northern Affairs*

positions of the two countries—we certainly have no desire to adopt their methods in this or any other respect—I think it would be helpful to have exchanges of information and even a personal visit by the minister, especially if he were accompanied by his officials. I recall when I was in Moscow a few years ago bringing up this matter, and at that time it was received by the officials in Moscow as something that could be done with advantage to both countries.

There was a meeting of the Royal Society of Canada in the early part of June in Edmonton, at which there was a great deal of discussion of Arctic matters by experts without any axe to grind, except perhaps their own professional prejudices that experts are bound to have. At this meeting there was a rather careful and friendly, but analytical, examination of all aspects of this question of northern development. I suggest to members of the committee that the report of this convention of the Royal society dealing with this matter makes very interesting and perhaps informative reading. One of the delegates at that convention was Dr. William C. Wonders of the University of Alberta, who among other things dealt with the Russian successes in the north. He said that Canada has about 32,000 people north of the 60th parallel, compared with 4,500,000 in Russia. The Russian climate is more favourable, he said, and there has been a population pressure lacking in Canada. Then he referred to the point I have been making, that much of this northern population in the U.S.S.R. is not there voluntarily.

There are only two other matters that I want to bring to the minister's attention, with which he might perhaps deal now. He has already dealt with one of them at some length in another debate, and that is the Geneva conference on the law of the sea. The minister felt, and I am not criticizing him for his feeling though I do not entirely share it, that this was a great diplomatic triumph, a great step forward in the codification of international law.

So far as it being a diplomatic triumph is concerned, I realize the efforts that were made by the Canadian delegation to find a compromise resolution in regard to the law of the sea establishing a territorial and jurisdictional zone which would protect our own interest in this matter and would obtain the necessary two thirds approval, which you have to get if the resolution deals with questions of substance. The Canadian delegation was not able to succeed in that regard.

It is not the first time a Canadian delegation has tried to bring about a compromise and has not been able to get the necessary two

thirds majority. But on this occasion, as the minister himself pointed out when he returned—I think it was in a speech he made in Aylmer—the only chance, as it developed, of getting that two thirds majority was to secure the support of the Soviet delegation and its satellites. That gives you seven or eight votes—sometimes a few more and sometimes a few less—at the meetings.

The reason that support had to be secured was that the United States and the United Kingdom were both against the Canadian proposal and were able to line up a good deal of support for their point of view. While I happen to think the Canadian position in this matter was a more intelligent one than that taken by the United States and the United Kingdom, and while I certainly believe that if we have a position which we think should be maintained we should not abandon that position or modify it substantially merely because the United States and the United Kingdom are against it—that would be the abandonment of our independent position at these conferences—subject always to the requirements of the co-operation within the coalition and the interdependence we desire to maintain. It is always an unhappy position in any diplomatic initiative for the Canadian delegation to find that you have both the British and the United States—and I think in this case the French and a good many of our friendly allies—against us and that we have to rely on the Soviet in order to get our two thirds majority.

But even if we had obtained that two thirds majority I suggest to the minister that the resolution in question could not have been very easily established as international law if the United States and the United Kingdom refused to accept it. While I realize that this matter is going to come up again, and that there are other achievements at this conference which did not get much publicity and which are important technical developments in the fields they cover, nevertheless the main issue before the conference—perhaps ultimately the continental shelf may turn out to be the most important issue—but the main issue as it seemed at that time was to establish a territorial zone or a territorial zone plus a jurisdictional zone over the sea which would be accepted by all sides.

That is an effort that has been going on since 1930, when the first conference on this matter of the international law of the sea was held at The Hague to deal with territorial waters. Over all those years attempts have been made to get agreement—something which is very important for countries like Canada—on the law of territorial waters, but they have not succeeded. The minister now