

dispute. However, some hon. members went farther. The hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen), according to page 6004 of *Hansard*, goes so far as to say, as I understand his words, that we should claim great tracts under some sector theory. He said, as is reported about the middle of the page, in the left hand column:

We own the whole of the area between the 60th meridian and 141st meridian and up to the North Pole.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a claim to regions far beyond the waters of the archipelago. It is a claim to waters, therefore, that go beyond even, in some cases, the 100-mile limited jurisdiction which we are seeking in the Arctic pollution control zone legislation. Unless and until I can be corrected, I can find no substantiation in my reading for this claim of ownership of the ice of the Beaufort Sea, to name one region.

• (5:40 p.m.)

The drawing of sector lines on maps of the north originated with Senator Poirier. I gave the wrong date to the House the other day when quoting the senator. I said it was 1903, but it should have been 1908. He suggested, and the government later adopted in its cartography, that we should draw these sector lines to the pole to include lands so far undiscovered or unclaimed within these lines. The Russians at various times, including April 15, 1926, did the same. They claimed the lands which might be discovered within their sector lines.

I wish to deal briefly with the Russian position today, as I understand it. There seems to be no doubt that the government of the U.S.S.R. has greatly blurred its claim under the sector theory. It certainly claims the islands of the north. It claims extensive territorial seas, as we are claiming, but I draw to the attention of the House that the American coastguard ship *Northwind* sailed north of the Russian Island of Severnaya Zemlya without protest from the Russians. The *Northwind* went north in 1967 and, as I understand it, crossed what could be called the Russian sector line, without protest. However, when this ship sought to pass through the Viliitsky Strait lying between the mainland and island, the Russians did consider this their territorial waters and forbade passage. As it happened, the *Northwind* became stuck in eight feet of ice and was broken free by our own icebreaker, the *Sir John A. Macdonald*.

I do not raise this point in order to urge the Canadian government to cease drawing sector

Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act

lines on the map. We should continue to draw them. However, I draw to the attention of the House that it is not in the interest of this nation to make unreasonable claims. It is not in our interest to make claims more extensive than those of one of the two great superpowers on earth, namely Russia. Our claims should be those which meet our interests and those which we can sensibly enforce. At present, this is the extension of the three-mile limit to the 12-mile territorial limit which, as I pointed out in a previous speech, if all else fails, creates a gate of territorial waters across the Northwest Passage. I maintain that one gate is the equivalent of many gates.

The country remains faced with a test on this matter in which we find the two superpowers, the United States and, according to my understanding the U.S.S.R., in agreement. It is the position of the United States that the waters of archipelagos lying between oceans should be subject to a high seas passage. It is my understanding that Russia, which has some concern about the right of Turkey to close its canals to military traffic in times of war, is supporting the American government in this position. Needless to say, this must be vigorously resisted by the Canadian government. We cannot accept a high seas passage through the Arctic archipelago.

Because my time has almost expired, I am not going to deal with the various questions of international law which I, as layman, understand to support the perfectly justifiable Canadian claim that the Arctic archipelago is not comparable with oceanic archipelagos such as Indonesia in the West Indies. The Arctic archipelago has never been an international waterway. I am convinced we can prevent it from becoming a high seas waterway. I do not urge the Canadian government to bar innocent passage to safe shipping. In fact, we all look forward to the establishment of considerable commercial traffic through the Northwest Passage, provided it is safe and provided we are the judges as to whether it is safe.

With my eye on the clock, Mr. Speaker, I thank the House for its courteous attention.

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): I too will try to be brief, Mr. Speaker. This bill and Bill C-202 are additions to an awareness of the laws of the north. I think it is right to put things into context as the last speaker did, and I will follow his example, on what was somewhat disparagingly called the northern vision. I participated in an election campaign where the talk was that the govern-