Archived Content

Information identified as archived on the Web is for reference, research or record-keeping purposes. It has not been altered or updated after the date of archiving. Web pages that are archived on the Web are not subject to the Government of Canada Web Standards.

As per the Communications Policy of the Government of Canada, you can request alternate formats on the "Contact Us" page.

Information archivée dans le Web

Information archivée dans le Web à des fins de consultation, de recherche ou de tenue de documents. Cette dernière n'a aucunement été modifiée ni mise à jour depuis sa date de mise en archive. Les pages archivées dans le Web ne sont pas assujetties aux normes qui s'appliquent aux sites Web du gouvernement du Canada.

Conformément à la Politique de communication du gouvernement du Canada, vous pouvez demander de recevoir cette information dans tout autre format de rechange à la page « Contactez-nous ».

CANADIAN FORCES COLLEGE / COLLÈGE DES FORCES CANADIENNES
JCSP 33 / PCEMI 33

EXERCISE/EXERCICE
New Horizons

In Defence of the Canadian Arctic

By /par Maj/maj Sharon Broadbent
JCSP 33
23 April 2007

This paper was written by a student attending the Canadian Forces College in fulfillment of one of the requirements of the Course of Studies. The paper is a scholastic document, and thus contains facts and opinions, which the author alone considered appropriate and correct for the subject. It does not necessarily reflect the policy or the opinion of any agency, including the Government of Canada and the Canadian Department of National Defence. This paper may not be released, quoted or copied except with the express permission of the Canadian Department of National Defence.

La présente étude a été rédigée par un stagiaire du Collège des Forces canadiennes pour satisfaire à l'une des exigences du cours. L'étude est un document qui se rapporte au cours et contient donc des faits et des opinions que seul l'auteur considère appropriés et convenables au sujet. Elle ne reflète pas nécessairement la politique ou l'opinion d'un organisme quelconque, y compris le gouvernement du Canada et le ministère de la Défense nationale du Canada. Il est défendu de diffuser, de citer ou de reproduire cette étude sans la permission expresse du ministère de la Défense nationale.

Canada is the second largest country in the world, encompassing an area of nearly ten million square kilometres. The Canadian Arctic measures almost four million square kilometres in size, or about 40 percent of Canada. Within that area is the Arctic Archipelago, a group of 36,563 islands covering 1,424,500 square kilometres.[1] This entire area is referred to as the 'far north', 'North of 60°', or simply the Canadian Arctic. It has always held a special place in the hearts of Canadians, perhaps because it is a symbol of Canada itself – a vast, thinly populated area, with harsh weather conditions. Those who live in the far north must be very hardy and able to adapt to the extreme climate in order to survive. Over the years the Canadian Arctic has been romanticized to the point where, even though most Canadians have never travelled to 'North of 60°', they are extremely proud and possessive of this region. In fact, the Canadian national anthem includes the phrase, "The True North strong and free."[2]

Canadian federal governments have been no less proud, but they have generally fallen short when it comes to providing the funding required to assert sovereignty, ensure security, and to let the world know, in no uncertain terms, that the Arctic is Canadian. Arnold Wolfers explains this state of affairs in his classic article, "'National Security' as an Ambiguous Symbol" stating, "numerous domestic factors such as national character, tradition, preferences and prejudices will influence the level of security which a nation chooses to make its target."[3] The government faces the political challenges of meeting public demands for quality improvements in health care and education services, at the same time as it provides for the defence of the

---

[1] Canada, Natural Resources Canada, The Atlas of Canada, http://atlas.nrcan.gc.ca/site/english/learningresources/facts/surfareas.html; Internet, accessed 1 April 2007.

[2] Canada, Canadian Heritage, http://www.pch.gc.ca/progs/cpsc-ccsp/sc-cs/anthem_e.cfm; Internet, accessed 1 April 2007.

[3] Arnold Wolfers. "'National Security' as an Ambiguous Symbol." *Political Science Quarterly* 67, no. 4 (December 1952): pp. 489.

country.[4] Canada has traditionally spent more money on social programs than on defence and security.

The original inhabitants of the Canadian Arctic, the Inuit and First Nations peoples, have watched as 'southerners' have tried to establish ownership of the land. There is a disconnect in the approach to the land between the two cultures – the First Nations people see themselves as stewards of the land, they work with the land, respect it, and pass it on to future generations. Southerners, who see themselves as more civilized and generally more advanced than the First Nations peoples, see the abundant wealth of natural resources as an untapped reservoir which must be drained in such a manner that all involved can make their fortunes. The aim of this paper is to examine the history of the Canadian Arctic, to look at past governmental involvement in the region, to examine the threats to the Canadian Arctic and the issue of the Northwest Passage. Federal government actions and reactions to incidents will be discussed, including what was promised and what actually came into being. Has Canada done enough to prove to the world that it can defend all that it has claimed in the Canadian Arctic?

HISTORY OF THE REGION

The First Nations and Inuit were the first inhabitants of the Canadian Arctic. They believed that the land and its resources were to be respected, shared among all, and bestowed to their descendants. Europeans came to North America in the sixteenth century and laid claim to the vast territories they discovered. The European approach to the land was that its value lies in ownership, it should be used for monetary gain wherever possible, and it must be defended against threats if one wished to retain possession. From 1576 to 1905, many fabled explorers such as Martin Frobisher, William Baffin, Henry Hudson, Vitus Bering, Robert Peary, and Roald

[4] CIA, The World Factbook, Canada, https://www.odci.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/ca.html; Internet; accessed 15 April 2007.

Amundsen sailed the waters of the far north, searching for a shorter shipping route between Europe and Asia. In the process, they charted much of the area by sea while the Hudson's Bay Company was exploring the land, mapping routes, and setting up trading posts in support of the fur trade. Britain and France fought over North America until possession was finally resolved via the Treaty of Paris in 1763[5], in which France was removed from North America, giving Britain possession of Canada.

Canada came into being via the British North America Act, or Confederation, in 1867. The Northwest Territories were originally part of Rupert's Land; they were given to Canada by the Hudson's Bay Company in 1870, and made into a territory. The territorial boundaries changed many times between 1870 and 1912, as provinces expanded or were created from this immense area. In 1880, possession of the Arctic Islands was passed from Britain to Canada. The most significant modern-day change in territorial boundaries and governance came about in 1999, when the eastern part of the Northwest Territories became the new Canadian territory of Nunavut.

Oil and natural gas were discovered in the Northwest Territories in 1925 and 1971, respectively. In 1991, diamonds were discovered in the Arctic, and the first diamond mine opened in the Northwest Territories in 1998. It has been said that the Canadian Arctic is a vast region, thinly populated, and far from the eye of the Canadian public. It has enormous natural resource potential but there are significant challenges involved in removing these valuable resources and bringing them to market. The harsh climate is not conducive to building processing plants in the Canadian Arctic. The Arctic waters are generally ice-covered from

---

[5] Encyclopædia Britannica, 1985. *Canada*. The Treaty of Paris, 1763, ended the French and Indian War. All French North America east of the Mississippi was ceded to Britain. Britain and its colonies had eliminated France from North America. pp 503.

October until April, which severely limits access to northern ports. Transporting raw resources by air is quite expensive and poor weather in the winter can prevent access to aerodromes or landing strips. There are few railroads or highways in the region, so access by rail or vehicles is very limited. As a result, while there are untold riches in these lands, there are few economical ways of getting those riches to world markets.

HISTORY OF GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT IN THE REGION

When the British defeated the French in Canada in 1763, they were reluctant to allocate the required resources to defend this territory. North America was far removed from Europe and there were no real challenges to British sovereignty. The British felt that Canadians should contribute to their own defence with minimal assistance from England. The British were proponents of exploring the region's lands and waters, but saw no need to send troops to the far north or to build northern forts to ensure security and sovereignty. During the War of 1812-1814, the British built forts mainly in modern-day southern Ontario and defended Canada against an American invasion, but this was the most heavily populated area of the country and was deemed to be crucial to defend. After this war, defence spending returned to its pre-war level. In 1896, gold was discovered in the Yukon and the fabled gold rush began. To help manage this influx of people and to prevent Americans from taking over the region, the territory of Yukon was added to Canada in 1898. In 1897, Prime Minister Wilfred Laurier sent William Wakeham to establish Canadian jurisdiction in the region.[6] This was an attempt to assert sovereignty, but some say it was more an effort to deter the Americans from expanding into the gold-rich Yukon and to resolve problems with American and Norwegian whalers who were plundering northern

[6] Canada, Library and Archives Canada, Canadian Confederation, http://www.collectionscanada.ca/confederation /023001-2245-e.html; Internet, accessed 1 April 2007.

villages.[7] Some North-West Mounted Police (established in 1873) were sent to maintain law and order in the Yukon in 1889, and in 1903, the first mounted police post north of the Arctic Circle was established at Fort McPherson.[8] During the First World War, there was little, if any, interest in the Canadian Arctic. All of Canada's resources were needed to fight the Great War in Europe. In the 1920s, the government dispatched Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) to the region to establish a presence and sovereignty.[9] By 1941, there were nearly a dozen RCMP posts scattered around the Canadian Arctic.

During the Second World War, most Canadian resources were again needed for the European battle, although Canada did send some aircraft to Alaska to help defend against a potential Japanese invasion. This was the first bi-national cooperation between Canada and the United States to defend North America. Under the guise of defence, the Americans were quite involved in the Canadian Arctic. The Alaska Highway was completed in 1942 between Dawson Creek, British Columbia and Fairbanks, Alaska, to allow the Americans to send people and resources north to defend against Japan. The Americans also built a large airbase near Iqaluit in 1943 (it closed in 1963).[10] During the Second World War, in the name of continental defence, Americans were involved in building airports, highways, weather stations, pipelines, a telephone system, docks, and shipyard facilities in the Canadian Arctic.[11]

---

[7] Major R.R. Romses, "North of Sixty – Why Canada Should Increase its Military Effort." CFC Exercise New Horizons research paper, 1985, p6.

[8] Canada, Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Fact Sheets, http://www.rcmp-grc.gc.ca/factsheets/fact_ history_e.htm; Internet, accessed 1 April 2007.

[9] Canada, Royal Canadian Mounted Police, History, http://www.rcmp-grc.gc.ca/history/did_know_e.htm; Internet, accessed 1 April 2007.

[10] City of Iqaluit, History, http://www.city.iqaluit.nu.ca/i18n/english/history.html; Internet, accessed 1 April 2007.

[11] Elizabeth Elliot-Meisel, Arctic Diplomacy, New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 1998, pp 42-57

During the Cold War, Canada was located between the world's two superpowers – the United States and the Soviet Union. Since Canada was aligned with America ideologically, politically, militarily, and financially, it made sense to continue to collaborate with the Americans in the defence of the continent. The concept of continental air defence appeared in the Canadian Arctic in the form of the Distant Early Warning Line (DEW Line). It was an "integrated chain of 63 radar and communication systems stretching 3,000 miles from the northwest coast of Alaska to the eastern shore of Baffin Island opposite Greenland. It is within the Arctic Circle over its entire length and for much of the distance crosses country hitherto unexplored."[12] Built between 1954 and 1957, these stations created a visible military presence in the far North, along the 70th parallel. The former DEW Line was modernized, automated, and incorporated into the North Warning System (NWS) in 1985.

As well, a Canadian/American Joint Arctic Weather Station (JAWS) was built in 1950 at Alert, on the northern tip of Ellesmere Island. The Canadian military added buildings in 1956, thereby establishing a permanent military presence on the farthest northern point of Canada (Alert is the world's northernmost permanently inhabited settlement). The Alert JAWS was the fifth and final station to be built; the others were built in Eureka and Resolute Bay in 1947, followed by Isachsen and Mould Bay in 1948.[13] The military presence was not just on the land; efforts were also made to provide a naval presence. In 1949, the keel for the Royal Canadian Navy icebreaker *HMCS Labrador* was laid; she was commissioned in 1954, transited the Northwest Passage in 1954 and was transferred to the Canadian Coast Guard in 1957. She was

---

[12] Lynden Harris, The DEWLINE CHRONICLES, http://www.lswilson.ca/dewhist-a.htm; Internet, accessed 1 April 2007.

[13] Canada, Environment Canada, High Arctic Weather Stations – 50 Years of Operation. http://www.mb.ec.gc.ca/info/news/cc00s20.en.html; Internet, accessed 1 April 2007.

the first deep draft ship and the first naval ship to transit the Passage.[14] As recently as 2006, the government was talking about building an icebreaker for the Canadian Forces to use to conduct sovereignty patrols in Canadian Arctic waters.

More military infrastructure was built in the Arctic. As part of North American Air (later Aerospace) Defence Command (NORAD), Forward Operating Locations (FOLs) were established at Inuvik, Iqaluit, Rankin Inlet, and Yellowknife.[15] FOLs are located at airports from which fighter aircraft can operate in defence of Canada's North. But in May 1985, the Canadian government announced that the Canadian Forces base in Inuvik, the largest military installation in the north, would be closed, removing over 250 military personnel from the Arctic.[16]

The major contemporary military presence in the Arctic is the headquarters of the present-day Canadian Forces Joint Task Force (CFJTF) (North), established in Yellowknife in 1970. It oversees nearly 3,500 personnel involved in military activities in the Arctic and has two detachments – one in Iqaluit and one in Whitehorse.[17] Most of the people it oversees belong to the First Canadian Ranger Patrol Group (CRPG), a volunteer force of part-time reservists forming patrols in Canada's north. Along with the Junior Ranger program, there are over 2,800 people grouped into 94 patrols. The Rangers are "the eyes and ears in the north for the Canadian Forces in support of Canadian sovereignty."[18] The Rangers grew out of the Pacific West Coast Militia Rangers who kept watch for a possible Japanese invasion in the remote parts of Canada's

---

[14] Elizabeth Elliot-Meisel, Arctic Diplomacy, New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 1998, pp 105.

[15] Canada, National Defence, The Defence Portfolio, http://www.forces.gc.ca/menu/consult/current_policy/defence_portfolio/annexd_e.asp; Internet, accessed 1 April 2007.

[16] Inuvik, Inuvik History, http://www.inuvik.ca/tourism/inuvikhistory.html; Internet, accessed 1 April 2007.

[17] Canada, Canadian Forces, CANCOM-JTFN Fact

west coast in 1942. The Rangers were formalized in the early 1950s when they were issued with rifles. They report unusual activities, collect local data of significance to the Canadian Forces, and conduct surveillance or sovereignty patrols as required.[19]

THREATS TO THE CANADIAN ARCTIC

Sovereignty is defined as "supreme power especially over a political unit; freedom from external control; an autonomous state."[20] A country must have proof to establish a claim to sovereignty. Generally accepted proofs are "discovery, cession, conquest and administration."[21] The Canadian Arctic has already been discovered and, aside from Hans Island (a disputed island also claimed by Denmark in the eastern Arctic waters), there are no real contenders for the land and islands in the region. Cession was accomplished in 1880 when Britain gave the Canadian Arctic to Canada and conquest was never an issue, but administration remains unclear. Canada can claim vast tracts of land and water but international law requires that there also be "effective occupation or administration."[22] Effective occupation is accomplished by a visible, continuous presence and administration entails establishing law and order, operating a post office, or taking a census. In many parts of the Canadian Arctic, effective occupation and administration are lacking. It would be impossible to establish a presence on each of the more than 35,000 islands in the Canadian Arctic Archipelago, so alternatives must be considered. The RCMP established many stations throughout the area and they routinely patrol beyond those posts. The Canadian

---

[19] Canada, Canadian Forces, 1 Canadian Ranger Patrol Group, http://www.cfna.forces.gc.ca /units/rangers/history_e.asp; Internet, accessed 1 April 2007.

[20] The New Britannica-Webster Dictionary&Reference Guide. USA: Encyclopædia Britannica, 1981.p 884.

[21] W.R. Morrison, "Arctic Sovereignty." The Canadian Encyclopedia, http://www.canadianencyclopedia .ca/index.cfm?PgNm=TCE&Params=A1ARTA0000298; Internet, accessed 1 April 2007.

[22] W.R. Morrison. "Arctic Sovereignty." The Canadian Encyclopedia, http://www.canadianencyclopedia .ca/index.cfm?PgNm=TCE&Params=A1ARTA0000298; Internet, accessed 1 April 2007.

Rangers also cover an immense area on their patrols but a permanent presence is lacking. The lack of a permanent presence also means that there is no defence against intruders. Canada's dilemma is how to maintain security and sovereignty in an area where there is no permanent presence. Staff from the Canadian Parliamentary Information and Research Service conducted an assessment of Canadian Arctic Sovereignty in January 2006 and they determined that sovereignty is "linked to the maintenance of international security. There is an increasing expectation of state responsibility in ensuring territorial control and in providing the presence of state authority."[23] The presence of a state authority must be more tangible than merely planting a flag or laying a plaque but this presence will come at a cost – funds must be expended in order to assert sovereignty and ensure security. At stake is the undisputed ownership of nearly 4 million square kilometres containing a wealth of natural resources and the security of Canadian soil.

The threats to the Canadian Arctic are not all related to security and sovereignty. The threats have ranged from being taken over by the Americans in the late 1800s, to the possibility of a Japanese invasion during the Second World War, to the chance of a spill when an oil tanker first transited the North West Passage, to the contamination of the fragile Arctic ecosystem with the use of Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) during the building of radar and communication stations in the 1950s. The Commander of CFJTF (North) stated in October 2006 that the greatest threat to the Canadian North today comes from organized crime, involving smuggling in illegal drugs and illegal aliens.

---

[23] Matthew Carnaghan and Allison Goody. Canadian Arctic Sovereignty. Library of Parliament, 26 January 2006. http://www.parl.gc.ca/information/library/PRBpubs/prb0561-e.htm; Internet, accessed 3 January 2007.

THE ISSUE OF THE NORTHWEST PASSAGE

Canada has been trying to achieve worldwide recognition of its claim to the Canadian Arctic and its waters for over a century. The claim has changed over time, so its history and status will now be examined. In 1907, a Canadian Senator stated that the Sector Theory would be used to mark Canadian territory. The Sector Theory proposed a boundary using longitudinal lines from the east and west coastlines. No further action was taken until 1925 when the federal government made a formal statement in support of this claim. [24] In 1946, Lester B. Pearson, then Canada's Ambassador to the United States, stated that the Canadian Arctic included the mainland, the islands, and the frozen sea within the eastern and western boundaries of Canada, up to the North Pole.[25] In 1957, however, the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources stated he was not sure if Canadian waters extended as far as the North Pole. It is very challenging for a government to declare an official position when there is discord within the government itself. This uncertainty does not send a positive message to the rest of the world and undermines the credibility of the claim.

In response to the transits of an American oil tanker, the *Manhattan* in 1969 and 1970, the Trudeau government enacted the *Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act* (AWPPA) in 1970 to deal "with shipping in Canadian waters that lie north of 60° North latitude."[26] This act detailed the specifications for ships to operate within a one hundred mile zone, including hull

---

[24] Major R.R. Romses, "North of Sixty – Why Canada Should Increase its Military Effort." CFC Exercise New Horizons research paper, 1985, p7.

[25] Andrea Charron, "Canada, the United States and the Northwest Passage: Sovereignty to the Side", http://www.westga.edu/~canconf/Charron.htm, Internet, accessed 12 Dec 2006.

[26] Peter Timonin, Transport Canada's Legislative Mandate in Regulating Shipping, http://ftp.nunavut.ca /nirb/NIRB_REVIEWS/CURRENT_REVIEWS/03UN114-BIPAR_PROJECT/02-REVIEW/01-DECISION/104-Transport%20Canada%20Legislative%20Mandate%20(June%2018-04).doc; Internet, accessed 1 April 2007

construction standards and the need for an Arctic Pollution Prevention Certificate. The intent was to require all ships intending to use Canadian Arctic waters to advise Canada before entering. Advance knowledge of transits would enable Canada to have adequate search and rescue (SAR) resources on standby in case of an accident. As for the damage to the ecosystem by PCBs from the military installations built in the 1950s, the government is working with the local Aboriginal people to remove all contaminants through the DEW Line Cleanup Project, which started in 1989.

The reasoning behind the *Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act* was good; it would require all ships to notify Canada prior to entering Canadian Arctic waters. Unfortunately, there was no means of detecting ships that chose not to notify Canada. In an attempt to define official boundaries of the Canadian Arctic waters, Canada declared its intention to place straight baselines around the Arctic Archipelago and deemed the waters inside these baselines as internal waters in 1985. But later that year, the Americans sent the *Polar Sea* icebreaker into Canadian Arctic waters without advance notice. Not all of the world's shippers or countries recognize Canada's claim to the waters of the Arctic Archipelago as internal waters. The United States sees these waters as an international strait, with the right to transit at any time, without notifying Canada.

Canada had not adopted legislation to formalize its claim because it was unsure whether international law recognized the difference between sovereignty over the land and sovereignty over waters.[27] As well, the United States felt that Canadian Arctic waters were an international strait, through which all shipping had the right to transit. Despite the Canadian claim, the

[27] Andrea Charron, "Canada, the United States and the Northwest Passage: Sovereignty to the Side", http://www.westga.edu/~canconf/Charron.htm, Internet, accessed 12 Dec 2006.

American submarine *USS Nautilus* accomplished the first known transit through Canadian Arctic waters in 1958, without the knowledge of the Canadian government.[28] A Canadian and an American icebreaker escorted the first transit by the *Manhattan* but it ran into some ice and a spill of 15,000 barrels of ballast water occurred.[29] This incident highlighted the necessity for Canada to take steps to protect the Canadian Arctic; hence the AWPPA was enacted in 1970. Andrea Charron, a recognized Canadian authority on the status of the Northwest Passage, wrote that Canada had to find a way to bolster its Arctic sovereignty claim and the AWPPA served that purpose very well, as it was designed to "exercise functional sovereign control over the Passage."[30]

All was quiet in the Arctic for a few years until the United States Coast Guard Ship *Polar Sea* icebreaker transited the Passage in 1985. This led to the Right Honourable Joe Clark's statement: "The policy of the Government is to maintain the natural unity of the Canadian Arctic Archipelago and to preserve Canada's sovereignty over land, sea and ice undiminished and undivided."[31] Shortly thereafter, the Canadian government issued the Canadian Territorial Sea Geographical Co-ordinates (Area 7) Order of 1986 to formally enclose the Canadian Arctic Archipelago within straight baselines.[32] There was no legal or international precedent for Canada to use this method for such a complex area of land, water, and ice, and the intent of the straight baseline declaration was to have the water and ice areas recognized as internal waters. If

---

[28] I Major R.R. Romses, "North of Sixty – Why Canada Should Increase its Military Effort." CFC Exercise New Horizons research paper, 1985, p9.

[29] Andrea Charron, "Canada, the United States and the Northwest Passage: Sovereignty to the Side", http://www.westga.edu/~canconf/Charron.htm, Internet, accessed 12 Dec 2006.

[30] Andrea Charron, "Canada, the United States and the Northwest Passage: Sovereignty to the Side", http://www.westga.edu/~canconf/Charron.htm, Internet, accessed 12 Dec 2006.

[31] Ibid.

[32] Ibid.

the world acknowledged this claim, then Canada would have complete jurisdiction over the waters, allowing it to place limitations on shipping through the Northwest Passage. The United States, however, still prefers that the waters be considered international, and this dispute remains unresolved.

The United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea III, 1982 (UNCLOS) does not provide specific guidance for determining the boundaries of the unique Canadian Arctic Archipelago. Even if it did, while Canada ratified UNCLOS in 2003, the United States has not yet ratified the convention. International law experts, such as Bing Bing Jia (non-Canadian) and Donat Pharand (Canadian), take opposing views on the Canadian claim, and Canada is reluctant to put the case forward to the International Court of Justice for resolution until it feels it has a more solid foundation and is likely to receive a favourable judgment. The American University Inventory of Conflict & Environment (ICE) has created a case study on the issue of Canadian sovereignty in the Northwest Passage (Number 185, May 2006). ICE describes the dispute as a "global crisis concerning international shipping"[33] through the Northwest Passage brought to the forefront by global warming and the possibility of the Northwest Passage becoming more accessible as the polar ice cap melts. The opening up of the Northwest Passage could mean more international shipping traversing Canadian Arctic waters, with the potential for environmental destruction from various types of spills, such as oil or ballast water, especially if the region is declared an international strait, where Canada would be unable to regulate standards for ships.

---

[33] Alicia Zorzetto, "Canadian Sovereignty at the Northwest Passage." Inventory of Conflict and Environment (ICE), American University, http://www.american.edu/ted/ ice/northwest-passage.htm; Internet, accessed 2 April 2007.

Therefore, it is essential for Canada to assert its sovereignty in the region and have these waters recognized as internal to Canada.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT REACTIONS

There are three primary reasons for a government to take action – economic need, security threat, and/or political necessity. The economic aspect has been well documented with the discovery of numerous natural resources in the Arctic. The government has been very active in establishing its proprietary rights as owners of the land and taking its share of the profits in the harvesting of these resources. As for security, the government has had various plans to establish sovereignty and ensure security to the Canadian Arctic, but not all of these plans have come to fruition. Political necessity is harder to define. On an internal political level, the three territories have a low population, and therefore have little representation in Parliament (3 of 309 seats) and in the Senate (3 of 105 seats). The larger, more powerful provinces exert considerable pressure on the federal government to receive the bulk of the tax dollars, so most of the defence budget is spent on activities outside the north. On the world stage, while Canada is a member of the Group of 8 (G8) most industrialized countries and is relatively wealthy, it does not possess a lot of political clout. Canada must prove that it is able to defend its borders and ensure its sovereignty, and it has not yet been able to do so to the satisfaction of other countries. Canada has border disputes with the United States in the Dixon Entrance, Beaufort Sea, Strait of Juan de Fuca, and around the disputed Machias Seal Island and North Rock, with Denmark over Hans Island between Ellesmere Island and Greenland,[34] and with the rest of the world over the status of the Canadian Arctic Archipelago waters.

As previously mentioned, some of the Canadian government reactions to these threats have been minimal but very innovative. The response to a possible takeover by America during the Yukon Gold Rush was to send a police presence to the area; the response to a possible Japanese invasion was the creation of Rangers on the west coast. Other military efforts over the years have included an annual eastern Arctic Patrol starting in 1922, which evolved into a resupply of government outposts, and by 1951 it fell under Arctic Services of the Northern Administration Division of the Northern Administration and Lands Branch.[35] In the 1920s as well, the Royal Canadian Air Force (RCAF) "conducted research on flying conditions, began routine patrols from northern bases, established radio stations and communications systems, and carried out aerial photography."[36] According to Elizabeth Elliot-Meisel in her book "Arctic Diplomacy: Canada and the United States in the Northwest Passage," the military saw its role as defending Canada and supporting the RCMP, who were protecting sovereignty in the north.[37] In 1925, Canada amended the Northwest Territories Act to require all scientists and explorers to obtain a permit before entering the Arctic in an effort to establish administration.[38] As well, Canada bought three large Arctic islands east of Ellesmere Island from Otto Sverdrup, a Norwegian explorer who had discovered and claimed them for Norway in 1903, thereby consolidating the ownership of the entire Canadian Arctic.[39]

---

[34] CIA, The World Factbook, Canada, https://www.odci.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/ca.html; Internet; accessed 15 April 2007.

[35] Canada, Library and Archives Canada, http://mikan3.archives.ca/pam/public_mikan/index.php?fuseaction=genitem.displayItem&lang=eng&rec_nbr=138094&; Internet, accessed 15 April 2007.

[36] Elizabeth Elliot-Meisel, *Arctic Diplomacy*, New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 1998, p. 19.

[37] Ibid.

[38] Shelagh Grant, *Sovereignty or Security?*, Vancouver: University of BC Publishing, 1988, pp 15.

[39] Shelagh Grant, *Sovereignty or Security?*, Vancouver: University of BC Publishing, 1988, pp.17.

PROMISES, PROMISES

While the intentions of the Canadian governments may have been good with regards to establishing sovereignty and providing security and defence in the Canadian Arctic, they have not always followed through on their promises. This is not a complete list of promises, but gives an indication of what might have happened had the funds and the resolve been present. Some of these promises were fulfilled but were discontinued shortly after implementation. These are not all military; rather they demonstrate a whole-of-government approach. A nation can establish its presence in an area and declare that area to be sovereign, but this type of sovereignty does not ensure security or an ability to defend the territory.

In response to the transit of the USCG icebreaker *Polar Sea* in 1985, the Canadian government announced a plan to buy nuclear-powered submarines, build a northern training centre, and buy many northern terrain vehicles[40] in the National Defence White Paper of 1987. Canada was aware that the United States and other countries (most likely France, Britain and Russia) had been sending their nuclear-powered submarines under the Canadian Arctic ice cap. There was also talk of installing an underwater sensing system that could detect underwater transits, but this and the other plans were dropped due to their high cost. A key point throughout Canada's efforts to establish sovereignty and lay claim to the region is one of presence. A detection system could raise an alert when a vessel transits the Northwest Passage but Canada would still have no means of taking any physical action if a security threat were to evolve.

Where a military presence is not possible, the government has used other branches of government to establish a presence. The Polar Continental Shelf Project was created in 1954 using *HMCS Labrador* to commence scientific studies of the Arctic. By way of contrast, as an

---

[40] Martin Shadwick, "Northern Exposure." *Canadian Military Journal*. Summer 2002, vol 3, no. 2, p 65; http://www.journal.forces.gc.ca/engraph/vol3/no2/pdf/61-64_e.pdf; Internet, accessed 15 April 2007.

example of what could be done in Arctic climes, in 1956, the Soviet Northern Sea Routes Administration was operating 15 icebreakers, 100 ocean-going freighters, 150 aircraft and had 35,000 employees, plus 107 polar stations and two or three icebreakers to escort chartered ships to weather stations and trading posts.[41] This is a vast difference in approaches to the Arctic. The Soviets were (and still are) willing to expend a lot of money and effort to access their far north, and, today, they even offer some pleasure cruises through the Russian equivalent of Canada's Northwest Passage.

In 1988, the Canadian government created the Canada-U.S. Arctic Cooperation Agreement in an attempt to force Americans tell Canada when they were planning to have military vessels transit Canadian Arctic waters. Canada developed an *Arctic Environment Protection Strategy* in 1991, and signed the *Canada-Russia Agreement on Cooperation in the Arctic and the North* in 1992. In 1994, Mary Simon was appointed as Canada's first Ambassador for Circumpolar Affairs (the position is presently not filled). Canada was the driving force in creating the Arctic Council in 1996, a forum where arctic nations (Russia, Iceland, Norway, United States, Denmark, Finland, Sweden, and Canada) can discuss issues and collaborate on their resolution. The 1994 White Paper on Defence called for an increased presence in the Arctic but the required funding never materialized. In 2000, Canada released a colourful document *The Northern Dimension of Canada's Foreign Policy*.

Canada's International Policy Statement on Defence in 2006 again emphasized the need for a stronger military presence in the Arctic, but when the government fell, the incoming new government discarded that statement. They created their own policy, "Canada First" which has yet to be sanctioned. For the far north, the "Canada First" document calls for a northern training

---

[41] Elizabeth Elliot-Meisel, *Arctic Diplomacy*, New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 1998, p. 111-112.

centre, a deep-water port, an icebreaker for the maritime element of the Canadian Forces, an increased number of joint Arctic exercises and more Canadian Rangers. The new RADARSAT II satellite, to be launched in June 2007, will provide increased coverage of northern waters. This will permit better surveillance, but the resources to respond to incursions or to provide northern SAR are still lacking.

CONCLUSION

Canada has not yet been able to establish definitive sovereignty in the Canadian Arctic. The requirements for international recognition of sovereignty centre on maintaining a presence, having adequate surveillance to know what is happening in the area, and being able to respond to emergencies or threats as required. Historically, Canadian governments have spent more on social programs than on instituting the required measures to guarantee sovereignty and security in the Canadian Arctic. This trend has resulted in a weakening of Canada's sovereignty stance in the eyes of the world. Canadian governments have been innovative in their reactions to incursions in Canadian Arctic waters; they have made use of departments other than the military to establish a presence, and they have fostered international cooperation in the Arctic through a variety of councils and accords. The bottom line is that there is a very limited ability to defend the Canadian Arctic from threats to security or sovereignty. If Canada truly wishes to lay claim to the entire Arctic Archipelago, more money and effort must be forthcoming in order to convince the world that Canada can, indeed, defend the its valuable Arctic.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Canada, Canadian Forces, 1 Canadian Ranger Patrol Group, http://www.cfna.forces.gc.ca /units/rangers/history_e.asp; Internet, accessed 1 April 2007.

Canada, Canadian Forces, 1 Canadian Ranger Patrol Group, http://www.cfna.forces.gc.ca /units/rangers/index_e.asp; Internet, accessed 1 April 2007.

Canada, Canadian Forces, CANCOM-JTFN Fact Sheet; http://www.cfna.forces.gc.ca/ aboutus/fact_sheet_e.asp; Internet, accessed 1 April 2007.

Canada, Canadian Heritage, http://www.pch.gc.ca/progs/cpsc-ccsp/sc-cs/anthem_e.cfm; Internet, accessed 1 April 2007.

Canada, Department of National Defence, Backgrounder, Permanent Joint Board on Defence, http://www.dnd.ca/site/newsroom/view_news_e.asp?id=298; internet, accessed 1 April, 2007

Canada, Department of National Defence, The Defence Portfolio, Canada, National Defence, The Defence Portfolio, http://www.forces.gc.ca/menu/consult/current_policy/defence_ portfolio/annexd_e.asp; Internet, accessed 1 April 2007.

Canada, Environment Canada, High Arctic Weather Stations – 50 Years of Operation. http://www.mb.ec.gc.ca/info/news/cc00s20.en.html; Internet, accessed 1 April 2007.

Canada, Library and Archives Canada, Canadian Confederation, http://www.collectionscanada.ca/confederation /023001-2245-e.html; Internet, accessed 1 April 2007.

Canada, Library and Archives Canada, http://mikan3.archives.ca/pam/public_mikan/ index.php?fuseaction=genitem.displayItem&lang=eng&rec_nbr=138094&; Internet, accessed 15 April 2007.

Canada, Natural Resources Canada, The Atlas of Canada, http://atlas.nrcan.gc.ca/ site/english/learningresources/facts/surfareas.html; Internet, accessed 1 April 2007.

Canada, Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Fact Sheets, http://www.rcmp-grc.gc.ca/ factsheets /fact_history_e.htm; Internet, accessed 1 April 2007.

Canada, Royal Canadian Mounted Police, History, http://www.rcmp-grc.gc.ca/history/ did_know_e.htm; Internet, accessed 1 April 2007.

Carnaghan, Matthew and Allison Goody. Canadian Arctic Sovereignty. Library of Parliament, 26 January 2006. http://www.parl.gc.ca/information/library/PRBpubs/prb0561-e.htm; Internet, accessed 3 January 2007.

Charron, Andrea. "Canada, the United States and the Northwest Passage: Sovereignty to the Side", http://www.westga.edu/~canconf/Charron.htm, Internet, accessed 12 Dec 2006.

CIA, The World Factbook, Canada, https://www.odci.gov/cia/publications/factbook /geos/ca.html; Internet, accessed 15 April 2007.

City of Iqaluit, History, http://www.city.iqaluit.nu.ca/i18n/english/history.html; Internet, accessed 1 April 2007.

Dowd, Alan, "Canada: Don't Tread on Us." The American Enterprise Online, http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1564276/posts; Internet, accessed 1 April 2007.

Elliot-Meisel, Elizabeth B. *Arctic Diplomacy*: *Canada and the United States in the Northwest Passage*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 1998.

Encyclopædia Britannica, 1985. *Canada*. p 482 – 551

Grant, Shelagh D. *Sovereignty or Security? Government Policy in the Canadian North, 1936 – 1950*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1988.

Harris, Lynden T. (Bucky). The DEWLINE CHRONICLES, http://www.lswilson.ca/ dewhist-a.htm; Internet, accessed 1 April 2007.

Inuvik, Inuvik History, http://www.inuvik.ca/tourism/inuvikhistory.html; Internet, accessed 1 April 2007.

Morrison, W.R. "Arctic Sovereignty." The Canadian Encyclopedia, http://www.canadianencyclopedia.ca/index.cfm?PgNm=TCE&Params=A1ARTA0000298; Internet, accessed 1 April 2007.

Okalik, Paul. "Devolution and Nation Building in Canada's North." http://www.gov.nu.ca/Nunavut/English/premier/press/dec1306.pdf; Internet, accessed 1 April 2007.

Shadwick, Martin. "Northern Exposure." *Canadian Military Journal*. Summer 2002, vol 3, no. 2, p 65-66; http://www.journal.forces.gc.ca/engraph/vol3/no2/pdf/61-64_e.pdf; Internet, accessed 15 April 2007.

Romses, Major R.R. "North of Sixty – Why Canada Should Increase its Military Effort." CFC Exercise New Horizons research paper, 1985.

The New Britannica-Webster Dictionary and Reference Guide. USA: Encyclopædia Britannica

Timonin, Peter. "Transport Canada's Legislative Mandate in Regulating Shipping" http://ftp.nunavut.ca/nirb/NIRB_REVIEWS/CURRENT_REVIEWS/03UN114-BIPAR_PROJECT/02-REVIEW/01-DECISION/104-Transport%20Canada%20Legislative%20Mandate%20(June%2018-04).doc; Internet, accessed 1 April 2007.

Wolfers, Arnold. "'National Security' as an Ambiguous Symbol." *Political Science Quarterly* 67, no. 4 (December 1952): 481-502.

Zorzetto, Alicia. "Canadian Sovereignty at the Northwest Passage." Inventory of Conflict and Environment (ICE), American University, http://www.american.edu/ted/ice/northwest-passage.htm; Internet, accessed 2 April 2007.