

and matters related to the continental shelf, have been delved into on numerous occasions by the members of the Committee on Transport and Communications. I believe they understand the background of the problems which shipping along our Canadian coasts will face much better than members of the new committee which has just recently been set up.

● (4:20 p.m.)

I suggest to the minister that he seriously reconsider changing the terms of reference and having this matter referred to what I consider is the appropriate committee, namely, the transport committee. Although I must point out that I would very much like to sit in on the discussions of the committee, I realize that our members on the transport committee are very capable, and can certainly handle all the discussion that will take place there.

To get back to the bill, let me say that it deals primarily with pollution control problems as they refer to shipping. I want to say right at the start that no matter what aspect of pollution we consider, it is becoming crystal clear to the government and to the public alike that we need very tough legislation in this field. We have had warnings galore from ecologists and others who have pointed out to us what is happening to our environment.

When we are dealing with a bill of this nature which affects the ecology of our east and west coasts, I feel members of the House and the government in particular should be prepared to write into the legislation some of the toughest provisions that we can possibly make. I am one of those who feel that we do not have too much time to play around with the ecology of the oceans and of the waters and streams in this nation. There are also other aspects of pollution where firm steps have to be taken. I am convinced that in several respects the bill is not nearly tough enough. I support the objectives of the measure before us but, as I said earlier, I feel it would be far more effective if the minister could accept several of the amendments suggested by hon. members who have already spoken. I believe the acceptance of these amendments will help to make this legislation more effective.

For example, I suggest that Canada should extend its jurisdiction with regard to pollution control zones from the proposed 12-mile limit to the same 100-mile limit which we imposed last year in our Arctic waters. I ask the minister, in all sincerity, are the east and west coasts of Canada of any less value to our nation than the Arctic? Is there less chance of oil doing terrific damage in these areas than in the north? I am aware of the delicate ecology in the Arctic area, but I want to point out also that the amount of shipping in the Arctic, even with the possibility of big shipments going from the Prudhoe Bay area and from other oil fields which might be found in that area, will be small when compared with the amount of shipping along the east and west coasts. The oil pollution hazard that this potential shipping will create, far outweighs the damage which might be done in the Arctic area. If there is a section of this nation that needs protection, it is the east and west coasts of Canada. This is where the most development has taken place and where our coastal cities are to be found.

Canada Shipping Act

Coming from British Columbia as I do, I am aware of the immense and terrible damage that could be done if a major oil spill were to occur along the west coast of British Columbia. The same situation applies to the eastern area. It appeals me to think that as yet we are afraid to tell the world that we will impose a pollution control zone 100 miles out from our coasts. We already claim a 100-mile zone in the Arctic. We have announced this to the world, so why should we not tell all countries that we are going to have a similar zone out in the Atlantic as well as in the Pacific to protect the shores of Canada? In this way we could have some type of control over the ships that come into the area.

This recommendation does not come from the New Democratic Party alone. This recommendation was made by the task force "Operation Oil" that was in charge of the cleanup of the *Arrow* oil in Chedabucto Bay, and it is contained in their report. I think the minister and the government should take cognizance of what is contained in that report.

The task force points out in their report that the *Arrow* oil travelled over 100 miles from Chedabucto Bay and polluted the shores of Sable Island. No doubt this oil, spilled as a result of one of our worst disasters of this kind, did a great deal of damage to Sable Island, although one cannot say that that island is densely inhabited. This is the recommendation of the task force to the government:

We recommend that extensive pollution control zones be established to cover the rest of the coast of Canada consistent with the position taken by the government in the Arctic.

I endorse that position 100 per cent. If we can put this protective zone around the Arctic areas, then we should bring it right down the east and west coasts to the U.S. boundary and insist on having some control over oil pollution so far as shipping in this area is concerned.

Another point with which I would like to deal is related to the cost of cleaning up. I understand that under this bill the liability of a ship owner for cleaning up has been limited to \$14 million, with the balance of the cost to come from a fund. I am of the firm opinion that if there were an accident involving a big oil tanker and it cost \$30 million to clean up the mess, the ship owners ought to be liable for every single penny of the clean-up cost. I think this principle ought to apply on a Canada-wide basis to other industries polluting our streams and rivers. I do not see why the public should be liable for part of the cost of the clean-up. The polluters ought to be made liable. On the day we make ships and shipping companies liable for the costs of cleaning up, we shall begin seeing standards of construction of oil tankers that will to a very large degree, I believe, eliminate many of the oil pollution problems confronting the world today. I have no hesitation in saying that I think there should be unlimited liability on those who, perhaps through accident or otherwise, cause tremendous damage to the ecology of our country. This is the recommendation in the task force report, page 41:

● (4:30 p.m.)

We recommend that the law should make it clear that those who pollute pay the complete cost of clean-up, including the