

*Canada Shipping Act*

Perhaps one of the most important contributions I could make to this debate at this particular stage would be to urge the Minister of Transport to appeal to his colleagues very strongly—I know he is quite capable of that—to release the strings on the budget of the Department of National Defence so that it might get on with an orderly program to meet the policing requirements. I do not think this policing is something which should be done by the minister's department. I believe that in 1970 we have reached the point where we must separate the responsibilities of the Department of Transport. I shall not go into the reasons because I think they are very clear. I suggest that never before has it been more obvious that there is a need for a loosening of the budget of the Department of National Defence. It would seem to me that this is the only department of government competent to carry out the policing that is required, not only under this legislation but also under several other measures which presently are before us. The people in this department would seem to be the only people who have the legal status necessary to successfully police this and other measures.

It would be absolutely wrong for us to say to the world that these are the measures we intend to enforce to protect our coast line and then fail to do anything about it. There is no need for me to say anything about the tramp steamships of the world and the condition of those ships which carry bulk cargo around the world. Others have dealt forcefully with this, and I agree strongly with them. In the absence of a Canadian mercantile fleet, it is obvious that we do not have the courage or intention of saying that no pollutant may be carried in or out of Canada except in a Canadian bottom. However, we must be prepared to show the world shipping community that we intend to enforce the provisions of this bill.

• (4:10 p.m.)

It will be difficult to enforce the provisions of the bill. It will be hazardous to send destroyers out alongside oil tankers or, for that matter, alongside fishing vessels. The Department of National Defence will not be able to undertake this job when operating with a frozen budget, and I have not heard any plans announced by the Department of Transport to expand its fleet of vessels by building patrol type boats. In any event, Mr. Speaker, this is not a coastguard responsibility. A para-military operation is required. The coastguard's duties should be the day-to-day maintenance of our waterways and aids to navigation.

Why is it only oil tankers that are to be taxed? Why not tax all ships carrying pollutants? What about the very forceful suggestion made by the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Carter) in connection with the regular movement of phosphorous in and out of Placentia Bay? When the bill refers to the movement of any bulk cargo that is a pollutant, does it refer only to cargoes leaving Canadian ports destined for overseas, or does it refer specifically to the movement of bulk pollutant cargo between Canadian ports? I hope the minister can deal forcefully with these questions.

[Mr. Forrestall.]

Many segments of the Dr. McTaggart-Cowan task force report are ignored by this bill. I hope the minister is prepared to explain in detail why this has happened.

In conclusion I hope the minister will bring about a change of heart on the part of the government, withdrawing reference of the bill to the Special Committee on Environmental Pollution and instead sending it to the Transport Committee where shipping people will have an opportunity to speak to a body that has some continuity in shipping matters, instead of a committee that has no expertise in shipping matters.

I also trust the minister will announce the government's intention to introduce legislation soon dealing with offshore drilling, particularly with reference to the east coast. Provision has been made with respect to drilling in the Arctic, but we are still very much in the dark with respect to regulations governing other offshore drilling for oil and other minerals.

It is to be regretted that, despite the government's efforts, the community of maritime nations meeting at Brussels did not accept the Canadian suggestion to establish an international convention protecting all the world's shorelines and beaches, not to mention the full ocean environment, the birds above it and the fish below it. Protein from the sea may well become necessary to the survival of human life. I hope Canada's efforts in this direction will soon produce meaningful results. The government is on the right track and has responsibility to move unilaterally in the absence of such an international convention. In implementing the bill, I hope we demonstrate clearly to the other maritime nations of the world that we intend to keep our sea environment clean, no matter what the cost may be to them.

**Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West):** Mr. Speaker, debate on Bill C-2 has been going on for two days, and most of the points I would like to make have been covered by previous speakers. However, I would like to emphasize two or three matters. I feel a great deal of good can come out of our discussion at committee stage, and I give notice of my intention to propose one or two amendments when we reach that stage because I believe this legislation could be greatly improved if the minister would accept several amendments.

I am not sure that the suggestion to send this legislation to the Special Committee on Environmental Pollution is a proper suggestion. I feel that the legislation is not going to the right committee. I feel it should be sent to the Transport Committee, which is a much larger body than the Special Committee on Environmental Pollution. There is an opportunity in the Transport Committee for more members to delve into the intricacies of the various sections of the bill and to express their views on them. But I think more important than the size of the committee is the fact that for years the Committee on Transport and Communications has been dealing with shipping problems which, I suggest, should not be the subject of deliberations of a committee that has been set up primarily to deal with special environmental problems. The coastal trade, problems of shipping, transport