

*The Budget—Mr. D. W. Munro*

unprepared to enforce any mandate we might secure over such an area.

And if, as I believe, our case is weakened precisely by the absence of enforcement machinery, what plans is the government able to announce, in the way of shipbuilding programs, for example, command structure reorganization—not to mention improvements in our airborne surveillance posture—which will make Canada's claim more credible? The recent replies of the Minister of National Defence have given cause for even greater worry than I felt when I was in Caracas.

This is like the question which was asked many years ago in another context, and it is the question which our friends were asking us in Caracas: how many divisions has the Pope? How many divisions has Canada? I have asked this question four or five times in the last year or 18 months in the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry, but was pooh-poohed for my pains. Speaking in plain credibility terms, who is going to believe that we are serious in advancing our argument in favour of a 200-mile economic zone off-shore, let alone a good claim out to the margin, unless we can show that we are either prepared or are seriously preparing to carry out appropriate enforcement measures in that extended territory?

● (1750)

By enforcement I do not necessarily mean total exclusion of all comers, but rather enforcement of rules of our making as to the size of catch, kinds of fish caught, open and closed season and so on; management decisions over that extended territory. That is what we have to make. That is what we have to enforce. That is what we cannot now enforce.

Extending our coastline out 200 miles on the Pacific and Atlantic means, as I said, adding another Ontario and another Manitoba over which we should be able to exercise some control. To carry our claim out to the edge of the margin, as would be required if we wanted to protect the breeding grounds where our inshore species begin their life cycle, to carry our claim out that additional distance into the Atlantic as far as the Flemish Cap, the only area affected, would mean we would be taking in another British Columbia. Is the government aware of the scale of these extensions of territory? I think it is completely oblivious to these dimensions.

The magnitude of these claims takes on some meaning when stated in these terms. To satisfy the wishes, and possibly the needs of all Canadians in terms of fishing and spawning grounds, we might have to acquire control over seaward areas as great as Ontario, Manitoba and British Columbia combined. How are we going to exercise any sort of control over such areas with our present seaborne and airborne equipment?

All we have is some 86 vessels of all types operated by the Department of Transport, not one of which is designed to travel much more than 12 to 15 miles offshore at the best of times, and not one of which has the speed required, let alone being built for offshore service, to intercept and inspect poachers in distant waters. Can you imagine what patrolling the whole of Ontario and Manitoba would be like with patrol cars, not one of which is capable of travelling at more than 25 miles per hour, and none of

[Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich).]

them fitted with snow tires? That is the sort of comparison I am making here. It is ludicrous.

The navy could do this work if we could man the vessels now stored in polyethylene. I am sure it would rise to that challenge, but before the navy can take on, or even share properly in such a task, some decisions are needed from government so that those in command of our naval units have the power to search and, at need, to arrest. I might point out that a commander of a Canadian naval vessel does not have the power in peace time to carry out an arrest unless it is expressly accorded to him by the Minister of Fisheries on a case to case basis.

Are our naval forces enough to handle these extended territories? What plans does the government have to strengthen our hand at sea? The Minister of State (Fisheries) (Mr. LeBlanc) mentioned in committee the other day plans to lay down six new keels. That is good, but will those additions to the coastguard and naval strength prove sufficient to meet our future needs in that vastly extended area of the sea? Somehow I doubt it. I fear the decisions have not been taken long enough in advance of the need.

To be absolutely convincing, both at home and at the international conference table, we have to show that we mean business inside our newly acquired economic zone, be it 200 miles or out to the edge of the margin. Command structures must be redesigned, and new tasks for our maritime and airborne services have to be clearly established so that effective surveillance can be carried out, and so that offenders will know they will be brought to task speedily.

Let it be added here that it would be a mistake to think of the remodelled force charged with guarding our coasts, which I like to call our maritime protection service, and let us not think of it solely in terms of our fisheries. A capable and competent protective service is needed for pollution patrol as well.

This was written before hearing the comments today and yesterday of the Minister of National Defence. I know I will be told that our long-range patrol aircraft, our Argus and their replacements, if they are ever acquired, can effectively carry out the surveillance necessary in terms of pollution control. We are told they can. To observe maybe, but not to prevent.

You cannot serve summonses from aircraft. Those of us who have flown in aircraft on patrol know it is an impossibility. The very idea that a surface vessel on patrol could pop up over the horizon at any moment, with a warrant to arrest nailed to its masthead, is enough to deter any skipper from sluicing out his bilges as soon as he loses sight of land and discharging filthy oil sludge into the sea just off our beaches, a sludge which produces a film to cut off the oxygen necessary for the healthy development, the very life, of our fish.

The fact that in Canadian waters today—and tomorrow too, unless the government stirs its stumps—no skipper need fear the appearance of any such vessel is like a ticket of leave to do whatever the skipper wants to do once he can no longer be seen from the shore.

The government has been severely criticized for its inaction in the face of inflation, its failure to deal effectively with unemployment insurance abuses, its inability