

*Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act*

• (4:30 p.m.)

Arctic waters will occur only after we see the legislation that the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) intends to introduce in the form of amendments to the Canada Shipping Act.

I am sure the Secretary of State for External Affairs will not quarrel with my suggestion that the kind of control we are prepared to exercise over shipping and the discharge of oil into our coastal waters, either directly or as a result of an accident, is a very vital matter. Some aspects of this important question lie within the general area that is covered by the Canada Shipping Act and come under the purview of the Minister of Transport.

I recall when the House considered an amendment to the Canada Shipping Act in 1956. At that time Canada ratified the international convention for the prevention of the pollution of the seas by oil. Additional legislation, as set out in part VII(a) of the Canada Shipping Act, was enacted for this purpose, as well as providing that the regulations required for the control of shipping in respect to the discharge of oil would also apply within Canada's own waters, both internal and territorial. It was felt that this amendment to the Canada Shipping Act, and the terms of the 1954 international convention for the prevention of pollution of the sea by oil, which was considered by the former railways, canals and telegraph lines committee, made significant progress in solving the matter of pollution of our waters by oil.

The passage of time has made it very evident that the proposals of the international convention and the domestic legislation adopted by Canada at that time were certainly no longer adequate in providing protection from oil pollution. For quite some time further action has been required, both in the international field by way of new treaty arrangements and in changes to our approach to domestic legislation. It was in my mind at that time that we should consider more closely this question of the pollution of the sea by oil. I pointed out that the coast of North America was not set out in the annex to the treaty, which provides what are referred to as prohibited areas in which the dumping of oil is forbidden. It was suggested to me that the density of traffic and the incidence of the discharge of oil into the sea around this continent were not sufficient to cause any special concern. I mention all this to illustrate the extent to which knowledge of the danger resulting from discharging oil into the sea has advanced since 1956 when this proposal was being considered by the House of Commons.

I am not at all convinced that the bill as it stands will provide comprehensive protection, despite the minister's assertion. Its success will depend a good deal on the kind of legislation which the Minister of Transport will be placing before us. I hope this legislation will at least be introduced and read the first time before we proceed very far in the committee with our study of the bill now before us, so that we may be familiar with the terms of both these measures. Nor am I convinced that protection is adequate because of the government's intentions with regard to the declaration of fishing zones. The proposed amendment to the Fisheries Act, which is also to some extent a companion piece of legislation, will provide authority for some control over the extent to which waste matter goes into the water within our fishing zones. These fishing zones are considered to be coastal waters. In my view the present bill is not adequate to control pollution in terms of what could be done under the proposed amended Fisheries Act. However, it will enable the government to exercise more jurisdiction over an area extending a further nine miles seaward, enable us to control more effectively navigation close to our shores, and will allow us to exercise more stringent controls over what may be put into those waters by sources other than vessels. So, the minister is quite correct in saying that these proposals will make possible some measure of control over the pollution of our coastal waters on the Atlantic and the Pacific.

I do not intend to try to analyse what further effects the bill may have, other than in relation to increased control over navigation, ship movements and so on. I do not know whether the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux) intends to enter the debate at any point. One inference from the statement made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs is that these proposals will make for increased national security. I would interpret this as meaning the defence of Canada, though it seems to me that in this day and age, with the kind of hardware modern nations possess, this aspect must be a relatively minor one. Perhaps when the minister closes the debate he will have some comments to make on the importance of this element in relation to the full range of Canada's vital interests, to use the hon. gentleman's phrase. Possibly other hon. members who are more knowledgeable than I am on these matters