

Gray's Harbour, at the mouth of the Chehalis River, the entry from the sea to Aberdeen, Washington, is the port which I suggest should be used. I made this suggestion in Washington more than a year ago. I said, "Either dredge the channel that is already there for deeper draft ships, or create an off-shore offloading rig, as is done in the Persian Gulf; or construct a fully protected basin." The swell, I am told, off this part of the coast of Washington is something to experience. Overcoming it involves engineering. Mr. Speaker, engineering problems are there to be solved; they are not there to beat us down.

And what of the cost? We should have a cost to bear in transporting our offloaded oil from our east coast port to the large consumer centres east of the Ottawa Valley; they would incur the expense of improving facilities at Gray's Harbour and transporting the crude oil only a few hundred miles to refineries at Cherry Point or Eugene, Oregon.

I submit that the sort of pipeline I am suggesting will bring advantages over and above those which are readily apparent. It would provide a transport vehicle for Canadian oil to flow east when the right moment comes, if we can ever get back into production. Considering the provisions of the present budget, I wonder if we shall ever be able to do this. Nevertheless, if the pipeline were in place we should have in our hands a real bargaining weapon and not be subject to OPEC's whims and arm twisting.

In light of this budget and its depressing effect on production, my proposal may be out of step with the times. On the other hand, if we can recover from the deductibility features of this budget, we may be able to consider the ideas I have put forward and put these notions to work.

I wish to deal with other matters relating to the proposed tanker route, such as navigational aids which will be needed for regular merchantmen using our inland sea off Vancouver Island. Because of the time limitation, I must put these concerns to one side and talk of a matter which is equally important in maritime terms. I am referring to the enforcement machinery at Canada's disposal. This relates to the claims the government made at the Law of the Sea Conference which was held last summer in Caracas.

As I said at the beginning of my remarks, this debate is very likely to turn into a litany of complaints about problems. At this point, however, I wish to pay tribute to the Canadian delegation which carried Canada's case at the conference in Caracas.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich):** Do not applaud too quickly. While I was there I saw that the operation was wholly in the hands of public officials. Of these I cannot speak too highly. They were professionals to their fingertips and they worked tirelessly for causes of deepest concern to Canadians—reduction of the risk of pollution on and off our shores—this ties in with my present remarks and with those immediately foregoing—fisheries, appropriate jurisdiction for mining and petroleum development off our shores, marine research and so on.

As an observer at the conference rather than as a delegate, I naturally made no public allusion during my short

*The Budget—Mr. D. W. Munro*

stay in Caracas to the reservations I had about the position the government was taking, or, rather, to the doubts I harboured as to the government's ability to present a credible case on its claims to jurisdiction over an economic zone extending 200 miles off-shore.

It is important to look at this 200-mile zone and see what it actually means. Of course, we are talking about 200 miles to seaward from a headland to headland baseline drawn around our deeply indented coasts. In short, we are talking of 200 nautical miles, which equal 230 land miles that you, Mr. Speaker, and I travel in our cars. To give this distance some real meaning, I suggest that we get in a car and travel for four hours without let-up at 60 miles an hour. At the end of four hours, if you were at sea, you would reach the edge of the 200-mile zone. That is a long way.

In terms of area, the proportions of this economic zone to seaward are even more staggering. Extending our jurisdiction seaward by 200 miles from our east coast and west coast is like adding a few more provinces. I do not think the government understands this. Have you any idea, Mr. Speaker, how much extra acreage is involved? Extending this zone 200 miles out to sea of our east and west coasts alone would mean adding another 660,000 square miles to the area over which we claim jurisdiction. That would be like adding another Quebec plus another set of maritime provinces, or another Ontario plus a second Manitoba.

What bothers me is that we must enforce our writ over all that extra territory. I do not believe, as matters now stand, that we have that enforcement capability. Nothing in the budget suggests that we shall acquire that capability. This afternoon the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Richardson), in reply to a question, said that his department is carrying out patrols every once in a while. The next one will be carried out next month, and the next one the month after that. This I find frightening.

I have long contended that Canada's coastguard is inadequate even for patrolling and enforcing jurisdiction over our existing territorial waters, which at present extend only 12 miles offshore. Complaints have been heard from both coasts, and incidents recorded regularly in the press and queried in this House during question period, testifying to the validity of my contention.

As a consequence the question I must ask myself, and which I now put to the ministers concerned, is this: given that we do not have a seaborne protective service on a scale sufficient to keep poachers out of our present 12-mile waters, what measures are being taken to remedy that situation, in view of the possibility that we might shortly be expected to keep poachers out of a 200-mile zone; or, if we are not to keep poachers out, how are we to keep track of licensed vessels within the area to ensure that what they are doing meets with our approval?

My second question relates to the first one. It is the question which I refrained from asking during the conference, but it is one which must now be faced honestly. It is this: how forcefully does the government believe it can press its claim to a 200-mile economic zone at an international conference—the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Macdonald) might ponder this question—when it is clear for all to see that we are completely