

the provisions that now exists, and it is also, I think, in line with the new federal labour code dealing with safety matters.

Of the last two matters dealt with in this bill, the first concerns the pollution of waters. Sections 23 and 24 give power to the minister to take whatever measures are required to deal with the cargo or fuel of a wrecked vessel which may create pollution, constitute a danger to waterfowl or marine life, or cause damage to coastal property. The purpose is obvious, and it is a good purpose.

The last matter covered by this bill is contained in sections 25 and 26, which deal with the investigation of accidents to ships navigating in Canadian waters, or to Canadian ships wherever they may be. These sections will give more power to the investigators, and will oblige the masters or owners of ships to report on certain types of accidents.

Honourable senators, as I have indicated, this bill deals with many subjects, most of which are of a technical nature. It seems to me that the purposes of these amendments are excellent, but the bill covers topics that can be studied with greater facility in committee than in this chamber. It is my understanding that the honourable sponsor (Hon. Mr. Langlois) will move that the bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, where officials from the department will give us all needed further explanation. It may be that the honourable sponsor wants to deal further with the subject of the Royal Commission on Pilotage, and I have no objection to that. On the other hand, he may well wish to have the departmental officials tell us more about that in committee.

Hon. Mr. Fournier (Madawaska-Restigouche): Honourable senators, I should like to ask a question of the honourable sponsor of the bill (Hon. Mr. Langlois). Can he give us more information as to air cushion vehicles? There seem to be two classifications, one of which includes vehicles that are air-propelled like airplanes, and another which includes water-propelled vehicles. Perhaps the honourable sponsor could clarify this matter for me, because it does seem to make a difference.

Hon. Leopold Langlois: Honourable senators—

The Hon. the Speaker: I must inform honourable senators that if the honourable senator speaks now it will have the effect of closing the debate.

Hon. Mr. Burchill: May I ask the honourable sponsor of this bill (Hon. Mr. Langlois) one question. First, I want to say that I agree with the last speaker (Hon. Mr. Flynn) when he says that this bill should be referred to a committee, because it is a bill that the committee can delve into with profit.

I notice that section 24, which concerns pollution, provides that the minister may cause the vessel, its cargo or fuel to be destroyed or removed to such place, and sold in such manner, as he may direct. Are there not local authorities of the different harbours and rivers who have the power to fine captains who allow oil to be discharged from their vessels?

Hon. Leopold Langlois: Honourable senators, I thank Senator Flynn for his important remarks on this bill. I apologize if I left the impression that I considered this bill unimportant when I introduced it. What I meant to say was that this bill contained amendments that could not wait for the total revision of the Canada Shipping Act that will be forthcoming. We are dealing here with amendments that are very important, and some of them date back to 1966-67. It was felt that they had been delayed long enough, and could not be further delayed.

Senator Flynn dealt in detail with the various aspects of the bill, and I want to comment briefly on his remarks.

First he referred to air cushion vehicles. This is a new type of craft, and we are not prepared at the present moment to agree that it should be considered a vessel within the meaning of the Canada Shipping Act, or as aircraft. That is why we are introducing this temporary measure to cover the present situation, pending further development of these craft. It is possible that later on it will be decided to have special legislation dealing with air cushion vehicles.

Here I should like to answer the question asked by the honourable Senator Fournier (Madawaska-Restigouche). There is no distinction between the various types of air cushion vehicles according to their propulsion, whether they be propelled by jet, propellers or wheels. No distinction is made in this bill between the different types of air cushion craft.

This bill deals with the Load Line Convention of 1966 and amends the present act to bring it in line with the new convention. The present act contains provisions to implement the 1930 Load Line Convention, and the changes are minor and technical in character.