

on their toes they should see all those damages because a ship to obtain clearance. Take the case of the ship that clears through customs and gets also its clearance from the port authorities at six o'clock p.m. just before the office is closed. She is due to sail at midnight and clears at six o'clock. She sails, for example, from a berth near the Victoria basin in Montreal, which is the western section of the harbour in Montreal. The board's properties extend some 30 miles. That ship sails and half an hour later, when some eight miles down, she passes too close to a jetty and causes extensive damage to the jetty, but she is not damaged too much and can carry on and proceed to sea. The next day somebody will discover that jetty has been damaged and before this damage is linked to the ship, an investigation must be carried out when we are in a position to determine that such a ship has caused the damage she then might be quite a way out and outside the territorial waters of Canada. It is exactly cases like that that we want to cover. I must add the fact that we have had no bad experience in 18 years does not mean that we might not have a case where the board might lose a lot of money in the future. We have been lucky so far that the accidents were caused by responsible Canadian shipping companies or foreign shipowners that were not trying to evade their responsibility. But, just the same, in one case given the other day, the board had to incur quite heavy legal expenses in order to recover its losses. I think that with the development of our inland navigation network through the deepening and widening of the St. Lawrence seaway, that Canada may expect more foreign ships visiting our ports in the future and it may be a good thing not to deprive the board of the power it already has under the Act to sue the agent, when the owner of the vessel does not want to submit to Canadian courts. That is the party we are protecting the board against; the owner who is a foreigner and does not want to submit to Canadian courts. In that case we are able to go after the agent. Someone said the board might lose some business. If we lose that kind of business, that of owners who are trying to evade the responsibility in those cases, then we do not want that kind of business.

Mr. DECORE: This would apply to foreign vessels?

Mr. LANGLOIS (*Gaspe*): Yes.

Mr. DECORE: I think Mr. Winch's point was well taken with reference to foreign ships.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Decore had the floor.

Mr. DECORE: I just wish to bring out one point. I thought Mr. Winch brought out a matter that while you said that Act gives enough protection as it is right now, it is a matter of giving a clearer definition.

Mr. LANGLOIS (*Gaspe*): Yes. We are not changing a thing as far as the agent is concerned.

Mr. DECORE: And you are trying to get protection from foreign ships who may go out of territorial waters of Canada—the right to protect our property here in Canada to prevent those ships from going out of Canada.

Mr. LANGLOIS (*Gaspe*): We want whenever possible to be able to seize the ship before it sails.

Mr. DECORE: Do we have that power now?

Mr. LANGLOIS (*Gaspe*): Yes. We want no new power. We want the ship to put up the security and if the ship is gone, we want to be able to go against the agent, and we have been able to do so under the existing legislation.

Mr. GREEN: The parliamentary assistant has got this mixed up. The board has the power now to seize any ship, Canadian or foreign, for any damage