

*Supply—Transport*

at all which says what is a crew sufficient and efficient from the point of view of safety of life.

When the minister says it is the intention of the government that this should be covered by law, then I say, for heaven's sake get cracking on this matter. I would have thought the government would have moved long ago because the minister has authority to develop proper safety rules so that everyone can clearly see what is required.

Section 410(1) of the Canada Shipping Act reads as follows:

The Governor in Council may make regulations respecting—

There are a variety of things in the list but paragraph (m) reads:

The manning of steamships, the number of certificated lifeboat men to be carried, and the qualifications for and the granting of certificates to lifeboat men.

The Governor in Council may make regulations in respect of the manning of steamships. Here is an opportunity for the Governor in Council to declare, in so far as safety is concerned, what the minimum requirements are for the manning of certain ships. Every other shipping nation in the world has developed safety regulations. Many of these regulations were developed a long time ago and they determine what is a safe crew level, what is an adequate level of manning for that particular ship and so on. Canada has not got a single word about it.

When the minister stands up, as he did a while ago, and says so far as the government is concerned this is a matter that should be determined by regulation, then he is talking through his hat because he has not done it. The regulations under the Canada Shipping Act are silent on this matter and have been for years. The Governor in Council has authority under Section 410; the minister has had it for a long time but he has not used it. Why has he not used it? The minister said this is what should be done. I am not going to attempt to correct him and outline what is correct government policy, but why does he not do it?

The minister will not mind if I make a reference to the fact that a few years ago we used to call him "Sailor Jack". This was because of the experience he had with a yacht which sank off Newfoundland some place.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** I never had a yacht, I had a schooner.

**Mr. Howard:** All right, he had a schooner. I wonder whether that schooner was ever manned with a crew sufficient and efficient from the point of view of safety of life?

**Mr. Pickersgill:** Well, I risked my own life aboard her.

**Mr. Howard:** The minister's own life was at stake and I will bet you she was a safe ship. Why don't you do the same thing for the sailors of Canada? Why don't you think about their safety? This is not a matter to be tossed off lightly because the lives of Canadians and others are involved. We have had a tremendous number of wrecks in the seaway, a tremendous increase in traffic through the seaway.

If I may draw a comparison, I would say that when there is an increase in the use of automobiles, large trucks and so on, the various highway departments get busy and impose speed limits, erect warning signs and set requirements for safety belts and other safety factors in automobiles. We build better highway systems. We build new highways and divide them so that traffic is not on a collision course but rather there is a division between lanes of traffic going in opposite directions.

In so far as the seaway is concerned we do not do that. We have a great increase in ship traffic through the seaway and these ships are always headed on a collision course. No steps have been taken by the government to do a single, solitary thing about it except to undertake some meetings and to promise that they are going to do something. I point out again that on the three matters of vital concern there was not one iota of difference between the ship owners, the Seafarers International Union and the underwriters. They were unanimous from the point of view that there should be radiotelephone communication systems between ships and with the Seaway system.

What happened? We were told regulations were being drafted. We are told that there should be a traffic control system installed. What happened? I am told that the matter is still under study. There was also an agreement to develop a two way channel in order that ships may not always be on a collision course in certain parts of the seaway. What about that? Those are questions which I think should be answered and answered as quickly as possible.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** I assume that when the hon. gentlemen keeps referring to the Seaway