

that we should not become anti-American on this issue. Nevertheless, a coastal state has a special interest in preventing marine pollution, and innocent passage does not include passage through these straits by vessels which do not adequately meet safety or anti-pollution standards which this country has every right to insist upon. I therefore welcome and support the clause of this bill which would repeal section 3 of the present legislation. I feel this is necessary at the present time to make the government's position on the north perfectly clear.

The other point on which I should like to comment is the concept of fisheries closing lines. This is a new concept. It does not go quite as far as I would wish. Some times ago I presented a private member's bill to the House, Bill C-91, which would have made all waters over the continental shelf exclusive Canadian fishing zones. This would be better, in my opinion, than the present bill, but I am willing to admit I may be wrong on this. However, the present proposal is a step in that direction; it is a step based on more traditional concepts than was my bill, and I think it is well worth while.

The fact that we have at present foreign vessels fishing in Queen Charlotte Sound on the west coast, and similar bodies of water on the east coast, is most unfortunate. This new concept of fisheries closing lines will, I hope, tidy up the untidy situation which was left in the original territorial sea and fishing zone legislation of 1964. I would point out that it is not, of course, the final step that should be taken. I commend the hon. member for Comox-Alberni for questioning the minister on this point a few minutes ago. It is clear that the minister views this as perhaps a step only in what should be done with regard to the Canadian exclusive fishing zone, and not conservation on the continental shelf affecting many species, and conservation on the high seas affecting such species as salmon. Per-

Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act
haps this matter might be further clarified at the committee stage of this bill.

We have heard a great deal today about how slow the government has been in bringing forward this amendment—from 1964 to the present day. Some members have stated that we have shown too much concern for the opinions of other nations. May I at least point out that in the five-year period before the original bill the Conservative party was in power, and saw fit to do nothing at all about this subject.

Some hon. Members: That is not true.

Mr. Crouse: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. We have kept this discussion on a non-partisan basis so far and I hope the tenor of the debate will continue as it started out. I put on the record the fact that in 1958 and 1960 Canada made worth-while contributions to improving the law of the sea. We were within half a vote of getting agreement.

Mr. Anderson: It is true efforts were made at the Law of the Sea Conferences. But I am talking in terms of legislation, of unilateral action such as has been commended to the House by the hon. member from Newfoundland who spoke earlier this afternoon—I am sorry, I am not very good at remembering names of constituencies.

Mr. McGrath: St. John's—the oldest city in Canada.

Mr. Anderson: St. John's. It is important to point out that the original legislation was brought in in 1964 and that it is now being made more effective. I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to continue until now.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

At six o'clock the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.