

### Canada Shipping Act

the proposals in this bill in the total picture of our economy. We must recognize that directly or indirectly the consumer is going to have to pay the costs resulting from this legislation. We should have detailed estimates of the added cost of oil products in Canada as a result of the requirement for liability insurance, the tonnage tax on oil, the required standards of construction, and of equipment on the ships carrying pollutant cargos to our shores. The committee also should have information of the indirect impact of this legislation upon the Canadian oil producing industry.

If the efforts to control pollution are going to be effective, Canadians must understand what it is going to cost and why. They should be able to assess the cost of this measure in relation to its importance to our environment. If that understanding is not created and developed, we will continue in the future, as has so often been the case in the past, to find that the legislation with high sounding terms and laudible objectives will not receive more than lip service from governments and industry. The exercise in this Parliament will have been futile. The law will not provide any real protection no matter what its provisions.

One important provision in the bill with which I agree is the one setting up special standards for ships carrying pollutants, oil and other substances, through our waters, as well as the establishment of the new pollution inspection service. These seem to be steps in the right direction, but the committee must obviously question whether these new services can be established without too much duplication of existing government services, as well as the way in which they can be efficiently established in order to further the real purposes behind the proposed legislation. I am interested in, and generally approve of, these sections of the bill.

The committee must examine this bill for defects. An obvious defect, which has already been referred to by the hon. member for Fraser Valley West, is that jurisdiction is limited to an area extending only 12 miles from our sea coasts. I imagine the Minister of Transport has also had the experience of travelling along some portions of our sea coasts in a small plane. In my experience, 12 miles off shore from a height of 2,000 feet in a small aircraft is nothing more than spitting distance.

The western edge of my constituency along the open Pacific has historically been known as the grave yard of the Pacific. History books refer to the countless wrecks along those shores. One of the areas included in the new west coast national marine park is the area along the historic life saving trail where there was a single wire telephone line. When shipwrecked mariners crawled ashore they walked along this trail until they reached a telephone which they used to inform someone of their plight. In the days of sail and small steamers, wrecks were frequent. Even though the incidence of shipwrecks is not as great today, nevertheless we cannot discount the impact of wrecks of larger ships. The number of wrecks may be smaller, but the potential results of a single disaster are much greater.

I already referred to the sinking of the motor vessel *Schiedyk* shortly before the 1969 legislation came into

[Mr. Barnett.]

effect. Since that legislation came into effect there has been the *Arrow* incident on the Atlantic coast as well as the wreck of a tramp schooner off the northern shores of Nootka Island. If the latter had been a tanker, it would have created a disaster at least as serious as the *Arrow* and from the point of view of logistics, would have been infinitely more difficult to deal with.

• (3:30 p.m.)

It is almost unbelievable that in this day and age, with all the electronic aids to navigation which exist, Loran stations, lighthouses, and all the rest which have been established along that coast, the master of a vessel driving for the shore of northwest America could find himself 250 miles or so off the Strait of Juan de Fuca and take his vessel in through shoals he could not possibly have navigated had he known they were there, until his vessel was finally deposited high and dry upon the rocks. Such vessels, flying the modern equivalent of the Jolly Roger, certainly have no place close to the shores of Canada whether they are tankers or whether they only endanger our sea life to the extent of the fuel they carry in their supply tanks.

It should be obvious that the proposed 12-mile limit, whether it involves a question in our own jurisdiction or of international law, is pitifully inadequate. No one should have any illusions on this score. When I flew over the Soviet trawlers a year ago this fall, watching them operate off the West Coast marine park area, I felt I could almost reach out and touch the sands of Long Beach, though at that point the vessels were some 20 miles offshore. I suggest that if it is to be of any real value, jurisdiction should be extended to the limit of what is referred to as the prohibited zone set out in annex A to the International Convention for the Prevention of the Pollution of the Sea by Oil, that is to say, a distance of 100 miles. The Convention makes reference to what is known, in the Pacific Ocean, as the Canadian western zone extending a distance of 100 miles from the nearest land along the west coast of Canada. On the Atlantic coast, as far as Canada is concerned, the zone would extend from latitude 42 degrees 05' north, longitude 64 degrees 37' west along the east coast at a distance of 100 miles from the nearest land. This is the minimum distance which should apply under this law.

I believe we could enforce jurisdiction of this kind, regardless of the position of international law, at least with respect to all ships sailing to or leaving Canadian ports; that is, we could ensure that all the required standards were maintained. I am referring, of course, to the proposed regulations governing ships carrying cargoes capable of causing serious pollution. No greater difficulty would attach to requiring that these vessels submit to inspection 100 miles off our shore, if they were bound for a Canadian port, than at the point of entry into what the bill presently refers to as Canadian waters. If the government is not prepared to make the kind of declaration in the present bill, as was made in the measure directed against Arctic water pollution, I suggest we might, at least, be able to shame other nations whose ships wish to sail close to our shores into operating