

the committee has other things to do. Perhaps it might be worth enlarging this committee so that the various things that committee must do may be covered.

An hon. Member: This bill will not go to the Transport Committee.

Mr. Rose: I know it will not; that is what I am complaining about.

In conclusion, may I say that we shall watch this bill as it goes through its various stages and try to change its direction here and there. I compliment the minister on the legislation. I reiterate my main objections to it: the bill encompasses too limited a geographical jurisdiction. I think it should go farther. We feel that the kind of mobile clean-up operational methods the Task Force envisaged should be clearly outlined and instituted, either in the provisions of this legislation or in the regulations resulting therefrom.

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, may I just clarify a matter for the hon. member? I have no particular insistence on taking this bill to this particular committee. I wish to advise the House that it seemed to us that that committee was the most logical place for a consideration of the bill under all the circumstances. However, if the House is disposed to change that, there is certainly no objection on my part.

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, first may I be permitted to take this opportunity of extending my congratulations to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) who has had conferred upon him an honorary doctorate by the Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

An hon. Member: He is now Dr. Jamieson.

Mr. McGrath: I have no hesitation in saying that I welcome the fact that the minister has been honoured by our university. I think he truly deserves that honour.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. McGrath: It may be a coincidence that the minister's first action after having had conferred on him an honorary laws degree was to delve into the rather hazy and mixed up field of admiralty law.

The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken) put forward the principal views of my party and some of our reservations about the bill we are debating. He pointed out some of the shortcomings of the bill, although indicating to the House, as I am pleased to reiterate, our support of the principle of the bill.

There are one or two points I should like to put forward which are of particular interest to that part of the country I represent. Certainly, I know they are of special interest to the minister. Perhaps he will have a chance to deal with these points when the bill goes to committee. I notice that a number of the major recommendations of

Canada Shipping Act

the McTaggart-Cowan Task Force have largely been ignored in the drafting of this bill. I should point out also that, to my knowledge, this report was never tabled in the House. I find it difficult to understand why it was not tabled and why a ministerial statement was not made.

While on the subject of statements, sir, may I say this. When the minister participated in the Brussels conference on pollution of the high seas last year he also promised, after being prompted by members of the opposition who were questioning him, to make a statement on the outcome of that conference in respect of the position that Canada took there and the course that Canada intends to pursue in subsequent international conferences. We were denied the opportunity of hearing that statement in the House and the opportunity of commenting on it. The minister can certainly correct me if I am wrong in that respect.

My reference to the Brussels conference reminds me of what I consider to be the major weakness of the legislation now before us: the fact that Canada has found it necessary to take unilateral action in a field where effective action can only be taken on a multilateral basis. All we shall be doing by passing this legislation is attempting to enforce the regulations set out in the bill within our limited territorial fishing zones. It is well known that some of the larger super tankers in the world today, tankers of the size of the *Manhattan*, require at least nine miles in order to get a full stop from full ahead. One can readily appreciate the difficulty connected with our jurisdiction being so limited, as well as the difficulty of enforcing any meaningful control over this very serious form of pollution.

Even though we may go along with the idea of enforcing this legislation within the territorial fishing zones of Canada, we shall immediately get into trouble when we come to the minister's own constituency or when we get to the province of Newfoundland and certain areas of the east coast. The one area of the country with respect to which the government has not been able to enforce effectively the fishing zone regulations is that area off the south and east coasts of Newfoundland. There is a very good reason for that. The reason is that the government has found its hands tied by international treaties which Canada, as a country, inherited from Great Britain and to which the government maintains we must live up. Those treaties involve the fishing rights of other countries, in addition to traditional rights of other countries the fishermen of which have fished off the coasts of Newfoundland for centuries.

The difficulty has been made even more serious by the fact that Newfoundland recently signed an agreement with an international consortium to build a 100,000 barrel oil refinery at Come-By-Chance on Placentia Bay, on the southeast coast of Newfoundland, that being the one area where the bill as it now stands would be ineffective and inoperative. The largest oil refinery in eastern Canada today is a 50,000 barrel refinery, which is either in New Brunswick or Nova Scotia. So, one can see the importance of the new refinery to the east coast and the serious pollution hazard it poses to that one area of Newfoundland where this bill will not have jurisdiction.