

represent the only constituency in Canada, Mr. Speaker, that is 700 miles long and half a mile wide. This actually is the case. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, there are parts of it that are so narrow I have difficulty in getting all of me within it.

● (12:20 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Jamieson: Be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, as I have already said, we cannot exercise pollution control over the whole coastline at any one time so, we are proposing to establish depots for mobile teams at various points.

I have not touched on what is perhaps the most important part of the legislation. I will do that quickly. It is that part of the legislation which is designed to reinforce and enhance our contention that where there is pollution the polluter must pay. As hon. members will see when the legislation goes to committee, we have provided for several ways in which this can be achieved. In the first place, we have provided that various ship owners must give evidence that they have covered their liability through insurance, bonds and various other ways; that the insurance is in force and their liability is covered before they can move in to or out of Canadian waters. Secondly, we are proposing to level up to 15 cents per ton, not only on oil shipments entering Canada but on all movements of oil by water within Canada. In other words, we wish to cover the kind of situation which we encountered in the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

The provisions of the legislation will extend to such situations. We do not really know exactly how much this toll is likely to generate, although on the basis of 15 cents per ton it should be in the neighbourhood of \$300,000 annually. And, just to show that that is not an excessive amount may I say—and I believe hon. members already know this—that the cost of cleaning up the oil spill by the *Arrow* alone exceeded \$300,000 by a very wide margin. Therefore, we have proposed the establishment of this fund.

One of the things about the fund which I think hon. members will appreciate and which I am very pleased about—I am very proud to be able to introduce this because I think hon. members opposite representing the Maritimes will also be pleased about it—is this: the fund will be and can be used to cover loss of income by fishermen as a result of pollution. Up to now there has been no means through which fishermen could be compensated. Individuals have found it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to take action in the courts and the like. There has been no means, other than government largess of one type or another, for making up the loss of income. Under this plan, the pollution fund will be used to clean up a pollution incident. From it payments can also be made to fishermen in order to cover their loss of income.

There are two ways actually in which the fishermen will be protected. On the one hand, the fund will cover income losses and, on the other hand, the liability provi-

Canada Shipping Act

sions which I have outlined and which involve insurance and the like will be applied to any damage that may occur to the gear of fishermen, to their wharves, to their boats or anything of that kind. So, there is a clearcut distinction here which I think will work very satisfactorily. In other words, there is a clear insurance provision covering situations in which boats are damaged, nets are soiled or anything like that. On the other hand, the fund can take care of the loss of income and, through this means, we shall be able to make payments to fishermen much more quickly than otherwise would be the case in order to bridge them over any difficult period which they inevitably face under these circumstances.

A number of questions have been asked about this legislation. I have not attempted today to cover all of them by any means. I can only say that there is unanimity, I believe, within the shipping community that we have gone further, much further, than any other country in using this type of legislation in order to protect ourselves. I make absolutely no apologies for that, Mr. Speaker, so far as I am concerned. We have seen that historically, as I tried to document earlier in my remarks, the law of the sea generally has been weighted for centuries in favour of the shipping community. I believe it is high time that we reversed the circumstances and attempted at least to correct the balance somewhat on our own account and in our own interest.

I therefore believe that what we have proposed will do two things—perhaps it will do many other things, too. It will do two things at least. First, it will make the shipping community much more conscious of what I contend is its fundamental and basic responsibility in this regard. There will no longer be any inducement for those who want to exploit the shipments of oil and the like to the maximum degree to use rotten or rusty tubs in which to carry this highly dangerous and highly polluting substance. Second, I think it will help us to achieve what we ultimately wish to see: international agreement on the whole question of the control of pollution, not only within coastal or territorial waters but on the high seas as well. Third, and this is incidental to the other two points I have made, we want to make ship operators, those being the crews and captains of vessels, more conscious of their responsibilities when they are in our waters, not merely in terms of navigating carefully but also in terms of what they do with such things as oil bilge, the flushings from their tanks, garbage, and such other things which, unfortunately, crews and captains at the present do not seem to feel are important.

To cover this kind of situation, we have increased what was essentially a token fine of \$5,000 for this kind of pollution to \$100,000. Furthermore, as the legal gentlemen in the House will know and will see when the legislation is considered in committee, we have broadened the base on which we can take action against a ship operating in this way. We have tried, during the past several months of intensive examination and study of this matter, to determine just exactly what kinds of package measures were needed. I believe we have come up with what is at the moment the maximum that we can achieve unilaterally.