

still find, according to the available evidence before us, that the pollution problems on the high seas are increasing rather than decreasing.

We recognize, Mr. Speaker, in this party, as does the hon. member for South Shore, that this particular bill we are considering is not designed to cope with the over-all problem of the increasing pollution of the oceans of the world. It is the view of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson), according to the statement he made when introducing the bill, that the bill will do something towards protecting the immediate coastal waters of Canada from pollution by oil and other pollutants carried by large cargo vessels. It is our intention, in considering this bill at the second reading stage as well as in committee, to see how far the measure before us will fulfil the hopes of the Minister of Transport.

In his opening remarks, the minister referred to the days when he was a professional broadcaster and to the instant experts that appeared on every side. He drew some parallel between that and the many people who are now instant experts on pollution. I do not know whether I am an expert, instant or otherwise, on pollution. Being able to recall a little encounter of mine with the minister when he was a professional broadcaster, I can tell the House that since that day I have always considered the minister to be an expert in professional broadcasting.

In his speech, the minister devoted a good deal of time to the question of the creation of a task force, under his authority, after the incident of the *Arrow* in Chedabucto Bay. I have had an opportunity of looking through volume 1 of the report of that task force. While I realize that it does not give us all the answers for coping with problems of pollution at sea, I can say that a review of the report indicates to me that if the minister were not involved in creating instant experts in the field of pollution, at least he had some success in that venture in creating what I would call a bit of instant expertise. To this extent, I found the reading of the report very encouraging. Perhaps one can venture to say that it may have some bearing on the success, in future, of the proposals in this bill, if they are included in the law of our land.

The report is forthright, couched in language that is characteristic of the head of the task force, Dr. Patrick McTaggart-Cowan. As it happens, he crossed my trail some time before I met the Minister of Transport at the time he was a broadcaster. I knew him when we were fellow undergraduates at the University of British Columbia, which is some little time ago now. Having read the report, I found that he put forward his point of view as vigorously as he did in the past when we argued about the major issues of the world as undergraduates. I ought to point out, perhaps, particularly for those from British Columbia who are following these proceedings, that we ought not to confuse Patrick McTaggart-Cowan with his equally distinguished brother, Ian, who has achieved a reputation in another scientific field and who is well known and respected in British Columbia and beyond.

Having read the report of the task force, Mr. Speaker, it came to my mind that there was a considerable con-

Canada Shipping Act

trast between the situation, so far as the responsibility and the ability of the Minister of Transport to cope with the emergency that occurred when the *Arrow* was wrecked, and the situation that had prevailed in the period before 1969, before we adopted the bill which added section 495-C to the Canada Shipping Act.

The hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose) referred to this bill in his speech. I think it is important to note that prior to the passage of that particular piece of legislation, the minister really had no power to act under the law unless and until a vessel was formally abandoned by its owner. That that bit of legislation was enacted in Parliament before the *Arrow* disaster was fortuitous, to say the least. If the situation at the time of the *Arrow* disaster had been that which prevailed at the time the motor vessel *Schiedyk* grounded on the west coast, off Vancouver Island, when we lacked effective anti-pollution measures and no one had any real authority in this field, the disaster on the east coast could well have been of major proportions instead of being contained and controlled to the extent it was. While it is true that the *Schiedyk* was not an oil tanker but a cargo vessel carrying pulp, it is nevertheless true to say that serious damage resulted from the leakage of oil from the fuel tanks of that ship when she went down. For example, there was damage to an important herring spawning area at Nootka Sound. There was damage also, real and potential, to pulp logs that move back and forth in the adjacent waters. As far as I am concerned, it was certainly a warning for the minister of the need to take instant action. To this extent, the enactment of section 495(c) represented another step forward in our rather fumbling approach towards the objective of government having the proper authority to deal with the ever increasing danger of pollution of our coastal waters.

• (3:20 p.m.)

I was interested to find out by chance, as one sometimes does, that the *Arrow* almost docked at the port of Port Alberni in my constituency with its cargo of Bunker C rather than Chedabucto Bay. In any event, there was a substitute "crate" that went into Port Alberni which carried a crew so ill-trained they created a smallpox scare on the Pacific coast. It came into our coastline flying a quarantine flag. According to reports, it was another gerrybuilt cockleshell that should not have been carrying any kind of oil cargo.

We must now consider what improvements, if any, the present bill makes upon the legislative provisions of existing section 495(c) of the act. I suggest there are at least two areas of improvement which should be assessed and considered in depth in committee. One is the provision which is in this bill and which was removed from former Bill S-23, the liability on the polluter to pay. While there will be arguments as to whether this particular provision is adequate, nevertheless there is embodied in the bill direct liability upon the owners of the ship and its cargo, and through establishment of the Maritime pollution claims fund, a supplementary payments pool.

I hope experts from the government's services will be prepared to inform the committee regarding the cost of