

Transport Act

it had moved up to 9,300,000 tons. Therefore the domestic traffic in and out of Vancouver compares very favourably, with a ratio of approximately seven to nine, with the port of Montreal, which gives some indication to the house of the extensive traffic which plies our inland coastal waters.

I want to turn for a moment to the figures for the port of Vancouver for passenger traffic, because my hon. friend mentioned them when discussing the shift in coastal traffic by vessels in the inland waters. I refer to these figures because this is a matter of considerable importance in plotting how traffic should be governed in the future under legislation such as that suggested by my hon. friend today.

In 1959 coast wise traffic in total numbers of passengers, again excluding foreign traffic, taking both landings and embarkations into consideration, amounted to 1,000,183. This number declined steadily until in 1963—and this figure is hardly believable—the number of passengers was down to 198,000. Some of that drop from 1,000,183 to 198,000 had to do with some changes in ferry service and the withdrawal of some of the old ferry services between Vancouver, Nanaimo and Victoria. But, as my hon. friend conceded, there has been a very marked decline indeed in coast wise passenger movements.

There has also been a comparable change in the number of vessel movements, and I want to refer to this for a moment because it is quite significant. I am sorry I have no comparative figures here, but coastal or inland commercial vessels, including fishery vessels, numbered 22,316 in 1962 and 19,325 in 1963. This is in terms of arrivals only. These figures give, I believe, some indication of the importance of this traffic.

In listening to the hon. gentleman's remarks I wondered whether or not it was wise to attempt further to regulate this traffic through a federal agency and to remove the regulation of that traffic from the area of provincial jurisdiction in which for the most part it now rests. It is this point to which I wish to come next. As this question is peculiar to British Columbia and has to do to some extent with the growth and direct development of British Columbia, I wonder whether or not we are wise in bringing this domestic traffic into the federal field in the manner suggested by my hon. friend.

Mr. Barnett: Would the hon. member permit a question at this point. Quite frankly, I am puzzled at his reference to this coastal traffic being within provincial jurisdiction. I wonder whether he could spell that out,

because my understanding is that it is under no jurisdiction, except for steamship inspection and that sort of thing.

Mr. Deachman: I think this is quite true. This traffic is literally self-regulating today in the province of British Columbia. I might explain, although I am sure my hon. friend knows this, that the movement of ships, for instance, for use at pulp mills up and down the coast and for the movement of paper from the pulp mills down the coast to Vancouver and further to Seattle is done in two ways. Contracts are let for this movement at the beginning of the season. The job is put out to tender and the various barge operators on the coast contract with the operators of the mills or the shippers for the hauling of the paper and chips from the mills.

Mr. Barnett: Is not the hon. member aware that my bill refers only to the public carriage of goods and passengers? It has no relationship to the contract carriage of bulk goods.

Mr. Deachman: I am sure that the barges operated by commercial bargaining companies are classified as commercial carriers; that these carriers who contract for the movement of goods are in fact the carriers of the goods for the shipping company, and would thereby be classed as public carriers. I see my hon. friend shaking his head, but I do not know just how I could classify them. If a barge company, for example, is not in the special business of hauling pulp and paper, but is in a commercial business, then I believe that company would be classified as a public carrier. I believe it is a public carrier whether its goods are moved under a tariff or whether its goods are carried under contract.

I should like to go on and point out some of the features relating to the exemptions under section 12 of the Transport Act to which my hon. friend referred, and which I feel he rather skipped over. I do not want to leave this section without explaining it a little more fully. This is the one that deals with exemptions under the act. I quote from section 12, subsection 4:

The provisions of this part do not apply in the case of ships engaged in the transport of goods or passengers,

(a) between ports or places in British Columbia—

It was there that my hon. friend stopped early in his remarks. However, the section continues as follows:

(b) between ports or places in Hudson bay, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland, and the gulf and river St. Lawrence east of the western point of the island of Orleans, or between any two or more places therein, nor does this part apply between any of such ports or places and ports or places outside of Canada.

Thus the exemptions which my hon. friend mentioned in explaining the act apply to the