

hon. member missed this tabling of bills, this list is appended to *Hansard* at pages 116 and 117 of that date.

Regulations covering the packaging, handling and transportation of dangerous goods have been promulgated by a variety of federal, provincial and municipal authorities since the early part of this century. The resulting mass of often conflicting regulations, penalties, and enforcement provisions had led to confusion on the part of the distributors, carriers and manufacturers of these products and their containers. Indeed, in order to meet the needs of commerce, they have sometimes had either to ignore the rules or disguise the characteristics of the products. Attempts to enforce these conflicting standards would be exceedingly difficult and complicated, and would constitute a severe barrier to trade.

And so, Mr. Speaker, the object of this bill to regulate the transportation of dangerous goods is to ensure safety in transport while facilitating trade by providing for the promulgation and enforcement of a uniform set of regulations governing the handling and transportation of dangerous goods, and establishing a joint safety program with the provinces which will ensure that compatible standards are applied across the country.

In short, the act will be designed to ensure the complete integrity of hazardous shipments, be they commodities or wastes in and across Canada.

To respond to the specific concern of the hon. member over rail traffic through Winnipeg-Birds Hill, I can assure him that federal inspectors will enforce the provisions of the proposed transportation of dangerous goods act.

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS—PROTECTION AGAINST OIL SPILLS
IN WEST COAST WATERS

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, it is nice to speak to a full House.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Waddell: My topic tonight is the transportation of Alaskan oil. It arises from a question I asked in the House on October 11 of the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Fraser). The question was as follows:

What does the minister propose to do to ensure that the routing of Alaskan oil will be done in the best interests of Canada and will not endanger the west coast?

My main point tonight is that the policy followed by the present Conservative government, and indeed by the previous Liberal administration, is a disaster for British Columbia and Canada, in my opinion. What really irks me is that we are on an American timetable in this issue. Surely the minister must realize that. It is like an old movie. We did the same thing with the gas pipeline. I have spent three years of my life on the regulatory procedure for that pipeline and we speeded up the regulation to meet the American timetable. What happened? We finished our regulatory procedures but we are still waiting for the Americans to get their act together. It seems to me that now we are doing it again, we are again trying to meet the American timetable.

Adjournment Debate

I should like to give members in the House some brief facts on this matter so that it becomes a little more clear. The problem is to get Alaskan oil to the midwestern United States. There have been five proposals: first, a tanker route to Kitimat. That seems to be gone now. Second, a tanker route to Skagway. That seems to be gone. Third, a tanker route to Port Angeles, Washington, thence to Edmonton and thence to the American mid-west. That seems to be still there. It is the Trans Mountain proposal. Fourth, a tanker route to Low Point in Washington, near Port Angeles, and again by pipeline to the American mid-west. It is the "all-American" route. Fifth, an overland line, the Foothills line. Yesterday we heard that apparently Foothills has withdrawn its application or at least put it on the back burner. Now we are faced with an oil port on the west coast and a tanker route.

● (2220)

Ask any student in the city of Vancouver or in any one of the members' constituencies. They know about oil spills, about Chedabucto Bay, the Torrey Canyon incident and the present spill in Mexico. They know, and our scientists know, that there will be a spill if there is an oil port on the west coast. I know the minister shares with me the terrible thought of seeing British Columbia beaches covered with oil.

There is another reason why we worry about a spill. It is not just the love of the sea. The fact is that we have an incredible Fraser River salmon industry. It is a resource, as a food resource, that is comparable to the wheat capacity of the prairies. It is a permanent renewable resource. If we have a spill, it is gone.

Another matter which concerns me—and I will be frank about this—is that the government looks like a fool. My Canadian government, our government, looks like a fool. It seems to support the Foothills application. The Prime Minister (Mr. Clark) practically said so in the House the other day. It is counting on that, and then suddenly Foothills withdraws. Where is the policy? There is no policy. I hope the minister will rise after me and tell the House the policy. I do not like to see our government look like a fool. If that is an example of private planning, then God help us after we return everything to the private sector. We must plan for this. We cannot just let Foothills carry the ball. We cannot put everything on Foothills, and then suddenly they withdraw and leave the government with egg on its face. Where do we go from here? What is something positive that we can do?

Apparently the minister has accepted as a *fait accompli* the fact of a west coast oil port, and the Liberal member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Phillips) appears to have accepted that. I do not accept that for one minute, and neither do my colleagues in the NDP.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Waddell: I suggested to the Prime Minister in a supplementary question that he should get together with the American president on November 9 and 10 and put this item on the agenda. The Prime Minister was kind enough to accept that