

### *Damage to Shoreline by Passing Ships*

**Mr. Howard:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable and mouthy parliamentary secretary obviously missed what I was saying. It is not a question of relying upon his generosity; it is a question of permitting the House to make a decision. We should not have to rely upon the graciousness of the hon. member for Winnipeg South, or wherever he is from—

**An hon. Member:** St. Boniface.

**Mr. Howard:** —from St. Boniface (Mr. Guay), the parliamentary secretary, or anybody else on the government side to tell us how generous, friendly and willing they are to accept specific ideas put forward by members of the opposition. I am saying that there should be a right inherent in the rules to permit an hon. member to move a motion, to introduce a bill and to have it accepted or rejected on its merits, and not on whether the hon. member for St. Boniface wants to pick and choose. That is the point I was trying to make.

The motion put before us by the hon. member for Kent-Essex has an element of deficiency about; certainly not from his point of view or from the point of view of the people living alongside inland water areas who are confronted with problems, but it has a deficiency. This matter was touched upon by the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. McRae) at the conclusion of his remarks when he spoke about coastal waters and the effect shipping can have upon communities and lands and buildings there as well as inland.

I should like to make a few remarks with respect to the impact of shipping upon coastal communities. When I say the motion is deficient in this regard, it is only from the point of view of expressing the needs and feelings of people in these communities; it is not meant to refer in a derogatory way to the substance of the motion itself. I am sure the hon. member for Kent-Essex and others appreciate the need to think about this question in expanded terms.

In recent times we have oil damage caused to some of our coastal communities by oil tanker groundings and collisions. We think of the *Arrow on the east coast*, the *Irish Star* earlier this year on the west coast, the leak from the ruptured oil pipeline of Richfield oil refinery in the state of Washington which spewed oil all over the beaches in that area and the lower coastal part of British Columbia. More recently, we think of the two ships which collided in Vancouver harbour and spewed their oil all over the area. At the time, or just prior to the rupture of the oil line at the Richfield refinery in Washington there was a discussion in this House about oil tanker routes, a discussion about the Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act as well as the alterations that were made to the Fisheries Act to deal with deleterious substances in waters frequented by fish and the like.

During the course of debates in the House, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Davis) on numerous occasions assured us that in the absence of legislation and proposed changes to the Canada Shipping Act—because the Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act did not apply to the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, but only to the Arctic area—the government had a contingency plan to deal with any accidental oil spills that might take place on our coasts. Upon the

heels of this declaration we experienced the effects of the broken line at the refinery to which I referred earlier and the inundation of oil in the Crescent Beach area, the White Rock area, the Boundary Bay area and the lower coastal part of British Columbia. We then discovered that the government's contingency plan consisted of voluntary help from school kids. The contingency plan was just froth and air; it did not exist. The cleaning of the beaches had to be done by citizens and students.

This appears to have been the case since that time. There is no contingency plan that I have been able to discover, there is no over-all plan, no concept of what should be done, especially in light of the decision of the United States government to build the Alyeska pipeline. It is proposed to bring oil by supertanker down the west coast via Alaska to Washington and California. These tankers will be routed alongside the coastal communities of British Columbia. The government does not seem to know what to do about the situation except wait and see how extensive the damage is and then deal with it. That is not good enough, Mr. Speaker. For the people of British Columbia and of the Atlantic provinces who are concerned about coastal routes, this approach is too careless.

• (1740)

The Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act, as we have said before, is one of the finest pieces of legislation in the field of preventing oil pollution to be found anywhere in the world. Its requirements are most stringent. It includes extensive requirements governing the construction of ships; it requires the installation of safety features such as certain types of valves and double hulls for ships that might be carrying oil in Arctic waters. This legislation was a commendable move by the government. The Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act established a 100 nautical sea miles limit which extended off certain Arctic islands and the archipelago in that area; it extended Canada's authority 100 nautical miles seaward of the Arctic islands. The act applies to oil-carrying tankers.

The sad part is that this piece of legislation, the finest of its kind anywhere applying to oil tankers, governs an area in which there are no oil tankers operating. It applies to the Arctic, and nobody is hauling oil in or around the arctic. The oil that is to come from the North Slope of Alaska, from Prudhoe Bay, is to come across land. It will be taken across Alaska and down the west coast where the legislative requirements are not nearly as stringent as those contained in the Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act.

We have said that in the absence of any other declaration on this matter—and no declaration has been made so far—Parliament should amend the Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act so that it applies also to the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. In that way we could extend our authority in those areas 100 nautical miles farther than it extends now. We should consider such legislation because the hazards off the Atlantic and Pacific coasts are even greater than the hazards in the Arctic. We ought to extend our authority 100 nautical miles seaward so that we could limit and control the construction of oil tankers plying those waters. We could then say to tankers coming under the jurisdiction of a foreign country, "If your tankers come inside our 100 nautical mile zone, they must have

[Mr. Guay (St. Boniface).]