

tions will be answered today: Nos. 1,054, 1,494, 1,740, 1,787, 1,815, 1,925, 2,011, and 2,063.

[Text]

OSHAWA HARBOUR COMMISSION

Question No. 1,054—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. Has the Oshawa Harbour Commission (OHC) filed with the Department of Transport or Ports and Harbours an application for expansion of the Oshawa Harbour and, if so, on what date will the environmental studies be undertaken through EA, EPS, EARP, RSCC and what will be the cost?

2. Has the Department of Transport fully exercised a site-selection process to determine the best location for a harbour in Oshawa in view of the economic constraints and environmental considerations?

3. Has DOT given the OHC full authority to preside over marshlands and does this conform with the Harbour Commissions Act?

4. Is it accepted policy for harbour commissions under DOT to engage in land-banking, real estate, industrial planning for municipalities, lakefront planning for municipalities, etc. and, if DOT has given the OHC such authority (a) on what date was it given and by whom (b) what are the limits of the authority?

5. Did OHC have permission to construct an earthen dyke across the natural outlet of the marsh in the fall of 1974 and, if so (a) on what date was such permission given and by whom (b) for what purpose was permission granted (c) who was consulted before permission was granted (d) does such construction violate any sections of the Fisheries Act (e) was the opinion of the Department of Justice or the Department of the Environment sought and, if so, what were their recommendations (f) were any environmental studies done (i) prior to the construction of the dyke to determine the environmental change and/or damage that would occur (ii) after the construction to assess the damage and, if so, what were the results of these studies and will they be made public?

6. Does OHC forbid entry to the marshland to naturalists, the public and the provincial government and, if so, for what reason?

7. Will access to the marshlands be granted to (a) concerned conservationists so that nature studies and educational programmes may continue (b) Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Canadian Wildlife people to continue with the waterfowl banding under the Migratory Birds Act and, if so, on what date?

8. Will the dyke be removed and the outlet restored to its natural condition and, if so, on what date (b) what was the agreement between federal and provincial personnel with OHC?

9. (a) Will the public have input into the decision-making process prior to any announcement about harbour expansion (b) can the public be assured that full environmental impact studies will be undertaken before any such decision is reached (c) will DOT make public its intentions for future harbour expansion, and will it justify the intentions with appropriate documentation (d) are studies and testings being conducted at other sites along the Oshawa lakefront, or has the decision been made to proceed with expansion into the second marsh (e) are there any studies that demonstrate a need for expansion of the present harbour into the second marsh?

10. Will DOT and OHC open their files on the issue so that the public will have full knowledge of all facts pertaining to OHC, the harbour expansion proposals and the future of the marshland?

11. Did DOT and DPW complete studies and testings in 1975 and, if so (a) what was their purpose (b) will the results be made public and, if so, on what date and in what form (c) will the results remain confidential and, if so, was this requested by OHC?

12. (a) Are DOT and OHC willing to accept full responsibility for any damages that have occurred as a result of the dyke construction (b) what action does DOT intend to take to correct such damage (c) what action will DOT take to insure that such things would not occur in the future?

13. (a) Does OHC have permission to divert the Oshawa Creek as it flows into the present harbour (b) is the Creek subject to provincial act and regulation (c) did the OHC allow dumping of waste materials into the harbour in 1975 after the federal government paid for dredging operations in Oshawa Harbour and, if so, for what reason and is this contrary to government policy and to NWPA?

14. Does the DOE intend to take action against DOT if any infractions of federal laws are indicated and, if so, on what date?

*Order Paper Questions*

15. Will DOT and/or DOE make the Johnston Report on the environmental importance of the Second Marsh public?

**Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** I am informed by the Departments of Transport, Public Works and the Environment as follows: 1. No.

2. No.

3. Yes.

4. The Oshawa Harbour Commission is established under the Harbour Commission Act 1964 which authorizes the commission to acquire or sell land as required for harbour development purposes. A harbour commission does not however engage in industrial planning or lakefront planning etc. for municipalities.

5. No. (a) N/A; (b) N/A; (c) N/A; (d) N/A; (e) N/A; (f) (i) No. (ii) No.

6. Limited entry is now allowed to approved bird watchers on a permit basis.

7. Controlled access to the marsh has been extended.

8. (a) Department of the Environment has advised that the dyke is not causing the high water levels in the marsh. The marsh is being drained adequately by the present outlet, hence removal of the dyke would be an imprudent expenditure. (b) No agreement.

9. (a) and (b) The public can be assured that full environmental impact studies will be undertaken in conjunction with economic and engineering studies for development of the harbour and full opportunity will be given for public response. (c) Yes. (d) No. (e) Economic studies are being undertaken.

10. Any proposals for expansion of the harbour and the future of the marsh land will be fully documented in studies which will be made public before any action is taken.

11. Preliminary engineering studies remain incomplete. Soil tests were completed in 1975. (a) Oshawa Harbour Commission requested Department of Public Works to provide necessary engineering service to enable the commission to complete an overall long range plan for harbour expansion, including conceptual layouts with related costs. (b) As Department of Public Works was providing a consultant service to the Oshawa Harbour Commission, it will be the responsibility of the commission to make the results of the studies and tests public. (c) Further to (b), the Oshawa Harbour Commission formally asked Department of Public Works to refer any information requests from public or other government agencies to the commission, who would treat such requests on their individual merit.

12. (a) There is no indication that any damage has occurred. (b) No action is indicated. (c) No action required.

13. (a) There is no intention to divert the Oshawa Creek from the present harbour basin. (b) No. (c) In 1975 the Oshawa Harbour Commission used stone and concrete from local construction projects as shore protection against erosion in the northeast corner of the harbour. This did not affect any dredging operations and is simply good practice for shore