

The Deputy Chairman: Shall the further amendment to clause 52 carry?

Amendment (Mr. Munro, Hamilton East) agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall clause 52 as amended carry?

Mr. Baldwin: On division.

Clause as amended agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: The committee will now return to the final clause, clause 53, as amended. Shall clause 53 as amended carry?

Clause 53 as amended agreed to.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): When shall the bill be read the third time?

Some hon. Members: Now.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, even those of us who favour this bill must face the fact that a great many amendments have been made to it, and in all fairness to the operation of this House I believe we should see the bill in its reprinted form before third reading.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): At the next sitting of the House, then.

* * *

OCEAN DUMPING CONTROL ACT

MEASURE TO PROVIDE FOR CONTROL OF DUMPING
SUBSTANCES INTO THE OCEAN AND TO ESTABLISH A BOARD
OF REVIEW

The House resumed, from Tuesday, April 22, consideration of the motion of Mr. Sharp (for the Minister of the Environment) that Bill C-37, to provide for the control of dumping of waste and other substances in the ocean, be read the second time and referred to the standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, while my voice holds out I propose to make a few further comments on this bill without in any way wishing to hold up its passage.

As I mentioned in the course of the debate which took place on April 22, this is legislation for which we have been waiting. It is good legislation. However, there are just a few comments that need to be made about the proposal. I know, for example, that the United States Congress considered a similar measure more than a year ago, in March, 1974. Why have we had to wait so long? The legislation has to do with an act of a United Nations organization, the final act being concluded in London in 1972. Therefore, I think it is appropriate that we ask ourselves here and now why it has taken 2½ years to implement this enabling legislation. However, it is with us

Dumping at Sea

now; let us pursue it, make our comments on it and get it into committee.

● (1600)

During question period today I raised a question with the Minister of the Environment (Mrs. Sauvé) about the stock of clean-up equipment in the Strait of Juan de Fuca and off the coast of British Columbia. I asked the minister whether she was satisfied with the amount of material in stock and available. I suppose I should not have been surprised by her answer because, after all, she has to be satisfied with, and uncritical of, the work that goes on in her department; but I feel we should push more forcefully for this clean-up material.

In a starred question which I placed on the order paper in February, I asked about the stock of clean-up equipment in this particular area which right now is threatened with spills. There have been spills at Cherry Point. Indeed, my colleague for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser) asked a question on Friday about the financial responsibility for a spill that occurred there a year ago. We have had spills further north in the area of my hon. friend from Comox-Alberni (Mr. Anderson) who is also concerned about these matters. If I got him outside the House, I fancy he would not be satisfied with the answer to the question which I put on the order paper and which is recorded. Although it was a starred question, it was asked to be reported as an order for return.

I find that in this whole area, through which pass hundreds of thousands of tons of oil each year, we have six skimmers that are designed to lick off the surface any oil that has happened to escape from a ship. There is no stock of absorbent material nearby, though we were assured in the answer that was tabled on March 12, 1975, that the commercial enterprises in the area are holding sufficient inventory. The reply is completely inadequate. The stock is not there; there is not sufficient material to contain a major spill in the area, should it occur in the near future.

Another reply that I received from the minister today upset me. The minister seemed to be satisfied with a decision to offload oil in Port Angeles to avoid a spill in the Strait of Juan de Fuca. I suggest that the minister take a look at a geography book; she would then realize that Port Angeles is at the southeastward end of the strait—away inland from the sea. You have to go through the Strait of Juan de Fuca to get to Port Angeles; so how, by offloading at Port Angeles, you prevent a spill in the Strait of Juan de Fuca I am at a complete loss to understand.

Another matter I want to take up with the minister in a question, but which I will record here, is this: Over the weekend a number of my colleagues from all sides of the House attended a meeting of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group in Quebec City to discuss the problems confronting our two nations. One problem raised was this very matter of a tanker route into the Strait of Juan de Fuca and on into the Strait of Georgia. As all hon. members know, I have been very anxious to keep these ships out at sea.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!