

U.S.-operated and controlled west coast route to be more desirable. And so it seems evident as we watch—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I interrupt the hon. member to remind him of the agreement reached as to the time to be allotted to speeches. The hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. Deachman: Perhaps hon. members would be good enough to give me a few more moments. I shall be finished in a very few moments.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I will put it to hon. members. At the same time, I will incorporate with that request the suggestion that the hon. member for Cumberland-Colchester North might be allowed the 15 minutes to which he is entitled. Is that agreeable to hon. members?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deachman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In summary, I would like to particularly praise the work of the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich in his fight before the U.S. courts and in congressional committees in an effort to point out what this issue means environmentally to the Puget Sound and Georgia Bay areas. I would remind hon. members how effective the hon. member has been in making the people of Canada, the people of the United States, the Congress of the United States and this Parliament aware of these problems.

I would also praise my colleague, the hon. member for Victoria, for what he has done. He has made some extremely valuable suggestions as to what could be done on the west coast to ensure more effective control of tanker traffic. We must recognize that tanker traffic is coming, and I very much doubt that it is within the power of this Parliament or the people of Canada to prevent these vessels operating on the high seas off the west coast and in and out of U.S. ports.

While I do not have time today to discuss the details of the measures advocated by the hon. member for Victoria, may I simply refer to his suggestion that an elaborate system of radar control operate on the west coast to keep this traffic under surveillance throughout its passage. This program would provide rigid inspection and would prevent rust-buckets, as one hon. member called them a moment ago, entering the sheltered waters of the west coast. The hon. member also suggested provision of harbours of refuge for vessels in danger, places where safety gear might be kept ready for use whenever oil spills occur.

It will be seen, therefore, that work is being done to bring about better rapport between Canada and the United States in an effort to control these matters, and that suggestions are being made by Members of Parliament both to our own government and to the United States as to what can be done to control this growing threat.

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): Mr. Speaker, at the outset I wish to say that in my opinion this has been a very useful debate today after what might be termed a lost weekend yesterday. I think the government has materially assisted in allowing the amendment

Oil Pollution

proposed by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen). It was accepted today by the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) on behalf of the government.

• (1650)

The International Joint Committee now will not only have authority to consider the matter by way of reference but will also have the necessary resources, financial and otherwise, to produce results that will provide protection to the people of the United States and Canada against hazards, real and realized, from the tanker transportation of oil.

The gravity of the situation can best be appreciated when the facts are examined. We learned that within three to five seconds between 4,000 and 12,000 gallons of oil were spilled into the ocean. We in Nova Scotia know the frightening dangers to the ecology from oil spills. The *Arrow* disaster in Chedabucto Bay resulted in 1.2 million gallons of crude oil plastering 190 miles of our province's shoreline, killing wildlife and costing the taxpayers of this nation a fortune.

The oil spill in British Columbia is a drop in the bucket compared to the *Arrow* disaster and the danger of future disasters to British Columbia from tankers which will have a 100,000-ton dead weight capacity as compared with the 18,000-ton dead weight capacity of the *Arrow*. The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman) was talking about tankers with a 250,000-ton dead weight capacity and the possibility of still larger tankers being built.

I have a 1972 year book issued for the "National Fisherman" in which is a picture of one of the great supertankers being produced. Part of the accompanying story reads as follows:

Controversy over proposed superports—deep water terminals to receive oil tankers which may range up to one million tons dead weight in another decade—

That indicates what the people of British Columbia have to face in the future so far as tanker traffic is concerned along their shorelines. We in Nova Scotia appreciate how frightening this whole situation is for members who come from that area of Canada and the people who live there, just as we are frightened in Nova Scotia about similar future problems associated with our coastline.

What concerns me about this debate, just as with the situation at the time of the *Arrow* disaster, is that we approach each of these disasters as they occur, and when they occur, to our ecology on a piecemeal basis. The time has arrived for an integrated, national long-term policy which will ensure control and regulation of all such activities be they problems of pollution associated with the Great Lakes, tanker traffic on the east and west coasts or the development of nuclear power plants whether the sites be on either of our coasts or in central Canada.

While the residents of British Columbia have this week been concerned about the oil spill from the Cherry Point refinery, we in Nova Scotia have been concerned about the possible construction of a nuclear power plant on Stoddart Island in Shag Harbour. We were told discussions were being held between officials of a United States group and Mr. Regan's government about the possible