

Expo Expenditures

I suggest to the government that it seems to me there are three things that ought to be done. First, we need regulations that will apply to all ships using Canadian ports and Canadian territorial waters, particularly in respect of those which are carrying cargoes of oil or any other commodity that is likely to pollute our coastline. These regulations ought to be formulated as quickly as possible and enforced rigidly.

Second, we need to put back into the Canada Shipping Act the provision removed from the original draft that the cost of dealing with a situation like that which has been created by the *Arrow* should be assessed against the company to which the ship belongs or the company which owns the cargo.

● (2:20 p.m.)

Third, we need some legal provision to establish legal responsibility in order that those who are adversely affected by such pollution may have recourse to proper redress and the right to compensation. An incident of this magnitude brings the situation to the attention of Parliament, but in my own constituency smaller ships frequently discharge part of their surplus oil into the sea and the whole harbour is polluted. Those who are affected, those who own small ships which are contaminated and those who live along the coast whose property is contaminated, have no redress whatsoever. There is little use going to court to bring a case against the foreign owners of a small vessel which spent only a few days in the harbour. Since this is likely to be a recurring and increasingly serious problem in the years ahead, I hope the government will take vigorous steps to ensure that there is no repetition of this unfortunate incident.

PRIVILEGE

MR. DIEFENBAKER—REPORTED STATEMENT BY
PRIME MINISTER RESPECTING RESPONSIBILITY FOR EXPO EXPENDITURES

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege in connection with a news article, written by Mr. David Crane, which appeared today in the *Globe and Mail*. According to this report the Prime Minister made a certain statement in the course of answering questions. I notice that at the time he was smelling flowers and had beads about his neck. The degree to which this statement is removed from the truth would indicate either

that what he was breathing was worse than the effects of pot or that the beads he was wearing were not truth beads.

To the question, why did the farmers not get the \$200 million—the reference was to the money provided in connection with Expo—the Prime Minister answered:

I don't think these people are poor, Mr. Trudeau said. In his visit to the west he had seen farmers riding \$20,000 tractors and they probably owned land costing \$100,000 to \$200,000.

Mr. Trudeau: What is the question of privilege?

Mr. Diefenbaker: He went on to say:

Why not give it to the small grocer in my riding who is being forced out of business by the supermarket?

Some hon. Members: Question!

Mr. Diefenbaker: Then he went on to explain the \$200 million granted in connection with Expo. He was asked why it was that when Montreal needed millions for Expo the money was available, but when the western farmer needs \$200 million it is not. "Can you explain, the student asked Mr. Trudeau."

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to invite the right hon. gentleman to indicate to the House as quickly as possible what his question of privilege is. I also have to remind him that all hon. members are required to give notice of questions of privilege. He is reading from an article which appeared in a newspaper this morning, which would indicate he had ample time to give the Chair the notice which all hon. members are required to give.

An hon. Member: Contempt of parliament.

Mr. Speaker: I would therefore suggest that if the right hon. gentleman has a question of privilege he should come to it quickly.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, this was brought to my attention a few minutes ago and it is a matter to which reference must be made because the honour of the government I had the honour to head is impugned by a statement which is false and frivolous.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: The Prime Minister replied that the federal government was fulfilling an obligation made in 1962 under a Conservative government. In 1962 a statute was passed by this Parliament under the terms of which the federal government would provide \$20 million, the province of Quebec \$10 million, and the city of Montreal \$5 mil-