

Water Resources Programs

rise in the House and indicate that the government and its supporters are prepared to accept the amendment proposed by my colleague.

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, in joining the debate on the amendment to clause 8 I wish to say I am very much surprised that the government is not prepared to accept this amendment, particularly when one reads the press report in today's *Globe and Mail*, which was referred to a number of times this afternoon, which says that the Ontario government questions whether this clause will have any weight if it is passed in its present form. I was amazed that earlier this afternoon the minister suggested that possibly the *Globe and Mail* misquoted him when it reported him as saying:

We shall have to maintain some very strong federal inputs in the authorities to assure that standards for comparable bodies of water will be the same in all parts of Canada—

I realize that the amendment we have before us does not deal with standards, but surely if the minister questions the validity of the press report under date of May 25, there exists a question—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to interrupt at this moment—I think I should, and I believe I owe it to hon. members—to warn against repetition. The hon. member is embarking upon a repetition of a suggestion which was made this afternoon. He is going over arguments which were made previously. He is quoting an article which was quoted a number of times. He is referring to an amendment which was debated this afternoon. I respectfully suggest to the hon. member that his contribution to the debate at this time should be limited to the particular amendment which is before the House.

Mr. Skoberg: Mr. Speaker, with due deference, if you will give me one moment, I have to set the stage for what I was about to say with regard to clause 8 and the amendment proposed by my colleague. As an analogy I have to refer to a situation which is occurring once again in my constituency, regarding oil refinery spillage and effluent deposit. This oil went under the ice last winter, but when it comes out in the spring the oil companies are absolved of any responsibility. I am sure the amendment that has been introduced, that "No person shall deposit or permit the deposit of waste in any waters," is a clear indication

of what has gone on in many areas of Canada today—not yesterday or tomorrow but it is happening today.

• (9:50 p.m.)

I refer to this analogy, Mr. Speaker, because the amendment was accepted by the government that no person, corporation, or you name it, could deposit waste in any waters at any time of the year. I am certain that there is one industry which deliberately uses nature as a cover-up for depositing waste in our waters. If they knew of a law in the statute books of Canada that would make them liable under the Criminal Code, they would not be so likely to use mother nature to cover up their sins at any time of the year. In this particular case, about six miles below Moose Jaw there is an indication of what the oil company in that area did this past winter. You just have to walk through the bushes and weeds and you will find a clear indication that spillage and oil deposits were dumped under the ice during the winter. Of course, when it comes spring this is not supposed to be seen by the authorities.

Even with your reprimand, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we have to look at the situation as it exists all over the nation, and I am sure the situation in my area can be duplicated in areas all across Canada. I believe the amendment introduced by my colleague indicates that if we accept some really stringent measures and bring this matter under the Criminal Code there will not be the abuse and the type of pollution that we have seen in this case and in many others.

We know that any industry damaging our environment and wildlife is just as responsible as the individuals who damage our man-made facilities. As an analogy to this I should like to refer to the incident at Sir George Williams University where people damaged man-made facilities. What is the difference between that and individuals or corporations who deliberately damage our natural resources but who are not brought before the courts of the land as were those involved in the Sir George Williams incident? I see no difference. Why should people doing damage to wildlife and human beings not be considered in the same light and be charged under the Criminal Code?

In the same situation, and again using the analogy of my own area, there are indications that the oil company I am referring to—and this is an estimate I have been given to understand is correct—spent \$14 million in