

*Oil Pollution*

the Arctic. We have a 100-mile zone which we have claimed for the purpose of pollution control". Members of the government point to the law which is on the statute books. An old friend of mine, a Newfoundlander, many years now dead, originally a leader of a trade union, used to say to me that gentleman's agreements "ain't worth the paper they are writ on". A law which is not proclaimed ain't worth the paper it is writ on either. A law of that sort which does not have the regulations proclaimed is not worth having on the statute books because most of the powers are left to the regulations.

Then, two years ago we passed the Canada Water Act. As yet there is not a single water quality management area established in this country. There are no national standards established in this country, and we are faced with something on the statute books which is merely another dead law. Then, we had the land use regulations for the north, but we find as usual that the government yielded to the pressure of the large corporations, their dear close friends, with the result that those regulations were watered down. As a result of this they do not cover the whole Arctic, but deal only with a select area in the Mackenzie River Basin and do not cover the matter of control over the Islands or other Arctic areas. Then, we have the Northern Inland Waters Act which was passed two years ago and proclaimed only a few weeks ago. Under that act we do not have the regulations, either. Not one of these acts is of very much value without such regulations. Then, finally, we have the James Bay development in northern Quebec which apparently is going ahead without ecological surveys having been made which are effective, adequate and conclusive. We will be faced with more ecological damage in that part of the country.

I find that this record is a dismal one. The Minister of the Environment (Mr. Davis) is now in Stockholm. He can make the finest speeches he likes and take admirable steps there. But I must say, from what I read—and I will know more when the conference is over—that I do not find much to criticize in the attitude of our delegation at Stockholm. If he can do that in Stockholm it seems to me he ought to be burying his head in shame because of the total inactivity of the government in the area of ecology, despite the laws it has placed on the statute books. Ecology is now like motherhood. Everybody talks about it. All of us talk about the dangers to the environment. All of us make fine speeches about the quality of life. It is only the government of this country which can do anything really effective about it and the government of this country has done very little—if you can call it even "little"—in the national sphere. In the international situation, in respect of these oil spills, we are in the same dead alley, in the same cul-de-sac, as we are in respect of all international measures.

According to the Secretary of State for External Affairs we have not yet received from the United States any reply even to the request that the matter be sent to the IJC. The TAPS route and the tanker route, which is connected with the TAPS route, apparently has been approved in Washington. I suggest the government is merely bleating pleas all the time like wounded sheep. And, like wounded sheep, they just bleat all the time and do nothing worthwhile about it. I say, appreciating the seriousness of the words I

use, that the decision of the authorities in Washington to approve the TAPS route and the tanker route is an unfriendly act against the interests of the people of this country. In our modern world it is not only guns, rifles, canon and bombs which can do damage. In our modern world, I think ecological damage is almost as serious. It is not as quick. It takes longer. The threat to human existence for decades to come is just as great from ecological damage as it is from outright war so long as this war is with conventional arms and not with nuclear arms. It is just as important.

For a powerful neighbour of Canada to disregard—there is no other way to put it—the interests of the people of Canada on the west coast and indeed all the people of Canada, despite requests from us, and to approve the TAPS and tanker routes is almost the equivalent of an act of war. It is almost the equivalent of an act of war. It is an unfriendly act, and I ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs, who is in his seat today as Acting Prime Minister, to stop bleating and to start speaking firmly and loudly on behalf of the people of Canada so that Washington's ears may at last be opened to the rights and interests of the Canadian people.

• (1210)

As I have said, the very building of the refinery at Cherry Point was an affront to Canada and Canada's interests. As I was preparing a few notes for my remarks this morning I could not but recall the statement of the President of the United States when he was in this chamber. I admit that I did not greet him with the enthusiasm that some others in this House did, but I could not help but recall the sweet words of reason and the expressions of friendliness as well as the assurance of our independence that the head of government of our great neighbour uttered in this House. I want to say that as far as the members of my party are concerned, we want friendship with the United States.

However, we say to the president and his advisers in Washington that one of the ways in which that friendship can be made real, practical and relevant for the people of Canada is for the government of the United States to join us in stopping the TAPS route and the tanker route down the Pacific along our west coast. No general words of friendship will hide the unfriendliness if the president and his advisers permit that ecological threat to the wellbeing of the Canadian west coast to take place. I suggest to you, Sir, that this is the kind of approach that this country should take with the administration of the United States.

What we obviously need on this issue is to mobilize the wishes, the desires and the protests of all the people of Canada, and that is what this government should be doing. That is why the motion before us now to send the matter to the International Joint Commission is a petty step, and that is why the suggestions made by the Conservative and NDP members in their motions would have been much more useful. That is why it was shameful of the government to refuse to allow the Committee on the Environment, chaired by a member of the Liberal party who is now the provincial leader in British Columbia, to travel to the west coast to hold hearings, and more recently to refuse a motion requesting unanimous consent that the Committee on External Affairs, which was in the west