

• (1140)

The Hon. Member for Skeena on a similar application, but not on the same subject.

VALDEZ OIL SPILL

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I also rise pursuant to Standing Order 52 in relation to the Alaskan oil spill.

Two weeks ago the *Exxon Valdez* spilled 270,000 barrels of oil into Prince William Sound and no efforts were made to seriously contain the spill by Exxon or by the U.S. Government. It now covers some 2,700 hundred square kilometres and 1,200 kilometres of coastline. It is the largest spill in North American history and the twelfth largest in world history. It is a highly persistent and toxic oil, four times as hard to disperse as Alberta crude. Canadian officials have erroneously continued to state that the spill is 1,000 kilometres from Canadian territory. The oil is in fact now within striking distance of the Canadian transboundary rivers the Stikine, the Taku, and the Alsek Tatsenshini.

Dr. Stephen Pond, an oceanographer at UBC has confirmed that the spill could enter Canadian waters.

The emergency debate is required for the following reasons.

First, Canadian resources are now being impacted: herring, salmon of Canadian origin, and halibut.

Second, Canada's state of preparedness is dismal, as was proven with the chaotic response to the Vancouver Island spill.

Third, we have no scientific team on site evaluating the present impact on Canadian resources, and particularly on transboundary salmon stocks.

Fourth, we have had no movement of spill containment or clean-up equipment to the Dixon Entrance area. Fifth, the water column and biology of Dixon Entrance must be monitored now before the spill gets into there.

Sixth, as was proven by the Grace Harbour spill on December 22, the "Don't worry, be happy" speculation of the Coast Guard, both Canadian and U.S., has proven to be defective; 870 thousands litres ended up on our shores as a result of the December spill—

Privilege

Mr. Speaker: Again I take the comments of the Hon. for Skeena very seriously indeed. I do not think there is any necessity to get into argument. The facts speak for themselves. I will again give this very careful consideration and report back to the House as soon as I can.

I should advise the House, and the public who are watching that, probably as a consequence of the long adjournment, there are a number of applications today that are taking up the time of the House, but they are all important ones.

I now want to advise Hon. Members that I have an application on a question of privilege from The Hon. Member for Prince Albert—Churchill River and I will hear him now.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

CANADIAN CROP DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

Mr. Ray Funk (Prince Albert—Churchill River): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. Having sent you notice of my intention to raise this question, I would like to place before you my argument as to why I believe that my privileges as a Member have been breached. I am raising this matter at the earliest possible opportunity since I did not become fully aware of this breach until I received my personal Canadian Crop Drought Assistance form, which application form I received on March 3. That was 71 days after the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Mazankowski) told me personally in this House, and I quote from *Hansard* of December 22, 1988 at page 622:

The forms are close to being ready for being sent out to the producers. We hope that they will be out in the next week or 10 days. Everything is proceeding as it should, consistent with the program that was announced.

Seventy-one days later I received my form. My intention though is not to draw from this evidence the conclusion that the Minister deliberately misled me, but rather to suggest that his remarks impeded my abilities as a Member of this Parliament to properly serve my constituents.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: I hesitate very much to interrupt the Hon. Member because the matter he raises is, certainly in the mind of the Hon. Member and probably in the minds of some of his constituents and others, a grievance.