

double hulls, they must have installed the latest and best safety devices and they must submit to inspection by Canadians."

These ships should meet our requirements because we are trying to preserve our land. As well, we ought to say, "If you do not intend to meet these requirements, we shall require you to carry your oil more than 100 miles offshore; and please do not bother coming inside our particular zone because our land is more precious to us than any oil which any tanker may be carrying from one part of a foreign jurisdiction to another."

If this motion were to come to a vote, which I doubt, I would think of moving an amendment the concept of which would be to extend the provisions of the Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act to our coastal waters east and west. I have written out an amendment such a that but will not move it at this time. If the matter is to come to a vote, the amendment can be moved by a colleague or somebody else. My amendment would apply to inland waters, coastal waters, territorial seas and to those areas around our territorial seas. It would include a measure that would take into account contemplated damage from oil spills as well as from the simple passage and manoeuvring of ships in our waters.

Apart from that, the motion before the House has my full endorsement. Even though the parliamentary secretary suggested that my original request was improper, I think it would be fine if for the next few minutes before six o'clock the Liberal Party ceased and desisted from attempts to talk this motion out and allowed it to come to a vote so that Parliament could express itself on a matter as important as this.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Question.

Mr. Joseph-Phillipe Guay (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) had not spoken so long, perhaps his wish would have been fulfilled. We can look at the clock and note the length of time for which he spoke. I think it could be said that the hon. member personally took the most time in debating this particular matter. I also take note of a comment he made about vessels operating more than 100 miles offshore if they do not meet certain requirements. That approach will not solve the problem. I find his attitude rather surprising. As I say, sending ships farther out to sea will not solve the problem. No matter whether ships are operating 50 miles or 100 miles from shore, oil that is spilled in one area can show up in another area.

Speaking on the motion, the problem of shore erosion is of concern not only to those areas of the country about which we are now concerned but to many other parts of Canada. This is a matter for harbour commissions, which have been discussing it for many years. Some of them no doubt are finding solutions, as are governments. They will continue to do so. The Department of Public Works, for example, discharges the federal government's responsibility for the construction of protection works along shores where ship-generated waves cause erosion.

The federal government has constructed shore protection works since confederation, although the major activity in this area began in the high unemployment period of

Damage to Shoreline by Passing Ships

the 1930s. The construction of this type of project became a substantial item in terms of both cost and workload throughout the years, particularly since the end of World War II. During the period 1947-1967 the department spent about \$25 million on shore protection works. The bulk of this work was carried out by the department along the St. Lawrence River.

In 1960, in an effort to establish a rational approach to determining the department's responsibilities and location of works, the department established the Shore Erosion and Protection Committee. The purpose of the committee was to investigate the following: (a) areas where erosion is taking place; (b) factors which may be contributing to this erosion; (c) design of protection works; (d) economic analysis of government activity in this field; and (e) upon completion of the initial investigation the committee would investigate and review specific proposals for the construction of protection works. In 1964 the structure of the committee changed somewhat and as a consequence it was renamed the Treasury Board Shore Erosion Protection Committee.

In 1966 cabinet approved a new policy governing federal participation in the construction of shore protection works. The cabinet directive provides as follows:

(a) The Department of Public Works be authorized to construct remedial works and pay 100 per cent of the cost of such works only where the erosion can be attributable, by more than 50 per cent, to navigation or a federal government structure, and the value of the land to be protected exceeds the cost of such remedial works by 100 per cent.

(b) Where erosion is caused for the most part by natural causes but where navigation or the presence of a federal government structure is a contributing factor the Department of Public Works may contribute to the cost of such structure in proportion to the effect these causes have on the erosion, provided that in no case this contribution exceeds 50 per cent of the works, which in the opinion of the department would provide adequate protection.

● (1750)

Technical studies have been undertaken by the Department of Public Works to establish criteria for assessing federal responsibility in cases where erosion is due at least in part to ship-generated waves. These criteria have been in effect since 1968. They are used to determine the degree of federal government responsibility for shore erosion resulting from wave action on the St. Lawrence River, the Richelieu River, the Detroit River and the St. Clair River. Once the degree of federal government responsibility is known, the 1966 cabinet directive dictates the federal government contribution in the construction of remedial works.

An hon. Member: You are living in the past.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): This may be from the past, but it is still in order. The trouble is that some opposition members do not look back to find out what remedial action is available. Instead of shooting off their mouths when they do not know what is going on, they should at least listen to what is being said because it may benefit the areas which they represent.

It is interesting to note that in the summer of 1969, because of a number of urgent and extensive problems along the St. Clair River the Department of Public Works