

Fraser Valley East, found it necessary to move a motion urging the government to do more.

Mr. Sharp: To get the support of the House of Commons.

Mr. Nielsen: This was a piece of staged showmanship because the B.C. members were in trouble. The whole thing was set up to give them some favourable publicity in a province where their fortunes are going down rather rapidly.

Mr. Basford: Why don't you have a B.C. member speak on the matter? I suggest it is because you do not have any.

Mr. Woolliams: Wait until after the next election.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nielsen: I want to tell hon. members opposite, in the event they have forgotten their geography, that I come from the most westerly city in Canada, so I have an interest in this too. I consider this matter serious. I have spoken many times before about the seriousness of these spills and of having a tanker route down the west coast, as has our leader.

Because there is no real substance in the motion that has been proposed, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), the following amendment to the motion:

That this motion be amended by adding at the end thereof:

"and that the International Joint Commission have a mandate to utilize and requisition such financial and other resources of Canada and the United States as will best and soonest restore the ecology and environment on the west coast to pre-spill conditions."

Perhaps the acceptance of that amendment will commend itself to all hon. members of this House, especially members from British Columbia and particularly the hon. member for Fraser Valley East, because it puts some teeth into what otherwise is a poor piece of cosmetic surgery in order to get them out of the political embarrassment they face in the province of British Columbia.

I condemn hon. members opposite for the shallow device used in an attempt to use this House for their own pure political advantage in coping with a situation for which they are being criticized for not doing enough. If the ministers responsible had a little backbone and did something about confronting the United States on this matter, we would be much happier.

Mr. Douglas A. Hogarth (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I take it that I can speak on the motion and the amendment in the course of this debate. I will be very short in what I have to say because I recognize how deeply indebted we are to members of the Ralliement Cr ditiste—

An hon. Member: You mean the Social Credit party.

Mr. Hogarth: I prefer the old name, because we have Social Crediters at home and I get along much better with them. We are indebted to them for the time provided to debate this subject today. In speaking on this matter I must confess that, like many other persons who do not

Oil Pollution

have a certain amount of expertise in this matter, it is not within my ken to judge or determine whether there should be a pipeline through the central part of Canada to remove Alaskan and northern oil or whether there should be a tanker route on the west coast. I can say, however, without doubt or qualification that to my mind a tanker route on the west coast which takes large vessels through the Juan de Fuca Strait will mean that a disaster will occur somewhere along the route. I should like to emphasize that statement because some people on the North American continent will not accept the fact that a disaster will occur.

Recently we have witnessed the disaster of the *Torrey Canyon* in the English Channel and the *Arrow* in Chedabucto Bay, Nova Scotia. I assure the House that in terms of land value and value of the environment, those disasters are nothing compared to what will happen when one of these large tankers breaks up in Juan de Fuca Strait, or Georgia Strait in the vicinity of the lower mainland of British Columbia.

This and other governments have had many warnings and a great deal of time in which to take very firm action. I should like to reiterate the many remarks which have been made by the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Anderson) about a situation so serious that he felt he had to go to Washington in an endeavour to prevent this sort of thing happening. I quite frankly admit that many members on the opposition side, members on this side from British Columbia, members of the cabinet and people from other parts of Canada have viewed this matter with great concern. I do not think it behooves anyone to suggest that anyone is taking political advantage by referring to the matter again.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (1630)

Mr. Hogarth: Mr. Speaker, I am amazed at the personal attack made on the hon. member for Fraser Valley East (Mr. Pringle) today. He has been accused of being a government dupe. He has even been accused of protecting his own property! There is not a person in this House of Commons who would ever question that hon. member's motives concerning anything in the course of his parliamentary duties.

I should like to point out to the member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose), that if the hon. member should happen to own property in the United States in the vicinity of the Cherry Point oil refinery, there are also hundreds of Canadians who own property at Birch Bay, Point Robert, San Juan Island and Boundary Bay who would be affected by a disaster at Cherry Point. I say to those hon. members who suggest that the hon. member for Fraser Valley East moved a motion to protect his own property that there are many Canadians who have thousands of dollars invested in that area who wish to protect their investment.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. The hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose) is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Rose: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I should like to point out to my hon. friend from New