

Oil Pollution

ka pipeline right-of-way into this broad context and determine how well these policies serve the broad public interest—

"The hearings on June 9 and 22 will investigate whether there is evidence to support the Interior Department's decision to approve the trans-Alaska pipeline right-of-way. As I indicated in a May 19 letter to Secretary Morton, a preliminary analysis of the available information indicates serious omissions and inconsistencies between Secretary Morton's public statements and his department's analysis of the situation."

Of particular interest to us is that in the schedule of witnesses, attached to this press release, who will appear before the committee today the first witness is "David Anderson, Member of Parliament, Canada". A little later I want to remark on why the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Anderson) happens to be before that committee today, about the work he is doing and also the very valuable work being done by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Groos) in this field. Before I do so I want to refer to the area that is affected.

The Gulf of Georgia and Puget Sound would be affected by the oil spills we have been discussing today. Puget Sound and the Gulf of Georgia are formed by an indentation of the west coast and by the inland shore of Vancouver Island. These two bodies of water together are about 20 to 30 miles across. They extend northward from the southern point in the state of Washington for a distance of approximately 200 miles. This inland sea is an extremely busy area. It is plied daily by hundreds of vessels, commercial, recreational, small craft and one of the biggest fishing fleets in the world. The area is of inestimable value for trade, recreation and marine life. It is also a great commercial fishery. Around its shores and in the Strait of Juan de Fuca, which is the strait leading into the Gulf of Georgia and Puget Sound, are the cities of Victoria, Tacoma, Seattle, Vancouver and smaller centres such as Nanaimo, and so on.

Let me now deal with the threat to this area from oil spills. While it is true that oil has moved daily in vessels up and down the Gulf of Georgia and Puget Sound for decades and spills have occurred again and again, it is only with the possibility of giant oil tankers proposed for the Alaska route, or TAPS route as it is called, that a threat of this magnitude comes to the Gulf of Georgia. This threat is beyond our present capability to manage or even comprehend. To give hon. members some idea of what is meant by an oil spill if vessels of the 250,000 tons and up class were to spill oil in the Strait of Georgia, let me refer to words which the hon. member for Victoria used in a speech last February to the Vancouver Island Liberal Association.

Mr. Bell: Was this before you kicked him out of caucus, or after?

Mr. Deachman: I am referring to the hon. member for Victoria, whom we have not kicked out of caucus. We never kick anybody out of the Liberal caucus.

Mr. Crouse: What about Hellyer and Kierans?

Mr. Deachman: Sometimes members decide that they want to leave us, but we never kick anyone out. The hon. member for Victoria said:

The tankers they are building for the Valdez-Bellingham route carry about a million barrels of crude. At roughly 250,000 tons

[Mr. Deachman.]

they are today considered to be only medium-large tankers. It would take about three of that size every day to take the maximum output of the TAPS line at Valdez. But I did a little calculation with the help of some handy conversion tables, and if the million barrels they carry is as incomprehensible to you as it is to me perhaps it is easier to understand if I say that a million barrels would make a trail of crude oil 18 feet wide and an inch thick for a distance of 700 miles. If you want the 700-mile trail a little wider—say 30 feet wide—still an inch thick—just move up to a 500,000-ton tanker.

• (1640)

The same hon. member, in an address to the Chamber of Commerce of Vancouver Island at Duncan, British Columbia, in March, 1971 said:

The *Torrey Canyon* was a 100,000-ton or 600,000-barrel capacity oil tanker. It got off course and spilled the whole works in the English Channel. The tanker *Haro* which ran aground off a reef in Chedabucto Bay spilled about 10,000 tons, 5,000 tons of which escaped the sea and was never a part of the immediate problem. It cost \$3.5 million to clean up even superficially the other 5,000 tons. What is by today's standards now known as a medium-sized oil tanker of about 100,000 tons would carry about the same amount—about 5,000 tons of oil for its own consumption and a 200,000-tonner of the *Universe* class will carry over 12,000 tons. This is not the end. Tankers nowadays range up to double that size, to 400,000 tons, and there are bigger ones on the drawing board.

Consider the threat brought to the west coast by the proposed TAPS line. Consider for a moment what is at stake here as far as the Americans are concerned and what the possibilities are of preventing traffic along this route, as was suggested by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis), or seeing it diverted down the Mackenzie Valley through Canada. I wish to quote from a well respected industrial newsletter published on the west coast, Beale's Resource Industry newsletter. Reference is made to a report published in the United States by the president of the Alyeska Pipeline Service Company the purpose of which is to set out the United States case in support of the west coast tanker route. The president stated:

The dependency on foreign crude sources in district V is greater than comparable dependency in the aggregate of district I-IV.

In other words, the interior of America is already well supplied by internal oil resources. It is the coastal area which has economic problems. The article goes on to point out as follows:

Shipment of North Slope crude oil to district II could lead to a current underutilization of existing systems and a future oversupply in that district at the expense of district V—

The uncertainties associated with any trans-Canada pipeline indicate it could not be built without much delay and greater cost than suggested in the environmental impact statement.

He points to the seriousness of the Canadian native claims issue which he feels would upset going ahead with the Mackenzie route. The report continues:

A trans-Canada pipeline would raise significant environmental issues where there is currently no established forum for dealing with them and could involve regulatory and jurisdictional delays beyond any reliable estimate—

Canadian equity financing would be necessarily limited and requirements for transportation of Canadian oil could result in excessive net resource costs to the United States.

The report goes on to document various reasons why they do not want to accept the Mackenzie Valley route and why they consider the less costly, more flexible, totally