

portion, has not been examined at all. As well, we have the Canadian route with respect to which, as the minister said, we have not completed the required studies. We do not know what the impact on the ecology on that route would be. We are discussing two routes. Half of one route has been properly examined from the ecological point of view; there is doubt about that. It is obvious at this point that we are faced with an area where knowledge is inadequate. We must wait until knowledge is better before we proceed. We cannot make decisions now. I was pleased to hear the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) make a commitment to wait.

• (3:50 p.m.)

When we are discussing transporting oil from Alaska to the southern 48 states, it is important that we do not become too involved with the red herring of ownership of this pipeline, such as the NDP has done. The minister referred to this. If a pipeline between Alaska and the lower 48 is to carry American oil—and let us remember we do not have oil of our own to carry—there is no reason why we should deprive growth areas of investment of Canadian dollars putting into the pipeline to carry American oil between two portions of the United States of America.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member who is making such an interesting speech. We have tried to limit speeches to 15 minutes in order that as many members as possible will have an opportunity to participate.

**Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey-White Rock):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment of my colleague, the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett), and to commend the official opposition for having made their opposition day one in which this very pressing problem can be discussed. Some interesting speeches have been made by government members. However, I am left with the general impression that these members, particularly the minister, really had the intention of pouring oil on troubled waters, whereas at least in this portion of the House our party is diametrically opposed: we want to pour cold water on troubled oil. What confronts many thousands of people in British Columbia is the potential oil spillage, ruinous to our maritime life, beaches and the welfare of our people. I ask hon. members to consider these effects which illustrate a threat.

The plan of a section of the United States oil industry is to bring oil from Alaska down our British Columbia coast-line to a refinery already rising a scant 11 or 12 miles south of the lower mainland of British Columbia. Half of the population of British Columbia lives in the lower mainland. This tanker fleet will travel through zones and straits especially dangerous to the vast floating bathtubs that they are. They are so vast that before they can slow down to change course, it is reported that they cover three miles. These tankers will be four or five times the size of the *Arrow* whose oil loused up the Maritimes coast and cost millions of dollars to clean up.

### *Trans-Alaska Pipeline*

I have a special concern in this matter. My constituency of Surrey-White Rock is just across the international border from the Cherry Point area in the state of Washington, where the refinery which will receive the oil from these tankers is being built. I wish to quote from the *White Rock Sun* with regard to the refinery, the situation facing British Columbia waters and the waters of Washington state. Many Americans are as much against this project as we are. I quote as follows:

The \$150 million Atlantic Richfield oil refinery at Cherry Point bristles with industrial spires. Huge trucks continually stream back and forth through the guarded gate. Outside the compound some 300 cars in the parking lot are mute evidence of the numbers of workers within.

It is later than some hon. members realize, Mr. Speaker. We should not overlook the additional potential threat which will exist in the northern Pacific waters if the oil is brought down by the land-bridge plan instead of by oil tankers along our coast to the Puget Sound area. Possibly part of the crude will be reshipped out of that zone through the waters to the south. If that happens, we will still have a potential oil water spillage threat, although admittedly reduced.

Bearing in mind the confined waters of the Strait of Juan de Fuca, the passageways through the Gulf of Georgia and the San Juan Islands and the heavy shipping traffic already using these waters—the increased tanker traffic to handle the hundreds of thousands of barrels a day—will surely result in a collision and an oil spill. An oil spill from a tanker carrying 300,000 tons, if it is washed on shore, will create a blanket of oil one inch thick, 30 feet wide and 3,000 miles long. Those who know estimate that if this oil shuttle-service of huge tankers is established, we can count upon two to four oil spillages every 10 years. In other words, we can count upon our marine life, beaches and way of life along the coast of British Columbia, Vancouver Island and the gulf almost being desecrated.

Hon. members are familiar with the findings of Dr. Patrick McTaggart-Cowan who directed the \$3 million clean-up required off Nova Scotia after the comparatively minor wreck of the *Arrow*. I say “comparatively minor” because what is proposed with regard to the giant oil tankers that will travel down the Pacific coast will be four or five times the size of the *Arrow*. Dr. McTaggart-Cowan said:

Seven per cent of the world's ships are involved in collisions every year—Incidents involving oil tankers average one per week. Some 300 million gallons of crude are leaked into the seas every year from such incidents.

The people of British Columbia are not easily united; in fact, they are very easily divided. However, the threat of the oil tanker shuttle-service off our shores has united the people as one. They have rallied as one against it. The ecologists, ordinary citizens, city councils, the British Columbia legislature, unions, churches, the old and the young all have one concern and one determination: they will do everything they can to see that no oil is shipped along our coast and that we are spared the inevitable desecration and ruination of our shores.