

the government wants to do it. Apparently this government has given its allegiance to big business on both sides of the border, to oil companies and other big companies. Its polite notes are designed to give people the idea it is doing something.

Let the government think what all this means to British Columbia. Let it think of the beaches fouled, of water polluted, of recreational possibilities damaged, and so on. Our second largest industry, the tourist industry, is shot because the environment which makes that industry possible is being wrecked. Wildlife is destroyed. Such pollution is a disaster for marine life and for bird life. These things are irreplaceable. Our province, one of the most beautiful areas in the whole world, is being desecrated by oil companies, mining companies and lumber companies which are taking out all that the traffic will bear without any thought of what will happen. It is time British Columbia members made their voices heard loudly and clearly. It is not enough, in view of what is going on, to introduce a motion of this kind. I can hardly believe that British Columbia supporters of the government will allow the government to get away with this sort of thing.

An hon. Member: You had better believe it.

Mrs. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, of course we are in favour of this motion even though its introduction involved political trickery. We believe in what the motion says and we support the amendment. We will support the motion as amended. However, let me say this: the people of British Columbia are not fooling and they do not intend to let this government get away with what has been happening in the past 18 months. They will not tolerate such complete neglect and failure to do anything concrete that will stop tankers coming down the west coast. I for one hope that every force in this country will be mobilized to prevent this outrage being perpetrated against our west coast province.

Mr. Grant Deachman (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, the motion of the hon. member for Fraser Valley East (Mr. Pringle) has provided the House with an excellent opportunity to review a subject very close to the hearts of west coast members and all members who serve constituencies adjacent to or involved with bodies of water that are navigated by commercial vessels.

In order to focus our attention more sharply after the numerous speakers who have spoken in a number of hours of debate, let me deal with the spill and say how large it was. Strangely enough, this was not a big spill and not a very damaging spill. It was dramatic, not so much because of its size but because of the location in which it occurred and what is anticipated will take place on the west coast. I have some notes which the hon. member for Fraser Valley East was good enough to give me after he had been in touch with the office today of Congressman Meeds of the state of Washington. According to these notes, the clean-up co-ordinator is Captain David Gershowitz, captain of the port of Seattle coast guard district. The tanker involved was the *World Bond*, a ship under Liberian registry carrying oil from Iran. This was not oil that is to be connected with the new, proposed oil route from Alaska.

Oil Pollution

The ship arrived at Cherry Point late on June 3, 1972, and began discharging oil almost immediately. The spill occurred during darkness on June 4. Witnesses say that crude oil discharged for approximately five hours before it was discovered. A great deal of the spill was contained by plastic booms surrounding the discharging vessel. There is a regulation which states that loading or discharging vessels must be surrounded by these booms. However, they are not effective in currents greater than seven-tenths of one knot; oil is sucked under the boom when the current exceeds that figure. Coastguards estimate the spill at approximately 100 barrels, each running to 55 gallons. Some estimates are as high as 300 barrels. So, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about an oil spill of between 5,000 and 6,000 gallons.

• (1630)

A broken valve caused the spill. The valve has been taken from the ship and sent by the coastguard to an independent testing lab to determine the cause of the break, whether it was the responsibility of the vessel or of the Atlantic Richfield Oil Company.

On Monday, Congressman Meeds will testify before a sub-committee on the navigable waters safety act sponsored by Senator Magnusson and himself. This legislation was introduced after the spill at Anacortes last year. It will provide for strict harbour controls which will lessen the possibility of collision and strict construction standards for bulk liquid carriers, such as oil carriers. Initially, only United States tankers will have to comply with this ruling, but by 1974 foreign tankers will also be included. The notes conclude:

A letter was mailed today from Senators Magnusson and Jackson and Congressman Meeds to Secretary of State Rogers requesting the administration to call a cabinet-level, Canadian-U.S. oil spill conference. This conference would specifically discuss the international consequences and possibly co-ordinate action in the event of future oil spills.

Here is a movement toward Canada-U.S. co-operation which up to this point has not been recorded in this debate. It is certainly going to be a useful addition to the studies now being taken to see if some control can be brought to the matter of oil spills on an international basis between Canada and the United States. This is in addition to the recommendation made by the government of Canada for action by the International Joint Commission.

It is interesting to note that today, June 9, hearings are taking place in the Congress of the United States, in Washington, in the joint economic committee of which Senator William Proxmire is chairman. I quote from a press release dated June 2:

Senator William Proxmire . . . announced Friday that the Committee will hold four days of hearings on June 7, 8, 9 and 22 on natural gas regulation and the trans-Alaska pipeline.

"It is becoming increasingly clear that the supply of energy has shifted from abundance to scarcity," Proxmire said, "and that the nation badly needs wise public policies to avert an energy crisis—"

"It also means that government policies must be formulated in a broad perspective that carefully balances the environmental, economic, national security, and other social demands of both consumers and producers—"

"The purpose of the hearings I am announcing today will be to place the Federal Power Commission's regulation of natural gas and the Interior Department's decision to approve the trans-Alas-