

David Randall

Public testimony provided 9-19-19.

Okay. Well, there is a couple of comments I'd like to make. One, I hope or I would demand that the supremacy rule, article six of the Constitution of the United States be followed in that any treaty signed by the United States Government is supreme law of the land. So if there is any treaties that this would infringe on as far as the indigenous people's rights, those treaties must be followed. There can be no rule that would right around those treaties.

It's against the Constitution. I'd also insist that if any public resources are affected or responsibility for mitigation, then the cost must be borne by the shipping or oil companies. If water is polluted, not only clean up but replenishment of water is the responsibility of the shipping -- that all responsible parties must provide proof of financial resources not only for the cleanup but for the replacement and the restoration of damage. And must provide for liability of loss of life or whatever [bell ringing].

And then I'll get back to the -- my point on liquid natural gas. I think the distinction between oil and liquid natural gas is an arbitrary one. I believe there is no contingency plan possible for a liquid -- an explosion of a liquid natural gas either at the point of departure, shipping, or storage. If a vessel is to have liquid natural gas, one spark could create an explosion that would be greater than the nuclear bomb that killed Hiroshima or Nagasaki. So I believe that because there is no -- absolutely no possible contingency plan, shipping liquid natural gas should be banned.