

Trans-Alaska Pipeline

may very well be built first, and I hope it is; but ultimately there will be a TAPS line.

In my submission, the Canadian government had done a very good job in making representations on behalf of the petroleum industry of Canada and Canadian interests in the United States. When the United States government imposed quotas on the importation of petroleum to the United States, the Canadian government kept its cool. It did not succumb to the blandishments of those who suggested that Canada should impose counter quotas, as if to say, "Let's show them". We allowed the political pressure on the United States government in that situation to come from where political pressure counts, and that is from the United States.

That is why I am very firmly of the opinion that in this particular case the government, and the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) in his appeals to the United States public to be conscious of the ecological dangers posed by a trans-Alaska route and the shipping of oil down the west coast, are following precisely the course of action that will lead to results. We know from this morning's *Globe and Mail* that the United States Secretary of the Interior has already indicated his desire that the Mackenzie Valley route be explored. I suggest that in view of this sign of the effectiveness of our policies and the effectiveness of the pressures put on the United States government from their own constituents, it will not be too long before results will be achieved.

In conclusion, I can only say that we are talking here about United States oil, about United States markets and the problem of getting that oil out of the ground and into the market. It is really a United States problem, one that is within their sovereignty. The United States government will have to respond to real pressure from within the United States. All the pressure brought to bear by the Canadian government can achieve only one result, and that is the weakening of the bargaining position of the Canadian government. If the U.S. government feels that the Canadian government, as a result of public pressure, has its hands bound in some way, then the Americans, good businessmen that they are, will take advantage of that fact. Let us keep the ball in the United States' court, and let us at the same time express our willingness to deal fairly with them, bearing in mind continental, Canadian and the United States interests.

● (4:20 p.m.)

[Translation]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, generally speaking, I agree with the motion of the official opposition blaming the government for its attitude with regard to the construction of a pipeline for the transport of oil from Alaska to the United States.

I would like to make two brief observations, the first of an ecological nature, the other of an economic nature.

Obviously, the first is the most important. Oil production increases by 4 per cent annually, while its transport by sea increases by approximately 60 per cent. At the present time, the production and transport of oil presents particularly great dangers of pollution in the waters of

[Mr. Mahoney.]

the Arctic, where polar conditions slow down considerably the degradation of oil.

We have seen the destruction that resulted from the wreck of the *Arrow* in Chedabucto Bay which happened in the temperate zone.

In 1954, 1962 and 1969, Canada was one of the countries signatories to an international convention on sea pollution. The United States have not yet agreed to sign the document.

International maritime law seems to evolve very slowly and does not sanction any measure regarding sea pollution although the maritime pollution treaty Canada signed allows the contracting parties to impose fines to ships causing pollution within 100 miles of shore. The fine can be levied only against ships of countries that have signed the international agreement, and not being one of them the United States are exempt.

Since international maritime law is very slow to change, I would like to quote what the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said, in spite of the objections raised by the United States about the Canadian legislation extending to 100 miles the control area in the Arctic waters, in order to prevent pollution. The Prime Minister stated the following:

Canada will not submit that legislation to the Hague court as long as international law has not caught up with technological developments.

Indeed, more than 40 countries have approved that treaty and the Canadian government's attitude has been one of indifference with regard to its southern neighbour when it should have urged it to sign that agreement.

To place the problem in another context, I would say that the United States have already suggested the construction through Alaska of a pipeline to be known as the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System or TAPS. The oil products would then be carried from Alaska to the United States by tankers, which, obviously, would present a serious threat of pollution along the coastline of British Columbia. This threat becomes that more obvious when one considers that the United States have, on several occasions, refused to recognize the Canadian rights of maritime control up to the limits claimed by the Canadian government.

There is a second problem regarding which the Canadian government has shown apathy. Faced by this threat, the Canadian government claimed that it could do nothing more than to suggest the construction of a pipeline through the Canadian North and Northwest, down the Mackenzie Valley.

For too long, Canadian development has been dictated by the profit motive. This is no longer a question of profit or investment, but one of quality of life and means of survival. The environment of central Canada has been spoiled badly enough, through the lethargy of the government, without doing the same thing now in the North.

Until today, the problem was dealt with in such a way as to oppose the interests of the West coast of Canada to those of the North, and the decision was made to give