

gested no specific date, nor has any refusal been made, Mr. Speaker. I have indicated, as has the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, that there is still much to be done on the Canadian side by way of research into the ecological and sociological as well as the economic problems before we can have a clear, final and definitive Canadian position.

**Mr. Comeau:** In view of the time factor and the fact that the Canadian people as a whole, including the member for Esquimalt-Saanich, have expressed their position, will the government make its formal position known very shortly?

**Mr. Greene:** Mr. Speaker, the government made its first position known last August when we issued guidelines based on the scientific and technological information available after some two years of work. We will refine and define more explicitly the government's position as the science, technology and research become available.

PROPOSED MACKENZIE VALLEY PIPELINE—POSITION FOLLOWING DISCUSSIONS WITH COMPANY PRESIDENTS

**Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Following the meeting with the oil company executives last Wednesday pertaining to this matter, can the minister indicate whether or not there is still room for a good deal of optimism that the pipeline will come down the Mackenzie Valley route?

**Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Just a few moments ago I think most of us were under the impression that the first line would definitely be the Valdez line and thence by tanker down the coast. At the present time, and this was confirmed by our meeting the other day, because of the delay in respect of that line I think there is certainly a much better chance that the first choice for a line would be the Mackenzie Valley line if this should be acceptable to Canada, and certainly every chance that a gas line, if this should be acceptable to Canada, will in the not too distant future be built to transport gas.

TRANS-ALASKA PIPELINE SYSTEM—POSSIBLE CANADIAN RESTRICTIONS ON TANKER TRANSPORT

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I understood from the Minister's statement the other day that in the discussions he and his colleague the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development had with the representatives of the group of United States companies operating in Alaska the Valdez route now looked much more likely than the route through mid-Canada. Were the representatives of the oil companies made clearly aware of any restrictive measures the Canadian government would impose should they attempt to bring oil by tanker from Valdez to the United States down the coast of British Columbia?

**Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, I do not think I can put track

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

odds on the likelihood of one route versus the other. Certainly the companies had very clearly made a decision, which was a very public decision, I think, as evidenced by the fact that pipe is piled up on the Valdez route, to go that way. The delay by reason of United States decision and United States department has certainly made the Mackenzie Valley line worth looking at by them. With regard to indicating what we would do if they should go via Valdez and then by tanker, provided they keep beyond the 12-mile limit in transporting the oil I do not know of anything we can legally do under international law.

**Mr. Douglas:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that government members turned down our proposal for a 100-mile pollution control zone on the Pacific coast, has the Canadian government any proposals at all that would protect the coastline of British Columbia in the event the United States should decide to ship oil from Valdez down the Pacific coast?

**Mr. Greene:** I do not think Canada unilaterally can change international law, much as we would like to. I feel sure, in the event there is a decision that the ships will go in this direction, that the Department of Transport and other affected departments undoubtedly would have contingency plans to try to meet the problems in respect of any accident.

**Mr. Douglas:** Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister if he drew to the attention of the representatives of the United States oil companies the fact that this Parliament has already unilaterally claimed the power to control ships carrying pollutants in a 100-mile area in the Arctic and if he made it clear that this Parliament could, if it so desired, exercise the same power in respect of the Pacific coast?

**Mr. Greene:** Mr. Speaker, I think those men were very conscious of the fact of our Arctic decision in which the Prime Minister, when he announced it, very clearly enunciated the principles under international law whereby this is a valid decision. In respect of whether those principles would apply, as my hon. friend suggests, to Pacific transportation, I think there may be some doubt in international law.

**Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster):** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Prime Minister yesterday told us that members of his staff censor the utterings of certain of his ministers, will he in the case of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources either change censors or look at what he says himself so we will understand what is going on?

POSSIBLE PIPELINE FROM PUGET SOUND AREA TO CALIFORNIA—DISCUSSION WITH COMPANY PRESIDENTS

**Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni):** I would like to address a supplementary question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. In the discussions with the representatives of the oil companies and in the consideration of a possible routing of Alaskan oil through British Columbia to the Puget Sound area, was there