

very extensive documentation on this point, to show just how badly informed is the hon. member.

• (1450)

As a start I should like to bring to his attention the statement made by my predecessor, the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Greene) in a debate in this House on March 12, 1971. He said:

As I have said, the Prudhoe Bay oil discovery was disclosed in June of 1968. As early as within one month from the time of that declaration the chairman of the National Energy Board met with the presidents of the oil companies who owned that oil—Arco, Humble and BP—and pointed out to them that the Mackenzie Valley line had advantages, as an alternative and should be considered by them.

Mr. Speaker, previous to that, in a statement made to the Canadian Club in Vancouver on February 12, 1971, my predecessor also said:

The Canadian government is not opposed to the construction of oil and gas lines from Alaska through Canada to the continental United States and the government of Canada has already acted in a broad way to define the national goals of such a development. On August 13, 1970 I announced some definitive guidelines to assist industry in their planning.

He went on to say to that audience:

Personally, I think that the United States oil industry has been too hasty and too unplanned in its decision to move Alaska North Slope oil across Alaska from Prudhoe Bay to Valdez and then by sea to receiving points in the U.S. northwest. Too hasty, because they did not give proper care and attention to the problems of the physical security of the oil line, the security of the environment in Alaska, the protection of the Alaska, British Columbia and Washington coastlines from sea-going tanker disasters, and to the question of the long term economics of the operation of such a line—

Once again, Mr. Speaker, my predecessor the hon. member for Niagara Falls made the government's concern about the risks to the coast amply clear. He also made it clear that the government was taking careful steps to make certain that it knew all about Arctic ecology and the impact of a pipeline in northern Canada before going ahead to issue permits.

My colleague, the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp), made reference to a series of meetings he had with officials of the United States government. To the hon. member who asserted that no attempt had been made to bring to the attention of the United States government the views of the Canadian government, I would refer an aide memoire delivered by the Canadian Embassy in Washington to the United States authorities on June 29, 1971, precisely on this issue, which reads in part:

At a meeting in Washington, D.C., on June 10 the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the Minister of the Environment expressed to the U.S. Secretary of State, the great concern of the Canadian government regarding proposals to move oil by tanker along Canada's Pacific coast and to the Puget Sound area. The Canadian ministers held the view that because of the virtual certainty that oil spills would occur if the proposed tanker movements were permitted in these confined coastal waters, present plans should be reviewed with the objective of diverting these oil shipments to destinations other than Puget Sound.

The aide memoire continues:

The Canadian ministers drew attention to the widespread public concern in Canada about the environmental risks involved in the proposed Alaska oil movements. This concern has been expressed by the unanimous approval given in the Canadian House of Com-

Oil Pollution

mons on June 21 for the adoption of the third report of the special committee on environmental pollution. A copy of this report is attached.

That unanimous approval, Mr. Speaker, must have been in the absence of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) or maybe he was here and as usual did not know what was going on. The aide memoire goes on to indicate to the United States government the proposed line of discussions to deal with the oil tanker problem and to carry out additional research into the possible damage to fish and bird life, the question of monetary damages, the question of shipping control—all proposals that dealt with these questions long before the United States government had made its decision to go on with this route.

The aide memoire of June 29 was followed by an aide memoire to the United States government on August 20, 1971, in the following terms:

The great concern of the Canadian government regarding proposals to transport oil by tanker from Alaska to the Puget Sound area has been made known to the United States government on a number of occasions during the course of this year. This concern is based upon the certainty that any movement of oil by tanker on the scale which has been proposed will eventually result in oil spills. The most recent occasion was at a meeting of United States and Canadian officials in Washington on June 29. At that meeting a proposal was elaborated in an aide memoire for detailed consultations to be held as soon as possible,—

The aide memoire goes on to say:

In general terms, as outlined on earlier occasions, the Canadian government is convinced that if the full economic costs of the substantial environmental risks are taken into account it will be found desirable to avoid introducing large and hazardous tanker movements into the inner waters of the Pacific Coast. The Canadian government is concerned, however, that there has so far been no indication of sources of oil supply for the States in the Pacific northwest. In order to explore this aspect of the question the competent Canadian authorities would be prepared to discuss the technical and other factors which might affect the continuing contribution to the oil needs of the region from Canadian sources.

Mr. Speaker, coupled with my responsibilities as Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, I had the opportunity to meet with the United States Secretary of the Interior, under whose jurisdiction this comes, on March 30 of this year and to point out to him the great concern of Canadians as echoed unanimously by this House with respect to the danger of heavy movements of oil in the northwest Pacific coast area, particularly Puget Sound, the progress that has been made by the Canadian government in the studies I have referred to, the progress that has been made in defining the area for a Mackenzie Valley pipeline—

Mr. Woolliams: Whom did you meet with?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The United States Secretary of the Interior, the member of the United States government responsible for the pipeline.

Mr. Woolliams: What was his name?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Rogers Morton. The hon. member seems to be as ignorant of that as he is—

Mr. Woolliams: I wanted to find out if you knew.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): What is your name, do you know?