

*Government Organization Act, 1970*

organization of the Government of Canada and matters related or incidental thereto—Mr. Trudeau—Mr. Honey in the chair.

**The Chairman:** When the committee rose on Wednesday, February 17, clause 2 of the bill with the amendment of the hon. member for St. John's East was under consideration. Shall the amendment carry?

**Mr. MacLean:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I believe there is agreement that Part I of the bill be stood at this point and that we go on to consider Part II.

**Mr. Drury:** Mr. Chairman, I think there has been agreement that Part I will be stood. It is hoped that we will proceed to Part II, Energy, Mines, Resources and Technical Surveys. These are consequential amendments. Then, subsequently, we would pass over part III, which has been approved, pass over, or let stand, part IV, let stand part V, deal with part VI and following that, with part VII, Public Service Superannuation. It is thought that in this way we shall be able to make more rapid progress than we have done up to now.

**Mr. MacLean:** That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Yes, Mr. Chairman, the statement made by the President of the Treasury Board represents an agreement which has been reached. I think you will find the committee ready to proceed with clause eight.

**The Chairman:** I shall not repeat the agreement. It has been stated for the record by the President of the Treasury Board. Is this course agreeable?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**The Chairman:** Then, the committee will proceed to the consideration of clause eight.

On clause 8—*Energy, Mines and Resources*

**Mr. Yewchuk:** In dealing with clause 8, Mr. Chairman, I wish to concentrate on development in northern Canada, particularly as it relates to energy in the form of oil and gas and the transportation of this form of energy to southern parts of Canada, keeping in mind the need to proceed in such a way as to ensure that the environment does not suffer irreparable damage.

Though we are aware that some research is being done in Arctic regions into the effects of pipelines, hot and cold, on the ecology and on the permafrost, we also know that a good deal of this research is still only in the planning stages or has not progressed to the point at which convincing reports can be drawn up and presented to the government. Much attention has been focussed on the transportation of oil in particular from the northern slopes of Alaska in the past year or more, but ecological research has not kept pace with the desire to transport oil to the south. Since the discovery of oil in this region of Alaska, exploratory activity throughout the Arctic and the Arctic islands has been intensified.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Particularly since the Americans announced their intention to build a trans-Alaska pipeline system from northern Alaska to the port of Valdez, the government has begun to make a fevered pitch for the construction of a pipeline down the Mackenzie Valley as a superior alternative. I am concerned about this because it is possible that as a result of its desire to obtain commitments to use the Mackenzie Valley route, the Canadian government may be inclined to proceed more quickly than its knowledge of environmental problems should permit it to do. A few days ago, in the course of a debate on this subject, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development as well as the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources indicated that much research was being done in this field, and both implied we were almost ready to begin pipeline construction down the Mackenzie Valley. I wish to take issue with some of the remarks these ministers made since I believe there was a good deal of exaggeration as to the amount of research which is actually in progress and the amount of information which has been accumulated with respect to effects of pipelines on the ecology.

The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development suggested that the Arctic land use research program had resulted in the effects of pipelines upon the permafrost, for example, being actively studied. I am informed, however, that this particular study had in fact been concerned primarily with the effects of exploratory seismic and drilling work and that in fact it had very little to do with the effects of pipelines on permafrost. I hope that minister will clarify this situation for the benefit of hon. members. He also made reference to the experimental pipeline at Inuvik, where the oil industry is working in collaboration with the government to discover the effect of a hot oil pipeline on the permafrost. I think this is a very worthwhile study, but it would appear from an answer given a couple of days ago by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources that no ecologist was attached to this study group. If this is not the case, I should like to know why the minister declined to give a more positive answer. I am concerned lest in the rush to develop these energy resources ecological studies should be overlooked, in which case Canada could wind up with another Peace—Athabasca Delta fiasco.

The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources gave the House the impression that a committee on environmental matters, chaired by an official of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, had been sufficiently successful in its research program to be in a position to draft guidelines pertaining to pipeline construction and operation in the north in relation to the ecology. I wonder whether the minister could make these findings available to hon. members so that we could be assured that the studies have, in fact, been as extensive as might appear. I take it the minister was referring to the Arctic land use studies and to the Arctic land use regulations which are nearly ready to be published, according to the hon. gentleman. If you would recall, Mr. Chairman, a few months ago the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources delivered his famous nationalism