

S. O. 52

Yes, I too was here when we discussed pipelines. The shrillest voices came from the red rump over there. Those were the voices against pipelines in the North and the options to transport oil. Yes, we talked. I remember sitting in the committee.

You people are primitivists. You shut it all down. We all live by a lake somewhere in a log cabin, the smoke curling to the sky. We do not need any more fossil fuel. We do not need any more power dams. These are primitivists sitting over there. They were up on the north shore of Alaska saying you cannot build a pipeline here.

I recall sitting in the committee. There was a very arrogant, aloof witness who pointed out these tankers going up and down the coast. They were talking about the strategy of getting oil down to the lower 49 states. They were worried about not being secure having a pipeline through Canada; so they would rather have tankers going up and down the coast. As if that was a strategic system. Can you imagine, if we ever got into a conflict, how easy it would be to blow these tankers out of the water and mess up all of the coast and the rest of North America? The reason they did not have any trust in us is because of these primitivists who had ideas that you should not be harvesting oil in the north, that you should not bring it down.

I would very much prefer to sit down and talk about the alternatives that we have. There are those who say in ten years from now you will be driving your automobile up to a service station or to a grocery store and purchasing a solid hydrogen fuel cell which you plug into the side of your car and which allows you to drive for two or three weeks. These are all things that are perhaps 50 or 75 years away.

• (2300)

Ms. Copps: That will require research.

Mr. Oberle: We are now speculating about nuclear fusion at room temperature. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, what that will do? Yes, even the Hon. Member from Hamilton will perhaps in her lifetime see where oil and fossil fuels will be used for synthetic conversion and no longer be burned up in our smoke-stacks where they pollute the environment.

The fact is what could we do tomorrow. What have we omitted to do in the last 10 years, and what can we do in the next 10 years? Let us pull out the old plans. The former Premier of British Columbia did go to the United States. I recall the headlines. He was promoting a railway to Prudhoe Bay,—tank cars. My God, I suppose there would have been little platforms for moose to get on and take a little hop to the next pasture. It was a

haywire idea. Nevertheless, I give him credit. He did fight the tanker routes, as we all did at the time.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that from 1968 to 1972 Conservatives were not in this House. It was the New Democrats and the Liberals who made all these plans and all these agreements. Now they are blaming us for it.

The fact is that this is an accident of monumental proportions. It is an accident from which we can now do nothing but learn lessons. This is an accident as a result of which we should all get together. When an accident occurs, when an airliner crashes, be it a Soviet airliner, a Korean airliner, an American airliner or be it an earthquake that occurs, we get together to pass a unanimous motion to send aid. We do not worry about whose fault it is or what the consequences are or could have been. The feeling is: "Let us go to see how we can help". Let us go to see how we can help. Let us have a debate, as we are having tonight, in a rational and reasonable way and take politics out of it.

The resignation of a Minister will not scoop up one drop of oil. It will not save the life of one muskrat. It will not save the life of one fish. The Minister had nothing to do with it. If anybody is to blame, it is those people who laid these great designs and schemes in the past. Let us not worry about the past. Let us worry about the future. There are alternatives. By being reasonable and by offering to debate, as we have, and by meeting with people and doing so in a rational and responsible way, we may convince our neighbours that we have a common coast to protect, that we have an attachment to our environment that is part of our Canadian psyche, part of our Canadian culture. We have the right to protect it. We have the right to have it respected by our neighbours.

Our neighbours are just as concerned about the environment. It was said by our friends here today that they were much more active in cleaning up the Grays Harbour spill on their own coast. They are just as concerned as we are. The fact is that we are tied to this source of energy. It represents 20 per cent of the entire needs of the United States. It is strategic to them. They will have to get this oil down there. Let us offer some alternatives. Let us sit down to work out new guidelines.

I recall that when we talked about these tankers, there was this arrogant person I was telling Hon. Members about who was sitting there. When I raised the issue, there was this sort of aloof smile as if to say: "How can this lumberjack from British Columbia know about all these satellite guiding systems that would be steering these tankers? There would be no room for human error. It just would not be possible with all this new technology that we have guiding these systems. Do not worry". We all know that accidents do happen, that