

Oil Pollution

A massive leak from a pipeline, difficult to construct and maintain over and through the permafrost territory, could in itself destroy the northern ecology. In conjunction with the ecology problems, the two transport methods and routes would have to be weighed in light of the economics of getting the product to the consumer. In brief, which method and route would be more beneficial to Canadian consumers, and indeed to the ecology of North America? It is just that simple a question, but it requires a decision. I hope the minister will make an announcement today. As I said, Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives for some time have recommended that a study be carried out.

Tanker oil pollution near the western shoreline of Canada, in conjunction with the increase in the price of gasoline, are among the foremost problems facing Canadians. You cannot divorce oil pollution from unemployment or the economic growth of the nation, but it can be done with judgment, with rules, regulations and decisions based on facts. As I said, Mr. Speaker, there is an increasing demand for fuel and gasoline throughout the world.

Now, I want to turn for a few moments to deal with the question of the dangers that have arisen simply because no decisions have been made. On February 15, 1970, the Liberian tanker *Arrow* was wrecked on the Cerberus Rock in Chedabucto Bay off Nova Scotia. Only 1.3 million gallons, of an estimated 2.5 million spilled into the water, were recovered. The remainder contaminated 190 miles of shoreline in the bay, miles of beaches on Sable Island 100 miles away, and 4,800 birds lost their lives. The *Arrow* was Canada's major oil spill disaster. What happened? Who paid the shot? Read the Henderson report. The Canadian taxpayer paid the shot. They cannot determine who owned the tanker. There has been no way of measuring the damage, and so the taxpayer has paid the shot.

At the beginning of May U.S. Interior Secretary Morton issued preliminary approval for a go ahead of the TAPS tanker system to ship oil from Prudhoe Bay to Valdez by pipeline and from there to the west coast by giant oil tankers. One terminus for these tankers is Cherry Point in the state of Washington, which is exactly 20 miles away from the place in Canada which is polluted today. The tanker *Arrow* was 18,000 tons dead weight. The tankers for the TAPS route are to be over 100,000 tons dead weight. What will our shoreline be like if one of these large tankers is wrecked? Where will the government be then? Where will its supporters in British Columbia be then? It is a sad story.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. I regret having to interrupt the hon. member, but the time allotted to him has expired.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the opportunity to follow the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) in this debate because I can put to him directly the very extensive record, which has already been outlined in this House, of work done both with regard to the question of the Mackenzie Valley pipeline route and the dangers involved for Canada's west coast because of the TAPS route.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

The hon. member made a number of points, saying there has been no indication on the part of the government of its views with regard to the TAPS route, that the government has not undertaken any feasibility studies with regard to the Mackenzie route, and has failed to let the United States government know its views. I am glad to have this opportunity to point out to the hon. member, from documentation tabled in the House, and from statements made in the House and outside it, that on all three points he is dead wrong and his assertions to the House are all false.

Dealing first with the question of feasibility studies, he said that the Conservatives for some time had recommended a feasibility study. If the hon. member was on the ball and was doing his job, Mr. Speaker, he would know that on April 18, 1972, I tabled in this House copies of documents dealing with 30 various aspects of a feasibility study preparatory to informing the two agencies of government concerned with regard to the Mackenzie valley pipeline.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): These are studies that have been under way for the past three years, and that we would hope to have finished by the end of the summer season. This has been indicated repeatedly. I suppose the only way to get a message across to the hon. member would be to have a chisel, engrave the message on a tablet of stone, and hit him over the head with it, because he does not learn easily. This question has been under extensive study. Over \$15 million have been expended to put the government into a position to make a judgment about the Mackenzie valley pipeline. As I have said repeatedly in this House, Mr. Speaker, at the end of this year when the companies themselves are ready to come forward, we will be in a position to evaluate proposals for a Mackenzie valley pipeline. So, on the first of the hon. member's points that there has not been any preparatory work, he is dead wrong. If there has been any lack of preparatory work it has been by the hon. member in preparing for his speech. He just has not done his homework.

The hon. member also said that I have made no speeches in the House on this question. I spoke extensively, in fact probably too extensively on it, in the Throne Speech debate. I reviewed the question extensively—

Mr. Woolliams: Not on this.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): On this and the question of energy, and I dealt at length with the matter of studies before the standing committee. Further, I dealt with the question of energy policies during an opposition day debate. Once again there is lack of preparation. Mr. Speaker, but it has been lack of preparation by the hon. member for Calgary North who has been lying down on the job.

The hon. member also suggested that members of the government have not been in the position to set before the House, the country, and the United States government its position with regard to the proposals for a tanker route and the Mackenzie valley pipeline. I would like to take a few minutes of the time of the House to go through the