

policy and the same concern for environment, but as regards environment if the same reasoning should be followed on the eastern and the western coasts, I think something is wrong and does not make any sense.

I now come to the concern of Quebec and Ontario which depend on foreign supplies for 80 per cent of their supply; Ontario gets it from Alberta and Quebec from imports. You know that the Quebec minister of natural resources, (Mr. Massé), when stating the objectives of a Quebec policy on energy, has indicated some priorities: building a supertanker harbour to handle raw products from overseas, rationalizing distribution and building a pipeline from Gros-Cacouna et Quebec, Montreal and the United States.

Does this appear as still being irreconcilable with Canadian interests? If it is quite reconcilable, and it is even in our interest. For the reasons I mentioned earlier, as long as we can profitably get our supply from foreign sources I do not see why we should not draw benefits from it.

We must accept the fact that Quebec is now at the end of the natural gas pipeline. Now, when it comes to extending this gas pipeline, the government is requested to pay the entire cost of the extension and furthermore, as it still is at the end of the pipeline, the product becomes more expensive. It is obvious that the situation would be the same if we only adopted this policy extending the pipeline. The Montreal refineries would then be in a non-competitive position with those of Ontario. This would be a fool's deal that Quebec would not accept. Unfortunately, there are people who think that the true vocation of Quebec is to remain in the field of crafts, folklore and leave to other provinces the responsibility of developing their more advanced, more industrialized resources.

Some people are quite sincere and earnest about environment. However, they did not make a single move about the Golden Eagle Canada Limited in Quebec City. They never even thought of refineries in Montreal, stating high principles about pollution. The city of Montreal dumps its raw sewage into the St. Lawrence River through four 18-foot pipes; nobody says a word about it. But at a time when a region which suffers an annual average unemployment rate of 31 per cent tries to get out of its misery, to industrialize its part of territory, all these famous thinkers who would not have made a single move to help it, appoint themselves as experts and geniuses in the field of environment. Everyone of them comes and gives us a lesson and shows us the path to follow.

In this House, some hon. members have proved themselves to be so unacquainted with the conditions of the environment and even with port and maritime conditions, that I wonder whether it is worth answering them. But since this has been said in the House, let me only remind them that all the experts who have carried out studies not only stated that there was the necessary depth of water, that is 100 feet or more—this is also found in the English Channel where traffic is ten times heavier than here—but also that this is the most accessible place in the whole St. Lawrence River, and that this was recognized as a result of many studies and surveys which would take too long to mention.

Then, the common good, the good of the province of Quebec, requires that most profit be taken out of it, and

Petroleum Products Controls

not only as far as oil is concerned. Let me remind our friends who are sitting in this House that we must take advantage of it in the context of the four big vocations of development of the whole St. Lawrence Seaway. It is quite obvious that the province of Quebec is separated by this Seaway which constitutes the real "entrance door" to it. The province must take full advantage of it. It can profit by it and the Gros Cacouna port is the only one to have the four major benefits required. It can benefit from the fact that it can accommodate the latest lines of ships closer inland. It can handle the loading and unloading of special ships on the Great Lakes which cannot leave the St. Lawrence River, which cannot, for example, go to the Maritime ports because they are not built for it. They would not be insurable and for them it would mean a route extension involving five to ten days more of navigation. In addition to handling, loading and unloading in other ships to develop our whole St. Lawrence Seaway, there is pipeline loading and unloading and shipping by the shortest route to supply Quebec, and railway transport which would allow access to the port 12 months a year and the transport of goods to the inland. Transport by a four-lane highway, the Trans-Canada Highway, which goes up to that place, can be found nowhere else and it facilitates the development of the whole St. Lawrence Seaway. There will be projects which will be developed at Thunder Bay as long as we are intelligent enough to build that sea port and accommodate the new generation of ships. And there is no conflict between different sea ports along the Seaway. The question is which of the United States or Canada will be more intelligent to get there first to handle in the most economical way all primary resources which make our country an industrialized country. And that is how the problem shapes up.

And I ask people concerned with environment: Is it more logical to have three thousand ships go up to Montreal or to have 300 go up to Gros Cacouna? And that is the situation of the problem.

Anyhow, Quebec needs 30 million barrels of oil a year. Right now, small ships flying a foreign flag—about this read the report of the inquiry on pilotage—and without any radar or radiotelephone in good order sail up the St. Lawrence River and no one is shocked about this. However, they are shocked about the fact that some people want to build a super harbour on the lower St. Lawrence. They say: Wildlife must be protected. We are not allowed any more to gather shells along our shores, because that is forbidden. Eel fishing has been forbidden. We are not allowed to catch any salmon because that fish is threatened with extinction. Finally, it is certainly not this super harbour which has caused all these problems concerning the environment since the Minister of Environment has already been forced to ban fishing in this area. Several other cases could be given.

It is obvious that it would be far less dangerous for the environment to accommodate this new generation of ships to the most inland places and thus take full advantage of this development. That, they will tell me, comes into conflict with the interests of the Maritimes. I say it will not. But even there there can be conciliation. How so? On the one hand, the potential of the continental shelf of the Maritimes has not yet been developed. If and when it is developed, the building of a pipeline reaching the Mari-