

ecological dangers that arise from the building of this pipeline, and we will be discussing with the United States how best the interests of the Pacific coast of Canada and the United States can be protected.

Did that mean that the government supported TAPS? I want the minister to tell me that this afternoon. I want him to tell the Canadian people whether he supports the TAPS line or the Mackenzie Valley line. Let us have it without any evasion or equivocation.

Mr. Diefenbaker: He isn't here.

Mr. Woolliams: But the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Macdonald), who had a little argument with me a moment ago, is here. My next question was:

Perhaps the Secretary of State for External Affairs did not quite get the import of my question. What I am asking is whether those officials are expressing the position that Canada must be a formal party—I mean formal party—to the discussions on the initiation of the TAPS route or any other route?

The minister answered:

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, this is a decision that has to be made by the United States.

At this point he let the cat out of the bag. This decision was left to the United States. They left Canada out of it and made the decision themselves. We heard the minister say that the decision was left to the United States. If there should be a spill, the government will then make a formal protest. That will clean up a lot of White Rock, that will clean up a lot of sea, that will clean up the damages done to the birdlife, fishlife and other life along the shores.

Before I leave this point, I want to say again that for four years we have pressed the new government—because the former Pearson government did nothing about it—to make a study, to supply us with evidence, to tell us who is heading the study, to give us the facts, and to give us the decision, painful as it may be. Whatever decision is made, as somebody said earlier today, it will not be an easy decision. I will repeat that this energy will come the north whether this government wants it or not, and yet they have not even met or negotiated with the United States.

Now, I will go on to another subject which was touched upon briefly today, that is oil pollution caused by tankers carrying crude petroleum on the high seas near the shoreline of Canada. This, in conjunction with the fact the consumer faces an extensive increase in the price of his gasoline, are the two foremost problems facing the federal government today. Those were the words I used once before in this House. Neither unemployment nor the economic welfare of the nation can be separated from pollution by oil, or the cost of the product to the consumer. The point I am making there is obvious. One can take an extreme, personal stand and say that ecology is everything and that we must not move anything. If mankind had led that kind of life since the beginning of time we would not be here. There must be some development, but also there must be some rules on how the ball game is to be played. There must be a balance between pollution control, the economic welfare of the nation, consideration of the gross national product, and employment. The question is linked with the development of the north.

As I said before, in 1957 the Progressive Conservative Party created and started a northern vision which has led

Oil Pollution

to a vast energy exploration in the north, and in consequence huge discoveries of natural gas and petroleum have been made both in northern Canada and in Alaska. There is a growing demand for and a shortage of fuel energy and gasoline in the United States, and indeed in Canada. In fact the National Energy Board recently refused permission to enlarge the amount of natural gas exported, but I will not go into that matter at this point except to say that when representatives of the National Energy Board appeared before a standing committee of this House they said they were starved for staff to provide them with scientific advice. Yet when we ask the government questions, it replies, "We are leaving it to the National Energy Board." But the government will not give the National Energy Board the proper staff so that it can get the information on which to base decisions.

• (1440)

In the light of the hard fact that the Mid-East won an unprecedented price increase for its crude petroleum, the industrial centres of the United States and Canada have turned their thirsty oil eyes to the north for the purpose of replacing Mid-East exports. The consumers of both countries are seeking a reasonable price now and for the future, and to achieve that aim plans are being consummated to transport crude petroleum reserves and other by-products to the industrial centres of both countries. How is this to be done? There has been no study, no decision. To date the greatest proven field for crude petroleum appears to be on the northern slopes of Alaska, while an extensive find of natural gas has been located in northern Canada on Christian Island.

An early start on a pipeline in Alaska is now being planned in earnest, if not already under way, as a step to keep the United States and indeed eastern Canada, from being too heavily dependent on imports from the Mid-East and elsewhere. It is said that there is a reserve of 10 billion barrels of crude petroleum in the northern slopes of Alaska, and I might add that these statistics were given out two years ago.

There are two routes for transporting the crude petroleum to the industrial centres of North America. There are two serious problems that must be weighed carefully in the decision making on how to get this oil safely and cheaply from Alaska to the midwest of the United States. That is the decision the government will not make, and has not made for the last four years. It is a decision it will not make until it calls an election. First, the question of our economics, and still more important, the question of preservation of our northern ecology must be considered and weighed well. That is why a study is necessary.

The first method would be to build a pipeline from the northern slopes of Alaska to the port of Valdez, and then to take the oil by large tankers down the west coast of British Columbia to the United States. That seems to be what will happen at this time. The second method and route would be to build a pipeline from the Alaska slopes down the Mackenzie delta across the Prairies to the midwest, sharing the flow in the line with the oil supplied from the other proven provincial fields in Canada.