

than the minister really is. I think he is a pretty shrewd cookie and I do not think he swallows that argument himself. Interprovincial Pipe line is owned by Imperial Oil, which in turn is a subsidiary of Standard Oil, and Standard Oil is the company bringing crude up from Venezuela to Montreal. Thus, it is not keen on having one of its subsidiaries bringing western oil into Montreal in competition with Standard Oil brought from Venezuela.

It makes sense that Standard Oil Company would like to have a national oil policy that will keep western crude west of the Ottawa River, and leave it the eastern market for Venezuelan oil. I do not blame it for following that policy, but I blame the government if it is prepared to accept a policy which is advantageous to Standard Oil but is disadvantageous to the welfare and well being of the Canadian people. That is why I want to see this matter discussed further, and to have more information from the minister.

The minister has to give us something more specific about the government's policy with respect to Home Oil. I am not going to deal with that at any length, but when the question of Home Oil being sold to Ashland of Kentucky came up, the government said there was nothing it could do. Then it relented, and said some of the Canadian private companies might want to buy out Home Oil. When that did not materialize, the minister announced that the Canadian government was willing to buy it. Now, the minister tells us that Mr. Brown, president of Home Oil, and the government have not been able to make any deal, and that the company is back in the market place.

This underlines the point I made when I started. The reason the government is not able to grapple with the danger of losing Home Oil to American companies is that the government hasn't any policy. For three years and more, we have been waiting for a policy on foreign ownership and control of the Canadian economy. The longer the government delays formulating a policy the more the problems pile up, and the more we get ad hoc deals that have no meaning and no direction. I hope the minister is going to tell us what the government intends to do about Home Oil, and whether it will be bringing in legislation designed to give the government the necessary power to deal with Home Oil before this company, the last of the large Canadian-owned companies, passes out of the control of Canadians.

I hope the minister will also make a statement regarding the oil pipelines. According to reports from Washington, the President of the United States instructed the State Department in February, 1970, to approach the Canadian government about the possibility of building a pipeline from Alaska to the United States through Canada. The report says that the Canadian government rejected that proposal. Whether that is correct or not, we do know that the oil companies which were active in Alaska then began to advocate what has come to be known as the TAPS program, the Trans-Alaska pipeline system, which would bring oil from Prudhoe Bay to Valdez, and by tanker from Valdez to Cherry Point,

Washington, as well as to other points on the American coastline.

The Canadian government became alarmed at this prospect, and very understandably so, because one has only to look at the coastline of British Columbia to see what will happen if oil tankers of 100,000 tons, 200,000 tons—and now they are even talking about 300,000 ton oil tankers—were to come down the west coast of Vancouver Island and through the Straits of Juan de Fuca. The wreckage of one of those tankers would pollute the coastline of British Columbia and would ruin the finest salmon fishing area in the world. It was only at this point that the Canadian government began to make noises through the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. It asked the United States government to look at the possibility of a pipeline through the Canadian Arctic and down through Edmonton, to the United States. The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources in a speech, the report of which I have before me, said that it would be 30 cents a barrel cheaper to take this gas down to Chicago instead of taking it by sea from Valdez.

● (12:50 p.m.)

I think we ought to make two points clear. First, we, in this party, are vigorously opposed to any program that will bring oil tankers down the west coast of Canada. We believe that the results of such a program could be disastrous for the people of British Columbia and for the industries of British Columbia. That is why we introduced an amendment to the Canada Shipping Act, which was rejected by the government, asking that Canada establish a pollution control area up to 100 miles from the west coast, just as we have done in the Arctic. The government has rejected this proposal, although it introduced the concept of a pollution control zone for the Arctic. It has never been able to explain to the House why it makes sense to protect the Arctic and why it does not make sense to protect the Pacific coast.

The second thing which ought to be made clear is this: Although we are anxious to avoid the pollution of the Pacific coast by encouraging the TAPS program, we should not be stampeded into building a hot pipeline over the Canadian Arctic. This should not be done unless all the ecological studies have been completed and the government can assure us, so far as scientific know-how and technology can assure us, that this will not bring disastrous consequences for the Arctic.

If the ecological question is settled, I hope the minister will tell us what the government has in mind about the ownership and control of such a pipeline. Who will own this pipeline? Will it be an American pipeline to take oil from Alaska to the United States? Will there be any Canadian ownership? Will there be a participation by the Canadian government? Who will control the input and the output? Who will control the rates that will be charged for the oil which will be put in the pipeline in the Canadian Arctic and probably taken out in Alberta or some other part of Canada? It is all very well to say that this is a common carrier; but if someone else