

I point out that this brief was presented on August 14, 1969. It continues:

According to that source, the specialist brought in by the company to stop the blowout reported that a routine approach would not be feasible because of the almost impossible working conditions on and around the rig. Had this blowout been oil instead of gas, Canada would at this very moment be deeply embroiled in the most massive case of oil pollution in her history.

I think every one knows that where you find gas you frequently find oil, and vice versa. The brief continues:

One has but to reflect on the widely documented recent oil blowout of a well offshore of Santa Barbara...to realize the potential magnitude of such a disaster. And since the Canadian Government owns 45 per cent of the stock of Panarctic Oils Ltd....the Government may therefore find itself in the most unenviable position of becoming a major polluter of the environment while simultaneously trying to curb pollution by others.

The brief then refers to oil pollution problems in Cook Inlet, Alaska. It says:

● (5:00 p.m.)

The pattern of oil pollution of Cook Inlet, Alaska, can be utilized to evaluate some of the potentials of Canadian Arctic oil development activity. Oil was discovered in Cook Inlet in 1962. Today there are 13 giant drilling platforms in upper Cook Inlet, each one valued at \$12 to \$15 million. Wells are drilled through the platform legs, and the oil subsequently pumped from them passes through concrete-encased underwater pipelines to storage tanks on land. Tankers then receive the oil and transport it south. Approximately 116 miles of these underwater pipelines are now in operation, some of them extending for several miles on the floor of Cook Inlet. There are conflicting reports from the oil industry as to whether the lines are equipped with automatic shut-off devices, but apparently they are not. It will be recalled that a report is at hand indicating destruction of such pipelines by ice action at a water depth of 250 feet.

This underlines the need for research projects to be carried on. I quote further.

An extraordinary series of oil pollution incidents followed the discovery of oil in Cook Inlet. These incidents now average 1-2 every fortnight; their severity ranges from modest to extremely destructive. Tens of thousands of seabirds and waterfowl have been killed by this pollution, and even the commercial species of fish and bottom-dwelling crabs have been affected.

Concern is growing for the welfare of the mammal populations of the region, including the beluga whale, seals, sea otters, bears and furbearers.

In April 1968, the then U.S. Secretary of the Interior, Stewart Udall, called for an emergency control program for Cook Inlet oil operations, and for more conscientious efforts by industry. The comments he made at that time are most appropriate to the present discussion. He stated, in part:

"During recent months I have received well-substantiated evidence that exploration and develop-

### *Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act*

ment activities in Cook Inlet have resulted in a recurring series of pollution incidents. Between June 1966 and December 1967 there were some 75 incidents of oil pollution in Cook Inlet reported by federal and state agencies responsible for the conservation of natural resources in the area."

One report available to the Secretary revealed that nearly 100 pollution incidents were recorded in Cook Inlet, Alaska, between March 1966 and April 1968.

This unenviable record of environmental contamination produced by the oil industry in Cook Inlet is in part the result of inadequate controls, in part the result of attempting to exploit oil resources in a difficult and poorly understood environment. Cook Inlet is, climatically, no more difficult—and probably considerably less difficult—than the Canadian Arctic slope and Beaufort Sea.

And since Canadian environmental protection legislation and regulations governing oil activities are considerably more lax than those of the U.S., there is every reason to expect that Canadian Arctic oil activities will be at least as destructive as those in Cook Inlet. Add to this probability the results of ancillary terrestrial activities—roads, pipelines, settlements, storage facilities and their relevant construction and maintenance activities—and the prediction of impact upon the fragile Arctic environment is not an encouraging one.

That is the end of the quotation. Since this brief was written, some legislation has been presented to the House to tighten up the regulations applicable to the oil industry in the Arctic, but I should like to point out that we have leased many hundreds of millions of acres in the Arctic covering not only the mainland but some of the islands and the waters in between. Oil drilling is taking place and the number of wells drilled will increase. Further oil discoveries will be made. There is no doubt about this. We shall encounter problems similar to those which have been discussed in the brief from which I have just quoted. This is why there is such a need for an amendment of the kind now proposed. A guarantee of protection is needed and the greatest measure of protection which could be afforded to Canadians today is the certainty that adequate research into our Arctic ecology would be carried out.

I have gone through a large number of pamphlets and booklets on the work done by various nations in northern regions. Canada is not in the forefront of research. We have done some, but the amount has been limited. Over the years we have been reluctant to pump money into research projects which are desperately needed in these areas. As I say, there is no doubt that oil will be discovered. The problem of transporting the oil from the islands to the mainland and thence to various depots in the south will have to be met. There is talk of a pipeline south. There is talk of