

pollution as to contaminate the whole coast of British Columbia. One such accident could destroy the marine life of a great area and as a result destroy the industries based on it.

Is the threat exaggerated? Is the danger overstated by those who oppose the project? Have modern methods of shipbuilding and navigation eliminated the threat of pollution from these tankers? Do they now have so many built-in safety features as to make our concern unwarranted? Honourable senators, I do not think so. You may have seen the description in a recent issue of *Time* magazine of the new Esso of the Netherlands tanker *Europoort*. It is the world's largest ship being just over 1,141 feet in length. It carries 243,000 tons of crude oil. I do not know how many gallons this would amount to, but obviously the pollution which would be caused by the escape of 243,000 tons of crude oil would be considerable. According to the *Time* story, it would be enough to pollute the beaches all the way from Holland to Spain. This great ship carries a crew of only 30 men. It does not need more as it has an automatic pilot, automatic radar, and an automatic steering adjuster. An officer of that ship is quoted as saying "We stay in our staterooms. This ship runs itself and when something does go wrong, it is too complicated to fix anyway." One can imagine the result if such a ship carrying 243,000 tons or more of crude oil was involved in an accident off the coast of British Columbia or if something went wrong that was too complicated to fix, and oil escaped.

I believe the concern felt by Canadians on account of the proposed tanker system is justified, and Canadians are justified in trying to prevent it. Yet there is a distinct possibility it will be proceeded with in the near future if the necessary permits to build the pipeline can be obtained from the United States Government. On March 20 a Canadian Press story from New York quoted Dudley Knott, Vice-President of Public Affairs for B.P. North America Incorporated as saying his company's basic concern is with the extraction of oil from Alaska to meet the increasing requirements of the United States market, and the United States interests demand that the oil come from Alaska. Mr. Knott further stated that the oil companies do not care how they get the oil out—whether by pipeline, tanker or submarine—but the method must be economical and they believe the best way is by pipeline across Alaska. On April 7 there was a story from London which quoted Sir Eric Drake, Chairman of British Petroleum Company, as saying it was hoped that some time this year the United States Government would authorize construction of the planned pipeline from the North Slope to the ice-free port of Valdez on Alaska's south coast.

People of influence in the United States are in favour of the TAPS project. I have read that Mr. George Lincoln, Chairman of President Nixon's oil policy committee, wants this done in a hurry to meet the anticipated petroleum needs of the west coast of the United States. The United States Federal Power Commission also thinks Alaska oil should be brought to market as speedily as possible, and that the TAPS system is the most economical way of doing this. Mr. Edward Patton, President of

[Hon. Mr. Macdonald.]

the Alyeska Pipeline Service Company, which is the consortium of companies wanting to build the pipeline, has stressed the fact that since the Mackenzie alternative was proposed, there has been no new evidence that this alternative is sounder than TAPS.

Another factor to be remembered in discussing this matter is the large investment already made in preparation of the Alaska pipeline. An article in *Time* magazine of March 29 had this to say:

Anticipating U.S. Interior Department approval, the Alyeska Pipeline Service Co., a consortium of oil companies with stakes in Prudhoe, has already invested in ground surveys and tanker contracts; in fact, 80 per cent of the 48-in. pipeline that would be required has already been delivered.

When we are discussing this matter, and especially the part dealing with our opposition to the Trans-Alaska pipeline tanker project, one other consideration must be kept in mind and that is that the United States needs this oil and is determined to transport it by some means or other in the near future. That the need is there is emphasized by a Canadian Press despatch from Vancouver which said in part:

The continental United States desperately needs oil from the North Slope of Alaska, Edwin C. Hurd, President of Trans Mountain Oil Pipe Line Co., told the annual dinner meeting of the University of British Columbia Alumni Association.

Mr. Hurd said the "growing militancy" of other oil-producing countries of the world means that the resources in those countries may not always be available to the United States.

I think Mr. Hurd's words carry a lot of weight as he is also President of Mackenzie Valley Pipe Line Research Limited, a company conducting research into the feasibility of constructing a pipeline from the Arctic Slope to Edmonton.

In my view, there can be no doubt that the United States wants, needs, and is determined to have that oil from Alaska, and I do not think they are willing to wait too long to get it. It is apparent that the United States oil industry favours the Trans-Alaska pipeline and tanker system as the one to move that oil in the cheapest and quickest manner. If we are opposed to this project, can we hope to prevent it? There have been some roadblocks thrown up against it by the conservationists in the United States. The permit to build the pipeline has not been granted and there is no indication that it will be granted in the near future. Various individuals and groups in the United States have presented serious objections to the proposed system. These objections are of interest as all or some would apply to a pipeline built in Canadian territory. Such objections are based mainly on ecological-pollution and social grounds. Conservationists in the United States have apparently been able to prevent the granting of a permit to construct the pipeline by arguing before the courts that pollution dangers have not been adequately weighed and examined as required by the new United States National Environmental Policy Act. Some of the apparent reasons for a reevaluation of the Trans-Alaska pipeline system appear to be: