

Oil Pollution

laughed, including a former Prime Minister, Mr. Chevrier and Mr. Pickersgill. They all laughed about that vision which has brought about this great development. This government has known for a long time that we must move these vast quantities of crude oil from Prudhoe Bay down to Anchorage, and from there by some other means to Seattle and other places in the United States. Many speakers have pointed out that this is one of the most dangerous shipping areas to be found. It is very dangerous in the area of Cherry Point where this leakage occurred.

I come from a province whose economic foundation has been based on energy since the 1940's. Agriculture is an important industry in that province, probably the primary one, but natural gas and oil have led to the building of urban centres. Many young men and women are leaving the farms to find employment in these large cities built from the material wealth of that energy. Perhaps this is why I am so concerned about this matter. I realized immediately this government was elected that the time had come to find out whether this government had a plan for moving this energy. There is no point in criticizing or being worried about the ecology of the sea because of potential spills or leakages unless you are in possession of scientific fact. We have spent a great deal of money on many ridiculous things when we should have been taking advantage of the human resource of this country, putting university graduates to work on finding answers. Had this been done the government would not be floundering today without answers.

I asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) whether he had suggested to United States authorities that instead of using a tanker route down the B.C. coast they would consider an inland pipeline route. I asked whether he had come to any conclusion based on scientific fact that it would be better to pipe that crude petroleum and natural gas out of the north than ship it by tanker. I asked whether he had scientific information showing that a pipeline would be safer than the use of tankers. Let us remember that one of these methods will be used. That energy will be moved out of the north and the United States is going to move it to its industrial centres. Regardless of what the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) says, the United States needs that energy. Canada is a fast-growing industrial nation and it will require this energy in the very near future.

On April 27, 1971 I directed this question to the Prime Minister as recorded at page 5258 of *Hansard* for that date:

Mr. Speaker, the questions directed to the Prime Minister indicate how complex and divisive this problem is. I do not mean division on the part of the government but rather the complexity resulting from the pollution factor, economic factors and the defence aspect mentioned by the hon. member for Calgary Centre. Will the government now consider setting up a feasibility study by the best experts in these fields and Members of Parliament and Senators in order that we can get together on this subject, work together as a nation and come up with the right answers as a basis for our submissions to the United States?

This, in itself, is an indictment of this government, because it has no plan and has not even indicated that it prefers the pipeline route down the Mackenzie delta. It has not said it prefers the use of tankers down the coast of Canada. I suggest the reason the government has not said anything is that it is frightened of the electorate. The

[Mr. Woolliams.]

government cannot play politics for too long with this issue, it must come to grips with it.

An hon. Member: Do you know something?

Mr. Woolliams: Somebody asked whether I know something. I hope when I have finished that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice will appreciate this problem. In answer to my question the Prime Minister said:

Mr. Speaker, we hope that in respect of all questions affecting Canada's future we can work together as a nation, but as a result of the way the parliamentary system has been set up there is one executive called upon to take its responsibilities, and that we intend to do.

In other words, the Prime Minister said this government would take a decision, but no decision has been taken as yet. No feasibility study has been carried out. Up until last week I had a question on the order paper seeking information in respect of who was the head of the task force. I wondered whether this was being left to private enterprise, or whether the task force was made up of people from private enterprise, from the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce and the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources. I wanted to know who was the head of the task force.

My first indictment of the government is that there has never been a proper task force set up or a feasibility study made so the government could make a decision. That is why this government is floundering, and that is why the Secretary of State for External Affairs cannot give answers. I do not expect to get answers in this regard from the new Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Macdonald) as he is a new minister and has not made any speeches on the subject in the House since becoming minister. He has made his speeches on an extramural basis outside the House. I will be very surprised if he comes up with any answers today as to how this energy is to be moved; that is by pipeline, tanker, train or aircraft.

• (1420)

Let us see what some of the other questions are which were put. I am referring to March 11 of the same year as recorded at page 4163 of *Hansard*. At that time I said:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Normally I would have put it to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development but he is not here.

One of the great troubles with the question period is that only half the ministers are here. I went on:

As the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development has stated that the government would entertain a United States project to build a pipeline down the Mackenzie Valley through the Prairies, has the Canadian government set down terms under which Canadian labour, equipment and pipeline supplies will be used if such a project is undertaken by the United States.

Now, what was the answer by the former Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources? He said:

Mr. Speaker, I think the guidelines issued last August, which represent the government's position in respect of a pipeline, were very clear in this respect. Guideline number one, I believe, indicates there will be a clear preference for maximum Canadian