

3. What is the total cost per year of maintaining the Canadian contingent in Cyprus?
4. Who pays for the maintenance of the Canadian contingent in Cyprus?
5. For how long does Canada intend to maintain a peace-keeping force in Cyprus?
6. What other countries, if any, are at present participating in the said peace-keeping operation?
7. What are the respective sizes of the forces of these countries in Cyprus?

Hon. Paul Martin: Honourable senators, Senator Desruisseaux this afternoon gave me notice of his intention to ask these questions and I am now in a position to reply. The answers are as follows:

1. Yes, Canada does participate in the United Nations peace-keeping operation in Cyprus.
2. The total number of Canadian personnel at the moment is 583.
3. For the fiscal year 1971-72 the estimate is \$1,727,500.

This, of course, does not include pay and allowances, which would be paid whether or not the forces in question were in the United Nations peace-keeping operation. The pay and allowances total \$4,300,000.

4. So far as the Canadian forces are concerned, they are maintained by the Government on behalf of the people of Canada. The recoverable amount from the United Nations this year is \$580,000.
5. The mandate of the force was set last June 15 for six months. The mandate will end on December 15 next, and it will be up to the Security Council to decide whether the force should be renewed for a further three-months or six-months period.
6. The following countries participate in the United Nations force in Cyprus:
Ireland, Finland, Sweden, the United Kingdom, Denmark and Canada. Austria has a medical contingent present and Australia has a police contingent present.
7. The largest contingent is that of the United Kingdom. The second largest is that of Canada. The other contributing countries have contingents numbered below the Canadian figure of 583.

I am sorry I do not have at my fingertips the exact figures.

Hon. Mr. Choquette: Are they kept very busy?

Hon. Mr. Martin: Yes, they are kept very busy. The United Nations force in Cyprus has been able to maintain peace in that disturbed island.

NORTHERN OIL AND GAS

GOVERNMENT TRANSPORTATION STUDY URGED— DEBATE CONTINUED

The Senate resumed from Monday, April 5, the adjourned debate on the motion of Hon. Mr. Argue:

That this house opposes the Trans-Alaska pipeline and tanker project and urges the Government to proceed with the various economical and ecological feasibility studies of alternate routes and to report from time to time upon the most appropriate steps that in the Government's opinion may from time to time be taken to accomplish the prudent and efficient transportation of northern oil and gas.

Hon. John Mr. Macdonald: Honourable senators, I thought Senator Argue gave a powerful speech and that his reasons for moving the resolution were very sound and most convincing. As I place before you my reasons for supporting his motion, I am sure you will notice that they bear a strong resemblance to his, although I go into greater detail in some instances and approach the matter from a different point of view in other instances.

Honourable senators will have noticed that this motion can be divided into three parts. Part 1 is simply that this house opposes the Trans-Alaska pipeline and tanker project. Part 2 urges the Government to proceed with the various economical and ecological studies of alternative routes. Part 3 requests the Government to report from time to time upon the most appropriate steps that, in the Government's opinion, may from time to time be taken to accomplish the prudent and efficient transportation of northern oil and gas.

Honourable senators will also have noticed that the first point of the motion expresses opposition to a project which is not under the control of the Government of Canada. Those seeking to build the pipeline do not need a permit from any government in Canada. Parts 2 and 3, however, are matters within the competence of the federal Government of Canada.

As you are no doubt aware, the Trans-Alaska pipeline and tanker system is a proposal to build a 789-mile pipeline from the great oil fields of Prudhoe Bay south across Alaska to the all-weather port of Valdez on the south coast of Alaska. The oil which would be pumped through this 48-inch pipeline would be taken by huge tankers to a new refinery at Cherry Beach, which is about 12 miles from the Canadian border and about 32 miles south of Vancouver.

If the United States is prepared to grant permission for this pipeline to be built across Alaska, that is their business, and it could only be of interest to us if it had some adverse effect on the ecology of our territory. I have not seen anywhere that Canadian opposition is caused by any direct or indirect adverse effect which the pipeline might have on the ecology of Canadian territory.

However, if it is decided to carry that crude oil in huge tankers from the terminus of the pipeline along the coast of British Columbia to the proposed refinery, even if it is outside our territorial waters, then it becomes very much our business and very much our concern. It is of great concern to us because in the opinion of many people such tanker voyages would constitute a threat, an ever-present menace, to the coast of British Columbia. One accident—and there will be accidents as long as ships ply the sea—involving one of these tankers could cause so much