

Government Organization Act, 1970

not challenged as an economic method of transporting oil. However, some of the reasons for re-evaluation of the TAPS system include a suggestion by a study that two to four tanker collisions could occur in this area within the next ten years. The extent of the damage which could be done by even one collision is such that could turn the entire west coast area into a dead sea.

Ecological harm to the Alaskan countryside caused by melting permafrost is a problem similar to that faced by the Mackenzie Valley route. The frequency of earthquakes in Alaska brings up the possibility of breakages in the pipeline which could result in extensive spills and pollution. Earthquake activity is such that it may prohibit construction of port facilities at Valdez. The alternative, which I have already briefly discussed, is the Mackenzie Valley pipeline which is considered to be both ecologically safer and probably as economic or even more economic than the TAPS system.

Because of the controversy surrounding the Mackenzie route, the government has laid down a few guidelines: the pipeline should stay in a specific corridor; it should be a common carrier; allowance should be made for participation by Canadians in engineering, construction and finance; the northern ecology must be preserved and natives should be employed during construction. I think there should be one other guide-line—provision should be made for Canadians to invest in the pipeline, by way of buying shares.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, a consideration of the TAPS tanker project and the apparent effects of this system suggests that Canada should seriously oppose it on the grounds that severe ecological harm could result on the west coast as a result of the collision of supertankers bringing oil from Valdez through Puget Sound to Washington. A recent meeting with American oil executives suggest that Canada is probably too late with its objections.

We are also aware, given the increasing consumption annually, that the United States will need Prudhoe Bay oil in the foreseeable future. If agreement could be made with the Americans, the Mackenzie Valley pipeline could go ahead but there are several other considerations that must also be taken into account. How useful will this route be as a common carrier, in view of the problems that are likely to be encountered in building additional pipelines from Inuvik to Prudhoe Bay and from the Arctic Islands to Inuvik if oil is found higher up in the Arctic?

To my knowledge no research is being done with regard to the transportation of oil from the high Arctic to the northern tip of the Mackenzie Valley route. There are a host of new problems. Where will the pipeline go, over the ice or on the bottom of the sea? What are the dangers to the pipeline in this area? How great is the pollution threat with this type of pipeline? A proposal to build a pipeline from Prudhoe Bay to Inuvik, a distance of about 600 miles, could very well meet with similar objections from conservationists as has the Valdez line.

[Mr. Yewchuk.]

That particular piece of pipeline could be a great threat to our ecology as well, since Inuvik is in the same earthquake zone as Valdez.

What information do we have as to how to deal with a ruptured pipeline in that particular area and what is our knowledge of mopping up procedures under Arctic conditions should such a rupture and such pollution occur? It is virtually nil. Other considerations that we must look at from the non-ecological point of view are the possible expansion of existing facilities from Edmonton to Chicago to meet the anticipated increased oil flow through these facilities. If Alaska oil goes to Chicago via the Mackenzie pipeline, what guarantee is there that the oil will not infringe upon existing markets for western Canadian oil in the U.S. midwest?

• (12:20 p.m.)

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to reiterate that decisions made now pertaining to the transport of energy from the north will have far reaching effects in the future. Canada must not be panicked into development which is not based on thorough and complete research in the field of Arctic ecology, pollution and pollution prevention. At the same time, I want to say I disagree with the government in its stance concerning who should benefit the most from development in the north. I do not feel Canadians are so greedy as to consider that developments in the north should not be primarily for the benefit of native northerners directly. The greatest benefit to all Canadians in general, however, still remains in the area of prevention of the destruction of the environment of the north.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Chairman, we are now dealing with Part II of Bill C-207, which deals with Energy, Mines, Resources and Technical Surveys and which adds to the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources additional powers, including, first, energy development from water and, secondly, responsibility for non-renewable resources. It seems to me when we discuss these new powers which are being given to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) and his department, it is incumbent on the minister to make a statement to the House concerning what the government's policy is in respect of energy resources. I think we should remember we are dealing with non-renewable resources. We are dealing with such things as uranium, oil, gas and certain ores. Such resources are not unlimited. These are resources which, once they have been dissipated, will no longer be available to the people of Canada. We should like to have a statement from the minister setting forth the government's policy with regard to how these resources will be husbanded, on what basis they will be expended and what provision is being made for their long-term use.

What we should remember is, that in this generation we are merely the trustees of these resources, and that we have the responsibility to see they are not dissipated. I think it is our duty to make sure Canada does not become a mere hinterland supplying energy resources to the more technically advanced nations which need our energy resources but which, if they are allowed to com-