

preference to the latter. In so doing, we are guilty of a third mistake, since in giving preference to the interests of one region of Canada rather than to those of the country as a whole, the national interest is being ignored. I shall come back to this later.

And that is not all. It is not only a question of maintaining a balance between different interests, as the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) and the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) would have us believe. We must go further and not be afraid to impose our Canadian viewpoint. We must not resort to force for this purpose, but we must get our feet out of the same boot, and quickly.

If, as it was suggested by the federal government, we offer the United States an alternative to TAPS, it is absolutely necessary that this system and the route should be better. The Mackenzie route is certainly not so, at the moment. No sufficient study has been made up to this day of the permafrost problems and of the risk of the pipeline system heating the ground and thus damaging the pipeline.

In addition, unfortunately, polar conditions would offer many a problem, should oil be spilled.

I agree with the motion of the Progressive-Conservative party to the effect that no development should be undertaken without the problem being scrutinized, which has not been done. We must not always yield to our southern neighbour, even though we are mindful of our own interests. We must solve the problem before taking any action and make sure that our interest will really be protected, because in the North, we might be able to prevent rather than cure. That is why I feel this debate is extremely important.

Mr. Speaker, I shall conclude my remarks here to comply with your wishes that I limit my speech to ten minutes, in order to give my colleagues the opportunity to take part in this debate.

I suggest that under the Canadian Constitution of 1867 the Canadian Parliament has the power to legislate on all coastal and inland fisheries. It can not only make all laws involving marine and aquatic life, but even reassume, as and when it deems advisable, powers in this field which may have been delegated to one or other of the provinces.

Marine and aquatic life includes plants as well as animals. Any kind of aquatic life comes within the jurisdiction of the federal government whose powers in this field are unrestricted.

Mr. Speaker, the present government, vested with such powers, is placed in a critical position by the requirements and the needs of the United States and is now inclined to compromise with that country, but an examination of statements made by the various ministers of the Crown on this matter and a consideration of the underhand positions of the government will tell us that three points are being ignored which I want to bring to your attention.

In the first place, for us Canadians living in 1971, ecology is the art of survival and in this respect nothing,

### *Trans-Alaska Pipeline*

not a single study even, has yet been undertaken. Here, I have a copy of a speech made by the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) before the Capilano Liberal Workshop Acadian Gardens in North Vancouver last February 12. In this speech the minister was confessing to the fact that no studies had been undertaken, that everything still had to be done in this field and that could not proceed any further for the time being until we became more knowledgeable on ecology.

• (4:30 p.m.)

The minister himself said that for him and his government ecology was a new science and a word they could not even spell.

The second thing the government will have to do will be to guarantee our economic interests. Instead of conducting thorough economic studies to defend Canadian interests, ministers merely make startling and contradictory statements, which is not likely to reassure Canadians.

I was a member myself of task force on oil last year with a group of American parliamentarians, and we had absolutely no document to defend the interests of the Canadian government, unlike the Americans. They came with documents, helped by researchers and experts. They knew where they were going. As for us, we did not know exactly what to say or what to do, since the Canadian government was sending us there for show, without a serious position and without a thorough study.

This is why, if we rely on appearances, we will be forced to conclude—I speak about those who have studied this matter quite seriously—that, after all, there is nothing.

The government does not seem to take a position about the sovereignty of Canada. According to the British North America Act, it is the sole valid power to protect the environment in Canada. But as it constitutes the only power and claims the exclusive use of this power, it will have to suffer the defeat of its policy, if it is not careful, if it is not really Canadian but simply the puppet of the Americans.

For this reason, I support without reservation the motion of the Progressive Conservative party because it allows us to discuss a very important problem, namely, pollution.

Mr. Speaker, if the Canadian government does not make a real and extremely thorough ecological study, if it keeps on with its noisy and conflicting statements—whenever it sends its members on a visit to our southern neighbour—if moreover, it forgets it is the supreme authority in such a field and that the Canadian people are ready to invest large amounts of money for the preservation of their environment, if, for the sake of petty interests it forgets Canadian sovereignty and fails to convince the United States to adhere, along with 40 other signatory countries, to an agreement that has existed for more than 17 years, I seriously wonder what influence the government believes it has now to safeguard Canadian interests in the problem that concerns us at the present time.