

Northern Pipeline

Dempster spur. There has been no environmental impact study on the Dempster spur.

Environmentalists in the Yukon say that the Porcupine caribou herd will be in real jeopardy if the Dempster spur is proceeded with because it will interfere with the calving ground. In that very sensitive northern ecology, one of the most fantastic purposes of nature and great natural assets of Canada is the Porcupine herd. I hope every one in this House will have a chance to see it by air, but not during calving time because there must be no interference with that herd. If the line is brought down from the Mackenzie on the Dempster spur, there is a real chance of that herd damaged.

Mr. Nielsen: No, no!

Mr. Leggatt: The hon. member for Yukon does not agree. However, there are many people in his constituency who are very sensitive to this problem who do agree.

Mr. Nielsen: The calving grounds are too far west of the line.

Mr. Leggatt: In any event, we should certainly have a meaningful environmental study of the Dempster spur before the pig in the poke connection up to Dawson.

Mr. Nielsen: Pig in the pipe.

Mr. Leggatt: There is something which makes the risk to the caribou herd much less, that is, the amount of gas now being found in Alberta. If you examine the figures, you see that the chance of tying into the Mackenzie gas is now much more remote. Therefore that aspect of the bill is bad. It is a nothing part of the bill. Let us not get excited because we had some participation in terms of the spur up to Dawson as a part of the over-all bill.

I believe in going back to what we are trying to accomplish, which is basically three things. We are trying to create jobs in Canada for Canadians. We are trying to create purchasing power in terms of the materials for the line. We are trying to co-operate with our American neighbours to assist them in carrying their natural gas resource to the American market.

We have failed on the question of jobs. That has been dealt with extensively, therefore I will not go into great detail on it. However, if we get 90 per cent of the jobs, that is 10 per cent too few. If we get 90 per cent of the materials, that is 10 per cent too little. There is no reason why it should not be 100 per cent.

The minister is certain we will not get any part of the American section. That is clear from these estimates. The minister shakes his head. He is not sure. Let me give an example of what is occurring.

When the Americans built their pipeline, the pipe-laying machinery was bought. It is now in place in Alaska. It has been paid for as a result of the Alaskan line. Canadian competition is now being asked to amortize new equipment in order to compete in terms of bids.

[Mr. Leggatt.]

If the minister talked to small contractors who are seeking small units for this line, they would tell him that there is no competition in this game. We are starting off with a handicap. The American taxpayer has paid for their equipment. It is on site. The equipment is owned by the Americans. Canadians are being asked to come in and capitalize that equipment from day one.

I am assured that the equipment in place is in excellent condition and ready to roll, for the Americans, not the Canadians. This is the kind of deal we have gotten into. Nobody is as sharp a trader as the Yankee trader. This government has again been out-traded and out-bought. We have wound up with not merely a pig in the poke, but with a sell-out.

An hon. Member: What about the Columbia River?

Mr. Leggatt: Someone mentions the Columbia River. The minister does not want that mentioned. He does not want to be reminded of the fantastic amount that has gone down the tube as a result of the Columbia River treaty. The Social Credit government in British Columbia is still trying to cover up. They are totally ashamed of what was done by their ancestor, the W.A.C. Bennett government. The federal Liberal government was responsible for a massive sellout on the resources of the Columbia River.

That is typical of the bargaining that has gone on by our Canadian representatives in terms of Canada-U.S. negotiations. Our typical negotiating stance is feet up, and on our back. The minister will say it is easy for us to stand up in the House and make these statements because we do not have the responsibility. However, one need only look at the record. The record of Canada-U.S. negotiations is bad. The auto-pact is one example.

Let us look where we are going with regard to sea boundaries. We have already offered to take a territorial boundary near the constituency of the hon. member for Yukon, the Dixon AB line. We have offered to give six miles of our territorial water. That boundary was set by the Alaska boundary tribunal in 1903 as the territorial boundary of Canada. We are not talking about boundary extensions, we are talking about Canadian territory. I did not notice the Canadian representatives asking the United States to shift the Strait of Juan de Fuca boundary six miles south, but we are always ready to be accommodating and always ready to compromise. Unless we learn to be independent, to be sovereign and tough in our international negotiations, this will be only one of a continuing series of sell-outs for Canadians.

● (1722)

I am disappointed that we did not get a good deal out of this. This party was the first to appreciate that the Mackenzie valley route was a mistake and it was the first to look at the environmental consequences of the Alaska Highway. I am not saying that the Alaska Highway is not good environmentally, because I believe it is and I think the environmental damage in that area can be reduced to a minimum. I am not satisfied