

have a very great effect on the Old Crow Indian people in the Yukon territory. They are completely self-sufficient today as hunters and trappers. Unless we are absolutely satisfied that this route will have no effect on their future habitat, I think the only alternative is to make an adjustment so far as the Alaska wildlife reserve is concerned.

To a northerner and to a Canadian these pipelines can set the tone of prosperity in Canada in the 1970s. We hear these astronomical figures of \$5 billion, \$6 billion or \$7 billion for the construction. When you take into account the amount of pipe, the use of transportation and the volume of employment during the construction phase, you see what this will do for our Canadian economy. I believe that at this stage the Canadian government holds all the cards that they need to ensure that Canada get a fair deal from whatever develops as the result of the construction of one line or both.

I know that the feeling is that we want to have as much Canadian participation as possible, not only in the financing of the pipeline but in its construction, the use of materials, supplies and the employment of men. So I would like to think that these problems can shortly be resolved to the satisfaction of all concerned, to the satisfaction of the people who require the oil and gas, to the satisfaction of the people whose lives will be affected by whatever route is taken and to the satisfaction of the Canadian people generally. We must ensure that Canadians get the full benefit from a development of this magnitude.

In conclusion I want to speak again about our native people in northern Canada and reiterate what I said earlier, that no effort is too great on the part of industry and government working in unison to ensure that our people understand what is happening to them, understand the meaning of these massive machines that will be cutting across their land, understand that this will not necessarily change their way of life and that they can continue in their old ways and still have new and developing functions taking place around them without interfering with their normal ways. We must ensure that when this project moves on there is complete and total involvement in the job so far as our northern people are concerned. The ministers have already indicated their determination to see that this is carried out and I am convinced that we can accept what they have said, because the results are already starting to show.

**Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West):** There is not much time left, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to speak briefly on this rather important motion which is before the House. Most of all I would like to address myself to the amendment which was moved by our party. The amendment was that we add to the motion the following words:

—with a view to developing under public ownership a transport system for oil and gas which will best serve the long term interest of the Canadian economy.

A number of those who have spoken in the debate have indicated that they feel the type of amendment

### *Trans-Alaska Pipeline*

offered by our group does not seem to fit into this picture very well. I could not disagree more with the government members, the official opposition or those who are opposed to the Canadian pipeline. If it comes from the north and is a common carrier, it should be publicly-owned. We should control this common carrier which will bring the great wealth of northern Canada to this part of the world. What is wrong with that? Here we have a clearcut issue of Canadian ownership and we challenge the government and members of the House on this issue.

**Mr. Greene:** Would you raise taxes to pay for it?

**Mr. Harding:** If we are to have a pipeline bringing not only U.S. gas and oil to Canada and to the U.S. but a common carrier that I hope will be bringing vast amounts of Canadian gas and oil from the north, then this is a stand which we must take—and we must take it this year. The government must be prepared to see that we have the pipeline Canadian-owned and controlled.

● (4:50 p.m.)

We will not drop this issue, Mr. Speaker. If we must have a pipeline down the Mackenzie—and there will be some sacrifice involved so far as our ecology is concerned—it is the people of Canada who should benefit. We must put our reserves into this project. Even if it costs \$2 billion or \$3 billion to construct, within 20 years that would be paid off in the dividends it would yield to the people of this nation. This is something we cannot afford to overlook at this stage. That is the first point with which I wanted to deal.

I am opposed to a tanker route down the west coast of British Columbia. I realize we cannot stop the Americans from taking oil from Prudhoe Bay to Valdez and shipping it down the coast; and we must not forget that even if the oil were not transported in that manner, oil would still reach the Cherry Point refinery. That refinery is already being built. The tragedy of it all is that it will be almost as dangerous to ship oil from California to the refinery as to ship oil from Alaska to it. However, the difference is that there would be 50 billion barrels less oil going down the west coast.

I endorse the position taken by several hon. members in the debate, that we have not done enough research on pipeline routes and that the government must be prepared to undertake immediate extensive research on all such routes. We must be assured of the best possible route for Canadian interests. Just a few years ago one of the most important debates that ever took place in this House concerned the Columbia River treaty. What happened in the case of the Columbia? We went to the bargaining table with the Americans thinking we had all kinds of cards in our hands. We thought we obtained a top-notch deal from the Americans. Now, looking at the effect of the treaty on Canada, we see it was one of the biggest "rides" we were taken for in our lifetime. We sold the whole of the water of an important riverway to the Americans for next to nothing.

Now we are going to the bargaining table with the Americans again—and we have even fewer cards in our