

and that kind of propoganda is not going over any more. The province is finally smartening up.

I really enjoy these free enterprise arguments, because when we finally come to the point of doing something, we get to Syncrude. I look at the Syncrude project—I do not have a very complicated mind, that is fairly obvious—and I say—

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Indeed, you have a very simple mind.

Mr. Leggatt: I do not think that people who are complicated are necessarily right. But when I look at the Syncrude project, I remember that I used to represent small business when I practised law. I say that this must be like the corner drugstore. The guy is having trouble, he is bankrupt, what is he going to do? He does not seem to be able to sell his product. First of all, his product being drugs, it is harder to make and more expensive. The first thing he must do is to find a partner before he goes out of business. Whom should he find? What he needs is a government. The government is the best partner. But he does not want to sell his partner 50 per cent of the business. He wants control. So he sells him 15 per cent.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Which side are you representing?

Mr. Leggatt: There are certain conditions that this druggist really wants to impose. First of all, the other guys are charging a certain price for the product. What he says is: I need the government to make sure that I get a better price. That is easy to work out. We guarantee his price. Then he says: Those taxes are killing me, I cannot pay them. The response of the Minister of Finance and his friends is: "That is okay, we will fix you up on these taxes. All the other fellows will have to pay those taxes, but you will not need to pay them." The last thing he has to worry about is price. What will I sell this drugstore for, he asks. He says: "Look at my appraisal, John, and you will be fine." "Accept my price," he says. That is exactly what this government did. That is really the free enterprise situation.

Let me tell you, Madam Speaker, that that development is not free enterprise. It is the best demonstration you can find in this country of the bankruptcy of free enterprise. In five years' time we will look back at the Syncrude project and say: Gee, that is a lot like the Columbia River Treaty. Do hon. members remember the Columbia River Treaty when the Liberal government sat back idly in quiet consent while the government of B.C. went down the tubes for \$600 million? That is exactly the cost of that deal to the people of B.C., negotiated by a Social Credit and a Liberal government at that time.

There is a company now called the Great Canadian Oil Sands. They should retain their initials GCOS and call it the Great Canadian Oil Sell-Out, because that is what it is going to be.

There is one question we should ask ourselves about the tar sands. There is no question about the position of this party. If they are to be developed, they should be developed publicly. But I still think we should ask ourselves whether the tar sands should be developed at all. I do not

Income Tax

think enough members in this House have really taken a hard look at the question of the tar sands development in terms of the environmental effect that it will have. I remember very well the words in the Speech from the Throne, words which impressed me greatly:

Stemming the despoliation of our planet and returning our water, air and land to a more natural state are urgent and challenging goals.

How do you put those words into the context of the Syncrude development? The Syncrude development will be the largest strip mine in the world. It will create 13,000 tons of tar sand per hour. It will work on a hot water process creating 750 tons annually, twice as much as all the waste produced by all the mines in Canada. The tailing pond, as it is euphemistically called, is 9.3 square miles. We should call it a tailing ocean. The water in it will be highly toxic and covered with oil.

● (2100)

This project is going to create a serious threat to millions of waterfowl in the Peace-Athabasca delta. It has already been reported in a provincial civil service report that the sulphur dioxide can form a killer fog similar to the London fog which killed about 3,500 people.

Mr. Benjamin: How about Liberal fog?

Mr. Leggatt: Not only would the miners and workers be affected, but airborne SO₂ combining with surface water will form a lethal acid adversely affecting vegetation as far away as Saskatchewan. Anti-pollution technology is clearly not available for that project, and yet we are rushing ahead in a mad desire for another project, a mad desire for another development, and a mad desire for Liberal credibility in the province of Alberta where they have none.

It is interesting to look at the letter of the Minister of the Environment (Mrs. Sauvé) regarding this matter.

Mr. Anderson: Madam Speaker, may I address a question to the hon. member?

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Will the hon. member allow a question?

Mr. Leggatt: Yes, Madam Speaker.

Mr. Anderson: Madam Speaker, if the hon. member is concerned about pollution and about the environment, is it true that on the Qualicum River on Vancouver Island in British Columbia the NDP government is considering the building of a steel mill, on a river that is known for its salmon fishing and for salmon reproduction? Can the hon. member, although he is not a member of the provincial government, reply to the question regarding pollution in an area which will employ 5,000 people, which will bring in 30,000 people, and which will completely destroy the Qualicum River?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Shame.

Mr. Leggatt: I will think about it, but I must say I cannot see how it is related to the subject, nor quite frankly, do I know the answer to the hon. gentleman's question. I do know that charges laid under the pollution laws of British Columbia have tripled since the present