

WRITTEN REFLECTIONS: FYSM 1502.B

1. "Green activism: from consumer choice to climate justice"

Question: Do you support the Energy East Pipeline? Why or why not?

In my opinion I do not believe that the Energy East Pipeline is needed in Canada at the moment, so I therefore do not support the construction of this pipeline. The first reason why I do not support this pipeline is because as Jeff Rubin states the East Energy Pipeline is only being discussed because President Obama may not approve of the Keystone XL Pipeline, and as well the Enbridge Northern Gateway was opposed by first nation's people which did not allow for the pipeline to be constructed. This shows that Energy East is really only being established as a backup plan and was not the first major pipeline that Canada wanted to construct, which I believe means that Canada only wants to see an improvement in oil production and does not have any other solutions to strengthen its economy.

Also, there are many environmental issues that should factor into why this pipeline should not be established, the main reason is that this would be the largest pipeline to exist and it would consist of over 4,600 kilometers. This is bad in my opinion because parts of the pipeline will be close to rivers, such as the Rideau, which could be extremely detrimental to the river and area if something was to go wrong with this pipeline. As well, this means that the construction of this pipeline will need to add more pipes which further tears apart and destroys Canada's natural environment.

Although I do not support the Energy East Pipeline there are some points that do make me believe that this pipeline could be beneficial for Canada and should be constructed. This pipeline should be constructed because as Newman claims, Provinces do not have jurisdiction over the fate of the Energy East Pipeline, this is a decision that is under federal jurisdiction. This means that if the Federal Government believes that the Pipeline should be established then the Provincial Governments should not be able to delay or interfere with this project. Furthermore, Girling believes that building this pipeline gives the oil sands distributors access to global markets, which would allow them to gain profit and expand the production of oil in the global market that is produced by Canadian companies. I believe this point assures that this pipeline could make Canada an even more established and influential distributor of oil in the global market.

Even though there are valuable points as to the why Energy East project should be established, I still believe that it should not be constructed due to the fact that even if Canada constructs this pipeline, the gas prices would be jacked up by Energy East and

it would potentially curtail natural gas deliveries to the provinces during peaks of demand which would not be beneficial for Eastern Provinces nor the rest of Canada. As well, Rubin further states that right now with lower global prices in oil it indicates that refineries in the rest of the world are not scrambling to secure Alberta bitumen which means that even though this pipeline would give oil sands companies access to the global market it does not mean that they would be able to sell their product due to the current prices of oil. The final reason for why I am against the Energy East Pipeline is because the United States has more than enough oil to supply Eastern Canada which could ultimately be cheaper due to the current oil prices, rather than to create a new pipeline which would cost Canada billions to construct. Therefore, these are the reasons why I do not support the construction of the Energy East Pipeline.

=====

THESIS:

I **do** support the Energy East Pipeline because it gives money to the Canadian economy rather than to other economies, like the US, Saudi Arabia, or Algeria.

EVIDENCE:

It is stated by the Huffington Post that the US could totally supply Eastern Canada's oil. If Canada supplied the majority of its own oil, then the economy could be better off. I see no issue with Canada and the US exchanging oil, however, the US appears to be benefiting from this deal more than Canada is.

ANTITHESIS:

If Canada were to supply a majority its own oil, the Huffington Post said that the companies could raise the prices to 'during times of peak demand.' This is not fair to the Atlantic Provinces and that means that Alberta may become on bad terms with the Atlantic provinces for not better supporting them. The last thing anybody wants is to have the provinces of Canada fighting over oil and then rely on the US when we don't necessarily NEED to. There is also, of course, the environmental aspects of the pipeline. The ability to import foreign oil is occurring right now and it's not damaging our ecosystems. Canada is such a vast and beautiful country and to ruin that because of oil is disgusting.

SYNTHESIS:

My final thoughts on the Energy East Pipeline are mixed. However, as I am not an avid environmentalist, I would have to say I am for the Energy East Pipeline. I think it is a good idea for Canada's economy and Canada's oil companies to have the Energy East Pipeline in place.

SOURCES:

<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/industry-news/energy-and-resources/why-the-timing-isnt-right-for-transcanadas-energy-east-pipeline/article21422787/>

<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/transcanada-chief-slams-ludicrous-arguments-by-energy-east-opponents/article22233005/>

=====

Thesis: I do not support the Energy East pipeline due to the political, environmental and temporal effects that it will have on Canada if it is approved.

Evidence: The Energy East pipeline already has controversial implications on the political jurisdictions of both the provincial governments of the eastern provinces and the federal government. As Dwight Newman stated, "[provinces] have no constitutional basis to be making conditions, demands or anything else on this pipeline, and they play a dangerous game in attempting to do so." (Robitaille 2014)

Thus, any actions or attempts taken by the provinces to alter the current structure of the pipeline would be grounds for constitutional war between themselves and the federal government. In addition, because of these political and constitutional implications, any provincial law that opposes the pipeline is overridden by federal law that supports the pipeline. If the political and legal effects do not display the controversy and the potential conflicts that arise, the environmental effects argue the physical side of the pipeline.

The physical construction of the pipeline would inflict heavy consequences to the environment, disrupting local communities and natural ecosystems at a large scale across numerous provinces (Uechi 2014). In turn, this would affect the livelihoods of the local communities and potentially destroy even more of the meagre geographical and logistical provisions of the First Nations reserves.

Temporal effects also bombard the nation. "Timing... is everything and Energy East's is off on two fronts. First, U.S. oil production is now more than enough to supply Eastern Canadian refineries. Second, lower global oil prices indicate that refineries in the rest of the world aren't exactly scrambling to secure expensive Alberta bitumen either." (Rubin 2014) This means that Canada will have little to no economic benefit resulting from the Energy East pipeline, rendering the high-budget project essentially useless.

Antithesis: Organisers of the pipeline argue against the above thesis. Many of them are trying their best to explain the project to local communities, "engaged in making sure local leaders...understand what this project is all about." (Uechi 2014) They argue that jobs would be created in the creation of the pipeline, boosting and improving the health of Canada's economy. In legal terms, provincial law has been considered over federal law. "In *Ontario v. Canadian Pacific*, the federally regulated railway was held to be subject to the Ontario Environmental Protection Act with respect to smoke it caused by burning dead grass along its right-of-way." (Robitaille 2014). Thus, there is flexibility in terms of political and/or legal action taken by the provincial governments.

Synthesis: These arguments, however, are met with opposition. Sure, jobs would be created, but this pales in comparison to the overall economic picture. Even if jobs are created, the Energy East project, through bad timing, is useless because of its little to no additional economic benefit to Canada. In fact, it would act as a liability to Canada because of its insanely high budget, cancelling out all of the additional created jobs. Arguably, Canada should diversify its economy and encourage the growth of other economies that are sustainable and highly beneficial and healthy for the overall economy. The *Ontario v. Canadian Pacific* case was applicable to Ontario only; this pipeline involves multiple eastern provinces, each having different provincial laws pertaining to the environment. Therefore, the decision in *Ontario v. Canadian Pacific* may not be considered in the Energy East Pipeline due to the multitude of jurisdictions it encompasses.

Conclusion: The negative effects of the Energy East pipeline outweigh its positive effects, which resulted in my opposition to the project. There would be a ruthless constitutional battle between the provincial and federal governments, which would waste valuable time and damage relationships between these two levels of government. The physical placement of this pipeline will disrupt local communities and even destroy the already meagre livelihoods of the First Nations reserves. As the American oil market begins to boom, there is no need for the pipeline to be built, since it would only act as a liability to the Canadian economy. These elements warrant my opposition to the Energy East pipeline.

=====

Thesis:

I do not support the Energy East Pipeline simply because of the way the government is defining it. The government wants us, the citizens, to believe that this "project" is meant to solidify us more as a nation. When in actuality, this "project" was not even the initial

plan. It's almost the back-up plan to the back-up plan. I believe that Canada is hungry for its title as an independent country, more so economically, the government will do anything to achieve that goal.

Evidence:

The Keystone XL pipeline is failing to take root due to the US president's criticisms, therefore TransCanada is not able to get their desired pipeline to the US. They decided to develop a new project that can look beneficial to Canadian society by completely disregarding the Canadian society's perspectives.

By implying that this pipeline is meant to solidify us as a nation is redundant because the federal government will go far and beyond to get this project started, even though it means that they may break or disregard any provincial conditions or laws that are imposed onto companies to protect the citizens in which pipelines can pass to. The federal government's attitude does not support Canada as a 'unitary state'.

Anti-thesis:

The Energy East pipeline does and can represent Canada's independence. It is said to prevent motorists from depending on oil from Middle Eastern dictatorships and/or revolutionary regimes in South America. The pipeline is also meant to benefit gas shippers and reduce the spike in shipping tolls when there was less gas available.

Synthesis:

Sure the idea of removing the dependence that motorists have on the importation of oil from volatile countries is important, it is proven that Canada barely gets any of its oil from the countries they wish to protect us from. It is also proven that oil prices have dropped and will be dropping because of this project.

=====

I do support the Energy East Pipeline on the basis that it offers more benefits to society than risks. The Energy East Pipeline will most likely increase tax revenue; create a stronger economy, more jobs and more energy independence for Canada, according to TransCanada. The Energy East Pipeline helps Canada to not have to rely on importing oil from other places in the world, therefore helps us as a society to lower prices on gas, oil, heating, etc.

However, the Energy East Pipeline is controversial due to the risks it offers to the environment. Many people are concerned about the risks of oil spills, leaks, fracking, and in turn the consequences of these events. As well, since the Energy East Pipeline is interprovincial, it offers many legal issues, mainly surrounding jurisdiction.

Although there are valid concerns about the construction of this pipeline, there are more benefits offered than risks. As well, the TransCanada Company have also acknowledged the concerns and are taking precautions to make sure these concerns do not happen. Therefore, overall, the Energy East Pipeline is a project that should be supported in order to help our society to grow economically and independently.

=====

Oil has been a major export and import for Canada for decades now and has proved to help the economy in many way. Being able to produce our own oil from the Oil sands in Alberta benefits Canada not only with our economy but also with the world trade and the world economy. This being said the risk far outweigh the pros for this Energy East Pipeline project, and this is why I disagree with the project being done.

I disagree for many reasons, not because I am a huge environmentalist but because I am conscious of our environment and what happens to it, as well as our economy and what will become assets and what would become liabilities. Therefore the first reason I disagree with the Energy East Pipeline is because of the economic impact it could have on Canada. Being in Canada we are very lucky to produce our own oil like I stated in the aforementioned paragraph; this being said it also comes at a cost. The united states are one of our largest if not the largest trader with Canada and with the production of the new pipeline they would want us to sell our oil to them at a 30% discount. This could hurt the companies that are producing the oil because they aren't getting the full dollar value for their productions which means they could potentially be losing millions possibly billions of dollars to shareholders.

Not only that but with the oil prices being at the lowest point we have seen in decades at almost \$80 a barrel and could even be dropped as low as \$75 is it even worth spending \$12 billion to add the pipelines? I say this because although it won't shut down plants that produce oil because of the prices, it will drive their stocks down and force shareholder's to withdraw because they could make millions.

With all of that said TransCanada still has firm beliefs that the 12 billion dollar project will benefit Canadian and so do many of the miners who have sought after the movement of the oil to New Brunswick. They are still pushing for the government to

pass the project so they can start drilling and adding the new pipelines which is expected to start in early 2016. Yet with all of that happening they are still facing major road blocks from people in parts of Quebec and across the other countries. The project could affect major habitats across the provinces they wish to drill on. In Ottawa they want to drill where there are major populations which is not making their fight any easier because about 15000 residents in that area and surrounding areas are worried about the health implications that the drilling will have as well as the damage done to the surrounding environments. As well you have to look at the affect it will have on aboriginals and their land because they want to drill on their land which would cause major turmoil between them and the peoples living there.

In conclusion and based on the evidence shown in the readings assigned to us I feel even more strongly that pursuing this project is not in Canada's best interest as of yet and if we continue to push for the Energy East Pipeline to be put in place it will cause major turmoil amongst Canadians across Canada.

=====

Thesis: I do not support the Energy East pipeline as it is incentivized by market-driven values, discouraging costs, and it poses a great threat to the land, wildlife, and human health.

Evidence: Firstly, the project is ran by market-driven values. For example, when referring to the oil companies Marie Adams said, "All they see is...money going up, up, up, while our waters are going down, down, down (*Quiet No More*, pg. 68). With this as their incentive it is no reason one would have difficulty supporting the pipeline.

Another reason I would not support the pipeline, especially at this moment in time, is due to the declining cost of oil. For instance, the project is estimated to cost \$12 billion, however the cost of oil is on the decline according to Goldman Sachs. This is surely another reason it's difficult to support the project as there is a risk of not being able to cover producer costs and receive a reasonable rate of return (*Jeff Rubin, Globe and Mail*). Finally, not only is there a risk of not being able to profit from the pipeline, but there is a risk of endangering the environment, wildlife, and human health. Alberta farmland risks contamination, Quebec terminals risk endangering the marine life, and finally

human health is threatened in Fort Chipewyan due to heightened cancers from water contamination (*Jeff Lewis; Joel Harden*). What more would anyone need to be convinced that this project is one that should not be supported?

Antithesis: Although there are many risks in following through with the Energy East pipeline, supporting the project would mean greater independence and nation building, as well as maintaining our role as beneficiaries of cheap fossil fuels. First, the pipeline would create a more unified, independent nation. For example, currently we rely on oil suppliers from overseas and the U.S., but by implementing the pipeline our country will be able to support ourselves in oil, as well as jobs stemming from the pipeline (*Jeff Rubin*). Another reason for supporting the Energy East pipeline is to avoid an impossible fight. According to Bill McKibben, “since all of us are in some way beneficiaries of cheap fossil fuels, tackling climate change [and similarly the pipeline] has been like trying to build a movement against yourself (*Quiet No More*, pg.60).” In other words, the pipeline will support our economy, as well as our current lifestyle habits.

Synthesis: Although there are obvious benefits to the pipeline, the drawbacks far outweigh the incentives to follow through with the project as we would be jeopardizing our economy and our ecosystem.

=====

Thesis

I do not support the Energy East Pipeline because its risks greatly outweigh its benefits. The Energy East Pipeline project involves converting an existing natural gas pipeline to an oil transportation pipeline and constructing a new pipeline in Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick to link up with the converted pipeline (NEB). Many say that the Energy East Pipeline was only proposed because of the Keystone XL Pipeline was delayed (Rubin, 2014; Uechi, 2014). Many Green activists oppose the pipeline because of the negative effects it may have on the environment and to the people being affected. Some also say that perhaps building the pipeline might not even be that necessary at this time.

Evidence

It is important to ask whether refiners around the world as well as those in Eastern Canada would want or even need Alberta Bitumen. Oil prices have dropped to around \$80 a barrel and the deals that Energy East has with its suppliers only matter if the price of oil around the world is high enough to provide economic incentive to continue with the project. Right now, there is more than enough oil production in the US to supply refineries in Eastern Canada and the low global oil prices suggest that refineries around the world are not necessarily in need of expensive Alberta bitumen (Rubin, 2014). Aside from being unnecessary, the Energy East Pipeline also poses threats, which includes oil spills, water pollution, contamination of farmland, and contribution to climate change (Uechi, 2014).

Antithesis

Although the pipeline poses risks, it may have some benefits. Building the pipeline allows Alberta and Saskatchewan to transport their oil to the market (Newman, 2014). This will also create more jobs, boost tax bases of municipalities, deliver Canadian energy from East to West, which means we would no longer have to rely on import oil from foreign sources like Saudi Arabia or Nigeria (Uechi, 2014). According to TransCanada, Energy East would also benefit gas shippers by removing under-used export capacity from the main line's rate base (Lewis, 2014). Aside from having benefits, some argue that the provinces will not be able to interfere with the pipeline plans because exclusive jurisdiction lies within the federal government. In the case of *Campbell-Bennet v. Comstock Midwestern*, the provinces cannot interfere with interprovincial pipelines. This means that the final decision on the pipeline belongs to the Federal government and those provinces affected cannot really interfere (Robitaille, 2014; Newman, 2014). Furthermore, the President of the AFL-CIO, a common voice for US-based unions, says that the pipeline could be built while meeting environmental standards. It can be done in an environmental way and still create more jobs for people (Harden, 2013).

Synthesis

Although the provinces cannot interfere with the passage of pipelines, they can impose conditions on the companies to respect environment laws and the health of the community. They can make sure that these companies take special precautions (Robitaille, 2014). However, if people knew more about climate change, they would know that even while taking precautions, there is no acceptable or environmental way to facilitate the pipelines. The Fort Chipewyan First Nation, who live close to the tar sands have seen heightened cancers, ruined ecosystems, and destroyed livelihoods due to the development of the tar sands. Approval of the pipelines is directly connected the

expansion of the tar sands and according to Allan Adam, the Chief of the Fort Chipewyan First Nation, this destroys eco-systems that are essential to the continuation of the treaty rights of the Fort Chipewyan First Nation and can also greatly contribute to climate change. The pipelines can affect everyone greatly in the long run. It can destroy the earth, water, air, and our other means of survival (Harden, 2013). Having a few thousand jobs and being able to transport oil does not outweigh the risk of destroying the planet and leaving nothing for the next generation. Therefore, this is why I do not agree with the Energy East Pipeline.

=====

I do Support the energy east pipeline. I believe it is a crucial example of a way Canada can make a meaningful impact on the economy of the country in a positive way.

The eastern provinces are crucial to this process. Oil at mass numbers (1.1 million barrels a day) can be sent from the plants in Alberta all the way to the coast and loaded into tankers. Therefore these tankers can take these mass amounts of oil to foreign land and increasing our national economy doing so.

The negative impact would be where the pipe specifically runs through. Some people have concerns that the environment will totally be ruined by these pipes however this is not the case. Most of the pipe is already in place in Ontario and Quebec and therefore there would only need to be a connection from the west to this pipe and from this pipe to the east.

In conclusion, i believe the pipe greatly benefits the country and should be implemented.

=====

The Energy East Pipeline is a project that was proposed by TransCanada on October 30, 2014. This project plans on "Converting the existing natural gas pipeline to an oil transportation pipeline." The pipeline will be using the old existing mainstream gas pipeline and will be adding new ones to it in the following provinces: Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Eastern Ontario, Quebec, and New Brunswick. The National Energy Board has been given the task of reviewing the project and to decide whether or

not it should be given permission to go forth (National Energy Board). There are two polar opposite sides on the arguments of the pipeline- one where the pipeline should be built as it would bring economic prosperity and stability and the other where the pipeline will only cause more problems, particularly environmental ones. Personally, I am with the latter. The Energy East Pipeline should not be built as the consequences will be result in being more than bargained for.

The Energy East Pipeline project is a \$12 billion dollar project that is not all that it seems. What is portrayed to be a way of reducing Canada's dependence on imported oil from foreign producers such as Saudi Arabia, Algeria, Nigeria, and Venezuela, is really just a way of improving "economics [rather] than...nation building" (Rubin 2014). TransCanada is portraying the Energy East Pipeline as a way to "put the country's energy profile on a safer footing" (Rubin 2014). Also, despite the fact that the company has secured bitumen producers for the pipeline, the deals are upheld only as long as global oil prices are high enough to continue to provide incentive to continue expanding oil sands production. If it is not, the deal will fall and bitumen will no longer be supplied to the pipeline. Also, a lot of the oil that the country gets currently comes from the United States, which is enough to continue to supply Eastern Canadian refineries. So the question comes up of why do we even need such a pipeline? These are just a lot of risks to take for something that is not even in need at the moment (Rubin 2014). In addition to the false promotion of the project, there is also the negative

environmental effects that result from such a development. Within the city of Ottawa, 90% of city candidates stated that they would oppose the pipeline if it were to pose a threat to their communities (Uechi 2014). If this project were to go forth, it could have similar effects as the Keystone XL pipeline did on various communities, particularly Aboriginal communities. "The Fort Chipewyan First Nation...have seen heightened cancers, ruined ecosystems, and destroyed livelihoods" (Harden 67). The chief of the Fort Chipewyan First Nation, Allan Adam, said the following, "*Expansion of the tar sands means a death sentence for our way of life, destruction of eco-systems vital to the continuation of our inherent treaty rights and massive contributions to catastrophic global climate change, a fate we all share*" (Harden 68). The government is already on treacherous grounds with the Aboriginals, a step such as this could put any chance of true peace among the two groups. The pipeline may be economically prosperous, but are the environmental costs something the government is willing to pay?

However, are all these allegations against the Energy East Pipeline truly warranted? According to Russ Girling, the TransCanada chief executive, all these accusations as "'ludicrous' with no basis in fact." Mr. Girling has also said that "having multiple export terminals for the project is a 'luxury, not an imperative.'" The Energy East pipeline would also bring a of benefits to the country such as increasing the tax base, creating jobs, delivering Canada energy in a safe way, and it eliminates the need to import oil from foreign countries (Uechi 2014). So the economic benefits may be

realized, but what about the environment and how it will be effected by the pipeline?

Well, even without the Energy East Pipeline, our environment is deteriorating as it is.

The curbing of this project is not really going to cause any significant difference in stopping things like climate change. There is also the fact that the provinces of Quebec and Ontario have placed conditions to be met to ensure that if the pipeline goes through the safety of the communities and its citizens is maintained. These conditions, however, is no outright opposition and shows that the pipeline should not just be cast out.

Yes, the world will still continue to deteriorate but allowing such a project to go through sets a precedence for others alike and the world (in this case Canada) will break down at an increased pace. If something is not done, such projects could affect many lives and ecosystems at the cost of a project we currently do not even need. This is not only a concern for the people of this generation but the generations after. If we continue to destroy our earth, what will our future generations have to survive: *“There’s a saying that only when the last tree is chopped down, and only when the last fish is caught, and only when the last river is poisoned, only then will they know that money can’t be eaten”* (Harden 68-69). Also, regarding the fact that there are conditions placed by the a couple of the provinces, there are arguments going around that these conditions should not even be taken into consideration as it is not within their jurisdiction (Newman 2014). If such a thing were to happen, then there is nothing there to protect people from the negative effects of the pipeline. The National Energy Board has a big job this year. They must

consider all sides of the argument and be sure not to just look at the infrastructure of the project. If they fail to do so, the country will face a \$12 billion dollar project that may end up having a much larger price than money.

=====

I do not support the new proposed pipeline because of a few different reasons. How do we know that safety for communities and the environment is going to be a priority when in the Globe and Mail piece (by Jeff Lewis) Mr Girdling is quoted saying "having many export terminals is a luxury and not imperative". How can we, as residents of communities and provinces involved in the pipeline, be confident that safety is the number one priority and not just trying to pump out as much oil as possible. One argument could be that Canada needs to be exporting oil off-shore because that way we will be making the most amount of money possible and encouraging This is because USA can buy Canadian oil but at a cheaper price than the rest of the world market would buy it for as the US has begun extracting oil at a higher and more efficient rate leaving them less dependable on our oil reserves. However, the method that is used in southern states is fracking, through this process its resources will deplete far quicker than the tar sands, so in the future maybe the USA will again be needing to purchase Canadian oil to ship to it's refineries. The possibility of the Keystone pipeline then seems more economical purely in that sense. Realistically the pipeline is going to pump out so much oil that our refineries, of whom are already being provided oil from the US

(as Jeff Rubin states in his article in the Globe and Mail), excessive surplus will be exported. I can say with confidence the Northern gateway will not be built, BC won't let that happen and the goal of Northern Gateway is to export oil so they will use Energy East to fulfill this goal. Will the pipeline improve our economy and encourage big business with the worlds super powers like China and other nations? Sure, but how sustainable and reliable is this massive source of income in a time when developed countries are actively pursuing alternate energy solutions. I do not believe the risks and loss of natural resources would outweigh the business it could bring to Canada.

=====

I do not support the Energy East Pipeline. I don't support the pipeline for several reasons, one of which is the cost. Twelve billion dollars is a lot of money to put into a project that will more than likely have issues throughout, leading it to cost more money and that means that tax payers will pay more. Also, there are two other pipelines in the works such as the Keystone XL and Enbridges Northern Gateway pipelines. If Keystone XL is being put on hold by the Americans and Enbridge is in contention with first nations and environmental groups, why is a third pipeline being pushed on Canadians? For starters, Trans Canada says that the pipeline will allow Canadian oil to displace foreign barrels in eastern refineries , a substitution which will put Canada's energy profile on safer footing. However, the article goes on to state that Saudi Arabia produces less than 8%, Algeria less than 5%, Nigeria less than 1% and Venezuela 0% of Eastern Canada's oil imports. Eastern Canada is supplied by imported oil from the USA, which Trans Canada is most definitely aware of.

Oil prices also need to be high enough to provide economic incentive to continue expanding the oil sands, if crude prices don't cover the cost of producer costs and have a reasonable return rate then the oil system doesn't work effectively, making the timing of creating another pipeline a bad choice. The amount of oil imported from the US is enough to support the refineries in Eastern Canada and right now, refineries aren't looking for Alberta oil.

What about the overall concern for harm/ damage to the environment? Even here in Ottawa, 90% of city council is opposed to the pipeline if it will cause detrimental harm to the their communities. There are major risks involved with this and it has residents concerned about the potential risks (oil spill, water quality, property value, contaminated farmland, climate change and the economy). However, even if Ontario completely opposed this, it wouldn't matter because the six provinces where pipelines would be built don't really get a say because it interferes with inter-provincial transportation therefore, they have no jurisdiction.

In some ways the Energy East Pipeline would be useful as it would create jobs throughout the provinces involved in the construction of the pipeline. As well as being able to slow the constant import of American oil. Besides that, I don't really see the benefit to the pipeline.

Canadians need more convincing on why this is a good thing for Canada when we know that there are two other pipeline also in motion. Trans Canada should be a little more concerned about the people and things that will be displaced by this, and the harm that it may cause to them. The Energy East Pipeline simply does not have the necessities that it needs to be successful at this time, the price and time just isn't right.

=====

I do not support the energy east pipeline for a number of reasons. The main reason that I will be discussing is that I would hope that Canada would be focusing \$12-million on a renewable energy source, rather than fossil fuel. With that said, I understand that we need to make sacrifices in the name of progress.

This story could be compared to the Canadian Pacific railway built in the 1970's. A lot of people were opposed to it and lives were sacrificed in the name of progress, but there is no argument that it made Canada into the thriving country it is. In contrast, the case of the pipeline would not necessarily bring progress.

Arguments about timing and Canada's possible dependance of the middle east for oil aside, the pipeline seems like a lot of money to be spending on something that may not even really be "progress". Jeff Rubin states that even financially this may not be the best option for Canada. I believe Canada could find a much better project to fund \$12-million, and in a perfect world, perhaps something that wont go obsolete.

=====

Although there are both pros and cons to the suggested pipeline, I do not support the Energy East pipeline.

One of the reasons I do not support the pipeline is that it claims that the addition of this pipeline is a way for a safer footing within the economy. However, as Rubin states in his article for the Globe and Mail, the bulk of our oil is coming from the states, not from far away foreign countries. Also, neither Quebec or New Brunswick really want the pipeline as they get enough from the oil from the states on rail. Another reason as to why I don't support the pipeline is that they claim to be freeing motorists in Eastern Canada, however as stated in a couple articles, the original plan was to go to the states and then to go to Western Canada. Therefore, it seems that they don't really care who takes it and thus don't care how they win, but that they win.

However, there are a few reasons that support of the pipeline does make sense. One reason is that the pipeline would be faster than the current transportation of oil through the use of railways. Where the legal side of the pipeline comes in is another wavering point. Each province itself cannot interfere with transportation of interprovincial items, such as this pipeline, or else it would be unconstitutional and interfering on a federal level.

Although the legal side of it being unconstitutional for the provinces to interfere on a federal level, they are able to act within their province allowing them to protect their own communities. As well as the speed of transportation issue, I still do not support the Energy East Pipeline. Many citizens are concerned about the impact the pipeline would have on the water supply, the property values and potential to contaminate surrounding farmlands. Finally, as stated in the Vancouver Observer article, the government seems to stack the books and the odds in favour of large companies, which occurs in not only this aspect but many others.