

# Letters from Here and There

## Endorsement was good

Jan. 28, 1977

Dear Sir:

Your editorial (Jan. 19th) on the gasoline supporting the Northwest route was well received. I, too, feel this route is preferable as it would use existing right of ways and tie into existing pipelines in Canada and deliver gas to the Midwest. The Arctic Gas route would cross the calving grounds of the Porcupine Caribou herd with probable drastic results. The El Paso route would have many disadvantages as you point out and would be economically (cost-ratio benefits) and environmentally the poorest choice.

I do wish to point out that you are wrong in saying that the conservationist elements are special interest groups which often have little respect for the Native subsistence life styles nor for the property rights of the original Canadian and Alaskan Native landlords.

The Alaska Coalition (of Alaskan and national environmental groups) has worked long on the subsistence issue and feels that subsistence should be protected strongly and has incorporated these feelings in the recent D-2 Bill (HR-39) submitted to the U.S. House of Representatives by Rep. Udall. We feel that the highest priority is maintenance of wild-life species (as caribou) which obviously requires protection of the land in vast areas. Next in priority is protecting subsistence.

I do feel the Arctic gas route would jeopardize subsistence lifestyles of Alaskan and Canadian Arctic peoples.

Sincerely,

Mike Holloway  
Chairperson  
Executive Committee  
Alaska Chapter/  
Sierra Club

## Endorsement was bad

January 24, 1977

Dear Sir:

We were sorry to read your recent editorial in which you came out in support of an Alcan gas line route as the best compromise between the Arctic Gas route through Canada and the Trans-Alaska line.

To abandon support for the trans-Alaska line in favor of the Alcan route is jumping out of the frying pan into the fire. The Alcan proposal was scathingly condemned by the Federal Power Commission in November. It is neither logical nor reasonable to argue that because of the FPC staff favored the Arctic Gas route over the trans-Alaska project that we should switch our support to the Alcan line, which the FPC liked even less. We agree that the environmental problems that the Arctic Gas route suffers should

be lethal, but this is no way the case for the trans-Alaska line...

We are also afraid that your editorial has done a disservice to regional corporations south of the Alaska Range which would... be left out in the cold by an Alcan route. We know of one corporation which has arranged for the use of 1,200 acres of land..for a terminal site for the gas line.

Land claims for Yukon Indians have not been resolved. As a result of the many divergent views in Canada, we in Alaska should be hesitant about

trying to commit Canadians to policies before the Canadians have had a chance to decide for themselves.

Speaking for Alaskans, however, it is clear that if we fragment support in Alaska between the trans-Alaska and the Alcan proposals we are only guaranteeing the final success of the Arctic Gas line.

Sincerely yours,

Benjamin F. Harding  
Community Relations  
Director  
OMAR