

*Northern Pipeline***GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[English]

NORTHERN PIPELINE ACTESTABLISHMENT OF AGENCY TO SUPERVISE PIPELINE
CONSTRUCTION

The House resumed, from Wednesday, February 22, consideration of the motion of Mr. MacEachen that Bill C-25, to establish the Northern Pipeline Agency, to facilitate the planning and construction of a pipeline for the transmission of natural gas from Alaska and northern Canada and to give effect to an agreement between Canada and the United States of America on principles applicable to such a pipeline and to amend certain Acts in relation thereto, be read the second time and referred to the special committee on a northern gas pipeline.

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, in speaking on this bill this afternoon I want to outline as clearly as I possibly can the reasons why my colleagues and myself cannot accept this legislation in its present form.

The New Democratic Party has an interest in this project. We were the first political party in Canada to talk about the Alcan pipeline as being the most desirable in principle, if and when we developed the means of facilitating our American neighbours and thereby transporting American gas from Alaska to their southern markets. And, coincidentally we could provide a facility to be used in the future for transporting Canadian energy reserves from our north to the south as well.

A year ago this month the New Democratic Party said that, of all the proposals under consideration, the Alcan proposal made the most sense. The Arctic Gas proposal and the El Paso proposal had very formidable arguments to be made against them. I will not repeat those arguments now. The Alcan route, if properly implemented, had some significant advantages. It would provide for the future possibility of bringing Canadian gas to Canadian markets and thus meet Canadian needs. It was, in comparison with the other alternatives, much more desirable in terms of coping with serious issues, including native rights and environmental concerns.

This particular proposal had major benefits for the United States, and I wish to stress that. Members of my party, as with all members of the House, believe it is a normal duty for a neighbour to facilitate another neighbour whenever possible. Therefore we were entirely sympathetic toward the development of the best means, from a Canadian point of view, to aid our American neighbours in getting gas to their markets.

Before I reach the substantive benefits for Canada in this Alcan proposal I want to make it clear that this route has, as its overwhelming purpose, benefits for the United States. We should not forget that. In deciding on the Alcan route we were of course making it possible for the Americans to bring their gas from the north to the south. More particularly, in comparison to the alternatives open to the Americans, the Alcan route is some \$6 billion cheaper than the El Paso route would have

been. In comparison with the Arctic gas route it is an even greater saving for the Americans. Therefore there is a major financial advantage of some \$6 billion accruing to the Americans because of this proposal. By using the Alcan route the Americans will avoid a major environmental hazard of significant proportions which would have existed had they chosen the El Paso route, and which would have been inflicted upon the west coast of the United States. In choosing the Alcan route we head off that serious concern in terms of human decency and in terms of financial cost for our American neighbours.

This Alcan proposal meets with the central recommendation of the American department of defence. That department was strongly in favour of a continental route, and strongly in favour of ensuring that gas from Alaska was transported to the United States by means of a route which would have the minimum security risk in the event of a war. Obviously to send gas by tankers via the west coast, would leave their energy lines far more vulnerable to attack.

There are four important considerations to the Alcan proposal which we are debating today, and have been debating for some days, which meet American requirements. They obtain gas, it saves them \$6 billion, removes an environmental risk, and it meets their military requirements; all very substantial indeed.

What are we going to get out of it as a country? About the only benefit of significance that will accrue to the people of Canada from the Alcan proposal is jobs, jobs that would accrue in the manufacturing of the pipe, in the manufacturing of steel, and jobs that would accrue on the construction site itself. In terms of these implications it is not simply Stelco, Welland, and Ipsco in Regina, it is also the other part of the steel industry in Hamilton, and in Sydney, Nova Scotia, and a component industry in Port Coquitlam in British Columbia which would benefit. In other words, if Canada received what my party believes it should receive as a minimum, that is, the guarantee of labour needed to produce the steel, the labour needed to construct the pipeline for all of the portion of the pipeline in Canada, then the benefits would have been substantial. It would also have a beneficial effect on most of the provinces right across the country, directly and indirectly.

When the Deputy Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. MacEachen) reported last September 9, after negotiations with the United States, that the Government of Canada had agreed on the Alcan route, on behalf of my colleagues I said, and said with pleasure, that I agreed to the proposal that it would produce a substantial number of jobs, as it was described by the Deputy Prime Minister. He assured us at that time, and had statistics to prove it, that the minimum Canadians would get from this project would be 100,000 man-years in jobs. Well, that is a lot of jobs, particularly at a time when a million and half in real numbers are unemployed.

Almost within days of this announcement doubts began to be raised concerning the credibility of the minister's promises. I repeat the minister did not say that we might get, we could get, or if possible we should get 100,000 man-years; he said

[Mr. Speaker.]