

Northern Pipeline

available in its entirety we might find that it contained an explanation. Clearly, it demands one. This study was referred to during the question period a few minutes ago. It is not a simple statement. It is headed "Estimates of Canadian Man-Hours Related to Pipeline Construction." It refers to the joint project and is broken down into the construction phase, engineering, project management, transportation and related services, and so on. There is also a separate item for the manufacturing phase, and the total number of man-years estimated is 69,078. It is common knowledge that if the Dempster link is not built, a reduction of about one third is to be expected which reduces the number of man-years according to this still secret study to about 47,000. I hardly need point out to the Deputy Prime Minister that this is less than one half of the estimate he has been giving the country for some months.

An Ottawa columnist, Mr. Richard Gwyn, recently published an article disclosing that a further study exists with respect to Canadian content. This was carried out by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. Noting that the figure 100,000 man-years is based on the assumption of 90 per cent Canadian content, Mr. Gwyn cites this study as saying Canadian content could be as low as 67 per cent. The author quotes the study as follows: "Unless there are more effective controls to ensure Canadian content this 67 per cent may be the more realistic projection." The Deputy Prime Minister has told us he does not intend to get into debate about what might happen upon the basis of the worst possible assumptions. But if this study, which remains unavailable, is correct, then the estimate of 90 per cent content being equal to 100,000 man-years for both Alcan and Dempster is just not realistic.

A further cause for concern are the words "unless there are more effective controls to ensure Canadian content—" What do these words really mean? Do they mean that a government department believes the controls are not effective and that some officials in government are concerned that in the absence of more effective controls—we do not know their nature—pressures will build up to by-pass Canadian content during the construction period? Again, this situation should be clarified to the satisfaction of parliament and of the labour movement during this debate.

Then again, the question must be asked: will the Dempster line be built? As of today its construction does not seem to be completely assured. According to the press the Department of Energy said recently that Canada has enough gas in the south to meet all its needs into the middle of 1990-2000. What is the government's response to this assertion? What is the position of the government on the likelihood of the Dempster link being built in the coming years? Obviously this is important because, as I have pointed out, without the Dempster link the estimate of the 100,000 man-years, even if accurately based, drops by 30,000.

There is a third important consideration. Assurances must be given by the government that its own department of manpower has under way, or will have in place in time, an adequate training program. At present there is considerable confidence that the principal unions involved can supply the

manpower needed now to be sure of maximum Canadian labour content. We want to know that the present capacity will in fact be available in 1980 and throughout subsequent construction years. I might add that inquiries of the Department of Manpower by my office and myself have not resulted in any information on this point. We understand that certain training programs in the field of skilled work on pipelines have been in place for sometime but, as far as I can determine, nothing is in place specifically for the Alcan pipeline project.

The Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Cullen), in a speech reported in the *Globe and Mail* on February 10, said:

● (1542)

—he expects arrangements will be made with the pipeline companies to have interested Yukon residents sent south for training and experience on pipeline jobs.

The article continued:

There will be major pipeline construction for this training in Alberta and British Columbia during the next few years involving two of Foothills companies, the Alberta Gas Trunk Line Co. Ltd. of Calgary and Westcoast Transmission Co. Ltd. of Vancouver.

It is interesting that the minister, in his recent speech, seems to be putting the entire onus for training on Foothills or its associated companies. Perhaps this is satisfactory, but surely parliament should know whether the company alone can provide the training required.

Despite assurances from the company, based on its own experience, we really do not know whether a sufficient and satisfactory manpower training plan is either in effect or being planned. This question must be clarified, especially in view of the newspaper report to which I referred.

It continued:

Mr. Cullen said that, depending on the demands for skilled workers by other projects, the gas pipeline might require the use of foreign workers in certain trades.

If the Minister of Employment and Immigration made this statement as recently as last week, I should think someone on the government side owes us an explanation. How many workers might this involve? What categories of work are involved? What unions are involved? Does the government have information which casts doubts on company assurances that the highest degree of Canadian labour will be used? All these questions need to be answered. Most certainly they were not answered by the Deputy Prime Minister in his speech opening the debate yesterday, nor today in answer to questions posed in the House.

The hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) put the position of the Progressive Conservative party exactly, when he said that there is a need to have some sort of monitoring of Canadian content. It is all very well to be given vague assurances, but the proof of whether these assurances are taking place can come only in the future. No one is suggesting that the company, or for that matter the government, does not want Canadian labour content. Reports should be submitted to parliament on a regular basis indicating clearly the job situation