

*Northern Pipeline*

I am glad the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar has more sense than the hon. member for Yukon. If I understood him correctly, he said there would not be a Liberal elected there for years to come because of this type of legislation. It is this type of stupid legislation which hurts that party and makes people cynical about them at the federal level. I wish the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar would argue against the position taken by the hon. member for Yukon, who is defending the government.

The second part of the motion by the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie is to ensure that the federal government will not have any financial obligation to the pipeline if at some time in the future more money is needed to complete construction. The hon. member for Yukon said there is no bill before the House which states that the federal government has to provide more money, that there is no mention in the legislation that more money will be needed, that there is no financial obligation, that everything will be okay. I have heard that argument many times in the past. The engineers and economists say a certain project will cost so much money. However, the final cost is much higher. I can think of many such publicly financed projects like Expo, the Olympics and the National Arts Centre, where the final cost was much higher. Many private projects cost much more on completion than originally estimated by architects and economists.

In this motion, we say that if there should happen to be this type of cost over-run, the Government of Canada, on behalf of the people of Canada, should not bear the responsibility of that over-run. That could be legislated very easily before we pass this bill. All we want from this government and this House is a commitment that in five or ten years, or how many years it takes to build the pipeline, the Canadian taxpayers will not be responsible for any deficit.

If the cost should be an extra \$2 billion or \$3 billion, we may see before this House a bill asking us to subsidize the pipeline. I remember many areas where the government has broken faith. The hon. member for Yukon is of the same mentality now as the hon. member for Crowfoot was a year ago when he was willing to forgive the Liberals for everything.

I remember the 1974 election. Many Liberals remember it with a certain amount of guilt. They promised they would never impose wage and price controls. They said the leader of the Conservative party was an evil man who was going to impose wage and price controls which would wreck the Canadian economy. They were certainly right about one thing; they ruined the Canadian economy. But it was not the Conservative party which brought them in, it was the Liberal party. It was the leader of the very party which one year prior to imposing controls reversed his stand and imposed them. In effect, they lied to the working people of this country. That is the type of integrity the government across the way really has. If they had that integrity then I do not know how the hon. member for Yukon can trust them when it comes to the pipeline.

[Mr. Nystrom.]

● (2152)

**Mr. Nielsen:** I trust the parliamentary process.

**Mr. Nystrom:** The hon. member says he trusts the parliamentary process. How were we able to stop the government imposing wage and price controls through the parliamentary process? There was nothing we could do. We tried. We fought. There were massive demonstrations in this country, including one of the largest this country has ever seen, certainly in my day, by the trade unions and working people against the legislation. Questions were asked in the House and there were all kinds of debates, but we could not stop them. The Liberals had a majority and they did not listen to us. They imposed on us a bill we did not want. So how can we stop them bringing in a bill if they come back with another majority, hypothetically, and in a couple of years ask us to bail out the pipeline? Can anybody answer that question? How can we stop them? We cannot do it. If the Conservative party thinks we can, I should like to see them take that argument to the people.

**Mr. Nielsen:** It is up to the people at the polls.

**Mr. Nystrom:** A lot of us still have the memory of Mayor Jean Drapeau of Montreal.

Those are the two principal parts of the motion moved by the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie. I suggest, in closing, that there are two main approaches we ought to be discussing in connection with this bill at the present stage. One is that we guarantee jobs so that we can build this country together from coast to coast. Surely we need some of that vision. In the second place, we find a very simple phrase in the motion which would guarantee to the Canadian people that they will not have to meet any financial obligation in the future to pay a cost over-run incurred by a private consortium which is building a pipeline across our country from one part of the United States to another.

Surely that, too, is a reasonable request, one which any reasonable Canadian would expect parliament to legislate on his behalf. The apologists for the oil companies, such as the hon. member for the Yukon, should be—

**An hon. Member:** Ashamed.

**Mr. Nystrom:** —ashamed of themselves. Or, perhaps, they will be getting up one day in parliament and saying: "I am sorry, we should have legislated those guarantees for the ordinary people of Canada because that is the job we were elected to do".

**Mr. Young:** Would the hon. member permit a question?

**Mr. Nystrom:** You are not filibustering, are you?

**Mr. Young:** No. I just want to ask the hon. member a couple of very direct questions. One thing he has asked this government to do is to guarantee jobs for people in this country. I just want to ask him if he thinks that anyone in this country—anyone—has a guaranteed job. First of all, you have to work. Nobody in this country has a guaranteed job. He made his