

implication of that argument is that the United States and Canada have so outmanoeuvred each other that they have handed over all the business to Japan.

● (2042)

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: How much Canadian content in the Alaska pipeline?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I really cannot refrain from quoting the immortal words of the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby on this particular point. He said on February 21, 1978, that: It is a total capitulation to American interests. The Canadian government has yielded to American pressure to allow more Japanese competition.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. MacEachen: This will certainly go down on the record as one of the most absurd and most nonsensical statements ever made, even by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby.

I ask you to contrast that reaction from the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby with other interest groups. You would think the president of Ipsco would have complained if he had been thrown off base. He said "We are delighted." The president of Stelco said "Tremendous." The vice-president of Foothills said "This is great." I am using general terms for their words. However, I will not use general terms for the statement issued by the office of the premier of Saskatchewan, Allan Blakeney. The premier of Saskatchewan said when we announced the decision that "This is a good decision for Canada." He did not say it was a total capitulation to American interests in order to get business for the Japanese."

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. MacEachen: I wish the former premier of Saskatchewan had updated himself on this question. On major points the premier of Saskatchewan has taken opposite positions from the New Democratic party in the House of Commons on the source of piping. He has not asked for guarantees. He asked at the federal-provincial conference if the pipe could be made in Canada, not if it will be made. All he wanted to do was compete, and he pointed out the benefits to his province of so doing.

On the question of energy projects he disagreed totally with the analysis of the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands when he urged Canada to get on with new energy projects now. He underscored the importance of this particular project in improving our balance of payments situation and reducing our dependence upon foreign imported oil.

I regret to say that on the question of jobs for Canadians the members of the New Democratic Party have been creating a false issue where no issue exists. I once again remind them of the benefits to Canada that are contained in this agreement with the United States and in the legislation that is before the House. The New Democratic Party intend to vote against this

Northern Pipeline

legislation because they say there are no guarantees for Canadian jobs. If their will prevailed the legislation would be defeated and Canadian business would have no opportunity to compete. Canadian workers would also have no opportunity to compete, and indeed the plans for expansion in Hamilton and Regina would have to be delayed.

An hon. Member: You are ready for the Senate.

Mr. MacEachen: All I can say is that the Canadian people and the House of Commons will bear in mind the irresponsible approach to this bill by the members of the New Democratic Party.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I would like to suggest that the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby has already spoken in this debate, and unless he has a point of order, I will not recognize him.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Since the Deputy Prime Minister was granted a half hour extra time for his speech I wonder if he would reciprocate the courtesy by answering one question. The Deputy Prime Minister has indicated he would.

Following the Deputy Prime Minister's long, interesting and at times even factual discourse, I noted he did not deal with a matter I raised concerning a speech made by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce on February 20, and it is really very germane to his whole argument. He said on that date with reference to the problem of competition that we really did not have to worry because we had procedures under our Anti-dumping Act that would enable us to deal with the Japanese or the Italians or all these people who managed to build the Alaska pipeline in the face of intense Canadian competition. As reported at the top of page 3036 of *Hansard* he said:

● (2052)

It should be noted that neither (11A) of the anti-dumping regulations nor the imposition of countervailing duties for reasons of export financing subsidies appear to have been tested as yet. Moreover, the anti-dumping option would really only come into play after the fact, which renders its use, other than as a threat mechanism, somewhat ineffective.

The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce said in fact the anti-dumping regulations, which the government is relying on so heavily to ensure fair competition, are ineffective. Would the Deputy Prime Minister comment on that?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I am glad the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby raises that point. I just do not have the clause before me at the moment, but within this bill there is provision under which the minister or the agency may, quite apart from the authority resting with the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, send back or cause to be sent back for review any bid or any contract.

An hon. Member: Will it be done?