

was in possession of members of parliament. The press package was not even in the hands of most of the members until this morning's mail. Tonight members can accuse me of whatever they wish, but I was in the government's lobby looking for sugar for coffee and I found that the notes for the remarks of the minister, in both official languages, on the second reading of the northern pipeline bill are supplied in that lobby in stacks a foot high. There is nothing in our lobby that would enable members to have recourse to the actual words the minister used in the debate. This is the kind of attitude this government adopts with respect to informing members of parliament. If it was convenient for the minister to make these publications available in the governments' own lobby, why on earth did they not have the courtesy to make them available in the opposition lobby so that we on this side could have access to them in order to participate in the debate?

Before the adjournment, Mr. Speaker, I was speaking of the intent which is expressed in the appendices to the bill. Admirable as those intentions are, we have suggested that there should be some kind of regular quarterly monitoring process by parliament. I simply add that regardless of what degree of trust members throughout the House might hold with respect to the intentions of the government to follow through, the road to hell is paved with good intentions. It is essential, in our view, that that kind of monitoring process exist.

The Deputy Prime Minister accused the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) of charging that we have been sold out. He charged the member with labelling the bill as a sellout before it was exposed to parliament. I reject that contention of the Deputy Prime Minister. We do maintain, as I am sure my hon. friend from Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands will maintain, that in certain areas we have been sold out, particularly those areas which affect my constituency. There are others which are more important and which I intend to mention briefly in a moment. Since the hon. member for Nickel Belt is not here, I do not have to be concerned about concluding too quickly.

● (2012)

An hon. Member: You will put him to sleep with that speech!

Mr. Nielsen: Before this electronic surveillance was introduced in the chamber I could hear that kind of intervention and reply to it. In any event, most of the interventions which come from that rump end of the House are worthless, so there is not much point attempting to listen to them, let alone reply to them.

Mr. Gilbert: The same applies to your end!

Mr. Paproski: Forget it. He can't hear you!

Mr. Nielsen: I want to reiterate the ground for this debate which was staked out by our leader on August 4—the conditions upon which we agreed in principle during that debate to accept the construction of the pipeline.

Northern Pipeline

We have these reservations about it. Some of them have been covered by the Deputy Prime Minister in his remarks. Our leader said on that occasion that we agree in principle with the construction of that pipeline, but that before that construction commenced we would insist upon the following conditions.

That the \$50 million advance impact payment to Yukon communities to the native peoples be in place.

That the \$200 million heritage fund paid by the pipeline consortium to the Yukon government, up-front money, as recommended by the Lysyk inquiry and the National Energy Board, be in place for the purposes of planning.

That the investigation of temporary export permits for the sale of so-called Albertan "bubble gas" to the United States in return for future gas be in place.

That there would be pipeline capacity to handle future Canadian supplies; this is absolutely essential.

That a comprehensive study of the Dempster route, including the environmental and socio-economic impact and all of the other factors that go into such a study, be undertaken.

That there be no Canadian government financial guarantees. Such an undertaking has been forthcoming from the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) as well as from other members of the government sitting on the treasury benches.

That there be maximum possible participation by Canadians in jobs and the supply of material for Canadians. This, we contend, can only be accomplished through parliamentary input initiated by such a process as we have suggested or some modification thereof. I am sure with co-operation we can achieve this unless the government adheres to an arrogant denial of the possibility of any constructive suggestions coming from the opposition.

We must insist that there be access to northern gas supplies by northern communities. We insist upon the creation of a single agency to deal specifically with the socio-economic impact of the pipeline. In this connection, may I say, there was an order in council setting up the Lysyk inquiry which had the full force and effect of the law, with the inclusion of a term in that order in council that there would be a second stage inquiry. The Lysyk inquiry repeatedly, throughout its hearings, led people of the Yukon to believe that the representations which they were making before it would come before a second inquiry. That is the law as expressed in the order in council.

I know the government may abandon or alter or ignore an order in council at their will; that is also the law. But as the CYI has pointed out, this renegeing on the government's promise amounts to betrayal. I understand from the replies to certain questions addressed to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Faulkner) and the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. MacEachen) that there is no such intention to hold any formal second stage inquiry but rather that it is the intention to allow the regulatory agency to accomplish this purpose. We want to consider that and make suggestions in committee with respect to how it can be accomplished. This