

Summer Recess

involve some 4.75 trillion cubic feet of our gas which will be gone forever.

Secondly, as a result of that cabinet decision, there are absolutely no guarantees on the financing for the whole pipeline, which is something that came out in its most open form today in the answers provided by the Prime Minister. The original project ought to have been guaranteed in the United States. The then secretary in the United States said that some \$2 billion to \$3 billion would have to be put up just for the Alaskan portion alone if there were to be any real guarantees. The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources had the nerve to say in the House a week ago that his obtaining some \$500 million for feasibility studies of one kind or another really constituted a guarantee. That may go over in the Liberal caucus, but that will sure not go over in any home in any part of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: Another result is that inevitably we are selling off relatively cheap natural gas in the south of Alberta with no guarantee of swaps at all, not even a sincere effort. The Senator responsible for the pipeline provided a truly ludicrous spectacle on television the other night when he had to admit that the only way swaps were talked about in discussions with the Americans was in the form of a casual conversation. When the visiting American responsible for energy was asked about the matter in the same television interview, during the same evening news, if I recall correctly he shrugged his shoulders and said, "What are swaps?" He said that that was the first time he had ever heard about the subject.

Swaps were serious for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources when he was in opposition, but of course, now that he is in government, and like so much of what the Liberal party stands for, he has completely forgotten the matter of principle. So we have no swaps.

● (1530)

Secondly, it is going to mean, in terms of prices, that Canadians pay inevitably higher gas prices because we are using up the low cost gas from the southern part of Alberta; it is going to mean to the United States that the more expensive gas will come from the Canadian Arctic, or the gas we may be forced to buy from the Americans at some point down the road if they will sell any, is going to cost us much more. That means the people of Atlantic Canada, Quebec and everywhere in the land, are going to have to pay more for energy. It also means that Canadian industry—whether we are talking about Ontario or Quebec or the emergence of industry in western Canada—is going to have to pay more. That reduces their competitive position. In addition, it means that we will not have—if we do not have a guarantee for a northern part of the pipeline—any access to our own gas in the Arctic.

What are we going to do? Are we going to construct our own pipeline? If we are going to have to go after that gas in the Arctic it looks as if we will have to construct our pipeline

now. The cost to get that gas down to the Canadian market will be massive because without the guarantee and the northern portion of the pipeline we have no access to our own gas.

Finally, on the question of jobs, what does it mean? It is true that steelworkers in certain parts of Canada now will get some jobs because of this decision to build an export pipeline. It is true that if the government did not make this decision, some of those jobs would not exist. But I want to point out two things, Mr. Speaker. The first is that if we got the commitments that are written into the original bill for the original pipeline, there would be ten times the number of jobs that we are going to get from this pipeline.

Second, as leader of the party that probably associates itself with the trade union movement, I do not hesitate to say that one of the things that distinguishes this party from the present party in power, is that we are prepared to take a long-range view of this country. We are not prepared to sell out our energy resources in the short run even if it means a few more short run jobs. We believe in the long-range development of this country. The time is long since past when the country should have been given a long-range industrial strategy that would make that possible.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: Instead of getting that from the Liberals, we have their traditional "in power" solution. The quick-fix boys are in action again. Yes, we are going to make money, in the hundreds of millions—indeed billions of dollars—from selling it off. But at what cost, Mr. Speaker? The Liberals are going to sell off \$17 billion worth of irreplaceable natural gas. It will be gone—gone forever. That means that if we need it, as I have just indicated, it will not be there. It is the archetypical Liberal solution. It is, indeed, no solution at all to the long-range needs of our country.

In this part of my comments today I want to deal with something that I hope the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources will deal with in his argument, because to me it is crucial, and that is the reasons why we in this party believe either the pipeline in the north will never be built at all or, if it is built, will not be built by 1985. You can bet on that, Mr. Speaker. Instead, it will be built at some distant point in the future when it suits American, not Canadian, purposes. At this time I want to set out our reasons for believing that.

First of all, it has not been brought out up to this point, because we have not had the debate, that a lot of American investors for very good reasons are skeptical about the project because of the costs involved. They know, from the Valdez oil pipeline experience in Alaska, that the cost estimates are likely to be well in excess of the original estimates. Right now the pipeline which when we debated it a couple of years ago in the House was estimated to cost \$8 billion, has jumped to an estimated cost of \$22 to \$24 billion. That, for a very large multinational corporation, ain't hay; it is a lot of money. It is the reason why the companies involved have indicated to American congressmen and to a lot of people that they may