

Northern Pipeline

strong competitive steel industry. There is every reason to believe that other companies in other parts of the world will get a substantial piece of the action.

An interdepartmental committee in the United States, DREE here in Canada, the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, and heads of companies in the steel industry here in Canada have all expressed the same concern. Only the Liberal Government of Canada, which was taken to the cleaners in negotiations, is saying that we are going to get 100,000 man-years in jobs. That is rubbish, and all experts in the field know it is rubbish.

The only way we can be guaranteed that we will get the jobs Canadians deserve is to make provision for that in this legislation. I want to repeat that I refer not just to jobs at Ipsco or Stelco. There would be a spin-off effect. If we were to get the contract, jobs would be created in Sydney, Nova Scotia; Sault Ste. Marie and in Port Coquitlam. Jobs would be spread right across the country. The only way we will get jobs in the numbers we ought to get them—because the Americans will get plenty as a result of the agreement—is to have embedded in this legislation guarantees that Canadian workers, wherever possible, will produce the steel for the Canadian part of this project.

I want to say in advance that I will be moving an amendment. If the amendment carries, we will be delighted to support this legislation. If it does not carry, we will regretfully have to vote against a project which could have been a project of monumental significance to the people of Canada.

I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters):

That Bill C-25 be not now read a second time, but that the subject matter thereof be referred to the Special Committee on a Northern Pipeline with instruction that the said committee give consideration to the making of recommendations for the inclusion in the said bill of guarantees that all of the pipe for the pipeline the production of which is possible in Canada be produced in this country, in order to assure the attainment of the principal Canadian benefit from this pipeline, namely, jobs for Canadians.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I suggest that we take this amendment under advisement and continue with the debate.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I remind hon. members that if the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. MacEachen) speaks now, he closes the debate.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Not on an amendment.

● (1622)

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I want to raise a point of order on the amendment. I do not think this amendment is acceptable on second reading. I think the amendment has not been put before the House. If I speak I clearly understand I am speaking on the main motion, so I would have to clarify the situation or continue the debate.

[Mr. Broadbent.]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): It is moved by Mr. Broadbent and seconded by Mr. Peters:

That Bill C-25 be not now read a second time, but that the subject matter thereof be referred to the Special Committee on a Northern Pipeline with instruction that the said committee give consideration to the making of recommendations for the inclusion in the said bill of guarantees that all of the pipe for the pipeline the production of which is possible in Canada be produced in this country, in order to assure the attainment of the principal Canadian benefit from this pipeline, namely, jobs for Canadians.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt said motion?

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I am going to intervene very briefly to point out the irresponsibility of this motion.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Hypocrite.

Mr. Nielsen: What the New Democratic Party is doing is attempting to kill this bill. If that amendment should pass it would effectively kill the project.

An hon. Member: They do not care.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Two-faced again.

Mr. Nielsen: I do not know whether two faces is unparliamentary or not.

Mr. Broadbent: I do not care.

Mr. Nielsen: That party has adopted three different positions. First, it was going to be a filibuster, then it was going to be all troops thrown into the fray, and now comes the impractical suggestion inherent in this motion of amending the legislation to ratify an international agreement with which we are stuck—a poor agreement for all that—and this is an out and out attempt to kill the bill.

There are timetables which must be met, Mr. Speaker. This project is vital to the national interest, but if this irresponsible amendment were accepted it would go down the tube as a good many other advantages went down the tube during negotiations.

I want to make it clear that while we are after the same kind of guarantees that those on my left are after; the difference is in the method. We know that it must be done by legislation and we know that if the government is reasonable with respect to suggested amendments, it can be done by a monitoring agency of this House. There is the difference. The same guarantees can be procured by either method. The method in this amendment is impractical and out of order. No such amendment can be made to the bill. That is the question that should be taken up by the Chair and the President of Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) should support me on this. It is out of order because that bill cannot be amended to go beyond the provision with the United States that binds the two countries.

Having said those brief words I would urge the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent) to withdraw his motion and vote on the main motion.