

too many. Let him tell unemployed steelworkers that the New Democratic Party says that factories being out of work is not important because there are not too many steelworkers involved. There is always one too many if one person is unemployed.

Even if we were not creating jobs with this project, I would stand with the NDP if I felt that we were exporting natural gas that we need. Of course we will need natural gas in 50 years, 100 years or 200 years. In the early seventies I had the same misgivings about selling gas and oil, and expressed them quite publicly, but I have to say I was wrong because since the sale of natural gas and since the sale of oil in the seventies, the effect those sales have had on research and development and on exploration has been obvious. We have more natural gas now than we had in the early seventies. The incentive under the private industry system is profit. That is not a dirty word in our party, nor in the Conservative party. It is a dirty word only in the NDP. They do not tell us where they would get the capital if the state were to own all sources of production. That is something they skim over. In the last year or two when members of the New Democratic Party were pretending to be liberals, they could skim over it, but never again.

They cannot any more. So despite telegrams from the leader of the Canadian Labour Congress, subtly worded, and the head of the steelworkers, subtly worded, I am more impressed by the steelworkers, employed and unemployed, I met in my riding on Saturday morning. They expressed concern and anger at the New Democrats for blocking a project which means the difference between survival and prosperity and poverty in that particular part of the community.

● (1610)

An hon. Member: Name one.

Mr. Mackasey: The member over there does not care about the rank and file.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: Name one.

Mr. Mackasey: The hon. member wants me to name one. I have a telegram signed by Len Stevens, Director, District 3, United Steel Workers of America.

An hon. Member: Read it.

Mr. Mackasey: I will read it into the record because the hon. member has asked me to read one. It reads as follows:

For your information following telegram sent to Ed Broadbent by Dick Martin, President, Manitoba Federation of Labour:

"The Manitoba Federation of Labour representing over 76,000 Manitoba workers requests your support of approval of the construction of the western Canadian section of the Alaska highway natural gas pipeline, while at the same time pursuing guarantees and environment safeguards. Jobs are badly needed by Canadians, particularly in view of the increasing unemployment and forecast of a bleak economic winter".

An hon. Member: Read it all, Bryce.

Summer Recess

Mr. Mackasey: It does not please them. They think that the labour movement is homogeneous. They cannot elect a member in Windsor despite the concentration of the labour force there. It is because they treat unionized members as robots. The NDP said that this project was bad. They asked, "Why is it bad?" The NDP said, "Because we tell you it is bad". They fail to appreciate that workers today are educated, sophisticated, and knowledgeable as investors. They will make their own minds up as to whether this is a good project or a bad one.

What we have heard today is total disdain for the word of the President of the United States. That amazes me, because I grew up in a period when there was great respect for the United States and for the office of president.

An hon. Member: Oh, come on.

Mr. Mackasey: I cannot understand it. Obviously they do not have that respect. They would rather salute some other country, which is their privilege. But I was brought up that way and I cannot see any politician, because politicians are people of integrity, sending out a letter over his signature as did President Carter—and restating it verbally on the weekend—a statement which clearly implied that the pipeline would go ahead as scheduled—

An hon. Member: You cannot guarantee that.

Mr. Mackasey: Nor can the hon. member guarantee that it will not. That comes down to the differences in our philosophies and convictions. Maybe the hon. member is right, but he does not know if he is right. If he is wrong, he should think of the harm he is doing to the country at the moment.

An hon. Member: You are gambling.

Mr. Mackasey: The other day I read an article by someone in the steel industry. It pointed out quite logically that this country, as was pointed out by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, is truly a great one. It needs a little vision, a little leadership, and a little entrepreneurship. As many members in the House will remember, when we were building the Seaway we procrastinated, delayed, and waited for the Americans, and finally got it through. I can think of other projects that were dealt with in the same way. But this gentleman, in a well-reasoned speech, made the point that in the matter of a very few years by necessity this country will be dealing with a half dozen massive projects, not just one. There will be Beaufort, Hibernia, further development of the tar sands, the eventual pipeline to the Atlantic provinces once we see the quantity of gas available off Sable Island, and of course the Alaska pipeline.

If all these projects come on stream simultaneously in two, three, four, or five years, one should think of the problem we will have. It will be as much as we had in the late sixties with the building of the subway in Montreal at the same time as Expo was being built. One must remember the impact it had on the economy, wages, and salaries. There were shortages of skilled labour, professional labour, engineers and capital.