Northern Pipeline

to oppose it. I think the $200 million payment alone is sufficient reason to vote against this bill. It represents nothing more than a fantastic con job that has been done on the Yukon.

The principle of the bill is not the building of a pipeline; the principle of this bill is whether we are in favour of the treaty. That is really what the bill is all about. I want to say that we are against that treaty. It is a sellout of Canadian interests. We must have some hardnosed bargainers in this country before we will get any decent deals.

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Goodale: Is this a filibuster, Stanley?

Mr. Nystrom: I hear the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Goodale) worrying out loud about a filibuster setting in. I wonder if that hon. member is going to get up and make a speech in the House, asking that the government guarantee jobs for the steelworkers of Saskatchewan. I am sure that with a riding right near Regina he is very, very interested in making sure there are guarantees of jobs for the steelworkers in the city of Regina. Maybe the hon. member for Assiniboia thinks there are not very many unemployed in the province of Saskatchewan. I am sure that after the election there will be at least one more unemployed person in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Goodale: Bill Knight.

Mr. Nystrom: I hear the hon. member for Assiniboia is running scared. He is not running scared about losing, but the fact of the matter is that he is going to run third, and I am sure he will find that rather embarrassing in Assiniboia.

Mr. Goodale: We will see, Lorne. Bill is running last out there.

An hon. Member: It will be goodbye, not Goodale.

Mr. Nystrom: In any event, the bill before the House today is a very important bill. I am sure more members of the House should be getting up to participate in the debate. The Tory party has very suddenly died in this debate and I am wondering why. I know there has been quite a split in their caucus. They have one group in the caucus very concerned about certain aspects of the bill, as are we in our party. We want to make sure we "buy Canada first", that we have a Canadian option in this bill which will make sure we are giving jobs to Canadians for the construction of the pipeline, and giving jobs to Canadians in supplying the steel for the pipeline and so on.

I do know there are a few Tories who have the same concerns we have expressed. I would name specifically the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser) who made a very eloquent speech in the House. We also heard from the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) and the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie). Then, of course, we have members of the other wing of the Conservative party, led by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen), who are very anxious to have this bill railroaded through the House as

[Mr. Leggatt.]

quickly as possible because they believe it is very good for the international business community, namely, their friends in the United States.

I know why they are so anxious to have this bill railroaded through the House so quickly, but it is going to be quite a while before we actually start construction on the pipeline, so why are they so anxious to have the bill go through the House? Why can we not spend a little more time and get a little more support from the Conservative party in trying to force the government across the way to put into the bill some legislative guarantees which will make sure that the pipeline that goes through Canada is built by Canadians, and that the pipeline is built with materials manufactured in Canada by Canadians?

Mr. Nielsen: That will be done in the committee.

Mr. Nystrom: We have before us the principles of this bill. What we are doing is supplying the United States, our good friends to the south, with a land bridge so it can carry its gas from one part of the country to another. We are supplying that land bridge to the United States of America. It will carry gas from Alaska to the United States, and none of it will be used here in Canada. Surely to God when we are doing something like that, in return for that favour we can have legislative guarantees that we will be building the pipeline and using our materials to do that. I am sure any other country in the world, particularly the United States, would insist that be a minimum guarantee in view of the problems it would put their country to if the pipeline was going across part of that country to supply us or some other country in the world.

I do not think that is asking too much because there are some problems for Canadians. There may be some environmental problems. I am sure, as the hon. member for Yukon would say, there will be problems for the native people in the north. These are problems we will have to face up to. These are problems that we will have to solve if we are to build this pipeline. In return I believe we should be getting more benefits for our country from the pipeline that is about to be built.

I want to say as clearly as possible that the most important items to me are really the following. I believe we should have put into this bill a clause that will guarantee Canadian content and guarantee Canadian jobs. Many people say we do not need these guarantees because we are competitive enough. Let me remind them of who supplied the pipe to build the pipeline in Alaska. It was supplied by the Japanese, and there is not any guarantee, from what I understand, in this legislation that we will necessarily get the contracts.

I do know that some of the steel companies in our country are concerned about this. I refer specifically to the steel company in my own province, one in which the hon. member for Assiniboia should be interested. It is about 20 per cent owned by the people of Saskatchewan and 20 per cent owned by the people of Alberta.

I would remind the House that when the Alaska pipeline was built Ipsco put in some bids to supply the pipe for part of that pipeline. It did not get the contract because of bids put in by the Japanese. I think perhaps, if all things are equal, Ipsco