

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, May 10, 1977

The House met at 2 p.m.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

### ENERGY

PROPOSED COMMITTEE STUDY OF CONSTRUCTION OF A RAILWAY RATHER THAN NORTHERN PIPELINE—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert):** Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity.

In view of the strong views expressed by the Honourable Mr. Justice Berger in connection with a gas pipeline from the Yukon and that a railroad was commended and approved by the Canadian Institute of Guided Ground Transport in 1972 following an engineering, economic and environmental feasibility study of a railroad to carry Arctic oil and liquefied natural gas to markets in central Canada, and as the institute agreed with an earlier preliminary analysis which concluded that a railway is technically and operationally feasible and appeared to be financially attractive, with unanimous consent of the House, I would move:

That a committee of the House be set up to examine this question without delay, as the conclusion of the Canadian Institute was that 360 locomotive units and 11,000 tank cars of 94 ton capacity with 20 trains per day could move the necessary requirements of oil and gas.

Furthermore, having regard to the unemployment situation, the report agreed that such a railroad would require 5,000 workers to build over a 5½ year period, and it would employ, on completion, some 4,600 people in the Yukon and Northwest Territories, and there would be very little disruption to the environment.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** Presentation of such a motion for debate, pursuant to Standing Order 43, can be done only with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDATION NO NORTHERN PIPELINE BE BUILT FOR TEN YEARS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity pursuant to

the provisions of Standing Order 43. Given the fact that Canada has a sufficient supply of natural gas to last until 1990, and given that a Mackenzie Valley pipeline would cost between \$8 billion and \$12 billion, and in particular given the conclusions of Mr. Justice Berger that: "a pipeline across the northern Yukon would entail irreparable losses of national and international importance" and that if a pipeline were built now "... it would bring limited economic benefits, its social impact would be devastating, and it would frustrate the goals of native claims", I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That this House supports the principal recommendations of the Berger report that no pipeline be built across the northern Yukon and that no Mackenzie Valley pipeline be built for at least ten years.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** Presentation for debate of such a motion, pursuant to Standing Order 43, can only be done with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

PROPOSED ASSISTANCE BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO COMPANIES DESIRING TO MOVE FROM QUEBEC—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. René Matte (Champlain):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity.

Given the fact that a number of companies whose head offices were situated in Quebec have moved or will move on account of the Charter of the French Language in Quebec, and the fact that an alarming situation is being artificially created to discredit the legitimate aspirations of the Quebec government, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier):

That the federal government do not provide any assistance by way of loans, subventions or subsidies to companies moving their head offices but that, on the contrary, government consider the advisability of giving them assistance so that they may remain in Quebec and comply with the requirements of the priority given to French in that province.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The House has heard the hon. member's motion. Pursuant to Standing Order 43, presentation of such a motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?