

Mackenzie Valley Pipeline

the case. Mr. Justice Berger said that the environmental threat of an interior Yukon route was not as compelling as the threat from a coastal route. There is some potential threat to the caribou wintering grounds. The people of Canada need to know, before they make a decision, how serious that threat is.

There has been an indication that there may not be an adequate opportunity for native employment on large-scale development projects. A committee of this House has the responsibility to inquire into means by which we can ensure, if large-scale projects go forward, that there will be opportunities for the native people of the north to work not just on simple projects but to make use of the opportunities to develop their own skills. That is an area which must be investigated by a committee of the House of Commons. That flows from a question raised by the Berger inquiry.

Mr. Justice Berger has indicated it is going to take some time to resolve questions relating to native titles. He suggests ten years, but there is no guarantee that it would take ten years. We need to have the opportunity to hear other evidence and other views as to other time-frames that might apply. Mr. Justice Berger suggests that an economy in the north can be based upon small business, and the orderly development of gas and oil resources could be in partnership with small business. That is a theory which has to be examined in some detail. It is essential to examine that theory if we are to have all the evidence we should have.

Those are some of the questions which flow from the report of Mr. Justice Berger. They are questions which need to be answered before a decision can be taken. Those questions can only be answered by a special committee of the House of Commons of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: There are innumerable other questions which arise outside the report of Mr. Justice Berger. One relates to the viability and the feasibility of a railway. Another relates to the extent of our gas reserves and the possibility of new frontier discoveries in the Delta or the Arctic Islands. We need to have some solid information about the effects on exploration in the Beaufort Sea, in the Delta and in the High Arctic. If there is no pipeline, we need to know the effect of that on the economy of Canada generally.

We need to know the effect of proceeding with a pipeline or not proceeding with a pipeline. We need to have a clear understanding of the environmental, the social and the economic impacts of an Alcan route. As a committee of the parliament of Canada, we need to give our advice, to gather our evidence and to make our views known on the broad question of what constitutes the Canadian national interest in a question of this kind.

Mr. Speaker, this is a time when we face highly important questions. The report of Mr. Justice Berger, as well as the particular recommendations it brought down, was a clear indictment of the failure of this government to develop an effective policy for northern Canada or to operate within the

[Mr. Clark.]

context of a comprehensive national energy policy. There is no policy in either of those areas.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: That is a matter which the parliament of Canada must study and consider in detail, with the power to call witnesses, with the power to gather evidence and with the power to make recommendations and not simply talk. We have ahead of us some highly important decisions. As the parliament of Canada, we have an obligation to gather evidence with care and to consider it with the utmost care. We have the obligation to do that work in public. This is not a time to close doors, as the motion by the New Democratic Party proposes. This is a time, instead, to open doors and to allow full examination of all the evidence in the public eye of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: For that reason, in the interests of ensuring we have the broadest possible opportunity to gather all the evidence, to open all the doors and to make in public the best possible decisions for the future of Canada, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker):

That all the words after the word "government" be struck out of this motion and the following substituted therefor:

"to appoint a special committee of the House to consider the recommendations of the Berger report and all other reports, studies and recommendations relevant to the building of a northern pipeline, and the method of settlement of native land claims and urges that no commitment in principle be made to build a northern pipeline without parliamentary approval".

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The subject matter of today's debate is too important for us to spend any time on the procedural argument, but I suggest that Your Honour should seriously consider whether this amendment is in order. An amendment to the kind of motion that is down for today is certainly provided for, but it has to be relevant and it must not introduce a totally new proposition.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Nonsense. How does it do that?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): If my hon. friends wanted to do this, they should have done it on Tuesday.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendment substitutes for what we put down a totally different proposition, the kind for which notice would have to be given. Without taking the time to read the citations, I suggest to Your Honour that as an amendment it is clearly out of order.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: We mentioned Berger.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, the member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) seems to feel it is all right for the NDP to move amendments to opposition day