

*Mackenzie Valley Pipeline*

With regard to the Alcan proposal, I call upon the government, on behalf of the NDP, to respect the Berger precedent for adequate discussion. The Yukon hearings must be given slightly more time. The Americans must agree to finance the project, since it will carry their gas, and parliament, not just the government, must discuss the final decision, one of the most important in our social and economic history. However, apart from the Alcan proposal—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. I was ready to allow the hon. member a minute or two, but he has gone beyond his time and he can only continue by unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Broadbent:** I thank hon. members for their consideration. I am about to wind up. I call upon the House today simply to express its respect for, and support, of Mr. Justice Berger's principal recommendation that there should be no pipeline in the Mackenzie Valley for at least ten years. The evidence before Mr. Justice Berger was substantial and persuasive. His arguments, on practical and moral grounds, are irrefutable. When he began his hearings, Mr. Justice Berger said that the way in which we decide to treat the north when making this decision will tell the world what sort of people we are. This statement has often been quoted. The time has come for us to show the world what sort of people we are. I hope we are equal to the test. And the place to start that test is right here and now.

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

**Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I was particularly pleased to hear the reference of the leader of the New Democratic Party to the importance of there being a debate in the House of Commons before a decision is taken. But I cannot forgo passing a comment on the irony of the situation. The NDP wants parliament to debate the matter before taking a decision. But the NDP is quite prepared to take a decision itself before there has been any public debate.

Nevertheless, within the next few months the House must take a very important decision regarding energy and the attitude we should take toward northern development and native claims. I emphasize that it is the House of Commons which must take that decision, not just the government, and that we must do so on the basis of all the available evidence. This means that a simple debate, a simple exchange of views in the House, is not enough. There would have to be an opportunity for a committee of the House to consider all that is involved, and then, on behalf of the people of Canada, to make recommendations which will reflect and determine the general national interest of the country on these questions.

Mr. Justice Berger has submitted an extensive and excellent study. He has carried out his terms of reference in an extraordinarily effective way. The methods he used in his inquiry are a model of participation and democracy, and he deserves the gratitude of the country—not simply for his work but also for

[Mr. Broadbent.]

the standard he has set. He makes a recommendation for delay in the construction of a pipeline, a recommendation which the evidence before him supported. It would be hard to contest his evidence—although, naturally, some of it will be contested—but the fundamental fact for parliament and the people of Canada to understand is that there is other evidence yet to come, evidence into other parts of this question which deserves to be considered as seriously as the Berger report.

• (1250)

As I said on Monday, Mr. Speaker, it is necessary to consider the evidence from the National Energy Board, whose report on pipeline applications is expected this summer. Then there is evidence from the study by Dean Lysyk into the Alcan route. There is evidence from various studies prepared for governments, or agents of governments, and not yet made available to this House of Commons. There is evidence, indeed, concerning the accuracy of some of the conclusions of the Berger inquiry—or filling in information that Mr. Justice Berger felt was beyond the terms of reference of his inquiry—in the way that future design proposals from pipeline companies were beyond what Mr. Justice Berger described as “my responsibility . . . to assess the project proposals as they now stand”.

I was pleased, Mr. Speaker, not only that the leader of the New Democratic Party quoted me in his opening remarks, but that he quoted me correctly as saying that, on the basis of the evidence we now have, the Berger recommendation for a delay would seem to be a sensible proposal. That is the statement which I made, and I am pleased to have that statement correctly quoted by the hon. member. I also said at that time that we may well receive new information regarding Canadian reserves, regarding Canadian requirements, regarding some new techniques for dealing with some of the problems that Mr. Justice Berger raised which could change the time-frame that he proposed. Certainly, we in the House of Commons should not prejudge this important question in the way this motion requests, when only part of the evidence is in. Indeed, that is the fundamental fault with the motion now before us. This motion wants the parliament of Canada to take a binding decision before all the evidence is in. The reason for that is that the NDP is not really interested in the evidence. Not only are they prepared, with this motion, to prejudge the evidence of the National Energy Board, and any other evidence that may come available, but three months ago they were prepared to prejudge the Berger report. On February 23 the hon. member of parliament for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) introduced an amendment expressing the opinion “that the proposed construction of a Mackenzie Valley pipeline is not in the best interest of the Canadian people”. That was well before Berger—

**Mr. Leggatt:** It was ahead of your time.

**Mr. Clark:** It was ahead of the evidence. That determination to prejudge the evidence indicates that the major motive for most of the NDP—and I would exclude here probably the hon. member for Northwest Territories (Mr. Firth)—is not hard