

Oil and Gas Act

the only point that is now before Your Honour is the procedural admissibility or inadmissibility of the amendment.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I hope the hon. member is not prepared to give away Canada's interest in this.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On a question of privilege—

Mr. Aiken: On a point of privilege—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. There are two hon. members rising on a question of privilege. I have already made one suggestion to the President of the Privy Council. I will hear the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre on the question of privilege and then the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege is that I have said nothing either directly or by implication that has anything to do with the substance of either the bill or the amendment now before the House. When the minister suggests that I am giving away something belonging to Canada he is incorrect and he is going far beyond the bounds of what is proper in this debate. It was my intention to remain silent on this point of order because I have some doubt about the admissibility of the amendment, but if he keeps on I may change my mind.

Mr. Aiken: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I resent the suggestion by the President of the Privy Council that I am trying to give away the rights of Canada. I suggest that if the President of the Privy Council would read the bill he would see that is what his government is doing. I have a map here that will show it. I intend to establish this later in the debate.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am sure the President of the Privy Council and others will agree with me that perhaps we should revert to the particular procedural question which confronts the Chair at the moment and confine our argument to that question.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, might I refer to the following reference from May's seventeenth edition at page 527:

The following rules govern the contents of reasoned amendments:—

The principle of relevancy in an amendment governs every such motion.

May I point out that it is perfectly proper, in the course of arguing a point of order on a

question of relevancy, to refer to the subject matter of the bill in question on which second reading is being moved and to refer to the subject matter of the amendment. I take it there is no contest on that point. All the amendment refers to is the question of the territorial seas of Canada, the waters surrounding the Canadian mainland and the waters of Canada but what the bill refers to are those submarine areas adjacent to Canada to a water depth of 200 meters or beyond. We have here no question of territorial waters or a three-mile limit or a 12-mile limit or questions of navigation or non-navigation. This particular bill relates to the continental shelf, the sea-bed underlying the waters.

What I said about the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, in the form of an injunction, was that I hoped he would not be intervening in this debate to cast any doubt on the fact that we have an uncontested jurisdiction over the continental shelf. We have here an amendment referring exclusively to the question of territorial waters. It refers to a report in which the question of the territorial waters was raised. I suggest therefore, because this bill relates to the continental shelf and the marine areas in and about the continental shelf, that an amendment with regard to navigation is not relevant in this particular case. The amendment, therefore, should not be accepted.

Mr. Woolliams: You keep the establishment going.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I cannot imagine the hon. member keeping anything going, useful or otherwise. Perhaps I might refer to the ruling of the Speaker of January 15, 1970 already referred to by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka. He selectively read from the ruling at that time. May I draw Your Honour's attention to the words recorded at page 2428 of *Hansard* of that date where the chair referred to Section (1) of citation 393 of *Beauchesne's* fourth edition which was quoted at length:

An amendment purporting to approve the principle of a Bill and at the same time enunciating a declaration of policy cannot be moved to the second reading. It must oppose the principle of the Bill.

What we have here, in effect, is an amendment which does not oppose the principle of the bill. It really is, in a guise, a statement of policy and a statement of policy not even about the subject matter of the bill itself. It is a statement of policy with regard to the question of the territorial waters. Because it is