

Navigable Waters Protection Act

than two dozen persons the authority or the right to work on ships on which they could commit acts of sabotage.

I am willing to give consideration to any proposal the government may make that would make it clear to us exactly what it is trying to prevent, and what it must do. If the government will spell out something I will be very glad to give it consideration. Under the circumstances, however, I must go along with those who have spoken already against giving wide and indefinite powers as set out in section 34. I would like to hear the minister, or some other member of the government, place before us something in specific terms. If so, I would give it my support.

Mr. Speaker: Without finding fault with anything that has been said in debate thus far, at this juncture may I observe it strikes me that, while it has been pointed out that there are three parts in the bill, all the debate has revolved around section 34. There has been a complete omission of the other two parts, with which, it would seem, hon. members are in agreement.

It strikes me that this debate could take place in committee on section 34, where the questions hon. members are anxious to ask could be answered. I am led to these remarks by the closing words of the hon. member for Peace River, who is anxious to learn the views of the various ministers concerned with section 34. Apparently no disagreement exists with respect to the other two parts. I have allowed the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Drew) and members who followed in the debate to refer to the sections because this is an amending bill, and perhaps it would have been difficult to discuss it without referring specifically to some of the contents of it. But now, as the debate on second reading carries on and we hear nothing about the other two parts and the entire discussion revolves around section 34—I am not making a ruling—I ask hon. members whether they would not consider, in the interests of order in the debate, restraining themselves at this moment and carrying on in the fashion they wish in committee on section 34.

Mr. Low: I apologize if I was out of order.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member was out of order. That is not the reason I rose. He suggested that he was anxious to get some replies, and I thought that I would make these observations because, as he does realize, if the parliamentary assistant, who opened the debate on this measure, replied he would close the debate; whereas if we

were in committee on the bill and were discussing section 34 the hon. member could have his reply and could ask any further questions not only of the parliamentary assistant but of others such as the Minister of Justice (Mr. Garson) and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Gregg) who have spoken in this debate. The hon. member cannot ask for further clarification before making up his mind because these two ministers cannot speak again. The only one who can speak now would be the parliamentary assistant, who opened the debate on behalf of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Chevrier), and should he be called upon to speak again he would close the debate.

Mr. Low: Perhaps we could get the Minister of Finance (Mr. Abbott) into this.

Mr. Colin Cameron (Nanaimo): I quite understand your point and your misgivings about the debate, sir, but with all due respect to you I would point out that a very important part of the principle of this bill is involved in this particular section that shall be nameless. Not only that; there is another principle involved, one to which members of this group and, I think, of the official opposition have taken exception, and that is the principle of including this type of thing in this particular sort of legislation.

Mr. Speaker: May I at this moment interrupt the hon. member and tell him that these arguments have already been made by three, four or five speakers before him. If I were to put into force the standing order, which I think is standing order 40, to the effect that repetition is not permitted, not only repetition in one's own argument but repetition of the argument of others who have participated in the debate, I think I could perhaps persuade him that he should not pursue his point until we are in committee of the whole on the bill.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo): Then I shall proceed, if I may, to the discussion of what seems to be the important principle of this bill, namely, the inclusion in it of a measure that should be somewhere else, and not only that, but the inclusion of something which obviously will not have the effect the government pretends it will have.

Some few days ago the *Winnipeg Free Press*, an ardent, not to say sycophantic, admirer of the Liberal government, saw fit to publish an editorial in which they were viewing with grave misgiving the evidence of intellectual and administrative degeneration in the Liberal government. What they are going to say when they see a report of today's proceedings, I do not know, but I have heard a number of fatuous and puerile arguments from the government benches. With all due