

4. In each such case, are final payments still to be made and, if so (a) to whom (b) for what reason are accounts still outstanding?—Sessional Paper No. 301-2/2,118.

No. 2,483—*Mr. Yewchuk*

1. Did the government conduct a study of the possible environmental or pollution aspects of the Syncrude Canada Ltd. oil sands operation and, if so (a) on what date (b) by what department?

2. Has there been concern by the government about any design or engineering inadequacies from the environmental point of view in the Syncrude plant and, if so (a) what are such inadequacies (b) have they been corrected?

3. What are the (a) names (b) positions (c) qualifications of officials involved in such a study?

4. Was the study ever passed on or released to (a) Syncrude officials (b) the Province of Alberta (c) the public?

5. Did the study contain any recommendation to safeguard against environmental damage and, if so (a) what, if any, were such recommendations (b) what was the reaction to them of (i) Syncrude officials (ii) the Province of Alberta?

6. (a) To date, how much money has the government invested in Syncrude (b) what will be its total commitment?

7. Will the government insist that a portion of the money be spent on environmental protection or anti-pollution devices and, if not, for what reason?

8. Is the government or any of its departments or officials working with any Syncrude or provincial officials to ensure that environmental damage at the oil sands plant does not occur or, if it does, is rectified?

9. Have any checks been made to see that employees and future employees of the Syncrude project are protected from unusual health problems resulting from oil sands operations and, if not (a) for what reason (b) will any be made in the future?

10. Does the government intend to use its investment in the project to ensure that (a) environmental damage is kept to a minimum (b) all anti-pollution steps necessary will be taken (c) present and future health hazards to employees will be assessed and eradicated (d) such protection will extend to residents in the area surrounding the oil sands plant?

11. Is the government prepared to work in mutual co-operation and mutual consultation with both the Syncrude officials and the Province of Alberta to see that environmental damage and health hazards are kept to a minimum at the oil sands operation?

12. As the government is an equity partner in the Syncrude project, and is into a conflict of interest situation (profit vs. environmental control), what assurance is there that the public interest will be protected insofar as environmental factors are concerned?—Sessional Paper No. 301-2/2,483.

Mr. Cullen, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, presented,—Returns to the foregoing Orders.

Bill C-63, An Act to amend the Olympic (1976) Act, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates, was again considered at the report stage.

Whereupon, the House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Jelinek, seconded by Mr. Stevens,—That Bill C-63, An Act to amend the Olympic (1976) Act, be amended in Clause 4

(a) by striking out lines 23 to 46 inclusive on page 2, lines 1 to 48 inclusive on page 3, lines 1 to 47 inclusive on page 4, lines 1 to 47 inclusive on page 5, and lines 1 to 14 inclusive on page 6; and

(b) that the figure "17" in line 15 on page 2 and line 17 on page 6 be struck out and the figure "14" substituted therefor.

And the question being put on the motion, pursuant to section 11 of Standing Order 75, a recorded division was deferred.

Motion numbered (3) standing in the name of the honourable Member for High Park-Humber Valley (Mr. Jelinek) having been called, as follows:

That Bill C-63, An Act to amend the Olympic (1976) Act, be amended by adding to Clause 4 thereof, immediately following line 14 on page 6, the following:

"(2) For greater certainty it is hereby declared that the provisions of sections 13 to 16 inclusive of the *Olympic (1976) Act*, as enacted by subsection 4(1) of this Act, are subject to the *Canadian Bill of Rights*; and, for the purpose of this subsection, the words "due process of law" in paragraph 1(a) of the *Canadian Bill of Rights* shall be construed and interpreted to mean the judicial process and to exclude the legislative process."

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: To deal with Motion numbered 3 standing in the name of the honourable Member for High Park-Humber Valley (Mr. Jelinek), nothing which has been said dissuades me from the initial position I have taken. It seems to me that the honourable Member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Baker) is perfectly correct in his opening remarks. The Canadian Bill of Rights, by its own provisions, applies to all Canadian legislation. If any further certification of this were needed, the stamp of the Minister of Justice to this effect appears on the front page of the Bill. This certifies the application, and for this reason the first part of the amendment would seem to me to be redundant.

The second part of the amendment, and I cannot be persuaded otherwise, goes on to put forward a specific