

**Mr. Waddell:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a separate point of order. I have had a chance to read your ruling very quickly and look through the sections of it. I think the groupings are set out quite fairly. The first section of your ruling states that Motions Nos. 1 and 2 will be grouped for debate and that a vote on Motion No. 1 will also apply to Motion No. 2. I think there is a problem there. I ask that Your Honour perhaps reserve on this area or give us leave to raise our concerns later as the debate progresses with respect to the first motion. I think you might find, Mr. Speaker, that they should not be grouped together for a vote.

• (1120)

The Government might be prepared to accept Motion No. 1, and I will make my reasons for that clear during debate. In any case, Motion No. 1 is a far less drastic amendment than Motion No. 2. Motion No. 1 simply adds words like "for greater certainty" and brings it into line with the wording in the Sechelt Act which we passed not too long ago. Motion No. 2 is quite drastic in the sense that it excludes all lands that are the subject of land claims negotiations. That goes quite a long way.

I am rising now to identify that point. Perhaps the Parliamentary Secretary could listen to my remarks.

**Mr. McDermid:** I am listening with great intensity.

**Mr. Speaker:** I thank the Hon. Member for his intervention and I have listened very carefully to it. I invite the Parliamentary Secretary to comment at this time if he so chooses.

**Mr. McDermid:** Mr. Speaker, I gather that the Hon. Member was up on a point of order. I have no objection to splitting that vote if that is what he desires. We are here to cooperate with the Opposition and to get this Bill through. If he would like to split the vote on Motions Nos. 1 and 2, that is entirely up to him. I can tell him now that we will oppose both his amendments.

**Mr. Gauthier:** Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with my exact point. We are now debating whether or not Motions Nos. 1 and 2 should be grouped for debate. We are debating certain things which I believe we should have debated before you ruled, Mr. Speaker. In other words, we should have had copies of this beforehand, but we just got them when you walked in here.

**Mr. Speaker:** I thank the Hon. Member for his intervention. Perhaps we can return to this in a few minutes. I would ask that Hon. Members consult together. Of course, if there is consent to split the vote, the Chair is the servant of the House.

**Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver—Kingsway)** moved:

Motion No. 1.

That Bill C-5, be amended in Clause 3 by striking out lines 4 to 8 at page 4 and substituting the following therefor:

*Canada Petroleum Resources Act*

"3. For greater certainty, nothing in this Act abrogates or derogates from any aboriginal title, right, claim or interest that pertains to the, or any of the, aboriginal people of Canada."

Motion No. 2.

That Bill C-5, be amended in Clause 3 by adding immediately after line 8 at page 4 the following:

"(2) All lands subject to unsettled aboriginal claims, which have been accepted for negotiation by the federal government, are excluded from the application of this Act."

He said: Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I would like to make my position clear on the last point I raised. It seems to me that your ruling is fair, Mr. Speaker, except for that constitutional point that I raised. On a quick reading of the ruling, it seems to me that the groupings are all right. I agree that Motions Nos. 1 and 2 should be grouped together for debate, as we are doing now. However, I think there probably should be separate votes on them. Perhaps at some point when listening to the debate you could make that decision, Mr. Speaker.

Regarding Motion No. 1, let me explain how this process works; You know how it works, Mr. Speaker, but it is good to summarize it.

We are on report stage of a Bill that will in fact set up a new regime for licensing oil companies to explore in the Canada Lands. The Canada Lands are the lands on the frontier and are lands over which the Canadian Government and not the provinces has power. These lands are located in the northern territories of Canada and include the Beaufort Sea where there is lots of oil and gas, and the high Arctic where there has been exploration for gas. Perhaps in my lifetime—if not, in the lifetime of other Canadians—we will be able to use that gas. Of course, the Bill also covers the offshore, both off the coast of British Columbia and the coasts of Newfoundland and Nova Scotia.

The Government has decided that the provinces should have control over the offshore, and is bringing in a separate Bill which we will discuss later that will deal with that issue. Therefore, this Bill deals with oil and gas licences for the offshore and the northern frontiers.

People ask if this is really important. The energy committee found out that between 1980 and 1987, the Government will have spent \$7.2 billion or \$7.3 billion on Petroleum Incentive Program grants for the oil companies. That is one of the reasons the Government has a big deficit. It has given \$7.3 billion to oil companies to explore the frontiers; that was part of the National Energy Program. Therefore, this matter is very important. The Government will be ending these grants but it will bring in tax incentives to get companies exploring in the future. Canadians should, therefore, pay particular attention to this. Even though this is an energy Bill and deals with exploration in the frontiers, it in fact affects things like social programs and whether or not we can afford to have daycare in Canada.

People say that it does not matter right now because nothing is happening anyway. The price of oil is \$15 per barrel, and until it gets back up to \$30 per barrel nothing will happen. In