

Order Paper Questions

2. As the contract for this particular type of technology has been awarded to the Great Lakes Paper Company Ltd., other companies would not qualify for financial assistance. However, should any company in the paper industry submit a proposal pertaining to new pollution abatement technology that could be developed and demonstrated, that company would be eligible for financial assistance through the DPAT Program, given a favourable technical assessment.

● (0000)

STATE OF THE ART OF KNOWLEDGE

Question No. 3,178—**Mr. Marshall:**

What is (a) Canada's position (b) the meaning of the application of fundamental means to apply "State of the Art of Knowledge" to the management and protection of the marine environment as stated by the Minister of the Environment at the opening session of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea in Montreal on September 29, 1975?

Mr. George Baker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment): Canada's position is that effective management of the living and other resources adjacent to the shores of a coastal state requires that the coastal state have the right and jurisdiction, clearly detailed in international law, which will enable it to manage and protect the marine environment and the resources therein, on the basis of the most up-to-date current information and techniques.

PANARCTIC OILS LTD.

Question No. 3,302—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. Is the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources aware of the statements in the press attributed to the President of Panarctic Oil during the week of October 20 to 24, 1975 indicating the possibility that Panarctic Oil will purchase three Scandinavian crude oil tankers for transport of Arctic oil to market should that be feasible?

2. Is the Minister aware of the extent of participation in Panarctic Oil by the government and its agents and, if so, to what extent is this participation?

3. Has the Minister examined the implications of going outside Canada for such vessels in terms of the long-term viability and health of the Canadian ship-building industry and trade balance and (a) if so, what conclusions have been reached (b) if not, for what reason?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): The Department of Energy, Mines and Resources reports as follows: 1. Yes.

2. Yes. The federal government has a 45 per cent equity participation in Panarctic Oils Ltd.

3. Prior to any decision on the marketing of oil from Arctic Islands sources a thorough appraisal will be made of all transportation possibilities, with full regard to the capabilities of the Canadian ships-building industry.

[Mr. Baker (Gander-Twillingate).]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

ANTI-INFLATION ACT

MEASURE TO PROVIDE FOR RESTRAINT OF PROFIT MARGINS, PRICES, DIVIDENDS AND COMPENSATION

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-73, to provide for the restraint of profit margins, prices, dividends and compensation in Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, at the outset of this stage of Bill C-73 I would like to raise a point of order, as I did the other day, regarding the technical relationship of the recommendation with the contents of the bill. I need not repeat what I said the last time with the exception that on the occasion of second reading of the bill on October 22, I raised the question as to clause 26(2) and clause 46, particularly clause 46(2) and what follows, in that they did not conform with and went beyond the concluding words of the recommendation "and to provide for the measure to expire on December 31, 1978". We know that these words are clear, unambiguous and unequivocal. They limit the power of spending money, the application of the act and all those things that flow from it.

Mr. Speaker agreed with me with respect to clause 26(2) but may I point out, with respect, that the Chair said nothing about clause 46(2). I do not have to quote the words with regard to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and the appreciation of the situation by the government House leader, but we did have the undertaking then, at my suggestion that we would rather have the bill amended to conform with the recommendation, or vice-versa; that in any case we would not see the bill withdrawn. The minister thought he was introducing amendments at the committee stage to make clause 26(2) conform in this way. However, I would indicate that the mere use of the words "three years" as against "four years" is not sufficient because contingently, as it is quite easily understood, appointment of the officials concerned who are the ones who offend under clause 26(2) could be made after December 31, 1975, and therefore offend under the Act.

Mr. Speaker, there is such a hubbub in the House that it is difficult to get my voice across to you.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With regard to clause 46(2), may I say that the offending portion consists of all the words after the words "This act expires on December 31, 1978, or on such earlier date as may be fixed by proclamation". At report stage of a bill the only Standing Order that deals with an additional recommendation is 75(6). I quote that Standing Order as follows: When a recommendation of the Governor General is required in relation to any amendment to be proposed at the report stage of a bill, at least 24 hours' written notice shall be given of the said recommendation and proposed amendment.

However, that provision applies only when there is a government amendment, and that requires a further recommendation. There is on the order paper no amend-