

Oil and Petroleum

tion that at report stage in the House the minister brought in amendments which were along the same lines. In fact, the amendment I have drawn up is, with the exception of a few words, precisely the same as the amendment the minister brought in on the energy allocation bill. I think it was the minister's decision that it could not be done in committee, so it was done in the House: one of his colleagues moved the amendment.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Chairman, this is the first time in the eight years we have been dealing with these matters that the hon. member for Peace River has agreed with me on anything. I am quite unprepared to respond on the question of procedure, however. Certainly, amendments were made to terminology at that time, but I cannot recall how they compare with this one. I think I would have to leave it to the Chair to decide, as I have no advice to offer on procedure at this time.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Chairman, the minister at least has not opposed me, which is the first time this has happened in eight years. Possibly we might take some time to review this. I think I would be able to find the *Hansard* which would affirm that an amendment along the lines of this one was brought in by the government. Your Honour has not ruled that this amendment is in order and it is not before the committee. One of my colleagues has another amendment to the same clause, which he intended to move in the unlikely event that this one was not accepted. While we review the likelihood of this happening, perhaps we could entertain the amendment to be offered by the hon. member for Don Valley.

The Chairman: Of course, I can let it stand but this might present a difficulty. If we stand the amendment moved by the hon. member for Peace River, and if by any chance the second amendment were accepted by the committee, that would have the effect of eliminating the first proposition.

Mr. Baldwin: I would be perfectly willing to accept the elimination in that case, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Gillies: Mr. Chairman, I move:

That clause 35 of the bill be amended by striking out lines 1 and 2 on page 15 and substituting therefor the following:

"35. This division shall come into force on a day to be fixed by proclamation but any such proclamation shall be subject to affirmative resolution of parliament.

The reasons for this amendment are much the same as those advanced for the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Peace River. The argument we have made constantly and continuously with respect to this legislation is that we believe the government alone should not have the right or the power to put this division into effect. We have argued as strongly and as constantly as we can that this is a joint proposition between the provinces and the federal government, but this argument has been rejected by the minister over and over again.

We now believe, as the very least proposition, that if this division is to come into effect it should only be proclaimed by resolution of parliament. I hope the minister will accept this amendment and indicate that the government is willing to discuss a very complicated situa-

[Mr. Baldwin.]

tion, one which can and will bring forth great feelings of concern across the country. It could even bring about division in the country or exacerbate division. If there is a procedure by which some of these problems can be alleviated and yet not subtract from what the minister wants to do in this legislation, I hope he will see fit to support my amendment.

● (1450)

I think it is unnecessary to restate the arguments put forward in this debate. The minister knows how strongly the members of my party feel about this issue and how strongly the various regions of this country feel about it. Surely it would be only wise to accept the amendment. Surely that would make sense. Acceptance would add to one's belief that we can govern this country with conciliation, not confrontation and that we can work out solutions to difficult problems in a positive fashion.

If the government supported the amendment it would make possible discussion before any new price is put into effect. It would ease some of the strain that has always been evident in this sort of situation. It would lessen the divisions throughout this country which this sort of legislation is bound to bring about and which have been created in the past. We should be operating more effectively.

Further, by so doing, the government would involve parliament in the consideration of something which affects everyone in this country significantly and importantly. The government would lose little by accepting the amendment but the country would gain much. I hope that parliament will be involved in making a decision which will affect all Canadians in a variety of ways. We should make sure that parliament is involved in that sort of decision. I think that as the coming into force of this legislation will depend on compromise, and as that sort of decision may not be reached in the normal course, there is every reason to involve parliament in the matter.

We think this amendment is important, significant and will add to the willingness of people across our country to accept this bill. We hope the minister will see fit to accept the amendment.

The Chairman: I might say that the Chair is ready to put this amendment. Of course, hon. members may feel that it tends to do what the previous amendment tried to do. However, to my mind the amendment we are discussing is more relevant to clause 35 of the bill. At the same time, it does not, to my mind, affect the legislative process, as the other amendment would do that. That amendment, if accepted, might delay proclamation on the legislation. I am therefore ready to put the amendment at this time. The hon. member for Don Valley moves:

That clause 35 of the bill be amended by striking out lines 1 and 2 on page 15 and substituting therefor the following:

"35. This division shall come into force on a day to be fixed by proclamation but any such proclamation shall be subject to affirmative resolution of parliament.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, may I ask for clarification of your ruling. I take it that you have now accepted the second amendment proposed to clause 35.

The Chairman: Yes.