

Water Resources Programs

the council later is a matter entirely apart from anything which might be contained in the interpretive clause.

I should like to draw to the attention of the House a point we were discussing on March 12 when we were considering the setting up of a standards council. The argument which applied then would, I believe, apply now. As reported in *Hansard* at page 4714, the leader of the House summed up his argument then by saying: "The fundamental point in connection with the creation of the body is separate and independent of the appropriation of funds for it from time to time." I submit that the very same point arises here. The operation of the body once established is an entirely separate question.

A number of agencies are being set up under this legislation. It would be simple for the government to change these agencies around so as to meet the terms of the pollution control board as set out in one of the amendments. In any event, the points have been well covered by now and I am certain that hon. members are willing to give Your Honour an opportunity to take them into consideration.

Mr. Speaker: I thank hon. members for their contributions to the procedural debate. I did not wish to interrupt the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka; I have the impression that he had something of value to add to the argument.

Mr. Aiken: Perhaps I should have waited to hear what Your Honour had to say, because there are certain motions which appear to be related in a manner different from that indicated in the first part of Your Honour's statement. I think that Nos. 6 and 25 are related.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member is anticipating the suggestion I propose to make to hon. members. I think the arguments put forward are very interesting and certainly worth every possible consideration. This is a most important bill. The amendments proposed are highly technical and the procedural arguments advanced in support of or against the proposed motions are worthy of careful consideration. What I suggest to hon. members is that for the time being the Chair be allowed to stand motions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 16. Exception has been taken in some measure, in any event, to Nos. 6 and 25. I would be disposed to give the benefit of the doubt to movers of those motions. There has to be some start to the consideration of these

[Mr. Harding.]

amendments and my suggestion to hon. members is that the debate begin with Nos. 6 and 25.

The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka suggested a few moments ago that there is a close relation between these two suggested amendments. I agree with him. My proposal to hon. members at this point is that we initiate the debate on these amendments by considering at the same time motions Nos. 6 and 25. These motions will be the occasion for one debate but could eventually be the subject of two different votes. I shall give serious consideration to the more general arguments put forward originally by the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants and to the submissions of other hon. members respecting motions Nos. 1 to 5 and 16. I shall try to reach a decision and give a ruling as quickly as possible with regard to these motions but we can initiate the debate on Nos. 6 and 25 if hon. members are in agreement with this suggestion.

Mr. Rose: I would ask Your Honour whether in reaching a decision on motion No. 5, you will take into consideration the committee report of February 5, 1970—

● (4:10 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to the hon. member that we are not going to start the argument again. The hon. member should understand that the Chair will consider all aspects. I will consider the precedents and the Standing Orders. I am not at all sure that I will consider the evidence that was given in committee. I suggest to the hon. member that that is not the responsibility of the Chair.

I have already spent quite a bit of time looking at all these motions. I will at this point study particularly the arguments which have been put forth by hon. members who have taken part in the debate. I respectfully suggest that for the moment we allow the matter to stand and give the House an opportunity to consider the following motion moved by the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Harding), seconded by the hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose):

That Bill C-144, an act to provide for the management of the water resources of Canada including research and the planning and implementation of programs relating to the conservation, development and utilization of water resources be amended by adding thereto a new clause 5A to read as follows:

"5A. No inland waterways shall be diverted for the purpose of exportation without the approval of parliament."