

many winch trucks, caterpillars and other related heavy equipment. What has the loss been to Canada? We have suffered a tremendous economic loss under this energy policy. Who knows what the people of Newfoundland will lose? These are people who, like the people of Saskatchewan, need it. What does this do to Canada?

● (2110)

We in the Conservative party view Canada as a great chain and each province as a link. British Columbia contributes some lumber; Alberta, some oil and some gas; Saskatchewan, some wheat; Manitoba, some wheat and some power; Ontario, the great manufacturing area of the country, various manufactured goods such as rubber and so on. In fact, Ontario might be the greatest loser when it comes to the energy policy before us. The parallel is that Canada could become a nation of great strength, with each province making its contribution as a link. But if we have a government which wants to seize power from every one of those links, the links will be broken down and we will not have a Canada.

Is it any wonder that the people of Newfoundland are somewhat concerned about their industry and their resource, just as the people of Saskatchewan are very concerned about their resource? It is interesting to note that even the NDP in Saskatchewan woke up about a year late. They supported the government until it got itself into a mess which I do not think it can straighten out. Mr. Blakeney will have to bear a certain responsibility in the history of the country in allowing the Liberal government and the Liberal-NDP coalition to bring about an energy policy which has had a devastating effect upon the whole economy of the country as no other business arrangement has had in the history of Canada. Some people project that the energy policy is costing Canadians in lost opportunities and spin-off benefits about \$1 million per hour, or \$24 million per day.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Again I regret to interrupt the hon. member. I am trying to convince myself—and I would like the hon. member to convince me—that his argument has any relevance to the motion before us. For the benefit of hon. members, motion No. 3 reads in part as follows:—be amended in Clause 2 by striking out lines 17 to 25 at page 1 and lines 1 and 2 at page 2—

Again for the benefit of hon. members, those lines read:

—Northwest Territories, or Sable Island, or

(b) those submarine areas, not within a province, adjacent to the coast of Canada and extending throughout the natural prolongation

of the land territory of Canada to the outer edge of the continental margin or to a distance of two hundred nautical miles from the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea of Canada is measured, whichever is the greater.

If hon. members want to refer to Canadian ownership, they can do so when we discuss the bill because it is not included in the motion. I invite hon. members to address themselves to the motion.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have sat through this debate and have tried to pay close

attention. I understand Your Honour wants to maintain the general rule of relevance. I am sure that is the intention of every hon. member of the House. I sat through the speech of—and I make no reflection on Your Honour's observations—the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of State for Science and Technology (Mr. Simmons). The difficulty is that he did not say one word with respect to this amendment, and there was no intervention by the Chair. Yet, when we rise to talk about this motion, the Chair intervenes.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. That argument was brought forward this afternoon. The answer which I gave to that argument this afternoon was that when hon. members make their remarks, we in the chair often give quite a bit of latitude and are very lenient as far as the rule of relevance is concerned. We had listened to the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie), and I would say that most of his remarks strayed from the motion. Therefore, I had to be lenient also with regard to the parliamentary secretary, but on two occasions in the middle of his speech I asked him to direct his remarks to the motion before us. I want no one to feel offended if I do so again. I invite hon. members to address the motion before the House. If not, I do not know why they would need a speaker or someone in the Chair. We have a rule of relevance, and I hope hon. members will abide by it. The hon. member for Selkirk-Interlake.

Mr. Skelly: Mr. Speaker, it is Comox-Powell River, which is a little distance beyond Selkirk-Interlake.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: You are now part of the Canada lands.

Mr. Skelly: The unfortunate part of compelling absolute and strict relevance on the first clause of a bill is that it is difficult to set the context within which the debate will take place.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. That argument was also raised by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath). Again, I must remind hon. members that we are not dealing with the first clause of the bill. We are dealing with motion No. 3, and I hope hon. members understand. I have clearly read motion No. 3. I am at the disposition of the House. If there is unanimous consent that we discuss the whole bill, I will accept it.

Mr. Evans: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Otherwise, I will invite hon. members to discuss the motion.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, it is not a matter of being broad in the sense of discussing everything under the sun.

Mr. Evans: Respect the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): This particular amendment affects the definition of Canada lands. The last speaker was talking about revenues and ownership. Section 40 deals