

National Energy Board Act

may I say that the bill as presented does not encompass, of course, the whole National Energy Board Act as originally drawn. The specific amendments are referable to certain particulars, such as the increase in the size of the National Energy Board and certain considerations in respect of how in its accounting procedures the board will consider such things as depreciation, and so on, in determining rates. The bill does not really in any way encompass the aspect the hon. member has in mind concerning safety from an ecological standpoint with regard to pipelines. I submit, with respect, that the amendment goes considerably beyond the context of the bill.

I know the very great interest of the hon. member in this matter and the great contribution he has made to our thinking in respect of pollution. With regard to air, water and soil pollution I do not think any other member of this House has given more attention to the matter or has been more concerned or so well informed. Knowing of the hon. member's concern, I should like to advise him that when I brought his amendment to the attention of the officials I was assured that they would examine very carefully, before granting the right to construct a pipeline, the very considerations my hon. friend envisages in respect of his amendment.

This apparently is not clearly spelled out in the exact words referred to by the hon. member, but in the general authority of the board in granting permits one of its major concerns is that it never grant a permit unless it is sure the pipeline will be constructed in such a way, and over such terrain, that the ecology will be protected and pollution will not ensue. So while the bill is not clearly worded in the terms the hon. member has suggested, I can assure him that in practice the National Energy Board, I am advised, is very much concerned about this question in the granting of permits.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I thank hon. members for their contribution to the procedural aspect of this matter. I may say that my original doubts are the same. It seems to me that the amendment proposed by the hon. member goes beyond the bill before the House, and in fact goes behind the bill to amend the act. As I have pointed out several times this afternoon, this renders the proposed motion irrelevant and beyond the scope of the bill. I would simply remind the House of May's cogent rule on this matter which appears at page 549 of

May's seventeenth edition and reads as follows:

An amendment is out of order if it is irrelevant to the subject matter or beyond the scope of the bill, or if it is irrelevant to the subject matter or beyond the scope of the clause under consideration.

For these reasons I must rule that the motion is inadmissible.

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources) moved that Bill C-190, to amend the National Energy Board Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When shall the bill be read the third time?

Some hon. Members: By leave, now.

Mr. Greene moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, may I speak very briefly on the third reading stage of this bill. It is not my intention to hold up its passage. I appreciate the words of the minister when he indicated that he feels the spirit of the amendment I suggested is in effect being implemented by the National Energy Board in its interpretation of the general tenor of the legislation. This is somewhat reassuring. Nevertheless, I am one who feels that sometimes it is a pretty good plan to lay down exactly what we mean and what we expect the board to look into. Then they will know their duties and I think the general public will have a better idea of the duties of the board.

• (5:00 p.m.)

I draw the attention of hon. members to a rather interesting event which took place in the last couple of weeks. I am referring to the rupturing of our pipeline. I do not think it had anything to do with the ecology of the area, such as permafrost causing a sloughing and a breaking of the pipeline. But let us not kid ourselves that we will not have a host of major problems arising, particularly in Arctic areas when we build pipelines and similar facilities there. If we reach the stage where oil is transported by pipeline southward to where it can be picked up by other pipelines, where it can be readily accessible to rail lines and other types of transportation, I am convinced we will run into a host of problems which we never imagined might exist. For