

Oil and Gas Act

irrelevant and because it does not oppose the principle of the bill, I suggest the amendment should not be accepted.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): That is what I thought before you spoke.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I shall try to restore this debate to the dignity of a reasoned argument on a procedural question. In doing so I applaud Your Honour's decision in trying to prevent the rather deplorable and sly attempt by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) to get around the mealy-mouthed position the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) took in the past.

• (2:20 p.m.)

Mr. Madonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I now proffer to the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) the same piece of advice I offered the President of the Privy Council.

Mr. Baldwin: I feel better now, Mr. Speaker.

I will now proceed to speak on the procedural question. I should like to point out that I do not think the minister has really directed his mind to the bill in its entirety. It is true that clause 3 deals with the question of the submarine areas, but if hon. members would look back to clause 2 and subclause 3, they would find a new definition of pipeline which brings into question offshore installations or vessels. In other words, the definition of pipeline is extended to include offshore installations or vessels. How far offshore—

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): To the depth of 200 metres.

Mr. Baldwin: The minister has not contributed to the debate so far, and I think that the longer he remains silent the better off this House will be. With regard to the installation of vessels, we want to know how far offshore this would apply and to what extent. Are we entitled to consider that offshore means any part of the water between the islands of the Arctic Archipelago and the mainland? This has been brought into issue by the government in this clause. It purports to affix to the word "pipeline" an artificial interpretation, and therefore we are entitled to say that it is not proper for this Parliament to come to a decision on this matter until it has decided what the government has not had the insti-

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

nal fortitude to decide, namely, what are the limits of our sovereignty so far as the Arctic waters are concerned.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I thank hon. members. I am now prepared to make my ruling on the amendment of the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale).

The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken) and the President of the Privy Council in their interventions on this question mentioned the ruling of Mr. Speaker on January 15 last when a reasoned amendment in relation to the bill to amend the Canada Water Act was before the House. I suggest to hon. members that the ruling on that occasion is relevant and applies in full measure to the amendment now being considered. I should like to quote two sections of that ruling. Paragraph 5 on page 312 of *Votes and Proceedings* which is an excerpt from May's, citation 382, reads:

It is also competent to a Member who desires to place on record any special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of a Bill, to move as an amendment to the question, a resolution declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy, or provisions of the bill, or expressing opinions as to any circumstances connected with its introduction, or prosecution; or otherwise opposed to its progress; or seeking further information to the Bill by Committees, Commissioners, the production of papers or other evidence or the opinion of Judges.

In my view, the really operative part of that citation is the following: "a resolution declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy, or provisions of the bill". Farther on, the same ruling refers to section 1 of citation 393 of *Beauchesne's Fourth edition* which reads:

An amendment purporting to approve the principle of a Bill and at the same time enunciating a declaration of policy cannot be moved to the second reading. It must oppose the principle of the bill.

In my view, the amendment moved today by the hon. member for Brandon-Souris is substantially the same as the one moved by the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau) on January 15. I am afraid that, for the same reasons, I cannot allow the amendment.

Mr. Pat Mahoney (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, when we rose at one o'clock I was discussing the proposition that with all the optimism we may reasonably entertain regarding our prospects in the Arctic, in the Northwest Territories, certainly the fact of Prudhoe Bay or the fact of the oil and gas