

*Oil and Gas Act*

The Chair is of the opinion that the decision reached on June 5 last should be re-echoed on this occasion. The motion proposed by the hon. member would introduce into the bill the question of treaty rights of certain people in our northern areas and, as such, the subject matter of the proposed motion is beyond the scope of the present bill. In this regard may I refer the hon. member for Skeena to citation 406 of Beauchesne's fourth edition, which in part reads as follows:

Amendments are out of order if they are

(a) irrelevant to the bill, or beyond its scope, governed by or dependent upon amendments already negated;

(b) inconsistent with or contradictory to the bill as agreed to by the committee.

For those reasons I must with regret declare that the motion to amend the bill may not be received.

**Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni)** moved:

That Bill S-5, An act to amend the Oil and Gas Production and Conservation Act, be amended by adding thereto the following as clause 7:

"7. This act shall come into force on the 1st day of July, 1972."

He said: Mr. Speaker, I think it should be quite apparent to members of the House why I have moved this amendment, considering it has been placed within the immediate context of one Your Honour has seen fit to rule out of order. I shall not seek to quarrel with the ruling on it. The purpose of my amendment, in effect, is to give the government an adequate breathing spell in which to move forward in the area suggested by the amendment of the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) which unfortunately is out of order in the present circumstances.

Nevertheless, I feel this amendment raises a very important matter. While this matter may not come directly within the scope of the bill, it is one which obviously requires the attention of the government of the day. You, Mr. Speaker, have already referred in your ruling to what happened on June 5, 1969, when a similar motion was ruled out of order. On that occasion the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) was in his place in the House and raised a question as to whether the amendment then proposed was in order. As recorded at page 9802 of *Hansard*, he said:

● (8:10 p.m.)

I realize there are problems connected with treaties entered into with the Northwest Territories and it is our intention to take the necessary [The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard).]

steps to settle them. However, this matter is altogether outside the scope of this legislation—

My purpose in moving this amendment, which would delay the coming into force of the bill until July 1, 1972, is to give the government an opportunity to do between now and then what it obviously has not done since the original bill was dealt with last June. Despite the statement then made by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development that it was the intention of the government to take the necessary steps to settle this matter of Indian and other aboriginal rights in these areas, the government obviously has done nothing to fulfill that intention in the time that has elapsed since last June. Rather, I submit, it has moved in exactly the opposite direction, because since that time we have had placed before the House for consideration a statement of government policy with respect to the Indian people, and that statement very deliberately and specifically turns it back completely on any action leading to the settlement of the aboriginal rights of the Indian people in the territories and indeed in other parts of Canada.

That is why I am asking to have this amendment accepted by the House so that the government in the interval between now and July 1, 1972, may in fact do something to fulfil the stated intention of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development as expressed in June of last year. I think this matter has in effect been made more pointed by certain events that have transpired in another country which has been visited by our Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). If I might just briefly refer to a story which appears on the front page of today's *Toronto Globe and Mail*, I should like to quote in part what this story has to say about our Prime Minister and his activities in New Zealand. The story outlines a meeting he had with the Maori people of that commonwealth country. At one part it says the Prime Minister told the Maoris:

In seeking to build a harmonious society, white New Zealanders and Maoris had "succeeded more than we have, and this alone is enough to make my trip worth-while, for I will have learned from you the ways of brotherhood."

I hope indeed that the Prime Minister has learned something about the ways of brotherhood through his encounter with the Maoris or New Zealand. Mr. Speaker, in striking contrast to the reception which apparently was given the Prime Minister of Canada by the aboriginal inhabitants of New Zealand, we