

*Northern Pipeline*

doubt, what we are discussing here today endorses the noblest of concepts, human dignity. Unfortunately, those of us who feel compelled to point out some difficulties—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier):** Order, please. Unfortunately, it is also six o'clock. The hour allotted for private members' business having expired, I do now leave the chair until 8 p.m.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

● (2002)

**AFTER RECESS**

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

● (2012)

[English]

**NORTHERN PIPELINE ACT****ESTABLISHMENT OF AGENCY TO SUPERVISE PIPELINE CONSTRUCTION**

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-25, to establish the Northern Pipeline Agency, to facilitate the planning and construction of a pipeline for the transmission of natural gas from Alaska and Northern Canada and to give effect to an Agreement between Canada and the United States of America on principles applicable to such a pipeline and to amend certain acts in relation thereto, as reported (with amendments) from the Special Committee on a Northern Gas Pipeline.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Hon. members are aware that there are some 11 proposed motions to amend Bill C-25 at the report stage. I have given to hon. members present my suggestions as to how these motions may be grouped for discussion and voting and I will go over those. However, there has been some understanding about motions 8, 9 and 10 I will come to those in a moment. Motions 1 and 11, in the name of the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie, I think should be grouped together for the purpose of debate with a vote on motion 1 disposing of motion 11. It seems to me that motion 11 will have no existence if motion No. 1 is not carried.

Motion 2, in the name of the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie, appears to have two very serious difficulties and I will be hearing argument on it. The idea of a committee introduced into the minister's orbit of authority seems to be a totally new concept within the bill. Furthermore, unless the committee is already employed in some way or it is composed of unpaid volunteers, the motion would raise the element of new expenses which are not covered in the recommendation.

[Mr. Philbrook.]

Motions 3, 5 and 7 I think would be discussed and voted upon separately if votes are required.

Motions 4 and 6 both deal with native claims and I think should be grouped together for discussion, although probably they should be voted on separately if votes are required.

My initial impression of motions 8, 9 and 10 is that they should be grouped together for discussion because they all deal with manpower and procurement conditions set out in Schedule III. I had thought that probably a vote on motion No. 8 might dispose of all three but I understand there is some feeling that motion No. 8 should be voted separately from a second vote which would take place on motions 9 and 10. That seems to me to be satisfactory. I do not have any strong feelings about the original suggestion. So we could take it as arranged that the three motions, Nos. 8, 9 and 10, would be discussed together and there would be a separate vote on motion 8 and a second vote on motions 9 and 10, if in fact votes are required.

If there are any other comments at this time I would be glad to have them, particularly in respect to motion 2.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, the statement you have just made makes unnecessary any extended remarks at this point. You were good enough to supply us with a copy of what you intended to say, so we have had discussions about motions 8, 9 and 10. It was our desire that motions 8 and 9 be voted on separately, since motion No. 8 deals with Canadian labour and motion No. 9 deals with Canadian material. However, Your Honour has accepted that point so we are at one in that respect.

This means that in so far as the lineup you have given to us is concerned, the only question we still raise has to do with motion No. 2. My hon. friend the member for Sault Ste. Marie feels that it does not involve the expenditure of any new money. At some point, whenever Your Honour directs, he would like to have the opportunity to argue in favour of its admissibility. With that one request we accept the proposal you have placed before us.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. If there are no other comments, my preference would be to take that argument now so that the whole House would have the benefit of knowing whether they are dealing with or without motion No. 2.

**Mr. Symes:** Mr. Speaker, motion 2, standing in my name, calls for the establishment of a committee to review the bids for goods and services from Canadian sources for the Alcan pipeline to ensure that there is no price fixing. We felt that this amendment was necessary in light of other amendments we have moved which would guarantee Canadian content. The purpose of this amendment was to prevent any abuse of that guarantee provision as it relates to prices.

I would argue that the committee proposed in the amendment would not constitute any expenditure of public funds. If Your Honour will look at clause 9 of the bill on page 6 you will notice that clause 9 says "The Minister may". It then lists a number of duties and powers for the minister. Clause 9(d),