

*Water Resources*

tion declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy, or provisions of the bill".

Recognizing this, the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka has sought to indicate to the Chair that this type of principle is exposed in the amendment proposed by the hon. member.

There are two other citations which I would commend to hon. members. Section (1) of citation 393 of Beauchesne's fourth edition states, in part:

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.

The most pertinent of the two citations, I suggest, is section (3) of citation 393 of Beauchesne's fourth edition, which reads as follows:

An amendment which is not adverse to the principle of a Bill but proposes that certain provisions be added to the Bill cannot be moved on the motion for second reading.

It seems to me that this citation is very relevant to the procedural question that is now before the House. The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka suggested in his argument that this amendment is drafted so as to be in harmony with our new rules. I find it difficult to agree with this suggestion. It is still possible to amend new sections of a bill in committee. It is still possible to amend a bill on second reading according to the forms and principles that are long established and recognized by the practice of the House. In addition, detailed amendments can still be proposed at the report stage; and amendments on third reading can be proposed in the same way as they could prior to the adoption of the new rules.

In my humble view there is nothing in the new rules, I suggest, that can be taken to broaden the scope of the amendments which can be proposed to the House and received by the House as in order. To my way of thinking, the amendment proposed to the House is not a reasoned amendment because it does not, in my view, oppose the principle of the bill.

I am not suggesting that it would not be possible to move an amendment at this stage which might include some parts of the amendment that has been presented, and which could be moved in the acceptable form of a reasoned amendment. I would think that could be done quite easily. But at that point

[Mr. Speaker.]

hon. members would be called upon to vote for a principle which opposes the essence of the bill before the House; and at that point hon. members are in fact invited to vote against second reading of the bill, which is not what this amendment seeks to do.

For these reasons, it seems to me that the Chair has no alternative but to rule that the proposed amendment of the hon. member for South Western Nova cannot be received at this time. Again, I do not want to insist that the same purpose might not perhaps be achieved in other ways. However, I have very serious reservations that the purpose can be achieved in the ingenious way proposed by the hon. member for South Western Nova, and I must refuse to put the amendment to the House at this time.

**Mr. Aiken:** Mr. Speaker, we do, of course, accept your ruling. We will examine your words of wisdom very carefully and try again.

**Mr. Speaker:** I trust the hon. member will not look at them too closely.

● (3:20 p.m.)

**Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with considerable interest to the procedural arguments, but not being an authority in this area I naturally will not refer to procedure.

I first came to Ottawa as a member of Parliament about a year and a half ago. I was not nearly as aware then of what pollution meant as I am at the present time. I recall the first time I smelled the miasma from the pulp mill across the river. I thought the House was on fire or that something was smoldering. I went to the Sergeant-at-Arms and suggested that he make a check. I am sure he did not know what I was talking about, but that is the way it struck me. I thought we had a fire.

**An hon. Member:** There has been some pollution here.

**Mr. Thomson:** Someone suggested the House has suffered some pollution, but that is of another kind. I hope I can clear the air so far as this party is concerned.

Certainly, everybody today is talking about this very urgent problem. Let me read from an editorial that appeared in the *Canada Month*. This is the apostle of free enterprise in which appeared an epistle. I should like to read one or two excerpts from it as follows:

We ought not, at this point, to need the creative capacities of little men stacked in offices at Ottawa