

about the admissibility of the amendment. In my view it goes beyond the scope of Bill C-203. But prior to making any definitive statement I am prepared to hear argument, if there is argument to be made.

Mr. Doug Rowland (for Mr. Brewin) moved:

That Bill C-203, an act to provide for the amendment of the Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act, be amended by adding at the end of clause 2 thereof:

"and that section 4 of the act be amended by adding as subsection (3) the following words:

(3) the seas adjacent to the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of Canada within a line measuring seaward a distance of one hundred nautical miles shall be subject to pollution control by regulation as may be approved by regulations to that effect passed by the Governor in Council.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw three considerations to your attention with respect to the admissibility of the amendment under the rules of the House. The first is that Bill C-203 is declaratory in nature, as is the amendment. Clause 3 of the bill asserts Canada's sovereignty over waters extending 12 miles from straight baselines drawn along our coastlines. Clause 4 asserts that Canada has the right to regulate fishing within a zone or zones to be established by Order in Council. The amendment is also declaratory in that sense. It asserts Canada's right to exercise control over shipping to a distance of 100 miles from our east and west coasts for the purpose of protecting our environment against damage from possible pollution resulting in large part from accidents to shipping. So in the sense that it is a declaratory amendment, as are the provisions of the bill, I consider that it is in keeping with the general tenor of the bill.

The second consideration I would draw to Your Honour's attention is that the obvious purpose of the bill is to protect Canada's national interests with respect to its maritime regions. That, again, is the purpose of the amendment drafted by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), although on the specific matter of pollution. The 1958 Geneva Conference on the Law of the Sea confirmed the general acceptance of the concept of a contiguous zone within which the coastal state may exercise exclusive authority for limited designated purposes in a zone within modest limits and contiguous to a territorial sea. That concept was accepted with narrow limits because those narrow limits were appropriate to the problems and functions envisaged by that conference.

Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act

It may, therefore, be argued, as do many experts in international law that a pollution zone is not less acceptable because of the spacially less modest limits it would require if these limits are to be wholly appropriate to the problems of pollution and the functions of environment control. So I am in effect arguing that the motion is in keeping with the general purpose of the bill, which is to protect Canada's national interests by extending those areas of the adjacent coastal waters over which we claim to exercise total or partial sovereignty.

With those arguments I will retire from the field, I hope unbowed. Perhaps there may be something that my colleague, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), might care to add.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the amendment moved by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) seeks to establish, by means of the bill under study, a pollution control zone related neither to the territorial sea nor to the fishing zones of Canada. Thus it amounts to an attempt to amend the Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act rather than the bill under study. For this reason alone, I do not see how it would be possible to entertain the amendment moved by the hon. member.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I thank hon. members for their contribution to the procedural discussion. I must say that despite the very persuasive arguments of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Rowland), I share the doubts of the Parliamentary Secretary. It seems to me that the amendment in the name of the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) is not relevant to the subject matter and in fact goes beyond the scope of the bill.

The main provisions of Bill C-203 provide for a 12-mile territorial sea in substitution of a three-mile territorial sea, and for the elimination of contiguous fishing zones. It also provides that such zones shall be prescribed by the Governor in Council. The remaining provisions of the bill are subsidiary to the main provisions. The motion proposed by the hon. member deals with the question of pollution, which is foreign to the purpose and content of Bill C-203. I would remind hon. mem-