

instruction to amend the bill by adding thereto, immediately after clause 27 thereof, page 23, the following:

28. Nothing in this act shall in any way be construed to be inconsistent with Canada's rightful claim of sovereignty in and over water, ice and land areas of the Arctic regions between the degrees of longitude 60 and longitude 141.

and by renumbering clause 28 of the bill, page 23, as clause 29."

The arguments put forward by the honourable Member in support of the acceptability of his motion are interesting but I have some doubt as to whether it would be in order for the Chair to accept them. To my understanding the honourable Member has proposed by way of amendment a motion instructing the committee to insert a declaration of principle asserting sovereignty over the Arctic. He indicates this is being done in a negative way as a saving clause, but even if it is done in this way it seems to me the honourable Member is going beyond the terms of the bill.

There has been protracted discussion on this point ever since the bill was introduced for second reading—questions as to whether this was an anti-pollution bill or a sovereignty bill—and the honourable Member for Peace River together with a number of his honourable friends proposed that it should be changed in such a way as to go beyond the terms of the proposed legislation before the House. As the honourable Member who has just spoken pointed out, this amendment was proposed originally by the honourable Member for Oxford in practically the same terms as are used in the one which is now under discussion, and the Chair expressed reservations at the time. I doubt very much whether the amendment should be accepted in those terms. It does seem, if only indirectly, to seek to bring within the four corners of the bill a declaration of a principle which, to my way of thinking, is not there at the present time.

I have been referred to citation 418 of Beauchesne's 4th edition as follows: "All amendments which may be moved on a second reading of a bill may be moved on the third reading with the restriction that they cannot deal with any matter which is not contained in the Bill."

I fail to see how I could ignore this long standing precedent and say that the honourable Member's amendment, which does seek to introduce a new declaration of principle, is acceptable.

I would also refer honourable Members to the very cogent and learned ruling of the Deputy Speaker reported in *Votes and Proceedings* for June 4, page 937, when a similar amendment was proposed for the consideration of the House. The learned and respected Deputy Speaker referred the House to Beauchesne's 4th edition, particularly citation 418, and also to May's 17th edition, page 572. I suspect that this is where the honourable Members who have participated in the debate got their wisdom and knowledge. I would find it difficult to disagree with a ruling so clearly expressed by the learned Deputy Speaker and I am honoured to have the opportunity to confirm the ruling that he made at that time and to say that it applies on all fours to the situation we now have.

I regret, in the circumstances, that the motion proposed by the honourable Member for Peace River cannot be put to the House.

---

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Chrétien, seconded by Mr. Greene,—That Bill C-202, An Act to prevent pollution of areas of the arctic