

accept when it comes for the consideration of the House in the form of a reasoned amendment, but I regret it cannot be accepted in the form presented by the honourable Member.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Greene, seconded by Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton),—That Bill C-144, An Act to provide for the management of the water resources of Canada including research and the planning and implementation of programs relating to the conservation, development and utilization of water resources, be now read a third time and do pass;

And debate continuing;

Mr. Harding, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), proposed to move in amendment thereto,—That Bill C-144, An Act to provide for the management of the water resources of Canada including research and the planning and implementation of programs relating to the conservation, development and utilization of water resources, be not read now but be referred back to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works with instructions to insert after clause 25 the following clause:

“26. Any person who has been convicted of an offence under section 25 shall thereby become liable for the total cost of cleaning up the water or waters whose quality has been degraded or altered by his violation.”

and by renumbering the remaining clauses.

RULING BY MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: First of all I want to thank honourable Members for their contributions. As I have indicated I have had some difficulty with this amendment. I might just read it again. I will read the proposed new section, which would be numbered section 26. It would read as follows: “Any person who has been convicted of an offence under section 25 shall thereby become liable for the total cost of cleaning up the water or waters whose quality has been degraded or altered by his violation.”

As has been indicated to honourable Members the decision faced by the Chair is the following one: does this amendment add something to the bill—a new section to the bill, or a new proposition to the bill which is not there? The difficulty at third reading has already been outlined by Mr. Speaker in a previous ruling, but I might refer to May's citation on both pages 571 and 572, using key sentences. On page 571 I quote: “The procedure on the third reading of a bill is similar to that described in relation to the second reading, but the debate is more restricted at the later stage, being limited to the matters contained in the bill.”

Again at the top of page 572 of May's seventeenth edition it continues: “As the debate on the third reading should be confined to the contents of the bill . . .”

This, of course, would apply equally forcibly to amendments.

I would also like to refer to Beauchesne's fourth edition, particularly citation 418: “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.”