

Rochon,	Stafford,	Trudel,	Walker,
Rock,	Stanbury,	Turner	Watson,
Roy (Timmins),	Stewart (Okanagan-	(London East),	Whelan,
Roy (Laval),	Kootenay),	Turner	Whiting,
Ryan,	St. Pierre,	(Ottawa-Carleton),	Yanakis—101.
Smith	Trudeau,	Wahn,	
(Saint-Jean),			

On motion of Mr. Chrétien, seconded by Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), the said bill, as amended, was concurred in at the report stage and ordered for a third reading at the next sitting of the House.

The Order being read for the third reading of 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.

Mr. Greene, seconded by Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton), moved,—That the said bill be now read a third time and do pass.

And debate arising thereon;

Mr. Aiken, seconded by Mr. Rynard, proposed to move in amendment thereto:

“That this bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works with instructions to amend it by providing for the continuing scrutiny of the management of Canada’s water resources by a committee of the House, with a permanent staff of one or more persons to assist it, and that for the purpose of any additional expenditure, the committee request a further recommendation by His Excellency the Governor General.”

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: I respect the honourable Member’s knowledge of the rules and his understanding of procedure, and I always listen with every possible consideration and with attention to the views he expresses from time to time when procedural matters are raised in the House. This is why I hesitate at this point to disagree with the views he has expressed, but I have come to the conclusion that even in the light of the very strong and cogent arguments he has submitted for the consideration of the Chair it would be very difficult to accept the amendment which he proposes at present.

I have indicated to him in a summary way that there are two difficulties. One of them deals with relevancy. This, of course, has nothing to do with the new rules. It is a long standing practice that an amendment on third reading has to be particularly relevant to the motion for third reading of the bill before the House. I would like to refer the honourable Member to citation 418 of Beauchesne’s fourth edition which reads as follows: “The question for the third reading is put immediately after the report from the Committee of the Whole. 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.”