

*Water Resources Programs*

motion No. 2. As stated earlier, the Chair is of the opinion that amendments to an interpretation clause should not be used for the purpose of bringing substantive and not too closely related propositions under debate and consideration. I have decided after careful consideration to give the benefit of the doubt to motion No. 4. That motion could be considered and debated in due course.

May I now turn for a few moments to the point of order raised by the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave) with regard to the adequacy of the terms of the financial recommendation in respect of this bill. Being of the view that the financial provision of our rules is a fundamental part of our procedure, I suggest that the hon. member's submission has caused me serious concern. It would appear that I can add very little to what has been stated in section 3 of citation 246 in Beauchesne's fourth edition which reads as follows:

The guiding principle in determining the effect of an amendment upon the financial initiative of the Crown is that the communication, to which the royal demand of recommendation is attached, must be treated as laying down once for all (unless withdrawn and replaced) not only the amount of a charge, but also its objects, purposes, conditions and qualifications. In relation to the standard thereby fixed, an amendment infringes the financial initiative of the Crown, not only if it increases the amount, but also if it extends the objects and purposes, or relaxes the conditions and qualifications expressed in the communication by which the Crown has demanded or recommended a charge. And this standard is binding not only on private members but also on Ministers whose only advantage is that, as advisors of the Crown, they can present new or supplementary estimates or secure the royal recommendation to new or supplementary resolutions.

I suggest to the hon. member that it is not necessary that all objectives of the bill be recited in a financial recommendation but rather it is the financial charges or expenditures that must be covered in it. When the recommendation is in general terms, it may appear to be deficient or inadequate, and I believe that in this case the government has taken steps to expand the financial aspects of the bill.

In this regard I might refer the hon. member to the supplementary recommendation presented to the House to cover the proposed motions Nos. 10, 12 and 13.

In the light of all the circumstances, it is not my view that further proceedings on Bill C-144 should be arrested at this time because of the scope of the financial recommendations related to this bill.

In concluding my comments at this time, may I remind hon. members that a convenient time will have to be arranged in relation to the hearing of the procedural argument on motion No. 16. There will also have to be agreement on when the debate should take place on the motion which stands in the name of the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau), which has now been bypassed since we have started on motion No. 6. Perhaps there might be such agreement among hon. members in due course after we have completed the debate which is now current on motion No. 25.

**Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants):** First of all, like the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) I have to say how much we regret the absence from this chamber of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). It is probably the first time that he has allowed himself to stray outside since the general election way back in 1968.

**An hon. Member:** You mean in 1948.

**Mr. McCleave:** Anyway, he is a thoroughly knowledgeable fellow about the type of breeze that one is apt to meet in this particular chamber, but I hope he has not been caught up by a sudden spring tempest and been wafted away somewhere else. We hope he gets back shortly.

**Mr. Lewis:** He will be back tomorrow.

**Mr. McCleave:** It must be a reverse, boomerang breeze that has taken him away from us.

When I reread Your Honour's statement about the order of business, I realized that my request last night was an exceptional request. It was very clearly indicated that the debate on motion No. 6 and on my own motion should accompany each other, and therefore I am all the more grateful to the House for giving me some time to go into certain aspects of the motion. However, because of the general understanding in the House I will make my speech as brief as I possibly can.

First of all, I hope that the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) will be here this afternoon while we are dealing with my motion. He is a gentleman who can go abroad and talk about putting up an electronic fence to keep such seditious nonsense as the Beverly Hillbillies and the Ed Sullivan show out of Canada, but here we are dealing with something that we have in Canada that we are not prepared to allow to