

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: I also wish to thank the honourable Member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) for his comments.

I am afraid the honourable Member has failed to differentiate between the two types of amendments: the one which allows the House to consider the suggestion that a bill be referred to a committee for one of its sections to be re-examined or reconsidered, and the other one which is called a reasoned amendment in English and which is used by a Member to indicate why he intends to vote against the principle of the bill.

The reasoned amendment here gives a detailed account of the reasons why the honourable Member intends to vote against the bill as such on second or third reading. There is no question then of referring the bill to a committee but simply of saying why the House should vote against the bill as such.

I think that the honourable Member is aware of the precedents in this respect.

The other type of amendment suggests that a clause of a bill be referred to a committee for consideration and it is possible of course to give instructions to a committee to consider any clause. Unfortunately, the instructions to be given to the committee must comply with our Standing Orders and a well established precedent is that which is found in Beuchesne in citation 415. I should like to quote from it and to refer honourable Members to paragraph (4). I quote: "On the third reading of a bill, an amendment to refer back to the Committee of the Whole must not tend to change the principle approved on the second reading.

418. . . On the second reading of a bill, an amendment may be moved expressing opinions as to any circumstances connected with its introduction or prosecution, or seeking further information in relation to the bill by committees or commissioners, the production of papers or other evidence, or the opinion of judges. This cannot be done on the third reading because it is not directly connected with any provision of the bill."

The principle expounded by the author of citation 418 is to the effect that there should be a strict relevance in the case of an amendment moved at the third or second reading stage.

The 3rd paragraph of citation 246 of the Fourth Edition of Beuchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms reads as follows:

"(3) 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* . . . not only the amount of a charge, but also its objects, purposes, conditions and qualifications. . . ."

I do not want to read the whole paragraph, but in quoting paragraph 3 of citation 246, I wanted simply

to remind the honourable Member that it is not possible to instruct the committee to do something the House itself cannot undertake, which the committee cannot be authorized to do, that is to amend the financial orders of the Crown.

I could read other citations, including No. 252, but I do not think it is necessary to do so. It is obvious to me that honourable Members could, if they so wished, simply move an amendment to the effect that a particular clause of the bill be reconsidered. A motion to this effect would be acceptable, contrary to that moved by the honourable Member.

Moreover, I sincerely believe that it violates our Standing Rules and I do not think that it could be acceptable to the Chair.

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 6(5) (a), Mr. Jerome, seconded by Mr. Watson, moved,—That the hours of sitting be extended beyond six o'clock this day until debate upon third reading of Bill C-207, is concluded.

And more than ten Members having objected, the said motion was, pursuant to Standing Order 6(5) (b), deemed to have been withdrawn.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Munro, seconded by Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt),—That Bill C-207, An Act to amend the Old Age Security Act, be now read a third time and do pass.

And debate continuing;

By unanimous consent, the House reverted to "Routine Proceedings".

Mr. Foster, from the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs, presented the Second Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Tuesday, May 16, 1972, your Committee has considered Bill C-208, An Act to amend the Pension Act, the War Veterans Allowance Act, the Civilian War Pensions and Allowances Act, the Children of War Dead (Education Assistance) Act and the Department of Veterans Affairs Act to provide for the annual adjustment of pensions and allowances payable thereunder, and has agreed to report it without amendment.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence relating to this Bill (*Issue No. 6*) is tabled.

(*The Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence accompanying the said Report recorded as Appendix No. 18 to the Journals*).