

I find it difficult to agree with the suggestion that the new rules have changed this requirement. I suggest to honourable Members that the rule is still in good standing, that amendments which can be proposed on second reading can also be proposed on third reading although there is a further restriction that they contain only items included in the bill before the House. In other words, a proposed amendment on third reading should not go beyond the terms of the bill.

Perhaps, if it is necessary, I should refer honourable Members also to a citation from May's seventeenth edition at page 571, which reads as follows: "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."

Then the learned author continues for some paragraphs referring to reasoned amendment. It may well be that the kind of proposition advanced by the honourable Member for the consideration of the House could be acceptable from a procedural standpoint if it were in the form of a reasoned amendment rather than in the form of an ordinary amendment to the bill on third reading.

The second objection which the Chair has to bring to the attention of honourable Members has to do with its financial implications, and the financial initiative of the Crown. Without reading the citations I refer honourable Members to citation 260(1) and 249(1) of Beauchesne's fourth edition.

The honourable Member suggests that no expenditure will be required, but of course in his proposed amendment he does refer to the fact that if there is any additional expenditure the committee would request a further recommendation by His Excellency the Governor General, and I do not think it is possible in this way to do indirectly what honourable Members cannot do directly.

It may be, and I have no evidence to this effect, that committees have tried to do this, but I would not think that if this kind of amendment were put to the House for consideration, even though it might be accepted by the chairman and the members of a committee, that would automatically make it acceptable from a procedural standpoint to the Chair in this House. I have serious doubts about it.

My understanding is that a committee will sometimes recommend that the government give consideration to the provision of the funds necessary for the financing of an amendment supported by the committee. I would not think a committee has the power to go further than that, and I would not think that in the House a private Member, either on the government side or the opposition side, has the power to go beyond that. According to our long-standing practice the financial initiative belongs to the Crown.

It seems to me we would have a rather difficult situation if this amendment were accepted, if the bill went back to the committee, and the committee gave it its approval, and then this became law and we left it to the initiative and the goodwill of the government to accept or not to accept, or to proceed or not to proceed with the recommendation of the committee. I suggest that would make a rather unusual kind of legislative proposal. For this reason, and for the other reasons I have tried to expound I would not think that the amendment as put can be accepted.

For the benefit of honourable Members I would like to reiterate, if this can be of assistance, that this kind of amendment is much easier for the Chair to