

a positive way. Clearly, it does not constitute a question of privilege. The question of unanimous consent, in the circumstances, is clearly described in Standing Order 43. If it were the will of the House that refusal under Standing Order 43 was to be carried out in a way similar to the manner in which a recorded vote is carried out or the way in which objections are made to the extension of hours pursuant to the Standing Order, that within the last hour of debate in the day a member may put forward a motion for an extension of the hours unless a certain number of members rise in their place to object to it—if the language were to be used in that way it would, presumably, accomplish the purpose of the hon. member and those who have raised the point before.

However, that is not the wording of the Standing Order. Accordingly, unanimous consent means exactly what it says, that if any one member indicates to the Chair by the traditional method of saying “No” that his or her consent is withheld, then the Chair cannot proceed on the basis of unanimous consent. That consent may be withheld not in relation to the merits of the motion but on procedural grounds. It may be an unwillingness to set aside the business of the day, even an unwillingness to debate a matter or to let a matter go without debate. There can be all kinds of motivations. Whatever it is, the Chair is compelled now to simply determine whether or not unanimous consent exists.

The Chair must not proceed if it is the desire of the House to examine any possibility for doing it in a different way on the basis of the suggestion of the hon. member. That suggestion should be forwarded to the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization. It does not constitute a question of privilege.

Mr. MacKay: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a brief point of order. A few moments ago a memorandum was delivered to me intended for my friend, the government House leader. It is marked “Memorandum” and “Confidential”. I wonder whether this is an innovation on behalf of the government, a more reasonable attitude toward freedom of information, or whether it is just an indication of lack of government organization.

Mr. Paproski: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I was surprised by the interjection of the Prime Minister when he recognized Thespius, from “Romeo and Juliet”, during my serious and important question. However, in view of the answers the Prime Minister gave me during the question period, I hope he will go and take a jump in “Swan Lake”.

Order Paper Questions

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

FINANCE, TRADE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Fifth report of Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs—Mr. Cafik.

[Editor's Note: For text of above report, see today's Votes and Proceedings]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

[Translation]

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Maurice A. Dionne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: 1,613, 1,614, 1,615, 1,616, and 1,826.

[Text]

INDIAN RIGHTS AND TREATY RESEARCH PROGRAM

Question No. 1,613—**Mr. Holmes:**

For the fiscal year (a) 1972-73 (b) 1973-74 (c) 1974-75 (d) 1975-76, what projects were rejected under the Indian Rights and Treaty Research Programme and, in each case, for what reason?

Mr. B. Keith Penner (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): There were no projects which were rejected by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development under the four year, \$7.5 million Indian Rights and Treaty Research Program. The research program being carried out by the Indian associations was not project oriented, rather, it was geared to enable the Indian associations to set their own research priorities within the limits of available funds and to begin work on the identification and substantiation of Indian rights as well as to commence basic research into the resolution of grievances and/or claims relating to the administration of land and other Indian assets under the Indian Act, and to the fulfilment or interpretation of Indian treaties.

INDIAN RIGHTS AND TREATY RESEARCH PROGRAM

Question No. 1,614—**Mr. Holmes:**

1. Are the recommendations of the National Indian Brotherhood as set out in their December 1976 evaluation report of the Indian Rights and Treaty Research Programme being followed and, if so, to what extent?

2. What levels of research funding is the government prepared to allocate for each of the 17 major Indian research teams for the fiscal year 1977-78?