

No. 633—*Mr. Valade*

Since January 1964 (a) how many Royal Commissions were established (b) what was the name of each (c) what was the cost of each?—Sessional Paper No. 283-2/633.

No. 741—*Mr. Howard* (Skeena)

What studies have been conducted by the Development Analysis Section of the Northern Economic Development Branch of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, and (a) what were the amounts spent on each of these studies (b) who conducted these studies (c) what is the status of each study?—Sessional Paper No. 283-2/741.

No. 745—*Mr. Skoberg*

1. With reference to the Department of Manpower and Immigration recent publication "Manpower Mobility Program Follow-up Study", prepared by Kates, Peat, Marwick and Co., dated March 31, 1969, how many applications for a relocation grant since the inception of this plan until December 31, 1970 have been refused?

2. How many applications for relocation grants under the Manpower Mobility Program have been refused by province?

3. On what grounds was the majority of the applications for a relocation grant under the Manpower Mobility Program refused?

4. How many applications for grants under the Manpower Mobility Program have been accepted by province?

5. What is the total amount of the grants paid for those qualifying under the Manpower Mobility Program by province?—Sessional Paper No. 283-2/745.

Mr. Jerome, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council, presented,—Returns to the foregoing Orders.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Benson, seconded by Mr. Pepin,—That Bill C-186, An Act to authorize the provision of moneys to meet certain capital expenditures of the Canadian National Railways System and Air Canada for the period from the 1st day of January, 1970, to the 30th day of June, 1971, and to authorize the guarantee by Her Majesty of certain securities to be issued by the Canadian National Railway Company and certain debentures to be issued by Air Canada, be now read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

And on the proposed motion of Mr. Howe, seconded by Mr. Thomas (Moncton), in amendment thereto,—That Bill C-186, be not now read a second time as, in the opinion of this house, the making of financial guarantees or grants to the Canadian National Railways without the appointment of the Auditor General of Canada at least as a joint auditor of the CNR is not a principle that this House ought to support.

And debate continuing;

RULING BY MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This might be an appropriate time to rule on the amendment proposed by the honourable Member for Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo (Mr. Howe).

When Bill C-186 was last before the House on November 30, 1970, the honourable Member for Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo proposed to move an amendment as follows: "That Bill C-186 be not now read a second time as, in the opinion of this House, the making of financial guarantees or grants to the Canadian National Railways without the appointment of the Auditor General of Canada at least as a joint auditor of the CNR is not a principle that this House ought to support."

On that occasion I indicated that I intended to deal with the procedural aspects of the amendment but before I could do so the hour for Private Members' Business intervened and, subsequently, the debate on Bill C-186 was unanimously adjourned. This is the first occasion on which the bill has been back before the House and therefore, if it is agreeable to the House, this might be an opportune time for me to deal with the procedural aspects of the amendment.

It seems to me, and I appreciate that this was the intention of the honourable Member who moved it, that the proposed amendment, if adopted, would have the effect of amending clause 15 of the bill which provides for the appointment of auditors. It would in the words of the proposed amendment, provide for "the appointment of the Auditor General of Canada at least as a joint auditor of the CNR."

While the purpose of the amendment is clear my concern must be whether or not it is procedurally correct.

With great respect to the honourable Member who proposed the amendment it seems to me that it may not pass the test as a reasoned amendment which could be accepted at this point in the proceedings, in two particulars.

First it appears that the proposed amendment does not oppose the principle of the bill. It opposes or adds to the provision of clause 15 by substituting one auditor for another, or by providing that instead of the auditor named in clause 15 acting alone, he would act jointly with the Auditor General of Canada. I cite here as authority, without reading it to the House, Beauchesne's fourth edition, citation 393(3).

Again, on the second point which gives me some concern, the proposed amendment may fall somewhat short of the practices of the House in that it does appear that the purpose which the honourable Member for Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo is attempting to achieve is the amendment of a detail in the bill which might very well be attempted in the standing committee, or at the report stage of the bill. Again, without reading the citations may I refer honourable Members to May's 17th