

### *Auditor General*

I find that all the requirements of Standing Order 68 have been complied with.

I feel quite certain that Dr. Beauchesne did not go to see the Governor General of that day to find out whether he supported our petition, but he took the view that there was a Governor General's recommendation in favour of an increase in old age pensions and therefore he found our petition in order. I submit there is an analogous situation before us now. There is a Governor General's recommendation that something be done in respect of the Auditor General, and now we have a bill that can make use of that recommendation.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. If there is no further discussion on the matter I am quite prepared to give a ruling at this time. I have given serious thought to the matter in that the hon. member indicated a few days ago this bill would be introduced. As I said, I have given serious consideration to the procedural aspects of the hon. member's proposed bill and I am quite prepared now to give my views of the situation.

I have to recognize that the argument proposed by the hon. member for Peace River, gallantly supported by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, is interesting but, I suggest, nothing more. I cannot in any way agree with the hon. member for Peace River. Again I say that he has to receive some kind of commendation from the Chair and those interested in procedure for the arguments which he has submitted for the consideration of the Chair and all hon. members, but I would not think hon. members would expect the Chair to accept those arguments. They point again to the difficulty relating to private members' bills. I fully appreciate this. I gather there have been discussions between representatives of the parties and that there is an intention to have the whole question of private members' public bills referred to the Committee on Procedure and Organization. This would include the bill of the hon. member for Peace River, apart from this one, which is on the order paper and which will bring the whole matter to the fore. It will then be possible for the Committee on Procedure and Organization to make recommendations to the House in respect of the handling of public bills introduced by private members.

● (2:30 p.m.)

The difficulty of course is that no hon. member, including a member of the Cabinet, can introduce a public bill which implies the expenditure of public funds without a recommendation of His Excellency. This applies not only to private members but to members of the government. They cannot introduce such a bill without the recommendation of His Excellency.

In the case of the Auditor General's bill such a recommendation was required. The bill was introduced to the House with the recommendation. It is of course a very novel approach to say that that bill having been withdrawn the recommendation is still available for anyone who desires to introduce a bill which might be called

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

the same thing but which provides for something different. The hon. member I am sure would be the first to admit that his bill is not on all fours with the one which was presented by the government. Having admitted that himself, at this moment he has put himself out of court because it is a different bill. His Excellency recommended a bill which was different. He looked at that bill and said to us, "I have seen the bill and recommend it to the House", and it is that bill he recommended. That bill having been withdrawn I do not think it is necessary for His Excellency to communicate with us and ask us to return the recommendation.

The hon. member cannot deal with a bill once it has been withdrawn. There is no recommendation for the hon. member to seize upon and attach somewhat artificially to his own bill. This having been said I would say I cannot accept the hon. member's suggestion and I have to tell him that his bill cannot be read a first time at this time or at any time.

### QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

#### CREATION OF SPECIAL RESERVE AREAS IN CANADA'S NORTHLAND

Question No. 55—**Mr. Orlikow:**

Has the Government of Canada decided on which special reserve areas in Canada's northland in which resource development activity is to be banned and (a) if so (i) what are they (ii) what criteria were used to identify them (b) if not, when is it anticipated that they will be created?

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** The Government of Canada and those departments responsible for development and for conservation in the north have not yet completed their studies of special reserve areas in which resource development activity is to be banned. There are certain areas now being investigated for national parks, special ecological areas under the auspices of the International Biological Program and archaeological sites which will be considered for withdrawal at a later date in an orderly schedule commensurate with present and future requirements. The Government of Canada is particularly cognizant of the need to protect the northern environment because of the critical sensitivity of this environment, and has accepted the principle that unique areas, unless they must be developed in the national interest, must be protected even if no immediate need for aesthetic appreciation or research can be justified. (a) (i) One of the areas withdrawn is the East Arm, Great Slave Lake (Artillery Lake) area consisting of approximately 2,860 square miles. This area was withdrawn from further alienation under the Territorial Lands Act on March 24, 1970. (P.C. 1970-526 and 527) for the purpose of a future