

No. 2,311—*Mr. Hales*

1. Since the new postal regulations became effective on April 1, 1969, has any information been made available as to what publications previously granted 2nd class privileges are now obliged to mail under 3rd or 4th class?

2. Will this information be made public and from whom may such be available?

No. 2,474—*Mr. Yewchuk*

1. How much money was spent last year by the federal government on financing university education for foreign students (a) at the undergraduate level (b) at the post-graduate level?

2. How much money was spent last year by the federal government on financing university education for Canada's native people (a) at the undergraduate level (b) at the postgraduate level?

No. 2,485—*Mr. Robinson*

1. How much money has been paid under the Canada Assistance Plan per year since its inception in 1963?

2. How much was paid to each province in each year since the inception of the plan?

3. Do the provinces still contribute to the Canada Assistance Plan?

4. How many people in each province receive benefits under the Canada Assistance Plan?

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

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Trudeau, seconded by Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale),—That Bill C-120, An Act respecting the status of the official languages of Canada, be now read a third time and do pass.

And debate continuing;

Mr. McIntosh, seconded by Mr. Gundlock, moved in amendment thereto,—That the said bill be not now read a third time but that the Government of Canada take such steps as may be necessary to have the Supreme Court of Canada provide a decision with respect to the constitutionality of the provisions of the said Bill.

And a point of Order having been raised by the Honourable Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) as to the regularity of the said proposed amendment;

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: Essentially the argument advanced by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) is based on citations in May's 17th edition, which of course have to be taken very seriously, and I think that the Minister of Justice was quite right in bringing this particular difficulty to the attention of the Chair. The argument of the Minister is that this kind of amendment cannot be moved on third reading if it goes beyond the scope of the bill itself, or to use the words of May, as quoted at page 417: "... a reasoned amendment should not urge the rejection of the bill on the ground of what it omits."