

Pursuant to Standing Order 39(4), the following three Questions were made Orders of the House for Returns:

No. 379—*Mr. Coates*

1. How many architectural firms have been retained for specific projects by the government since June 25, 1968?
2. (a) What are the names of the firms retained (b) what is the specific project in each instance (c) what is the amount they have received to date in fees and expenses for services rendered (d) what will be the final estimated cost in fees and expenses in each instance?—Sessional Paper No. 283-2/379.

No. 617—*Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia)*

1. What was the surplus or deficit in the Canadian Wheat Board accounts for durum wheat, other wheat, oats and barley in each of the past twenty crop years?
2. How many bushels of each class of grain were delivered in each of the same years?
3. In cents per bushel, what were the initial and final Wheat Board payments on the top grade of each of those four types of grain in each of the same years?—Sessional Paper No. 283-2/617.

No. 675—*Mr. Skoberg*

1. How many federal contracts have been let to the consulting firm of Kates, Peat and Marwick, in 1968 and 1969 (a) what was the total cost of the contracts in 1968 (b) what was the total cost of the contracts in 1969?
2. How many of these contracts for consulting services were awarded by competitive tender?
3. Were there any contracts let to the firm of Kates, Peat and Marwick concerning the survey of coal reserve estimates in any part of Canada and, if so, in what areas?—Sessional Paper No. 283-2/675.

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

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Chrétien, seconded by Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale),—That Bill C-187, An Act respecting minerals in the Yukon Territory be now read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

After debate continuing;

Mr. Alexander, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand), proposed to move in amendment thereto,—That all the words after “That” be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

“inasmuch as this House opposes the principle of a Bill which provides for the payment of royalties accruing from the sale of mineral rights into the general revenues of the Consolidated Revenue fund whereby

such revenues may be appropriated for purposes to be recommended by His Excellency the Governor General and which Bill is not accompanied by a Message from His Excellency recommending that such royalties be subject to a trust or lien in respect of the land claims of the Indian tribes in the Yukon Territory, this House resolves that this Bill be not now read a second time but that the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development prepare an Humble Address of this House to His Excellency praying that he be pleased to recommend the appropriation of a proportion of all royalties received from the sale of mineral rights in the Yukon Territory in partial settlement of Canada’s undertaking that the land claims of the Indian tribes in the Yukon Territory would be settled in conformity with equitable principles, as by reference to the *Journals* of this House for 1867 will more fully appear.

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: The difficulty with the amendment now proposed by the honourable Member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) is that it is so unusual it is hard for one to put one’s finger exactly on what is wrong with it.

My feeling is that a number of things are wrong. The point raised by the President of the Privy Council is interesting; his proposition is that you cannot do indirectly what you can do directly. I have very serious reservations whether, if this motion were proposed in any way other than the way now proposed by the honourable Member for Hamilton West, it could be accepted. It would clearly go against the financial reservations and prerogatives of the Crown, and in this regard I doubt that it would be acceptable.

That is not really my main objection to the motion. It seems to me that basically the motion is a substantive one. The honourable Member suggests that all of the difficulties have been overcome by the initial words of the amendment “inasmuch as this House opposes the principle of the bill which provides for the payment of royalties” and so on. The honourable Member suggests that the inclusion of this statement in the amendment automatically makes it an amendment that ought to be accepted as a reasoned amendment.

There are other considerations. This difficulty having been cured, I think there is another difficulty that has not been cured, and it is that this is a substantive proposition. Last week I refused to rule on the question whether the amendment then proposed, which of course was not the same as this one, was within the four corners of the matter before the House, and whether it was relevant. I suggested at the time that I was not sufficiently familiar with all the details of the bill to be able to decide whether the amendment as proposed was relevant to the bill before us.

I would not hesitate to say at the moment that as it stands this proposition goes beyond the terms of the bill before us. It is in itself a substantive motion, and as such I do not think it can be proposed as a reasoned