

Yukon and Territorial Lands Act

on procedure. It is Friday and it is a good day to have this kind of debate. At any rate, having been caught unaware and not having had the opportunity to go into my files for something that I know is there, I will have to rely on my memory. But I think it is fairly accurate in this case.

About 1948, the government of that day proposed an increase in the old age pension. The resolution preceding the bill, to which was attached the recommendation of the Governor General, did not specify an amount. It merely said that the Governor General recommended this proposal for an increase. During the course of that session we, in our party, had been circulating rather extensively a petition asking for an increase in the old age pension, I think to what was then the magnanimous sum of \$50 a month. When we collected the signatures for that petition, and we received considerable help to bring them down and table them in the House, there was some question as to whether the petition would be in order because it asked for an expenditure of \$50 a month for every old age pensioner in Canada. To our pleasant surprise, when the Clerk of Petitions gave his report a day or so later he indicated that the petition was in order despite the fact that it asked for something that involved the expenditure of money because there was on the Order Paper a recommendation in the name of the Governor General asking for an increase in the pension without specifying the amount. Up to this point, I am absolutely sure of my memory. In fact I think I even have the right year, 1948.

I am not absolutely sure of my memory on what I am going to say next. It seems to me that we also moved an amendment to the bill when it came before us, relying on a citation in Beauchesne that says that if the precise amount was not named in the recommendation of the Governor General, it is in order for any member to move any amendment provided it comes within the terms of that recommendation.

• (12:50 p.m.)

Whether that amendment was moved, or voted upon, I am not sure; I would have to check the record. But as to the previous statement I made, I am sure of my memory. The clerk of petitions—and he is a very authoritative person—ruled that because there was this blank cheque recommendation from the Governor General our petition was in order. I trust this bit of history is not only interesting

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

to younger members but that it is relevant to the present situation, because what the Governor General has recommended in this case is an increase in the size of the respective councils and in the number of members elected thereto. The recommendation does not say to what number the councils ought to be increased. It is a blank cheque, an unstated increase, just as was the case in the recommendation of 1948 to which I referred.

I realize that a lot of water has gone under the bridge since 1948 and that there has been a lot of jurisprudence, but I do not recall any case that would upset that one. So, on the basis of that decision and because the recommendation is so broad, it seems to me it is open to any hon. member, whether he is a member of the government or not, to move an amendment provided it stays within what is recommended, namely, the authority to increase the size of the respective councils and the number of members elected thereto. I believe that what the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) seeks to do is within the provisions of the blank cheque given and that as far as this aspect of the matter is concerned it should be allowed as being in order.

Mr. Nielsen: With the indulgence of the Chair and members of the House I would draw the attention of Your Honour to an exchange which took place on the introduction of this bill—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Since the hon. member has already spoken on this question he can only do so again, as he said, with the indulgence of hon. members. Is the House agreeable to allowing the hon. member to continue on this point of order?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Nielsen: I thank hon. members. I would draw Your Honour's attention to *Hansard* for May 13. I raised this point of order then, as reported on page 6927 and subsequently. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) took part in the exchange, as did Mr. Speaker, who was in the Chair. As reported on page 6928, Mr. Speaker had this to say—the reference in the first line is to myself:

In this instance the hon. member objects to it (the recommendation) because there are not in the bill some matters which perhaps should have been there in order to be covered by the royal recommendation. I would not think that this makes the recommendation invalid. I hope I am not making a mistake in this regard, but I will look into the matter further and try to study the point a little more closely. I assume that this bill is not going