

this became even more obvious. This bill, if passed, will have a harmful effect on northern development, perhaps not so much in the Northwest Territories as in the Yukon. It will have an immediate and harmful effect on private investment capital being attracted to the Yukon. I urge all members to consider the whole package with which Parliament is being presented with respect to northern development. This includes not only the amendments to this act but the amendments to the Yukon mineral act which follow. Other land use regulations which will be introduced will literally inhibit the existing base of development and exploration in the north. In addition, the impact of the regulations of the inland waters act are being felt. Above all, there is the white paper.

I have been almost universally charged by the residents of the Yukon to urge this government to stand this bill until such time as the impact of all this legislation can be viewed as a package in terms of its economic effect. The Yukon Chamber of Mines, the Yukon Chamber of Commerce, the Prospectors' Association, the Mining Association and hundreds of Yukon citizens make this appeal through me to the government. Failing that, they make the plea to all members of this House to support the motion I am about to make. They do so because of the intense and universal objection of the principle embodied in this bill, the danger inherent and the likelihood that revenues generated in the Yukon or any part of the system will be applied to defray losses in other parts. Because of the unacceptability and unfairness of that principle, I wish to move a motion. I hoped that my motion would be seconded by the hon. member for Northwest Territories (Mr. Orange), who is in his seat, but I do not think he will do that.

Mr. Orange: Right.

Mr. Nielsen: I move:

That all the words after "that" be left out and the following inserted:

"this bill be not now read a second time but that the subject matter of the recommendation in relation to the bill be referred to a committee of the whole House."

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I would like to hear representations from hon. members at this time. I have some reservations about accepting the amendment. I state frankly that I have a completely open mind. It appears, initially, that the amendment purports to change the procedural aspect of the motion. As I understand the motion now before the House, the bill now under consideration will be referred to the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Hon. members may be able to make a distinction. The amendment moved by the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) suggests that the subject matter of the recommendation with relation to the bill be referred to a committee of the whole House. I have some reservations about the procedural acceptability of the motion and I will be happy to hear argument.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, prior to the change in the rules hon. members will recall that it used to be the

Northern Canada Power Commission Act

practice of the House to discuss the principle of a bill at the resolution stage, because of the requirement in regard to the financial responsibility of the government. Because of the far-reaching economic impact this measure will have, the motivation behind my amendment is that the matter is far too important to deal with other than by this House in committee of the whole. That is precisely what will happen if the amendment now before Your Honour is accepted. Rather than going to a standing committee, a committee of the whole House should deal with the matter.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I will hear from the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) in a moment. The hon. member for Yukon refers in his amendment to the subject matter of the recommendation. I presume he is referring to His Excellency's recommendation. My impression is that this is a prerogative of His Excellency; it is not within the capacity of this chamber to go to His Excellency with a directive even though a committee of the whole House may make such a directive. I would like to hear from the hon. member on that point.

Mr. Nielsen: With respect, Mr. Speaker, a motion cannot, even inferentially, be read so as to result in a reference back to His Excellency. The House is now seized with the matter through the recommendation of His Excellency. The motion simply asks that the recommendation of His Excellency be dealt with in a slightly different fashion than is called for by the resolution on the Order Paper, that is, that it be dealt with by a committee of the whole House.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, we are continuing to plow new ground in connection with these motions. I think we are developing very useful jurisprudence which will extend the rights of the House to deal with motions of this kind in a more adequate way. I agree with Your Honour that if the motion of the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) purported to indicate that the committee of the whole had the right to make suggestions to His Excellency with regard to changing the recommendation, I would have some difficulty supporting it.

● (4:20 p.m.)

Implicit in the motion is that the committee of the whole might have an opportunity to consider this issue, and its consideration would be directed not only to His Excellency but to the government. I recognize that under the British North America Act there is a connection between the government and His Excellency, and that His Excellency should listen to his advisers and not necessarily to this House: the government must intervene. I am assuming that the purpose of part of the motion by my hon. friend is that the committee, having considered this matter, might then make a recommendation to the government. The government may or may not act upon it. The committee might decide, in its collective wisdom, that the original recommendation was proper. In those circumstances, that is the way it would be brought about.