

select how the money is to be spent. They can decide to spend so many dollars on paving, so many dollars on civic improvements, and so on. But even this power is denied the so-called elected representatives of the people of the Yukon.

Some advances have been made with respect to the achievement of responsible government in the Yukon. These started in 1958. When the Yukon Act was amended in that year we achieved some input through the creation of the advisory committee on finance. We achieved an enlarged council, from five to seven members. We achieved certain reforms with respect to the administration of justice and the setting up of our court structures in the Yukon. With a hiatus in between, these reforms have been continued, notably under the ministership of the predecessor in office of the hon. member for London. The council has been increased from seven to 12 members and an executive committee has been created on which now sit three members of the elected council and two civil servants. I was glad to see that change come about, because when it was first created the bureaucracy was sitting in a majority in terms of three to two.

I still maintain that that creation of the government is unconstitutional, because by virtue of the provisions of the Yukon Act the authority of the administration of the government of the Yukon lies squarely within the hands of the governor in council—in other words, the minister—who instructs his appointed civil servant, the commissioner, from time to time as the need arises. There is no constitutional authority which will permit him to transfer the parliamentary authority to another subcommittee or other body, whether it be the executive council or the executive committee. What should be done, as I said at the time and say again, is that these changes should be embodied in an amendment to the Yukon Act. We would then be sure that the composition of this policy could not be changed at the whim of a minister, which in fact is what has happened.

• (1710)

On the occasion of the meeting in Whitehorse, the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Pelletier) went on to say these words, and this was an expression of view that certainly was shared by all Liberals and other members of the committee, as displayed by the vote:

You can be sure that you have at least one person in Quebec who would subscribe to your idea.

That was in response to Mr. McKinnon's suggestion that we wanted responsible government and wanted the committee to endorse this resolution. I am sorry the hon. member for Sherbrooke is not in the House, as I am sure he would re-endorse the words he uttered then. The motion I put to the committee on that occasion was seconded by the hon. member for Northwest Territories (Mr. Firth). Incidentally, I put it there in French, but I would not dare to do so here. They understand little about French pronunciation in the Yukon, and for the sake of my French-Canadian colleagues on the committee I made that effort there. I moved,

The Territories

seconded by the hon. member for the Northwest Territories:

That your committee recommends that the repeated requests of the Yukon Territorial Council for government reform at the territorial level be granted and that Motion No. 1 of the council, dated January 23, 1968, submitted to the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, be accepted by the government and that the government consider the advisability of introducing appropriate amendments to the Yukon Act.

I went on to state:

A copy of motion No. 1 is appended and each member of the committee has been given a copy of motion No. 1 dated January 23, 1968.

The chairman thanked me for that motion. The chairman, now the minister, also had some very interesting remarks to make in respect of that motion. They can be found at pages 145 of those proceedings. The chairman said:

Is there any other discussion on the motion? Motion agreed to.

Our present minister, who was then chairman, went on to say:

How do you like that? Now that we have passed the motion I do not know whether we are going to—

I interjected and said:

I think, Mr. Chairman, the record should say that it was passed unanimously.

Our present minister then said:

Right, it was a unanimous vote.

The present minister was not only expressing the sentiments expressed in the motion, but emphatically bringing it to our attention that the motion was passed unanimously. I do not think any member, including the member for Kamloops-Cariboo (Mr. Marchand)—who I see is in the House—who was present at the meeting on that date can gainsay the unanimity which existed on that occasion. How, then, could anyone suggest any different? I see the hon. member for Kamloops-Cariboo attempting to rise. I think I know what he wants to say. Before the motion was put to the committee I think he had an urgent commitment to meet elsewhere, and left before the vote was taken. Because of the rule which prevents me from commenting on the vote of any individual member of the House, I was not going to say anything—but I did anticipate the privilege which the hon. member probably wanted to draw to the attention of the House.

In any event, that is the way the motion went, and I am sure that had the hon. member for Kamloops-Cariboo been present, he would have joined in the unanimity expressed by the members of the committee, including the chairman who is now the minister, in respect of that motion. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, in the name of all that is reasonable, how any member opposite can now rise and take a view different to that expressed by the minister on December 12, 1973, in committee? How can they do that?

Mr. Watson: Wait and see.

Mr. Nielsen: The hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Watson) says, "Wait and see". I have sat here in the