

*Yukon and Territorial Lands Act*

council. I should like to submit to the Chair that these are two completely different matters, and that the point of order should not be entertained. We should discuss this amendment and the House will have the right later on to say whether they agree or disagree with my amendment. I am quite convinced, with due deference Mr. Speaker, that they will agree when I have a chance to explain.

**Mr. Stanfield:** You have your troops there.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, we seem to be discussing what has been referred to as a preliminary judgment from the Chair. I think this is an unusual situation but I should like to support the position that Your Honour has taken in this preliminary judgment which is now being supported by the minister.

Could I ask hon. members to look at this in as simple as possible terms? In ordinary proceedings it has happened time and time again that an amendment is made to something that is before the House—somebody has something else that he wants to propose by way of amendment and he is told to wait until the first one is disposed of. But when the first amendment is disposed of, then it is possible to move another amendment, and that goes on all the time. The fact that an amendment has been moved, whether carried or defeated, does not deny the right to subsequent amendment.

What we have in the report stage is a convenience. Rather than taking all the recorded votes at one time, we defer that and take the different amendments at the same time. We have been through this a number of times. When we were at the report stage of last year's omnibus Criminal Code bill there were amendments on the abortion question both ways, indeed all ways—some wanted to enlarge the provision, some wanted to restrict it and some wanted to remove it from the code altogether. We had debate on these different amendments before finally taking the votes.

Sometimes the Chair has to rule that once a vote has been taken certain other amendments fall but until the vote has been taken I think it would be hurting the rights of members generally to say that having had discussion on one amendment, no others could take place. Suppose the minister's amendment had appeared on the order paper ahead of that of the hon. member for the Yukon—he could not have had his discussed. I ask members to think this through a little more carefully. In

this instance I think you were right, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I appreciate the comments of hon. members and I must state that I think my original preliminary ruling will be my final ruling as well. Perhaps I used the word preliminary ill advisedly. I obviously was rising to the point of order not having looked at the two motions very closely and that was probably an error of judgment. In any event, I will put the motion now.

**Mr. Chrétien:** Mr. Speaker, the amendment that I should like to propose to the House is quite simple. In its wisdom, the committee made the amendment and I have no objection to it. It said that if the Governor in Council wants to cause a new council to be elected he should consult with the council. We see that this could create a lot of problems. I want to clarify the word "consultation". If the members of council were not sitting at the time the Governor in Council decided to call an election he would have to call them in just to consult about the advisability or inadvisability of calling an election.

I want to add a few words that will permit consultation in a different form if the council is not in session. This would have the effect of permitting the minister to get in touch with each member of the council by letter or other communication and to consult with them about the advisability of calling an election.

In the last analysis, the power in the legislation remains the power of the minister, but we have decided to follow the pattern established in the Yukon and the Northwest Territories, that is to consult at length with the members. This is something quite new and something with which the people of the Yukon and the Northwest Territories agree.

The purpose of the amendment is to permit the minister to consult with the members of council in the best way possible if council is not in session, in order to arrive at a decision. The same amendment will appear two or three times more. If I can elaborate on it, suppose, for example, there were a disaster, a big oil spill, and the minister saw fit to change the land use regulation right away. Under the terminology in the legislation at the moment, he will have to wait until the council is in session. What I am proposing is that if the council is not in session and the minister wants to proceed quickly to change the regulation, he will have the right to com-