

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** I should like to point out to the hon. member that I will take his point of order under advisement. I should also like to point out that on May 3, as recorded at page 13087 of *Hansard*, the following exchange took place:

**MR. SPEAKER:** The immediate difficulty with that is that tomorrow is an opposition day. I take it the intention is that it be on the next appointed day.

The House has heard the terms suggested by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen). Is it agreed that motion which would ordinarily be called at this time will be put over and will retain its priority until the next appointed private members' hour, and in the interim the Chair will prepare whatever ruling was anticipated. Is that agreed?

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Agreed.

**MR. SPEAKER:** It is so ordered.

**Mr. Herbert:** I can only assume that I did not properly convey my feelings in this matter. I am not objecting to the business being called before the House today. I am objecting to the fact that 11 items of business, nine of which date back to 1974, and two to January, 1975, are allowed to remain on the order paper. I am not objecting to today's business.

**Mr. Reid:** Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I do not believe the government should have the right to dictate what takes place in private members' hours. That is the right of the private member. If private members choose not to have their business come forward, that is their right. I do not believe the government should impose on the House of Commons what is to be taken up in private members' hours, as has been suggested by the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Herbert).

\* \* \*

## THE CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

### REQUEST FOR APPLICATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES TO TERRITORIES

The House resumed, from Monday, May 3, consideration of the motion of Mr. Nielsen:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should immediately introduce legislation to implement the resolutions of the Yukon Territorial Council and the Northwest Territorial Council requesting that the government apply those principles of constitutional and democratic development that will establish a fully representative and responsible system of government to the Yukon Territory and the Northwest Territories respectively.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** Order, please. When notice of motion No. 13 was being considered last February 3, 1975, the Chair expressed reservations about the procedural acceptability of a proposed amendment by the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes) which reads as follows:

That the subject matter of motion No. 13 be referred to the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development for further study and that the committee be authorized to travel to the Yukon and Northwest Territories to hear witnesses.

Hon. members will recall that at that time the Chair took this proposed amendment under advisement. The Chair would like to point out to hon. members the provisions of the Standing Order 46 which are as follows:

### *The Territories*

When a question is under debate, no motion is received unless to amend it; to postpone it to a day certain; for the previous question; for reading the orders of the day; for proceeding to another order; to adjourn the debate; to continue or extend a sitting of the House, or for the adjournment of the House.

In my opinion, the proposed amendment of the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie does not seek to achieve any of those objectives. It raises a new question not contemplated in the notice of motion of the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) and it seeks to increase the powers of a committee beyond those set forth in Standing Order 65(8) by allowing the committee to travel. It must be stressed that when a committee wishes its powers to be increased, it must seek that authority from the House itself through a report which requires notice of 48 hours. The same rule also applies to members of the House. In short, the hon. member is raising by way of an amendment a substantive motion which requires a different notice.

I should also like to draw the attention of the House to citation 203(5) in *Beauchesne's Fourth Edition*, which reads:

An amendment was ruled out because it raised a new question which could only be considered on a distinct motion after notice.

● (1710)

For these reasons, I regret that I cannot accept the amendment and therefore cannot put it before the House. The hon. member for Yukon.

**Mr. Nielsen:** Thank you for recognizing me, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** Order, please. If the hon. member speaks now, I should point out to hon. members that he will close the debate.

**Mr. Guay (St. Boniface):** Who will close the debate?

**Mr. Nielsen:** The last time this matter was debated—

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Cyr:** Mr. Speaker, you have said that if the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) took the floor, he would close the debate on this motion. Are we debating today a new motion or is it the debate of February 3, 1975 that is resumed?

**An hon. Member:** Yes, we are going on.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** It is my understanding that we are resuming debate on motion No. 13.

**Mr. Blais:** Mr. Speaker, I am rising on the same point of order. It was my error that I was not listening to your comments at the time. Was there some indication that the hon. member had already begun, or had made initial remarks on this motion?

**Mr. Nielsen:** It is in *Hansard* for February 3, 1975.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** The hon. member for Yukon moved the motion. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mrs. Campagnolo) had the floor on February 3.