

*Yukon and Territorial Lands Act*

and that the Fisheries Act must be considered by the House when it comes here at the report stage, and at the subsequent third reading stage.

I merely ask this: What sort of mess are we in? What would happen if someone, and it could be the government, were to move an amendment to the fisheries bill at the report stage or at the third reading stage, as could still be done, and thereby change some definitions? I understand that the definitions are not entirely satisfactory to all concerned. I think the whole thing is out of kilter. I think this bill has been brought too far too soon. This shows how little co-ordination there is in our whole anti-pollution and water management programs, something that many Canadians have been saying during the last few months.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

**Mr. Aiken:** On division.

Motion agreed to, amendment read the second time and concurred in.

**YUKON ACT, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES ACT AND TERRITORIAL LANDS ACT****AMENDMENTS RESPECTING MEMBERS OF COUNCILS, VOTERS, APPOINTMENT OF JUDGES, LAND MANAGEMENT ZONES, ETC.**

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-212, to amend the Yukon Act, the Northwest Territories Act and the Territorial Lands Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

**Mr. Aiken:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, before we proceed I wonder if it could be agreed that any votes on the amendments at the report stage will be deferred until all amendments have been considered.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** That is the rule.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** That seems a reasonable proposition. Is that agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Prior to proceeding I must say, on a pessimistic note, that I shall have difficulty in accepting several of these motions. I am prepared to hear procedural arguments on them. Specifically, I am speaking of Motions Nos. 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10 standing in the name of the hon. member for Yukon. I think he will probably agree with

[Mr. Aiken.]

me that the procedural difficulties are the same in each of the cases. If he prefers to argue all the motions as a group, that will be fine; if he prefers to argue on each motion as it comes before the House, that also will be fine.

**Mr. Nielsen:** Mr. Speaker, I am prepared, and I think for the sake of order it will be more convenient, to argue the procedural difficulties chronologically as we consider the amendments. This will prove somewhat difficult because we have the bill as originally printed before us which includes the explanatory notes, whereas the reprinted bill as amended by the committee does not include the explanatory notes.

May I deal with Motion No. 1, which reads:

That Bill C-212, An Act to amend the Yukon Act, the Northwest Territories Act and the Territorial Lands Act, be amended by adding thereto, immediately following clause 1 thereof, the following: "2. Subsection (1) of section 9 of the said Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

Before reading the substitution, I should like to place on the record the existing subsection 1 of section 9 of the Yukon Act, which reads:

There shall be a Council of the Yukon Territory, which shall be composed of seven members elected to represent such electoral districts in the Territory as are named and described by the Commissioner in Council.

The amendment reads:

"(1) There shall be a Council of the Yukon Territory, which shall be composed of fifteen members elected to represent such electoral districts in the Territory as are named and described by the Commissioner in Council and by renumbering the subsequent clauses accordingly."

The only change that this amendment makes, of course, is to increase the number of such members on the Council from seven to 15. I anticipate that Your Honour might believe, and members on the government benches might submit to Your Honour, that this amendment affects the expenditure of revenues from the Consolidated Revenue Fund and therefore cannot be brought by a private member. However, may I draw Your Honour's attention to the recommendation contained in the bill as originally printed, which was read the first time on May 11, 1970. Opposite page 1 of the bill, in the left hand column in the English version, I read the recommendation.

• (12:40 p.m.)

His Excellency the Governor General has recommended to the House of Commons the present measure—