

Mr. Speaker: I think I will read the "blues" on that one.

Is the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary rising to speak on procedural points?

[Translation]

Mrs. Maily: Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a point of order in connection with this Bill. Should I raise it now?

Mr. Speaker: One moment, please.

[English]

If that is the end of the procedural arguments, I might indicate that I shall take them under advisement. I will say to Hon. Members that I have looked at the question of what can be done and what cannot be done by unanimous consent. There is a very significant difficulty when one comes into the area of those things that involve the royal prerogative.

I am also, as I think Hon. Members know, disinclined, where I sense there is a will of the vast majority of the House, to force something that could simply become the subject of another Bill and thus put it through all the stages again. I think that I sense there is a will to do those things and I will want to confirm that. I certainly do not believe the Chair should stand in the way of the will of the House. I do, however, want to enter a caveat. We have traditionally allowed unanimous consent on matters that do not relate to the Royal Recommendations. I may be making a phone call or two and I will be back to the House on the matters that have been raised.

Mrs. Maily: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. At this morning's sitting on this Bill, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when putting one of the motions put forward by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Shields), used my name as that of the seconder. As a matter of courtesy I allowed this, but then Mr. Deputy Speaker proceeded to use my name for several other motions. I did not protest this morning, but I have now taken a look at the content of these motions and I am afraid that I find I cannot possibly support them. Therefore, I would like to have the record amended or, if that is not possible, at least to have a note put that I did second the motions as a matter of courtesy to my colleague. I wish the motions to be debated, then I will be able to vote on them according to my conscience.

Mr. Speaker: There is a procedural difficulty here.

Mr. Blenkarn: Mr. Speaker, in view of the need to debate these matters, I would be most pleased to second the motions put by our colleague, the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Shields).

Mr. Speaker: The rules of the House stipulate that where someone wishes to change a matter like that, it can only be done with unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent to change the name of the seconder of the motion and substitute the name of the Hon. Member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn)?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Indian Act

Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

[Translation]

Mrs. Maily: Mr. Speaker, in that case, perhaps it could be said, for the record, that I did it as a courtesy, because the Acting Speaker actually did not give me a chance or a choice in the matter. He did not ask my opinion. He simply read the motion without consulting me.

[English]

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member will know she has sought the floor on a point of order and that that point of order and her comments will themselves be recorded in *Hansard*. *Hansard* will show what she has just said.

Resuming debate.

Is the House ready for the question?

Is there some confusion? I was calling resumption of debate. I indicated that I would reserve on the further procedural matters.

Mr. Crombie: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think the Minister was speaking this morning when we entered the debate.

Mr. Crombie: Yes, I was, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: And I believe he had spoken for 10 minutes. The Table indicates to me that the Minister had completed his 10 minute comments and some other Member can now have the floor, unless the House wishes to give consent to the Minister to continue beyond the 10 minute period. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: There is unanimous consent. The Hon. Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Crombie).

Hon. David Crombie (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to delay my own Bill. I think there were approximately three other motions in this grouping. I have some modest though wise thoughts to offer to the House, although it may well be that the wisdom of the Bill is so overwhelmingly obvious that I do not need to do so. I was, however, speaking to that part of the grouping dealing with Motion No. 21 which I would urge the House not to support. Motion No. 21 would delete a positive amendment which was adopted after careful consideration by the standing committee, with support from all Parties.

The discriminatory provisions of the Indian Act have been present for over 100 years. It is a fact of life that documents such as birth and marriage certificates are often lost or destroyed. In some remote areas, especially in the period before the Second World War, they may never have existed.