Mr. Chrétien: I agree, and I do not intend to exercise it, but we never know. If there should be a complete disagreement we could be in an inflexible position for four years. If the minister should be a tough guy who does not give a damn about the people of the Yukon—you know, if the Tory administration ever came back, which will not be the case—there would be no chance for the people to debate.

Mr. Nielsen: Amend the act.

Mr. Chrétien: Oh, yes, but you know the problem in respect of amending legislation. Members of the House of Commons always have a lot of good ideas with which we have to cope. Why should we create problems when we can have flexibility in the legislation? The hon. member would have us establish a system which is imported directly from the United States. What the hon. member wants to establish by his amendment is a sort of congressional system, such as exists in the United States, where the members sit for two years or four years.

Mr. Nielsen: You have to be out of your tree.

Mr. Chrétien: No. That is the same system they have. In Canada when there is a conflict between the administration and the legislature, the people have the right to have an election to decide between the two. I believe so much in the Canadian institution that I do not wish to deprive the people of the Yukon of that right.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Chrétien: I think my hon. friend has overlooked that aspect of the problem and, for that reason, will not pursue his amendment.

• (2:20 p.m.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe it was agreed before we embarked on the debate on all these amendments that the votes on all of them would be put at the end of the day. I will not disagree if the House wishes to reverse its decision, but I think that was the agreement.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That was the proceeding I was following. The question has to be put to determine whether a vote is required and if five hon. members rise, I will defer the vote.

Yukon and Territorial Lands Act

Mr. Nielsen: I rise on the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. I understood that it was agreed that all questions would be put at the end of the day, whether or not five members rose.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The proceeding is a fairly common one at this stage of our proceedings. The question is put, and if a decision is required, the division is deferred.

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Before the question is put, may I make a few comments since I second this very reasonable amendment. I was quite surprised at the explanation given by the minister, for whom I feel a great deal of affection and kindness. In explaining this particular amendment to the House, I cannot say that the minister deliberately misled the House but he certainly confused the House, so far as I am concerned, because the amendment advanced by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) is so simple.

I am surprised that the young, energetic and emancipated Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien), and the government which prides itself on advocating participatory democracy, is propounding such a sterile, ancient and archaic provision. The House of Lords and House of Commons in England would look like good bedfellows if they ever tried to apply such a sterile type of provision to the House of Commons in Canada, which they might have done in the old days. As the hon, member for Yukon said, what this clause does is to avoid a free expression of the will of the people of the Yukon. We also have disagreements in this House from time to time, but surely if the minister is trying to bring in an emancipated form of government in the north that would be progressive and independent, then the worst way of trying to do it is through this type of provision in the act which tries to treat people in the north like children. In effect, you are saying to them: "You will be a grown up boy now. You can go to school, but mind you come back at five o'clock, and if you do not do so we will whip you".

Mr. Lachance: You are not speaking on the point of order.

Mr. Nowlan: No, I am speaking on the amendment.

Mr. Lachance: You are not on the point of order.

Mr. Nowlan: No. Mr. Speaker, could you explain to the member what I am doing? I am