

Oral Questions

provinces of Ontario and Quebec and the federal government has been concluded—could that agreement now be tabled?

Hon. Iona Campagnolo (Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport)): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has the agreement. Clause 3, as he suggests, is precisely the agreement between Ontario, Quebec and the federal government.

Mr. Dick: Mr. Speaker, as clause 3 of this agreement states that the federal government will abandon the proposed Loto game and, as was foreseen during the last provincial conference, a reasonable agreement will be reached between the provinces of Ontario and Quebec and the federal government regarding the proposed disposal of assets for the Loto game, can the minister tell me what the disposal arrangements are for that equipment which was contracted from General Instruments, and considering this document has the word "will" in it proposing that something will be done in the future after the timing of the agreement?

Mrs. Campagnolo: Mr. Speaker, as I have said several times in this chamber to the hon. member, when such an agreement is concluded, I will be pleased to give him the information. Such an agreement is not now concluded.

* * *

THE CANADIAN CONSTITUTION**REQUEST THAT COMMITTEE BE RECONSTITUTED**

Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Prime Minister. It concerns his response some ten days ago that he would consider reconstituting a special joint committee on the constitution so that it could, through parliament, address itself to the ongoing debate on confederation.

I ask the Prime Minister if he has yet reached a decision to re-establish this very important committee. If so, could it have referred to, among other things, the economic studies that are being done on the future of confederation by government departments and related agencies, including the Economic Council of Canada?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I said the other day that I would consider that worth-while suggestion. I was hoping, quite frankly, that if the matter is so important to the opposition they would find it useful to take one of the opposition days to discuss the constitution. We would welcome such a discussion, and I hope the opposition will follow up on that suggestion.

Miss MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. I realize the Prime Minister's long-standing regard for members of parliament and what they can accomplish, but I do not think that even he feels that all of the problems of the constitution can be resolved by a single day's debate.

However, I would like to ask him a related question dealing with the recommendation that came out of the former commit-

[Mr. Dick.]

tee on the constitution with regard to a reference to the Supreme Court of Canada as to the authority of the federal government to reform the Senate. Since the Prime Minister stated recently that he would not proceed with any changes to the Senate without the unanimous agreement of the provinces, I ask if that statement of his was based on the recognition that the federal government does not have the authority, under the British North America Act, unilaterally to make changes to the Senate without the consent of the provinces. If it does not, what is the present standing of the reference to the Supreme Court—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. lady that having a day's debate would not preclude setting up a committee after that. But I would have thought that one day's debate would be enough to put all of the ideas of the opposition on record.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: So far as the reference to the Supreme Court is concerned, Mr. Speaker, the answer is, of course not. If we believe, like the hon. lady, that the federal government has not, under section 91(1), the authority to change the Senate, we would not refer the matter to the Supreme Court. It would have been a no contest. We would have agreed with that, but because there was a division of opinion within, particularly, the joint committee, we agreed to refer to the Senate to see which of the two parties is right—

Miss MacDonald: To the Senate, or the Supreme Court?

Mr. Trudeau:—either the opposition or those who, like the government, believe that section 91 does permit the federal government and the Parliament of Canada to amend the Senate.

* * *

INDUSTRY**AUTOMOBILE MANUFACTURE—STEPS TO CREATE JOBS IN CANADA**

Mr. Stuart Leggatt (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. It concerns the fact that in Canada all auto parts manufacturing and otherwise takes place in central Canada and there is no manufacturing of any significance outside central Canada, particularly, of course, with regard to the Pacific Rim.

My question is this: at the present time there are proposals for duty remissions respecting places such as Japan: The Japanese can purchase Canadian parts and, therefore, take advantage of a duty remission to that country. In other words, can we bring them within the auto pact? Has the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce made submissions to the Japanese for duty remissions in order that we can make some