

## MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

**Mr. D. M. Collette (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** Madam Speaker, Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 10 is acceptable to the government.

**Madam Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House that notice of motion No. 10 be deemed to have been adopted?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

[Text]

B.C. TELEPHONE COMPANY—TRANSFER OF LEGISLATIVE OR GOVERNMENTAL JURISDICTION

Motion No. 10—**Mr. Fulton:**

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House copies of all correspondence, telegrams or other documents exchanged between the government or any of its departments or agencies and the government of the Province of British Columbia or any of its departments or agencies, since January 1, 1976, relating to the transfer of legislative or governmental jurisdiction over the B.C. Telephone Company or telephone rates levied by the company.

Motion agreed to.

[Translation]

**Mr. D. M. Collette (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** Madam Speaker, would you kindly call Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 32?

[Text]

APPLICATION OF FEDERAL LAW IN VARIOUS PROVINCIAL COURTS

Motion No. 32—**Mr. Herbert:**

That an order of the House do issue for copies of all correspondence, minutes of meetings, studies and other communications of the Department of Justice relating to the comparison of the application by the various provincial courts of federal laws.

[Translation]

**Mr. Ron Irwin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Minister of State for Social Development):** Madam Speaker, the Department of Justice has none of the documents which the member is asking for in motion No. 32. I would ask him to withdraw his motion.

**Mr. Herbert:** Transfer for debate.

**Madam Speaker:** Transferred for debate.

**Mr. Collette:** Madam Speaker, I ask that the remaining notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand.

**Madam Speaker:** Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

*The Constitution*  
GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

## THE CONSTITUTION

RESOLUTION RESPECTING CONSTITUTION ACT, 1981

The House resumed debate on the motion of Mr. Chrétien, seconded by Mr. Roberts, for an Address to Her Majesty the Queen respecting the Constitution of Canada.

And on the amendment of Mr. Epp, seconded by Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton),—That the motion be amended in Schedule B of the proposed resolution by deleting Clause 46, and by making all necessary changes to the Schedule consequential thereto.

**Mr. Robert Wenman (Fraser Valley West):** Madam Speaker, as I just witnessed the previous exchange a new low in Parliament has been found. I wonder if there is any point in my standing and speaking and asking to be heard on the floor of this Parliament. What is the point if in fact another cabinet minister has been appointed by the Queen to represent me? What is the point if I cannot be heard?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** Order, please. I think it is fairly well understood that even in a case where the Speaker has given what I understand to be a ruling today and has undertaken to give further consideration to an aspect of that ruling, it seems to me that the hon. member would be more in keeping with the rules if he were not to comment on that matter which is now under consideration. We are on orders of the day and I suggest the hon. member address himself to the bill.

● (1600)

**Mr. Wenman:** If hon. members opposite cannot see the relevance of this and how it is related to this Parliament, to my right to stand here, to my right to be heard, that is too bad.

When I left off speaking yesterday I was referring to western alienation, to the closure brought against me, against my constituents and against this House of Commons. I was talking about the very problem that was mentioned by hon. members across the way. The hon. member opposite said that you need no longer go through the Member of Parliament. Therefore, you need no longer go through Parliament; you now go directly to "the king". That relates to the basic foundation of what the Constitution and parliamentary democracy are about.

We can go back and examine this. Somehow, the Constitution that we are talking about began its evolution in history as an outgrowth of the feudal system. I do not know whether it was in the Magna Carta or in Simon de Montfort's parliament or where exactly, but there was something which was meant to stop exactly the kind of abuse we have just seen. It came from a feudal system where the king handed out fiefs, he handed out parcels of land, parcels of constituencies and the recipient had ultimate control of whatever form of law there was in the land.

We have now come full circle from the law coming out of the mouth of the king, through control of law transferring, it is hoped, to parliaments like this one; now it has come full circle