

provision of which requires lawyers to encourage public respect for the administration of justice, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Cambridge (Mr. Speyer):

That this House hereby adjourns the debate on the constitutional package until the highest court in the land can decide if it is legal.

**Madam Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent for this motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

\* \* \*

● (1415)

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

#### CONDEMNATION OF OFFICIAL OPPOSITION—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. John Campbell (LaSalle):** Madam Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43. As you know, Madam Speaker, the business of governing Canada is grinding to a halt as a result of the petulance and pique of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) and his colleagues preventing Parliament from doing its work. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for London-Middlesex (Mr. Bloomfield):

That this House condemns the tyranny of the minority in this House as exemplified by the Conservative party.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Madam Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent for this motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

#### THE CONSTITUTION

##### RULING BY SUPREME COURT OF NEWFOUNDLAND ON CONSTITUTIONAL RESOLUTION—POSSIBLE LAUNCHING OF APPEAL

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Can the Prime Minister tell the House of Commons whether he intends to instruct his officials to launch an appeal in the Supreme Court of Canada from the decision rendered yesterday by the Supreme Court of Newfoundland, a decision which finds the government's constitutional resolution illegal?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Madam Speaker, the position the government has taken after hearing

#### Oral Questions

the decision rendered yesterday by the court in Newfoundland and after learning, at the end of last week, that the Supreme Court of Canada had decided to hear the constitutional case before the end of this month, was to express the hope that these two cases would be brought before the Supreme Court of Canada, as well as the judgment of the Quebec Court of Appeal, if it is rendered in time. In other words, we would like to have the Supreme Court of Canada adjudicate all the cases which were brought before the courts by the provinces. How that will be done, I cannot say at this stage.

#### REQUEST FOR ADJOURNMENT OF DEBATE ON CONSTITUTIONAL RESOLUTION

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition):** Madam Speaker, I am sure the Prime Minister would not want this Parliament to be put in the position of voting on an illegal matter.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh!

**Mr. Clark:** We on this side of the House certainly do not want this Parliament to be put in the position of voting on an illegal matter, which is the situation now.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Clark:** In light of that, and in order to protect and respect the rule of law in the country, I wonder if the Prime Minister would consider adjourning debate on the constitutional resolution, which has been presented to the House of Commons and to the Senate, so that we can get on with the other important business of the country. Will he consider adjourning this debate until the Supreme Court of Canada has decided the legality of the government's position, and then bring the question back to Parliament for whatever limited debate would be necessary, after the Supreme Court of Canada had ruled what constitutional matters it is lawful for the federal Parliament to decide?

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition makes the assumption that Parliament would be voting on an illegal matter. I do not recall him making the assumption that the matter was legal after the Court of Appeal in Manitoba had made a favourable decision.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Trudeau:** I think that establishes, once again, that the opposition is not as interested in establishing the legality as it is in causing delay.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Trudeau:** The point is that we on this side are interested in knowing whether the measure is legal or not. That is why I made the suggestion, my offer, yesterday. The whole point is