

*Business of the House*

**Mr. Brewin:** The Speaker read my mind. I was going to seek clarification of the Speaker's ruling so that we might, as members of the defence committee, more clearly understand.

As I understood it, the Speaker was suggesting that it is necessary for—

**Mr. Speaker:** Just a moment. The hon. member not only read my mind, he listened to what I said. The two do not necessarily always happen in conjunction, one with the other.

The members of the committee are free to discuss among themselves what they wish to do. It is not for the Speaker to tell them what to do or, for that matter, to go beyond the most subtle suggestions. I am sure the hon. member, as he did earlier, has read my mind.

\* \* \*

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

**Mr. Dingwall:** Mr. Speaker, I have a few questions for the parliamentary secretary concerning House business for today and perhaps even tomorrow.

As the parliamentary secretary knows, the Minister Responsible for Constitutional Affairs has been reported in the press as saying that the resolution which has been passed in the New Brunswick legislature will be coming before Parliament, and there was some suggestion that it might be here later this day.

I am wondering if the parliamentary secretary would provide us with a copy of the resolution and perhaps provide further information as to when he intends to proceed with it.

Second, on the Notice Paper for Thursday, December 8, 1992, appears a Statutory Order pursuant to section 7, subsection (2) of the Special Economic Measures Act which calls upon the House to have a three-hour debate concerning the subject matter contained therein. I wonder whether the parliamentary secretary is in a position to indicate to the House when we will proceed with that debate.

**Mr. Edwards:** Mr. Speaker, on my friend's first question of the New Brunswick constitutional resolution, something that I am sure we all welcome, my under-

standing is that there are consultations going on among the minister and members opposite, the leadership of the parties, and that there well may be potential agreement to have a resolution dealt with today.

I will certainly endeavour to get a copy of the resolution into the hands of my hon. friend.

With reference to the other matter he raises, the amendment that has been proposed, I submit, is *ultra vires* the Special Economic Measures Act. Motions under section 7 of the act are allowed only in relation to orders and regulations made under section 4 of the act. That is specified in section 7(1).

Section 4 of the act authorizes the adoption of orders and regulations for specified purposes. Matters limited to the relationship between Canada and third states, that is states other than Canada or the states subject to sanctions, are not among the enumerated purposes.

Regulations and orders under section 4 are to be directed at restricting or prohibiting activities that involve the direct relationship between Canada or Canadians on the one hand and the sanctioned state on the other hand. Therefore, the proposed amendment would appear to be beyond the scope of the regulation-making power.

I would ask my hon. friend whether he considers it wise to propose something which is clearly illegal.

**Mr. Speaker:** Before we get into a discussion of this—as the hon. parliamentary secretary has raised it—if we are going to have a debate on whether or not this matter ought properly to be in front of the House, I would ask both the parliamentary secretary for the government and the leaders of the opposition parties to be in touch with me immediately and we will arrange to hear that debate. I do not think it is appropriate to raise it now.

I am not going to signal what my decision might be, but if there is a serious debate on this, then that is what it should be and it should not necessarily take place at the moment.

I would ask both sides to discuss this matter and to be in touch with the Chair. I will set a time when it can be debated.