

er as part of the resolution. Having decided that question, having determined quickly and expeditiously in this House what the final form of the resolution will be, it is then completely within the jurisdiction of the government, and I suggest would be desirable, to refer this resolution with the proposed amendments to the Supreme Court of Canada, pursuant to the provisions of Section 55 of the Supreme Court Act, and await their ruling on the jurisdiction question and on what lies within the powers of the federal government as opposed to the provincial governments. Having had a determination on that question, we in this House could then take our responsibilities.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council):** Madam Speaker, the two parties of the opposition have put forward two proposals that are not quite identical. To be as constructive as possible I would suggest to my hon. colleagues opposite that the House leaders meet this afternoon at which time we can examine more closely what has been proposed. I note a fundamental difference between, on the one hand, the proposal of the Progressive Conservative Party which gives no indication whatsoever about the length of the debate following the decision of the Supreme Court, which is essential. On the other hand according to the NDP proposal there could be an order of the House and one of the Senate, presumably, whereby when the decision of the Supreme Court has been handed down, the debate in the House would be extremely limited, no amendments would be allowed, and the resolution would be adopted probably within a set period of time, something like 24 hours. That is not clear in the Progressive Conservative proposal.

So, I feel that if hon. members are serious, they will accept the suggestion I am putting to them right now. Today, we have a motion that must be considered, ten minutes have already been used up and about two hours remain under the name of the Minister of State for Finance (Mr. Bussi eres). We would promise not to introduce today the motion providing time allotment to limit the debate on the Constitution provided the Minister of State for Finance is allowed to have the debate on his motion completed today and that motion put to a vote before six o'clock.

We would not introduce, today, the time allotment motion to limit the debate on the Constitution provided we could proceed with the study of the other motion under the name of the Minister of State for Finance. While the House proceeds presumably, with that study, and not being a victim of an opposition party trying to tie up the system, the House leaders in good faith would look further into the two proposals put forth by their respective party leaders.

[*English*]

**Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** Madam Speaker, there have been two House leaders' meetings and I am neither alarmed nor surprised by the proposals put forward by the Leader of

*Point of Order—Mr. Clark*

the Opposition today, nor should my hon. friend be. Of course, I am prepared to meet with my hon. friend to explore the areas upon which we can find agreement, from the point of view of, hopefully, reaching agreement. That has been my position from the outset, and we can begin that meeting, or series of meetings, today.

• (1530)

I note his undertaking with respect to government business. He said he will move ahead with the motion under 75C, which is agreeable, and that he will not call the motion in his name because a point of order is already outstanding with respect to that matter. Perhaps we can sit down and begin the process of exploring a way out of a position in which I regret to say the Parliament of Canada should never have been placed in the first place.

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

**Hon. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Madam Speaker, may I indicate that we are also prepared to sit down with the representatives of the other parties to assess this matter. I dare to express the view that we are making progress right here. The Prime Minister's (Mr. Trudeau) principal objection to the initial proposal made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) was that he was asking that a number of subject matter amendments be included in the reference, some of which might be hypothetical because they would not get passed down the road.

My leader offered something which corrected that. We could have a brief debate, one day each, on the various amendments so that we would be submitting to the Supreme Court only those amendments which actually have the support of the House. My leader also suggested that we could agree to a limited debate following the decision of the Supreme Court. I think we could also agree that there would be no further amendments unless amendments were necessary because of the ruling of the Supreme Court to strike certain matters out. I dare to believe we are making progress. I hope it will continue.

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

**Madam Speaker:** If I understand the terms of that proposal, it would be that today we would go to the business of discussing the motion under the name of the Minister of State for Finance (Mr. Bussi eres). I am in the hands of the House, but if we need two hours to discuss that motion, I would have to be asked by the House to defer the numerous questions of privilege or points of order which might be raised until after that discussion has taken place.

I am in the hands of the House, but if the point is realistic, if that debate requires two hours, and if it is to take place today, it would have to begin almost immediately.

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Madam Speaker:** This is agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No, no!