

James Bay Cree and the Inuit of northern Quebec regarding the way in which the so-called James Bay agreement has been implemented. Could the minister tell us whether he has any plans to introduce a new process or mechanism whereby this important agreement, which was considered to be something of a model, could be fairly and honestly implemented? In addition to that, could the minister tell us whether he would be prepared to accept suggestions and recommendations from the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development which is now carefully studying this very serious and urgent problem?

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Madam Speaker, to answer the first part of the hon. member's question, I have spoken to my colleague, the Minister of Justice, and we are prepared to review the agreement from the point of view of the implementation aspect in terms of it being adhered to and in terms of the spirit to which the parties entered into the agreement. As far as suggestions from the committee are concerned, yes, we are prepared to entertain the suggestions as they come forward.

\* \* \*

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

### WEEKLY STATEMENT

**Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** Madam Speaker, could the government House leader indicate to us precisely his intentions with respect to government business in the next day or so?

[Translation]

**Mr. Pinard:** Madam Speaker, if we do not proceed today with the debate on a motion to allocate a period of time to conclude the debate on the bill authorizing the government to borrow a certain sum of money, a bill which is very urgent and which as everyone knows the Progressive Conservative Party has prevented us from adopting within a reasonable period of time, we will proceed with that motion tomorrow or, I hope, some time next week. As for the rest concerning the normal business of the House of Commons we intend to begin today with the motion to allocate a period of time to put an end to the constitutional debate and, in the next few days, we will debate topics related to the Constitution.

[English]

### STATUS OF MOTION TO EXTEND SITTINGS DURING DEBATE ON CONSTITUTION

**Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** Madam Speaker, I have a matter for clarification. I refer to *Hansard* for March 24, 1981. At page 8566 in the second column under "Government Orders", the words appear "Business of the House—Motion to extend sittings during debate on Constitution". Then we read: "On the order: Government Notices of Motions: March 19, 1981—The President of the Privy Council:". There appears

### Business of the House

next the text of the motion which is subject, as you know, to a point of order. I raise this matter because I would like the status of the motion clarified.

When the motion was eventually called by the Table, the order was made, according to my recollection of what occurred in the House at that time, but the motion itself was not read. My recollection is that there was no request that it be dispensed with and the only reference on the floor of the House was with respect to the mention of the motion by the Clerk Assistant, and yet the motion appears in *Hansard*. As I have always understood it, *Hansard* is a verbatim account or an account of what would have occurred if something had not been dispensed with and there was no dispensation.

I raise this matter because I had a conversation with the *Hansard* office. That same evening I spoke, you will recall, on the point of order. When I went upstairs to the *Hansard* office, the person then in charge asked me whether or not that motion had been put in the House. I answered no, to my recollection it had not been put in the House, that although the first Clerk Assistant had just begun his preliminary remarks, no one had put the motion. Although I recall the conversation, I cannot recall the person's name, but in my presence that person called someone I believe in the legal branch of the House. I cannot recollect his name, but I think it is Cooke. The same question was put to him. The answer came back, as related to me, no, the motion had not been put in the House. As a result, the *Hansard* editor at that time took his pencil and ran it through the blues, from which this seems to be a transcription, striking out.

That becomes important from the point of view of processes which might be within the realm of the authority of the government to use so as to establish the status of the matter. I rise now to bring that to your attention, Madam Speaker. I must confess I have not looked at *Votes and Proceedings* because I have not yet had a chance, this having just come to my attention.

Given the importance of the subject matter, I think it is important that we have the status of this alleged motion, as it appears on the Order Paper, clarified. It may well mean you will have to consult with the officials of *Hansard*. There may be another explanation. However, I would like the matter clarified. Are we dealing with a motion that has been called or a motion that has been put? I put that to you, Madam Speaker, on the basis that the authorities of the House dealing with that matter on Tuesday night thought they were dealing with a motion that had only been called.

● (1510)

**Madam Speaker:** Is the hon. member rising on the same point? I can answer his question. If the hon. member for Yukon has another question, I will entertain it.

**Mr. Nielsen:** It is on the same question, Madam Speaker. You will recall I have raised on several occasions in the past the appearance in *Hansard* of matters that have not happened in this House, the appearance of words in *Hansard* that have