

I should like to get an undertaking from my honourable friend that in whatever form the report appears on our desks, when there is one, we will have an opportunity to amend the resolution in the same style as we do in Committee of the Whole and in the same style as can be done in regular legislation as the minister said would be the case.

● (1435)

Senator Perrault: Honourable senators, if there is a request by the honourable senator that there be a Committee of the Whole stage where clause by clause we can consider the Address to Her Majesty, which includes proposed constitutional amendments, I do not believe that at this time I can give assurances of formal Committee of the Whole consideration—but equivalent opportunities, I suggest, will be provided. In other words, if any honourable senator wishes to amend a certain section, that senator would have the right to rise in his place and make a motion to amend. The Senate then would have the right and the opportunity to debate such a motion and to discuss that proposal to change the Address to Her Majesty. The motion would be subject to voting procedures in the house. There would be no barrier to that kind of procedure. It would be the Senate acting, as it has in the past, as master of its own rules. If the senator wishes to launch that kind of endeavour, I want to assure him that he will enjoy the full co-operation of the government.

Senator Roblin: I am never very comfortable with the ad hoc procedures that are invented by my honourable friend on the spur of the moment, as I rather suspect he has been doing for the last little while. However, I guess I am not going to get much out of him today so I will have to be content with the observation that maybe he has moved a little way in my direction, so I appreciate that. I would like him, however, to deal a little more with the question of the revival of the committee. He has told us that he would regard it as a matter of courtesy that the other house would agree to a revival of the committee if it were recommended by this chamber. Would it be the policy of the government to advise the other house and this chamber to agree to a revival of the committee should either house request it? There is a difference between policy and my honourable friend's opinion.

Senator Perrault: Honourable senators, that question will be taken as notice, but as I said earlier, I would regard it as a courtesy that this place would extend to the House of Commons should a similar circumstance occur over there.

Senator Roblin: I should hope so.

Hon. John M. Godfrey: Honourable senators, I direct a question to the Leader of the Government. He referred to the greater opportunity the public will have for input by having this matter referred to a committee. I received representations from one organization pointing out that in one respect the public will not be able to participate as much because the proceedings will not be televised as are the debates in the House of Commons. My question is: Is the government considering the possibility of televising the committee's proceedings? If the proceedings are not to be televised, will they at least be

videotaped? This is a very historic occasion and there should be a videotape made of the proceedings.

Senator Perrault: Consideration is being given to the possibility of telecasting the proceedings in living colour.

MEETING OF CANADIAN CABINET MINISTERS WITH BRITISH
PRIME MINISTER

[*Translation*]

Hon. Martial Asselin: Honourable senators, I would like to put a question to the government leader. When the two ministers of the federal government, Mr. Roberts and Mr. MacGuigan, went to London to meet with representatives of the British government, was there during the discussions a recommendation made by the British Prime Minister to the effect that the Address presented by the Parliament of Canada would be acceptable if the said Address did not contain a Charter of Rights?

● (1440)

[*English*]

Senator Perrault: Honourable senators, I must take that question as notice. As far as my understanding goes, I do not know whether that was discussed.

STATEMENT BY PREMIER OF SASKATCHEWAN

Hon. Duff Roblin (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask the Leader of the Government in this house a question in connection with the statement made last night by the Premier of Saskatchewan, in which he indicated several factors of concern to him in the present constitutional package, and on which he expressed an opinion that varied somewhat from the policy so far laid down. Is it the intention of the Government of Canada to respond publicly to Mr. Blakeney's initiatives in this respect.

Hon. Raymond J. Perrault (Leader of the Government): That question will be taken as notice.

MEETING OF CANADIAN CABINET MINISTERS WITH BRITISH
PRIME MINISTER

Hon. Raymond J. Perrault (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I have some information that has just been handed to me with respect to the situation in the United Kingdom, at least in partial answer to Senator Asselin's previous question.

No United Kingdom minister has ever requested Canada to modify the substance of its constitutional package. It is inconceivable that the United Kingdom government, given its respect for the constitutional conventions between our two Parliaments, would do so. In fact, only yesterday Lord Hailsham, the Lord Chancellor, confirmed in the House of Lords that there is no change in the constitutional position of the United Kingdom government; that it would be in accordance with precedent for the United Kingdom government to introduce in the United Kingdom Parliament, and for Parlia-