

tures of major companies within the Atlantic region are already at rock bottom low, and here we find that they are going down by a further 5 per cent, approximately.

For my own province, the province of New Brunswick, the planned capital outlays for 1985 are reduced by 28 per cent.

The region is in trouble. If ever there was a time for the Government of Canada to feel right about assisting a region, rather than closing down these two operations at this point in time, surely it has to be now.

It is my hope that all honourable senators, and particularly those on the government side of the house, many of whom have their roots in Nova Scotia and perhaps still representing that province, will join forces with the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate in trying to impress upon the government that this is not just a subsidy; that there is some hope of a market for the heavy water produced, and in any event, if it is finally decided that these plants must be closed down, that they not be dismantled, leaving the future market in heavy water for the province of Ontario, a province that is certainly not in need of assistance to the same level as are Cape Breton and the maritime provinces.

Let me just add a word or two about what Senator Doody has said in relation to the output of Lepreau II going to other provinces. Much of the production of Lepreau I now goes into New England pursuant to long term contracts. One of the reasons that the plans for Lepreau II were shelved for a time was the softness of the market due to the economic conditions in New England. That market appears now to be firming, with the result that Lepreau II is very much on the front burner. Probably within months from today, AECL and the Government of New Brunswick will be proposing to the Government of Canada that Lepreau II be proceeded with, involving an expenditure of \$1.2 billion. That plant, once in operation, will require large quantities of heavy water into the foreseeable future.

**Hon. Jean Le Moynes:** Honourable senators, I should like to ask a question of the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate. No doubt he will find me incredibly naive. My question is: How will this debate end? Will it end with the adoption of the report of the committee?

**Hon. Royce Frith (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** In our procedures, the report of a committee is not always adopted. The motion that we have before us now is the result of a decision taken yesterday to have this matter taken into consideration today. We do not yet have a motion to have it approved. But the usual result of a report from the National Finance Committee on estimates is that that report is taken as the committee's view on the appropriation bill once it comes forward, because each of the items appearing in the report of the committee will appear as schedules to the appropriation bill.

Appropriation bills are not usually referred to the National Finance Committee, the reason being that the committee has already reported on the estimates. It is quite possible, however,

that this subject might be raised again when the appropriation bill is debated.

**Senator Le Moynes:** That is not my point. I am wondering whether it would be possible to end this debate by having a formal motion respecting these two heavy water plants.

**Senator Frith:** If a motion were put dealing with this report, it would have to be to the effect that the report be not adopted, for these reasons. I suppose that that is possible. It had not occurred to me. If it is the wish of the Senate that this money should not be granted to de Havilland, the action to be taken would be to defeat the appropriation bill.

**Senator Doody:** That bill will come in anyway.

**Senator Frith:** I am not inviting anyone to do that.

**Hon. Duff Roblin (Leader of the Government):** I would not want to leave the impression in the mind of Senator Le Moynes that that would constitute a sound course to follow.

**Senator Frith:** I wouldn't either.

**Senator Roblin:** I would like to make it clear that that is not my view, and I suspect that it is no longer the view, if it ever was, of honourable senators sitting opposite. It is generally accepted, regardless of what we think about regular legislation, that the Senate does not take unto itself, although it might constitutionally do so, any right to amend or to defeat money bills, and that would be the substance of the motion that is before us now, although it could be argued that it really isn't strictly—

**Senator Frith:** It is stronger than that. It is refusing supply.

**Senator Flynn:** That is on the bill. This is not a bill. It is not even a motion.

**Senator Roblin:** It is just to take it under consideration. However, I think the impression might have been left with Senator Le Moynes that it would be possible, in dealing with this motion, to somehow point the finger at the heavy water problem. I suppose it is possible to do that if the wording of the committee report does so. However, in terms of the effective results it is merely an expression of our opinion at that stage. If it is desired to underline it, I guess an inquiry will be introduced, under which one could review the whole matter again, if it is thought advisable to do so.

● (1710)

This underlines what I believe to be the role of the Senate these days, until we are reformed in one way or another. Basically, we are an advisory body. We are entitled to, and indeed should, express our opinions on matters of this sort, and I think there is no reason why other parties in the legislature may not be acquainted with what takes place in the Senate from our *Hansard*. However, it is my view, which is perhaps heretical and not entirely agreed to by everybody here, that we would be well advised at this stage in our constitutional development to recognize the essential advisory function that we perform, rather than thinking that we should take it upon ourselves to modify financial legislation.