

quotation marks and not attribute to me the interpretation of the journalist.

**Senator Gigantès:** If you will just stop for a moment, I shall do so.

Reading between the quotation marks, then, Senator Lowell Murray said:

"If they get away with this one, they'd be encouraged to repeat the performance on any bill that strikes their fancy."

**Senator Murray:** Right.

**Senator Gigantès:** And the journalist says:

In terms of the borrowing bill, the government could easily agree to a compromise with the Liberal senators without adversely affecting the government's borrowing capacity.

**Senator Murray:** The journalist said that.

**Senator Gigantès:** I have just said so. Continuing:

But if it does so it will represent a clear political victory for the Liberals and an ominous portent of troubles to come.

**Senator Murray:** That is the journalist again.

**Senator Gigantès:** Yes.

**An Hon. Senator:** Sometimes they speak the truth.

**Senator Flynn:** Sometimes. Not very often.

**Senator Gigantès:** The second argument which we have heard from the Progressive Conservatives seems to be that if the House of Commons passes a bill, even in circumstances when the government has not consulted this chamber at all beforehand, this chamber should acquiesce, that it should not discuss the measure but let it pass.

This view asserts that if a bill is passed by the House of Commons, it is perfect. That is what it means. If it is passed by the House of Commons, it is perfect; it has no flaws.

This view asserts that what the majority in the other place wants is, of necessity, right and infallible. That is the only possible conclusion.

What then of the occasions on which, by some procedure or another, the Senate obtained a change in the view held by the majority in the other place? I am referring to those very cases which the Leader of the Government placed before the Finance Committee on February 14 last, on which occasion he said that the Senate's views have been heard by ministers when the Senate produced those views.

This happened because the ministers were prepared to compromise, were prepared to listen. That is not the case now. We were not even consulted.

Senator Roblin thinks that the changes which the Senate suggested and which ministers of previous governments accepted were good changes. So he told the committee. I agree with him.

Are we to understand now that only those changes effected by the Senate should be considered good which have been effected by a Liberal Senate majority on views held by a Liberal Commons majority? That is the only conclusion. If we touch a holy of holies, a sacred trust Tory view, then it is not all right.

There is more to this. Various members of the government have been maintaining that if the House of Commons passes legislation, the Senate must roll over and play dead. What that means is that we would no longer be able to bring about the types of improvements to legislation that the Senate has effected in the past and in respect of which Senator Roblin had praise.

What the Leader of the Government is saying to us, both Liberals and Progressive Conservatives, is that we do not exist and should not exist; that we do not matter. What he is saying is that what we suggest should not even be listened to by the other place; that the type of compromise that has been made in the past should no longer be made. If we do not roll over and play dead, we are menaced by the Honourable Leader of the Government speaking in front of the committee. That was a more implied threat than the one made this evening by Senator Murray. I do not refer to the threats made by Senator Phillips. He is not here, and I must be coming down with a cold because I am beginning to have a sneaking feeling of affection for him.

● (2020)

I am surprised that Senator Murray should stoop so low. In my opinion, it is demeaning to the institution and to its character to have a member of this institution menace other members of the institution because they express their opinion. This is not democratic, and yet we all heard it.

I owe a great debt and obligation to this country. I do not think that I would fulfill this obligation, and even remotely begin to repay this debt, if I were to allow myself to be impressed by threats. And I am convinced that the members of this chamber on both sides will not be impressed by threats. In my opinion, it is demeaning and unworthy to have uttered such threats.

In sum, what is happening here is that the government has shunned normal practice for reaching a reasonable compromise. The government could have tabled the estimates, kept the Commons sitting and had Royal Assent by this Friday. It chose not to do so. The government has caused this crisis. It is a convenient diversion, I repeat, from the public embarrassments of some of its minister so of course, the government says that it is all our fault. This reminds me of a trial during which a man accused of rape pointed to his victim and said to the judge: "This is all her fault, Your Honour. If she had said 'yes' this would not have been rape." Thank you, honourable senators.

**Senator Guay:** Honourable senators, I rise on a point of order—

**Senator Roblin:** May I speak to a point of order before my honourable friend speaks? I am attempting to get the flavour