

debate should be kept open, I should like to ask the Senate to consider that we adjourn the debate until the month of September. I so move.

The Hon. the Speaker: I will first put the question and then honourable senators may, if they wish, speak to the motion.

Hon. Jacques Flynn: I would like it to be clear that we can debate the motion, because normally a motion to adjourn is not debatable. If it is agreed that we can debate the motion, I have no objection.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: His Honour the Speaker may wish to put the question before we debate the motion, but on the understanding that we can debate it.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is there agreement that the motion can be debated?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

The Hon. the Speaker: It is moved by honourable Senator Macnaughton, seconded by honourable Senator Hays, that this debate be adjourned until September 7. Is it your pleasure to adopt the motion?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I think this is the strangest procedure that I have ever heard proposed. Here we have a situation where a Government bill has been introduced in the Senate. It has taken its normal course in that it received first and second reading and was sent to committee, and the committee reported the bill back to the house without amendment.

Whether or not this chamber has been asked to mediate between two private parties is not a fit question, I submit. This bill has passed through its normal course. It is before the house for third reading, and I think that third reading should be proceeded with now.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: There is no reason to delay the bill until September. I wish to repeat that the committee unanimously recommended that the bill should be reported to the house without amendment. Apparently the members of the committee, of which I am not a member, were satisfied to report the bill without amendment. I think it is our responsibility to proceed with third reading today. As a matter of fact, the bill was introduced on Friday, December 18. Surely that has given sufficient time for the 102 members of this chamber to make up their minds?

Hon. Mr. Choquette: There are not 102 members here now.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: I would ask the house to proceed with third reading now, otherwise it will interfere with our summer recess. I do not think that even a minority of honourable senators would be in favour of that.

Hon. Mr. Flynn: I cannot see how it would interfere with the summer recess. Would the Deputy Leader of the Government indicate how?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The summer recess would be shorter.

Hon. Mr. Flynn: In what way?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: If we are able to clear up all the business now before us, our summer recess will be of a certain duration. If not, we will return at an earlier date.

Hon. Mr. Flynn: I suggest that this is not true, because this bill, to become law, would have to go through the House of Commons. Our voting on it on September 7 or September 14 would make no difference because it would not go through the other place until mid or late September anyway. I suggest there is subtle blackmail in that last remark, and I for one do not accept it.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: If any honourable senator thinks that I am attempting to blackmail the Senate, he is badly mistaken. I have made the statement, and it is the truth, that if we are able to clear up all the work that is before us before we adjourn for the summer recess, then we will return on a certain date. If not, we will return on an earlier date. These are the instructions that I have been given, and I must follow them.

Hon. Mr. Flynn: If the Deputy Leader says that those are the instructions he received, then we would very well understand. We would probably be more convinced than with the insinuation that we might have to come back at an earlier date.

Hon. John J. Connolly: I am not the least bit concerned about the length of the summer adjournment, and, for the benefit of the Deputy Leader and the Leader of the Opposition, I am sure that none of us are. However, on the question of the amendment to the motion for third reading, I think there should be some clarification given.

I think that I attended all of the meetings of the committee which studied this bill. The last committee session was attended by the minister who, in the course of his remarks, suggested that it might be appropriate for the committee to summon someone from the Economic Council of Canada on the question of whether the proposed measure was in the public interest. I for one would have been happy indeed to hear the experts or representatives of the Economic Council and said so during the course of the committee hearings. However, I was conscious of the over-riding view which prevailed in the committee that we had heard all the evidence and knew what the case was on both sides, as Senator Lang has described it. The opinion was that it was for us to decide whether the bill was in the public interest. Because of that I think that honourable senators on the committee felt that the bill should be reported without amendment, and it was so reported.

Hon. Mr. Flynn: On division.

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): If we are to adjourn this debate until September, I suggest that a motion at that time might well be required to return the bill to the committee. Without being the least bit invidious, I think the majority of the committee members felt that the bill