

Honourable senators, in practical terms, what are we doing? Are we depriving Senator Argue of having his motion dealt with at an early date? We are not.

**Senator Olson:** Yes, we are.

**Senator Roblin:** We are not. If the motion is dealt with right now, everyone knows that we are adjourning until January 26. There is nothing that the committee will be doing in the interval. It is not as if time is being lost or the issue itself is one in which time is of the essence. It is not. It is a matter that will be discussed by members of the Senate over the months that are to come. Apart from meeting the obvious desire of Senator Argue to get on with his particular idea, I really cannot see what the urgency is that we should be asked to deal with it now in such a way as to prevent a senator from adjourning the debate and discussing what is essentially a new proposition at a later date. If we get into this habit we will be making a mistake.

**Senator Robertson:** Without jeopardizing my position to speak, I must say, in defence of Senator Corbin, that he did give me a copy of his amendment. Some of us discussed this amendment at length. We decided among ourselves that we wanted to have a little more time, and in that spirit I moved the adjournment of the debate. The future of the motion is at your mercy, I suppose, but I assumed that it was a normal procedure. I certainly did not intend to cause a ruckus, but I still stand by my motion. Kill it or do whatever you want to do with it.

**Senator Corbin:** Honourable senators, on a point of order, if I may refer to the mechanics of the wheeling and dealing that went on this morning, some of it informally outside the house and some of it formally inside the house, I must say that I had been in contact with my leader, with Senator Argue, and with some of the members who sit on the government side. I do not want to name anybody, because that is beside the point in any case. However, I do want to respond to the remark that Senator Doody made, and that was that he had not been informed of the motion when I rose to speak this afternoon.

For the information particularly of Senator Doody, I wish to tell him that of course I have been speaking with members of his party. I have been speaking with one member in particular who said, "Well, discuss it with other members." All the time I assumed that you yourself, Senator Doody, would be informed by your own members. I hope that you are not tagging me with the responsibility of having to inform you. After all, who am I to approach your august person and tell you what is going on with your own party?

**Senator Doody:** I understand.

**Senator Corbin:** I hope we are clear that you are not blaming me for this imbroglio.

**Senator Argue:** Honourable senators, I am the type of person who usually tries to be agreeable and reasonable. I think I have been reasonable.

This motion was first moved in June of this year. That is now more than six months ago. In all the sitting days since

[Senator Roblin.]

that time this motion was on the order paper. Senator Robertson, or any other senator, had an opportunity to speak to this motion and make their views known. There were then certain objections made—mainly, but not exclusively, from the other side of the house—that the scope of this motion was far too large, that it would take \$6 million to look into this, and it would go on forever. I did not feel that way. I felt that there should be a broad basis of authority for the committee.

There seemed to be a substantial opinion that the terms of reference be narrowed. Senator Corbin felt that. My leader tried to accommodate others who had that point of view by coming forward with a compromise, shall we say, or with a suggested amendment. While everyone was not brought in on the discussion, a number of senators did discuss this question.

Now I do feel—and I feel this very sincerely and very honestly—that this is a time for decision. It is true to say that we are going into a recess and the question could be asked, "What is to be lost by waiting?" However, the difference between a decision today and waiting is that the decision will not be made. There is no assurance when a decision will be made. I am not trying to create difficulties, but Senator Doody some days ago seemed very amenable and said that we should make a decision on Tuesday of this week. That did not happen.

We on this side of the house have been very cooperative today. The government wanted a number of bills passed through the Senate—

**Senator MacEachen:** With virtually no notice.

**Senator Argue:** —in three stages so there could be Royal Assent today, and, as my leader says, with virtually no notice.

We have fully cooperated on this side of the house, and I think it is reasonable to ask for reciprocation, not in the same way and not to the same extent. We have accommodated the government on a number of motions. I think it is fair to say that a decision should be made on this motion today, and I hope that the question of the amendment and the question of the main motion could be put soon and put today.

**Hon. Orville H. Phillips:** Honourable senators, the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition about the urgency of proceeding with the formation of a committee have caused me to suggest to him that it is impossible to proceed with the work of the committee, because a selection committee has to meet. That committee cannot meet until the Senate returns. However, if the matter is so urgent, I point out to honourable senators that the motion for adjournment is subject to recall, and the Senate could be recalled during the adjournment to deal with the matter. I am sure that Senator Argue would come back for that.

**Senator Olson:** Honourable senators, I will just say a word or two while you try to get your act together. What is serious about the attempt to postpone this is that you are not keeping your word.

**Senator Doody:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, that honourable gentleman pointed across the floor to me. Can you sit down, please?