

Senator McElman is attempting to persuade the Liberal Party to retain the principle of universality. I do not know whether he will be successful in that endeavour, but, at least, he went to caucus and made that argument, and I give him full credit for that.

I have asked the mover for his reasons in support of an elected Senate, and if good reasons are given, I will consider them. However, I am not going to beat a drum, dance around the fire and say that we should have an elected Senate.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Daniel Riley: Would Senator Phillips permit a question?

Senator Phillips: Certainly.

Senator Riley: Before I pose my question, I should like to congratulate Senator Phillips on the clarity and fluency of the speech he has just made.

Regretfully, I missed the first part of his speech, and I should like to know if he suggested to the deputy leader that we be divided into small groups and sent to Australia for four or five days with a view to assessing the prospects for an elected Senate in Canada.

Senator Frith: Senator Phillips did suggest that.

Senator Phillips: I did suggest that it was only fair that those opposed and those in favour of an elected Senate be given that opportunity. Senator Riley's question has reinforced my suggestion.

Senator Marshall: Honourable senators, since there seems to be some duplication between Orders Nos. 11 and 16, and since Senator Frith has indicated that he will comment on the

Australian trip in the course of the debate on Order No. 16, should we, at this point, adjourn the debate on Order No. 11 or dispose of it in some other way?

Senator Frith: Honourable senators, Senator Marshall correctly observes that there is some overlapping of those two orders in that both deal with the question of Senate reform.

I think Senator Lamontagne's inquiry, respecting the report of the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs entitled: "Certain Aspects of the Canadian Constitution," was the first to appear on the Order Paper. Then Senator Roblin, wishing to focus on the question of Senate reform, particularly the subject of an elected Senate, presented the motion which appears as Order No. 11 on the Order Paper.

I agree that there may be some redundancy, but I choose to make my intervention—which will only partly be based on the trip to Australia—on the basis of Senator Lamontagne's inquiry because I intend to refer to the committee report. However, I could just as easily make my intervention in the debate on Senator Roblin's motion.

Nonetheless, I think it would be worthwhile to retain both items on the Order Paper a little longer since Senator Deschatelets has said that he wishes to intervene in the debate on Order No. 11, but only after I have made my intervention on Order No. 16.

Senator Macquarrie: We are all waiting.

Senator Frith: I hope it will be next week.

On motion of Senator Marshall, debate adjourned.

The Senate adjourned until Tuesday, November 30, 1982, at 8 p.m.