

the opposition in the House of Commons. It would have been a reasonable act and they would have gotten the \$7.3 billion. Immediately after the estimates were tabled they would have gotten their other \$12 billion. But, no.

Such flexibility on the part of the government would not have been unprecedented. On February 14 the Honourable Leader of the Government in the Senate—and I shall not quote him verbatim, since it is not allowed—during a meeting of the finance committee praised previous administrations for listening to Senate suggestions and for changing government proposals. However, these reasonable situations, which Senator Roblin presents to us as laudable examples, arose because the government then consulted and informed the Senate that the government was willing to reach a compromise. Earlier we heard Senator Stewart lay out the record. The Liberal government backed down before the persistence of the then opposition. That did not happen this time. Moreover—and this is what I find hard to take—the government has already approved the estimates. With the modern printing techniques at its disposal, those estimates could have been tabled by the government last Friday.

● (2010)

**Senator Haidasz:** Oh!

**Senator Gigantès:** Yes.

**Senator Haidasz:** How do you know?

**Senator Murray:** A good question.

**Senator Gigantès:** It is information that came in a brown envelope. I will tell you afterwards. I cannot give you more details, because the person who so informed me would be fired. This government is sufficiently paranoid to believe that it can keep secrets. You cannot print 450-page blue books and have stacks of them lying about and still keep it a secret. That is how I know. There are too many people who have seen them, people who have bundled and labelled them. They are ready to be distributed.

**Senator Haidasz:** And they told you so?

**Senator Gigantès:** They did not tell me so. An employee of the government told me so.

The government could have had this bill last week. They could have shown us the estimates this week. But no, they chose not to. And we have to ask ourselves why. Why do they want to create this psycho-drama?

**Senator Flynn:** And what is your answer?

**Senator Gigantès:** I can only speculate as to why—and I do not accuse any member of this house of having a part in this reasoning, because the members of this house are honourable men and women. I think it was to create a diversion in the minds of the media and the public so that they would stop harping—

**Senator Flynn:** Who is trying to create a diversion?

**Senator Gigantès:** —harping on the constant errors and foot-in-mouth mistakes of members of the government and concentrate on some other event.

[Senator Gigantès.]

They could give us the estimates this week. The government has said that it is willing to bring the House of Commons back. Why not bring the House of Commons back and table the estimates. If the government were to do that, it would have Royal Assent on this bill on Friday. But no, it does not want to do that. What it wants is to have this little crisis. Well, it is having a little crisis—

**Senator Flynn:** We are not the ones having a crisis.

**Senator Gigantès:** It is a crisis that has been deliberately fabricated by the government. It knew it could have avoided it. Why was it fabricated by the government? For the answer to that, I should like to quote from a newspaper interview given by Senator Lowell Murray. The article states:

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.

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

"If they get away with this one," said Senator Lowell Murray, one of the Tories on the finance committee—

**Senator Murray:** Just one moment—

**Senator Gigantès:**

—"they'd be encouraged to repeat the performance on any bill that strikes their fancy."

**Senator Murray:** May I ask the honourable senator to read the quotation that is attributed to me within quotation marks and not attribute to me statements that are made by the reporter in interpreting a political situation.

**Senator Gigantès:** I did not attribute the remarks to you, Senator Murray. You attributed them to yourself. So, if the shoe fits—

**Senator Murray:** I am asking the honourable senator to attribute to me the words that are attributed to me in the article between quotation marks—

**Senator Gigantès:** I am about to do that.

**Senator Murray:** Enough of this dishonesty!

**Some Hon. Senators:** Order!

**Senator Murray:** Enough of this dishonesty. My honourable friend had some difficulty a few weeks ago with Senator Phillips. Let us not have the same type of problem tonight.

**An Hon. Senator:** Are you threatening again?

**Some Hon. Senators:** Order!

**Senator Murray:** I am asking the honourable senator to place on the record—

**Senator Gigantès:** If you will stop for a moment, I will read it.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Order!

**Senator Murray:** I ask the honourable senator to place on the record the statements that are attributed to me within