

at 3.30 p.m., or when the Senate rises, again to continue its inquiry into the beef industry.

There are also some meetings which have not yet been arranged, but there will be additions to this list as those meetings are set down and further legislation is referred to this house.

Senator Flynn: Honourable senators, on this side we certainly have no objection to sitting next Monday, but the Deputy Leader of the Government has not convinced me, at least, that we would not be capable of accomplishing the work before us by simply sitting on Tuesday night as usual. On the other hand, if he feels sitting Monday night will have the effect of providing a better attendance at the committee meetings on Tuesday morning, that may be a valid reason; but I certainly do not think the volume of work before us is sufficient to justify our beginning a series of Monday night sittings. In any event, if it is the wish of the government side to have the Senate return on Monday, so be it, but I certainly do not see any compelling rush yet to justify such a motion.

Senator Langlois: As I said in my statement in support of this motion, honourable senators, we have studied the program presently before us and what can be expected from the other place early next week, and have concluded that the only orderly way of arranging for the reasonably speedy disposal of the legislation before this house is at least to initiate the Monday evening sittings next week. I did not intend to suggest as a hard and fast rule that the Senate would meet on Monday evenings every week from now until the adjournment; I have merely said that we should be prepared to commence that routine next Monday in order to endeavour to dispose of the legislation which is likely to come to us before the summer adjournment. Incidentally, as I understand it, that adjournment is presently scheduled to take place some time during the last part of June.

Senator Choquette: Honourable senators, if I may make the suggestion, commencing Monday we should stop saying, "Stand! Stand! Stand!" for every item on the order paper.

Senator Flynn: Yes. That could be done just as easily on Tuesday as on Monday.

Motion agreed to.

MACKENZIE VALLEY PIPELINE INQUIRY

REPORT—REPRESENTATIONS FROM NORTHWEST TERRITORIES COUNCIL—QUESTION

Senator Austin: Honourable senators, I should like to ask the Leader of the Senate whether the government has received representations from the Northwest Territories Council, or any elected member of that Council, about the conclusions and recommendations of the Berger Report.

Senator Perrault: Honourable senators, I will take that question as notice.

Senator Flynn: May I suggest that it would be preferable if Senator Austin could give you notice in advance so that you

would not always be obliged to say, "I will take that question as notice."

Senator Austin: Perhaps I should also be giving Senator Flynn notice at the same time.

Senator Flynn: No, no. It would not be necessary. I am not in the same class as Senator Perrault. I think I could probably reply to that question now.

• (1420)

PARLIAMENT

REINTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION—QUESTION

Senator Choquette: Honourable senators, I should like to ask the Leader of the Government a question. This might involve amending the rules. I do not happen to know the answer myself. Every now and then we hear, "This is a bill that died on the order paper in the last session." This is said in reference to a bill that had gone through the whole rigmarole in the other place, had been read the second time in this house and referred to a committee, which had heard witnesses from all over the country. Then, in the next session, we have to start the whole thing all over again.

In order to expedite matters, I am wondering if this could not be remedied in some way by amending the rules. What is the answer to this problem?

Senator Perrault: Honourable senators, I understand this matter is under consideration at the present time by a number of parties in the other place. I think the senator has made a valid observation. It has been traditional, as honourable senators have pointed out, to have those measures which have not been fully dealt with by Parliament reintroduced in a subsequent session. Parliament is examining ways now to expedite the people's business more effectively and efficaciously. Certainly the suggestion advanced by the honourable senator is under discussion—that is, completing the debate on a measure which may have been partially debated prior to the conclusion of a previous session of Parliament.

Senator Grosart: It is a rule of the other place, but not here.

Senator Choquette: We could make the suggestion to them.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

AGREEMENTS BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS—QUESTION ANSWERED

Senator Perrault: I have the answer to a question asked on May 11 by the Honourable Senator Manning, which is as follows:

—with respect to the contract . . . between the Government of Canada and the Province of New Brunswick for the use or employment of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, could he [the Leader of the Government] inform the house if all provinces which previously had these agreements have now entered into new agreements, or, if not, what is the present status of those negotiations?