

He was satisfied with the reply that was given in reference to the committee, although he observed that perhaps it was a double-headed response.

Now, I do not want the Leader of the Opposition to think that it takes two of us over here to reply to any question which he asks, and I do not want to say that I feel at all ashamed for calling to my aid Senator Doyle. In fact, Senator MacEachen, who knows his classics well, will recall that in the days of Rome when there were two consuls, things did not go too badly. But this is not to create a precedent.

● (1440)

I should now refer to the question Senator MacEachen asked and, indeed, on which he pressed me, which was as follows:

Has the Secretary of State for External Affairs sought advice under section 26 of the CIIPS Act on matters relating to international peace and security?

The answer is as follows:

The Government of Canada regularly avails itself of the expertise of the CIIPS in both informal and formal requests for information and advice, at all times consistent with the independence of the Institute. One example of a formal request for information pursuant to Section 26 of the CIIPS Act was that made by Canada's Ambassador for Disarmament, Doug Roche, for the Institute to undertake an analysis of proposals for a comprehensive and a selective freeze. The Institute agreed to undertake this study and provided a preliminary report to the ambassador on June 28 and a final report on October 1, 1985.

Thank you, honourable senators.

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Leader of the Opposition):** Honourable senators, I think the information is not really on the point which I raised. I think the sponsor has begun the process of getting the information. I asked a simple question as to whether the Secretary of State for External Affairs had asked the institute for advice on any matter relating to the question of international peace and security, which is provided for under law. Surely, it is not beyond the competence of the government to say yes or no. The Secretary of State has or has not asked.

Therefore, I think I will ask that debate on the motion for third reading of this bill stand until the government is more forthcoming on that point.

**Hon. Jacques Flynn:** I think that is rather irregular since the opposition has already spoken.

**Senator Frith:** Honourable senators, I do not think there is anything irregular about a senator asking to adjourn a debate.

**Senator Flynn:** He spoke yesterday.

**Senator Frith:** I moved the adjournment yesterday.

**Senator Flynn:** He put the question, and that is the same thing as speaking.

[Senator Macquarrie.]

**Senator MacEachen:** Honourable senators, yesterday I pre-  
faced each intervention by stating that I was asking a question in order to protect myself against the procedural point which the honourable senator is raising.

**Senator Flynn:** It is exactly the same thing.

**Senator MacEachen:** If, when a speech is completed, an honourable senator asks a question, that is not to be interpreted as an intervention in the normal course of debate. It has never been interpreted as such.

**Senator Flynn:** I was merely suggesting that perhaps there was a way out of the trap into which the honourable senator has put himself. If he wants to state that he is trapped, he can do so, and we will let the matter stand for months if it suits him.

**Senator Macquarrie:** Honourable senators, for clarification and for the record of what is taking place at the moment, I should emphasize that my reply began with the following sentence:

The Government of Canada regularly avails itself of the expertise of the CIIPS in both informal and formal requests for information and advice, at all times consistent with the independence of the Institute.

Is this information satisfactory?

**Senator MacEachen:** No, honourable senators, that is just a put-off. It is just saying that the government regularly makes use of the consultative process.

The question is: Under this provision of the act, which was put there for a particular purpose, did the minister ask for advice? That requires "yes" or "no," please. It is not a question of the government regularly making use—we know that the government would make use of the services of the institute, but did it formally invoke section 26 to ask for advice as is prescribed by the act? And did the minister take that action? That is all I am asking. It is not a very difficult question. The answer should be "yes" or "no." If the answer is "yes," I should like to know how often and on what subjects.

I think it is unreasonable for whoever prepared the answer to garb it in clothing that would obscure the point of the question.

**Senator Flynn:** We would never have done that.

**Senator Macquarrie:** On a point of order, I think it is, perhaps, not really fair of Senator MacEachen to say what he has just said. This answer clearly declares that the government regularly avails itself of the expertise of the CIIPS in both informal and formal requests for information and advice, and it seems to me that that is exactly what he has been talking about, that is, asking for advice informally and formally. Has he another category?

**Senator Hicks:** Yes. Did it occur in this particular instance? That is what your answer does not disclose.

**Senator MacEachen:** Did the Secretary of State for External Affairs, not the mass of government?