

Senator Argue was assured that this matter would be dealt with. In fact, he has patiently agreed to stand a decision from one day to the next. Therefore, I wonder if there is some way in which Senator Robertson could accommodate the Senate, or whether we could accommodate her by coming back to this order later in the day when she has had an opportunity to look at the amendment, and then we can come to a decision. I would not want to deprive her of the opportunity of speaking. It is the question of having a decision today that I think is somewhat urgent.

Senator Doody: Honourable senators, I have no desire to inconvenience Senator Argue or anyone else in this regard. I was very much impressed with the list of names that Senator MacEachen gave us of the people who had been told about the amendment and what was being done. Since my name was mentioned as one who had committed himself to moving this matter along, I was just a little bit surprised that I was not one of the people who were told that an amendment was coming forth, or what the gist of it was. Therefore to me this is a whole new situation, even though I am being told that I was committed to moving it ahead in the absence of any information to that effect.

Therefore I must really mildly—as is my manner—protest the situation in which I find myself, and, at the same time, defend Senator Robertson's right to examine this matter and to think about when and where she wishes to speak.

As to the argument that Senator Argue will not have time to move his committee along, today we will adjourn until January 26. If it is his intention to meet during the Christmas period, then he can do all of the logistics that are necessary to demonstrate the actuality of that situation, and that might put a different complexion on things. However, it is my understanding that this place will be pretty well vacated during the next several weeks. Therefore, the urgency is more apparent than real in that respect.

Senator Frith: Honourable senators, it is a matter of a conflict that we all have in accommodating two of our colleagues. It is a fact that for some weeks now Senator Argue has been asking that this matter be dealt with in its original form, and he has received undertakings from us that it would be disposed of this week. Therefore, if we are to fulfill our undertaking to him we should put the motion in its original form, without the amendment, and then vote on it, because that is the undertaking that we gave him.

What has happened is that he has said: "I will take into account some concerns and, in effect, reduce the scope of the motion that you have agreed you would dispose of this week." Then we have the problem of accommodating Senator Robertson. It is very unusual for us to refuse the adjournment. There also is a rather esoteric provision in some of the material in my possession that if a senator's motion to adjourn is refused, that senator loses the right to speak on the motion, and we certainly do not want that to happen to Senator Robertson.

However, that is the position we are in. It seems to me that Senator Argue would be justified in saying: "If you do not like

the smaller scope of my motion, and you say I have introduced a brand new ballgame, then fulfill the undertaking that you gave me and vote on the motion in its original form." I do not think that that original motion represents the consensus in the chamber. That is why I think the best solution is to have the matter stand until later in the day, and let Senator Robertson, and any others who wish to do so, speak to the amendment at that time. We have the time.

Senator Doody: Just to embellish the point that I thought I had made earlier, the principle of at least informing the government leadership—or what purports to be the government leadership—of the plans of the mover, the seconder, or the amender, on this matter is not so esoteric. I think it is a pretty well recognized convention. I even had to ask for a copy, which my friend so graciously and kindly brought across and presented to me with full yuletide greetings, and I will never forget that; it was a very nice gesture.

Nevertheless, the situation remains that this is a very different kettle of fish from what we started to deal with two days ago.

Senator Frith: That is why I say let us not deal with it now.

Hon. Duff Roblin: Honourable senators, I know perfectly well I am not going to add anything to the discussion, but it will give me some satisfaction, and I trust I may be allowed to express my opinion, because I was not one of the senators whose names were presented to the Senate as being authorities for the proposal that is before us now. Nor indeed was I one of those who were consulted in any way. However, I would like to say that I think it is a bad thing if we purport to limit the discussion in the Senate on a matter of this nature, particularly when we are dealing with a new proposition.

I am not aware of the arrangements made with Senator Argue. I certainly did not make any arrangements with him. In my opinion, it is probably not very suitable that private arrangements of this kind should be presented to us as something to which we should lend our support. I take the view that—

Senator Argue: No private arrangements were made with me.

Senator Roblin: I am glad to hear it.

Senator Argue: What Senator Doody has said is on the record of the Senate, that is all.

Senator Roblin: All I know is what Senator Doody put on the record right now. There was certainly no public arrangement made insofar as he was concerned. However, I am simply saying that we should not deprive Senator Robertson of the right to adjourn the debate at this particular moment on this subject for the simple reason that it is a new motion that we have before us now. This is not the original proposition; it is a new proposition. None of us, as far as I know—except those who concocted it—knew what was in it, although we heard it read to us just a few minutes ago. Therefore, to say now that the senator should not be allowed to adjourn this debate and to speak upon it at a later date seems to me to be quite wrong.