

of the Senate administration and there is a surplus there, that that money can be made available within the global Senate budget for committees? I may be in error—this is only my opinion—but it is not separated in all of the details, so that if you go over in one you have to have another appropriation. I think that we have an overall appropriation of money, and that covers our general budget and our general expenditures. If the budget is over by \$50,000 for committee work, my guess is that there is a surplus some other place where that money could be found, without necessarily coming back here for another vote.

● (1530)

Hon. Orville H. Phillips: Honourable senators, I would like to say to Senator Argue that I think he is right, but what disturbs me in his remarks is that he says we will have to guess that the money will be available from another source within the Senate appropriation.

Senator Argue: Someone who knew would have to tell us.

Senator Phillips: I must admit that when we are more than \$660,000 over budget, I am beginning to have some doubts about finding it elsewhere.

Senator Argue: But 70 per cent of the total.

Senator Phillips: For clarification, I should like to ask Senator Frith if the \$660,000 he quoted included the \$315,000 for the Senate Special Committee on the subject matter of Bill C-22, and if it also includes the supplementary budget for the Standing Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that was moved today? Are those items in addition to the \$660,000 to which he referred?

Senator Frith: Honourable senators, I have taken note of the question and I will try to get an answer. The figures I gave were figures that were just handed to me.

Senator Roblin: May I adjourn the debate in order to give my friend an opportunity to get the answers?

Senator Frith: Perhaps I should do that in order to furnish the figures. I think it is best that the debate be adjourned in my name.

Senator Roblin: If you do that then I will not have an opportunity to speak again, because you will be closing the debate.

Senator Frith: I started to speak on this order, and I am asking if you will allow me to adjourn the debate. It is only after the matter has been completely discussed that I get my right of reply, and I am not finished with my comments.

Senator Roblin: I am a purist in these matters. Senator Frith has made a speech and I have made one, so the senator has exhausted his right in the first instance. Someone else ought to adjourn the debate, and not Senator Frith. I will undertake that arduous task.

Senator Frith: I think it will result in exactly the opposite situation. When someone speaks on a debate, they are entitled to ask the Senate for an adjournment of the debate in their

own name, as Senator Marshall has done on the NFB matter. It is quite acceptable for a senator to speak to an order and then, rather than sitting down, ask to adjourn the debate in his name. The senator has not then exhausted his right to speak and can continue. If that application is refused, that senator cannot then speak on the debate.

If we do not adjourn it in my name, and then Senator Roblin speaks, say, tomorrow, and then I speak, then I will be closing the debate. Someone else may want to speak. I would find myself in the position of not being able to provide any of the answers because I would be closing the debate.

For that reason I think it is better that the debate be adjourned in my name, and I will continue tomorrow and give the figures. Then, if I speak later, it will close the debate.

Senator Roblin: My point is on an entirely different matter altogether. I am not questioning the custom we have here of a speaker adjourning the debate before he is finished and allowing him to continue again later on. I am simply saying that there has been intervening business in this discussion, namely, my speech, and that has foreclosed Senator Frith from adjourning the debate, because he is through on his first go around. I do not think it is worth any more than a casual comment, but it seems to me that I am right.

Senator Frith: Have it your way. It seems to me that it just makes it worse. Carry on however you wish.

Senator Roblin: I do not care.

The Hon. the Speaker: Would someone else move the adjournment?

Senator Frith: If someone else moves the adjournment of the debate, let us be clear, it means that I have finished. I have spoken once on this matter. Then, tomorrow when everyone is waiting for the figures and I stand up and give the figures, I will be closing the debate.

Senator Argue: We will give you unanimous consent to give the figures without closing the debate.

Senator Frith: Why not give me the right to adjourn the debate now? That respects the rules.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is it agreed?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

The Hon. the Speaker: It is moved by the Honourable Senator Frith, seconded by the Honourable Senator Roblin—

Some Hon. Senators: Oh, oh!

The Hon. the Speaker:—that further debate be adjourned until the next sitting of the Senate.

Is it your pleasure, honourable senators, to adopt the motion?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

SENIOR CITIZENS

OBSERVATION OF SPECIAL WEEK IN TRIBUTE—ORDER STANDS

On the Order: