

relating to the policies of the Government of Saskatchewan. My honourable friend knows that, and if he wishes to make a protest to the Government of Saskatchewan, then he should do so, but there is no sense making a protest to me.

Senator Argue: My question was: Did the Premier of Saskatchewan ask the Government of Canada to make that contribution to the Government of Saskatchewan? That was my question and I think it was perfectly clear.

Senator Roblin: That position is set out in the written answer I have given my honourable friend, and that is as far as I can go.

Senator Olson: Honourable senators, I have a supplementary question. The manner in which the Leader of the Government answered the question regarding the grain producers is very, very discouraging, because that answer indicates that there will be no action taken until all of the harvest for 1985 is in, at least that is the excuse the leader gave. If this is going to apply to the payment of crop insurance and whatever other factors may be taken into account, I must say that that is extremely discouraging. I wonder, therefore, if the leader would reconsider and resubmit the question to whoever provided the reply and ask if they were really serious that any consideration of the situation of the grain producers in the drought area is going to await the considerations the leader has outlined today.

Senator Roblin: I think my honourable friend has a point, and I agree with him. I think the government will move on the matter much faster than the answer indicates, and I think we should know in a matter of days what the policy is.

I will certainly do my best to see that that statement is made as promptly as possible.

Senator Olson: That is the most encouraging reply I have heard in some time.

CANADA-UNITED STATES INTER-PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

TWENTY-SIXTH MEETING—REPORT OF CANADIAN DELEGATION
PRINTED AS AN APPENDIX

Hon. Richard J. Stanbury: Honourable senators, on Tuesday next, October 8, 1985, I shall call the attention of the Senate to the Twenty-Sixth Meeting of the Canada-United States Inter-Parliamentary Group held at Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ontario, from May 16 to 20, 1985.

I ask leave today, honourable senators, to have the report printed as an appendix to *Debates of the Senate* of this day so that senators will have it available when I speak on the subject next week.

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Is leave granted, honourable senators?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

(For text of report see Appendix "A", p. 1332.)

CANADIAN INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY ACT

BILL TO AMEND—THIRD READING—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Macquarrie, seconded by the Honourable Senator Murray, for the third reading of the Bill C-69, intituled: "An Act to amend the Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security Act and certain other Acts in relation thereto".—(Honourable Senator Frith).

Hon. Royce Frith (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, I adjourned the debate on this motion yesterday to give the sponsor of the bill, Senator Macquarrie, an opportunity to obtain the rest of the information—in fairness to him, he did provide some information yesterday—requested by the Leader of the Opposition. As I recall it, that further information related to what consultations had taken place between the institute and government pursuant to authority to do so in the statute.

So, I yield to Honourable Senator Macquarrie.

Hon. Heath Macquarrie: Honourable senators, I thank the Honourable Senator Frith for what he has said. He is always fair and I am always informative. So, I agree with his opening sentence. I am also prepared to be even more forthcoming than I was yesterday in admitting that on our little difference of opinion on the question of third reading, he, in fact, was right. I want to remind him that some months ago when we discussed a similar matter in connection with the ICOD meeting it turned out that that was not the case; he stood up the next day and was so kind as to say not that I was right—which would have been better—but that he was wrong.

I want him to know that I am most trepidatious about our third argument, because one each way means that the next is a tie-breaker.

Senator Frith: The rubber match.

Senator Macquarrie: Yesterday, Senator MacEachen said that there was only one continuing question, and I have gone as far as to consult with the very highest authorities to prepare myself with a carefully worded reply. Referring to Senator Hicks' comment of yesterday about the bill not going through because information was not forthcoming, we must remember that a poor, humble senator sponsoring a bill in this place is not in the same position as a minister speaking with the authority of being a member of cabinet and having a host of officials to guide him. While a serious, conscientious sponsoring senator will look carefully at the legislation which he is sponsoring—and I studied very carefully, Senator Hicks, all those parts of the existing statute which were being amended—one would not expect to be asked to ad lib not only on all of the other sections, along with any of them which were under amendment, but also as to the functioning relationship of members of the executive and other people mentioned. So, if I was a few hours late in getting a reply to Senator MacEachen's penetrating question, I must apologize.