

or may not heed us. That is a matter of conjecture, mere guess. Perhaps Senator Flynn has his crystal ball with him today, I do not, but that is mere conjecture and not relevant to the procedural question now before the Senate. So, it is Senator Flynn who is engaging in gratuitous anticipation.

The motion is in order because there is nothing on our order paper that takes precedence over it. To guess that the eventual outcome of the debate will be such as to raise difficulties later, is simply to guess, and that is irrelevant on a procedural matter.

Senator Roblin: Honourable senators, I must elaborate on the argument put forth by my honourable colleague opposite. The first thing I should like to say, however, is that I do not think anyone in the Senate thinks that we are engaged in an exercise to limit discussion in the Senate, or to prevent any issue, no matter what it is, to be proposed in this house for debate and consideration. We are considering whether this is the best way to develop the arguments in the light of the rules of the Senate in respect of this issue.

I think that if an Inquiry had been submitted, as was suggested by Senator Flynn, it would certainly have cleared up any difficulty. We would have debated that Inquiry. I suspect that one way or another we will debate this resolution. If not, no doubt we will debate a slightly altered one, and I welcome that debate. So, I want to make it quite clear that this is not an attempt to frustrate the Senate.

On the next point, namely the question of anticipation, what Senator Stewart overlooks is that we can anticipate an answer to this proposition. In fact, there are two answers, "Yes" or "No." If he refers to rule 47, he will see that it is clear that that rule does not anticipate a "Yes" answer or a "No" answer, but it anticipates either. If either "Yes" or "No" is recorded in respect of this matter, that prevents the same subject from being discussed again.

Senator Stewart: No, it does not.

Senator Roblin: I think it does.

Senator Argue: Why not read the rule.

Senator Roblin: I am expressing an opinion. I am simply saying that this is one of the things the Speaker can take a look at. If my interpretation is wrong, I will stand corrected; I have no pride of authorship in the matter.

It seems to me, honourable senators, that the question of anticipation is valid and is one of the things that the Speaker has to rule on.

There may be other honourable senators who wish to speak on this matter. I must confess that I have no further advice to give the Speaker on the subject. I only wish him well in arriving at his decision.

Senator MacEachen: Honourable senators, in a sense I want to appreciate the comment made by Senator Flynn, which was that from a strictly procedural point of view, the rule of anticipation does not arise. If one looks at *Beauchesne*, one will be convinced that in order for the rule of anticipation to apply from a procedural point of view there has to be a proceeding

[Senator Stewart.]

on the order paper. I think we can agree that there is no other proceeding on the order paper other than the one which we are now discussing. In procedural matters, the technical points win the day.

Senator Flynn: Not necessarily. If the substance is raised, you have to decide on the substance.

Senator MacEachen: In order for the substance to be raised there would have to be a further proceeding, and we know what a proceeding is in a legislative assembly. A proceeding begins with a motion. When *Beauchesne* uses the word "proceeding", it has a distinct meaning. A proceeding begins with a motion, continues with a debate, and then there is a conclusion. That is the end of the proceeding, but we are talking about procedure.

The second point I wish to make is that it is a practical point, and I think it is conclusive that it is a practical point. Having made that point, I am now, in a sense, engaging in the practice of anticipation. It has been forced upon me irregularly; procedurally, I cannot even think about that proceeding because it is not before the Senate.

Senator Flynn: Read rule 47.

Senator MacEachen: When I look at this particular motion I say: If I anticipated a future ways and means resolution of the government giving effect to the elimination of full indexation, then this proposition is different from that future possible proposition. Then I say: "Why do I know that?" Because it is a different proposition. It is different because the effects are totally different. If I voted in support of that motion, I think honourable senators would agree that it would be an expression of opinion which would have no financial effect in itself. The pensioners would not be affected one way or another. It would only have effect if a further action were to take place, namely, that the government accepted, in a sense, the view of the Senate. But that would be dependent upon another action that is not contained in this motion.

So, my vote in support of this motion, if I voted that way—and I would—would have no effect if the motion were carried, unless the government did something.

Senator Flynn: Okay.

Senator MacEachen: So, we agree with that. Let us anticipate irregularly the ways and means motion that will be before the Senate at some future time removing the full indexation of old age pension benefits. If the majority voted against that, then, of course, something would happen—something would very much happen: The effect would be profound, and that would not depend upon another action. The action taken and that vote would be, in a sense, self-contained and conclusive.

● (1540)

I say that the propositions are quite different. At any rate, I did not intend to get into this debate.

Some Hon. Senators: Oh, oh!

Senator MacEachen: I thought that I had said farewell to *Beauchesne* a long time ago.