

ence is between the amendment, which was defeated, and this bill.

His Honour ruled that we could vote against this bill even if we voted in favour of the amendment which was introduced by this side some weeks ago.

This is an important matter because the Speaker did indicate to us that there was a substantial difference between the amendment and this bill, and we have to consider that matter.

Therefore, I do not see that we can accept the view that this is a technical matter. If it were a technical matter, of course, our point of order would have been maintained, but it was not maintained, and we are going to take all the time that is required to consider our position.

● (2040)

Hon. H. A. Olson (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I think there is a point of order. I am not sure that Senator Flynn intended to raise a question with respect to the Speaker's ruling, because the fact is that when that ruling was given there was also given a complete explanation as to why it was made.

Senator Flynn: Yes.

Senator Olson: The ruling is not an examination of the wording of Bill S-30 and an amendment that was moved some time earlier.

Senator Flynn: We heard it. You do not need to go through it again.

Senator Olson: If you heard it, then you will realize that "detailed examination" does not fit with the rest of your argument, because there were a couple of other paragraphs included in your amendment that are not contained in Bill S-30.

Senator Flynn: In any event, that does not change our stand.

Hon. George J. McIlraith: Honourable senators, it seems to me that a new matter has been raised tonight. The Deputy Leader of the Government in the Senate has asked that Bill S-30 be proceeded with in a manner that is not in accordance with the usual practice in the Senate.

I have just been looking at the order paper, taking note of some of the bills listed there. I notice such measures as: Bill C-129, to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act and the International Development Association Act; Bill C-135, to amend the National Housing Act; Bill S-33, to give effect, for Canada, to the Uniform Evidence Act adopted by the Uniform Law Conference of Canada; Bill C-90, to amend the customs Tariff and to repeal certain Acts in consequence thereof; and Bill S-32, to amend the Penitentiary Act and the Parole Act.

Honourable senators, I am inclined to believe that those are important bills. I am not inclined to believe that there is such great urgency attached to Bill S-30, because I have in my mind that July 1 is a few months away. Is the matter of such great urgency that the bill should be dealt with in a manner different from that in which bills are usually dealt with in the Senate? I want to put the Deputy Leader of the Government

in the Senate on notice that, as a senator, I am not willing to acquiesce in that unusual practice.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Senator Donahoe: Honourable senators, I rise to ask the senator who first spoke to this order if he will permit a question? I have a question which I would like to address to him. I take it that the honourable senator assents.

Honourable senators, my question is a simple one. I understood the honourable senator to say that an undertaking was given such that Bill S-30 would be introduced. My question is: Was he referring to the undertaking which was given by Mr. Joyal, the Minister of State? Did the honourable senator understand at the time, as I did, that Mr. Joyal was saying that there will be a bill with consequential amendments introduced in the House of Commons? Was I incorrect in that understanding?

Senator Olson: Yes, I think the honourable senator might have been wrong—

Senator Donahoe: Excuse me, honourable senators, my question was addressed to the Deputy Leader of the Government, who was the first to speak on this order. I would like to have an answer from him, if I may.

Senator Flynn: Give him a chance.

Senator Frith: Honourable senators, I shall deal first with the point raised by Senator McIlraith with reference to what he called an unusual procedure. I take it that, in his opinion, it is unusual not to constantly agree to all suggestions for the standing of orders. He and I disagree on that point.

Senator Flynn: What difference does it make?

Senator Frith: I was merely trying to be courteous to the Senate.

Senator Flynn: Oh, oh.

Senator Frith: That is, I was trying to advise honourable senators that it cannot be taken for granted that we will always agree to the adjournment of this particular order.

Hon. Eric Cook: Who is the "we"?

Senator Frith: Honourable senators, I spoke on behalf of the government.

Some Hon. Senators: Oh, oh.

Senator Flynn: What do you mean by "the government"? Do you mean the Prime Minister of Canada?

Senator Frith: Honourable senators, I mean those of us who represent the government. The government's point of view is what I put forward. That is what I said when I began to speak, and that is what I meant by "we." Therefore, I have nothing more to add to what I said when I first spoke to this order.

As to the question raised by Senator Donahoe, my recollection of what was said, both by Mr. Joyal and by Senator Olson, is that legislation would be introduced—

Senator Flynn: Senator Olson did not speak in committee.