

**Hon. Mr. Argue:** If there is not agreement, I will sit down. I happen to be a member of the majority party, which in this chamber used to hold caucus meetings, but now very seldom does. During most of my experience over the years since I have been in the Senate the caucus met for one of two reasons. First, it met when it was considered that a bill must be passed speedily without amendment; secondly, to decide whether we should adjourn for a week, or two or three weeks. During this session we have not had caucuses even to decide whether we should adjourn for two or three weeks. I say, very seriously and with great respect, that if a caucus of senators on the government side had met on this question of adjournment—and when Senator Connolly (Ottawa West) was the leader we always had a caucus on this question; now we are faced with an announcement—I do not believe we would have had this silly motion to wipe out Thursday's sitting that in all probability will be wiped out anyway. We did not need to announce to the people of Canada that, no matter what happens, we are going to go on holiday for two weeks.

**Hon. Mr. Prowse:** Honourable senators, one point that no one has mentioned is that, regardless of what happens in the other place, that house could decide on its own initiative to postpone any vote that would terminate it for a few days in order to give it an opportunity to deal with some of the important legislation which is presently before it. In other words, by agreement they could postpone dealing with the budget until they have dealt with the legislation. We will know by tomorrow morning whether that is to happen. I suggest that to move this motion to adjourn now puts us in a position in which we shall have to be called back if it is decided that we are needed here. Unless we receive specific instructions in writing to tell us to be here, who is to know where we are

off to? We are putting people to unnecessary work and expense. Every one who is here will be here tomorrow afternoon at 2 o'clock in any event, or ought to be, because there will be business before us. I say that that is the time when we should meet, when we will know what the situation is and we can do whatever the circumstances then indicate ought to be done. At the present time we are taking the pessimistic view that the worst will happen, that the government will be defeated; or, if it is not defeated, we are to take a holiday and allow the members of the other place to proceed with their work, which they may or may not do.

**Hon. Mr. Langlois:** Honourable senators, I did not want to interrupt but I suggest that this debate is out of order. The motion to adjourn until May 21 was agreed to earlier, and I do not believe any honourable senator can now ask the house to reverse that decision. In any event, I do not consider that the reasons advanced—and I am pleased to have had an opportunity to hear the complaints of honourable senators—justify any change in the decision which has already been taken.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, we have reverted to Notices of Motions, but no notice of motion was given. As Senator Langlois has pointed out, we have already agreed to a motion, and rule 47(2) provides:

An order, resolution, or other decision of the Senate may be rescinded on five days' notice if at least two-thirds of the senators present vote of its rescission.

There has been no suggestion that that should be done, and if we are to change the motion which has been agreed to, this is the procedure we would have to follow. I would have to take a vote to see if two thirds of the senators are in favour. In any case, five days' notice has to be given.

The Senate adjourned until Tuesday, May 21, 1974, at 8 p.m.

---

*The Twenty-ninth Parliament was dissolved by Proclamation of  
His Excellency the Governor General on May 9, 1974*