

leave can be easily evaluated, and assented to or dissented from, as the case may be. That is quite clear. But in the situation that arose and which engages our attention at the moment, the question of leave was fudged at the beginning, because I, for one, did not hear the word "leave," and, secondly, we really did not know what Senator Bosa wanted to talk about. When the point was developed further, I think I said at that time that I would not be prepared to give my leave for the continuation of that discussion.

I think Senator McElman's exposition of the rules of the House of Commons is correct, and I agree heartily with what he had to say, but my point is that the issue that was before us then, and to which I think the Speaker's comments were directed, is not that issue, on which there may be no disagreement, but the issue as to whether leave was granted to circumvent the rules altogether.

So, honourable senators, I accept my responsibility for the difficulty that arose, and I want to make that clear to the Senate, but I also want to say that I think we could with good conscience let the matter rest where it now stands, and be better advised on another occasion.

Senator McDonald: Honourable senators, I too, like Senator Roblin, was under the impression that no leave had been asked for, and I refer you to the *Debates of the Senate* of December 4, and to Senator Bosa's remarks on page 487:

Honourable senators, I would ask that Order No. 10 be allowed to stand, but I wonder if I may have your permission to raise a matter on a point of clarification.

So, in point of fact, leave was not asked for and leave was not granted. This is the reason why, as recorded on the next page, I asked for order. It was my understanding that no leave had been asked for and no leave had been granted. I still stand by the conclusion I came to in view of the evidence before us.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is it your wish, honourable senators, that the Chair take into consideration the points made by Senator McElman, and treat the matter as a point of order or a request for action by the Chair? I am in the hands of the Senate.

Some Hon. Senators: No.

Some Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Senator Roblin: I think we should proceed to the next order of business, Mr. Speaker.

Senator McElman: Excuse me, honourable senators, but I do not believe that an item put before the Senate as a point of order can be dispensed with quite that readily.

Senator Flynn: But the ruling was that it was not a point of order.

Senator McElman: His Honour the Speaker can do so, but not the Leader of the Government in the Senate.

● (1500)

Senator Flynn: I said that you did not understand what His Honour said. He said that it was not a point of order.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I waited for Senator McElman to state it as a point of order. My recollection is that he did not. He merely rose to say that a matter had arisen on which he wished to comment. Therefore, it would be my ruling at the moment that a point of order has not been directed to the Chair.

Senator McElman: Honourable senators, I was most specific in stating that I was referring it as a point of order to the Chair for a ruling, because I believe it extremely important to the good order of the proceedings of this house that this matter not be left hanging and that it be made clear what the decision of the Chair is. Again, I do so refer it.

Senator Flynn: You cannot raise a point of order three or four days after the event.

Senator Perrault: You can raise a point of order any time you want.

Senator McElman: I am sorry, Senator Flynn, but you are confusing a point of order with a matter of privilege. A point of order can be raised at any time; a matter of privilege must be raised at the earliest opportunity.

Senator Perrault: Right!

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I will take the discussion into consideration and report in due course to the Senate.

Senator McElman: Thank you very much, Your Honour.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES ACT

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Senator Macquarrie moved the second reading of Bill S-11, to amend the Diplomatic and Consular Privileges and Immunities Act.

He said: Honourable senators, there is an old saying that I am sure is familiar to all of us: "Some are born great; some achieve greatness (or attain it, depending upon which version you use); some have greatness thrust upon them." This afternoon I am very much in that third category. Here am I, a freshman senator, a veritable babe among you, and I have been given the great honour and privilege of being asked to usher, escort, launch and pilot—

Senator Perrault: And defend.

Senator Macquarrie:—a piece of legislation in this house.

Many years ago in this chamber Senator Dandurand, as reported by MacGregor Dawson, said that ministers were always very anxious to bring their legislative offspring to the baptismal font themselves. But here am I in the role, perhaps, of political godfather—as one might have said before that word became rather nasty. In the Anglican sense, the godfather was really supposed to be a pretty good person, and I will try to stick to that.

Bill S-11, honourable senators, is brief. It is clear. I would say it is non-controversial. The sponsor will try to emulate the