

[Translation]

You are not trying to amend the legislation, it is mere filibustering. Your strategy is both despicable and hypocritical. I am going to prove it irrefutably.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Shame!

**Senator Flynn:** First of all, I say that contrary—

[English]

**Senator McElman:** Would you reconsider—

**Senator Flynn:** Coward! That is the word.

**Senator McElman:** Would you reconsider that?

**Senator Flynn:** No, not at all, because I am speaking collectively. You can assess things for yourself and decide whether it applies to you, but collectively I will prove that point. "Coward" is the word I used.

[Translation]

Following this interruption, I come back to my notes. This is against our practice. I remember the days when even the party leaders were asserting that the Senate had nothing to do with finance and borrowing bills. Even their referral to committee was considered as being a useless exercise.

In the days when you were on this side of the house, you would probably have obtained before the Christmas recess our formal agreement, recorded in *Hansard*, that as soon as we would be back on January 21 or 22, the bill would go through within the next three days. Otherwise the Senate would have been recalled on January 14, that is a week earlier. This we have not done because we said to ourselves that usually this type of legislation is passed within three days. Given those assumed conditions, the Senate was only recalled on January 22 and even, at the end of that week, the bill having been referred to committee, the Senate adjourned for another 10 days.

Now we have a bill passed two months ago by the House of Commons still before us. This is silent filibustering because in committee, as soon as we were through hearing a witness, they did not want to proceed any further. They would say, "Maybe next week we will decide what is to be done." This filibuster is something that goes absolutely against the practices of this house.

Second, the Senate practice concerning borrowing and appropriation bills certainly is to make recommendations, never to obstruct. In matters of finance, and especially appropriation and borrowing, the views of the elected house are paramount. This debate, or the lack of it, this refusal to proceed we are being faced with since we came back from the Christmas recess flies in the face of the Senate's role in this respect.

Let us come now to Senator MacEachen's argument that there is a basic principle that the government is not to be granted any borrowing authority unless it has put before the House the budget or the estimates. In fact, in the November 8, 1984, economic statement of Finance Minister Wilson, the government clearly explained the budget requirements.

[Senator Flynn.]

If we refer to pages 18 and 19 of the French version, we note that total revenues will amount to \$70.50 billion and total expenditures to \$104,968 billion, which leaves a \$29,193 billion deficit for financial requirements excluding exchange operations. This is the situation outlined by the Minister of Finance on November 8.

At that time, we knew that the 1985-86 estimates would amount to about \$105 or \$104 billion.

What more can you learn by looking at the detailed estimates? Absolutely nothing substantial.

Of course, Senator Sinclair, who does not have a lot of experience in Parliament, but who has a lot of business experience, spoke of being able to look at these estimates. We know that the estimates are examined by House committees throughout the year. There is no way to get a specific and detailed idea of expenditures only by looking at the blue book. This changes nothing. It will confirm within a few million dollars the figures mentioned by the Minister of Finance in his November statement. We know exactly what to expect.

You have all the information you need. When you say that this is a matter of principle, I say that it is a farce, it is spurious and infantile to act in this way and to present such an argument. This is a strategy invented by an old hack like Senator Davey, who has, of course, come back to the Senate. He very humbly admitted that he had been busy elsewhere. Now, he becomes a senator once more and says that he will play his role fully. His first task it seems was to devise this strategy in an effort to make trouble and perhaps to improve the image of the Liberal Party or to console himself about the results of the last election.

**Hon. Stanley Haidasz:** Neither suggestion is true.

**Senator Flynn:** I understand his reaction quite well and I also understand Senator MacEachen for having the same feelings and for recruiting—

● (2040)

[English]

**Senator Davey:** Senator Flynn has been listening to Senator Phillips too much.

**Senator Flynn:** I have also been watching Senator Davey very closely.

**Senator Davey:** I have been watching the honourable senator opposite for years.

**Senator Flynn:** Yes. Perhaps Senator Davey will tell me that he did not participate in this plot. I am quite sure he is very proud of it up to now, but I am not sure that in the days to come he will be as proud of the consequences of his actions.

I saw Senator Davey in committee, along with Senators Sinclair, Stewart and others.

**Senator Davey:** On a question of privilege, I really wonder if the fact that I have attended committee meetings with my colleagues, who are friends, indicates that I am part of or head of a plot. That is a fairly serious charge which has no foundation at all.