

perks of committee chairmen. It came to this chamber, was sent to committee and when I, in my usual mild way, protested about the lack of progress by the committee, I was told, plain and plumb by the then Leader of the Opposition, Senator MacEachen, that I would not see that bill again at any time, that it would stay in committee because the opposition objected to its content.

As I say, that is no help to Your Honour in reaching your decision on this matter, but I thought I should place it on the record lest Senator Stewart's version of what the proprieties are go unchallenged.

Senator Stewart: Honourable senators, I must say that it is surprising to discover that one statement by Senator MacEachen is sufficient to make Senator Murray change his mind.

Senator Doody: They are both Cape Bretoners, you know!

Senator Lynch-Staunton: I am sure that Senator Carstairs is not the only one who aspires to being Leader of the Government in the Senate.

Senator Kinsella: It is that obvious.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: To declare that she is a representative of the government is, unfortunately, not recognized by our rules. She is a supporter of the government. There is only one representative of the Government of Canada in this chamber, and she happens to be the Leader of the Government in the Senate. There is no other representative of the government in this chamber. There are many who aspire to becoming so.

Senator Phillips: Watch your back, Senator Fairbairn!

Senator Lynch-Staunton: Only the Leader of the Government, or her delegate in her absence and in the absence of the deputy leader, can move under the rubric "Government Notices of Motions."

Second, to have the gall not only to ask the committee to report, but also to instruct it what to report, demeans the whole committee system of the Senate.

Senator Stewart: That is the substance of the motion now.

Senator Berntson: They are just puppets!

Senator Lynch-Staunton: If the report is unacceptable when it comes to the chamber, it can be amended. However, if we tell the committee ahead of time, "This is what we want you to say," we might as well look again at the value of the committee system. Presently, in our eyes, it is such that we have a lot of respect for it. That is another reason why we feel this motion should be declared out of order.

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, there may well be a valid point with respect to the point that the Leader of the Opposition

has raised with regard to the individual senator who put forth this motion. That is a matter of judgment and certainly one, I believe, of flexibility in this chamber, given the way we have operated.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: No. It is a rule.

Senator Graham: Both sides of the house have allowed debates to proceed. We have reverted to previous orders on the Order Paper with unanimous consent. It might very well be that, if His Honour ruled in favour of the point raised by the Leader of the Opposition — that it was out of order for Senator Carstairs to give a notice of motion on behalf of the government, even though she was the sponsor of the bill — we could ask for permission for leave to revert so the Honourable Leader of the Government or the deputy leader could put the motion.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: That's right.

Senator Graham: In considering your decision and possible precedents, Your Honour, I ask you to note that on September 3, 1987, there was a motion in amendment concerning Bill C-22. We all remember, those of us who were here, the drug patent legislation. That motion dealt with an instruction to a committee and was defeated. I refer honourable senators to page 1801 of the *Debates of the Senate*, September 3, 1987.

As well, honourable senators, on September 15, 1987, another motion was moved on the same bill. Even though objections were raised that the Senate had made a decision several days earlier, it was put to a vote because it was different. It was more limited in scope than the earlier motion.

Senator Berntson: This one is not.

Senator Graham: Indeed, honourable senators, this motion is more substantive and expansive.

Senator Doody: It is totally procedural.

Senator Graham: It is more substantive and certainly different from the original motion.

Senator Berntson: It is identical.

Senator Graham: I submit, honourable senators, that the motion is in order.

Senator Lynch-Staunton: Honourable senators, I should like to make a clarification on our concern with respect to the rules. The tabling of documents cannot take place under "Introduction and First Reading of Government Bills." The first reading of Commons public bills cannot take place under "Inquiries." Petitions cannot be introduced under "Delayed Answers." We have a set, standard form of proceeding prior to the Orders of the Day. That must be respected. If an honourable senator can rise under Government Notices of Motions and move any type of motion, that interpretation of the rules would mean, then, that under "Introduction and First Reading of Government Bills," I can present a petition.