

[Translation]

Hon. Roch Bolduc: I am not certain just what the senator is saying. To be certain, we would have to look at Hansard as suggested by His Honour the Speaker. Since it is not available today, we will have to wait until Tuesday to see what was said.

[English]

Hon. Marcel Prud'homme: Honourable senators, I doubt very much that Senator Carstairs violated the rules yesterday. In my opinion, she was wrongly advised. It will be clearer for me because I doubt very much that she would willingly violate the law. Senator Carstairs, you came prepared and well advised by people who should have known better. Of that I am convinced.

I would hate very much to proceed as Senator Graham is suggesting. I should like to leave the Chair out of this at this time, Senator Graham. Earlier today, the Chair, being unable to give his decision in both languages, asked that it be done so. What would be the net result if anyone — myself included — had said "No"? That would have been the end of the debate for today. We would have received this very well-written advice from His Honour on Tuesday next. Now, we want to revert back — I am sure so that Senator Graham can do today, legally, what was not done yesterday.

I say to Senator Graham, to have a very harmonious Senate, you will not get consent today for anything that may require the unanimous consent of the Senate. In good spirit, you are only delaying everything, and are not placing His Honour in an embarrassing position by delaying until Tuesday what you want to do later on this afternoon.

That could be the end of the debate. Otherwise, we will not give in on this issue.

Therefore, everyone was in error. Who misunderstood His Honour? We do not know yet. We shall know later on. I would not have found myself being ungracious to His Honour by saying "Tough luck. If the translation is not ready, we shall proceed when it is ready" and that would have been it for the day. We would have waited, then, until Tuesday.

We are placing the Chair in an embarrassing position where he is being asked to take sides, in a way, in a debate that is ambiguous for everyone. I make an appeal to Senator Graham and ask: Why not do on Tuesday what you want to do this afternoon?

Hon. L. Norbert Thériault: Honourable senators, there is no taking sides. This is normal procedure. His Honour simply asked to defer "Government Notices of Motions" until he was prepared to give the reasons for making his ruling. In anybody's common sense, it opened up the subject-matter of "Government Notices of Motions." For God's sake, it is very simple. There is no taking

sides here. It is common sense. No one is embarrassing His Honour. He knows what he is doing. For God's sake, let us have a little common sense.

[Translation]

Senator Bolduc: However, he did not know you intended to present a motion.

[English]

Hon. H.A. Olson: Honourable senators, I was not here when all these agreements were being made.

Senator Berntson: That will not slow you down, will it?

Senator Olson: The argument I want to make is that sometimes it is useful to have an objective view of what went on.

Senator Doody: And you are always objective!

Senator Olson: Yes, because I was not involved in this matter.

The opposition cannot have it both ways. We already know that the reason Senator Graham did not get to the business that he wanted to introduce was that there was an agreement to set aside that item until they had the translation and the printed copy. Both sides have agreed that that is what happened.

Senator Berntson: We agreed to wait for the ruling.

Senator Olson: Of course you were waiting for the ruling. However, Senator Graham told you, very frankly and very plainly, that his motion was dependent on what the ruling said.

Senator Berntson: You were not here.

Senator Olson: You admit that?

Senator Berntson: No, I do not.

Senator Olson: You cannot have it both ways. You cannot stop him now when you agreed to set aside that item until the ruling was ready.

Senator Berntson: We got the ruling.

Senator Olson: You now have the ruling, and you also have the reasons for the ruling.

It is perfectly clear to me. It was not to start with, but it is clear now, as a result of what both sides have said. Both sides agreed to set aside that rubric or that item for the purpose of receiving the ruling. Senator Graham told honourable senators that his motion now — and I do not know what it will be, because I was not here — depended upon what that ruling said.