

of the house as to how the members want this debate to proceed. We have had a pretty stimulating three or four hours' debate on this matter and I suppose that there are still quite a number of members who would speak, if encouraged. I know there are on my side, and I am quite sure it is probably the same on the other side.

However, it occurred to me that there might be some merit in giving consideration to the proposition that, since many of the points—possibly not all but most of them—have been ventilated in the debate so far, we might be willing to draw the debate to a conclusion.

Speaking for myself, if I were allowed to close the debate at this minute, I would be glad to do so. I do not say that that is anything I have any control over. Obviously, it is not. Members will use their discretion as to when they decide they have had enough of speaking on the subject. I simply raise the topic to find out if there is any interest in having an understanding as to how long we want the debate to proceed.

Senator Guay: Honourable senators, my point of order was the mention by Senator Gigantès of an article in *The Gazette* of February 20, about which Senator Lowell Murray took objection and asked Senator Gigantès to quote him properly. I rise on a point of order, or privilege, as the case may be, to finish the quotation properly. In the article, it says, quoting Senator Murray:

'If they get away with this one', said Senator Lowell Murray, one of the Tories on the finance committee, 'they'd be encouraged to repeat the performance on any bill that strikes their fancy.'

The article then continues:

Until now, Senate reform has been low on the government's list of priorities, but that might change. 'If they keep doing this kind of thing for very much longer,' said Murray, 'the prime minister will feel obliged to act on some measure of Senate reform.'

Honourable senators, I say that is unbelievable. Not only did he say it this afternoon. I call it a real threat—

Senator Murray: Far from being unbelievable, I assure my honourable friend that that is exactly what I said, and I was quoted quite accurately.

Senator Guay: I know what you said. That is why I am quoting it, because I would like the record of the Senate *Hansard*.

Senator Flynn: This is a phony point of order. I ask the Speaker to intervene. This is not a point of order.

Senator Guay: Honourable senators, let us call it a point of privilege, then.

Senator Flynn: No, not during the debate—

Senator Guay: Call it what you want; I am telling the truth in any case.

Senator Roblin: I just wonder how far my modest proposal about the course of the debate will go now. In any event, I would like to elicit some response to that idea because, if we

could have an understanding as to how far we want to proceed, I think that would be advantageous. There are other items on the order paper which will be dealt with at some time. Perhaps we should not try to deal with everything tonight, but if there is a disposition to conclude the debate, I would certainly be agreeable to such a move.

Senator MacEachen: Honourable senators, the Leader of the Government has suggested that a response be made. It would not be my expectation that this debate would conclude today. I would expect that the debate would continue tomorrow so that the maximum number of members can participate.

Senator Roblin: I thank my honourable friend. I am quite agreeable and I recognize the right of the Senate to continue the debate in accordance with our rules.

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Honourable Senator Flynn.

Senator McElman: Before Senator Flynn begins, honourable senators, I would like to ask the Honourable Leader of the Government in the Senate if he has some compromise to offer that might be of interest to the Senate. If so, perhaps he could seek the indulgence of the house to offer such a compromise and have it considered.

Senator Roblin: If you are talking about a compromise in the proceeding and the time of the debate, I may be able to make some suggestions on that.

Senator McElman: No, I thought it was quite clear that honourable senators who might wish to speak in any debate should have the privilege of doing so.

Senator Roblin: Quite so.

Senator McElman: However, since the Honourable Leader of the Government is speaking on behalf of the government, I thought perhaps he might have some compromise to offer on the part of the government which could have appealed to the senators at large. In that event, it would be useful, of course, if he were to state such a compromise at this point.

Senator Roblin: I cannot really respond to that in a constructive and authoritative sense, because we must realize that the resolution is one which refers the matter back to the committee. The committee will then have to consider what to do. I do not know what the committee will wish to do. If this motion is defeated and the committee does not meet—and I must confess from the tenor of the debate so far, that that seems to be the possible fate of the resolution—then we have to see where we go from there. However, until this debate is concluded, I think it would be premature to consider what move we make after that.

Senator Haidasz: Honourable senators, the Leader of the Government in the Senate, I believe, gave the impression that he would like to see this debate concluded as early as possible. In view of the allegations made by our colleague, Senator Gigantès, that the 1985-86 estimates are already printed and ready to be distributed at the decision of the government, I am wondering whether the Leader of the Government in the