

My information is that yesterday an officer of the Trade Negotiations Office handed the letter in an envelope to my friend, and that my friend handed it—

**Senator Stewart:** "... handed it"?

**Senator Murray:** Yes, handed the letter in an envelope to my friend, and my friend handed it to the clerk of the committee. At the same time a copy of the letter was given by the officer of the Trade Negotiations Office to the clerk of the committee. Indeed, the letter that I have—and I must refer to it again—while it is addressed to the Honourable John Stewart, states: "c.c. Mr. Patrick Savoie, Clerk of the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs."

All kinds of things can happen—the honourable senator did not open the letter or it was mislaid somewhere. Clearly, he does not have the letter. Clearly, this was the first he had heard of it.

**Senator Stollery:** It is getting worse.

**Senator Murray:** Well, I am sorry about that, but why is he so indignant that I should place the material on the record of the Senate in the course of the third reading debate? It is not as if the material was so offensive or inflammatory.

**Senator Perrault:** When was it on his desk?

**Senator Stollery:** It has characterized the whole debate.

**Senator Murray:** It amounts to a refutation, on behalf of the government, of testimony that was placed before the committee yesterday by a witness. I think it is the kind of information that the house and the country is entitled to, and I therefore place it on the record. Frankly, I find the interventions and indignation of honourable senators quite silly.

**Senator Stewart:** Honourable senators, I do not wish to pursue the matter any further. The Leader of the Government in the Senate says now that he wants to put this information before the Senate on his own authority. I do not object to his proceeding in that way. I have raised my point of privilege. The records of the house are clear. I can only conclude that the Honourable Leader of the Government's perception of parliamentary values is beyond improvement by anything I might say.

**Senator Frith:** Honourable senators, I assume that the questions—

Senator Murray, are you finished?

**Senator Murray:** Indeed, I am not finished. I sat down because—

**Senator Frith:** Let us get it straight about the letter.

**Senator Murray:** I have not finished my speech.

**Senator Frith:** This concerns a point of order.

On the orderliness of proceeding with this letter at all, I understand that the Leader of the Government in the Senate is having difficulty understanding why there was such a sharp reaction from the chairman and members of the committee to his attempt to introduce, on third reading of the bill, a letter addressed, but not delivered, to the chairman of the commit-

tee, not considered by the committee, and not now available for consideration by the committee. If we are to proceed—

**Senator Stollery:** Because we in fact have been reasonable.

**Senator Frith:** —as we have undertaken to proceed—

**An Hon. Senator:** Never seen it!

**Senator Frith:** —there was no way for the committee to deal with this. We reacted the way we did because we worked fairly hard on this committee. We worked nine to ten hours a day—and that is all right, we undertook to do that; I am not complaining or looking for sympathy. It was an instructive and interesting experience. However, the committee report was based on the evidence before the committee. On the basis of the evidence that was before us, as the report states, "On the evidence presented to us," we worked, again, long hours to prepare a report. We completed that report, passed it unanimously, and brought it before the Senate as a basis for the third reading. That report was adopted. We felt that the committee aspect of the matter had been dealt with.

If, then, at third reading, some honourable senator wants to deal not with some criticism of the report but with the evidence, there is nothing wrong with anyone talking about the evidence that is there.

**Senator Murray:** But he may not refute it?

**Senator Frith:** No, that is not the point. Certainly he can do what you eventually tried to do. I am simply trying to explain why we were concerned. It is because we are now faced with the evidence that we in the committee heard.

You did ask for an explanation. Do you want to hear it?

**Senator Murray:** I do not think I did.

**Senator Frith:** Yes, you said, "I cannot understand."

**Senator Murray:** That is not an invitation for explanation.

**Senator Frith:** Oh, I see. All right.

**Senator Perrault:** They want to bask in ignorance.

**Senator Frith:** I now understand how closed your mind is to it, but let me put it on the record—even if it is boring to you.

So, honourable senators, in any normal circumstances the committee would say at this stage: Since we cannot question this document, as we did question the author of the document when he was before us—

**An Hon. Senator:** I have not seen it!

**Senator Frith:** —the only way that we can deal with this in a normal fashion is to say that it is perfectly proper for the leader to raise it. We must now consider moving that the bill be not now read a third time but that it be referred back to the committee—

**Senator Perrault:** Right on!

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear!

**Senator Frith:** —so that in this way we can help the Leader of the Government get this evidence properly before the committee, delivered to the committee. We can convene and think