

made the wrong decision. I offer that piece of advice to the minister.

I would like to ask another question. If there is going to be an investigation of CP Rail, would my honourable friend undertake—and I gather from what he said that he does not have the information now—to tell us what form this investigation will take, when it will take place, and what the terms of reference will be.

Senator Argue: Well, I will be very happy to give that information, whenever the decision is made and whenever it is made public. As far as I know the precise date as to when the inquiry might commence, or even the composition of the commission, have not yet been determined. However, I do believe the principle of having an inquiry has been determined, and there will be an inquiry. That is the way I understand it.

Senator Roblin: I thank my friend, but I ask him to clarify for the Senate, the next time we meet, this relationship between the CP Rail inquiry and the Crow inquiry. He leaves me with the impression that they might come at the same time and, then, that they might not. What is the policy of the government going to be? Perhaps he could tell us the sequence of events.

Senator Argue: Well, I will make this commitment to the honourable senator. As soon as that sequence is known, and has become a matter of government policy, I will be happy to bring it to my honourable friend's attention, but as far as concerns his request today that I obtain the information and bring it here, I am not sure that I will be able to bring it here in the short time available.

Senator Roblin: I want my honourable friend to understand the dilemma in which he places some of us. He has, in one way or another, related this inquiry to the settlement of the Crow. It is important to find out exactly what he means in connection with this matter, because if he means the government is going to study CP Rail independent of the Crow rate decision, that is one thing. If he says they are going to discuss it at the same time as the Crow, that is another thing. If he says they are going to study it before they decide on the Crow, that is yet another thing. I think we need clarification of the government's policy as to which of these three alternatives—and there may be others—the government intends to pursue.

I repeat: in connection with that I would like to know, when my honourable friend knows, how the investigation is going to be handled; what the terms of reference are going to be; when it is going to be; and who the investigators are going to be.

Senator Argue: As soon as a decision has been made as to how it is going to be undertaken, as to what person or persons are going to make the inquiry and so on, I will certainly bring that to the honourable senator's attention. I do not think there is any need to repeat what I have already said. I have given all the facts I know.

Senator Roblin: We just want a few more, that's all.

Senator Argue: That is all right. As soon as they are available I will bring them here as fast as I can get them, but,

as you know, the various decisions I have talked about this afternoon are decisions that have been made. The precise timing is not known to me, and as far as I know that decision has not been made. I think the two things are associated, but I am in no position to say that you have to have one fully concluded before you do something with regard to the other. I am not sure that that is the way it is going to be.

Senator Roblin: Perhaps I owe it to my honourable friend to explain that when I was discussing this matter with the deputy leader, I asked him whether what the honourable senator said in Winnipeg represented government policy, or something else. I am afraid I was indelicate enough to say that I considered that he was talking out of the back of his head, though I did not really believe it, knowing my honourable friend the way I do. However, I do tell him that this matter of the study—not so much the study, but of the association with the Crow—and the timing of the Crow decisions, which are now becoming very critical, have raised a great many eyebrows with respect to what government policy is. So while my honourable friend tells me that he does not know what it is at the moment, I do urge upon him the necessity of having a decision very soon.

Senator Argue: I am not at all concerned about eyebrows being raised. I think that to get eyebrows raised in the right place might be very beneficial for all concerned. I have not talked about anything for a long time that has wider support than an inquiry into CP Rail. Even the friends of CP think it is a good thing to have it all out in the open. I think it is a very constructive thing to do.

Senator Roblin: We wait for the answers with much interest. I am not arguing with my honourable friend about the desirability; that is another debate. I do say, however, that we are entitled to know what the policy is, particularly in view of his last statement.

THE CONSTITUTION

SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE—QUESTIONS RESPECTING PROCEDURE—SPEAKER'S RULING ON POINT OF ORDER RESERVED

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I asked the Clerk of the Senate to research the question raised by the Leader of the Opposition, and he has done so. For my own part, I examined the rules and tried to understand exactly what they mean. The Clerk and I met today and compared notes, with the intention of providing a written ruling tomorrow.

Unless honourable senators insist that I give my ruling today, I think I will reserve it until tomorrow.

SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE—TELEVISIONING OF PROCEEDINGS

Hon. Jacques Flynn (Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, I do not know if this question will be objected to by the deputy leader, but I would ask the joint chairman of the special joint committee whether or not the decision not to televise the proceedings of the committee is final.