

And *May* on the same page, in paragraph (iii), also states:

When the later bill is the same in substance as an amendment rejected when offered to an earlier bill.—The National Insurance (Widowed Mothers) Bill (1961-62) was allowed to proceed although a new Clause to the same effect had been rejected when offered to the Family Allowances and National Insurance Bill.

● (1430)

So, I think it was unnecessary for the Leader of the Opposition to amend the title and the substance of the bill, but he could do so.

My first reaction when I heard the amendment was that I could not accept it, but while reading *Beauchesne* I noticed that it could be accepted provided the substance is taken back in the amendment.

So, I think that Senator Flynn's amendment was entirely in order. That is why at that point I insisted on asking Senator Olson if he was raising a point of order, and he said that he was not. Had he been raising a point of order, I would have had to make a ruling on that.

I can see a senator voting against Senator Flynn's amendment and voting for the bill. It is possible that someone who had been opposed to the change from "Dominion Day" to "Canada Day", once it is incorporated in the statutes, may very well vote for these amendments.

As I said, there is a substantial difference between the two texts, and that is why I rule that rule 47 does not apply.

Hon. Jacques Flynn (Leader of the Opposition): With all due respect, Your Honour, I would certainly ask the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Standing Rules and Orders to consider whether it would not be a good thing to delete rule 47 altogether. We might as well forget about that.

Hon. H. A. Olson (Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, Bill S-30 is a very short bill and deals only with consequential amendments that are required to the Interpretation Act, the Bills of Exchange Act, and the Canada Labour Code. Indeed, there has been sufficient debate on this already. Therefore, I will not repeat that debate, and I commend the bill to honourable senators.

Hon. Duff Roblin (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): If no one else wishes to speak on this order this afternoon, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Hon. Andrew Thompson: Honourable senators, I should like to speak to this motion today.

As I understand the substance of these amendments, they are to change the name "Dominion Day" to "Canada Day".

Senator Olson: That bill has already been passed.

Senator Thompson: I know it has been passed, but what I say is still implied in the amendments. Certainly, the words in these other statutes have to be changed.

Some Hon. Senators: Go ahead.

[The Hon. the Speaker.]

Senator Thompson: As I understand it, what we are discussing, basically, are national symbols, and I think we should be looking at the characteristics of a national symbol. A national symbol usually recalls an historical occasion or a landmark which indicates the striving by a nation to achieve independence and freedom. In my opinion, the word "dominion" uniquely evokes a spiritual as well as a political quality in reaching that goal.

However, having said that, I should like to point out some national symbols in this chamber. Honourable senators can look at the paintings adorning the walls of this almost sacred chamber, which impress upon us constantly the sacrifices that men and women made in the past as they strove for the freedom and independence of our country. We can look at the mace—

Hon. Royce Frith (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I hesitate to interrupt my good friend, Senator Thompson. However, it seems to me that he is engaging in a debate on a bill that has already been passed. The bill that was passed changed the name of Dominion Day to Canada Day. What we have before us now are amendments to three other acts that are technically required in order to give effect to the original bill. I regret that Senator Thompson was unable to be here when we debated Bill C-201, thus depriving us of hearing his views on that matter at that time. It seems to me that in opening the whole question of whether or not the name "Dominion Day" should be changed to "Canada Day" he is not debating the bill that is before us. What is before us is strictly a question of whether, as a result of the passing of Bill C-201, we should make these consequential amendments.

If Senator Thompson is saying that even though the name of the day has been changed, it should not be changed in the Bills of Exchange Act because of the great tradition that goes with the Bills of Exchange Act, or the Interpretation Act, or the Canada Labour Code—

Hon. Lowell Murray: You did not give him a chance to say that.

Senator Frith: I did give him a chance to say that. That is precisely why I did not make this point at the beginning. It seems to me that what Senator Thompson has said so far is out of order, and not related to the present bill. We should understand—I say this on behalf of this side and other honourable senators who supported Bill C-201, the original bill, while respecting those who did not—that we cannot debate Bill C-201 again in our consideration of Bill S-30.

Hon. Duff Roblin (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, I do not think Senator Thompson needs a defence from me but, nevertheless, I want to come to his assistance. We have a fairly relaxed style of operation in this house. We have not usually been sticklers for the rules, and having operated in other chambers where the rules were very important and, in fact, applied with a lawyer-like intensity, I have always been pleasantly surprised and spiritually refreshed in witnessing members of this house being allowed to speak in general terms on issues that come before us.