

after Parliament, as it has survived in the past, because that is fundamental to Parliament. It has been like that for centuries, and it will continue. Whether or not this house continues to exist is not for me to say.

In my book, the fact that a partisan majority in the House of Commons, of whatever stripe it is—blue, red, green, call it what you want—is able to crush a combined opposition and an amendment based on principle and on established parliamentary practice, does not give that party or the Crown the right to ride roughshod over the rest of Parliament, over the Senate. The amendment may be crushed, but the practice and the principle live on.

[Translation]

Of all the comments I have heard in this debate, and my intention was to refer to that even if many of the senators who spoke before me raised the question, I must say that Senator Murray's comments especially troubled me. While he probably intended to give his words the effect of cannon fire, they rather had the smell of a firecracker.

Under the circumstances, while recognizing his democratic right to speak, I must conclude that it would have been better if he had remained silent, because by brandishing the threat of Senate reform in the terms he used, he lowered himself along with this institution.

Certainly I did not feel personally concerned, because as a great democrat I am all for Senate reform. I favour a representative Senate. I said so during my first weeks in the House of Commons 16 years ago. I have not wavered on that. God knows if we have made efforts and attempts to correct that problem.

It is my feeling that the current government, if it wants to address in turn the task of reforming the Senate in cooperation with the provinces, in a spirit either of vengeance or creativity, will realize it is no easy matter.

In any case I have not come to the Senate as a repentant. My position has not changed. I must say that Senator Murray's comments are simply one form of blackmail. He got stuck in his reasoning. I do not know how he will get out of it. However, his words are fraught with consequences. They show a strange resemblance to the comments made by Lise Bissonnette, editorial writer for *Le Devoir* as quoted by Senator Flynn. This is an editorial I have difficulty holding in my hands for all its partisanship, its oneness, its ignorance.

What is funnier still is that the title, "Senate Games", appears below the newspaper's slogan: "Fais ce que dois". The sad thing in the circumstances is that *Le Devoir* is doing only half its work. It should set the options before the public. It has failed to do so. It did not even attempt to do so. *Le Devoir* is already sold to the concept of Senate abolition. So is Mrs. Bissonnette, so is Jean-Louis Roy.

However, I would like to quote the words of that newspaper's founder, Henri Bourassa when he spoke during the naval debate under Borden.

Honourable senators will recall that at that time, Borden was speaking to a public which had been handed out small

[Senator Corbin.]

Union Jacks, but this is unimportant. Borden was reviewing his naval policy, stressing the seriousness of the situation in England and threatening to reform the Senate if it refused to approve the measure. History is repeating itself.

The purpose of the then legislation clearly is different from that of the bill now before us. But the principle is the same. He threatened to reform the Senate if it refused to approve the measure. Senator Murray could not have said it better.

But Bourassa, founder of *Le Devoir*, the paper who is now asking that the institution be abolished had this to write:

That threat has not been issued by the statesmen or the gentlemen, but by the leader or rather the instrument of an arrogant faction led by gingoism and gold from the armaments trust. The Senate would be unworthy of its role, it would deserve public scorn were it to bow before that gross blackmail.

● (2200)

[English]

Honourable senators, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Senator Flynn: I do not understand. Does it mean that there is a refusal to vote on the motion? Is the filibuster to be continued?

Senator Argue: One day's debate is not a filibuster.

Senator MacEachen: Honourable senators, I indicated earlier that we would like to continue the debate tomorrow and, accordingly, my colleague moved the adjournment of the debate. I thought the Leader of the Government and I established earlier the understanding that we would continue the debate tomorrow. It is within our right to move the adjournment of the debate, and we do not intend to be intimidated by the honourable senator who has made a practice tonight of disrupting the proceedings.

Senator Roblin: Speaking on the point of order, it is perfectly true that my honourable friend said that he intended to speak tomorrow, but there was no agreement, as far as I am concerned, about adjourning the debate. That was his statement and it certainly was not accepted by me in any way whatsoever. I think this house ought to continue its discussions tonight for some considerable time yet. It is only a little after 10 o'clock.

Senator MacEachen: The motion, please.

Senator Roblin: I have to admit that the motion is not debatable, but I warn you that I shall call for a standing vote on it.

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Honourable senators, it is moved by the Honourable Senator Corbin, seconded by the Honourable Senator Gigantès, that the debate on this motion be adjourned until the next sitting of the Senate.

[Translation]

Senator Flynn: Honourable senators, I rise on a point of order.