

with respect to the time involved. The paragraph now reads, in part:

... the report will be deemed submitted on the day such report is deposited with the Clerk of the House of Commons and with the Clerk of the Senate;

In the motion of the Honourable Leader of the Government, it says:

... on the day such report is deposited with the Clerk of the Senate.

I wonder if perhaps the motion should not be identical in that paragraph rather than leaving out the reference to the Clerk of the House of Commons. I just draw these matters to the attention of the Senate for possible correction.

Hon. George van Roggen: Honourable senators, before the debate is adjourned, if it is in order to comment on the merits, as Senator Godfrey just did, I would like to say that, as always, Senator Frith's excellent legal mind has made a compelling case against a joint committee from a purely legal point of view. However, I feel that the art of politics often involves something more than pure legalisms, and it seems to me from a practical point of view that as we have established a Committee of the Whole of the Senate to consider this matter, there is nothing anomalous or incongruous in participating in a joint committee which can travel the country—

Senator MacEachen: That committee has no travel authority. That authority was refused in the House of Commons.

Senator van Roggen: I would think that is most unfortunate. Perhaps the Committee of the Whole in the Senate should give some thought as to whether or not that would be wise.

In any event, it seems to me that participation in the joint committee is not out of order, and that to have the report of that joint committee, which is to come down on a certain day in September, available to be considered by the Committee of the Whole in this place would be advantageous. On that basis, I will be supporting the motion when the time comes for the proposal.

[Translation]

Senator Murray: Honourable senators, is it the wish of my friends opposite to move the adjournment of the debate?

Senator Frith: Adjournment of the debate has already been moved by Senator Rizzuto. I think it is because Senator Rizzuto yielded to Senator Godfrey. Senator Godfrey asked for leave to speak today before Senator Rizzuto moved the adjournment of the debate. The debate adjournment has simply been suspended in my view.

Senator Murray: Senator Rizzuto has not yet concluded his speech, has he?

Senator Rizzuto: This is the point, honourable senators, and I moved that the debate be adjourned to the Senate's next sitting.

Senator Corbin: Honourable senators, I rise once more on the point of order I raised earlier, and which I feel is genuine. Nobody rose to argue against my submission.

On the other hand, the Government Leader in the Senate did not respond either. I will therefore ask His Honour the Speaker to rule on the validity of my point of order, later today or at a later sitting of the Senate, in view of course of the comments used by Senator Murray.

The Hon. the Speaker: I will take Senator Corbin's request under advisement.

Senator Murray: Is Hon. Senator Corbin suggesting that my resolution is not—

Senator Corbin: Senator Murray, I was in no way referring to the resolution as such. I was rather referring to certain remarks you made in your speech, where you referred to a majority decision in this house.

I argued the point that it is not proper, according to a longstanding parliamentary tradition, to comment on an earlier decision of the Senate, except to ask that the vote be rescinded.

I was suggesting that in my view, your comments offended a very ancient parliamentary tradition. Therefore, either you withdraw them immediately or, as I just did, I ask the Speaker to rule on the validity of my argument.

I think in that respect Beauchesne is quite clear, a vote must not be commented upon, and especially not refer to a majority decision. A majority decision commits the whole Chamber. It is not a majority decision, it is the Senate's decision. At that point, if you do not like it, the one option open to you is to move that the decision be rescinded.

So I cannot see how you can get out of that in any other way.

Hon. Jacques Flynn: Will the ruling be coming from Mr. Speaker?

Senator Corbin: I asked the Speaker to rule—

Senator Flynn: To rule how?

Senator Corbin: —to rule on the point I raised. I think this is quite in order, Senator Flynn.

[English]

Senator Murray: Honourable senators, I heard my friend speaking earlier in English on this point, and I made a note of it. I appreciate the point he has made, first of all, about my reference to a majority of this house. Actually, it was a majority of those voting rather than a majority of the house. In any case, if I misspoke myself and should have said a decision of the house, then I am perfectly prepared to amend my remarks in that respect.

As far as my remarks referred to a decision taken by the Senate a couple of days ago, I think he is stretching the point to suggest that my remarks were out of order. I did not reflect on the decision that had been taken by the Senate a couple of days ago. I did not comment on it. I did not try to reopen the debate. However, I thought and still think that the decision that was taken on Thursday is relevant to the motion that I have placed before the Senate today.