

Senator Lynch-Staunton: Before you come to a decision, Your Honour, will you allow us to debate the point, at the appropriate time today or tomorrow, once we have had a chance to reflect on the significance of the motion?

The Hon. the Speaker: That is certainly in order. Normally we ask for opinions on points of order. When the Speaker has heard enough opinions, he can either rule or take the matter under advisement.

We had agreed that we would return to this matter later this day. Once the hard copy of the motion has been distributed, we will address the issue.

• (1350)

ORDERS OF THE DAY

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD ADMINISTRATIVE MONETARY PENALTIES BILL

THIRD READING

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham, Deputy Leader of the Government moved the third reading of Bill C-61, to establish a system of administrative monetary penalties for the enforcement of the Canada Agricultural Products Act, the Feeds Act, the Fertilizers Act, the Health of Animals Act, the Meat Inspection Act, the Pest Control Products Act, the Plant Protection Act and the Seeds Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read third time and passed.

AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

CONSIDERATION OF REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FARM SAFETY—DEBATE CONCLUDED

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the consideration of the Ninth Report of the Standing Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry (special study of farm safety), tabled in the Senate on Friday, June 30, 1995.—(*Honourable Senator Spivak*).

Hon. Eric Arthur Berntson (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, on this particular item I have consulted with both sides of the house. If no other senator wishes to speak on this order, we could consider it debated.

Hon. B. Alasdair Graham (Deputy Leader of the Government): We are agreeable to that.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, is it agreed?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

FIREARMS BILL

INQUIRY

Hon. Anne C. Cools rose pursuant to notice of November 23, 1995:

That she will call the attention of the Senate to the speech that she had intended to give on Wednesday, November 22, 1995, during debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Beaudoin, seconded by the Honourable Senator Grimard, for the adoption of the sixteenth report of the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs (Bill C-68, An act respecting firearms and other weapons, with amendments) presented in the Senate on Monday, November 20, 1995; the speech which she was unable to give due to time limitations imposed by the Senate Order concluding debate by 5:15 p.m. and votes at 5:30 p.m. on Wednesday, November 22, 1995.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, before Senator Cools proceeds with this inquiry, I should like to put a statement on the record.

I am somewhat troubled by the terms used by the honourable senator in stating her inquiry. The notice makes it explicitly clear that the speech which the senator intends to make was originally to be given as part of the debate on the consideration of the report of the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs respecting Bill C-68. By order of the Senate, debate on this report and the third reading of the bill concluded last Wednesday, and the matter has been decided by a vote of the Senate.

My reservations about the terms of this inquiry stem mainly from the long established practice mentioned in *Beauchesne* 6th Edition, at citations 479, 480(1) and (2). The citations make it clear that:

479. A Member may not speak against or reflect upon any determination of the House, unless intending to conclude with a motion for rescinding it.

Then 480(1) says, in part:

...Members...cannot revive a debate already concluded...

nor should they refer to debates of the current session —

...even if such reference is relevant, as it tends to reopen matters already decided.

At the same time, I do not wish to unduly restrict the senator from raising a matter which is important to her. I would suggest, therefore, if the senator is agreeable, that she reconsider her notice of inquiry and rephrase it in more general terms so as to minimize any specific reference to the proceedings on Bill C-68.