

lery that not only are they propounding shameful propositions but they are shamefully poor actors.

Senator Perrault: Honourable senators, let me respond to the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate by suggesting that what we have here is a question of basic parliamentary courtesy, something which, tonight, the Leader of the Opposition has once again demonstrated he knows very little about. The Leader of the Opposition rose on an alleged point of privilege and then proceeded to employ quite unparliamentary language in discussing other members of this chamber. It was dreadful and abusive language.

Senator Smith: "Dreadful"—it hurt you, did it?

Senator Perrault: We are talking in terms of parliamentary tradition and custom—

Senator Smith: Go on!

Senator Perrault: —which has it that joint committees of Parliament should represent the various viewpoints in Parliament.

Senator Flynn: Never; that is not true.

Senator Perrault: And that includes members of the other chamber. We would expect the same consideration from the other chamber, were the situation reversed. We are suggesting that when members of the other chamber, in good conscience and for what they regard as good reasons, find themselves unable to attend meetings of a joint committee, then honourable senators should not move unilaterally to hold committee hearings; they should not move unilaterally to take decisions in an undemocratic fashion. We are talking here about parliamentary tradition and courtesy. We need no more lectures from the Conservative Party of this country about their desire to uphold Parliament and the traditions of Parliament, as long as the Leader of the Opposition condones that kind of committee performance by some of his followers.

Senator Flynn: What the Leader of the Government has said is entirely untrue. It is not in accordance with tradition at all, considering that the committee merely had to hear witnesses and that that was the only reason for the sitting of that committee. There is no rule that requires that all parties be represented in such a situation. The only requirement under the terms of reference is that the two houses be represented; that is all. When the Leader of the Government says what he says, he is not telling the truth.

Senator Perrault: Again, unparliamentary language.

Senator Flynn: I repeat: You are not telling the truth. Any committee chairman here with any experience at all will support my statement. It is not required that members of both sides be present if a committee is merely hearing evidence which is to be considered by the entire committee when it makes its decision. That is the reason there is a difference between the quorum required to hear witnesses and the quorum required to make a decision. The Leader of the Government should know that and should not get excited about what is going on in the other place.

[Senator Smith.]

I have been very careful to avoid discussing the goings-on in the other place, simply because it is none of our business. But that is not the reason the Leader of the Government is excited. He is excited because he feels that he must come to the rescue of the government every time we say an uncomplimentary word about it. I think he is behaving like a child.

Senator Smith: And a young child at that.

Senator Flynn: That is all I will say for now, although there is something I could add.

Senator Perrault: Honourable senators, on at least four or five points the Leader of the Opposition could have been called to order for using unparliamentary language.

Senator Flynn: Sure. You too.

Senator Perrault: First, he called the Leader of the Government a liar.

Senator Flynn: I didn't say that.

Senator Perrault: And then there are all the other statements.

Senator Flynn: I said that you were not telling the truth.

Senator Perrault: The Leader of the Opposition has said tonight that there is no requirement that both sides be represented at a committee meeting when hearing witnesses. That is a very technical and legalistic approach to the whole question.

Senator Flynn: Stick to the point about hearing witnesses.

Senator Perrault: Members of the other chamber are told by *Erskine May* that parliamentary committees should not meet while the division bell is ringing and, for that reason, under present circumstances, certain members believe that they must absent themselves from meetings of joint committees. The Leader of the Opposition knows that morally it is indefensible to proceed with meetings of a joint committee made up of members of both chambers and all parties, even though they may be hearings, as long as certain members must absent themselves for reasons of conscience and procedure.

Senator Smith: That is nonsense.

Senator Flynn: The Leader of the Government knows that when a committee is hearing witnesses, both parties or all parties need not be represented, and I would call on any committee chairman in this place, beginning with the Chairman of the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce, to establish that very often witnesses have been heard with only one party represented. The honourable senator is trying to defend the government, and this is neither the place nor the occasion. I suggest that he mind his own business. I am quite sure that if Mr. Trudeau were here he would say, "Sir, please deliver us from my friends and I will look after my enemies."

Hon. Joseph-Philippe Guay: Honourable senators, I rise on a related question of privilege and I hope that I will receive the same courtesy that was extended to Senator Flynn.

Senator Smith: And Senator Perrault.