

while ago where we were about to pass a motion, I presume, without even hearing it read. That is why I asked that it be read, as I wanted to know what the motion was.

I suggest that, in its present form, the motion is quite out of order because it does not conform to our Rule 3. The question, honourable senators, is simply this: Now that we have new rules, are we going to abide by them or not? I suggest that in its present form the motion before the Senate is out of order because it is conflict with Rule 3, Part I, page 2 of our Rules.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I have read the motion. The honourable Senator McDonald objected to a certain power asked for by this motion, and now the question has been raised that this motion is in conflict with one of our rules.

I am not in a position to decide immediately on the matter raised by the honourable Senator Grosart, to the effect that the motion as read would be contrary to our rules. I should like to take time for a second look before coming to a decision, perhaps later today or tomorrow. In the meantime, with the permission of the mover and other senators, could we allow this order to stand so that we may reach a consensus which might clear the difficulty we are facing? I should like to hear from other honourable senators.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: Your Honour, I am probably out of order by rising again, but with permission I should like to clarify my position.

We have two motions on the Order Paper today which were placed there prior to the meeting held this morning. With respect to Senator Grosart's statement this afternoon regarding Rule 76(4) and Rule 3 of Part I, he is quite right that we are going against our rules as passed by this chamber during the last session. It was my hope that no chairman in the future would bring in a motion drafted in the wording of the two we have before us at the moment. So far as I am concerned, I am prepared to accept those two motions, but I would hope that it would not happen again.

Hon. Arthur W. Roebuck: Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out that so far the Senate Committee on Poverty has held many meetings and has done a wonderful job. As I remember, it has never encroached upon the time of the Senate. Practically speaking, we are risking nothing. I cannot speak for the chairman, but I am perfectly satisfied that if

[Hon. Mr. Grosart.]

the committee ever sits while we are sitting in the chamber, it will be by arrangement with the Leader of the Government side and probably with the Leader on the other side as well.

We are taking no chances in passing this motion as presented. Furthermore, when one considers the importance of the work being carried on now by the Committee on Poverty and by its chairman, it becomes evident that we can waive any technical rules in order to allow the committee to continue as it has done in the past.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I bring to your attention Article 76(4), which reads as follows:

- (4) A select committee shall not sit during a sitting of the Senate.

That is the general rule. Rule 3 in Part I of the Rules, reads as follows:

3. Any rule, or part thereof, may be suspended without notice by leave of the Senate, the rule or part thereof proposed to be suspended being distinctly stated.

It is my contention that, under subsection 4 of Rule 76, a select committee shall not sit during a sitting of the Senate unless by leave of the Senate. I interpret that to mean with the unanimous consent being granted by the House.

Having said that, let me repeat that I think the matter should stand at least for a few hours in order to give us the opportunity to do some further research into the problem.

Hon. Maurice Lamontagne: Honourable senators, may I say a few words concerning this matter?

If this rule is already in force, as I suppose it to be, I, as Chairman of the Senate Special Committee on Science Policy, am probably the greatest offender against it. I should, however, like to point out that the Senate will do its most useful work in the future, as it has done recently, through its committees; not through debating in this chamber day after day. We have to plan our work so as to answer the big questions of the post-industrial society as we see them, as Senator Croll has seen them, and as my colleagues on the Special Committee on Science Policy have analyzed them. I think that is the best use that the Senate can be put to in future. That is my first point.

My second point is that those who are chosen to be members of these committees have to