

changes would mean higher taxes for taxpayers. We have to take their word as far as that is concerned.

As for the problems in grasping everything and understanding this issue, I must look to others. The person I consulted said: Listen, I spent three hours examining this bill. I have only gone through 75 pages and I did not find any error.

If this is what we have to do and if we cannot trust some civil servants or others, I believe that we will have to use our time in a different way.

In our parliamentary system, the ministers have to face the consequences or take responsibility for the actions of their officials.

I am not one of those who will blame the civil servants in six months or in two or three years for their actions. Maybe I would replace these civil servants, but we have to assume responsibility. Until proof to the contrary, I believe that things work reasonably well.

Senator Corbin: Senator Simard, I am not blaming nor criticizing anybody. I am simply saying that we parliamentarians have the responsibility to examine thoroughly not only the spirit but also the letter of the parliamentary documents referred to us.

In the final analysis, if a bill is defective and the flaw is due to a lack of careful examination on our part, we parliamentarians will be criticized. The civil servants do their best. The drafters do all they can to write bills that are in keeping with certain practices and traditions. But when I saw, this week, the bricks that were brought to us in the Banking, Trade and Commerce Committee, as well as in the National Finance Committee, and when I heard the motions asking us to adopt these bills because they were just technical bills, frankly it gave me goosebumps.

I do not want to be associated with that kind of procedure, in the name of technicality, because we did not have enough time to do our job well.

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Honourable senators, it is moved by the Honourable Senator Frith, seconded by the Honourable Senator Molgat, that debate be adjourned until the next sitting of the Senate.

Is it your pleasure, honourable senators, to adopt the motion?

● (1030)

[English]

Some Hon. Senators: Yes.

Some Hon. Senators: No.

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Will those honourable senators in favour of the motion please say "yea"?

Some Hon. Senators: Yea.

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Will those honourable senators opposed to the motion please say "nay"?

Some Hon. Senators: Nay.

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

Senator Molgat: Unbelievable action.

Senator Frith: How do you propose to run this place that way?

Senator Molgat: Refusing an adjournment, that is fine.

Senator Frith: We will have a vote.

And two honourable senators having risen:

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Call in the senators, please.

Senator Phillips: Honourable senators, I believe there is agreement between the whips—

Senator Frith: You made your bed; lie in it.

Senator Phillips: Would you please—

Senator Frith: No, there is a vote called, sir.

Senator Phillips: There is an agreement for a 15-minute bell.

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Honourable senators, the bell will ring for 15 minutes.

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Honourable senators, it was moved by the Honourable Senator Frith, seconded by the Honourable Senator Molgat, that further debate on the motion of Senator Simard for the third reading of Bill C-18 be now adjourned.

Motion negated on the following division:

YEAS

THE HONOURABLE SENATORS

Adams,
Corbin,
De Bané,
Fairbairn,
Frith,
Gigantès,
Graham,
Hébert,
Kirby,

LeBlanc
(*Beauséjour*),
Leblanc (*Saurel*),
MacEachen,
Molgat,
Olson,
Perrault,
Stewart—16.