

your deputy leader stood it yesterday. There are also bills dealing with the Penitentiary Act, the Canadian Heritage Languages Institute, the Criminal Code and aboriginal peoples. All of these bills were before us yesterday. We could have sat and dealt with them, but we were out of here—at what time? And at the request of the government. If that is the point of order, I think it is pretty weak.

In any event, we can deal with these matters today. Let us call these other items today.

**An Hon. Senator:** Let's do it today!

**Senator MacEachen:** Do not disguise your real intention. Your real intention is to get a vote illicitly on Bill C-62. If you want such a vote, we will deal with it when Bill C-62 is called. We will debate the issue and confront the Speaker with the issues that are involved.

● (1420)

In the meantime, don't tell us that you are stopped from doing government business. You had a full opportunity yesterday. Why didn't you do it then? Would you explain that?

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear!

**Senator Kelly:** Honourable senators, first, I do not need to be told what my intentions are. I know what they are.

**Senator Perrault:** We know what they are, too!

**Senator Kelly:** In fairness, I should like to remind Senator MacEachen—whom I respect immensely and I shudder at finding myself debating with him—that it may well be that the Senate adjourned last night although it should have worked all night. I would have to agree that that would have been the wiser move. However, it did not do that.

However, even Senator MacEachen cannot argue that we have spent hours and hours reading petitions very slowly, reading names very slowly, speaker after speaker. Take Senator Fairbairn—she will be my heroine forever. She spoke for 18 or 19 hours. She stayed up all the rest of that day. She was up for 35 hours, and was as bright and pretty as she always is. I apologize, senator; that may get me in trouble, but we have had long, long speeches, hours and hours of speeches, very often not on the subject. That was time that could have been used for dealing with the business of the Senate.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Oh! Oh!

**Senator Kelly:** Honourable senators, in fairness, that is what it was. It was done in the interests, quite legitimately, of delaying the bill. I understand that. However, no one would suggest that Canadians would believe the following argument: because the Senate adjourned last night, it was an indication that the Conservatives have this sneaky plan, that the people who have been delaying have been doing everything properly, and so on and so forth. That is plainly not right and not correct.

I do believe, as I said before, honourable senators, that it is our duty at least to ask the Senate what the Senate wants to do now.

**Senator Frith:** About what?

**Senator Kelly:** About getting on with the business of the Senate.

**Hon. H.A. Olson:** Honourable senators, if Senator Kelly wants to ask the Senate what it wants to do now, then he should at least follow the rules. Rule 44 (1) reads as follows:

Two days' notice shall be given of any of the following motions:

There is nothing there that senators opposite do not understand, is there? Then:

(a) to make a new rule or to repeal or amend an existing rule;

Surely that is what Senator Kelly is asking. If that is what he wants. Senator MacEachen, the Leader, asked him if he was giving notice. He said, "No, no, I am not giving notice. I want it right now."

That is the most ridiculous argument I have ever heard. He went on to talk about what Parliament is all about. Parliament is giving the people who are here and in the other place, because we are both Houses of Parliament, the right to speak. Rule 27 states that that is what Parliament is here for. Surely, if there is any respect whatever for Parliament and what it stands for—what its purpose is, why it has evolved the way it has—it is because Parliament is a place where the members therein have the right to speak. I ask senators to look at Rule 27. I shall not quote it, they can look at it themselves. It says that we have the right to speak.

I would hope that Senator Kelly will understand what parliamentary democracy is all about. Its rules are not to be trampled upon. There is a way of doing what he has described he wants to do. That is to follow Rule 44—nothing else.

**Senator Frith:** Honourable senators, I think it is clear that there is a point of order—and there very well may be—it is on Bill C-62, which is not before us. That point of order, if it were to come up, would come up on the item that is the foundation of the point of order. I ask that we proceed with the business on the Scroll. Let us have the messages from the House of Commons. That is the first thing. Eventually, we will come to this point of order.

The point of order cannot be anticipated. I cannot stand here and raise a point of order on the Copyright Act, or on something which is further down on the Order Paper. I ask the Speaker to do his job, which is to give us these messages from the House of Commons and deal with the items on the Order Paper as they come up. In due course, today, we will get to the GST, when we can deal with this point of order which is based on the GST. There is nothing before us at this time which is the basis for a point of order.

[Translation]

**Hon. Gerald A. Beaudoin:** Honourable senators, I want to speak on this point of order. For days, weeks, months, we have had a debate on a bill. I think everything has been said. Often, the debate continued day and night. To my opinion, with the reading of the petitions, it seems clear that the debate is no