

1987, we intend to maintain our position, we want to keep our amendments, even if we no longer have a say in the matter because of section 47, which has abolished—whatever Senator Frith may claim to the contrary—our absolute veto over constitutional matters and replaced it with a six-month suspensive veto.

If an issue ever needed clarification, this one certainly does. I remember there was considerable indignation about the fact that my motion said to the House: We have adopted this resolution and we invite you to give your approval. Obviously, by adopting this text, we hoped the House would approve it as well. It did not and decided to reconsider the original resolution. The Opposition Parties, which made their positions clear in the course of the debate last week, have indicated their position has not changed and that they will again and definitively support the Government's text, without amendments, when it comes to a final vote.

So I really don't see what Senator Frith wants to accomplish with this motion to send a message to the House of Commons. First of all, I consider it to be insulting, and I think the motion is unnecessary. By raising the issue again, unadorned, without the requisite qualifications and without the alternative I submitted to the Senate on April 21, which was declared out of order, it is of course out of the question that we on this side would support the motion.

I thought that perhaps we could move an amendment, but for the time being, I personally have no intention of doing so. I repeat that this move by Senator Frith is irregular and unnecessary. It is vexatious and comes close to being insolent and is, in any case, very insulting to the House of Commons.

● (1520)

[English]

Hon. Orville H. Phillips: Honourable senators, I was about to move the adjournment of the debate. However, if Senator Frith wishes to speak, he may do so.

Hon. Royce Frith (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, I was rising to reply and close the debate. It is well known on the other side that we wanted a vote on this order this week. I have told that to the leadership on the other side and to Senator Flynn. This item has been on the order paper since May 3.

There is the additional fact that the House of Commons started debate on the reintroduced resolution last week, I believe, and will be debating it again next week. If we are going to do this, we should do it now, because there is no point in our sending it back after they have concluded the debate on the reintroduced resolution.

Those are the reasons I expressed to Senator Flynn, without much persuasive effect on him. Senator Flynn did not understand why we wanted the vote, but I believe he understood why it should be done this week. Therefore, we will oppose any further adjournment of the debate.

Senator Phillips: Honourable senators, I am almost terrified of the remarks made by the Honourable Senator Frith. Apparently, the new rule is that he sets the time schedule. I am not

sure what rule that comes under, but it is one of those frequent changes that he makes in the rules for his own convenience.

I should point out that there are a number of items on the order paper that we on this side would like to have dealt with. For example, I am very interested in Bill C-103, to establish the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency. That bill has been standing on the order paper for some time. I would have liked a vote on Bill C-60 the other day, but that has to wait until it is convenient for Senator Sinclair. Bill C-74 stands on the order paper for the convenience of Senator Kenny.

I have no hesitancy and no regret in moving the adjournment of the debate.

Senator Frith: Honourable senators, I am not trying to set the rules my way. Senator Phillips has been around this chamber longer than I, and he knows very well that these questions do come up. Occasionally, both sides do want something dealt with. We discuss it, and we give each other notice of our intention to refuse a motion to adjourn the debate. I did so in this case. I followed the traditions of the Senate. I have nothing to add. I am prepared to make some comments about Senator Flynn's comments—

● (1530)

Senator Flynn: No!

Senator Frith: —but he says, "No!" He does not want those, and that is fine.

Senator Flynn: Not today.

Senator Frith: Then there is nothing else to add.

For those reasons, and the reasons that I have expressed to the leadership on the other side and to Senator Flynn for some time now, we will ask for a vote on the motion to adjourn the debate.

MOTION TO ADJOURN DEBATE NEGATIVED

The Hon. the Speaker: It is moved by the Honourable Senator Phillips, seconded by the Honourable Senator Macquarrie that further debate be adjourned until the next sitting of the Senate.

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

Some Hon. Senators: Yes.

Some Hon. Senators: No.

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

Some Hon. Senators: Yea.

The Hon. the Speaker: Will those honourable senators who are against the motion please say "nay"?

Some Hon. Senators: Nay.

The Hon. the Speaker: It sounds even to me!
And two honourable senators having risen.

The Hon. the Speaker: Please call in the senators.