

refused a second reading, the other is not proceeded with if it contains substantially the same provisions and such a bill could not have been introduced on a motion for leave.

Honourable senators, it is my understanding that Bill S-4 has received second reading and been referred to committee. Therefore, I suggest the procedure we should follow is to have Senator Haidasz dispose of S-4 before proceeding with C-204.

Hon. Royce Frith (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, I believe the citation referred to by Senator Phillips refers to an introduction of two bills in the same house, not to a bill from one house that arrives in the other house while it is considering a similar bill introduced there. Otherwise, if you interpreted it the way Senator Phillips has, you could paralyze Parliament. If that were true, then by introducing a bill in one house you could prevent anything being done in the other house. I am sure that the intention in *Beauchesne's* is to prevent its happening in the same house.

Hon. Jacques Flynn: That is a very interesting argument, coming from Senator Frith, that he is afraid of paralyzing Parliament. He has been doing his best to do that here for three years.

Senator Frith: "I," paralyze Parliament? Have you looked at the number of bills that have been passed by this Parliament? Are you not proud of them? Was that paralysis? Don't talk such nonsense, for goodness sake! Speak to the point of order.

Senator Flynn: I hit a very sensitive spot.

Hon. H.A. Olson: No, no. You are dealing with the facts now. That is the problem.

Senator Flynn: In any event, the fact is that we have already decided in principle on Bill S-4 and we cannot make a similar decision a second time in the same session. That is the case. Perhaps Senator Haidasz prefers this bill to his own, S-4. In that case, perhaps he could withdraw his first bill and concentrate on this one. We certainly cannot deal with two bills covering the same ground during the same session. That seems to me to be obvious.

Senator Haidasz: I should like to speak to Senator Phillips' point of order. I do not know whether His Honour the Speaker will want to make a ruling. Bill S-4 has been in committee for a year and a half. The members of the committee actually wanted to study all bills on tobacco smoking at the same time. It was my intention—and it still is now—to amend Bill S-4. In other words, it will be somewhat different from Bill C-204, if it is approved by the committee.

Senator Flynn: I think you validate the point of order raised by Senator Phillips, if you intend to make your bill absolutely similar.

● (1520)

Senator Frith: Honourable senators, I move that we adjourn the debate on the point of order and reflect on this overnight to see if we can come to some understanding, because it seems to

[Senator Phillips.]

me that the Senate does want to deal with this subject. I am sure that we can find a way to do so.

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Honourable senators, is it the wish of the Senate that I give a ruling on this now or that the debate be adjourned?

Senator Frith: Honourable senators, I move that we adjourn the debate on the point of order. It may be that we will not have to ask for a ruling.

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Is it agreed, honourable senators, that we adjourn the debate on the point of order?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Senator Haidasz: Honourable senators, I should like to know whether I can proceed with the second reading of Bill C-204 or must wait until tomorrow to hear His Honour's ruling?

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Honourable senators, a motion has already been put and accepted that we adjourn the debate on the point of order until the next sitting of the Senate. Senator Haidasz cannot proceed with second reading now. Senator Haidasz will have to wait until an arrangement has been made between the two parties or until I make a ruling, but Senator Frith has moved that we adjourn the debate on the point of order.

Senator Frith: Honourable senators, we are actually adjourning both the debate on the point of order and the debate on the motion standing in the name of Senator Haidasz.

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Is it agreed that we adjourn both matters, honourable senators?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

On motion of Senator Frith, debate adjourned.

[Translation]

PRIVATE BILL

REGIONAL VICAR FOR CANADA OF THE PRELATURE OF THE HOLY CROSS AND OPUS DEI—CONSIDERATION OF REPORT OF COMMITTEE—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Neiman, seconded by the Honourable Senator Côtteau, for the adoption of the Twenty-First Report of the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs (Bill S-7, An Act to incorporate the Regional Vicar for Canada of the Prelature of the Holy Cross and Opus Dei, with two amendments) presented in the Senate on 25th May, 1988.—(Honourable Senator Hébert).

Hon. Jacques Hébert: Honourable senators, those of you who did not have to sit on the Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs to consider Bill S-7 on Opus Dei should consider themselves blessed by the Gods! They were spared long and tedious discussions, the sickly sweet and ambiguous evidence of the rare witnesses who did appear,