

Motion for Adjournment

particularly when he is referring to the leaders of political parties, because he knows what it is to think about becoming a leader. However, no one on the other side of the house has given any clear assurance that this matter will be dealt with in the fall, and the Minister of National Revenue was very careful to outline all the difficulties involved. I do not often speak on the question of pensions because my colleague, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) is quite capable—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has revealed his intention to speak on pensions. Let me suggest to him that the question now before the house is the motion for adjournment.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on the adjournment motion and the importance of discussing this matter before we adjourn today because I think—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Orlikow: —it is important that we get some action on the part of the government or at least a specific commitment that there will be action. This matter has been raised by my colleague, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, and by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Bell) on several occasions. We have heard statements by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson), the Minister of National Revenue and the Secretary of State for External Affairs all indicating that they agree with this proposal. The house committee made a series of proposals in this regard and presented the house with a unanimous report.

The Minister of National Revenue indicated this morning that the legislation involved is very complicated. Let me inform him that I am concerned not about the complications but about a commitment by the minister and others that these retired civil servants will be looked after this year. There has been a great deal of talk about when and if this is going to happen, but the emphasis should be placed on the fact that this legislation should be brought forward as quickly as possible, with a provision making the increases retroactive. The implication of the statements made in the last few months—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I must again interrupt the hon. member. He must realize that there are rules which must be followed, one of which is to the effect that speeches should be relevant to the question or subject before the house for discussion. The question

[Mr. Orlikow.]

now before the house is a motion for adjournment. The hon. member must realize that he cannot completely disregard this rule and the motion before the house for consideration at this time.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, I indicated that I was speaking in opposition to the adjournment motion. I was referring to what was said this morning by the house leader. I indicated my opposition by stating that I believe we should deal with the pension legislation referred to by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. We should have a specific commitment on the part of the government that this legislation will be brought forward when the house resumes and that it will be in such a form that the increases will be retroactive. I do not intend to take up much more time but I should like to indicate to the house—

Mr. Korchinski: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have many problems, as do many other hon. members, which I should like to raise on this occasion. It seems to me that the debate now taking place reopens the earlier debate on the proposed amendment. Although I may subscribe to the idea embodied in the proposed amendment, I do not feel that this debate should be completely open for the discussion of individual problems. I am sure if I raised the problem I am now thinking of your Honour would wonder how it could be related to the subject before us, which is the motion to adjourn.

I have restrained myself with some difficulty from presenting this problem to the house. I am sure that if I had risen and mentioned it you would have ruled me out of order. In all fairness to myself and other hon. members who would like to raise specific problems at this time, I think you should apply the rules to the hon. member and restrict him to the subject now before us.

Mr. Speaker: I am in full agreement with the hon. member for Mackenzie and feel that his point is well taken. That is why on a number of occasions today I have asked hon. members to relate their remarks to the motion now before us. There must be some order in the house and that is why we have our house rules. They do not allow hon. members to discuss grievances of the type that have been discussed by the hon. members for York-Humber, Compton-Frontenac, and the right hon. Leader of the Opposition. I would ask hon. members to confine their remarks to the limited subject of the motion now before the house.