

Interim Supply

Mr. Woolliams: Yes, he refused to let a committee get at the facts.

Mr. McIlraith: No.

Mr. Woolliams: The hon. gentleman knows very well that if this bill gets second reading before going to the committee the facts which would be brought out then are not the facts which should be brought out now. Where did his own party stand on the situation in 1960, 1962 or 1963? It is surprising how some hon. members reverse their opinions when they leave the opposition benches to sit on the government side. What was their attitude toward the setting up of a defence committee? I quote from *Hansard* of February 4, 1963. This is what the leader of the opposition, now the Prime Minister, had to say as reported at page 3402. This brings us to the substance of the present debate, a debate which could have been ended, not in six days nor in six hours, but in one hour had the minister of defence not refused to let the House of Commons have the facts with regard to unification; had he not denied the country the opportunity to find out those facts by means of a properly constituted committee.

When this party was in trouble with the opposition in 1963 there was a big argument on this issue. The opposition asked the Conservative government in 1963 to set up a committee to inquire into defence matters.

An hon. Member: Six o'clock.

Mr. Woolliams: The minister of defence asked for such a committee. The leader of the opposition asked for one. That was the position they took. Today, they take a different attitude. The minister of defence tells us that what we suggest is against public policy. He must have something to hide. Something is bad, and he does not want certain facts to be disclosed to the House of Commons or to the country.

Mr. Knowles: Would the hon. member care to call it six o'clock?

Mr. Woolliams: I am prepared to do that, yes.

Mr. McIlraith: Do I understand the interjection to be a request for an hour's adjournment of the sitting?

Mr. Knowles: An hour or two.

[Mr. McIlraith.]

Mr. Winkler: I think the courtesy of the occasion would call for, maybe, two hours.

Mr. McIlraith: As long as hon. member understands that it is coming out of time available for the opposition to discuss supply, I am quite agreeable.

An hon. Member: A reciprocal courtesy.

Mr. McIlraith: I am being very agreeable at the moment. I just want hon. members to understand what the position is.

Mr. Knowles: A few weeks ago during another event in Ottawa we recessed for a couple of hours.

Mr. McIlraith: What is the request?

Mr. Woolliams: Adjourn from six o'clock to eight o'clock, our usual supper hour before the rules were changed in such an asinine way.

Mr. McIlraith: I am quite agreeable. It is just a matter of clarifying what is being asked for.

Progress reported.

• (6.00 p.m.)

Mr. McIlraith: There has been a request made in committee of the whole by hon. members opposite that we have a suspension of the sitting for two hours for a dinner adjournment. The government is quite agreeable to that proposition, and accordingly I ask that the sitting be suspended for two hours.

Mr. Speaker: Is there unanimous consent that the house suspend its sitting from 6 to 8 p.m.?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTION TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to provisional standing order 39A, to inform the house that the question to be raised at the time of adjournment tonight is as follows: the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), airports—report on adequacy of facilities.

Does the house agree to resume the business in committee?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.