

*Post Office Service*

notice of his intention to raise this question of privilege. As I pointed out to him, I said quite specifically, last night that I did not intend to reflect upon him in his capacity as chairman of the committee. I am pleased to repeat that in the House. I regret if this matter has caused him any embarrassment. Therefore I make it quite clear that I agree that one should not comment on the conduct of the chairman of a committee. I hope the House will remember that for future circumstances.

I might say, however, that it is entirely within the right of the House and any member of the House to criticize the collective decision of the committee and, whatever the hon. member may say about the decision of the committee generally, I do not think that is a question of privilege. I certainly apologize to him for any reflection upon him personally.

**Mr. Baldwin:** We will make something of you yet, Don.

**Mr. Speaker:** Having heard the hon. member for Wellington who raised the matter as a question of privilege and the comments made by the President of the Privy Council, I would think that there might not be too much purpose served by sending this matter to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections. The hon. member has raised a very good point and the references he has made are quite in order. As the President of the Privy Council has himself pointed out, it is not competent on a member to cast reflections upon the chairman of a standing committee of the House in the performance of his duties. The minister has indicated that that was not his intention, and by his words I think he has satisfied the hon. member for Wellington. I do think that in the circumstances we would not be assisting the House very much in the pursuit of its work if we referred this matter to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

**Mr. Hales:** Sir, I accept the apology of the President of the Privy Council.

**MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26****POST OFFICE****CONTINUING DISRUPTION OF SERVICE**

**Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough):** Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 26 I ask leave to move a motion for the adjournment of the House for the purpose

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

of discussing a specific and important matter involving the administrative responsibility of the government and one which requires urgent consideration. The matter is the continuing disruption of the postal service, a situation which is seriously affecting the national economy and the Canadian people.

**Mr. MacEwan:** And admitted by the Postmaster General.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Hillsborough has filed with the Chair the notice required under Standing Order 26. The subject proposed for discussion by the hon. member is "the continuing disruption of the postal service". Obviously, in the hon. member's own words the problem posed by him for an emergency debate has been in existence for some time and is a continuing one.

It is hardly necessary to remind hon. members that the postal situation has been the subject of interventions in the House over a prolonged period of time. On February 18 last a motion in the name of the hon. member for Sainte-Marie was allowed for the purpose of discussing the postal dispute in Montreal. This debate ranged far and wide and provided an opportunity for the discussion of difficulties in postal services quite beyond the limits of the dispute in Montreal. Since then the hon. member for Hillsborough has initiated a number of adjournment debates on the subject of the postal services. In that sense it would be hard to rule that we have before us a problem that is of the nature of a new and sudden emergency.

Hon. members will realize that this kind of decision is somewhat difficult to make. We have here a situation which has been continuing for a time. I think I must bring to the attention of hon. members that under the provisions of Standing Order 26 there can be only one debate on the subject. I am not, of course, suggesting that the debate we had in February was on this subject. I agree that it was not. But we must take into account the circumstances as they exist today when the motion is proposed.

My understanding of the situation is that there is to be a resumption of negotiations, and it seems to me that this might not be the ideal day to have the debate which perhaps we will have some day on this difficulty if it continues. As I say, there can be only one debate under Standing Order 26 and if we have one today, as hon. members realize, it would be the last one that we would have on this subject. It is incumbent on the Chair to