

Adjournment on Completion of Business

A week ago Monday I made it clear in informal conversations—I do not intend to disclose anything which was said in confidence, but this has been made public—that it was the intention of the government to bring on an adjournment when we had completed the passage of interim supply and the supplementary estimates. This was the intention. Naturally the New Democratic party asked us to bring on the drug bill. We considered this and found that consideration of the drug bill would involve protracted debate. It could not be disposed of in a day or two. Hon. members over in that corner say they only want the debate to take one day, which means that everyone else must agree to pass it in a day. Mr. Speaker, other hon. members may wish to take a longer time.

Mr. Speaker, we are committed to Bill C-190. It was brought in by the government, it has been given second reading, it has been approved in principle by the House of Commons. Yesterday the responsible minister stated he was ready to stand by the bill in terms of its economic significance and the safety afforded to the Canadian public.

Mr. Douglas: May I ask the minister—

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Douglas: May I ask the minister to read the rest of the statement made by his colleague?

Mr. MacEachen: I will. He said he was prepared to have it debated at any time. Certainly he is ready to have it debated at any time, because he is fully prepared; he knows his legislation and is ready to deal with it in the house.

• (3:20 p.m.)

We are not withdrawing this bill. It is still on the order paper and when the session is resumed next month it will be proceeded with by the government. I am quite satisfied that no matter what events take place in April this bill will be proceeded with by the government of Canada. In saying that I am satisfied that it is reasonable at this point to ask the house to complete consideration of the supply items and interim supply and reach an early adjournment so the house can return and complete the business on the order paper.

We are not asking for any special consideration. We have been engaged in the business of the house for a long period since the session began, and I believe it is reasonable to ask for an adjournment at this particular

[Mr. MacEachen.]

moment. I would ask the members of the New Democratic party to reconsider their position and give this motion unanimous approval.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the minister, as house leader, is prepared to say that the bill which has been under discussion will be the first item of government business to be called when the house resumes its sittings on April 23 in accordance with the terms of this motion.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to be house leader when we return.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is the hon. member rising on a point of order?

Mr. Knowles: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I hope you will grant me the indulgence of a very brief statement before you call for the vote. I accepted without question your ruling about this motion as to when it should be debated. May I ask Your Honour at your leisure to reread standing order 21(2) which requires that certain government notices of motion be transferred to government orders. Would Your Honour also look at page 2 of the notice paper of Monday, March 18, in which notice was given of this motion and in which it is identified as a government notice of motion. It was because it was so identified as a government notice of motion that I thought standing order 22(2) should apply.

I do not quarrel with the fact that we have had the debate now, but I should like to point out that this is the reason I thought it should have been transferred to government orders.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps I might further substantiate the opinion I expressed a moment ago when I ruled on the point of order raised by the hon. member. I suggest to him that this is a point of order he is raising now rather than a question of privilege.

I should like to refer the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre to the report of the committee on procedure which is referred to in volume XCIX of the *Journals* of the house for the year 1955, at page 746v. This is a report of the committee on procedure with which the hon. member is familiar. It was presented on June 14, 1955 and concurred in