

Columbia River Agreement

course, Bonavista-Twillingate could not sit back, so the member for that riding got into the act. You will find, Mr. Speaker, that he contributed his usual—

An hon. Member: Five cents.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): Whatever it may be. That may be found at page 2589. Then the hon. member for Laurier came back again and again. Then the hon. member for Kootenay West came back. Then the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate came back. Oh, yes, Mr. Speaker, I observe that the hon. member for Essex East did come in. I beg his pardon.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): He came in.

Mr. Chevrier: The minister is wrong again.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): I apologize to the house for saying that the hon. member for Essex East was not here. He did come in at that particular point. That reference will be found at page 2591. He made probably the greatest utterance he has ever made in the house. He said, "Whose fault is it?"

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pickersgill: And General McNaughton gave the answer.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): Then the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate came in and the hon. member for Laurier and the hon. member for Kootenay West. He went over the whole story. They kept the debate going until the hour of five o'clock.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I rise on a point of order. I regret being obliged to rise so often, but today we have had provocation. What the hon. gentleman is now doing is not addressing himself to the question of urgency. Whether there has been another discussion on certain aspects of the matter has nothing whatsoever to do with the proposal of the Leader of the Opposition, namely that this matter in its present context presents urgency of debate. That is the only issue before us. These ministers today, in these dying hours of this session, have been allowed, Mr. Speaker, to make irrelevant and improper remarks. The question is the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition that the statement made by General McNaughton late Friday, and over the week end constitutes within our rules justification for urgency of debate. That is the only issue before us. These red herrings drawn in by the minister who had to do with the Coyne affair should not be allowed.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): Mr. Speaker, may I give the citation?

Mr. Speaker: I think perhaps I might save the minister some time by indicating—

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): I have lots of time.

Mr. Speaker: —that the rules specifically prevent debate on a matter which has been discussed earlier in the session. Perhaps I had better read the rule. It is the sixth paragraph of rule 26, which I shall be obliged to consider:

The right to move the adjournment of the house for the above purposes—

That is to discuss an urgent matter.

—is subject to the following restrictions:

—(c) the motion must not revive discussion on a matter which has been discussed in the same session;

I am not deciding that this matter has been discussed.

Mr. Pearson: May I say a word, Mr. Speaker?

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Speaker: I think it is relevant to argue that it has been discussed. I therefore consider that the Minister of Finance is quite in order in the argument he is proposing.

Mr. Pearson: On the point raised by the Minister of Finance—

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): May I proceed?

Mr. Speaker: Is the Leader of the Opposition raising a further point of order?

Mr. Pearson: I should like to comment.

Mr. Speaker: I will give the hon. member an opportunity if he disagrees with any statement that is made.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): If the Leader of the Opposition wishes to make a comment, may I conclude as briefly as possible my submission on this point. I was about to read the citation which evidently had escaped the knowledge of the hon. member for Essex East. The rule is quite clear that a motion for the adjournment of the house in the manner proposed by the Leader of the Opposition cannot be tolerated under the rule if the motion will revive discussion on a matter which has been discussed in the same session.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that nothing could be clearer than that not only has the same matter been discussed at the present session, but it was discussed only three days ago. What is the subject matter? The Leader of the Opposition wishes to discuss a statement by the Canadian chairman of the international joint commission that Canada's interests were sacrificed, and so on. That is the very statement that was read into the record on Friday afternoon by the leader of