Motion for Adjournment

Mr. Diefenbaker: I never have to relax for any kind of remark.

Mr. MacEachen: The right hon. Leader of the Opposition has often asked me from that side of the house to take the house into my confidence. I regret that the Leader of the Opposition has not taken the house into his confidence and told us whether he will be occupying his seat when we resume on September 25. For my own part I sincerely hope he will be sitting in that seat when we return in September because parliament would really not be the same without his presence.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Churchill: Was that a grievance?

Mr. Knowles: Would the minister permit a question?

Mr. Speaker: Does the minister wish to answer questions?

Mr. MacEachen: One question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Knowles: My question to the minister is this: Is it not a fact that we are having this debate today and that we are engaging in what the minister calls "this wrangle" not because of one individual grievance but because the government has failed to keep its promise to our retired civil servants?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, at no time did the government make a commitment to deal with this matter before the summer adjournment.

Mr. Knowles: That is all the more reason why we should not adjourn.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker-

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

Mr. Peters: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I listened very carefully when the minister indicated that I had argued on—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I remind the hon. member that the rules have been fractured enough today and that we should try to respect them to some extent at this point. If the hon. member has a question of privilege it should be a valid one, not simply a reopening of the debate which should be closed by the minister's statement.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, my point of personal privilege is based on the minister's supposition that I argued on a false premise.

[Mr. MacEachen.]

Mr. Churchill: That is a debating point.

Mr. Scott (Danforth): Let hon. members over there keep quiet and we will get through more quickly.

• (3:10 p.m.)

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, I have no difference of opinion with the minister on the other remarks he made. However, he concluded that I was falsely informed or proceeded on a false premise when I said that the form of this motion lent itself to the abuse which has occurred. I believe this is true. The minister has said that there has to be royal assent for the supply bills that were presented and that no additional bills could be presented unless they were followed by another supply bill. My point was—

An hon. Member: There is no point of privilege.

Mr. Peters: Well, I feel I have a point of privilege whether or not the members on the other side do. Originally the point of this motion was—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to the hon. member that he should state his question of privilege. Up until this moment he has given no indication whatever that he has a legitimate question of privilege.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, the minister said that the premise I used as the basis for my remarks that the motion had nothing to do with the problem was false. It was not false. The whole argument has flowed from the wording of that part of the motion which reads:

—royal assent to the supply bills referred to in paragraph (5) of the special order made Monday, June 26, 1967, and to any other measures—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to interrupt the hon. member. This is a point of debate. The hon. member intends to argue with the interpretation placed on his remarks by the minister, and if I allowed the hon. member to make his statement then members on the other side could get up on a question of privilege to disagree with the interpretation placed by the hon. member on the minister's interpretation of what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has said. We could go on for a long time.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Is the house ready for the question?