

*Question of Privilege*

and every line of what has been said, that it is very apparent that repetition is not foreign to the opposition. Over and over again they have said the same things. More than that I need not say.

**Mr. Hellyer:** Listen to the master calling.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Compared with what happened over that period of five years, what is happening in this session of parliament drives anyone who gives it consideration to a conclusion which I am prepared to accept.

**Mr. Chevrier:** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Speaker:** I do not know whether or not the hon. member for Kootenay West wishes to intervene on this point—

**Mr. Herridge:** No, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** If not, I will hear the hon. member for Laurier.

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** On what subject?

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** On the merits now. We are going to have a debate.

**Mr. Chevrier:** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has said that he has been accused, by the statement which I raised on a question of privilege, that what he said in Montreal was unfair. That is not what I said; I said that the statement made by the Prime Minister was untrue, and I would like to prove that the statement he made was untrue, since he took time to deal with exactly the same thing by putting on the record some of the facts which he said he had.

We know very well what happened in this house on Thursday. On Thursday there was far more time taken up by hon. members on the other side of the house than there was by hon. members on this side of the house.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I think the hon. member for Laurier will agree, and I am sure the house has come to the conclusion by this time, that we are engaged in a perfectly fruitless debate. The hon. member for Laurier did, as was his right, raise objection to what was said on the basis that it involved a matter of privilege. In my view it does not raise a breach of the privileges of the house. There has been some debate on both sides as to the merits of the accusation which, as I said, is not relevant. We can go on and have a first class debate on that issue, but it would be entirely irregular and out of order.

If the hon. member for Laurier has nothing further to add except to demonstrate the propriety of the conduct of the opposition, I suggest that he do it by letting us get on with the work of the house.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

**Mr. Chevrier:** I have something more, Mr. Speaker. The Prime Minister has said that 14 days were taken up. That is not a fact. We have been dealing with further supplementary estimates No. 3 since the 8th day of March. That is seven days—

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** What about group No. 2?

**Mr. Chevrier:**—and not 14 days, as the Prime Minister said. As we well know, we were told by the Minister of Finance, first, that these supplementary estimates No. 3 had to be passed and disposed of by March 15. We were then told by the Prime Minister in this speech in Montreal that they had to be completed by the end of the month.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** No.

**Mr. Chevrier:** Then the leader of the house felt they were of such little urgency that it was not necessary to go on with supplementary estimates today; he announced on Friday that we should go on with legislation. So that we have three degrees of urgency; that laid down by the Minister of Finance, which was very urgent; that laid down by the Prime Minister, which was less urgent, and that laid down by the leader of the house, which was that there was no urgency at all because we would go on with legislation on Monday.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I recognize the Minister of Finance. Those other hon. members who wish to speak might send notice to the Chair.

**Hon. Donald M. Fleming (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I hope I can contribute to the calm which reigns sometimes in this chamber.

**Mr. Hellyer:** You can do that best by not speaking.

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** What I said last week concerning the urgency of the disposal of the supplementary estimates then under discussion in committee of supply was absolutely correct, as I do not need to say. The carrying of those estimates to a decision is highly urgent. I pointed out the reasons that payments are being delayed because we have no authority to make them, payments to contractors and also payment of wages in certain cases.

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** That is not what you said the other day.

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** That was the situation. The discussion of these estimates went on an additional day, an eighth day, last Friday, and one item had been passed in that period. In the eight days 22 items have been passed.