

*Adjournment of the House*

notice. That provision is still in our rules under Standing Order 42(1) which I read a few moments ago.

• (2:10 p.m.)

It is on the basis of these precedents that I wish to make a motion which I shall read in a moment. I want to speak briefly to it because, under the Standing Order, it is a debatable motion. Therefore, I do not want to present it in such a way that I will have to resume my seat. We can deal with points of order if necessary, but in any case my motion reads: That the house adjourn this day at four o'clock p.m. I point out, although it is crystal clear in the wording, that this relates only to this day's sitting; it relates only to the question of the hour of adjournment. This is fully covered in Standing Order 42(1). My purpose in making this motion at this time is also clear, I hope, namely, that it will provide an opportunity for us to try to cope in a different way from what we have been doing with the problem with which the house is now seized.

The president of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) in statements made to the press yesterday, which surprised some of us but which I accept at their face value, declared that he found it difficult to arrange a meeting with the opposition house leaders to discuss the procedural battle in which we are engaged at the present time. I practically live on the hill and I do not see any difficulty in being called to a meeting. I am ready to attend a meeting with the other house leaders at any time. But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it would be a good idea, that it would be common sense, and that the country would approve of this course, if we were to adjourn the house this afternoon at four o'clock so that the government house leader can call a meeting of the house leaders, or even go further and call an informal meeting of the members of the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, to see whether, within the confines of such a meeting, we can come to some understanding on the problem that is before the house.

I recognize, from the communications we seem to be having through the press, that our positions seem to be irreconcilable. The President of the Privy Council says that he wants the principle of rule 75c without question. We on this side say that we want rule 75c to be dropped. However, I submit that our positions are no more irreconcilable than they were in December on rule 16A. Yet in December, as a result of a conference of several hours, we did come to an understanding

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

on the basis of which the members of this house went home for Christmas. I submit that that conference produced more than that. It produced a package of rules under which the house has operated very well for the past six months. I believe that by holding such a conference this afternoon we might be able to achieve more than we can by carrying on a debate in which we have reached an impasse and in which neither side seems to be giving in at all.

That is my main reason for the motion. Some hon. members may have thought I was moving that we adjourn at four o'clock because it is such a hot day. That is an ancillary reason, and I am sure that the staff in this place would be delighted if we adopted this course. I would also point out that I have fixed the time so as to allow for a short debate, if that is necessary, and also time for the question period. I would not quarrel if someone wanted me to change the motion to five o'clock so that we could have the question period and a somewhat longer time for the debate, but I do think it makes common sense to follow a course of this kind.

This is my response to the appeal that the President of the Privy Council made through the press yesterday and this morning, namely, that he would like to meet with us. I did not think it was necessary to go about it in this way, but this is my response, the suggestion that the house not carry on this debate today, a debate which seems to be getting nowhere, but that there be an appropriate kind of meeting in the office of the President of the Privy Council or, if necessary, I would invite the meeting to be held in mine.

Therefore I have pleasure in moving, seconded by the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch):

That the house adjourn this day at four o'clock p.m.

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West):** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Is the hon. member rising on a point of order in connection with the proposed motion?

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** No, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** The motion has not yet been put to the house. Although I may have some doubt concerning the motion, in view of the fact that it has not been questioned procedurally I will put it to the house at this time.