

Transportation

fairly; otherwise, the people will no longer admit, they are even no longer prepared to accept, such competition.

The doings of the C.N.R. affect a whole segment of our population. Well, if a stop is not put to this, if the new legislation does not put an end to this and if the C.N.R. is not brought to its senses, I will be the first, Mr. Speaker, to tell the people of the province of Quebec that they are in fact ill-treated by crown corporations.

[*English*]

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege which affects all members of this house. We have witnessed tonight a shocking example of a misuse of the rules, customs and practices of this house. On the basis of information I have received from my colleagues, I should like to record the fact that there was an agreement made in this house between members of the government and the opposition side that the house would continue after six o'clock but would terminate its sitting at ten o'clock.

On many occasions in this house there have been similar agreements made without a written order being recorded in *Hansard*. I recall many occasions during five and a half years as party house leader on both the government and opposition sides when we have made arrangements like this,—on countless number of occasions. The flouting of this kind of an agreement tonight is the first time in my experience such a thing has happened. I should like to record this fact in *Hansard* so that parliamentarians today and in the future will realize that these agreements are agreements between gentlemen and are recognized in this house, despite our differences politically.

Let me also record the fact that a minister of the crown acknowledged there was an agreement to continue past six o'clock although, perhaps by negligence, the formal motion did not contain a reference to a ten o'clock termination. That arrangement should have been carried out by the House of Commons. I think our experience tonight has been a bad experience in the House of Commons and I hope it will never again be repeated.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I want to apologize to hon. members if, through any negligence on my part, what I understood and believed to have been an order of the house was not so recorded in the scroll. If that is what happened I do not blame anyone

[Mr. Grégoire.]

else but myself. There may have been some technical negligence on my part and, if so, I apologize.

I completely agree with the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill), that whether or not an agreement is formally entered, and I say this as a result of my long experience, a member does not have the right to consider that he is not bound by the agreement simply because he was not in the chamber at the time it was made.

I would hope, sir, that if there is any danger of this kind of experience being repeated, some steps could be taken right away to amend the rules so that this kind of thing could not happen again. I feel very humiliated, sir, that this should have happened in the circumstances in which it did, and any injury I did to hon. members I regret very much indeed.

I would now move the adjournment of the house.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the question of privilege before the motion to adjourn is put. I think we should have one thing crystal clear here. Contrary to what both the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill) and the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) said earlier—contrary to the opinions they expressed—it was undeniably the right of the member for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) to stand up and speak, having obtained the floor, and no gentlemen's agreement could wipe out that right of the hon. member.

If the Minister of Transport had wanted to make it an order of the house that we conclude at ten o'clock, he would have included it in his motion. In fact I submit to you, sir, that he was asked specifically if he would amend the motion. I believe the hon. member from Oshawa asked him for a cut-off hour at ten o'clock, and the minister refused point blank to do that. There was no order of the house and there was not any intention that there be an order of the house. There was just a conversation between two or three members, and that does not in my opinion constitute an agreement to ride roughshod over any individual member of the house.

The hon. member for Lapointe, regardless of what we may think about his speech and the fact that he may have inconvenienced some of us who thought we would go home at ten o'clock tonight, undeniably had the right