

*Business of the House***BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

**Mr. McIlraith:** Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will be dealing with the transport bill and subject to royal assent being given to the old age pension supplement legislation, which we expect to have tomorrow night, we will be proposing that we adjourn for recess until January 9. That notice is on the order paper and I hope we can carry it out.

May I add one cautionary note. We may wish to revert to the bill which was under discussion just now some time during the day tomorrow. If this situation arises, however, I will be speaking to the house leaders about it.

**Mr. Starr:** Mr. Speaker, a number of members have looked at this bill and feel it is a very important one. I understand there will be a great deal of discussion in respect of it, including discussion by members on the government side. I wonder whether the house leader would consider not dealing with this bill tomorrow.

**Mr. McIlraith:** I tried to introduce the cautionary note that we might wish to do so and if so I would speak to the house leaders about it.

**Mr. Olson:** Mr. Speaker, may I ask the house leader a question concerning the transport bill? When he introduced the bill today the Minister of Transport suggested he would be willing to stand clause 1 and move on to some of the other clauses if the house was in agreement. I am wondering whether any further consideration is being given to this.

**Mr. McIlraith:** I cannot very well settle that at the moment. I understand that this suggestion was made by the minister and I will draw the remarks which have just been made to his attention.

**Mr. Speaker:** Perhaps at this point I should bring to the attention of hon. members who are still here after midnight that earlier in the course of the evening a point of order which I considered was very interesting and important was raised by the hon. member for Queens, at which time certain precedents were brought to the attention of the Chair. Since then additional research has been made on behalf of the Chair, and to the list of precedents which I at that time mentioned I should add the following dates: November 12, 1963, November 18, 1964, and October 11, 1963. I do not suggest this is a complete record of the precedents, because as I indicated at the time the precedents go back to 1867, but

[Mr. Pepin.]

they perhaps may indicate a more objective picture of the situation.

**PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION**

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved.

**Mr. McIlraith:** Mr. Speaker, do I understand you are calling the proceedings on the adjournment motion? I wonder whether hon. members who are concerned in the adjournment debate would consider forgoing it.

**Mr. Churchill:** I think it should be the prerogative of Mr. Speaker to determine that and simply rule that there will not be a debate on the adjournment motion.

**Mr. Speaker:** According to the new rule a motion to adjourn the house is deemed to have been moved, so no formal motion is required. I would suggest, however, that there is no power in the hands of Mr. Speaker to say to the hon. member for Sherbrooke, the hon. member for Lotbinière, or the hon. member for Trois-Rivières that they will not have an opportunity to have their say in connection with the matters they raised earlier today.

*[Translation]*

## LABOUR RELATIONS—C.N.T.U.—DEFINITION OF BARGAINING UNIT

**Mr. Maurice Allard (Sherbrooke):** Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, December 13, I put the following question to the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson):

"As the ministerial committee has submitted its report to the cabinet, does the government intend to introduce shortly a bill defining the negotiating units and recognizing them on the natural as well as on the national level?"

The head of the government thought it best at that time not to answer. Maybe he hoped that I would repeat my question on proceedings on the adjournment motion, so that he might have the opportunity to make a more substantial and complete statement. At least, we all hope this is the case, since the controversy was brought up several months ago and has not yet been settled in any positive and efficient manner.

Early in 1966, the C.N.T.U. made violent protests to the cabinet over C.C.R.O. decisions and also protested against the type of representation in this federal organization. In addition to voicing grievances in connection