

Private Bills

That was accomplished in the house and in no way as a result of pressures or representations.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Allard: Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out, first of all, that this is not a question of privilege. If the hon. member wishes to speak once more to these amendments, he has the privilege to do so. But it is clear to me, as I was in the house, that the right hon. Prime Minister asked him or invited him to withdraw his amendment. If that is not pressure, if it is not an invitation or a request, it is actually as a result of the invitation of the Prime Minister that the hon. member for Lévis, having taken such action the other day, withdrew his amendment today.

[*English*]

Mr. Starr: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. We are getting close to private members' hour. I know that hon. members are emotionally upset about this subject, which should be debated in a cooler atmosphere at some time in the future when an opportunity can be given to everyone to express his views, but I wonder whether hon. members would not co-operate. We are on the last clause of this bill. Could we not pass it, give third reading to the bill and go on with other business of the house?

• (6:00 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Allard: Mr. Chairman, I think the best way to co-operate in order that this bill and the amendment may go through quickly, is to let the hon. members who have been recognized conclude, so that they may complete their argumentation. We do not intend to do any obstructing, but if our voice and reaction seem somewhat impassioned, it is with figures to support assertions that we say once more, while standing in this house and looking at all the hon. members: For 100 years, discrimination and injustice have been shown against French Canadians and they have been left out of the main crown corporations and the federal public service. We are here to ask for justice, in full light and in good faith, and that is the reason why the hon. members should at last support an amendment such as this one, which will not create disunity. How can sanctioning a fact that we are merely being asked to accept as usage cause disunity? It is a feeble argument which we cannot accept. That is why, in closing to allow other members to rise, I ask the house to support

this amendment and add that I was pleased to support the subamendment of the member for Lapointe.

The Chairman: Is the house ready for the question on the subamendment?

Mr. Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Chairman, this is the first time I have risen in this house to speak on such a topic.

The Chairman: Order. It being six o'clock, in order that the house may proceed to the consideration of private members' business, it is my duty to leave the chair.

[*English*]

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED UNDER ADJOURNMENT MOTION

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being six o'clock it is my duty, pursuant to provisional standing order 39A, to inform the house that the questions to be raised at the time of adjournment tonight are as follows: The hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Basford), Water Resources—sale of Canadian water; the hon. member for Hamilton South (Mr. Howe), Health and Welfare—request for grant for retarded and disturbed children; the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), Canadian Constitution—suggested study by parliamentary committee.

It being six o'clock the house will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, private bills and public bills.

PRIVATE BILLS

INTERPROVINCIAL PIPE LINE COMPANY

The house resumed, from Thursday, March 10, consideration of the motion of Mr. Wahn for the second reading of Bill No. S-10, respecting Interprovincial Pipe Line Company.

Mr. Raymond Langlois (Mégantic): Mr. Speaker, this bill has been discussed on several occasions and I for one would like the opportunity to consider the procedure that is involved here and the basic reason for the proposition we are asked to support.

I object to this bill as it stands and I believe further consideration should be given to it. The argument put forward by this company is that it ought to be given authority to split its shares so as to give a greater opportunity for participation by the public. I note, however, that there are at the present