

PRIVILEGE

REFERENCE TO EDITORIAL IN MONTREAL DAILY STAR OF JUNE 4.

Mr. H. G. ARCHIBALD (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege I should like to draw attention to a matter which affects me and might affect any member of parliament; that is, regarding the use of the frank. An editorial in the *Montreal Daily Star* of June 4 involves my name in a matter with which I had nothing to do. Perhaps I should read the editorial to show what a member is up against. It is called "The Unsoft Impeachment", and it reads as follows:

From time to time the *Star*, in common with every other newspaper in Canada, receives through the mails scurrilous comment on its editorials, or news items. If they are unsigned, they immediately find a resting place in that large wastepaper basket that stands beside every editor's desk. If they are signed, their contents are considered on the merits and, if worthy of publication, published.

But to-day one such piece of comment arrived which fits into neither category. True, it is scurrilous, and it is unsigned, but it arrived under such distinguished auspices as to warrant further attention being given to it.

At the top of the *Star's* editorial page of Friday, May 31, torn ruthlessly from the rest of the paper, there stands, written with the customary elegance of the anonymous school, this comment on an editorial dealing with the Canadian lake seamen's strike: "This stinks!—You live fat on the labour of unpaid workers in your own plant!" (The emphasis is that of our correspondent.)

Now we are not in the least hurt by this unkind reference to our avoirdupois, nor to the odoriferousness of something that may after all only have been printer's ink, but we are somewhat astonished by the distinguished auspices under which this anonymous contribution to the higher criticism reaches us.

The editorial page with its written comment came to us from the House of Commons, bearing the House of Commons postage "frank" and, on the other side of the envelope, the "frank" of a member of parliament—"H.G.A., M.P." The parliamentary guide attributes these initials to the C.C.F. member for Skeena, B.C., who, oddly enough, is described as "seaman," and who is so far off his course as to have permitted some unkind friend the illegal use of his parliamentary "frank."

I lock my stamp in my desk every evening religiously, so that how this happened I do not know. I may say that I quite agree with the comment but I would not have put it in those words.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION—SOUTHAM NEWSPAPERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ALSTAIR STEWART (Winnipeg North): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. In view of the fact that the dispute between the typographical union

and certain newspapers centres in Winnipeg, will the minister make another attempt to bring together representatives of the union and the *Winnipeg Tribune*?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): I wish to thank my hon. friend for having given me notice of the question. I shall be glad at any time to assist the parties to an industrial dispute in adjusting their differences, if they desire me to do so, and after consultation, of course, with the authorities in the province, which in this instance is Manitoba. But I have to receive a request and I have had no request from anyone.

C.P.R. EMPLOYEES—PENSION RIGHTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. STANLEY KNOWLES (Winnipeg North Centre): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Labour, notice of which I sent him yesterday. Has the Department of Labour received a reply from the Canadian Pacific Railway, with reference to the report of the department's industrial relations officer on the matter of the restoration of pension rights to certain employees of the C.P.R., which was referred to the company last December. Also may I ask if a copy of this report has been referred to the other interested parties, namely, the unions that requested the investigation?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): The reply of the company is being studied. It is not customary to give copies of these reports to any parties to the dispute, but in view of the peculiar circumstances of this dispute, which went back to 1919, we did so in this case. As soon as we have studied the matter I shall be glad to give my hon. friend the answer.

Mr. KNOWLES: May I ask a supplementary question? Since it is a dispute between two parties, and the government made an impartial investigation, if the report is referred to the company as one of the parties, should it not be referred to the other party as well, namely the unions?

Mr. MITCHELL: The company were not there when the evidence was taken in Winnipeg. We have to be very careful about these matters. I say that frankly, because if it becomes a practice to make these reports public we shall never get a frank report, since they will have an eye to public effect when we want a factual report.

Mr. KNOWLES: The minister will give us a report as soon as he gets a definite reply?

Mr. MITCHELL: Certainly.