

Motions for Papers

by the hon. member. I am quite sure he is acquainted with the narrow limits of debate on a motion for the production of papers. I would have to say at the beginning that he is getting beyond that. May I refer him to a statement made by Mr. Speaker Michener on February 8, 1962, as reported at page 682 of *Hansard* for that year:

Order. Before the hon. member proceeds further with that line of argument I think I should say to him that my view of the scope of the motion is that it is limited to the desirability of the production of the documents. The motion is one calling on the government to produce the documents referred to in the motion. The question in issue is whether or not they should be produced.

Later, on November 22, 1962, Mr. Speaker Lambert made the following observation which is reported at page 1911 of *Hansard*:

I think the hon. member will recognize the rather narrow confines of the debate in this regard. These have been referred to quite definitely by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George who cited the decisions of my predecessor to the effect that what is, in fact, the issue of this motion is not what is behind the documents, or what is their substance, but whether they should be produced or not.

Mr. Speaker Lambert then went on to say:

I think the hon. member will, on reflection, see he is going a little beyond that.

I have further citations here which I could give the hon. member but I think I have said sufficient for the house to realize the narrow limits within which the debate on a motion for the production of papers must be confined. I hope hon. members will confine themselves within those limits.

Mr. Byrne: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order you have raised, I must say with great respect that in the speech of the hon. member for Winnipeg North, part of which I have quoted, the hon. member made the argument that it was in the public interest that these papers be produced because a labour union had made contributions to a political party for special favour, in this case the Liberal Party. It turned out that one or two of the officials of this union acted in such a way as to be brought to court and sentenced to do time in prison. On the other hand, no action was taken to recover damages and so on. My argument now is to show that this is not necessarily correct.

Simply because a union makes contributions to a political party, it does not mean that the political party is tarred with the same brush as some irresponsible officers of the union. I am certainly not implying that any of the members of the N.D.P. are tarred with

the brush of the Bedards to whom I have referred as having been implicated in acts of violence much greater and more damaging than any wrongdoing in connection with the S.I.U. I was about to point out, Mr. Speaker, that this affair might have cost the lives of 10, 15, 20 or any number of workers. One worker was in fact killed. So these acts of violence were much greater than anything that was perpetrated on the Great Lakes. I think the argument of the hon. member for Winnipeg North falls to the ground in flames when this is understood.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I now have to advise the hon. member that his time has expired.

Mr. Byrne: Is it not true, Mr. Speaker, that I lost about five minutes on the point of orders?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The Speaker was very careful to note the time he commenced referring to citations, which occupied about three minutes. Those three minutes were added to the hon. gentleman's time.

Mr. H. W. Herridge (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I shall be very brief. The hon. member for Kootenay East (Mr. Byrne) suggested that this resolution was placed on the order paper to harass an independent union because it did not belong to the Canadian Congress of Labour or supply funds to our party. I think he is quite mistaken in this respect. The resolution was placed on the order paper with a view to getting the information contained in these documents and making this information public.

Quite frankly, let me say that I am an honorary member of Mine, Mill and I have no love for the Steelworkers Union and have no hesitation in saying so. I do not believe in splitting the working class and causing disunity in communities and the harassment of unions which have a good record of service over the years.

Mr. Byrne: Would the hon. member permit a question? Would he make reference to the plans of the Steelworkers to rig Mine, Mill at Trail, British Columbia, starting this year? They have already announced that intention. Would he make reference to this fact when speaking about the Steelworkers and Mine, Mill?

Mr. Herridge: I think I am in order, Mr. Speaker. If this unfortunate development does occur then all I can say is that without any