

Correspondence on Union Trusteeship

of the recommendations of the Norris commission. The motion has been submitted to the house because of the general principle that parliament is vested with the power to order that a document be laid before it that may be necessary for its information.

I might point out that such a power is broad enough to include documents of a confidential nature if the house believes that it requires their production. The fact the documents are confidential cannot be invoked to block their production, because the necessity for providing parliament with information would take precedence. These documents are being requested because they have been introduced already on a piecemeal basis into the debates of this house. Surely the house cannot be fully informed without their production.

I could cite quite a number of occasions within the last 10 or 15 days when references have been made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) and other members of the cabinet to these documents as well as to statements made by members of the United States administration. For instance, on October 15 at page 3525 of *Hansard* the Prime Minister is recorded as referring to the unhelpful intervention by the United States secretary of labour. He referred also to the statement by the President of the United States which in his view, indicated that the President would co-operate to see that Canadian shipping in United States ports would be free from harassment and sabotage.

On October 11, 1963, page 3441 of *Hansard*, the Prime Minister is reported as referring to the apparent failure of both the secretary of labour of the United States government and the president of the A.F.L.-C.I.O. to appreciate fully the fact that the dispute on the great lakes is essentially a Canadian dispute, although of course it has international ramifications. Then, the Prime Minister also stated that this matter—

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not want to intervene unfairly in the remarks of my hon. friend, but I am sure he is aware that in the discussion of this matter, under this particular procedure, it is not open to discuss anything other than the particular motion. One cannot discuss the merits of any dispute that may have some relationship to the problem. The only issue before us is whether or not these documents should be produced. What my hon. friend is now discussing is not a matter involved in the documents, but a matter of public statements by certain individuals already designated by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Martineau: Speaking to the point of order, I may say that the reason I quoted [Mr. Martineau.]

these extracts from *Hansard* is simply to bring out the fact that the documents and statements have already been referred to in the course of debate in this house. This is the only purpose. It is necessary for the house to know this in order to decide if the documents should be tabled. I am not arguing in any way about the merits of the situation in connection with great lakes shipping or the trusteeship.

I was stating, Mr. Speaker, that the United States secretary of labour had brought this matter within the domain of public concern by issuing public statements. I refer, for instance, to the statement made by the Minister of Labour (Mr. MacEachen) on October 11, as recorded on page 3457 of *Hansard*, in which the minister refers to a statement by the United States secretary of labour as follows:

I have expressed through formal channels the continuing willingness of the United States government to seek an accord which will meet fully the public as well as the private interests which are involved here.

Then, on October 8, as recorded on page 3304 of *Hansard*, the Minister of Labour stated:

I have discussed this matter with the officials of the labour department... the Canadian ambassador discussed this matter yesterday in the United States... the United States authorities will fully comply with United States law with respect to this situation.

On October 4, page 3203 of *Hansard*, the Minister of Labour referred to the fact that the discussions have not produced any clear conclusions. This again indicates that there were discussions. On October 3, at page 3149, the Minister of Labour referred to discussions with Mr. Reynolds, United States under secretary of labour, and finally on September 30, at page 3026, the Minister of Labour referred to a meeting at Boston with the secretary of labour.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, it is my submission that in this particular case public policy does not preclude the production of these documents. Indeed public policy calls for their production because, as the Prime Minister himself and other members of the ministry recognized, this is a purely Canadian matter and there has been, in the words of the Prime Minister, both a shocking and unhelpful intervention by the United States in it. Surely under these circumstances public policy dictates that the whole question be brought into the open.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to labour the point but my hon. friend knows perfectly well that the line he is now pursuing is out of order and is not permitted under this particular motion. The question before the house is whether or not these particular