

Labour Conditions

minister announced the settlement of the dispute. I shall read only the particularly relevant sections of his remarks. I do not want to read them out of context, and if anybody wants me to read the whole thing, I will do so. He said, as reported at page 6368:

It was difficult if not impossible for the parties to agree on the nature and extent of possible increases of productivity.

He was there approaching the nub of this question. Then he said:

When this situation developed I, as Minister of Labour, several weeks ago announced that I intended to set up a commission of inquiry under the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act to inquire into the possibilities of improving productivity—

That was the time the minister should have disclosed that he was going to do something unique. This was the time that I contend the minister misled the house by not going further, by not saying that he really did not intend to set up a commission under the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act as it exists. He should have said: We intend to follow that up by introducing legislation which will make that commissioner's report final and binding. He did not say that at that time.

Mr. Nicholson: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Howard: Gladly.

Mr. Nicholson: Was the hon. member in the house this afternoon and did he hear the minister's explanation of why he did not say that?

Mr. Howard: If you wait, I will give you the answer—if you will sit down. No, I was not in the house, unfortunately. I had every hope, desire and intention of being here, but other circumstances more personal than public unfortunately kept me away. I did not hear the minister's explanation. I would be glad to listen to it now. I realize we would be running contrary to the rules in doing this, because my hon. friend from York South ran into this difficulty before. Then, Mr. Speaker, I have to go in the direction of saying that the minister should have related that on that day. The minister then said:

I now wish to confirm that I intend to set up such a commission within the next few days. I will have more to say on that subject when I announce the appointment of the commissioner.

The minister was giving an indication of something vague and indefinite at that time, true; but an indication of something else,

something in addition to the mere appointment of a commissioner under the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act. I submit that the minister was probably ashamed to say it at that time—

Mr. Nicholson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of personal privilege. I think that when I asked the question that I asked a few moments ago the hon. member should at least have asked for a copy of *Hansard*, or the blues of this afternoon, or something else, before carrying on in this vein, because I explained in no uncertain terms that I had prepared a statement to be used in the house and had deleted a section of it at the request of the lawyer for the I.L.A., because he said he thought the representatives of the unions should be allowed to explain it to their membership before any statements were made in this house about proposed legislation. It was done at their request, and the original notes that were sent up to *Hansard* will show that.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Speaker, when the minister rose on the question of privilege I inquired of my hon. friend from York South what was said, so I have heard it from two sources. This is all the more reason why the minister should send this subject matter to a committee in order to get at the true facts of the situation, because I understand that Mr. Cutler denies that. Whether he does or not, I cannot say. What went on in those wee, small hours of the morning is unknown to me. I submit that perhaps the minister can be excused for not having disclosed that information to the house on June 14—

Mr. Nicholson: Mr. Speaker, I again rise on a question of privilege. The statement I made did not refer to anything that happened in the wee, small hours of the morning; it referred to something that took place just as I was coming into the house with a prepared statement.

Mr. Howard: The minister just said that on June 14 he did not make any reference to the compulsory feature of the legislation which he intended to introduce because he was requested not to do so by Mr. Cutler. Whether that took place in the wee small hours of the morning, I really do not know. It took place presumably in a conversation between the minister and Mr. Cutler. The minister says one thing; Mr. Cutler says another. All that the amendment before us seeks is a bit of reason, a bit of sense of fair play in