

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, January 12, 1967

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD

PROVISION OF REPRINTS OF "HANSARD" CONTAINING BIRTHDAY TRIBUTES

Mr. Speaker: A suggestion has been made that special reprints be ordered of yesterday's *Hansard* containing speeches made by hon. members relating to the birthday anniversary of Canada's first Prime Minister. If the house agrees, I will be pleased to order reprints for the convenience of hon. members.

PRIVILEGE

MR. HOWARD—SUGGESTED INCORRECT INFORMATION RESPECTING MOTION FOR PAPERS

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): I should like to raise a question of privilege touching some information which was given to the house yesterday in relation to my notice of motion for the production of papers No. 191 which related to correspondence between the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and any other person, group or organization, excepting any other department or agency of government.

In dealing with this motion the Associate Minister of National Defence said, as reported on page 11664 of *Hansard*:

I wish to inform the hon. member that there have been no correspondence, telegrams or other documents exchanged between the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation or any official thereof and any other person, group or organization relating to the application of the Canada Labour (Standards) Code or the deferment or suspension of any part thereof. Therefore I suggest to the hon. member that he might wish to withdraw his motion.

This I did. Subsequent to that, this morning, it came to my attention that there is certain correspondence, to which I should like to refer briefly. I have here a copy of a memorandum dated July 6, 1965, signed by one Guy Coderre. The address at the top of the memo is "Vice president, administration, Ottawa", of the C.B.C. and it is addressed to all the staff. The first paragraph reads as follows:

● (2:40 p.m.)

With the introduction of the Canada Labour (Standards) Code effective July 1st, 1965, it is

important that you be made aware of its implications on your conditions of employment with the C.B.C.

I have also a letter signed by one Clive B. McKee, director of industrial and talent relations of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, dated August 24, 1965 and addressed Mr. H. W. Sedgwick, Canadian vice president of I.A.T.S.E. While specific reference is not made in this letter to the Canada Labour (Standards) Code in those words, the second paragraph in the letter states that the corporation has applied to the Department of Labour for deferment of the act, and the implication is that that is the Canada Labour (Standards) Code.

I have another letter dated October 13, 1965 signed by Mr. C. T. Kelley, assistant director of industrial and talent relations of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, addressed to the same Mr. Sedgwick of I.A.T.S.E. In this letter specific reference is made to the code in the following words:

I am now able to confirm that, effective July 1, 1965, contract employees who work on a statutory holiday will be granted another day off in lieu, in accordance with section 31 of the Canada Labour (Standards) Code.

Finally, Mr. Speaker. I have a memorandum from the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation signed by Mr. D. J. van Bommel dated December 17, 1965 referring to a legal opinion they had received stating that certain people were not employees under the Canada Labour (Standards) Code, and under the circumstances were not covered by the code.

Based upon that, Mr. Speaker, my question of privilege is that there was erroneous information given to the house yesterday. Therefore I move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That the question of the refusal to produce the documents referred to in notice of motion for production of papers No. 191 be referred to the standing committee on privileges and elections.

Mr. Speaker: Before considering the motion proposed by the hon. member for Skeena a decision would have to be made by the Chair as to whether there is here a prima facie case of privilege. I would think it might be advisable to give the minister responsible, who is not in the house this afternoon, an opportunity to study these representations