

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, February 19, 1971

The House met at 11 a.m.

## PRIVILEGE

MR. KNOWLES (WINNIPEG NORTH CENTRE)—INCORRECT NEWS MEDIA REFERENCES TO BILL C-203 AS INCREASING VETERANS PENSIONS AND ALLOWANCES

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege, having given Your Honour the required notice under Standing Order 17(2). My question of privilege relates to a continuing error which has been repeated in this morning's news concerning the contents of the bill which we passed yesterday afternoon.

I do not rise to protest misleading headlines—we are used to that sort of thing—but rather to protest the failure to report to the people of Canada what was in the bill that we passed yesterday. I raise my point of privilege because this error was broadcast on the CBC news this morning and it appears on page 1 of this morning's *Toronto Globe and Mail* and on pages 27 and 29 of this morning's *Montreal Gazette*.

When Bill C-203 was first introduced, the news media immediately referred to it as a bill increasing veterans pensions and allowances. We have repeatedly pointed to the fact that it does not do that. Those increases were announced by the minister on December 2, but we do not yet have the legislation to bring them into effect.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, when the CBC news announces that yesterday we passed a bill dealing with veteran pension increases, when the *Globe and Mail* says the same thing on page 1, and when the *Gazette* repeats it on page 27, and even again on page 29 in reporting the incident, or alleged incident, concerning the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) being "obscene but not heard", I suggest this is a disservice to the Canadian people and will mislead the veterans of this country.

My point of privilege can be corrected quite easily, Mr. Speaker, if the government will now bring in legislation to increase veterans pensions and allowances as promised on December 2.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I think the hon. member will recognize that there is not a question of privilege in the point he has raised. As I have said from time to time, there may be a grievance, in this instance in the way the activities of the House of Commons have been reported, but I do not think that this is tantamount to a breach of parliamentary privilege.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### LABOUR RELATIONS

WAGE OFFER TO HMC DOCKYARD EMPLOYEES, HALIFAX  
—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE  
MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants):** Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 43 I should like to move, seconded by the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall), that in light of the government's bargaining with its employees in Department of National Defence establishments in Atlantic Canada, and specifically in light of the fact that the government is now offering the top wage in a majority conciliation report to its employees at HMC Dockyard, Esquimalt, B.C.—an increase of 42 cents an hour—and is offering the bottom wage in a minority conciliation report—an increase of 27 cents an hour—to its employees at HMC Dockyard, Halifax, the subject matter of bargaining over wage issues with prevailing rate employees be referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon. members have heard the motion proposed by the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants. Is there unanimity?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** Since there is not unanimous consent the motion cannot be put.

• (11:10 a.m.)

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

ENTRENCHMENT OF LANGUAGE RIGHTS IN FIELDS  
OF PROVINCIAL JURISDICTION

**Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister for the purpose of obtaining some clarification regarding the recent conference between the federal government and the provinces on the constitution and in particular the entrenchment of language rights. Would it be correct to say that in the communiqué there was no agreement indicated, without some reservation at