

No. 68

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 7, 1972

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Speaker informed the House that the Clerk of the House had laid upon the Table the Fourth Report of the Clerk of Petitions, which was read as follows:

The Clerk of Petitions has the honour to report that he has examined the petition of Herman Weisz, of the City of Ottawa, Ontario, in relation to a Report entitled "Concentration in the Manufacturing Industries of Canada", dated March 31, 1971 and published by the Queen's Printer for Canada on behalf of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, presented by Mr. Andrew Brewin, Member of Parliament, on Tuesday, June 6, 1972, and finds that the petition meets the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: The House has just heard the Clerk read the Fourth Report of the Clerk of Petitions in relation to the petition filed yesterday by the honourable Member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin). Since the filing of the petition yesterday, I have had an opportunity to study very carefully the contents and substance of that document. The substance of the petition is that the petitioner who was a public servant was largely the author of a report entitled "Concentration in the Manufacturing Industries of Canada" published by the De-

partment of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. This report was attributed to be the work of a public servant, not the petitioner, under the direction of yet another public servant, also not the petitioner.

The suggestion is that it was wrong, inaccurate and in failing to give the petitioner credit for his part in the publication, thereby damaging his reputation. The petitioner urges the House of Commons to cause the person or persons responsible for the alleged wrongful appropriation of his work to publish a correction and to give him credit for his part in the publication.

Honourable Members will recognize that it is a heavy responsibility of the Chair to ensure that petitions are in accordance with the historic practices and usages of the House. There is a fundamental right to petition the House of Commons, but that right should not be used to put aside other and probably more effective remedies. It is my understanding that there is an avenue open to the petitioner which has not been referred to in his statement of grievances. There is a precedent in the year 1956 to the effect that the House will not receive a petition dealing with a matter, the jurisdiction of which has been assigned to another body. This precedent may be found at page 163 of the *Journals* of the House for Thursday, February 16, 1956. I quote from the