

10. Criticism of Assistance Given by a Member to Air Canada Employee¹⁷

Counsel for Air Canada requested the Canada Labour Relations Board to declare that Members of Parliament ought not to interfere in employer-employee matters coming before the Board. Mr. Ian Watson, Member for Laprairie, attended a hearing of the Board to lend moral support to an employee. Mr. Watson saw the representations of Air Canada's counsel as an attempt to prevent a Member from fulfilling his duties.

The Speaker ruled that Mr. Watson's grievance, important as it was, could not come within the classic definition of a question of privilege. The Speaker stated that the complaint should be answered by the Minister of Transport.

10. Critique de l'assistance donnée par un député à un employé d'Air Canada¹⁷

Un avocat-conseil de la Société Air Canada demande au Conseil canadien des relations du travail de déclarer que les députés ne doivent pas intervenir dans les questions de relations entre employeurs et employés dont le Conseil est saisi. M. Ian Watson, député de Laprairie, a assisté à une séance du Conseil afin de donner son appui moral à un employé. M. Watson considère que la demande de l'avocat d'Air Canada a pour but d'empêcher un député de faire son devoir.

L'Orateur décide que le grief de M. Watson, tout important qu'il soit, ne répond pas à la définition classique de la question de privilège. L'Orateur déclare que la plainte doit être portée devant le ministre des Transports.

In the course of his speech, the Member stated that he had written the article in question and had signed the Member and requested him to sign his name to the House. The newspaper reported that the Member had signed the Member's name to the article.

The Member was accused of the act of the House on June 10. The House found that the Member committed a serious breach of privilege and resolved that they would in fact act on September 16.

Intendant d'élites: Wanglonging Ng (Member 11:33)

A Mr. Smith alleged in a letter—re circulated in a 100-hour club and mailed to a newspaper, that a Member of the House of Representatives, George Foster, had engaged in lobbying for certain firms and in so doing, had improperly influenced the government in granting a contract for an important construction contract.

The Committee of Privileges reported that the imputations against the Member did not affect directly the discharge of his duties in the normal course of the business of the House. The Committee concluded that the matter disclosed no breach of privilege. It also stated that in the exercise of its functions, the Parliament desires all allegations of improper conduct.

Photographs of the House taken by the newspaper (1985)

Many Australian newspapers had taken a photograph of the House of Representatives in session. The photographs showed the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Gough Whitlam, and, by virtue of an article, 'Whitlam' being taken, they advertised a particular view of the House.

The Committee of Privileges reported that the imputations against the Member did not affect directly the discharge of his duties in the normal course of the business of the House. The Committee concluded that the matter disclosed no breach of privilege. It also stated that in the exercise of its functions, the Parliament desires all allegations of improper conduct.

The House will consider the matter in the course of its business. The House will consider the matter in the course of its business. The House will consider the matter in the course of its business.

In the course of his speech, the Member stated that he had written the article in question and had signed the Member and requested him to sign his name to the House. The newspaper reported that the Member had signed the Member's name to the article.

The Member was accused of the act of the House on June 10. The House found that the Member committed a serious breach of privilege and resolved that they would in fact act on September 16.

Intendant d'élites: Wanglonging Ng (Member 11:33)

A Mr. Smith alleged in a letter—re circulated in a 100-hour club and mailed to a newspaper, that a Member of the House of Representatives, George Foster, had engaged in lobbying for certain firms and in so doing, had improperly influenced the government in granting a contract for an important construction contract.

The Committee of Privileges reported that the imputations against the Member did not affect directly the discharge of his duties in the normal course of the business of the House. The Committee concluded that the matter disclosed no breach of privilege. It also stated that in the exercise of its functions, the Parliament desires all allegations of improper conduct.

Photographs of the House taken by the newspaper (1985)

Many Australian newspapers had taken a photograph of the House of Representatives in session. The photographs showed the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Gough Whitlam, and, by virtue of an article, 'Whitlam' being taken, they advertised a particular view of the House.

The Committee of Privileges reported that the imputations against the Member did not affect directly the discharge of his duties in the normal course of the business of the House. The Committee concluded that the matter disclosed no breach of privilege. It also stated that in the exercise of its functions, the Parliament desires all allegations of improper conduct.

The House will consider the matter in the course of its business. The House will consider the matter in the course of its business. The House will consider the matter in the course of its business.