

## CBC Pension

[English]

## CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

## PROPOSED AUTHORIZATION OF COMMITTEE TO INQUIRE INTO PENSION PLAN—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I ask leave under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to present a motion, to which I hope the House will agree. The broadcasting division of the Canadian Union of Public Employees, NABET, and other CBC unions are experiencing difficulty obtaining from the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation details of their pension plan, to which I am sure we all agree they are entitled. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas):

● (1410)

That the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts be authorized to inquire into the pension plan of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, with a view to the obtaining of information about the pension plan to which the employees of the corporation are entitled.

**Mr. Speaker:** The provisions of Standing Order 41 require the unanimous consent of the House before this motion can be presented. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** Before calling oral questions I might ask the indulgence of the House in order to refer to a matter which I am sure will come as no surprise to hon. members. I have received notification of an application under Standing Order 26, and several notices of questions of privilege and others relating to the subject matter of a proposed motion, pursuant to Standing Order 43, of the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte). The circumstances will give rise, I am sure, to questions during the question period which could be beginning at this moment. It will also give rise to technical problems about whether the House is entitled to ask questions of a parliamentary secretary when the minister to whom he or she is the parliamentary secretary is present in the House.

I am sure it will be no surprise to hon. members to learn that I have also received notice of a question of privilege from the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Reid). It might solve some of the procedural and substantive problems associated with this most interesting matter if the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River were to be given the consent of the House to proceed with his question of privilege at this moment as opposed to three o'clock. Perhaps it can be understood that in so doing, whatever time is absorbed in participation in that discussion by members on both sides of the House, it will be my obligation to safeguard 45 minutes of questioning for members of the House after the question of privilege has been resolved in one way or another. Is there unanimous consent that we proceed in this manner?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Baldwin:** Just to make it quite plain with regard to the right of the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Reid) to deal with this problem and answer questions, this will in no way derogate from the right of members of the opposition to question ministers who are here on this issue.

**Mr. Speaker:** There can be nothing to prejudice that during the question period. If 45 minutes is safeguarded, there is nothing to limit or restrict the right of members on all sides of the House to pose questions to the ministry in general, or particular ministers on this or any subject, provided it is within the minister's competence.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, we wish to indicate our agreement to the procedure just proposed. However, can Your Honour make it clear how many will be able to speak on the question of privilege after the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Reid) has spoken?

**Mr. Speaker:** Of course, I have no way of knowing that at the moment. I will have to exercise some judgment as to the extent to which that will go on. However, there are other hon. members who have given me notice of questions of privilege and motions under various Standing Orders. They certainly ought to be recognized in order to comment. Beyond that, I will have to make some judgment as to how far we ought to go before we commence the question period.

\* \* \*

## PRIVILEGE

## MR. REID—NEWSPAPER ARTICLE ALLEGING NOVEMBER BUDGET LEAK

**Mr. John M. Reid (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege as a result of an article in this morning's *Montreal Gazette* which claims that I was leaked information on the November 18 budget and that I passed this information to businessmen.

Mr. Speaker, I categorically deny this. It is totally false. The story in the *Gazette* asserts that I said I had six weeks' advance knowledge from the office of the Minister of Finance that there would be a removal of the excise tax on boats in the November 18 budget. I had no such knowledge. I never had communication with the minister's office on the substance of the budget either before, on or after November 18 and, as the records of this House reveal, the November 18 budget did not propose to remove such a tax; it proposed to implement this tax.

As a result of the budget, Bill C-40 was introduced on December 2. It included a clause which would enact this tax. Like several members on all sides of the House, I made strong representations to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner), to other ministers and to some of their officials that the new tax on boats be reduced. From their response, I, like other members, came to the conclusion that the government would agree to a relieving amendment. On January 28 the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer) proposed an amendment to Bill C-40 that went even further than I had expected: it removed the tax altogether.