

made in the house that the Department of Labour and the minister have no quarrel whatsoever with the manner in which the trustees have carried out their duties which they were given at the time under the terms of the bill. So, the government has no quarrel with the manner in which the trustees are carrying out their duties. I am sure the government has not asked for reports from them beyond what is required under the terms in the bill—which is an annual report. Therefore they have no communications from the trustees except in this instance where an employee of the Department of Labour was requested to assist in forming a committee which would supervise the elections.

Under the normal rules of parliament, it is provided that departmental documents, with the consent of other persons, may be produced, such as documents that are related to provincial affairs. If the second or third party has no objection, they then may be produced. This is my reason for not approving of the documents being subpoenaed by the committee from the trustees, but rather that they be produced from the Department of Labour.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to get on with our business. I gather that everybody is prepared to accept the documents for different reasons. Being a realist, all I want to do is to have them adopted. These reasons which you have, I think perhaps are important to you, in view of possible similar situations which may arise in the future; but nevertheless I would appreciate it if these are taken up one by one. There are so many angles to this that we could spend from now until 12 o'clock discussing them.

I think Mr. Byrne and Mr. Greene made it very clear that they approve of the documents, provided they come from the Department of Labour. Others request them from the board of trustees. The Chairman has obtained them from both sources. I have one set from the Department of Labour and another set from the board of trustees, so everybody should be happy. I would now like to cut off the discussion and proceed to the motion.

Mr. GREENE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak to the resolution. I do not think I can leave Mr. Nielsen's views unchallenged on the record. I go along with Mr. Barnett's view and I must say I cannot take great exception to Mr. Bell's view; I do not think I could dissent from that too strongly. As I understand it his view is that the trustees are in no different position from that of the officers of any private company or public corporation. If the officials of the C.N.R. were here, they could be asked to produce such a document and if they wanted to produce it on their own volition, I do not think I would quarrel with the position of Mr. Bell.

Mr. STARR: May I put one question to clarify what you have said? Is there not a difference, in view of the repeated statements by the Minister of Labour in the House of Commons that the trustees are responsible to parliament; that is, that he was not responsible for them in the House of Commons, but rather the trustees were directly responsible to parliament. Is that not so?

Mr. GREENE: I quite appreciate Mr. Starr's view and my thoughts, for what they are worth, simply are that I do not concur in Mr. Nielsen's view. He says he agrees with Mr. Bell, but to my mind he took an entirely different stand. His stand is that we can go into any of the documents of the trustees, and I understood him to say we can subpoena other witnesses. While I quite agree with Mr. Starr that the trustees must report to parliament, at the present time I think we have only certain authority in this regard. I do not concur in Mr. Nielsen's view that if we cannot go into the matter with other witnesses