

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

during his 25 years as member of the legislative assembly, minister and Prime Minister of the province of Quebec. Later he sent his manuscript to the department.

Mr. Barrette was then advised that the publication of his memoirs, which were bound to give rise to controversy, was not compatible with his functions as Canadian ambassador to Greece and would conflict with departmental regulations which prevent any member of the Canadian diplomatic service from publicly expressing an opinion on controversial domestic political questions.

Mr. Barrette replied that he was most anxious to publish the book and consequently, on April 25 last, in all the circumstances he asked to be relieved of his duties. On May 5 I granted his request.

**Mr. Churchill:** As a supplementary question, do I understand that there are rules and regulations regarding the publication of articles or books by people who are employed as Canadian ambassadors, and do these same rules or regulations apply to ministers of external affairs?

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** Mr. Speaker, the last part of the question, of course, is quite academic. There are rules with regard to ambassadors and officers of the Department of External Affairs. Mr. Barrette was aware of these rules and has not questioned them.

[Translation]

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Charlevoix.

**Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix):** Mr. Speaker, the minister has answered my question.

[English]

**HIGHWAY SAFETY****ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL ACCIDENT RESEARCH CENTRE**

On the orders of the day:

**Mr. Heward Graffey (Brome-Missisquoi):** Mr. Speaker, I would direct this question to the Minister of Industry since he is in charge of research matters for the government. In view of the record slaughter on our highways over the May 24 week end will the government seriously consider the establishment of a national accident research centre, as recommended in a bipartisan brief presented to the right hon. Prime Minister over 10 months ago?

[Mr. Martin (Essex East).]

**Hon. C. M. Drury (Minister of Industry):** Mr. Speaker, we are giving study to this question.

**INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY**

On the orders of the day:

**Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton North and Victoria):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. May I ask the right hon. gentleman whether the revision in the Bank Act will be known as the Walter Sharp formula.

**Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton South):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State. Can she identify the Mr. Gordon whom Premier Thatcher cautioned the Canadian people about last evening in a national television broadcast?

**LABOUR CONDITIONS****REFUSAL OF B.C. LONGSHOREMEN TO WORK ON VICTORIA DAY**

On the orders of the day:

**Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Labour said he would take as notice the question I asked him arising out of the fact that the longshoremen of B.C. have been under harassment by their employers over the matter of the May 23 holiday as provided in the Canada Labour (Standards) Code. I wonder if the minister has an answer for me today.

**Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Labour):** Mr. Speaker, on Thursday and Friday of last week the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam inquired concerning a controversy that developed on the west coast with regard to the employment of longshoremen on May 23, Victoria day, which is specified as a general holiday in the Canada Labour (Standards) Code. The complaint arose with regard to the rates of pay which the employees claim are incompatible with the code.

I would reply that I was aware of the controversy because representatives of the international longshoremen's and warehousemen's union had discussed it some time ago in Ottawa with my departmental officials who administer the code. It would appear that so far the union has made only general allegations with regard to alleged violation of the code. Before any interpretation or ruling can be given by the department there would have to be a specific case cited where an employee had not received holiday pay or pay in the proper amount, whether it would be double pay or otherwise.