

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, June 2, 1978

The House met at 11 a.m.

● (1107)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SALARY REVISIONS—REQUEST FOR TABLING OF DOCUMENTS—
MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Walter Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, in the last two days I have heard a large number of complaints about the revised salary schedules which were tabled on Wednesday. There is a great deal of puzzlement, to say the least, over the fact that a member's principal secretary's salary has been frozen, while the top executive category, already paid over \$40,000 per year, receives a full 6 per cent permanent increase.

While accepting that a readjustment in all salary levels is necessary to correct any overclassification which may have occurred, I think morale has been harmed by the selective and mysterious manner in which this occurred. I, therefore, ask leave to move, seconded by the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro):

That this House requests the tabling of all documents, papers and memoranda on which House of Commons staff salary revisions, tabled in this House on May 31, were based, particularly those which compare House of Commons classifications with public service classifications and those which explain the differentials between positions within the House of Commons.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have some hesitation about whether the motion put forward relates to any administrative responsibility of the government. It is the responsibility of parliament and, indeed, one in which I have a representative capacity. While not a government responsibility, it would be clearly a parliamentary responsibility, so I will ask if there is unanimous consent to put the motion.

Presentation of the motion for discussion, pursuant to Standing Order 43, can be done only with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

COMMITTEE STUDY OF LAW ON SOLICITING, VAGRANCY AND
PROSTITUTION—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 43, I rise on a matter of serious and pressing necessity. For the law to be respected and obeyed, it must be clear, concise and free from ambiguity. Every Canadian, according to our system of jurisprudence, is entitled to know what the law is.

In light of the former changes in the law contained in the Criminal Code of Canada as to soliciting, vagrancy and prostitution, and in the words of one judge, persons will be tried for offences which are not contrary to the law but merely for publicity purposes, creating a false, unnatural, and unwarranted punishment, and in light of the fact that in some places certain police enforcement officers are used as decoys as a method of cracking down on activities that may or may not be illegal, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil):

That the questions of soliciting, vagrancy and prostitution be referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs for study and recommendation, with the right of the committee to hear witnesses giving their views and opinions with reference to all matters pertaining to the same.

Mr. Speaker: Under the provisions of Standing Order 43, unanimous consent of the House is required for the presentation of such a motion for debate. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

FISHERIES

RATIFICATION OF CANADA-U.S. INTERIM AGREEMENT—
MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to present a motion on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. In view of the many problems and animosities stemming from the failure of the U.S. Senate to ratify the Canada-U.S. interim agreement on fisheries, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock (Mr. Friesen):

That this House orders the Canadian section of the Canada-U.S. interparliamentary group to convene at the earliest possible moment a special meeting in Washington in order to explain to our congressional colleagues the need for ratification of the interim agreement, so that the fishermen of our two countries may gain their livelihood under this pro tem arrangement pending the conclusion of a more binding agreement between the two countries.