

● (1415)

WEIGHTS AND MEASURESREQUEST FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR RETAILERS
REVERTING TO IMPERIAL SYSTEM—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough): Madam Speaker, now that the federal government is following the course which was set by the former Progressive Conservative government in postponing the implementation of the metric system in the retail food sector on January 1, 1981, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity.

In view of the high cost to the retail food stores in Peterborough, Sherbrooke and Kamloops of converting back to the imperial system in order that they can use the same system of measurement as the rest of the country, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Towers):

That this government show compassion for these independent food retailers and offer them financial assistance to ease the difficulties caused by this necessity of reconversion back to the imperial system.

Madam Speaker: Such a motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

ENERGY

REQUEST ENERGY POLICY BE TABLED—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Madam Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 on a motion which is directed at the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde). I expect it will get unanimous consent.

Whereas there is no energy policy in this country at this time—the tar sands developments have stopped and there is no oil pricing agreement—and whereas the Prime Minister has been spending all his energies on the constitution and has met with the Premier of Alberta, I believe, for two days, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Young):

That the government move right away to deal with the real concerns of the ordinary Canadian and table in the House of Commons forthwith an energy policy for Canada.

Madam Speaker: Such a motion requires unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

*Oral Questions***ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

[English]

PUBLIC SERVICECR CLERKS DISPUTE—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON
SETTLEMENT REACHED

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Madam Speaker, my question is for the President of the Treasury Board. On October 6 the minister made a statement to the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton with regard to the settlement with the clerks. As it appears in *Hansard*, he said, "in the event that an agreement is reached I would be very pleased to return to the House and advise the House".

Would the President of the Treasury Board indicate when in fact he intends to make that statement? I am quite sure that we could get unanimous consent now for such a statement if the minister would care to make it.

Hon. Donald J. Johnston (President of the Treasury Board): Madam Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to make any statement in response to questions from the hon. member for York-Peel. He probably has a number of supplementary questions at his disposal, being the lead-off questioner. If there are any details of the arrangement which have not already been released and which the hon. member would like to have, I would be more than pleased to furnish them.

Mr. Nielsen: What happened to the commitment to the House?

Mr. Stevens: Madam Speaker, I find it shocking that in a matter involving over \$600 million in payroll, and after the President of the Treasury Board found time to post a notice in the press gallery that he would meet with the press after question period, and after distributing a press release, that he would turn up and affront the House by stating that he has no statement to make other than through answering questions.

Mr. Crosbie: Resign.

Mr. Nielsen: Another broken promise.

Mr. Stevens: Would the President of the Treasury Board indicate two things to the House: What is the total cost of the settlement arrived at; and would he specifically indicate the cost of the extra 4 per cent which he added on to the original majority conciliation board report as grounds for settlement?

Mr. Johnston: Madam Speaker, I would be glad to do the extrapolation for the hon. member because I have found his arithmetic in the past somewhat inadequate. The additional cost per employee over the two-year period from the time we made our last offer, which is well known and which was commented upon by the Leader of the New Democratic Party the other day, is in the order of \$234 per clerk over the two-year period which we think is very generous, Madam Speaker, and very helpful.