

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Hees: No, Mr. Speaker. The speech was made five days after the minister's speech—four days after—and did not refer to that speech. Therefore I shall pose a supplementary question because the Prime Minister is not aware of these moves. They obviously are not dramatic.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Hees: I would ask the Prime Minister whether the government has not been convinced by the latest Gallup poll that mere brave words are not impressing the Canadian people and that positive action along these lines is long overdue?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* * *

MANPOWER**LOCAL INITIATIVES PROGRAM—REASON FOR AVERAGE WEEKLY WAGE CEILING OF \$100**

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration arising out of the statement he tabled today. In view of the fact that many, if not most, persons involved in the local initiatives program will have been relatively well paid industrial workers prior to being laid off, could the minister explain why a \$100 weekly average wage ceiling has been established as one of the qualifying conditions for the program? I ask this question because the other part of the program, the manpower retraining aspect, has no such ceiling.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, there are a whole variety of programs which may be more or less available for different groups of people. This is an average rather than a ceiling. It is the average upon which the limiting of the grant for employment under the program will be made. It does not limit additional amounts being put in by an organization in the right case. The objective, of course, is to do some preliminary sorting, in effect, among the many applications we expect and to indicate preference for support of a maximum number of programs putting the maximum number of unemployed people to work.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Calgary North.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Chair has recognized the hon. member for Calgary North. I bring to the attention of hon. members that I am trying—and I can only do this with the co-operation of hon. members—to move on because we are running short of time. This is why I am trying to reduce, if possible, the number of supplementaries.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I am afraid you did not hear me. I am rising on a question of privilege with regard to the answer the Minister of Finance gave me a few moments ago. I went back to the record and I find that at page 8986 the minister indicated that the government did take action. The minister says he did not say that on Monday. The minister may have forgotten, but

[Mr. Trudeau.]

I do not want him innocently to mislead the House. The position must be made clear.

• (3:00 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member knows very well that a member cannot raise, by way of a question of privilege, a debate as to what has or has not been said. I do not want to be unfair to the hon. member if he thinks that the point should be made, but I suggest to him and to all hon. members that it is not very useful, by way of a question of privilege, to try to determine what has been said and what has not been said previously. But having said that, if the hon. member feels that he has a case and would like to pursue the matter by way of a question of privilege it is my duty to hear him.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I am a little puzzled by the interpretation. I would like direction from Your Honour.

Mr. Speaker: The direction I would give the hon. member is that he should try to state the question of privilege as briefly as possible and, as I said, I would have to hear him and I will hear him.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): My question of privilege concerns the answer given me by the minister in which he said that he had not said something, yet the record shows clearly what he did say, which was my interpretation of it. Surely the House is being misled and I am being misled. If that is not a question of privilege, may I respectfully point out that there must be some way of correcting it at this time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has made a correction, but I have to rule that it is not a question of privilege. There are many precedents, which are well known to the hon. member, in support of my contention. In any event, the hon. member has made his point. The Chair will now recognize the hon. member for Calgary North.

[Later:]

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. The answer which I gave on October 25, 1971, appears at page 8986 of *Hansard*. Perhaps the answer did mislead the hon. member for Edmonton West. It should have read, first of all—

Some hon. Members: Order!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Edmonton West, the Minister of Finance and all hon. members will see where this kind of question of privilege can lead us. If hon. members take five minutes of the question period to say that what the minister said is not what he said, and the minister replies that what he said was what he thinks he said, we might go on for a long time. I do not think it is a question of privilege on the part of the hon. member for Edmonton West or on the part of the Minister of Finance.