

(e) Employees have kept their jobs, have continued at the same salary levels and enjoy a similar benefits package to the one in which they previously participated. The only exceptions to this were three existing employees, two of whom accepted positions in Petro-Canada and the third who elected to accept an early retirement arrangement.

[English]

* * *

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Mr. Speaker, if Question No. 196 could be made an Order for Return, the return would be tabled immediately.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that Question No. 196 be deemed to have been made an Order for Return?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Text]

NATIONAL ACTION COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

Question No. 196—**Ms. Mitchell:**

For each year since 1975, has the government provided grants or contributions to the National Action Committee on the Status of Women and, if so, in each case (a) what amount (b) under which programs (c) what proportion of that year's annual operating budget of the committee did the sum represent?

Return tabled.

[English]

Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: The questions as enumerated by the parliamentary secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Privilege

[Translation]

PRIVILEGE

PROPER DRESS CODE AND MEMBER FOR DAVENPORT—SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. Speaker: On Monday, February 19, the hon. member for Davenport raised a question of privilege because he had not been recognized in debate the previous Thursday, February 15, when the House was considering the motion of the government on language rights. At the time, the Acting Speaker declined to recognize the hon. member for Davenport because he was not properly dressed.

[English]

The hon. member has asked the Chair to reconsider its reliance on the traditional interpretation of the practice of the House that required male members be dressed with jacket and tie. In making his case, the hon. member pointed to the latitude accorded women members who can dress, as he put it, "in a variety of ways according to fashions and changing trends".

The hon. member also quoted the Deputy Speaker who, last December 14, referred to Beauchesne and the practice that members are expected to respect in terms of their appearance. The hon. member stressed, however, that this is a practice and not a rule. This is certainly true, but it is a practice that is well established.

Exceptions have been allowed from time to time, but always within the context of the accepted practice. Clergymen members have requested the right to wear their distinctive collar instead of a tie and members who have sustained an injury have asked to be excused from the wearing of a jacket or a tie for short periods of time when it was not possible because of the injury. In this connection I would point to the recent cases involving the hon. members for Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte and for Trois-Rivières.

Such exceptions, as I have said, have proved the practice. There have been statements from the Chair supporting the usual practice for more than 60 years and I do not feel that as Speaker, I can disregard this practice.