

always that they are on a relevant matter, always on a matter which has the attention of the country at the time, and therefore a matter that can quite appropriately be discussed in general terms.

That does not alter the fact that frequently in the past—and, I suppose, frequently in the future—I have had to and will have to turn down motions because their continuing nature does not fall under the kind of precise and critical aspect of the language of Standing Order 26. The Standing Order clearly defines, not something which will be discussed under a bill, in a throne speech debate or a budget debate and not something which is the subject matter of day to day questioning, a matter of general policy or a matter of concern to the country, but a precise problem which the House will not have an opportunity to discuss at another time or in another way and which, within the language of the Standing Order, is a matter of specific importance requiring urgent consideration.

The question that has been raised here is the result of a statement on Friday by the Solicitor General (Mr. Fox). The hon. member's statement in support of his argument for the invocation of this order contains certain allegations and propositions. I think it is not for the Chair to evaluate them but to accept them as part of an argument in favour of the Standing Order. It is not for the Chair to decide what practices may or may not be followed. I am confronted with the Standing Order and the subject matter, and upon reading the Standing Order if I find that this subject matter does not qualify for debate pursuant to the Standing Order, we may as well take the Standing Order off the books. I therefore accept the hon. member's application and order that within the framework of the Standing Order we should provide for a debate on the subject matter raised by the hon. member.

However, I must point out that we are facing some extraordinary difficulties. During this month of June the House is sitting extra hours. It is also at present in the midst of a debate which, as provided by statute, must run for a certain maximum number of days without interruption. Ordinarily the Chair is in a position of setting eight o'clock for the hour at which this debate would commence. I cannot do that without offending the statute which provides that the debate must run without interruption. There is some comment, which is perhaps in the nature of speculation, that the debate on the anti-inflation program may be concluded before it runs its full course. I have no way of knowing that. In the circumstances, I wonder if hon. members would permit me to hold over my decision on the timing of the debate until tomorrow. My thinking of course would be that if the current statutory debate concludes today, tomorrow would be an ordinary day for government business, I presume, and I could then set eight o'clock tomorrow night for this debate. If that is not the case, then I am faced with a different set of circumstances and I would have to attempt to reconcile the statutory order under which we are now debating the anti-inflation program and this motion under Standing Order 26. That may be obviated by events which will take place later today, and if not, I could deal with it when the House assembles for routine proceedings tomorrow.

Anti-Inflation Act
GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

ANTI-INFLATION ACT

PETITION TO END CONTROLS ON JUNE 30, 1977

The House resumed from Friday, June 17, consideration of the motion of Mr. Stevens:

That the Anti-Inflation Act being chapter 75, Statutes of Canada 1974-75-76, as amended by chapter 98, Statutes of Canada 1974-75-76, shall expire on the 30th June, 1977.

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Last Friday I was some 16 minutes into my remarks on the motion before the House, and I was talking about two aspects of the motion moved by the Conservative Party, namely, the inequity of the AIB program pertaining to salaries of ordinary working people as compared with salaries of executives, and also the inequity of the program when you compare the wages of ordinary working people and the profits of large corporations.

I have before me a list of 51 corporate executives who received salary increases last year of more than \$2,400 a year when ordinary working people were told to limit their salary increases to \$2,400, and in many cases much less than that. In many cases they were given contracts increasing their salaries up to \$2,400, but then those increases were rolled back by the AIB. I put on the record of the House some examples of those huge salary increases and I was speaking about Kaiser Resources Limited and about the vice-president of that company named Howard Cadinha who had a salary increase last year of some \$10,415. I was about to go on to Edgar Kaiser, the junior president of Kaiser Resources Limited. He is the one who would really make the hair on the head of the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) turn grey. That guy had a salary in 1975 amounting to \$206,637 and in 1976, despite the AIB regulations his salary was increased by \$60,363, an increase roughly equal to the Prime Minister's (Mr. Trudeau) salary. Yet AIB did nothing about it. So now Mr. Edgar Kaiser, junior president, has a salary of \$267,000, with a salary increase of some 22.9 per cent.

Now I move on to Massey-Ferguson Limited, a well known company in the prairies. The president of that company, Albert Thornbrough had a salary in 1975 of some \$353,833. Last year he had a salary increase of \$20,000 a year, to bring his salary up to \$373,833. I am sure the hair on the head of the hon. member for Nickel Belt will start to fall off. Also, as the hon. member mentioned, this fellow has not paid anywhere near the tax he should be paying.

● (1600)

J. E. Mitchell, executive vice-president of Massey-Ferguson, received a salary increase of \$15,000 last year, raising his to over \$230,000. That increase was untouched by the AIB. The senior vice-president of the company, a fellow named J. G. Staiger, received a salary increase of \$6,000. He is the pauper of the trio: he makes only \$192,836. I now move to Hudson's Bay Oil and Gas Company, of Calgary. The president of that