

Wage and Salary Restraint

VETERANS AFFAIRS—RESEARCH STUDIES

Question No. 1,777—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. What research studies have been carried out by, or on behalf of the Department of Veterans Affairs during each year 1960 to 1969 inclusive?
2. What research studies are now being carried on and/or are contemplated during the next five years?
3. What was the cost of each of the research studies completed in each year 1960 to 1969 inclusive?
4. What is the estimated cost of each of the studies now in being or contemplated during the next five years?

Return tabled.

HIRING OF MESSRS. ROBIDOUX AND AUSTIN
BY DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRSQuestion No. 1811—**Mr. Laniel:**

Were Messrs. Robidoux and Austin, currently working in Vimy and Beaumont-Hamel, hired as locally engaged employees by the Department of Veterans Affairs and, if so (a) on what date were they hired and at what salary at the time of employment (b) what was their respective salary at the end of December, 1968 (c) what is their salary at present (d) what other benefits are attached to their position at present, and are they similar to those they had prior to January 1, 1969 (e) what were their duties and responsibilities prior to January 1, 1969 (f) what are their present duties and responsibilities (g) what are their normal channels of communication within the Department in the discharge of their duties for submitting recommendations, suggestions or claims (h) what job security do they have?

Return tabled.

Mr. Crouse: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, concerning question No. 513 in my name on the Order Paper. It is a simple question concerning the procedure followed by the government. It has stood on the Order Paper since November 19 without being answered. I again respectfully ask, through you, sir, that the government endeavour to give me a reply to the question.

Mr. Forest: Mr. Speaker, I have made representations to the Department of Public Works and I expect an answer soon.

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26**THE CANADIAN ECONOMY**INFLATION—GOVERNMENT POLICY RESPECTING
WAGE AND SALARY RESTRAINT

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), to move the adjournment of the House under Standing Order 26 for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring

[Mr. Noble.]

urgent consideration, namely, the federal government's policy to implement a restraint program against the wage and salary earners of this country as announced on Friday at the federal-provincial conference in Winnipeg. Any policy which seeks to hold down the incomes of one group of the economy, while leaving the incomes of other groups unrestrained, is discriminatory and inequitable and should be resisted by this Parliament.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo has filed the required notice and I have had an opportunity to give serious consideration to the proposed motion for the adjournment of the House. Under the terms of Standing Order 26 the hon. member suggests that this House should adjourn to consider "the federal government's policy to implement a restraint program against the wage and salary earners of this country." The hon. member goes on to argue his case by suggesting that such a policy "is discriminatory and inequitable and should be resisted by this Parliament."

There are a number of serious considerations which militate against the proposed motion. First, I remind the hon. member that the business which he seeks to displace is a supply motion under the terms of Standing Order 58, notice of which was given last Friday. In other words, we have already in actuality, set aside government business for the purpose of discussing a supply motion. I would find it difficult to pre-empt the supply motion in favour of a motion under Standing Order 26, even if under the provisions of Section 9 of Standing Order 26 the debate suggested by the hon. member for Waterloo might be postponed.

The second difficulty stems from the very nature of the subject matter proposed for discussion. Although it is one of extreme importance, and of national concern and interest, it seems to me it is one that will be the subject of continuing discussions and negotiations extending over a period of time. In such circumstances, I suggest that the Standing Order cannot apply.

The third difficulty I see in the motion as proposed is that it is rather in the form of a condemnation of a proposed government policy. A debate of this nature is normally put before the House by way of a no-confidence motion rather than by virtue of the provisions of Standing Order 26.

For these reasons, I do not agree with the hon. member's proposal that this matter be debated in the House under the provisions of Standing Order 26.