

Labour Conditions

[Translation]

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. Yvon Pinard (Parliamentary Secretary to President of Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if question No. 63 could be made an order for return, this return would be tabled immediately.

[English]

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that question No. 63 be deemed to have been transferred as an order for return if the return is tabled forthwith?

Mr. Paproski: I rise on point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is my understanding that the question was going to be No. 367, but the translation said No. 316.

Mr. Pinard: Question No. 367, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed that question No. 63 will be deemed to have been made an order for return?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Text]

DEPARTMENT OF MANPOWER AND IMMIGRATION—CONTRACTS
LET FOR STUDIES AND SURVEYS

Question No. 63—Mr. Orlikov:

1. For the fiscal year 1975-1976, what contracts for professional services were let (a) for studies, surveys and analyses into present or future policies, programs or information analysis, and their efficiency and effectiveness (b) into the examination of the administration or internal operation of the Department of Manpower and Immigration?

2. How much was committed on each contract and to whom?

3. What were the comparable figures for the fiscal year 1973-1974?

Return tabled.

* * *

[English]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

LAY-OFF OF WORKERS BY FALCONBRIDGE NICKEL COMPANY—
PROPOSED MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, to move the adjournment of the House under Standing

[Mr. Lang.]

Order 26 for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely, the announcement today by Falconbridge Nickel that it intends to lay off 750 workers, or 20 per cent of its work force, in its Sudbury operation in addition to the 500 already laid off since July of this year.

It is noted that today's Christmas present from Falconbridge to the Sudbury community aggravates an already serious situation there caused by Inco's cutback, not to mention the problems created in Thompson and Port Colborne by Inco and in St. Lawrence by Alcan; and it being further noted that at the same time the employment picture in the mining sector is deteriorating and is threatening to worsen appreciably, according to the government's own figures. Inco, Alcan and Falconbridge have committed large amounts of capital to foreign investments in Guatemala, Indonesia and Chile, Ireland and Chile, again, respectively.

It is noted, finally, that these lay-offs, among others, clearly demonstrate the government's failure to pursue its intention to increase diversification and growth of national and regional economies based on minerals, which I submit constitutes a crisis and an emergency situation.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. As I think all hon. members will agree, it is proper that this chamber ought to have machinery for bringing to the attention of the House matters of serious importance which would not otherwise come under our consideration in our regular practices or procedures. That has been the general purpose for existence of Standing Order 26. I think it is appropriate, therefore, to read parts of the Standing Order. Subparagraph (1) reads as follows:

Leave to make a motion for the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration must be asked immediately before the calling of government orders.

I think it is appropriate to read two other subparagraphs. Subparagraph (5) reads as follows:

In determining whether a matter should have urgent consideration, Mr. Speaker shall have regard to the extent to which it concerns the administrative responsibilities of the government or could come within the scope of ministerial action and he also shall have regard to the probability of the matter being brought before the House within reasonable time by other means.

Finally, I should read subparagraph (16):

The right to move the adjournment of the House for the above purposes is subject to the following conditions:

(a) The matter proposed for discussion must relate to a genuine emergency, calling for immediate and urgent consideration—

I think the Chair has, for those reasons, recognized that matters of crisis ought to be brought before the House in this way if they are not going to have the attention of the House in any other way. On the other hand, the Chair is naturally reluctant to take individual problems in individual constituencies—even when they are very close to home—as representing qualification under this Standing Order. The obvious would follow: every member who had anything of critical proportions affecting his constituency would want to bring it forward for the same emergency treatment.