

The hon. member for Winnipeg North has made a striking attack upon the administration of the house, and I suggest he must substantiate his charge by giving more particulars than he has done. I am sure the board of internal economy, as well as the officers of the house, including His Honour the Speaker, will be only too glad to rectify any errors which might have been made. I suggest, however, that the hon. member ought to give more detail.

Then, speaking to what has been said by the lady member of the house in connection with those who serve in the restaurant, let me say this. In the first place, they are asked to take the position, and at that time they are told definitely what the remuneration will be. I heard no complaints during my five years in office from any of the services in the house with regard to their remuneration—

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): They are scared.

Mr. GLEN: --and it is true that some meals are included while they serve here. I suggest that these complaints which have been made should be the matter of inquiry by the committee on the restaurant. They have been dealing with this matter, and they will deal with it in a way which will ensure justice being done to every person in the employ of the house. I am sure the committee on the restaurant would be very glad to listen to any complaints made.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): I am going to answer the minister, and in doing so I shall repeat the charge made last December, as it appears at page 3748 of *Hansard*:

I should like to draw the attention of the Minister of Veterans Affairs and the Minister of Labour to the fact that there are several messengers on this staff, men who were in the army for four or five years and who served overseas, who are going to be out of work when this house rises; and as far as I know no provision is being made by the government for their employment.

Mark you, that was just before Christmas.

That is a heartless and callous way to treat these men.

What the hon. member for Ottawa West said is correct. They do get \$138 a month. But I do not know to whom that would appear to be a large sum.

Mr. McILRAITH: That is a minimum.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): That minimum is to permanent help.

Mr. McILRAITH: No, it is to temporary help.

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): Temporary, too. But there are 157 employees, thirty-three of whom are permanent. We are

[Mr. Glen.]

giving people \$138 a month as income, when the average wage-earner in that group is probably unemployed for many weeks. His average income falls far below \$138 a month. I wish to repeat that there are only thirty-three permanent employees out of a total of 157, and they get a minimum of \$138 a month.

Mr. GLEN: Has the hon. member the names?

Mr. STEWART (Winnipeg North): I got this list from His Honour the Speaker. I can secure them from His Honour.

Mr. PROBE: May I, in as kindly a way as possible, draw to the attention of the committee the fact that this figure of \$138 a month does not apply right across the board.

I have before me the *Labour Gazette* for February, which discusses the case of an employee in one of the departments at Ottawa. It may or may not deal with a member of the protective staff, or anything of that sort. This deals with the claim of a widower, aged sixty-eight years, who was employed as a messenger by one of the government departments at a salary of \$89.12 a month, for a period of about a year and a half. These are the facts relating to his claim:

The claimant is a military pensioner in receipt of a pension of \$77.53 per month. On November 14, 1944, the claimant was advised that he could not receive a salary from the dominion government and at the same time draw his military pension. He was also advised that his pension would be reduced to the extent of his salary. The claimant therefore resigned voluntarily on November 14, 1944, and made application for benefit.

He was refused immediate treatment by the unemployment insurance commission, but he ultimately got it. It appears that if this man had elected to work in private industry he would have been entitled to continue to receive his pension in full as well as his salary. Had he remained with the government, in effect he would have been working for \$11.59 a month.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): Order. The item we are considering is that dealing with the estimates of the Sergeant-at-Arms and hon. members should confine their remarks to that item.

Mr. PROBE: This might well be an employee of the Sergeant-at-Arms.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): That is the item we are dealing with.

Mr. PROBE: I think this case should be investigated by the house. If he is an employee of the Sergeant-at-Arms then I am