

*Family Income Security*

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Timiskaming is rising on a point of order.

**Mr. Peters:** Mr. Speaker, I am in agreement with your decision on the last motion moved under Standing Order 43 and on a number of others as well. However, it does seem to me that if members use this method in a bona fide way as a means of putting forward their point of view on a matter of extreme urgency, then there has also to be an obligation on the part of members who refuse to give unanimous consent. I think they should have to stand and object to the putting of such a motion. It seems to me that if this is not done the use of this Standing Order will become a safety valve such as the "late show" and it will lose its importance.

• (1440)

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The point made by the hon. member has been made before. What the hon. member is suggesting, effectively, is that the Standing Order should be changed. That is a possibility which might be considered by the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization. I have indeed suggested before that this Standing Order and its operation should be considered by this august body and I am sure that some day they will get around to it. For the moment I do not want to raise a fuss about the matter, particularly in relation to the hon. member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador. He was not at fault any more than others. I thought it might be a good opportunity to make my point of order, and I will be glad to listen to him now.

**Mr. Peddle:** Mr. Speaker, I would have been long since finished and we would have been halfway through the question period. In any event, the urgency of this question is that this legislation was placed on the order paper last September and allowed to die because the government would not bring it up. I will proceed to my motion. In view of the fact it appears that this legislation will be delayed much further, I move, seconded by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath):

That this House urges the government to present forthwith the legislation on family allowances; that second reading be called by no later than next Monday, and that highest priority be given its passage through the complete legislative mill to permit its earliest possible implementation.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon. members have heard a number of nays and the motion cannot be put.

\* \* \*

**CANADA LABOUR CODE**

## AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE PENSION AT AGE 55

**Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-162, to amend the Canada Labour Code (retirement plan).

**Some hon. Members:** Explain.

[Mr. Peters.]

**Mr. Thomson:** Mr. Speaker, at the present time employees who are released or leave voluntarily from a federal work or undertaking as a going concern are not entitled to pension benefits if they leave before the retirement age. The purpose of this bill is to require the employer of such an undertaking to provide to the employee at age 55 a paid-up pension after ten years of work commensurate with the number of years he was in its employ, whether he leaves voluntarily or is released by the employer, and to provide for the employee a guaranteed portion of employer's contribution to the pension plan when the employee has worked over five but less than ten years.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

## AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE PENSION ON PERMANENT CLOSING OF UNDERTAKINGS

**Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-163, to amend the Canada Labour Code (pension on permanent closing).

**Some hon. Members:** Explain.

**Mr. Thomson:** Mr. Speaker, at the present time employees with many years of service are subject to losing pension rights when an undertaking permanently closes. The purpose of this bill is to require the employer of such an undertaking, when it is permanently closed, to provide for the employee at age 55 a pension commensurate with the number of years he was in its employ.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

**QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER**

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

## DEPARTMENT OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT—EMPLOYMENT OF MR. HILDING FRANSON

Question No. 6—**Mr. McIntosh:**

1. During the past two years that Mr. Hilding Franson was employed by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, was the Minister aware that in this same period Mr. Franson was also in the employ of an engineering firm known as EPEC and, if so (a) what salary was Mr. Franson paid by the Department (b) was the Department officially notified that Mr. Franson was working on behalf of a private firm while he was with the Department?

2. Did the Regina engineering firm of EPEC have any contracts with the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and DREE and, if so, what was the nature of each contract?

3. Have any complaints been received by the Minister or the Department from other engineering firms regarding the dual capacity of Mr. Franson in dealing with government contracts?

4. (a) Was an investigation carried out to ascertain if other departmental employees were involved or associated with such transactions (b) was disciplinary action necessary and, if so, what was the nature of any such disciplinary action?