

Interim Supply

The Chairman: It has just been ruled that all debate on this particular matter of the allowance or disallowance of a decision taken by another legislative assembly is out of order. Consequently, I cannot permit the hon. member for Burin-Burgeo to continue his remarks on this subject.

Mr. Carter: On a point of order. I think Your Honour has misunderstood the position. I have no intention of debating the question of disallowance. I merely wanted to correct certain wrong impressions which you permitted the hon. member for Kootenay West to put on record in *Hansard*.

The Chairman: Provided the hon. member confines himself within the regulations governing our procedures and the ruling which has just been made, he may continue his remarks.

Mr. Carter: I realize that all this is out of order, but since the hon. member for Kootenay West has been out of order and placing statements on record in *Hansard* ever since I entered this chamber, I think I should be given the right to say one word.

The Chairman: It is quite impossible for the Chair to rule an hon. member out of order until he has made a statement which puts him out of order. It is quite true that the statements made by the hon. member for Kootenay West were reported in *Hansard*, but a ruling was made, and the fact that he was ruled out of order does not entitle any other hon. member of this house to make a statement which would be out of order, especially if he advises the committee in advance that his statement will be out of order. I regret that I cannot permit the hon. member to make such a statement.

Mr. Carter: I have not made any statement yet. I hope you will permit me to make one. What I was going to say was that the hon. member for Kootenay West placed on record certain statements which implied that the legislation to which he referred, and which has recently been passed in Newfoundland, took away certain rights from the citizens. I want to tell the committee that that is not the case. That legislation did not take away the rights of any citizen of Newfoundland or of Canada. It merely took away from a union the right to bargain and that, as was ably pointed out last night on television, was not a right but a monopoly.

The Chairman: I must tell the hon. member that he is at present referring to a matter which comes under the jurisdiction of another legislature and that it is not permissible for him to discuss matters which concern one of the provinces. With regret I must therefore tell him that he is out of order.

[Mr. Carter.]

Mr. Caron: Mr. Chairman, I think you will be satisfied if I begin by saying that I do not intend to follow the pattern traced by the hon. member for Kootenay West. Neither do I wish to delay the committee for very long before accepting this motion for interim supply.

May I, however, express regret that members of the civil service and especially those in the lower income brackets have not been looked after better during the past year. Many demands have been made on their behalf for increases in salary. This matter has come before the cabinet for consideration month after month, but a decision has always been delayed and nothing has been done. Meanwhile, salaries all over the country have been increased because the cost of living has increased. Employees of the government are now placed in a worse position than that of any other Canadians working at the present time. We know that post office employees all over Canada have protested. They have protested in Montreal, in Toronto and in Winnipeg and they intend to protest in Ottawa next Sunday. They have a right to ask for higher pay. There are people working for the government of Canada who are earning as little as \$2,300, \$2,500 and \$2,800 a year. There are many people earning that latter figure. This means a wage of \$40 or \$50 or \$56 a week. When one deducts income tax and other charges, one finds that the take-home pay is, in certain cases, as little as \$40 a week. For a man who is married and who has children, it is almost impossible to live on such a salary.

The recession we are encountering today cannot be compared with the recession of the thirties. When that recession was in progress, though it is true there was an increase in unemployment, there was a decrease in the cost of living. The civil servants at that time did not ask for an increase because the cost of living was so low that they were able to take advantage of the situation. But at the present time, even though there has been an increase in unemployment there has also been an increase in the cost of living, and a very marked increase, too. That is why we say that the employees in the civil service are today, because of this rise in prices, in a worse position than that of any other employees.

Today it has become almost impossible for a civil servant to live on the same level as the rest of the comparable working force in Canada. That is one of the reasons why the wives of civil servants have to leave their children in the care of others and take employment to fill the gap and supplement the low income received by their husbands. The only thing this body seeks at this time is to have