

Order Paper Questions

SUPPLY AND SERVICES—DISTRIBUTION OF BRIEF CASES AND PORTFOLIOS

Question No. 3,247—**Mr. Reynolds:**

1. Do the Department of Supply and Services Regional Supply Centres stock and distribute brief cases and portfolios that in turn are supplied to departments?

2. Are the brief cases supplied free of charge to employees and, if so, what is the annual cost to the government?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): 1. Yes.

2. Distribution is made against customer department's requisition and at an established price per unit. It is the general practice for departments in turn to make these brief cases and portfolios available to their employees requiring them on an accountable loan basis, or for use as and when required by the nature of their duties. The annual cost of reprovisioning brief cases and portfolios is approximately \$150,000.

INDUSTRY, TRADE AND COMMERCE—RENOVATION AND REFURBISHING OF OFFICES

Question No. 3,279—**Mr. Coates:**

Has the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce recently selected a person whose main responsibility will be the renovation and refurbishing of offices within the Department and, if so, what is the (a) name (b) classification (c) annual salary of the person?

Mr. Marcel Roy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): In so far as Industry, Trade and Commerce is concerned: 1. Yes, main responsibilities are: (i) To advise on the planning and layout of offices and work areas in various branches of the department commensurate with maximum operating efficiency. (ii) To sketch, prepare plans and present colour schematics. (iii) To research and select furniture and furnishings available and prepare cost summaries for office accommodation. (a) Miss Louise McLaren. (b) Equivalent to GT 2. (c) Six month contract at the rate of \$1,000 per month.

[*Translation*]

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: Do the remaining questions stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*English*]

Mr. Crouse: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Again I must bring to the attention of the House the fact that on June 20 I placed question No. 2,833 on the order paper, asking what consultants had been hired in the fisheries and marine service of the Department of the Environment in the last two years, their names, salaries, duties, length of employment, and whether public tenders were called before they were hired. It does not seem an impossible question to answer, and I wonder why the government has taken this long to secure an answer.

[*Mr. Goyer.*]

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, I can indicate to the hon. member that his question is being revised and the answer will be forthcoming in a short time.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—ALLEGED GOVERNMENT FAILURE TO COMBAT INFLATION

On the order: Business of Supply—First votable motion for the supply period ending December 10, 1975.

November 13, 1975—That this House rejects the government's anti-inflationary program because it is totally unworkable in terms of controlling prices, because it provides no effective control over profits or professional incomes, and because it is completely unfair to wage and salary earners in Canada—**Mr. Broadbent.**

Mr. Speaker: Before putting the motion, I note that at least to this point no point of order has been raised about it. The use of the allotted day, as we know it now, is of quite recent duration. To my knowledge, it is not, therefore, the subject of any precedents concerning the motion put forward on an allotted day in so far as it may conflict with the usual business of the House or relate to it. There are precedents, of course, that no motion ought to be put before the House which anticipates other business before the House; as well, that the House ought not to pronounce itself on any question upon which it has already pronounced itself.

There was obvious reference to this program in Bill C-73 which has just received second reading and is before the standing committee. That would raise some question, I am sure, as to whether or not, in voting on second reading of that bill, the House has already pronounced itself on the question. There is, of course, the counter-argument that this motion is of broader scope than that particular bill. That may be so. In addition, there is the reverse of that proposition, that when the House pronounces itself on this motion at the end of today, or at 9.45 p.m. Monday evening when the vote takes place, the question may then come up as to whether or not the House, having pronounced itself in that fashion, is precluded from taking any other kind of vote in respect of Bill C-73. That becomes an even more interesting question if one reflects that this motion is broader in scope than the bill.

The fact is that the opposition prerogative, as I think all hon. members would agree, is very broad in the use of the allotted day and ought not to be interfered with. It certainly is not the disposition of the Chair to interfere with it except on the clearest and most certain procedural grounds. I feel it only fair to indicate that the closeness and similarity of the subject matter of this motion and the bill require a caveat from the Chair that under no circumstances could the consideration of this motion or the vote upon this motion at 9.45 p.m. Monday evening be taken in any way to prejudice the progress of Bill C-73.