

and also in Committee of the Whole, I find it extraordinary in light of the practice that goes on in Westminster that the Deputy Speaker should vote in a partisan way.

I raise this as a matter of reflection in the same way my colleagues have on the practices of the Chair. I am not calling into question the motives or the attitude of the Deputy Speaker. I am calling into question a severe censure of the practice of the Deputy Speaker presiding in your chair, in the chair of the Deputy Speaker, and then voting on behalf of the government at all times.

The British House arrange their matters differently.

Since the committee on procedure is now sitting, it might look very carefully at the practice there and improve the procedure here.

[Translation]

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): In fact, the hon. member recognizes that there is full justification for what occurred under our rules. He is arguing for a change in the rules of the House. I cannot share his views for the moment. However, I invite him to make his views known to those of his colleagues who are knowledgeable in procedural matters and who were chosen to sit on this very important special committee which will deal with parliamentary reform. At that time, his views can be seriously considered.

[English]

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Lincoln): Madam Speaker, I rise on the point of order, which relates to the intervention of a former Speaker of the House of Commons, whose views I respect. I say that quite sincerely. However, I am at a loss to understand why this point is being raised.

I want to ask for clarification in light of the fact that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole acts in that capacity and sometimes acts in the capacity of Speaker. Those are two entirely different roles.

Second, the hon. member went to great lengths to elaborate that he was not in any way casting reflection on the integrity of the hon. member. I then ask him, what is the point? When the hon. member in the role of Deputy Speaker becomes the Speaker, we agree with that. He is bound by the rules in order to limit, or expand if you like, the parameters in which the Speaker can perform his or her duty. In other instances, the Deputy Speaker or the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole acts in the capacity of Chairman of the Committee of the Whole with a different set of criteria.

The point I am getting at is that those watching this very interesting, or perhaps not so interesting, debate could be left unintentionally with the feeling that somehow we are questioning the integrity of the member, that somehow the member cannot play both roles. They might not quite appreciate that he is bound by two sets of criteria, two sets of precedents, two sets of rules.

National Training Act

Frankly, I am at a loss to follow the point the hon. member has made. It may be that in the mother of Parliaments they treat things differently. However, we are talking of this Parliament. Never in all my years in this House have I heard that point of order raised. Whether we like it or not, it does infer an inability of the hon. member to abide by the rules.

Madam Speaker: Order. I have to stop this debate. If hon. members want to discuss changes that we might make in future in the rules or practices of the House, there is a standing committee of the House of Commons set up specifically for that purpose. It is quite clear that the Deputy Speaker acted according to our practices. I agree with the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) that the practices in Westminster are different. We are sitting in this Parliament. The hon. Deputy Speaker has acted within the confines of our own practices and traditions.

• (1600)

An hon. Member: Madam Speaker—

Madam Speaker: That is fine. It might be with you, but I think it is quite clear that those are our practices.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

NATIONAL TRAINING ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House proceeded to the consideration of the report stage of Bill C-115, to establish a national program for occupational training, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Employment and Immigration) moved:

Motion No. 1

Bill C-115, An Act to establish a national program for occupational training, be amended in Clause 2 by striking out line 13 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

“thereby, declare, by order, any occupation to be an”.

He said: Madam Speaker, I thought that in the report stage this amendment would require some small explanation. In the discussions I had in the other place during committee hearings that they were holding on this bill, it was brought to my attention by Senator Tremblay that in the opening of Clause 2, where we have the designation of occupation, unless we were to make a slight amendment to it, it meant that we could not redesignate an occupation. By introducing the words “by order,” “par ordinance”, we therefore have the power to designate an occupation or to change an occupation. It is a technical amendment, Mr. Speaker, that I would commend to the House during this report stage.