

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, June 23, 1977

The House met at 11 a.m.

• (1110)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

EMPLOYMENT AND IMMIGRATION REORGANIZATION ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT AND
IMMIGRATION, ETC.

The House resumed, from Tuesday, June 21, consideration of Bill C-27, to establish the Department of Employment and Immigration, the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission, the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission and the Canada Employment and Immigration Advisory Council, to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971, and to amend certain other statutes in consequence thereof, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. Rodriguez: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. When Your Honour outlined the groupings of motions for debate, it was indicated that members could review the arrangement. Your Honour had indicated that motions Nos. 7, 8, 9, 10, 22, 15, 29, 30 and 32 would be debated together. Upon review, I note that motions Nos. 7, 8, 9, 10 and 22 deal with the subject of the minor attachment period going from the present eight weeks to a range of ten to 14 weeks, while motions Nos. 15, 29, 30 and 32 deal with the length of the benefit period.

I would suggest that motions Nos. 7, 8, 9, 10 and 22 deal with a topic that is separate and apart from the length of the benefit period dealt with in motions Nos. 15, 29, 30 and 32. I would draw to Your Honour's attention the possibility of splitting that grouping and putting motions Nos. 7, 8, 9, 10 and 22 together in one group, and Nos. 15, 29, 30 and 32, and No. 11 which you had indicated to be separate, could be put with the latter group for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We are in some difficulty because we are in the midst of debating motion No. 7 under that proposed grouping, and I would not want to do anything that might prejudice the contributions that have already been made to the debate. I do not think, either, that it would be appropriate to give those who have already spoken on motion No. 7 under that grouping a chance to speak again on the second grouping.

On the other hand, it is never the intention of the Chair to attempt to compel members unduly to speak on a subject that might not be convenient to them. Since we are continuing consideration of that motion, I think I would have to give this suggestion some thought. Had we not already launched upon this discussion, my basic inclination would be, of course, to accede to the request of the hon. member. The whole purpose of this is to try to make debate more meaningful for members, certainly not to cut short any contributions to be made by members.

I would want to reflect on whether we might create some difficulty by giving members who have already spoken a chance to speak again and in some way prejudice the contributions that have already been made.

Mr. Symes: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, as I recall, when we last debated this matter the two or three speeches made at that time only dealt with motion No. 7 and not the topics covered in the other motions. I do not think we would have a problem of repetition or prejudicing what has already been said.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I would also point out that only two members have spoken thus far, the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) and the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes), although the member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) had just started. Since the hon. member for Nickel Belt proposes including motion No. 11 in one of the groups, I think the problem of members speaking again is not a very serious one.

Mr. Speaker: My inclination would always be to accede to the request of hon. members that the grouping proposed by the Chair be adjusted as we go along in order to give effect to the desire of members to debate these motions intelligently. In view of the fact that I had indicated initially that while this rather broad grouping might be taken together for purposes of discussion, even under that arrangement the question would first be put on motion No. 7 and that would dispose of the grouping except for motions Nos. 8 and 10. I have already indicated something close to the division, at least for the purposes of voting, envisaged by the hon. member.

I would think we ought to be able to accede to the hon. member's request, and if there is no objection I propose to go ahead with that grouping and therefore consider that the discussion now continuing on motion No. 7 be considered as discussion on motions Nos. 7, 8, 9, 10 and 22. I did not understand the hon. member for Nickel Belt to include motion No. 11 in that grouping.

Mr. Rodriguez: No.