

An hon. Member: Sit down!

Mr. Scott (Victoria-Haliburton): I will take my orders from other places. I thought the hon. member was answering the government House leader.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): There was some confusion, I admit. The hon. member for Nepean-Carleton had the floor and was talking of reform. The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard) spoke at some length on the subject of the committee that will be formed next week. Perhaps the Chair got carried away and was listening with great interest to what was being said. I agree that not enough was being said about the matter before the House, namely, the amendment to Bill C-114. However, I recognized the hon. member for Mission-Port Moody. That was done inadvertently because I did not see the hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton rise in his place.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, there are two things that I should like to deal with. First of all, it is very strange that in the middle of a discussion on Bill C-114 we got into a discussion of parliamentary reform. There is limited time for debate on this bill so I do not think it is advisable at all to stray from it. A number of members want to speak on the bill, and the subject of parliamentary reform will be dealt with at another time. If we are to continue the debate on parliamentary reform then it is proper that we hear a member of the NDP, but we are dealing with Bill C-114 and the proper method is to go from one side to the other. Consequently the next speaker should be from the official opposition.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): I have not a list of hon. members who have participated. I said that I did not see the hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton rise, and therefore inadvertently I recognized the hon. member for Mission-Port Moody. That can be withdrawn with the unanimous consent of the House.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Consent is not given, so the Chair recognizes the hon. member for Mission-Port Moody.

Mr. Rose: Mr. Speaker, I feel like the phoenix rising three times from the ashes. If the rules of relevancy were to be strictly adhered to perhaps both sides of the House would come under criticism from the Chair. I support the Chair and the decisions of the Chair. When the Chair recognizes the hon. member for Mission-Port Moody I do not quarrel with that.

There has been a great deal of wandering from the subject in a couple of the other speeches, as was pointed out by the deputy whip for the Conservative Party. I do not think that started with the government House leader. It started with the intellectual and literal, if not verbose musings of the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker), who is a very capable man. He knows how many devils can dance on the head of a pin. He can launch into great stylistic meanderings on a moment's provocation. I think it is only fitting, after all

Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971 (No. 2)

his years in the House, that he be known as "the wizzard of ooze". I am very fond of him personally, even when he makes such gross literary errors as saying that the leopard can change its stripes at any moment. That kind of allusion baffles me, but obviously it does not baffle the master of bafflegab. I think he must have provoked the government House leader, which is why the government House leader got all mixed up, took the heat off the minister of unemployment, and we went on to a debate about parliamentary reform. I think there is probably a need for that because some of us tend to, if not defame, at least deform some aspects of Parliament. We should get on with reform through a special committee, and I think all of us are looking forward to it. I was a little worried, though, about the offer of the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton to buy the government House leader a bottle of champagne. I just wondered if that might be considered by some to be payola, or something like that.

● (1510)

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Canadian champagne.

Mr. Rose: Canadian champagne. I am quite sure he did not mean it in that way at all.

Since we started out today speaking about unemployment insurance and the extension of the variable requirement, I would just like to make a couple of observations. First of all, we do not oppose the proposed extension. We are going to have a lot to say, though, when the bill is amended because we do not like the attitudes which are assumed in some of the utterances, not only of the minister but also of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in attempting to put the blame for unemployment squarely on the backs of the unemployed, or to shift the cost of unemployment off the federal government and onto provincial welfare rolls. You might be able to do that, but you cannot shift the misery of unemployment to anyone else but the unemployed.

Some people do not pay unemployment insurance whatsoever.

Mr. Nystrom: Senators.

Mr. Rose: MPs, Senators—

An hon. Member: Stanley would not let us.

Mr. Rose: —but senators do not need it. They have a lifetime job. They do not need severance pay either. But I would point out that an MP's job is one of the most insecure in the world, as perhaps at least some of us have occasion to know. The average time in office of an MP is 5.3 years, so the job security is not all that great, and perhaps we as a group should be paying unemployment insurance regardless of what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) might have said.

I am sorry the minister has gone, Mr. Speaker, not that I blame him after the last couple of exchanges. He urged us not to talk today about the level of unemployment. He asked us to