

Business of the House

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have noted the suggestions made by hon. members and I can assure them that I agree with nearly everything that has been said these last few minutes.

[English]

I am in full agreement with many of these points, some of which have been made before. However, hon. members will appreciate that if the question period is to be lengthened or shortened, it is not for the Speaker to decide; that should be done by agreement between hon. members following discussion before the relevant and responsible committee.

The hon. member for Lotbinière referred to a very serious problem which came up today, that is the number of supplementaries on the first questions. If hon. members insist on asking four, five, six or more supplementary questions on the first or second matter brought up, and very often these are by members of the front bench, it is just about impossible for hon. members behind them to be given an opportunity to ask questions.

Mr. McCleave: Cut them off.

Mr. Speaker: The suggestion is made that they be cut off, and I have sometimes tried to do that but it is difficult without the co-operation of hon. members themselves. I would hope that co-operation will be extended, and I can assure hon. members that from day to day I shall continue to try to permit as many of them as I can to ask their questions. What I have tried to do for some time is to ensure that hon. members who are not recognized on one day be given priority the next. That is what I tried to do today, although I may not have been entirely successful. I did attempt it, however, and I shall continue to do so.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order in connection with the Business of the House to advise hon. members that we will continue with the committee discussion of the present bill tomorrow and next week until Wednesday or Thursday, when I intend to call opposition days.

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the hon. House leader. Since the members of my party have drawn straws and I picked the one that calls upon me to open the debate on the next group of clauses of Bill C-259, could the minister indicate what sections we will deal with after section 4 to 8.

Perhaps the President of the Privy Council would not mind if I state, on behalf of all members who want to take part in the debate when we are in committee, what I think is a legitimate grievance. It is felt that there should be some method or perhaps a better method of communication with reference to the specific point to be discussed. If we could have some listing, even five or six categories ahead, that would make it much easier for those who, like myself, are stuck with the rather awful responsibility. I

know my friend from Winnipeg North Centre and others would agree with me.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I agree with my hon. friend, and I think his point is well taken, that in view of the procedure we are following in committee of the whole, members should have some advance warning as to the various items to be discussed. We are attempting to do this but we are really just getting this particular system under way.

In reply, and with your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, I should like to advise my hon. friend that committee of the whole is to deal with proposed sections 4 to 8 on the question of computation of income. It was proposed and agreed that following this we would deal with other subjects under the general head of personal income, and call the appropriate sections that would permit a discussion of these other items. This would include, for example, averaging, rate schedules, child care, moving expenses, fellowships, training allowances, research grants and generally any other item that would fall under the heading of personal income. The subjects I have mentioned are those singled out by the House leaders as those upon which hon. members might want to comment in a particular way. That is what we would do in committee today and tomorrow.

Mr. McCleave: When we are through with sections 4 to 8, then, which sections do we deal with in the next three categories? Let me put it on a very specified basis.

Mr. MacEachen: After sections 4 to 8, in order to deal, for example, with income averaging we would call perhaps section 28 upon which to hinge the discussion. But there are other proposed sections which deal with the same subject.

Mr. McCleave: My friend is saying section 58 plus allied sections dealing with averaging?

Mr. MacEachen: Under income averaging, proposed section 28 with associated sections. The rate schedule is proposed section 117 and associated proposed sections. I could give my hon. friend—

Mr. McCleave: Child care is section 63?

Mr. MacEachen: Section 56, for example, would permit us to discuss fellowships, scholarships, bursaries, training allowances and research grants. We would call proposed section 56 and hinge the discussion around that section and carry all allied sections under the same system.

Having given my hon. friend that kind of information, I hope to be able to do it on a more systematic basis and have in the hands of all hon. members sheets which will indicate the subject matters that the House leaders have highlighted, presumably to carry forward the wishes of the various parties and the allied sections that would be carried in connection with that subject head.

• (3:20 p.m.)

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Speaker, at the risk of being a bore, may I ask another question? I think my hon. friend indicated that after the averaging provisions, found in section 28 and further on, and the rate schedules, which involve eight schedules to be found at section 117 and