

Business of the House

figures that I used, and that I used again today. Here is the question I asked yesterday and repeated at the beginning of my motion today. I said:

As the principal reason for this country losing manufacturing jobs at the rate of 11,000 a month is that productivity here remains well below the level in the United States, thus causing our costs to be higher than theirs and making our products uncompetitive with those of our principal competitors, would the minister advise us when he intends to introduce productivity incentives to be paid in direct proportion to increases in productivity, so that we can stop this serious loss of manufacturing jobs which is going on at an annual rate of more than 100,000 jobs?

Mr. Speaker, on that very serious question, which you can hardly find more important to the country, the minister chose to ignore it. He did not deny any of the figures, and then simply told us about a new airplane that he is building.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Hees: Something that he was so proud to tell us, that it was able to stay in the air for an hour, something a little better than what the Wright brothers were able to do at Kitty Hawk 70 years ago.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, what he is objecting to are my figures, and I repeat, I say his department stated recently, "We are losing manufacturing jobs at the rate of 11,000 a month" which is 130,000 a year, very much in excess of 100,000 a year. So he is wrong, and obviously I am right.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: In any case the House will realize at once that we are locked in a classic disagreement and not a matter of either privilege or order under the circumstances.

* * *

POINT OF ORDER

MR. LANG—INCORRECT REFERENCE TO DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport and Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In answer to a question put by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) I made reference to the Department of Justice, when obviously I should have referred to the office of the Attorney General. I would like to make the record clear in that regard so there will be no misunderstanding.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I am amazed at the wondrous thin skin developed by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Horner) since he has left us.

In any event, I ask a question of the government House leader with respect to the business of the House of Commons.

[Mr. Hees.]

What is his intention for today, tomorrow and into next week, up to at least the budget? Could he at the same time designate next Monday as an allotted day in accordance with the discussions we have had?

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared to designate Monday as an allotted day. And in reply to my hon. friend's question with respect to the business of the House, I would like to advise that for this afternoon we will be continuing the discussion on Bill C-10, the child tax credit measure. At eight o'clock we will move to Bill C-14, the unemployment insurance amendments. This change in business has been worked out co-operatively in order to take into account the desire of a number of members to be present at the state dinner being held tonight in Toronto for the Prime Minister of Israel. I appreciate the co-operation that has made possible this rearranged business.

I would gather the Unemployment Insurance Act amendments will be debated for a day or so. Following that we would attempt to return to Bill C-10 if it is not completed, which is unlikely, certainly not third reading. Then we would deal with the old age security bill and the borrowing authority bill, both of which, I understand, will be returned from committee today. That, I think, will probably take us well into next week. If necessary I will add some more items to the list.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, there are two matters arising out of that answer and connected with the budget to be brought down on November 16, that is, the government's intention with respect to the carriage, and more important at the moment, the beginning of the debate on the budget.

● (1522)

I understand there is an agreement to begin the budget debate on Friday, November 17. I assume it is the intention of the government to carry it on for the balance of the week, although there might be some change in that. However, with regard to Friday, can I have the government's undertaking that it intends to begin on Friday as we discussed and, I believe, agreed?

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I propose to call the first day of the budget debate on Friday in order to give members of the opposition an early opportunity to extol the virtues of the minister's budget.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): I want to assure my friend we will not let such an opportunity pass by. The final matter is with regard to the commodity sales tax review and the reference with regard to it. As I mentioned last week, we are prepared to agree to have that reference go without debate if my friend wants to make the appropriate move. As he perhaps knows, there are over 100 briefs waiting to be considered by the committee. If he could do that today or tomorrow, it could be done without debate.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): First, Mr. Speaker, may I thank the government House leader for designating