Supply

I say will not make an impression, not just on me, but on anybody.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I meant to raise this point of order when the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary was speaking, but I did not have an opportunity. I would like to refer you to S.O. 82(14) which says:

Following the speech of each Member, a period not exceeding ten minutes shall be made available, if required, to allow Members—

Members in the plural, Mr. Speaker.

—to ask questions and comment briefly on matters relevant to the speech and to allow responses thereto.

I felt the type of intervention being made by the Parliamentary Secretary completely violated the spirit of that Standing Order. I would ask that in the future when people rise to ask questions and make comments we have them comply with the rule in Standing Order 82(14).

Mr. de Jong: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I wish as well to draw the same matter to your attention. It seems to me in the past while that Parliamentary Secretaries particularly have been using the occasion of the 10 minute period after a Member has given an address to use most of the 10 minutes as a rebuttal. Very often government Members will not give speeches but will bootleg their ideas in the 10 minute question and answer period. Very often the speakers themselves do not have the opportunity to rebut the points made by Government Members, and in particular Parliamentary Secretaries. I think it goes against the very spirit of this important parliamentary reform. I think it is important that the Chair study this matter with some care and advise Members of the intent of our Standing Orders, particularly Government Members, when it appears as though they are using most of the 10 minute period to make short speeches.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Let me deal briefly with both Hon. Members' points of order. The Hon. Member for Dollard (Mr. Weiner) has the right like anyone else to make his comments. I found them a bit long. That is why I intervened. We must also remember that in that particular case the Chair saw only one other Member in the House who was ready to ask a question or make a comment.

Mr. Valcourt: Exactly.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It depends on each question. I realize 10 minutes is allowed for questions or comments. If the Chair sees many Members stand who wish to speak, the Chair tends to cut off Members more abruptly. In this case, I wanted to give the time to the Hon. Member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East (Mr. Allmand) who I saw rising at the same time as the Parliamentary Secretary. I will make sure that the Hon. Member for Windsor—Walkerville (Mr. McCurdy) gets at least equal time for reply. On a question or a comment, the Hon. Member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East.

(1550)

Mr. Allmand: I was rising for debate.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We are still on questions or comments. I will recognize the Hon. Member for Regina East (Mr. de Jong).

Mr. de Jong: I would lke to address a question to my colleague. It was important that he pointed out that he is not opposed to job creation efforts of the private sector. In Saskatchewan we have had a Conservative Government since 1982 and we have seen a steady erosion of support to social agencies, organizations that help the handicapped and the mentally retarded and help kids go to summer camp. Traditionally university and high school students have been able to find work during the summer doing important social services in the community. These students have been able to earn income to enable them to go back to university by providing important services. We are now in a period of cut-backs to social services and job creation programs which help people involved in social services. Does my colleague not find it shameful that there are cut-backs, not only to human services for the disadvantaged in our communities but also to summer employment programs which have also traditionally helped the underprivileged?

Mr. McCurdy: Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize what my colleague said about our Party's attitude on job-creation programs of small business. We must focus upon the fact that, as the internal report of the Department of Employment and Immigration demonstrated, in so many instances Challenge '86 is funding jobs which would have existed anyway. It is incumbent upon the Government to demonstrate that, with respect to private enterprise jobs, career-oriented opportunities will be created and that these will not be at the expense of full-time workers.

Anyone who has contemplated the future knows that there will have to be a re-examination of our concept of useful work. Young people across the country were aware that their contributions in terms of human health services are just as valuable as those of computer programmers, carpenters, politicians, and any of the other previously recognized jobs. There must be a recognition that the future must involve the enhancement of opportunities for useful work in providing needed human services. The Government has failed to anticipate that. If the Government had listened to youth, it might have learned that.

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party fully supports the motion before the House which condemns the Government's policy with respect to summer employment. With respect to summer employment, the Conservative Party is misdirected, inadequate, short-sighted, cruel and contradictory. I will deal with each of those points in turn during my remarks.

The disaster in summer employment policy is only part of the Government's disregard for youth. Right after the election