

[Translation]

Mr. Chairman, since I have convinced the opposition, I shall say no more. But I feel it would be extremely serious to accept such an amendment, because, for one thing, it is partly useless and secondly, which is serious, it destroys the very nature of advisory councils. I therefore think that the committee should reject the amendment.

[English]

Mr. Starr: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the minister a question. How different is this procedure in respect of the council from the procedure under the unemployment insurance advisory board legislation?

Mr. Marchand: I think that the advisory board makes recommendations mainly on financial matters.

Mr. Starr: No.

Mr. Marchand: It can go further than that, but usually they only make recommendations when there is a consensus. The labour organizations are directly represented on the board, and that board is much more balanced than this type of board. It is the duty of this advisory board to advise the minister and even the House of Commons, and in that case I think the procedure is normal.

There are also financial considerations. If, for example, the level of benefits is raised, that is an important matter for the house. The other board does not have such financial responsibility, and that is why the procedure is different.

● (9:10 p.m.)

Mr. Starr: They do not raise the level of benefits.

Mr. Marchand: No, no; but they can recommend it to the house—

Mr. Starr: Can these people recommend benefits?

Mr. Marchand: Through the minister, to the house.

Mr. Starr: Can this board recommend certain aspects?

Mr. Marchand: I think it could. I think that these advisory boards are very well integrated into the structure of the department and to accept this amendment would be to destroy

Manpower and Immigration Council

the value of these boards. I will tell my hon. friend something that is very simple. Supposing that tomorrow I nominated a chairman, or supposing that this government nominates a chairman—

An hon. Member: Why not nominate the hon. member for Timiskaming?

Mr. Marchand:—and then, suppose that another party is in power here; this chairman may decide to embarrass the government with this council. That is not the purpose here. This body is to help the minister, not to fight him.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Marchand: Yes. That is the purpose. The purpose of this body is to help the minister so that the law is properly applied. That is why I believe this amendment to be bad. It will not do anything. If it does something, it will be to the detriment of the good administration of the law.

Mr. Benson: Question.

The Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

Amendment (Mr. McCleave) negatived: yeas, 41; nays, 70.

The Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Shall clause 1 carry?

Clause 1 agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When shall the bill be read a third time?

Mr. Starr: At the next sitting of the house.

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Speaker, may we have the unanimous consent of the house to proceed with third reading?

Mr. Monteith: No, let us stick to the rules.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Unanimous consent of the house is required for third reading at this time. Does the house give that unanimous consent?

Mr. Starr: At the next sitting of the house.