

*Unemployment Insurance Act*

Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, and motion No. 1 (Mr. Leggatt).

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. What happened to the understanding of yesterday that at this point we would debate the procedural acceptability of certain motions?

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) is quite right. I did not have any other indication from any of the proponents of those motions, but if any of them are now prepared to debate the procedural regularity of their motions, I would be glad to hear them.

In order, they would begin with motion No. 11 which I understand may be the subject of an application by the government for consent at some time during the course of the proceeding. Motion No. 12?

[*Translation*]

As regards motion No. 27 standing in the name of the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Lavoie), I think it is only a matter of procedure.

**Mr. Jacques Lavoie (Hochelaga):** Mr. Speaker, I am willing to discuss the procedure at any time the Chair will consider appropriate. However I would like to discuss it clearly because I am told that motions Nos. 11, 27 and 30 go beyond the scope of the bill. That is why hon. members will realize, when I have an opportunity to explain my amendment, that it does not go beyond the bill, but goes in the same direction and would prevent the gaps that would appear should clause 14 and part VIII of the act be adopted the way they stand now. I think they could lead to injustices against workers and unemployed people. That is why I moved that amendment. That is why I introduced this amendment.

Now, as to the procedural aspect, I shall wait until Your Honour permits me to elaborate further.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member is certainly aware that motion No. 27 raises a number of procedural difficulties. The time has now come for the hon. member to support exclusively the procedural aspect of his motion.

**Mr. Lavoie:** Concerning this motion, Mr. Speaker, it is said that the purpose of this bill is to save money, which is understandable. The benefits are cut from 66½ per cent to 60 per cent. I suggest that if an unemployed person is paid, say, \$100 a week and receives unemployment insurance benefits, his or her hourly wages be set at \$5 over a 20-hour work week. We are all aware of the Canada Works program. The Canadian government is generous but very often the funds handed over are not adequate. That is not the fault of the government. However, the assistance those projects give the people is considerable. The amendment is intended to require of the people that they work on those projects, and work their full 20 hours a week, or where 30 hours are required, 30 hours. There

[Mr. Lavoie.]

might be other solutions as well; perhaps the minister could find something other than the Canada Works program. That seems logical to me. In that way, as I said in the House yesterday, instead of having unemployment insurance we would have employment insurance. That is the purpose of the amendment. I do not want to demolish the whole bill though, I realize this plays havoc with a good part of it. But I think that amendment is very logical, and if something else is wanted, if someone wants to move a subamendment, I am quite willing to discuss the matter.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member understands full well, I am sure, that he is suggesting the addition of a clause 141. The motion reads as follows:

The said act is further amended—

Very strict limitations apply to any bill intended to amend existing legislation. One of those is very clear and stipulates that a motion can never amend the present statute, unless the pertinent sections are already now being amended or changed by the bill before the House.

[*English*]

The hon. member seeks the occasion to add a clause to the bill which in its very language indicates that the said act is further amended. It further amends the parent statute, and the language is an indication that the hon. member is seeking to go beyond the scope of an amending statute.

The hon. member will understand that the scope of an amending statute, as is Bill C-14, is limited to the clauses which it seeks to amend in its text. For the hon. member, as he is doing now, to seek to add another amendment which is not contained in the clauses of Bill C-14, and in addition which seeks to introduce a new concept, that is, the concept of requiring that every beneficiary or claimant shall first accept a direction by the minister to perform some kind of work or endeavour, is an idea which is not contained in the amending statute, Bill C-14.

In the first place, the hon. member is seeking to amend the act in a way in which it is not amended by Bill C-14. In the second place, and in any event, he is introducing a totally new concept, that of having to obey a direction of the minister before becoming a claimant. Therefore, I must conclude that the hon. member has gone beyond the scope of Bill C-14, and that motion No. 27 is out of order.

Motion No. 30 is in the name of the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Clarke). The hon. member for York-Scarborough (Mr. McCrossan).

**Mr. Paul McCrossan (York-Scarborough):** Mr. Speaker, when Your Honour called motion No. 12 earlier, I did not realize I had to jump in at that point. I hope I will be allowed to speak to motion No. 12 for a second because there is a simple remedy to it.

As Mr. Speaker will no doubt have observed, the effects of motions Nos. 7 and 14 are the very same as motion No. 12. Our purpose in submitting motion No. 12 was to enable us to