

*Employment Support Bill***VETERANS AFFAIRS****REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF RESIDENCE RULE GOVERNING RECEIPT OF ALLOWANCES OVERSEAS**

**Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Veterans Affairs. Would the minister advise what action he has taken as a result of a resolution from the Canadian Veterans Association of the United Kingdom asking him to review the 12 months' residence clause which denies many Canadian veterans residing in the United Kingdom the right to draw war veterans allowance?

**Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, the War Veterans Allowance Act was amended in 1960 to provide for the requirement of at least one year's residence in Canada for those who want to draw benefits overseas. The reason for that was that these allowances are, of course, based on financial need and are very difficult to administer outside the country and this applies to the United Kingdom, France and all other countries in the world where our veterans are residing. This requirement does not apply, of course, to disability pensions which are based on actual disability and follow veterans everywhere they go.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I regret to bring to the attention of hon. members that the question period expired a few minutes ago. I tried to prolong it by a few minutes to give hon. members on the back benches a chance to ask their questions. I have noted those who were not called today and I will try to give them a chance tomorrow.

**Mr. Lundrigan:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise a question of privilege of very urgent importance which cannot wait until tomorrow. It involves a straightforward, simple question to the Prime Minister. I wonder whether in view of the very critical unemployment crisis facing this nation—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member appreciates that this is not a question of privilege. Essentially, he is asking that we prolong the question period to give him the opportunity to ask a question. Perhaps he might ask it tomorrow. Orders of the day.

• (3:10 p.m.)

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS****EMPLOYMENT SUPPORT BILL****MEASURE TO MITIGATE EFFECT ON CANADIAN INDUSTRY OF IMPOSITION OF FOREIGN IMPORT SURTAXES**

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-262, to support employment in Canada by mitigating the disruptive effect on Canadian industry of the imposition of foreign import surtaxes or other actions of a like effect, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

[Mr. Olson.]

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon. members will have noticed on the revised notice paper that there are four motions to amend Bill C-262, an act to support employment in Canada by mitigating the disruptive effect on Canadian industry of the imposition of foreign import surtaxes or other actions of a like effect. I have to advise hon. members that I have qualms about the procedural correctness of two of these motions. Motion No. 1, in the name of the hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan), appears, at least at first blush, to be defective in that it purports to introduce into the bill a substantive proposal to a section of the interpretation clause. While I do not wish to rule at the present time on the procedural admissibility of this motion, I would, of course, be pleased to hear argument on the point which would allow the Chair to express an opinion and to make a ruling.

Motion No. 2, in the name of the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton), also appears at first blush to be defective in that it seeks to introduce as an amendment to clause 11 of the bill a provision in relation to an income support grant to farmers and fishermen. It might well be that such a provision is beyond the scope of the bill. This is the impression I have from looking at this proposed amendment. This is why I bring the matter to the attention of hon. members, in the hope that they might be able to enlighten the Chair in this respect.

**Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley):** Mr. Speaker, since you have raised some objections to motion No. 1 standing in my name, I should like to address myself to it without the benefit of Beauchesne or May but with the benefit of what I suggest is basic common sense, though frankly I would think that that would be the guide in any interpretation, along with the discretion that Your Honour always exercises with such generosity.

Bill C-262 unabashedly does something about employment in Canada and is presented to the House because of the disruptive effect on Canadian industry of the imposition of foreign import surtaxes. I would point out to Your Honour—and this might be part of Your Honour's difficulty—that the word "industry" per se is not defined in the interpretation clause of the bill. What my amendment seeks to do is to extend the meaning of the word "manufacturer" to include with certainty the products of agriculture, fishing and I think forestry within the scope of the bill, thus making the producers of these goods eligible for application to the board.

This amendment does not establish any new principle of income support or anything like that; it merely enlarges the definition of "manufacturer". I submit to Your Honour that if the word "industry" had been defined in the bill with clarity, there might be more of a problem here. But even the use of the word "manufacturer" in the bill I suggest leaves much to be desired in terms of clarity and finality. Clause 2 defines it as an "activity in Canada whereby any goods, products, commodities or wares are made, fabricated or refined out of raw material or other substance".

Perhaps it would not be reasonable to use the word "liberal" in respect of interpretation when looking at this measure, because it contains a strict interpretation as well as a liberal interpretation. Even the word "manufacturer" leaves many things up in the air. Does an agricultural