

*Unemployment Insurance Act*

Speaker further indicated that he had some reservation as to the acceptability of motion No. 13.

Perhaps it might be simpler for me to start with motion No. 13 in this case, taking into account the fact that Mr. Speaker has indicated a caveat or a reservation as to the acceptability of that motion. In making a decision on motion No. 13, I think hon. members will later come to the same conclusion I have on motion No. 10 because of the close relationship of one amendment to the other with regard to what they both seek to achieve.

In referring to motion No. 13, Mr. Speaker made the point that it sought to go beyond the scope of the bill which is before the House at this time. That is the only argument he made at that time, but the hon. member must understand that, at the outset of any report stage debate, after a general and rapid examination of the amendments the Chair makes suggestions on groupings and on the acceptability of some of the amendments. I am sure the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and other hon. members would be the first to complain about a rigid decision at that time from the Chair without any hon. members having been heard. So I think that we can take the words of Mr. Speaker for what they are, and in the context of the time they were uttered to the House at the outset of the debate without precluding the rights of hon. members.

I am sure hon. members will agree with me that motion No. 13 suggests the elimination of subsection 36(1) of clause 11, which is really a section in the act and not in the bill in front of us, and that what the hon. member is trying to do is to eliminate a clause which has not been brought before the House for discussion or modification. If hon. members will take the time to read a citation in May's eighteenth Edition at page 508 they will find that an amendment is out of order if it is beyond the scope of a bill, irrelevant to the subject matter, or beyond the scope of the clause under consideration.

Clause 11 of the bill proposes to eliminate subsection 33(2), but there is no mention of subsection 36(1). On that ground alone I feel that motion No. 13 cannot be accepted. Although it was not mentioned by Mr. Speaker, the Chair had been concerned also about what would be achieved by the elimination of subsection 36(1), which is proposed in motion No. 13, but it had not noticed at that time that motion No. 10 was attempting to achieve the same purpose.

Because of the intricacy of the act and the difficulty for the Chair is seeing all the implications behind such a complicated piece of legislation, it was felt that instead of bringing it to the attention of hon. members early in the report stage in a procedural debate, the Chair should wait and at least invite hon. members to participate in a procedural argument when we came to motion No. 13. This debate has now come earlier because of the point of order raised by the hon. parliamentary secretary, and I am sure that even the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, who is well known for his competence in the interpretation and application of the rules of the House, and for identifying precedents upon which decisions can be made as to the acceptability of amendments, would argue with difficulty against the points which have been made by both the minister and the parliamentary secretary. The citation put

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

forward by the parliamentary secretary, citation 246 of Beauchesne, is very clear in paragraph 3, and I do not wish to read this paragraph again.

If some hon. member could have convinced me that these amendments would not bring a financial burden on the Crown, I would have been ready to let the motions come to a vote and to let the House decide. However, considering the basic principle by which a proposal, which definitely commits public money, has to be accompanied by a recommendation to support the expenditure of money, it is impossible for me to accept either of these amendments.

Just to be clear, because of everything I have said, which has been supported by arguments put forward by some hon. members and by the references to which I have referred, I declare that motions Nos. 10 and 13 are not acceptable.

We will proceed now to the consideration of motions Nos. 11 and 12 which are to be debated together and are to be disposed of by one vote on motion No. 11.

The hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) moves:

Motion No. 11.

That Bill C-69, to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971, be amended by deleting Clause 10.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) moves:

Motion No. 12.

That Bill C-69, to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971, be amended by deleting Clause 10.

**Mr. Alexander:** Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to be long with respect to my motion.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Alexander:** If I hear clapping from the other side I am likely to be extremely repetitious in terms of what I think is wrong in the thinking of the government when it comes to dealing with our senior citizens.

My motion once again registers extreme concern about the position the government, through its minister, is taking regarding our senior citizens. I am endeavouring to wipe out clause 10, with some sympathy from the minister who perhaps could show some compassion in this regard, but knowing he is involved with those in the bureaucracy who advise and counsel him, perhaps he cannot lean my way. I know that the minister has some sympathy in this regard.

● (2030)

What I should like to point out in reference to this particular clause is that in order to appease the senior citizens after having thrown them off the cliff, after having disenfranchised them regarding unemployment insurance, then the government wants to give them, as in the prior bill, a three week bonus. At the same time clause 10 amends section 31.(4) of the act to read:

Any benefit period established for a claimant under this part if not earlier terminated under this part terminates—

This is the important word, Mr. Speaker.

—terminates at the end of the week in which he attains the age of 65 years.