

Employment Equity Act

motions I have reintroduced here at report stage, that were defeated in the committee, are all of exceptional significance.

I note that you said at the end of your comments in this respect that: "— it must be clear that the Chair cannot accept to put to the House all the motions mentioned." This indicates to me that you might not be following the rule which is in the Standing Orders, but some sort of quota system. It would seem to me that if none of the motions which were defeated in committee are of exceptional significance, none of them should be allowed. On the other hand, if there are four or five such motions put forward and they are all of exceptional significance, then they should be accepted. I agree that this type of guideline puts the Speaker in a very difficult position because he is not always able to closely follow the debates in committee and in the House. Since we deal with such a wide range of questions, how is the Speaker to know what is of exceptional significance? I can only say that in interpreting this new guideline in the rule I hope you would give it broad interpretation and err on the side of permitting the motion that was defeated in the committee rather than keeping it out. If you do not do that, I suggest Hon. Members will begin to keep most of our key amendments for the report stage and not take a chance. I suggest this will simply clog the House with far more motions than you would otherwise get.

It has been my experience so far with the new legislative committees that little attention is paid to them. It is very difficult to reach the public in those committees because they are not covered by the press or television. In other words, one cannot have the impact on public opinion; whereas we can have impact to a certain extent in the House. If Members believe that every time they put a motion in the legislative committee and it is defeated it cannot be dealt with here, they will simply reserve and put them here. Therefore, I would argue for a broad interpretation of that rule.

You also stated in your ruling that it would be your intention to rule these motions out of order and you referred Hon. Members to Citation 773(10) of *Beauchesne's Fifth Edition*. That citation reads as follows:

A substantive amendment may not be introduced by way of a modification to the interpretation clause of a bill.

● (1520)

I would argue that two of the motions to amend which you say you intend to rule out of order are not substantive amendments to the interpretation clause because the interpretation clause of the Bill simply says:

"employer" means any person who employs one hundred or more employees—

We simply changed the number from 100 to 25. So we are not really changing the substance of the interpretation section but suggesting simply that the level be changed. I would ask you to reconsider that submission.

Finally, in point 13 of your ruling you say:

Motion numbered 33A would have the effect of enlarging the duties of the Human Rights Commission by making it a partner with the Minister in the preparation of reports under the provisions of the Bill.

In committee the Government agreed to an amendment which brought in the operation of the Human Rights Commission. After it had originally drafted the Bill and the Bill had gone to committee, the Government agreed to an amendment to the Bill to mention the Human Rights Commission and to bring it in as a partner. All we are doing simply is refining that new provision which the Government itself provided. I would respectfully ask that the Chair give some consideration to the points I have made.

Mr. Speaker: I will, of course. My dilemma, as the Hon. Member well knows, is that although I was happy to hear him on the selection question, he has continued beyond the selection question into his concerns about particular procedural arguments, which I had indicated I thought Hon. Members would prefer to make when the matter is next called.

However, I am perfectly happy to hear other Hon. Members on the procedural admissibility question now, if they want to be heard, or to proceed with Motion No. 1 and those motions which have been ruled in order for those Hon. Members who may wish to take a little time and make argument when we call the Bill again. I am perfectly prepared to hear argument now if the Parliamentary Secretary is ready to respond.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask for a point of clarification, Mr. Speaker? Did I understand the Chair to say that Motion No. 21A has been ruled on?

Mr. Speaker: I did indicate that I found it in order and subject to a debate and vote. Does the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary wish to make an argument that Motion No. 21A is out of order?

Mr. Lewis: I just wanted to clarify the position on Motion No. 21A. Motion No. 21 has been withdrawn and the Chair has ruled on Motion No. 21A, then.

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: Thank you very much. If Motion No. 13 has been withdrawn, that leaves for discussion the matter of whether or not Motions Nos. 13A and 15 should be proceeded with.

Mr. Speaker: Yes. Motions Nos. 13A and 15 are two of the motions which were defeated in committee. I have not yet made a ruling as to the procedural admissibility or inadmissibility of any of the motions which were defeated in committee. If the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary wishes to make a procedural argument that, even if they were to be considered significant, they should be regarded as inadmissible on other grounds, I have not reached that stage. Does the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary wish to make that argument now or wait?

Mr. Lewis: I am prepared to wait.