

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.
And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 75 (11), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred. Accordingly, this would also postpone a division on motion No. 2, which will stand deferred.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, are you not going to put the question on motion No. 2?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We are having a procedural difficulty. The hon. member will agree with me that if motion No. 1 had been accepted by the House, there would not be a clause 1 in the bill, so motion No. 2 could not be put. We have to wait and see what happens to motion No. 1 before we can make a decision on motion No. 2. If the hon. member agrees with this, we will defer putting the question on motion No. 2. This is my opinion, but I am prepared to receive the opinions of hon. members.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I just thought the point should be made so that we will have the right, when the vote on motion No. 1 is taken, then to call a vote on motion No. 2 if motion No. 1 is defeated.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is one other point I wish to bring to the attention of hon. members. When he was in the Chair, Mr. Speaker suggested some groupings but he forgot to say anything about motions Nos. 3 and 5, appearing in the name of the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander), which attempt to achieve the same purpose, to exclude people under sentence from the provisions of the act. I suppose the hon. member would agree that both of them could be debated together, and that one vote on motion No. 3 would automatically decide motion No. 5. Is that agreed?

Mr. Alexander: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) moves:
Motion No. 3.

That Bill C-69, an act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971, be amended in clause 4 by striking out lines 22 to 24 inclusive at page 2.

Motion No. 5.

That Bill C-69, an act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971, be amended in clause 5 by striking out lines 19 to 21 inclusive at page 3.

Unemployment Insurance Act

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, in prefacing my more concrete remarks I would say, without imputing motives, that any hon. member using his mind or his mouth to vote against this must have rocks in his head. It is my conclusion that, through implication, the government has indicated that crime does pay. Let us consider a hypothetical situation, a person who is a law-abiding citizen who, through the good graces of the work ethic, acquires an eligibility period and then goes sour for some reason or another. I cannot imagine a situation whereby he may go sour—but he then goes to jail.

The government says that after he comes out of jail he is entitled to pick up his eligibility period, because the government has now extended it to cover the amount of time he spent in jail. When I think of what the government has done with respect to our senior citizens, by indicating that it wants to remove them from the work force and thus from taking advantage of unemployment insurance, and on the other hand then saying that if a person commits a crime—and I am not talking about the merits—he is to be allowed subsequent to his release to pick up where he left off, I wonder what kind of nonsense this is.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Alexander: The government now says there should be a moratorium. If a chap goes to jail, I do not hear mortgagees saying that they are very sorry and that because he has gone to jail they will not call for payments. Can the minister advise me of any organization or institution which has moved into this area? Of course he cannot. I do not hear of banks, as a result of their loans which demand repayment, saying, "Gee, we are not sorry you stole from 'X' bank and not from us. We appreciate that, and as a result of this kindness we will not call for the repayment of the loan while you are in jail." They do not give a moratorium; you pay a penalty.

I get a little worried about this government. If a person, through a quirk of fate, ends up in jail, finance companies still want their money. All these institutions to which I have just referred demand payment and there is a penalty involved.

Mr. Rodriguez: That is ridiculous.

Mr. Alexander: There is my socialist friend with his big mouth. The hon. member, I am sure, will debate this point in his usual—

Mr. Rodriguez: Wise way.

Mr. Alexander:—wisecracky way, and he will be given that opportunity; but in the meantime I should like to finish. I am not trying to filibuster this bill because, unlike my hon. friend, I will make my point in a very short space of time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Alexander: However, the hon. member will go on for days being repetitious and bringing in a whole lot of nonsense and extraneous material, and we will all have to sit and listen.

As I was saying, I think I have made my point. We must be concerned about what this government is attempting to