

No. 225

JOURNALS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF CANADA

OTTAWA, MONDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1975

2.00 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale), seconded by Mr. Drury, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-80, An Act to provide supplementary borrowing authority for public works and general purposes, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

The Order being read for the consideration of the report stage of Bill C-69, An Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration;

STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: Consideration has been given to a number of motions which were Tabled at the report stage. Two, it seems, of the 22 motions which are before the House for consideration appear to be out of order, and perhaps the questions of procedure involved could be discussed when we come to them. I refer to Motions numbered 4 and 6. These two Motions appear to the Chair to introduce into the Bill a concept larger than that originally envisaged in the Royal Recommendation in that they would extend the qualifying period to those who are on strike lawfully and to those who are out of work for the purpose of establishing a self-employed operation. Both would appear to

increase benefits by extending the period of qualification. When these Motions are called, honourable Members might be prepared to put forward arguments addressed to the procedural aspects.

Furthermore, the Chair has some concern about Motion numbered 13 in that it appears, by way of amendment, to delete a section which is not proposed to be deleted by the Bill. However, there is the fact that Clause 11 proposes to amend a very similar subclause of the Bill regarding the initial benefit period, and the amendment would delete a second or a different section, but a similar kind of prohibition, with respect to the extended benefit period. It may be that by argument and explanation the Motion can be shown to be in fact in order. I simply caution that when Motion numbered 13 is called, there ought to be some attention paid on both sides to the procedural argument. On balance, it would seem to the Chair that the Motion should probably stand, but there may be a question whether or not it goes beyond the scope of the Bill. The two provisions seem to me to be so related that probably the Motion should stand, but I would simply suggest that when Motion numbered 4 is called there ought to be an argument about the procedural regularity of Motions numbered 4 and 6. When Motion numbered 13 is called it ought to be argued procedurally as well.