

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Are there any objections? There are no objections.

Motion No. 1 (Mr. Alexander) agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Motions 5 and 6 have been grouped for debate. The House will now consider them.

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West) moved motion No. 5:

That Bill C-27, an act to establish the Department of Employment and Immigration, the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission and the Canada Employment and Immigration Advisory Council, to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971, and to amend certain other statutes in consequence thereof, be amended in clause 27 by striking out lines 30 to 32 at page 11 and substituting the following therefor:

“(g) any employment provided under clause 41, section 38 thereof”.

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt) moved motion No. 6:

That Bill C-27, an act to establish the Department of Employment and Immigration, the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission and the Canada Employment and Immigration Advisory Council, to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971, and to amend certain other statutes in consequence thereof, be amended by deleting clause 27.

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It strikes me that motion No. 5 is consequential to motion No. 16, and motion No. 6 to No. 17. I note that Mr. Speaker grouped Nos. 5 and 6 separately and then grouped Nos. 13, 14, 16, 17 and 18 for debate. Perhaps it would be appropriate to consider Nos. 16 and 17 at this stage. That would be an appropriate grouping. Perhaps we could consider those motions together.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. Mr. Speaker grouped those motions as a suggestion. If the House wants to change that suggested grouping, the Chair would be willing to go along with it. Do hon. members agree?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): To what?

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, I suggest the House could consider motions 5 and 6, already put, with motion 16 in the name of the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander), and 17 in the name of the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt).

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is it agreed that we debate together motions 5, 6, 16 and 17?

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Speaker, I know we are trying to be expeditious. Motions 5 and 6 relate to job-creation and work-sharing. Motion 16 concerns work-sharing, and 17 concerns training, job-creation and work sharing. We could deal with those motions at the same time, although they need to be resolved by separate votes. If the House agrees, perhaps we could consider together motions Nos. 5, 6, 16 and 17.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, we are becoming confused. Motions 5 and 6 deal with clause 27 of the bill. Motions 16 and 17 deal with clause 41. Perhaps it would be best to agree, tentatively, to consider 5 and 6, and when we reach the other group later we can decide if 16 and 17 have been covered as well. I agree with the hon. member for

Employment and Immigration

Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) that they require separate votes. Cannot we go ahead with 5 and 6, as Mr. Speaker suggested yesterday, and decide later if 16 and 17 were covered in the debate?

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, I have no difficulty with that argument, although it seems to me next to impossible to debate Nos. 5 and 6 without referring to the subject matter of the other clauses.

● (1150)

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Speaker, the suggestion just placed before the House is certainly acceptable to me.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Is it agreed that we move on to motions Nos. 5 and 6 for the purpose of debate?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. This may be a technicality which we will have to deal with at this time. When I look at motion No. 27, I know what the intent is, but it seems there has been an error in drafting. It becomes very, very confusing. Clause 27 reads as follows:

Subsection 4(3) of the said act—

Right off the bat there is something wrong. I know what they want to refer to. Unless I am wrong, that should read, “Section 4(3) of the said act”. The minister, in clause 27, is referring to job-creation and work-sharing in terms of making that employment subject to unemployment insurance. Therefore, it needs to be tidied up in that regard. We cannot pass that clause as it presently stands. I just notice this and, therefore, was unable to give the minister notice. I think it should read, “Section 4(3) of the said act is amended”.

At line 30 it also becomes very confusing. What the minister is referring to in clause 27 is actually clause 41 of the bill under discussion. Under clause 41 you have subclauses 34, 35, 36, 37 and 38. The minister's motion under clause 27 really refers to subclauses 37 and 38 under clause 41. I respectfully submit that before we go any further with this matter we should amend the minister's motion so that we will be on target in terms of correctness. I do not have an amendment before me. I want to hear the minister and my friend, the House leader of the New Democratic Party. It should read as follows:

Section 4(3) of the said act is amended by striking out the word “and” at the end of paragraph (e) thereof, by adding the word “and” at the end of paragraph (f) thereof and by adding thereto the following paragraph—

Here is where we run into problems. I think it should read this way:

(g) any employment provided under clause 41, subsection 38, or under regulations made under subsection 37 thereof.

I think that would clarify the matter. At the present time that is not clear. We can debate this clause. I know what the minister wants to do. However, if we pass it, we would certainly be in error by going along without the necessary amendments at this time. Perhaps the minister would like to