

*Unemployment Insurance Act*

**Mr. Fulton:** Mr. Chairman, I submit the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate has misconstrued the effect of this clause and of the amendment. Clause 6, which we are now on, is the only clause which attempts to vary the schedule to section 37, and subsection (1) of section 37 is repealed and clause 6 substituted therefor. If clause 6 is deleted there is no change in the schedule, and therefore the amendment now before the committee would simply have the same effect as if clause 6 were itself defeated. Therefore the citation referred to by the Chairman is completely in point.

**Mr. Caron:** Mr. Chairman, you gave a while ago citation 202 (14). Subparagraph (13) says:

An amendment to alter the main question, by substituting a proposition with the opposite conclusion, is not an expanded negative and may be moved.

In this case it is just coming back to what it was before. It is just maintaining the Unemployment Insurance Act as it was. If we come to article 201, that says:

The object of an amendment may be to effect such an alteration in a question as will obtain the support of those who, without such alteration, must either vote against it or abstain from voting thereon, or to present to the house an alternative proposition either wholly or partially opposed to the original question. This may be effected by moving to omit all the words of the question after the first word, "That", and to substitute in their place other words of a different import. In that case the debate that follows is not restricted to the amendment—

So it seems to me quite clear that we do not have to accept the whole thing, but if we substitute something to replace that clause it should be accepted. It is up to the house to decide in that case whether they want a substitution or whether they want to leave the clause as it is.

**The Chairman:** I have listened with interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Hull who has read paragraph 202 (13). I have read paragraph 202 (14), and I would now like to read 202 (12), which says:

An amendment proposing a direct negative, though it may be covered up by verbiage, is out of order.

I shall read the amendment again, which is as follows:

That clause 6 be amended by deleting all the words after "act" in the second line thereof and substituting therefor the words "is maintained".

What actually the hon. member for Welland wishes to do is to eliminate what is proposed in the present bill to maintain the present rates as they are. This in itself, in my opinion, is a negation of the complete purpose of this bill to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act and as such cannot,

in my view, be accepted. It is my opinion that in view of article 202 (14) which says:

An amendment which would produce the same result as if the original motion were simply negatived is out of order.

I must make my ruling according to the words I have just read, and with regret I must declare the amendment by the hon. member for Welland to be in my opinion out of order. Of course, if the hon. member for Hull wishes to convince me—

**Mr. Caron:** I may not be successful but I wish to try. Article 202 (12) says:

An amendment proposing a direct negative, though it may be covered up by verbiage, is out of order.

It is not a direct negative because it comes back to the original rate of contribution; and it is not verbiage because there is very little in the amendment. The intention is to restore the original position, because we claim that there is no need to increase the contributions. To do that we had to present this kind of amendment and let the government find the way, and the only way is to have recourse to the clause of the bill. For those reasons it is not verbiage and it is not a direct negative. I do not accept the fact that it is a direct negative at all.

**The Chairman:** I will phrase it in another way. I believe the solution to this would be to vote against this clause as it stands, which would achieve the same purpose as the present amendment which is before us. Therefore I declare that the solution to this problem may be to ask the committee if they are ready for the question and submit it to a vote.

**Mr. Browne (Vancouver-Kingsway):** Mr. Chairman, before we vote on this I would like to say to the committee that any vote against this clause is, of course, a vote against the whole principle of unemployment insurance as we understand it in this country, and as we have understood it for a number of years.

**Mr. Benidickson:** Nonsense.

**Mr. Browne (Vancouver-Kingsway):** The schedule included in clause 6 proposes a 30 per cent increase in the contributions to the fund. I would like to refer to a statement of the actuary that was brought before the industrial relations committee.

**The Chairman:** I regret to interrupt the hon. member but I am afraid he is straying from the subject under discussion. The question is:—is the house ready for the question?

**Mr. Pickersgill:** What is the question?

**The Chairman:** The question is the following: shall clause 6 carry?