

*Employment Support Bill*

amendment which will deal with this issue when we get there.

**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):** That does not meet this problem.

**Mr. Speaker:** I hope, with the hon. member, that his third reading amendment will be in order.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** It is.

**Mr. Speaker:** The point made by the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald) makes sense, especially in the case of the hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan) who did not even have his motion on the notice paper because of an error for which the Chair and perhaps the table take full responsibility.

I see the difficulty faced by hon. members coming before the House this afternoon with the expectation that they could debate a motion, which is No. 1 on the order paper. Unfortunately, there is not very much I can do about that except to admit that it does perhaps cause a difficulty or unfairness in some cases. It is of course, up to hon. members to consider and perhaps debate this problem when they meet at the very high echelon of House leaders. I gather that from time to time they meet to consider matters which are of concern to all of us. Perhaps this is one of the matters they might consider when they meet again. Having said this, I am now prepared to put the motion which stands in the name of the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert). The hon. member for Edmonton West moves motion No. 3 as follows:

That Bill C-262, An Act to support employment in Canada by mitigating the disruptive effect on Canadian industry of the imposition of foreign import surtaxes or other actions of a like effect, be amended by adding the following immediately after Clause 18 at page 7:

"19 (1) In the event that Parliament shall then be sitting:

(a) An Order in Council authorizing the issuance of regulations with respect to any assistance period or periods or other matter pursuant to section 18 consequent upon the taking by any country of such action as referred to in section 3 shall not be made until the proposed text has been laid before both Houses of Parliament by a member of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and the making of the Order in Council has been approved by the affirmative resolution of both Houses of Parliament.

(b) Where the proposed text of an Order in Council has been laid before the Senate and the House of Commons pursuant to subsection (1) (a) a motion in both the Senate and the House of Commons by a member of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada in accordance with the respective rules of each House, praying that the making of the Order in Council be approved, shall be debated in each House for not more than seven hours respectively after which time the question shall be decided in accordance with the rules of each House as the case may be.

(2) In the event that Parliament shall not then be sitting by reason of adjournment, prorogation or dissolution:

(a) An Order in Council as hereinabove described may be made as deemed necessary subject to the said order being laid on the Table of both Houses within fifteen sitting days of the next ensuing session of Parliament and the making of the Order in Council has been confirmed by a resolution of Parliament within the first thirty sitting days.

(b) Where an Order in Council has been laid before the Senate and the House of Commons pursuant to subsection (2) (a) confirmation of the said Order in Council shall be governed as in subsection (1) (b)."

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

and my renumbering subsequent clauses accordingly.—

**Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West):** I did not want to get into the previous discussion, Mr. Speaker, but I think the only way that these motions could be handled would be for them to appear on the order paper so that if Your Honour has any doubts those doubts may be discussed in public, in this chamber, and not left to discussion derrière les rideaux in somebody's office. I think it is better that they all come here on the order paper and that we deal with them publicly. I think that is the answer to the problem faced by my colleague from Eglinton—

**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):** Egmont.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):**—Egmont—I have transferred him from one metropolitan area to another metropolitan area.

I have proposed this motion for a very good reason. As we will see, the proposal is divided into two circumstances, one when Parliament is sitting and the other when Parliament is not sitting. This bill requires an order in council pursuant to section 18 in order to describe, as shown in that section, the assistance period or periods and the level or levels of unemployment that are to be maintained, the information to be submitted and presumably a description of the action to be taken by whatever country may be involved. This cheque, as has been admitted by both the minister and his parliamentary secretary, is a blank cheque in many ways. The bill has been refined, so does not specify any particular country nor does it limit the action being taken by the trading partners to a surcharge. There are valid reasons for this, perfectly valid reasons. I say that the order in council must come before Parliament to be subject to affirmative resolution, and debatable, as indicated in the amendment, for a period not exceeding seven hours in this House and then in the other place for a period not exceeding that time, subject to the rules of the other place.

It is provided that in the event Parliament shall not be sitting, either by reason of adjournment, prorogation or dissolution, then the order in council may be passed but within 15 days of the next ensuing session the order must be tabled and brought forward for debate leading to confirmation within 30 days.

• (4:00 p.m.)

I put this amendment forward in a rather more limited form before the Committee. It was discussed and there was criticism, the majority of criticism being concentrated around the question, "What if parliament is not sitting and you need rapid action?" I have provided for that in the second portion of my motion. Under the second portion of the motion the government would take action immediately. Actually, the government would be better off while Parliament is not sitting, because they could pass the order in council and everything would be effective immediately. When Parliament is sitting, the order in council must be brought forward and be subject to an affirmative resolution. I must point out, however, this does not mean that any positive action shall be deferred while the matter is being discussed and an affirmative resolution is being sought. The act provides that the appropriate period shall relate back to the date of the action taken by the foreign country. Therefore, that par-