

Unemployment Insurance Act

Hon. members will note that the word "clause" is singular. I would also like to refer hon. members to a statement made by my very distinguished predecessor, Mr. Speaker Lamoureaux, on June 20, 1969 at page 1218 of the *Journals* which reads:

It appears each motion at the report stage should actually be directed to a specific clause of a bill rather than a number of clauses. Such motions, I submit, should not relate to two or more clauses.

Motion No. 12 is therefore defective in that it seeks to amend two clauses and clearly flies in the face of that precedent.

Finally, motion No. 31 is out of order on the ground that it does not make a date certain, either by royal assent, proclamation or date fixed, for the act to come into force. The hon. member, it seems to me, has made a very sporting attempt in motion No. 31, by a very imaginative approach, to put a condition precedent in front of the coming into force of the act. I am not saying that that is impossible, but that if it is attempted the effect of it has to be that the act still comes into force on a date which can be fixed. I would think that the hon. member, being a strong proponent of the argument that unemployment rates are not agreed upon in this House, will agree that the formula for finding an agreed upon rate of employment would be quite an achievement in itself. Even if that were to be agreed upon, it still does not lead us to a certain hour on a certain date when the conditions would be fulfilled and upon which the act would come into force. Whatever the effect of a proclamation clause, it must lead to a date which can be fixed with certainty so that all the world knows exactly the moment the law comes into force.

For those reasons, I would say these motions are procedurally unacceptable to the Chair. Each proponent, if he so wishes, may try to persuade me otherwise. I do not expect that they would be prepared to do so at this moment, but since we do not come to one of these troubled motions until we have debated the first ten motions, perhaps they could be debated at that time. I presume we will take the greater part of today on those ten motions. If we do not, however, it would not be inconvenient to the House, upon the calling of this measure tomorrow, if it is the government's intention to so call it, to give the proponents time to put their procedural arguments, whereupon I could rule at that time as to whether or not the matter ought to stand and be considered as part of the discussion on the report stage of this bill, or whether it will be set aside.

If there is no serious objection to my proposal, I suggest that the House move now to the consideration of motion No. 1. The next day that this bill is called, at the beginning of the debate, I would call the hon. members who put these motions to put their arguments. I would try to make a ruling as soon as they have completed their discussion, and let the rest of the debate proceed.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, on one point relating to your suggestion, I would advise the House that it will be the intention of the government to call this bill tomorrow and on whatever remaining days are required to pass it. I notice the very large number of amendments, and I would indicate to the House that it would be agreeable to the government, in order

[Mr. Speaker.]

to give hon. members additional time to debate this important item of legislation, to have additional hours of sitting during this week.

Finally, may I seek clarification as to whether it would be the practice, when the debate, for example, on motion No. 1 is completed, to call the vote at that point, or would we call the votes when a number of motions have been finished?

Mr. Speaker: It is my understanding that we would follow the practice which we have in the past, that is, to enter into the discussion of some of these motions and at a time when we have covered enough of them that a vote might be arranged, or when it is convenient for the House, or, failing that, when I thought that a number of votes might be called, we would deal with them.

I understand that one of the motions which I have ruled aside on procedural grounds stands in the name of the government, motion No. 11. In respect to that motion, there may be a desire to deal with it in some way, even if ultimately after argument it is found to be a new amendment to the bill. I understand there may be a disposition to deal with it and let it continue on some consent. Since we now have the assurance that the bill will be called tomorrow, I think we ought to deal with it in a final way at that time.

● (1522)

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to support the suggestion you have made that we might defer the first four, five or six votes until we reach a convenient time. In other words, there is no point in taking a vote immediately after motion No. 1. I also would indicate our approval of the proposal that the procedural debates might take place tomorrow. Only one of the five concerns us in this party, but it would seem logical to have all the arguments at the same time.

As to extended hours, perhaps we should wait to see what happens.

[Translation]

Mr. Lavoie: Mr. Speaker, I would like some information, as I am not used to the procedure regarding the introduction of amendments to legislation I would like to propose an amendment to Bill C-14 and I would appreciate if the Chair could tell me when I can do so.

Mr. Speaker: First of all, the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Lavoie) proposed motion No. 27. I indicated that there was some problem regarding this motion and I said that, if possible and if it is agreed, I would prefer to hear tomorrow the arguments of each member who has proposed a motion. There are five such members, including the member for Hochelaga, who has proposed motion No. 27. I have the impression that the hon. member for Hochelaga is now asking for a ruling regarding the motion that he intends to propose during debate. Is he referring only to motion No. 27?