

tomorrow. Does the hon. member have the consent of all hon. members to do so?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Caccia: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Chair will have to examine the argument made by the hon. member and the citations from Beauchesne.

While that is being done, perhaps the hon. member would like to make some representation on Motion No. 12, where again a caveat has been entered by Madam Speaker today with respect to the admissibility of the motion.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague, we are prepared to accept the Speaker's ruling on Motion No. 12.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): As I understand it, the hon. member for Kootenay West accepts the Speaker's ruling on Motion No. 12?

Mr. Kristiansen: That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Chair is left with a ruling to be made on Motion No. 11. I would ask the consent of the House to defer that ruling for a few moments while I check the authorities. I would then seek permission to revert to Motion No. 11 and deal with it.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

● (2130)

Mr. Kristiansen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I understand that we are grouping Motions Nos. 13 and 14 for debate.

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Minister of Labour) moved:

Motion No. 13

That Bill C-78, an act to provide for the payment of benefits to laid-off employees and to amend the Canada Labour Code, be amended in Clause 12

(a) by striking out line 25 at page 8 of the French version and substituting the following therefor:

"vités désigné dont l'établissement canadien d'où il";

(b) by adding immediately after line 29 at page 9 the following:

"(3) Notwithstanding Subsection (1), where an employee certified under Section 10 would be qualified under Subsection (1) to receive labour adjustment benefits but for the requirement set out in paragraph (1)(b), the commission may determine that the employee is qualified to receive labour adjustment benefits if he shows that he is in substantial compliance with the requirement and that he does not meet such requirement by reason only of illness, disability, lay-off or any other good cause whatever.";

(c) by renumbering the subsequent subclauses accordingly; and

(d) by striking out lines 6 to 10 at page 10 of the French version and substituting the following therefor:

"d'un employé admissible, suspendre ou modifier, si elle estime que les circonstances le justifient, l'exigence prévue au paragraphe (5)."

Standing Order 75(6)

Labour Adjustment Benefits

Recommendation

His Excellency the Governor General recommends to the House of Commons that Bill C-78, an act to provide for the payment of benefits to laid-off employees and to amend the Canada Labour Code, presently before the House, be amended in Clause 12

(a) by striking out line 25 on page 8 of the French version and substituting the following:

"vités désigné dont l'établissement canadien d'où il";

(b) by adding, immediately after line 29 on page 9, the following:

"(3) Notwithstanding Subsection (1), where an employee certified under Section 10 would be qualified under Subsection (1) to receive labour adjustment benefits but for the requirement set out in paragraph (1)(b), the commission may determine that the employee is qualified to receive labour adjustment benefits if he shows that he is in substantial compliance with the requirement and that he does not meet such requirement by reason only of illness, disability, lay-off or any other good cause whatever.";

(c) by renumbering the subsequent subclauses and any cross references accordingly; and

(d) by striking out lines 6 to 10 on page 10 of the French version and substituting the following:

"d'un employé admissible, suspendre ou modifier, si elle estime que les circonstances le justifient, l'exigence prévue au paragraphe (5)."

Mr. Lyle S. Kristiansen (Kootenay West) moved:

Motion No. 14

That Bill C-78, an act to provide for the payment of benefits to laid-off employees and to amend the Canada Labour Code, be amended in Clause 12 by adding immediately after line 29 at page 8 the following:

"(c) an employee shall be considered to have worked 1,000 hours in a year in each year for which he failed to work 1,000 hours because he was in receipt of a disability pension, sick benefits, workers compensation or was on leave of absence with the consent of the employer."

and that the following paragraphs be renumbered accordingly.

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I want to speak specifically to Motion No. 13, if I may.

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Motion No. 13 stands in the name of the Minister of Labour. I should like to draw that fact to the attention of the House.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I see no problem in that regard. Earlier today the Speaker ruled that Motions Nos. 13 and 14 could be debated together but voted on separately.

Mr. Deans: In fact I was quite prepared to concede that it stood in the name of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Caccia); I would not want to claim credit for it. I should like to draw to the attention of the minister paragraph (b)(3) of Motion No. 13, which reads:

Notwithstanding Subsection (1), where an employee certified under Section 10 would be qualified under Subsection (1) to receive labour adjustment benefits but for the requirement set out in paragraph (1)(b), the commission may determine—

The word "may" is the word which concerns me. I should like the minister to think for a moment about the possible consequences of "may", given the qualification which is then set out in the clause. It continues:

—that the employee is qualified to receive labour adjustment benefits if he shows that he is in substantial compliance with the requirement and that he does not meet such requirement by reason only of illness, disability, lay-off or any other good cause whatsoever.