

Employment Support Bill

the bill, and attempts to clarify the manner in which the bill is to apply to Canadian industry and the Canadian economy.

I also submit that it falls entirely within the framework of the bill with respect to the expenditure of money because that is not affected at all by the amendment I have proposed. The \$80 million figure is in the recommendation and in the bill, and I repeat that it is not affected by my motion.

In your introductory remarks Your Honour made reference to the fact that I incorporated the term "income support grant" in the amendment which I am proposing. I would like to suggest that this is entirely a technical feature of the proposal before us, and that the principle involved is entirely in accord with what is referred to in the bill and in the recommendation as "employment support grant."

In this particular area of the Canadian economy we are dealing largely with people who are self-employed, rather than with people working in an industry which involves an employer-employee type of structure. In both agriculture and fishing, employment is largely of the self-employed nature. The term "income support grant" used here is primarily for the purposes of identification because of the recognition that the mechanism involved would have to be slightly different in applying the provisions of the bill to these two industries.

I suggest that the principle in the motion is identical to the principle in the bill, that it is attempting to find ways and means of supporting employment in agriculture and fishing in a manner parallel to what is proposed in the rest of the bill. I suggest that the amendment as proposed is consistent with the present structure of the bill, and I hope Your Honour gives it favourable consideration.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I doubt that there is very much point in pursuing the argument. I would find it very difficult to accept this amendment after having ruled out the one standing in the name of the hon. member for Annapolis Valley. In fact, I think there would be a revolution in the House if I were to take that attitude.

It seems to me that if there was good cause to reject the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Annapolis Valley there is even more cause—I mean procedurally—to reject the one proposed by the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton) for exactly the same reason. The hon. member says that this is not a substantive motion, that it does not affect the financial initiative of the Crown. I regret that I cannot agree with him.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Clause 11 of the bill, as I read it, deals exclusively with the provision of employment support grants. Motion No. 2, standing in the name of the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton) would provide for the payment to fishermen or farmers of an income support grant. I suggest to the hon. member that section No. 3, citation 246 of *Beauchesne's Fourth Edition*, which I quoted a moment ago, applies with at least equal force to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Regina East. His contention is that since the adoption of his amendment would not affect the ceiling of \$80 million provided by the bill, his motion would be in order and not affect the financial

initiative of the Crown. Of course, that is not quite right. The citation to which I referred is to the effect that an amendment infringes the financial initiative of the Crown not only if it increases the amount but also if it extends the objectives and purposes or relaxes the conditions and qualifications expressed in the communication by which the Crown has demanded or recommended a change.

For these reasons, and with regret, I must reach the same conclusion as the one which I reached in relation to the previous motion. If hon. members wish me to do so I would now be prepared to put for their consideration amendment No. 3, unless there are further procedural objections at this point. Having looked at the motion, it appears to be in order so far as the Chair is concerned.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I ask one question so that we know where we will stand for the day. Is motion No. 4 all right?

Mr. Speaker: Of course, I am open to suggestions from hon. members but the motion appears to the Chair to be in order unless when it is called there is such strong objection to it that I am convinced it is out of order. I should say, in all honesty, having looked at motions Nos. 3 and 4, they appear to be acceptable procedurally. The hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald).

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, this is raised as a point of order and perhaps might be presented by way of a grievance or problem that has arisen out of the use of the new rules. It perhaps has been raised before, but it has come to my attention forcibly this afternoon.

We find ourselves in a situation where two hon. members have filed somewhat similar amendments with reference to a very important aspect of this legislation. Many hon. members who have had fair warning of one or both of these amendments may have considered that they would have been acceptable here this afternoon, and we would have had the opportunity to deliberate upon them in the normal way. Now, these two amendments have been set aside because they were, in the view of the Chair, unacceptable. We find ourselves prevented therefore, from bringing forward any other amendments at the report stage of this legislation. We are left then with only the reasoned amendment at any stage of the bill. This creates a number of problems in terms of full and sufficient deliberation of an important aspect of this legislation.

While I realize that it is impossible for Your Honour alone to review this aspect of the rules, because this matter has arisen again I would ask if there might not be some way to refer it to the Committee on Procedure and Organization so that hon. members are not placed in the position of moving into the report stage with the expectation of being able to deal in a substantive way with two amendments put before them, only to find that they are not procedurally acceptable and thus they are not able to deal in any way with the substance of the matters contained in them.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, on that point, may I just say that in anticipation of a negative ruling on motion No. 2 my friend the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton) already has a third reading