

Again, I return to the point that a trigger figure is not something totally foreign to our legislation.

Finally, allow me to touch on Your Honour's point about the need for a specific time for legislation to come into effect. Last year we passed another amendment in the continuing series of unemployment insurance amendments when considering Bill C-27. That bill was due to come into effect upon proclamation. Yet to this very day, more than a year later, one clause of that legislation has still to be proclaimed. I refer, of course, to section 56, and while I hope it is never proclaimed, it seems to me there is a better argument to be made for having the government commit itself to a set of preconditions than for allowing it to make legislation and proclaim it completely at their whim.

To recapitulate, Mr. Speaker, this amendment gives the government a target toward which to work. It accepts the argument that the government, through its economic policies, is responsible for the level of unemployment, and it does set a time for proclamation, that time being when the government's economic policies have begun to be effective. I would also like to make the point that the amendment also goes far in tying our unemployment insurance program to our over-all economic performance, surely a step which no one in this House would argue is a backward one.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has made a very persuasive argument about the merits of his clause setting certain conditions precedent to the coming into force of the act. The difficulty lay not with the merit of his argument nor with whether some precondition should exist before the coming into force of the act. An act has to come into force at a certain time which is understood.

The hon. member refers to the fact that sections of other statutes have not come into force even though they were scheduled to come into force upon proclamation. Perhaps he might have indicated that some conditions might be precedent to the coming into force of this act by proclamation. I am not sure about that. But the fact is that the condition which he has described here is incapable of a certain moment at which all members of the House and all of the people in the country could be certain that the act could come into force.

The reasons are twofold. First, he has prescribed that the national unemployed rate would be a fixed rate for a certain period of time. He and his colleagues have argued rather vigorously in disagreement with the national unemployment rate as described by the government. The government has described the national unemployment rate at one level while he and his hon. friends, along with other members of the House, have argued that the national unemployment rate is in fact at a different level. Therefore there is no fixed rate at which the national unemployment rate is measured for the purpose of this clause, and there would certainly have to be an understanding that some set of figures, or some rule would be accepted as describing the national unemployment rate.

The difficulty is even greater. As I said yesterday, even if that could be agreed upon—which it cannot—the period is 12

Unemployment Insurance Act

months after the national unemployment rate has been at 4 per cent or less. The time at which that 12 months begins or ends is not fixed and is not described exactly. Therefore, on two counts, the moment cannot be fixed exactly. I have already said I do not want to deprive the hon. member of an imaginative approach to the coming into force of any statute but whatever formula or approach is used, it must lead to a fixed time which is understood by all. On those two counts, therefore, I say the motion fails to do that and so on procedural grounds, I have to set it aside.

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to confirm your ruling that motions nos. 11, 12, 27, 30 and 31 are out of order on procedural grounds. I did say in the debate last night on clause 11 that it was introduced because I had undertaken to do so at the committee stage and I will, as you have suggested, seek unanimous consent. I think there may be unanimous consent for that. Similarly, I understand that the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Clarke) is trying to make some arrangement with motion No. 30. But we understand that motions 12, 27 and 31 have been described as out of order on procedural grounds.

Mr. Speaker: The motions that in fact have been described as being out of order are the five I set aside yesterday; I am reaffirming that decision today. They are all set aside on procedural grounds. This returns us to the discussion on motion No. 1 from yesterday. At the time of the adjournment, the floor was held by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert).

● (1552)

[Translation]

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I fully understand the minister is anxious to have Bill C-14 passed by the House so that it be implemented as early as January 1. But I am a little surprised that some arrangements have been made. That happens sometimes not more at the level of the Department of Employment and Immigration than in other areas. Indeed they presume the legislation will be passed and give public servants the responsibility of making UIC offices across Canada aware of its provisions before the House and the Senate have actually agreed before royal assent. I think that is a shortcoming in our procedure which we should correct so that we no longer give the public the impression that we are here to debate and that decisions are made even before the votes are taken in the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, last night at the time of the adjournment I was commenting on some remarks made by the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Lapointe) who hesitated to accept a provision in this legislation because of some disparity in the evaluation of unemployment which may exist between different areas. I fully agree with him. I was surprised to hear him mention that rather worrying figure of 42 per cent unemployed in the north shore region.