

Hon. Robert K. Andras (President of the Board of Economic Development Ministers): See Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, citation 171(a), (b), (c) and (d).

AUDITOR GENERAL—LAWYERS IN PROVENCHER

Question No. 258—**Mr. Epp:**

From June 1, 1974 to date, what lawyers in the Constituency of Provencher were given work by the Auditor General's Office and what amount was each paid per year?

Mr. Claude-André Lachance (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): In so far as the legal agents of the Minister of Justice are concerned: None.

TAX ON INSULATED STEEL ONE-DOOR SYSTEMS

Question No. 552—**Mr. Hare:**

1. What is the income from the tax on insulated steel, one-door systems?
2. What would the income be if all storm doors were not exempted from the federal sales tax?

Hon. A. C. Abbott (Minister of National Revenue): 1. Revenue is not recorded in a manner which permits identification of the sales tax paid on this product.

2. This information is not available.

[English]

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-14, to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The House is aware that there are 31 motions on the order paper at report stage of Bill C-14. I have closely studied all of these motions and should indicate now to the House that I have procedural reservations concerning five of them, specifically motions Nos. 11, 12, 27, 30 and 31. As has been my practice in the past, I will give an indication now, in a preliminary way, of the reasons for my reservations. Then, depending on progress in respect of the bill, I hope I will have an opportunity to give the proponents of

Unemployment Insurance Act

those motions the opportunity of trying to persuade me otherwise, following which I will make an adjudication in respect of these motions in a procedural way so the House will be aware as early as possible of the manner of dealing with these, and will be in a position to plan its business for the remainder of its consideration at this stage.

As I have done in the past, I have asked that a copy of my own notes in respect of this decision at this time be distributed to House leaders. My own notes are prepared for me and my use in the chair in English, but where relevant I have asked that a rough copy in French be prepared for those members who may be involved and who may be more at ease in French than in English.

Perhaps I could indicate the motions, and there are several, that ought to be debated and voted on separately. They are motions 1, 2, 14, 16, 21, 22, 23 and 29. Those eight motions in my view ought to be debated and voted on separately. Motions Nos. 3 and 4 will be grouped for debate and voted on separately. An affirmative vote on motion No. 3 would obviate the taking of any vote on No. 4. Motions Nos. 6 and 7 would be grouped for debate and a vote on No. 6 would obviate the necessity of a vote on motion No. 7. Motions Nos. 5, 8, 9 and 10 should be grouped for debate. Motion No. 5, I believe, is in the name of the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Faour). Motions 8, 9 and 10 are in the name of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). Motion No. 5 will be voted on separately. With respect to the other three motions, we will vote on motion No. 10 first, as the result of the vote may eliminate the necessity of voting on motions Nos. 8 and 9.

● (1512)

Motions Nos. 13 and 15 will be combined for debate. An affirmative vote on motion No. 13 would obviate the necessity of a vote on motion No. 15. Similarly, motions Nos. 17 and 18 should be debated together, with an affirmative vote on No. 17 obviating the necessity of a vote on No. 18. The same holds true with motions Nos. 19 and 20, motions Nos. 24 and 25 and motions Nos. 26 and 28. Those pairings of motions will be grouped for discussion with a vote on the motion to delete in each case ruling out the necessity of a subsequent vote on the motion to amend.

With respect to motions Nos. 11, 12, 27, 30 and 31 I have reservations on procedural grounds. Motions Nos. 11, 27 and 30 clearly seek to amend the parent act in a way that was not envisaged by the amending bill. In each of these cases the very language of the motions directs us beyond the amending statute into the parent bill and is contrary to the citation in May's nineteenth edition at page 521, paragraph (1)(d).

Motion No. 12 is defective in that it proposes to amend more than one clause. It poses for the House the procedural impossibility of amending two clauses in a bill by one motion. I would direct the House to Standing Order 75(5) which states, in part:

—written notice is given of any motion to amend, delete, insert or restore any clause in a bill—