

of their contents, the Chair has concluded that there are sufficient differences as to how they sought to accomplish their purpose so that they could not be judged to be substantially the same.

This approach accords with the practice both before and after the introduction of this standing order in 1986. The intent of the new rule was to give members an opportunity to put before the House items of concern to them, but to prevent a multiplicity of identical bills being submitted in the draw for Private Members' Business. However, Standing Order 86(3) provides that any member prevented from submitting a bill because of a decision of the Chair can add his or her name as seconder to a bill already on notice on the Order Paper.

In the present case, the Chair has carefully examined the bills in question and finds that there are sufficient differences in their content to allow them to proceed. I would, therefore, allow the hon. member for Scarborough West and the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell to move first reading of their respective bills.

I thank the hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby for giving me the opportunity to clarify the position of the Chair with regard to Standing Order 86. Again, I stress that the point raised by the hon. member was a procedural one and one to which she was completely entitled to argue. I also want to say to the hon. member that because of the nature of the bills, the Chair most carefully examined the references to various sections of the Criminal Code, and I do want to say to her that those various references did help to persuade the Chair that the bill should go forward. I assure the hon. member that very considerable attention was given to the legitimate point of procedure which she has raised.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, this being Thursday, I would like to ask the government

Government Orders

House leader to give us a statement of the business that the government intends to call for the coming week.

Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we are going to call first reading of Bill C-40, the broadcasting bill, followed up with Bill C-16, space agency bill, on Monday we will call the second day of the third reading debate on Bill C-21, on Tuesday there is a very good chance we will commence debate on the abortion bill.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mrs. McDougall that Bill C-21, an Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act and the Employment and Immigration Department and Commission Act, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Joseph Volpe (Eglinton—Lawrence): Mr. Speaker, thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak on this very important bill.

As many members of this House might have noticed, today we had a demonstration from members of an organization of Canadians who are highly trained, who have had training, and could have well-paying jobs. They are protesting the thrust of this bill, not only for themselves as beneficiaries, as people who will lose a lot because of this bill, but also for all the other Canadians who do not have the opportunity or cannot come to Ottawa to protest strongly against this Government's bill.

• (1510)

With them, I join the protests of other groups like Action Chômage, like the one in Montreal which at the same time as we are debating is holding a press conference in Montreal to protest the actions of the Department and the Government. What we see here, Mr. Speaker, is confusion between the policies of the Department, that is, the bureaucracy and officials, and the