

*Unemployment Insurance Act*

effect as he had intended in his own motion. Therefore his motion remains out of order. He will have the opportunity to address himself to the debate on motions Nos. 6 and 7, which have already been grouped, and in turn on motion No. 14 which remains in order.

**Mr. Clarke:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. Either Your Honour or I have missed the point the hon. member for York-Scarborough (Mr. McCrossan) was making. The grouping of my motion No. 7 for discussion with motion No. 14 would achieve what the hon. member for York-Scarborough is trying to do. If Your Honour will look at motions Nos. 6 and 7, they are identical. Motions Nos. 12 and 14 are identical with the exception that motion No. 12 proposes to delete clauses 4 and 5, whereas motion No. 14 proposes to delete only clause 5 and substitute another therefor. It is true that the package we have in mind requires the discussion of motions Nos. 7 and 14 at the same time in order to make a sensible argument. The reason is that the proposals in motion No. 14 would override not only the proposals in clause 5 but those in clause 4. That is why the discussion should be held together, although the votes would obviously have to be separate.

**Mr. Speaker:** I think the answer to it is that discussion on motions Nos. 6 and 7, which are grouped together, will range over motion No. 14. I do not think that the rule of relevancy should be so tightly enforced in the House at any time that the hon. member would be prevented from indicating to the House, in his discussion of motion No. 7, for example, that he had certain proposals with respect to motion No. 14 that would have an effect on it. Similarly the hon. member for York-Scarborough, in participating in the discussion on motion No. 7, will, I am sure, have reference to his motion No. 12 which has now been ruled out of order, but does not prevent him from discussing or arguing the merits of the idea he had in mind. Therefore the discussion will be as I indicated yesterday. Motions Nos. 6 and 7, both of which have the intention of deleting clause 4, will be grouped together for discussion and vote. Motion No. 14 will be discussed separately. Motion No. 12 is out of order.

Motion No. 30?

**Mr. Clarke:** Mr. Speaker, the intention of motion No. 30 is also to tie in with my motion No. 14. I understand the problem Your Honour has raised. I also understand from committee proceedings that it was sympathetically received by the government and perhaps some action might be introduced by the government at some stage to achieve somewhat the same thing. I am not sure of the order, but if it were possible to shift the content of motion No. 30 and, instead of making it a separate clause, add it to another clause, we might seek to do that. I seek the advice of the Chair.

**Mr. Speaker:** I have indicated my reasons for holding that motion out of order. I have also indicated my reasons for holding that motion No. 11, which is a government amendment, is out of order. It may be that when the House comes to

[Mr. Speaker.]

conclude discussions on the report stage of the bill, depending on the success of the order tomorrow, the House may want to extend its consent to include these provisions in the bill. If the House wishes to do that upon consent, it may do so. I can only determine that on procedural grounds, as I think the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra understands, his motion is out of order. If he is able to secure agreement to introduce his motion, or obtain consent to have it form part of the bill through report stage and third reading, so much the better; but I have to indicate to him that on procedural grounds I must set the motion aside.

● (1542)

Motion No. 31?

**Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt):** Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of arguments to present with respect to your preliminary ruling as to the admissibility of my amendment to clause 16, which is motion No. 31 on the order paper. You were kind enough to term my approach to this amendment "imaginative". I would like to say that at this time of economic crisis in this country, with over a million people unable to find work, imaginative approaches are surely what are required.

I am not sure I can agree with your suggestion, sir, that unemployment rates are not determined in this House. This parliament, as I am sure you and all hon. members will agree, is the chief body for the formulation of economic policy which exists in this country, and the rate of unemployment is surely one of the most accurate indicators of our success in formulating economic policies. I can think of no better indication of this than the bill which is before us. If approved, it will take close to a billion dollars out of the hands of those in this country who most need income support and who would be the ones most likely to spend the money in order to live. That spending would, in turn, do much to stimulate our economy, and its loss will do much to reduce the spending power of the 250,000 people who will be denied benefits. As a corollary to that, the loss of that spending power will create even more unemployment in our industries.

I would also point out that the 4 per cent figure I have used is not a figure simply drawn out of the air. When the government, back in 1971, first brought in the bill which is now before us for amendment, one of its clauses committed the government to accepting financial responsibility for the cost of all extended benefits when the unemployment rate in Canada rose above 4 per cent. At that time we were told that such a provision would act as an incentive to the government to keep unemployment below the 4 per cent level.

In bringing this legislation before us, the government has talked a great deal about the disincentives of the present unemployment insurance program—at least, as far as the government identifies them. All I am seeking to do here is to return some incentive to the government. Surely they would not argue that what is good for 250,000 unemployed Canadians is not also good for them. Indeed, in view of our present level of unemployment it would seem the government needs all the incentive it can get to do something about providing jobs.