

dren, be eradicated and that these women be eligible for the eight-week benefit.

My motion is in response to many letters and appeals from women across the country who have adopted or wish to adopt children. The criterion for adoption, under the rules of various children's aid societies, as is the case in Ontario, is that in the period of time prior to the child coming into the home the mother must quit work and be in the home, as well as for the first two weeks after the child has arrived in the home. So, in effect, this is a similar situation to the confinement period of the mother who bears a child. I feel, as do the women who have written to me, that the same confinement period should be granted to women adopting children just as it is to women who bear a child.

We argue that there is no question of expending money under the motion. These people have paid the premiums and they should be able to draw the benefits. All we argue is that they be given the opportunity to draw them. I am sure that in the actuarial figures and in the projections which the Unemployment Insurance Commission makes with regard to premiums and the payment of benefits, the commission must make certain assumptions, such as that women—they know the percentage of the insured work force—who pay premiums might at some time wish to draw benefits under the Unemployment Insurance Act. Basically, that is the argument we put forward before Your Honour, in the hope that the decision which was written for you before we had the discussion and put forward the argument will be withdrawn. How is that? I am not even a lawyer.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I have listened very carefully to the argument put forward by the hon. member for Nickel Belt, but my opinion is not changed, because the motion goes beyond the scope of the bill since it does not seek to amend any part of the bill, but section 30 of the act.

Mr. Alexander: It was a weak argument, at that.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): I would like to refer hon. members to the citation found in May's at page 521. It could be argued, also, that motion No. 12 would entail additional expenditures from the public treasury and, therefore, should be accompanied by a royal recommendation, which only a minister of the Crown can obtain. With regret, therefore, I must rule that motion No. 12 is not acceptable from a procedural point of view.

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, while we are on this subject, and given your eloquence—I certainly agree most assuredly with your conclusions—let me remind you, sir, that Mr. Speaker had also suggested that motions Nos. 19, 27, 28 and 33 standing in my name went beyond the scope of the bill. One of those amendments arose as a result of a question raised by the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) having to do with the minister, rather than the commission, deciding what confidential information might be made available. The reason I am rising at this time is that perhaps the hon. member for Hamilton West will later be able to seek the unanimous

Employment and Immigration

consent of the House to move that motion, but in so far as I am concerned, I am prepared to drop motions Nos. 19, 27, 28 and 33.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. It is my understanding that motions Nos. 19, 27, 28 and 33 standing in the name of the minister will be dropped. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Alexander: Reluctantly, I must agree with what Your Honour has just ruled, but I would appreciate it if Your Honour would keep in mind the comments of the minister regarding motion No. 27. I will try to seek the unanimous consent of the House to move that motion when we arrive at that point. Let me explain this. It was left up to the commission to distribute any information, written or oral, to any person within the department. I found that satisfactory. The offensive words were "to any other persons as they deem necessary".

● (1640)

Perhaps this information should have gone to other persons. Perhaps it should have been under the guidance and counselling of the minister because there could have been abuses. I am not saying there were; I have no reason for saying so. But in order to see to it that there is some control, I think hon. members from both sides of the House would appreciate there being some ministerial accounting in this matter. Therefore, in due course I will move an amendment, having given hon. members the opportunity to think about this so they can stand up and support me later.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I propose that motions Nos. 13, 14, 16, 17 and 18 be grouped for the purpose of debate, but that the question should be put separately on motions Nos. 13, 14 and 18. Then I propose that the question be put on motion No. 17. An affirmative vote would dispose of motion No. 16. However, if motion No. 17 is negated, then I propose that the question on motion No. 16 be put.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) (for Mr. Orlikow) moved motion No. 13:

That Bill C-27, an act to establish the Department of Employment and Immigration, the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission and the Canada Employment and Immigration Advisory Council, to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971 and to amend certain other statutes in consequence thereof, be amended in clause 41 by striking out line 14 at page 18 and substituting the following therefor:

"sections 34 to 37 of the said act are repealed."

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie) moved motion No. 14:

That Bill C-27, an act to establish the Department of Employment and Immigration, the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission and the Canada Employment and Immigration Advisory Council, to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971 and to amend certain other statutes in consequence thereof, be amended in clause 41 by striking out line 17 at page 18 and substituting the following therefor:

"than twenty weeks of insurable".