

Speaker's Ruling

complete second reading of that. Depending on further discussions, on Tuesday we might consider a possible return message to the other place in respect of Bill C-21. That will, of course, depend on the Chair's ruling on the point of order which the Chair, I understand, will be giving to us shortly.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, a short supplementary on a subject which is of interest to many members. It deals with the Deputy Speaker's position. As we know, we still have a Deputy Speaker, but it would be rather embarrassing for him to be sitting in that Chair since he is a minister of the Crown. I am just wondering if the government—and we would not accept that—had given some thought to following our Standing Orders, which call for an appointment forthwith. Can we expect an appointment to be made or consultations to be finished soon?

Mr. Andre: In such high esteem is the current occupant of the deputy speakership held that even though he now has cabinet responsibilities, there is a great reluctance to accept his resignation in order to propose his replacement. However, I understand that the discussions have advanced to some extent. If I may paraphrase all my predecessors—I stress, all my predecessors—in this position, we will be acting soon.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: I certainly hope so!

* * *

[*English*]

POINT OF ORDER

SENATE AMENDMENTS TO BILL C-21—SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. Speaker: On April 3, 1990 the hon. government House leader rose to contest the acceptability of certain amendments set out in the Senate message respecting Bill C-21, an act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act and the Employment and Immigration Department and Commission Act. He sought "the Chair's guidance in formulating a motion for a return message to the Senate," and asked the Chair "to rule that certain amendments contained in the message from the other place are out of order, because they differ in one way or another with the specific conditions laid out in the royal recommendation of Bill C-21, and because they infringe upon the financial initiative of the Crown." In his

reasoned and well-documented arguments, the hon. minister also claimed that the proposed amendments infringed upon the financial privileges of this House in that the Senate amendments "undermine in a significant way the budget of April 27, (1989) in which this House has expressed its confidence". He also claimed that the amendments violated the principle of the bill, that is to set up the unemployment insurance program, as an employer-employee finance program.

Following the hon. minister's intervention, we had, on April 3 and again on April 5, quite a full airing of this issue.

[*Translation*]

Perhaps it would be well to summarize briefly at this point the chronology of the proceedings to date on Bill C-21.

On April 27, 1989, the Minister of Finance tabled a document entitled "the Budget Speech" which at page 12 reads: "At the same time, changes will be made to ensure that the financing of the program is consistent with our efforts to control the debt. Beginning January 1, 1990, unemployment insurance payments will be fully financed by employer and employee premiums". This budget was adopted by the House on May 11, 1989. Subsequently, on June 1, 1989, the bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Unemployment Insurance Act and the Employment and Immigration Department and Commission Act" was introduced in this House and read a first time June 1, 1989. The bill was debated at second reading on June 6, 7 and 21, 1989. The debate at second reading was closed June 21, 1989 and the bill referred to a legislative committee.

• (1510)

[*English*]

The committee after travelling, hearing witnesses and considering the bill at length, reported it back to the House with amendments on October 10, 1989. The bill was considered at report stage on October 16, 1989. The time allocation motion covering both report stage and third reading was debated and agreed to on October 24, 1989. On October 25, the bill was again considered at report stage and concurred in with further amendments. It was debated at third reading on November 2, and after further debate on November 6, 1989 read a third time and passed.