

discuss both clauses at the same time. In the view of my party, the two clauses are so interrelated as to be inseparable in terms of discussion. We support restraint, but we disagree with the method the government is using.

Your Honour can solve the problem quite readily by combining motions Nos. 7 and 14 for the purposes of discussion, even though they will be voted on separately. We find difficulty in discussing one without discussing the other at the same time, because in our view they are all part of the same package. When Your Honour was combining motions yesterday, you did not come up with that particular combination. Since in our view they are the crux of our proposals to modify this bill, I suggest they should be combined for the purpose of discussion.

● (1532)

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I would like to supplement what the hon. member has said. Your Honour indeed ruled quite correctly, but as my colleague has indicated, there is a very simple solution, and that is that clause (d) of motion No. 12 be numbered separately as a separate amendment. Concomitantly, the rest of the clauses numerically change. In other words, clause (d) would become motion No. 13 and the rest of motion No. 12 would remain. Your Honour could then lump both together for purposes of debate, but they would remain separate motions in order strictly to adhere to the procedural problem which Your Honour presented when you made your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: I get a different impression from the two presentations just made. The hon. member for York-Scarborough, the proponent of motion No. 12, seeks to amend two clauses. He tells me that his amendment is contained in one way or another in motions Nos. 7 and 14. If I were to group, I have said that motions Nos. 7 and 6 should be debated together, motion No. 6 being, if I recall correctly, to delete the clause and motion No. 7 being to amend it.

Mr. McCrossan: No.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps we can take a moment and examine those two motions. The hon. member for York-Scarborough has told me that motion No. 7 could be grouped with motion No. 14. The purpose of his motion No. 12 would then have been accomplished. Do I understand that correctly?

Mr. McCrossan: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: I said that motion No. 14 should be debated and voted on separately. My suggestion to the House about the grouping and discussion of amendments is always a suggestion. It needs to be clarified by my understanding of the texture of the motion. If the House is agreed that motions Nos. 7 and 14 can be joined together for debate for the purpose of accomplishing all of the purposes the hon. member had in mind when he put motion No. 12 on the notice paper, that certainly is very agreeable to me.

Unemployment Insurance Act

It remains, however, that I cannot accept on procedural grounds the hon. member's motion No. 12. I am sure that does not put him in any difficulty because, if he is correct in his assessment, while he is discussing motions Nos. 7 and 14 he will have all the opportunity he wants to put forward the merits of what would have been an orderly amendment if it had been split in two pieces. Does that meet the accord of the House?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: That being so, perhaps the House can take it as agreed that motion No. 14 can be taken together with motion No. 7, which I have already grouped with motion No. 6, so the three would be discussed together. Perhaps during the course of discussion we can determine the manner in which votes should be taken when we come to them. Motion No. 12 remains procedurally out of order.

Motion No. 30?

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, I rise on point of order with regard to the lumping together of motions Nos. 7 and 14. As far as I can gather, motion No. 7 deals with the deletion of clause 4. That is the motion of the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra. His motion No. 14 looks at the implementation of a two-tier system dependent on whether a beneficiary has or does not have dependants. On the one hand, motion No. 7 is separate, having a certain intent, which is to kill clause 4 of the bill. Motion No. 14 has an entirely different thrust, which is to establish a two-tier structure.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member seems to have a point that is well taken. Motions Nos. 6 and 7, in the names of two different members, seek to delete clause 4. Clearly they have to be grouped together both for debate and vote. Motion No. 14 may perhaps accomplish the same purpose as the hon. member for York-Scarborough had in mind in his motion No. 12. Obviously motion No. 14 relates to clause 5. I think the hon. member for Nickel Belt has a point that is well taken. There seems to be no orderly way in which they can be grouped. Motions Nos. 6 and 7 remain grouped.

Mr. McCrossan: Mr. Speaker, I agree completely that they would have to be voted on separately. However, motions Nos. 6 and 7 deal with clause 4 which recommends a method of saving money. We are proposing a different method of saving money, bringing it in under clause 5. We feel it is part of the justification of our procedure, which is to eliminate the clause 4 suggestions and bring in additional suggestions under clause 5. That is why we wanted to discuss them together, because they form the kernel of our idea. We are asking that they be discussed together, not voted on together.

Mr. Speaker: If I understand correctly, the hon. member for York-Scarborough is telling me that his motion No. 12 is out of order because it seeks to amend both clause 4 and clause 5. However, he will have the opportunity to make his remarks on either the grouping of motions Nos. 6 and 7 or on motion No. 14, both of which together would have somewhat the same