

Oral Questions

indicate when legislation will be introduced concerning this matter?

Mr. Whelan: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before calling orders of the day, perhaps the Chair might be allowed to recognize the hon. member for Mackenzie who has been trying to ask a supplementary for a while.

COURT RULING THAT SASKATCHEWAN HOGS CANNOT BE SOLD IN MANITOBA UNLESS THROUGH PROVINCIAL MARKETING BOARD—FEDERAL INTERVENTION

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, my question is supplementary to that asked by the hon. member for Lisgar. I should like to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether, as a result of a ruling by the Manitoba courts that Saskatchewan hogs cannot be marketed in Manitoba unless they go through the hog marketing board, he intends to intercede on behalf of Saskatchewan producers since this would seem to be in contravention of the British North America Act?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I know of no representations being made to me expressly by the Saskatchewan hog producers at this time.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

REQUEST THAT MOTION CONCERNING VIET NAM BE CALLED

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order having to do with the House business. I realize that the Secretary of State announced the business for today, but in view of the very great interest shown in the motion brought forward by the Secretary of State for External Affairs dealing with Canada's participation in Viet Nam and in view of the fact the minister has indicated his willingness to vote for the amendment introduced by my colleague, the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Wagner), I wonder whether the government House leader would be able to satisfy the desire of the minister by arranging that this matter be brought forward tomorrow? I think we could obtain agreement that hon. members would not participate further in the debate so the motion could be voted on. Would the government House leader consider that request?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): Yes, Mr. Speaker. If my hon. friends will dispose of the unemployment insurance bill and the appropriation bill today we will consider bringing that on tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

[Mr. Whittaker.]

• (1500)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

**UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT, 1971 (No. 1)
PROVISION FOR APPROPRIATION TO BE DEEMED
ADVANCE**

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-124, to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971 (No. 1), as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. Speaker: As hon. members know, there are before the House on the order paper at the present time three notices of motion of which notice has been given pursuant to Standing Order (75(5)). I have given very serious thought to the many procedural aspects of the three motions. I am not sure what the position of the House would be from a procedural standpoint in respect of these motions and I have the same qualms and reservations about the three motions. But perhaps I might, for the purpose of discussion, put for the consideration of the House from a procedural standpoint the first one which stands in the name of the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) seconded by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin):

That Bill C-124, an act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971 (No. 1), be amended by deleting lines 4 and 5 on page 1 and substituting therefor the following:

"1. Subsection 137(4) of the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971 is repealed and the following substituted therefor: '(4) The total amount outstanding at any time of advances made under this section shall not exceed nine hundred million dollars except where an advance is approved by a resolution of the House of Commons introduced and passed in accordance with the rules of that House'."

If hon. members have procedural objections to this proposed motion, I will hear them and at the same time of course hear any arguments which might be advanced in support of this motion.

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the motion stands in my name, I think it is only appropriate that I make some submissions with respect to the advisability of accepting the motion as it stands. We are very much aware of the fact that section 137(4) of the Unemployment Insurance Act indicates that there is a ceiling, and if I am not mistaken, that ceiling is set at \$800 million. What is occurring at present is that the government, has given any indication of its wish to remove that ceiling. I would say that section 137(4) presently provides that the total amount outstanding by way of repayable advances or loans by the government to the Unemployment Insurance Commission shall not exceed \$800 million. If that is self-explanatory, it needs no further comment.

But at the same time, clause 1 of Bill C-124 would give the government the power to make advances to the commission unlimited in total amount. I should like to say at this time that there is a figure which is floating in the air but the government does not indicate what that figure should be. The message and recommendation of His Excellency the Governor General is to the same effect, and the relevant words are "to remove the ceiling on