

that has not been authorized. On that basis, but not only that, Sir, I submit the bill offends against the rule regarding anticipation. I will be glad to give Your Honour some references and citations in that regard in a minute. At present, the effect of this proposed amendment would be to provide that the supplementary estimate of \$454 million is a loan to the Unemployment Insurance Commission and not an outright grant.

I again seek the attention of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, in view of what he said yesterday. This is the second point I wish to make, a point he may have overlooked in his remarks yesterday. The amendment if passed would provide that the supplementary estimate is a loan to the fund and not an outright grant. I am sure the hon. member is aware that section 23 of the Financial Administration Act stipulates that whatever moneys are obtained by virtue of that section are deemed to be an appropriation. The effect would be that these moneys, being an appropriation, would come out of general revenues. The effect of the amendment, if passed, is that it would alter the situation; it would convert the appropriation to an advance, thereby requiring the blue collar workers, the people who draw unemployment benefits, to repay the fund.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Nielsen: Is that what my hon. friends to my left want?

An hon. Member: Absolutely not!

Mr. Nielsen: But that precisely would be the effect of it.

Mr. Andras: Nonsense!

Mr. Nielsen: If the party that calls itself the party of the lunch bucket set—

Mr. Brewin: Discuss the bill.

Mr. Nielsen: —supports the government, the party that purports to support the man with the lunch bucket will be imposing on that man a burden in future of \$454 million. It is that simple.

There is another point to this. If this amount of approximately half a billion dollars given to the Unemployment Insurance Commission is a grant, and that is what it would be if this amendment does not pass, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner) must include that amount in his figures when he casts his accounts and announces the fiscal or budgetary position of Canada for the 1972-73 fiscal year. This would bring consequent changes in the 1973-74 fiscal year. On the other hand, if the amount is a loan to the Unemployment Insurance Commission, then the minister need not account for the sums when giving the fiscal or budgetary position of the country, except to report under "Loans and Investments" that this sum was given to the Unemployment Insurance Commission by way of a loan. What does this mean? What would be the effect, Sir?

It means, Sir, that the government, by using this device, has \$454 million with which to woo more parliamentary support from NDP members, because that amount comes off the deficit in the budget and the minister can say to

Unemployment Insurance Act

the House, "Look we are \$454 million richer than we would be if we had not passed that loan." Hon. members to my left are being sucked into this device. Not only are those hon. members imposing a burden on the working man who must repay the loan; they are being sucked into a charade, because the minister can come along with all his goodies and say, "This is not costing us any more money; I do not have to raise taxes because we now have this windfall of \$454 million by virtue simply of passing clause 2 of this bill."

A further result would be this, Mr. Speaker. I am still speaking on the point of order. If the amount is a grant, then the contributors to the Unemployment Insurance account benefit accordingly and do not need to make up that amount by any increase in contributions. The amount is paid for out of general revenues contributed by all sources of taxation. If it is a loan, then, of course, the contributors must pay the loan back by increased contributions or by decreased benefits, or by a proportionate adjustment of the ratio of contribution to benefits, or by a restriction on eligibility. There are no other possible results than those. That is the burden we are placing on the working people. That is the burden my friends to my left would place on them by supporting the second clause of this bill.

Mr. Andras: Nonsense.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member has something to say, I wish he would stand up and say it. I do not like remarks I have not heard being smuggled on to *Hansard*.

Mr. Andras: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Nielsen: Certainly.

Mr. Andras: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member is not totally ignorant of the fact that the advance will include the government's share of the cost of this program, and that will not be calculated or even known until the main estimates and votes are introduced more than one year after the fact.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): He knows that.

Mr. Nielsen: Fair enough; but it still does not excuse the action. The government is still placing the burden on the contributor. The whole amount still has to be repaid.

Mr. Andras: But the act called for that in the first place.

Mr. Nielsen: There must have been some reason for the words "any sums obtained by warrant shall be deemed appropriations" to be included in section 23.

I now wish to quote, in support of the point of order, from May's most recent edition, the eighteenth. I shall read brief excerpts from pages 364 and 365.

A motion must not anticipate a matter already appointed for consideration by the House . . . whether it be a bill or an adjourned debate upon a motion. . . .

Stated generally, the rule against anticipation (which applies to other proceedings as well as motions) is that a matter must not be anticipated if it is contained in a more effective form of proceeding than the proceeding by which it is sought to be anticipated . . .