

dealing with the bill, and on the basis of the principle which Your Honour elaborated at an earlier time the bill is to take precedence.

Mr. Nielsen: It does not say "if authorized".

Mr. MacGuigan: I know what the bill says, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nielsen: Don't put an "if" in, then.

Mr. MacGuigan: Hon. members may have their own ideas of what the bill says. The hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) has been giving his interpretation and putting in words, now I am giving my interpretation of what the clause means. I am suggesting there is no contradiction between the estimates and the bill; the two work together. There is no other way in which the two could work together. It is a simple question for the Chair to decide which has priority.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the principle which you have established I suggest that the bill which is now before us ought to be given priority, and the point of order raised by the hon. members opposite should be found to be invalid.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) on the point of order.

Mr. Nielsen: There are just two points I should like to discuss, Your Honour. The hon. member opposite has spoken of a descending order of values in his attempt to equate what is happening now with your ruling of January 25. He has advanced to Your Honour the argument that the bill is a more appropriate instrument for dealing with the matter than is an estimate.

• (2010)

The point I made on the point of order, which he apparently fails to appreciate, is that the whole matter turns on the word "authorized". That has to do with the authority of this House which comes into effect upon passage of the appropriation bill that comes in with the estimates, and it has nothing to do with the estimates themselves. So we are dealing with two instruments that are equivalent, a bill which is an appropriation bill coming in with the estimates and, on the other hand, the bill now before us. There can be no choice about any descending order of bills when there are two bills to deal with.

An hon. Member: Not at all.

Mr. Baldwin: Why do you not deal with both together?

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, as I did not hear that interjection I cannot deal with it. Also, one clause of Bill C-124 might be inoperative if the estimates fail to pass, as has been suggested. That argument bolsters what I have been saying, that the bill before us anticipates the appropriation bill being brought in with the estimates; that appropriation bill is an essential prerequisite before the bill presently before the House can be dealt with.

I urge strongly upon you, sir, the idea that Bill C-124 anticipates an authorization that has not yet been given. The resolution itself uses the word "authorized". The use of the word "authorized", regardless whether it is used as a participle, presupposes that the appropriation bill will

Unemployment Insurance Act

authorize the expenditure of funds in a manner in which this bill seeks to do, namely, to change those expenditures from an appropriation to an advance. Therefore I submit that my hon. friend and the government are trying to put the cart before the horse. This is a totally irregular procedure and would cast doubt entirely upon the validity of Bill C-124, if it should ever pass in its present form.

An hon. Member: Right on.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, further to the point of order, we have reached the point in the debate this evening that was anticipated in the second reading debate on this bill.

An hon. Member: Keep talking. We can wait until Christmas.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): At that time I indicated to Your Honour, in speaking on the point of order raised in the earlier debate by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen), that the language of this bill, particularly with regard to clause 2 dealing with an item in the estimates, is total nonsense and an abuse of language in any way that one can reasonably consider it. With the objective of rescuing the government from its ineptitude with regard to unemployment insurance, some hon. members in the House are trying to hide behind the backs of the thousands of recipients entitled to unemployment insurance and, as a result, we have been taken to the brink of disaster because of that unconcern for the people.

The government, however, has chosen this method of asking the House for carte blanche with respect to ceilings on loans or advances from the Minister of Finance. Having taken action through governor general's warrants, and having followed the requirements of the Financial Administration Act to convert those items which appeared on the governor general's warrants into advances—

Mr. Nielsen: Seduction with intent.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):—the government has introduced this bill before the appropriation bill has come in, and the appropriation bill has not been passed by this House. I say this is a nefarious bill because it claims, in so many words, that this House has already authorized those advances. That is the point.

An hon. Member: True.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): That is what the bill says.

An hon. Member: No.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): There has not been any authorized advance under any appropriation bill.

An hon. Member: Go back to law school.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): No appropriation has been put through and therefore no advance has been authorized by parliament.

An hon. Member: No.