

consideration by the House and cannot be anticipated by a motion. I simply say they are different matters.

If I am to have really sound authority for validating my argument, I ought to go back to the ruling made from the Chair recently. That relied on the following words found at page 399 of Erskine May's Seventeenth Edition:

... the rule against anticipation ... 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 ... but it may be anticipated if it is contained in an equally or less effective form.

It is obvious, if one goes that distance and concludes that the same matter is dealt with in both proceedings, that one must conclude with Mr. Deputy Speaker that a bill is a more effective form of proceeding than a motion. Certainly, that is my position and that is the gist of the conclusion arrived at by the Chair a few days ago.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to add anything further of substance to the point I raised on January 25 and again today. I do, however, want to comment on something the President of the Privy Council said. The more he listens to lawyers in this House, the more he wonders why people go to law school. Sir, the more I listen to the minister and the interpretations he places on May, Beauchesne and other authorities, the more I see the need for more lawyers to understand those interpretations.

Mr. MacEachen: Touché.

Mr. Nielsen: I believe the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre owes the House the obligation of participating in the debate of this point of order if for no other reason than that of explaining the position he took on January 25. I would think it has not changed, although perhaps between that time and the present there may be some results from that brain wracking he was doing when he made his remarks.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, it is not often that one is so warmly invited to take the floor. I am happy to respond to the invitation. May I say that the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander), when he quoted my remarks, quoted them in full and did not take any of them out of context. What he said I said, I said.

Mr. Nielsen: But?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): And, there it is.

Mr. Nielsen: But?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): However, I point out that I made those remarks conditionally and, in particular I asked Your Honour to put the gentlemen at the table to work in trying to find the precedents I could not recall when wracking my brain, to repeat the phrase I used on January 25.

I must say, Sir, that since that date I have given this matter more thought and concluded that there were one or two flaws in my argument. For example, if it is true, and Your Honour may so find, that we cannot pass Bill C-124 because the estimate referred to has not been authorized, it means not just that the bill authorizing that

Unemployment Insurance Act

estimate has to pass third reading in this House, but that it must also be dealt with in the other place and be given Royal Assent by His Excellency, the governor general, or his deputy. I think, if one were to push the things I said on January 25 that far, that would be the position, and it does raise certain questions. I am still convinced that there have been occasions on which we have had to stop something because of something else, and I was hoping that the gentlemen at the table might find them. Hence I am leaving this matter for Your Honour to rule on it.

Further, there is this point to be raised: the language of clause 2 of Bill C-124 refers to an amount authorized pursuant to supplementary estimates. Supposing we were to pass this bill, and supposing those supplementary estimates are never authorized. In that case this bill, even if it becomes law, would not have any effect. That must be a point Your Honour ought to take into consideration. I freely admit I said those things recorded in *Hansard* of January 25, although I submit they were said mainly to help us over the hurdle at that point, namely, the difficulty over proceeding with second reading. However, I think the matter must be given further consideration by Your Honour before Your Honour renders a final decision.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Do other hon. members wish to make a contribution to this debate? May I have some indication whether other hon. members wish to contribute, before we proceed to our five o'clock business? I see the parliamentary secretary will participate. A decision will be rendered thereafter as to which comes first, the chicken or the egg, hopefully without the Chair laying the egg.

An hon. Member: Five o'clock.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall)—Veterans Affairs—Disability pensions—Request for statement on steps to expedite decisions on applications; the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett)—Harbours—Transfer of administration of small craft harbours to Department of the Environment; the hon. member for Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo (Mr. Beatty)—Communications—Bell Canada rate increase application—Inquiry as to opposition by government.

It being five o'clock, the House will proceed to private members business, namely, notices of motions.

• (1700)

Mr. Bell: Mr. Speaker, in order to be helpful, if you stand them all until item 13, this will meet with the approval of the House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is this agreeable to the House?