

### *Unemployment Insurance Act*

There are a great many other problems related to the public service, but I notice the time is nearing six o'clock and I have no intention of talking-out the hon. member's motion. I want it to come to a vote. I am certain there is not anyone on the government side who wishes to stand up and talk it out. But, Mr. Speaker, I see the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Isabelle) getting ready over there, and his readiness destroys my confidence in him. He is an excellent medical man but on the matter of the public service I am afraid he is going to protect the government, as usual. At any rate, he is listening to the debate.

As I say, there are many other problems in the public service. There was the matter of the back-to-back casual employment in the postal service whereby casuals in many post offices in 1968 and 1969 outnumbered the permanent employees. In addition, tremendous lethargy has been displayed with respect to the superannuation act and improving pensions, particularly with the 2 per cent cost basis for benefits.

The Speech from the Throne promises reviews and amendments. I do not know what these will be but I would point out, in dealing with discrimination and other problems within the public service, that I have on the order paper a private member's bill which anticipates a separate appellate body. I have found that if an employee questions the decision of a superior in the public service, the matter goes right back down the line to the person who made the decision in the first place, so that there cannot be a fair and impartial hearing of a legitimate grievance within the public service.

When these matters are rectified we will develop better attitudes and morale in our public service which even now is recognized as one of the greatest in the world. And when matters of which I have spoken are rectified the Canadian public service will function unquestionably as the greatest public service in the world.

[Translation]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger):** Order. The hour appointed for the consideration of private members' business having expired, I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock.

[English]

At six o'clock the House took recess.

### AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT, 1971 (No. 1)

#### PROVISION FOR APPROPRIATION TO BE DEEMED ADVANCE

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Andras that Bill C-124, to amend the Unemployment

[Mr. Rose.]

Insurance Act, 1971 (No. 1), be read the third time and do pass.

**Mr. MacGuigan:** Mr. Speaker, on January 25 of this year a point was placed before you which is almost identical to the point which you have now to consider. It would appear that the only substantial difference between that point and the one which you now have to deal with on the question of anticipation is that a different stage of the proceedings was in question. We were then at second reading stage of Bill C-124, and now we are considering a similar point at third reading stage.

The ruling which you gave at that time appears at page 661 of *Hansard* of that date, and makes the point that there is a descending order of values for matters in the parliamentary process. It was this conception which I believe you used at that time to enable you to decide that the most effective form of proceeding before the House then was Bill C-124 rather than the estimates. Mr. Speaker, I believe that is still the case. Although the estimates are now before the House, they have not been considered by it. This bill is in a more advanced stage and I believe this would still be considered to be the more effective form of proceeding before the House.

I would therefore suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the basis for your decision of January 25 is still a valid basis; that the principle of descending order of values and of a more effective form of proceeding still applies. In light of this principle I believe Your Honour's ruling should be to the same effect today as it was at that time. It would be difficult indeed to see how this question could go any other way because the two proceedings are tied together, each is dependent upon the other and each could be said in a sense to anticipate the other. If we were not to establish one as having priority over the other, one could go to an infinite regression in attempting to decide with which one we should begin. I am sure that would not be the wish of Your Honour or the parliamentarians of this House.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) placed before us, I believe, the question of the state of the bill in the case that the estimates which are before the House would not subsequently be approved. In that case, Mr. Speaker, on the assumption that this bill is passed, but taking the hypothesis that the estimates would not subsequently be approved, we would have an act of parliament in proper order which would be entirely valid but one of the sections of the act might be rendered inoperative as a result of the fact that the estimates had not passed.

I think we have to read the second clause of this bill with a close eye to the grammar therein. There is no verb before the word "authorized". It is not a verbal phrase, it is a participle, and it would seem that the best way to understand this wording would be in the sense of "the amount when authorized" or "the amount if authorized". In other words, it is a clause which is dependent upon another happening, which is conditional upon it.

**Mr. Nielsen:** It does not say that.

**Mr. MacGuigan:** But one has to start somewhere; one has first to approve either the estimates or the bill. We are