

I would like to suggest to the hon. member for Peace River that there is at least something to what has been said by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre regarding the possibility of having this very important point considered on third reading. As I said before, I would certainly hope there is that opportunity. I would think it should be consistent with the rights of the House that we find, through our procedures, a method to have this matter put to a vote and I would hope that in the course of the third reading stage, whenever that is reached, a method will be advanced by hon. members.

This could be done by an amendment which would be acceptable to the Chair procedurally, which would make it possible to have debate on that specific point, and a division of the House, if that is what hon. members seek. For the moment, to make sure that everything is at least half clear, I will refer to motions Nos. 2 and 3 so that they can be placed clearly on the record.

Motion No. 2 stands in the name of the hon. member for Yukon. Mr. Nielsen, seconded by Mr. Wagner, moves:

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:

[Translation]

"1. Subsection 137(4) of the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971 is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"(4) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 23 of the Financial Administration Act, the total amount outstanding at any time of advances made under this section shall not exceed nine hundred million dollars."

[English]

Motion No. 3 is as follows: R. Baldwin, seconded by Mr. Wagner moves:

That Bill C-124, An Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971 (No. 1), be amended by deleting lines 6 to 27 inclusive on page 1 and substituting therefor the following:

[Translation]

"2. Such amount, if any, as may be authorized for the purposes of the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971 in the fiscal year ending on the 31st day of March, 1973, under Manpower and Immigration Vote L30a of the Supplementary Estimates (A), 1972-73, tabled in the House of Commons on the 8th day of January, 1973, shall, notwithstanding any other provision of the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971, be deemed to be an appropriation described in paragraph 133(b) of that Act."

I suppose that it is now clear that these three motions, namely Motions Nos. 1, 2 and 3, were deemed out of order, and that the House is now proceeding to the next stage, that is consideration of the motion of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

[English]

Mr. Andras moved that the bill be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: When shall the said bill be read a third time?

Some hon. Members: Now.

Unemployment Insurance Act

Mr. Andras move that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Speaker, without being repetitious I believe I laid the groundwork with respect to a caveat, and I should like to enter it now. I notice that in terms of height and personality, the occupant of the Chair has changed but I think that the wisdom that comes from the Chair is still with us. We now have a Speaker who was not in the chair about five minutes ago, but since it was he who dealt with this matter of the bill being anticipatory, we are glad to see him. I would remind Your Honour of the problem we brought to his attention on January 25 when we commenced second reading of the bill. At that time, a point of order was raised that we on this side of the House found some difficulty in proceeding with the bill. Arguments were presented, which Mr. Speaker followed in his usual courteous manner, to the effect that Bill C-124, in clause (2), deals with a matter which was before the Miscellaneous Estimates Committee as Vote L30a. We all know what it is about.

• (1640)

Notwithstanding that the Vote was dealt with in committee, I submit it has not been authorized yet, that is the authorization of \$454 million by way of Governor General's warrants which the government now wants to call an advance rather than an appropriation. I respectfully submit that until such time as Vote L30a is authorized, not only coming from the miscellaneous estimates committee by way of a division but authorized by way of the Appropriations Act, we are faced with a very peculiar situation. Apparently in error—I do not know whether it is in error or not—the government thought that this would be an excellent way of having the House deal with a bill which anticipates. I cannot see how we can go into third reading now unless a bill has been passed, of which I have no knowledge, which would then bring the word "authorized" into full play and acceptability. I respectfully state that the word "authorized" must have some meaning at this particular time. The proper interpretation of the word is that the appropriation bill has been passed; it is in order; that what is supposed to have occurred somewhere else has already occurred. I submit that it has not.

I am pleased to note what my friend the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles)—whom I like to quote now and again because I say one should give credit where credit is due—said on January 25 as reported in *Hansard* in the right hand column of page 652. He made a very cogent argument—

Mr. Nielsen: Try where he starts wracking his brain.

Mr. Alexander: I see the hon. member has already found it.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I told you where to look.

Mr. Alexander: There is one thing, Mr. Speaker, that we have not forgotten. We believe that when an argument is based upon wisdom, experience and knowledge of the House rules, one should never forget it. The hon. member was dealing with the problem he knew we would have to