

1972 (a) what was the total amount involved (b) how many projects were approved as of December 31, 1972 (c) for what amount (d) how many projects were approved for the Province of Quebec as of the same date (e) for what constituencies and what was the amount involved in each?—Sessional Paper No. 291-2/208.

Mr. Reid, Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council, presented,—Returns to the foregoing Orders.

The Order being read for the report stage of Bill C-124, An Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971 (No. 1), as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration;

Mr. Alexander, seconded by Mr. Baldwin, proposed to move,—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:

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 Subsection 137(4) of the *Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971* is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

'(4) The total amount outstanding at any time of advances made under this section shall not exceed nine hundred million dollars except where an advance is approved by a resolution of the House of Commons introduced and passed in accordance with the rules of that House.'"

Mr. Nielsen, seconded by Mr. Wagner, proposed to move,—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:

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 Subsection 137(4) of the *Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971* is repealed and the following substituted therefor: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

Mr. Baldwin, seconded by Mr. Alexander, proposed to move,—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:

"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."

And debate arising thereon;

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: Honourable Members might like to look through citation 246(3) and also citation 250(4). It is my impression, my fear, that perhaps not only the honourable Member's proposed amendments but the others also would suggest the importing of a new principle, and I also suggest that they may infringe on the financial initiatives of the Crown. This is the area where I have troubles, and this is the area which the honourable Member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) has covered.

I thank honourable Members for their very interesting comments. As I indicated earlier this afternoon, I have given very serious thought to these several amendments. They have caused me a good deal of concern. I reviewed them, looked at May and Beauchesne and Bourinot and, of course, Standing Orders, hoping that I could see a ray of light which would make it possible for the Chair to allow them and hoping, also, that honourable Members could convince me that these amendments were acceptable and would be a vehicle for discussion of this important legislation under Standing Order 75.

In spite of the arguments which have been advanced this afternoon, I find it very difficult to accept that these amendments are in order. I want to insist on the fact that I have gone out of my way to study the arguments that have been brought forward by those who have taken part in this debate in support of the acceptability of the amendments. I was particularly impressed by the argumentation of the honourable Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen). In citing the precedents he did, I had the impression that, were I sitting on the bench, I would have come to the conclusion that he has worked very hard to advance very cogent arguments in favour of what, basically, was a very weak case.

I think the honourable Member will have to recognize, as will any Member who takes an interest in precedents and in procedure, that these amendments are not even borderline. I would find it extremely difficult to reconcile my judgment of such matters with accepting the amendments. I was hoping that perhaps some accommodation could be reached, but as I say I would find it difficult to countenance accepting the amendments.

My objections to them are those that I indicated when, at the suggestion of the honourable Member for Yukon earlier in the discussion, I voiced my reservations about them. Arguments in opposition were brought forward and the honourable Member for Yukon quoted a very interesting citation taken from chapter XXVII of the 18th Edition of May. My impression is that what he referred to is more