

It seems to me this is exactly what the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Hamilton West seeks to infringe.

Turning to citation 250(4), it is clearly stated there that the fundamental terms of a money resolution submitted to the House cannot be amended. I believe that is what this amendment seeks to do.

In addition to that argument, I would draw Your Honour's attention to the fact that this amendment is a direct negation of the bill. In its recommendations the bill states very clearly that one of its two purposes is to remove the ceiling on advances. I believe that the amendment which is proposed by the hon. member for Hamilton West, in its substance, directly opposes the removal of a limitation and seeks to place a new ceiling in the act. This fact may be somewhat obscured by the words which are contained in the amendment. If I may direct Your Honour's attention to the amendment, there is what we might call a substantive section which proposes that:

The total amount outstanding at any time of advances made under this section shall not exceed nine hundred million dollars—

This is the substance of the amendment. Then, there is a procedural proposal:

—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. Speaker, it seems to me that the words following "except" are purely a procedural proposal and the substance of the amendment is contained in its first clause. That clause is clearly and directly a negation of the purposes of the bill as set out in the recommendations.

If I may draw Your Honour's attention to citation 202 subsection (12). It reads:

An amendment proposing a direct negative, though it may be covered up by verbiage, is out of order.

I would submit with all due respect to the hon. member for Hamilton West that there is verbiage which attempts to cover up the basic contrariety between the substance of his amendment and the bill before the House. Mr. Speaker, these are the reasons it seems to me you ought to rule this amendment out of order.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, we have listened to junior counsel for the government who followed on the heels of senior counsel, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), who made his arguments on behalf of the government, if I may put it that way.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Now, we are getting the paralegal service.

Mr. Baldwin: I see that the hon. members opposite do not like the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre to advocate their point of view. I am amazed at that. While he is not always right, and he is not this time, he very often is. I think the government needs a procedural expert to make arguments on their behalf from time to time.

Mr. Speaker, by simple process of *reductio ad absurdum*, which is the first point I am making to Your Honour—

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): You are good at that.

Unemployment Insurance Act

Mr. Baldwin: —I hope to ask you to eliminate all this nonsense we have heard. If one examines the transcript of the proceedings before the committee in a case the government made when we were examining this bill in the House, the government was saying over and over again that what they were attempting to do by the first clause in this bill which my hon. friend from Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) is seeking to amend was in no way to deal with ways and means, in no way to deal with the amount of benefits of unemployment insurance but with the extent to which there may be a debit or credit position at the end of each fiscal year. They are simply saying, "Because we made such an awful mess of this act, and our estimates as to expenditures were so out of kilter, we found that this \$800 million ceiling to provide for advances was no longer valid. Therefore, we are removing that ceiling." What remains, then, is ceiling unlimited—no limit at all on the ceiling or the extent to which the government may make advances. I would still argue that as strongly if what the government was attempting to do was to deal with the situation which related to the actual payment of benefits. But it is not that at all, Mr. Speaker.

If my hon. friend from Hamilton West, instead of moving this amendment, had simply moved to delete the clause in question, then Your Honour has already held that that would be a valid amendment. But if that were the case, then what would the situation be? If the House saw fit to approve the amendment, we would then be back to the ceiling set in the original act of \$800 million. If we can do that, then I submit we certainly can do what we are now attempting to do, that is place some hobbles on this spendthrift government and say to them "not an unlimited ceiling but a limited ceiling".

I dismiss out of hand, of course, the argument of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, that the hon. member for Hamilton West is attempting to deal with the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971. He is only attempting to restrict the government's capacity to make advances. This is not a money spending bill. The argument of the government, and they have repeated it ad nauseam, is that it is a question of making advances. If they asked for the right to make unlimited advances we would refuse, but would place a limit on what they could advance. Surely, that is the purpose of the amendment. If Your Honour rules us out of order, then he is saying, in effect, that all we can do is vote against the bill. That is the effect, as I see it. We are not interfering in any way with the actual expenditure of money.

I come back to this because I think it needs to be made plain to my friends opposite that we are saying there must be a limitation, for a number of purposes which I do not need to deal with now but will deal with if we get into the amendment. If not, then I will be compelled to deal with it on third reading. I say if we are deprived of this opportunity the opposition is then restricted to voting against the bill. I agree that we should move to delete clause 1.

• (1530)

The government has seen fit, if one accepts the argument made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and his assistant, to place an unlimited ceiling on the fund. That is what it wants to do. But we, on the other hand, want a limited ceiling. We want less, not more. If the