

*Unemployment Insurance Act*

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** The hon. member for Yukon says "Oh, no". That other clause he is dragging into the discussion does not do anything new. It has nothing to do with the way in which Governor General's warrants are drawn. It merely says that any money parliament appropriates by adopting the miscellaneous estimate now before the standing committee shall be treated as an advance and not as an appropriation.

**Mr. Nielsen:** Then, you have not seen the arguments.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** The hon. member is making the same nonsense from a seat which is not his own as he does from his own seat. This bill is as clear as a bill can be. It does one thing. It deals only with that \$800 million ceiling. I accept the right of my friends in the Conservative party to argue that that ceiling should be maintained, but they can do so by voting against the second reading of this bill. It is, therefore, not proper for them to try to do it by means of a direct negative.

In respect of the third part of the motion, I will merely say what has already been stated. It seems to me it is irrelevant to the bill. It implies that in some way or other the bill is legalizing what has already been done. This bill does not do that. The legalizing of the Governor General's warrants will come when the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates submits its report and the House deals with it here. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, on these three counts I submit that you should find the amendment out of order.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Lotbinière, on a point of order.

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Fortin:** Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few comments on this point of order. I agree with what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) said. However, I regret that the amendment moved by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) has only been drafted in English—besides being contradictory, as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre said.

Indeed, the first part of the amendment states that benefits should still be paid because he would not want to antagonize the recipients. Yet the rest of it is contradictory and amounts to a sort of nonconfidence motion.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has quoted paragraphs (12), (13) and (14) of citation 202, on page 170 of Beuchesne's Fourth Edition. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to your attention paragraph (15) of the same citation, which reads as follows:

(15) An amendment approving part of a motion and disapproving the remainder is out of order.

Such is the nature of the motion moved by the hon. member for Peace River. It tends to approve part of the clause because payment of benefits is desired, but on the other hand it is a sort of non confidence motion.

However, Mr. Speaker, paragraph (15) adds, and I quote:

On the 20th October, 1932, the Prime Minister moved that the House approve a Trade Agreement entered into between Canada and the United Kingdom. An amendment was moved that the

[Mr. Nielsen.]

House welcomed certain terms of the Agreement and condemned several features of it. The Speaker ruled it out because (a) the portion of the amendment which approved the Agreement was useless as it suggested no change in the main motion, and also, (b), an amendment to disapprove what the main motion approves is nothing but an expanded negative.

This is why I suggest that this is not only a non confidence motion in disguise but a contradictory amendment and that, therefore, the Chair should rule it out.

*[English]*

**Mr. Baldwin:** Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) let me say that I have never disguised my lack of confidence in this government. In introducing this legislation, the minister made quite plain that the obvious purpose of the bill in part, particularly clause (1) which removes this ceiling, is to provide that there should be an opportunity to supply benefits to the unemployed which does not now exist. There is no question about that. He said that in his introduction, and it is quite plain that this is what it purports to do. It would remove a ceiling which has already been exceeded, and there would be an opportunity to make payment of those benefits. We are now carrying on the 1973 version of the battle of reasoned amendments.

Under citation 382 of Beuchesne—which is precisely the British practice and the practice carried on here—we find the following:

It is also competent to a member who desires to place on record any special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of a Bill, to move as an amendment to the question, a resolution declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy, or provisions of the bill.

In the first place, we are met here in this bill with two different principles, if there are any in the bill at all, about which I have my doubts. The first of two principles, if there are any, is the raising of the ceiling. Quite unrelated to that is the question of saying that advances made under Governor General's warrants shall be deemed to be advances made under the act. I shall come to that in a moment.

We approve that principle which we find in the legislation which says that because of the incompetence of this government in administering this act it is now in a position where, after February 8, benefits cannot be paid to those who are entitled to receive them. We say that to that extent we accept the principle.

Dealing with the other aspect of the bill, a certain ruling has been made over and over again, certainly in the United Kingdom and here as well. There was an occasion last session when Mr. Speaker indicated his approval of an amendment moved by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert). We were saying at that time that if we do not like all the relevant and surrounding circumstances involved in a bill, but do not want to be placed in the position of rejecting all of it, there is reason to say that we accept part but do not like the other principles involved. Our declaration of that particular fact is on record. That is what we are doing.

We say we are ready to accept that aspect of the bill which says a way must be found—the government has provided a way which might not be the right way—to make available these benefits, but we do not like the other