

*Unemployment Insurance Act*

The amount 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 . . .

The resolution uses the term "authorized" and Your Honour will recall that I raised the argument at the time that the bill was anticipatory of the work of the committee and that since the committee had not yet authorized the estimate, the bill could not be dealt with. On deeper reflection, I believe that the terminology used goes beyond the authorization which was granted on division in the committee and goes to the appropriation bill itself. I believe that the resolution which accompanied Bill C-124 contemplated that the authorization of which it spoke in the resolution was an authorization by the appropriation bill. In that sense, I believe that the consideration of this clause at this time is anticipatory and consequently out of order.

I raise the matter at this time because of something that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) said. He said that the amendment of the hon. member for Peace River directed itself toward the Unemployment Insurance Act, when nothing could be further from the truth because what clause 2 of the bill seeks to do is to reverse the effect of section 23 of the Financial Administration Act, and this has nothing whatsoever to do with the Unemployment Insurance Act. I raise the matter now, Your Honour, simply because when third reading comes along I do not want to be confronted with the admonition by Your Honour that it should have been raised at an earlier point.

• (1630)

**Mr. Alexander:** Mr. Speaker, in support of the submission made by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) on the point of order which he has now placed before the House, there can be no question but that this matter was dealt with earlier on second reading. At that time there was a certain hesitation displayed by many of us arising from a reading of Bill C-124, in particular of clause 2, which in effect anticipated the ending of something which was then occurring in another place, namely, the Miscellaneous Estimates Committee.

At that time the matter was dealt with in a very general way. As I recall, there were several cogent arguments placed before Mr. Speaker, both pro and con, with the ultimate result that there was no disposition of the matter.

As I say, at that particular time several arguments were placed before Mr. Speaker for his consideration, one of them coming from the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) who, in his wisdom, indicated that the bill could be proceeded with on second reading, be dealt with in committee, returned from committee and be dealt with on report stage. However, there was some question in his mind, as there is still in my mind at this stage, as to whether we could approach third reading of the bill while we were still seized with the dilemma with respect to something occurring in another place.

**Mr. Nielsen:** That is what he said.

[Mr. Nielsen.]

**Mr. Alexander:** I do not want to take the hon. member's words out of context. I am paraphrasing his contribution, but I think that he would say I am doing it correctly. The problem we are faced with here is quite simple. The Miscellaneous Estimates Committee did sit, and it dealt with many other votes—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I shall allow the hon. member to continue, if he wants to, in a short while, but my understanding is that the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) was raising this matter by way of a caveat, at the moment, so that he would not be stopped from raising this very important and interesting point when we reach third reading, which we have not yet reached.

My understanding is that at this point we are considering arguments either for or against the procedural acceptability of the third motion under Standing Order 75, the one which stands in the name of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin). When we dispose of it and go to third reading, that is the point at which we would want to hear the arguments now being put forward by the hon. member for Hamilton West in support of those which, I assume, will then be placed before us by the hon. member for Yukon. If the hon. member agrees, I think we might proceed on that basis.

**Mr. Alexander:** Mr. Speaker, I shall certainly follow your suggestion, but I just wished to emphasize the point of order raised by my colleague as a caveat. In any event, I believe it was couched in such language that it could be interpreted as a point of order. I agree that we are now dealing with arguments with respect to the admissibility of the amendment standing in the name of my colleague from Peace River.

**Mr. Speaker:** Again I thank hon. members for their assistance to me in reaching a decision in relation to the motion which stands in the name of the hon. member for Peace River. It was my thought, as indicated a moment ago, that many of the comments and reflections put forward addressed themselves to all three motions.

I have the same difficulties, basically, in relation to the motion of the hon. member for Peace River, which is why I had assumed that I could at that point go ahead with the seeking of concurrence on the part of hon. members. I have heard the additional arguments suggested for the guidance of the Chair, and I would have to rule that what I said before in relation to Motions Nos. 1 and 2 also applies to the third motion.

Essentially, the motion of the hon. member for Peace River is a new proposition which he is submitting for the consideration of the House. I would quote citations 246(3) and 250(4), to which allusion has been made earlier, and an additional reference could be made to paragraph (5) on page 509 of May's eighteenth edition where it is stated:

An amendment which is equivalent to a negative of the bill, or which would reverse the principle of the bill as agreed to on the second reading, is not admissible.

This is in relation to the principle of the bill. There are also the difficulties relating to the royal recommendation, to which I referred earlier, and which, it seems to me, still face us squarely.