

Unemployment Insurance Act

expenditures or there is no reason for parliament being here. I am sure I could find quotations in my name that would be along those lines, but I wish to point out that this is not a supply bill. This is not a measure in which we are providing supply or money for expenditure at all. This is merely a bill dealing with the question of advances to a commission to enable that commission to carry out a law which parliament has already passed, calling for the payment of unemployment insurance benefits. I submit, therefore, that the general rules about the voting of money and expenditures do not apply, and in that respect that citation 251(1), which he quoted, really has no bearing at all.

Citation 251(1) in Beauchesne's Fourth Edition deals with a measure which has provided for an expenditure, and indicates that under certain conditions—that is, if the Governor General's recommendation were in general terms—it would be in order to increase that expenditure. But we do not have before us a bill providing for an expenditure. Rather we have before us a bill concerned with advances of working capital to enable the Unemployment Insurance Commission to carry out the law as passed by this parliament.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having made those comments on the submission of the hon. member, may I state my own two reasons for feeling that this amendment is out of order, and perhaps I have already stated those reasons by implication in what I have said.

In the first place the amendment of the hon. member for Hamilton West, despite the fact that it is couched in terms of an amendment to Bill C-124, is not an amendment to that bill at all. It is an attempt to amend the act which Bill C-124 seeks to amend. In other words, he is trying to get behind the bill to the act itself. If he is going to bring in a bill to amend the act itself he has to meet the general rules about that, such as notice, getting the Governor General's recommendation, and all of that. I submit that that is a flaw that is almost fatal, the fact that he is trying to amend not Bill C-124 but rather the Unemployment Insurance Act itself.

The other objection to this amendment is of course the one that is brought out by a couple of citations to which Your Honour has already referred, citation 246(3) and citation 250(4), both in Beauchesne's Fourth Edition. Let me read at least parts of those citations. No doubt others who take part in this debate will have to read them as well. Citation 246(3) reads:

The guiding principle in determining the effect of an amendment upon the financial initiative of the Crown is that the communication, to which the Royal demand of recommendation is attached, must be treated as laying down *once for all* (unless withdrawn and replaced) not only the amount of a charge, but also its objects, purposes, conditions and qualifications.

Citation 250(4) reads:

The fundamental terms of a money resolution submitted to the House with the Governor General's recommendation upon which a Committee of the Whole is set up cannot be amended. Amendments will only be in order if they fall within the terms of the resolution.

Now, the Governor General's recommendation attached to Bill C-124 is very clear. It reads:

His Excellency the Governor General has recommended to the House of Commons the present measure to amend the Unemploy-

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

ment Insurance Act, 1971 to remove the ceiling on advances under section 137—

There is more to that, but I shall read the rest of it when we are dealing with proposed amendment No. 3. At the moment, we are dealing just with proposed amendment No. 1 which relates to the question of the ceiling, and I submit it is very clear that the recommendation is that there be a complete removal of the ceiling on the amount that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner) can advance to the Unemployment Insurance Commission to enable it to carry out its obligation. I submit that an attempt to substitute for that definite removal of the ceiling the reinstatement of a ceiling simply at a different figure is not in order, and I go back to the language of citation 250(4), is not an amendment that "falls within the terms of the resolution."

No matter how one dresses it up, as has been done in both the first and second amendments, by referring to the approval of parliament and so on, the fact of the matter is that the attempt to put in a ceiling is completely outside the terms proposed in the Governor General's recommendation, which is to the effect that the ceiling should be removed completely. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, because this amendment—and I would make the same arguments with respect to the other two, perhaps with some slight additions—seeks to amend the act behind the bill rather than the bill, and because it proposes something that is completely outside the parameters of the Governor General's recommendation, I feel that it is not in order to be presented at the report stage of this bill.

• (1520)

Mr. MacGuigan: Mr. Speaker, since I shall endorse the position which has been put forward by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, I may be able to spare Your Honour a rereading of some of the sections to which he has already directed the attention of the House.

It seems to me that the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander), in making his argument, has not only sought to amend the initial unemployment insurance commission bill but that he has also advanced arguments which relate to the wisdom of the policy which it is proposed to adopt in Bill C-124, rather than to admissibility. He spoke about the need for controlling government expenditure and things of that kind, which I submit are related to the wisdom of the matter before us and not related to the admissibility of the amendment.

There are two reasons it seems to me why these amendments in general, and the first amendment in particular, should be ruled out of order. The first of these is the one which has been so ably presented by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. That relates to the financial initiative of the Crown and is found in the citations which he has already read, citation 246 section 3 and citation 250 section 4. Without reading these, I would just draw to the attention of the House that the principle with respect to any limit on the financial initiative of the Crown is outlined in citation 246(3) which reads in part:

... the objects, purposes, conditions and qualifications expressed in the communication by which the Crown has demanded or recommended a charge.