

mismanagement, miscalculation and ineptitude of the government.

An hon. Member: That is not so.

Mr. Alexander: My hon. friend says no. That is exactly what it means. This amount will go into the fund and on such terms and conditions as the Minister of Finance sees fit to make, the loan will be paid back. The only people interested in the fund are employers and employees; that is why the methods used by the government are so disastrous.

In conclusion, one would hope that the arguments that we on this side of the House have presented will not be misinterpreted. I think they have been; the responsible minister is nodding his head, saying either yes or no. But what we are trying to do is to bring to light what we believe is wrong, what we believe the government should be chastised for and for which ultimately they will have to account. It is as simple as that.

I close by saying that we do not intend to put up any more speakers on this side of the House. Our points have been made, so let us bring this matter to a vote.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) seeking to ask the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) a question?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Yes, Mr. Speaker. My question is a legal one and is right up my hon. friend's alley. In view of the charge that there has been an illegal expenditure of money, can the hon. member for Hamilton West say whether, looking at section 137(4) of the Unemployment Insurance Act, the total amount of advances outstanding under this section exceeds \$800 million?

Mr. Baldwin: The Auditor General has already said there was \$980 million on December 22.

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Speaker, it appears as a result of information received that the answer to that question is yes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Is the hon. member seeking to ask another question?

Mr. Alexander: No, that is all he is going to get. I thought he had a good question, but now he has been stamped on he wants a second go.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): All I can say is: chicken!

Mr. Baldwin: May I ask the hon. member for Hamilton West a question!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Pelletier (Hochelaga): He said he did not want any more.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The Chair will permit a question, but I would ask hon. members to abate their excitement sufficiently to allow some of these exchanges to work their way to the front.

Unemployment Insurance Act

Mr. Baldwin: Would the hon. member for Hamilton West advise the House whether in a public statement the Auditor General said that on December 22, 1972, there were \$982 million of advances received by the Unemployment Insurance Commission, some \$180 million higher than the \$800 million ceiling that was set?

Mr. Alexander: To the best of my knowledge, yes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I have a great suspicion that those remarks were made, but for some time the Chair has been trying to divide the debate that has been going on in committee from the debate that has been going in the House. Earlier in this sitting the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) proposed the following motion:

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after "That" and substituting therefor the following:

"this House, noting that by clause 2 of Bill C-124 the government proposes to change the law so as to burden the present and future workers of Canada and their employers with the payment of the sum of 454,000,000 dollars to the detriment of the unemployment insurance plan; and further noting that the government thereby would avoid having to account for this sum in its statement of budgetary revenues and expenditures for the present fiscal year; and further noting that the government thereby would avoid having to seek supply for this sum from parliament as a budgetary expense and to propose ways and means by which this sum might be raised by additional taxation upon individual and corporate taxpayers, as the law presently requires, resolves that Bill C-124 be not now read a second time but that the subject matter thereof be referred to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates."

By the indulgence of the House, the question of the validity of the motion was put aside in order to deal with another point. There is a standard form of amendment to the effect that the subject matter of a bill may be referred to a standing committee. This motion, the Chair suggests, should be in a pure form and should not contain assertions which could only be considered points for debate. However, other matters are set forth in the motion and they make the motion unacceptable.

As Mr. Speaker ruled on January 26, 1971:

It is not a reasoned amendment. It is largely a deviation or a change from the old established form of amendment which provides that the subject matter of a bill or a motion before the House be referred to a special committee or a standing committee. What I believe is objectionable from a procedural standpoint in connection with this proposed amendment is that it goes into the details of the bill.

I also have some reservations about the suggestion that the bill should be referred to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates, but I have made my ruling on the point I first referred to. I now call on the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow).

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me to speak to your ruling for a moment, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) indicated, as did the government House leader, when we were discussing the point of order that had the verbiage, as it was referred to, been stripped from the amendment it would have likely been in order. Hon. members of this House know that I am very non-partisan in these matters. However, the amendment would be really meaningless if the truth were stripped from it, so I shall not ask for the indulgence of the House to remove those words.