

Mr. MacGuigan: Mr. Speaker, the only difference between this amendment and the other two is the fact that this relates to clause 2 of the bill and the others relate to clause 1. With all due respect to the procedural knowledge of my hon. friend from Peace River, I may say that his talents have been much better employed on other occasions. In this case he has not attempted to make an argument in terms of rules or citations. He has rather made his argument in terms of "might have been". He is suggesting that if the rules had been different the result might have been different, or that if Your Honour's ruling had been different the result might have been different, or even that if his own amendment had been different and were not phrased the way it was but were phrased differently, the result might have been different. All those "might-have-been" arguments are interesting to listen to, but they contribute very little to the procedural discussion on this point. I would suggest that the ruling which you have already given applies in its entirety to this amendment.

• (1620)

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I take it that when you were last on your feet you ruled out of order amendment No. 1 and that it is generally accepted that the same ruling applies to amendment No. 2. However, we are now discussing amendment No. 3. I would like to put in a word for the thousands of readers of *Hansard* who will be devouring the pages of this afternoon's debate to point out that thus far amendments No. 2 and 3 have not been put on the record. I think that at some point, either they should be read from the chair or some indication be made so that readers of *Hansard* will know what it is all about.

I wonder if I may comment briefly on the sad position in which the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) says that he and his colleagues find themselves, namely, that they have no opportunity to vote directly on clause 2 of the bill. I am really amazed. All he needed to do was to file an amendment last Friday which would stop after the words "page 1" in the amendment that is now before the House. In other words, if he had simply said that Bill C-124, an act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971 (No. 1), be amended by deleting lines 6 to 27 inclusive on page 1—

Mr. Nielsen: That is negative.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Just a moment. Your Honour has already declared that if a bill has only one clause it is difficult to see how it is possible to put forth a report stage amendment to delete that one clause. It is just a negative of the proposition itself. But, Sir, you have allowed many times amendments to a bill at the report stage deleting individual clauses where a bill had more than one clause. If I may, for example, remind hon. members of the long debate we had on the Criminal Code amendments a few years ago where some of the clauses were offensive; we had votes on individual clauses simply on that kind of a motion, that clause such-and-such be deleted. Since there are two clauses and since, as the hon. member has said, they are different, they are not attached to each other, he could have done it that way.

Unemployment Insurance Act

If he missed that opportunity, and is a member without much experience in drafting such amendments, I can tell him that even today he can still draft an amendment when we get to third reading. I suggest that he can still draft an amendment which says that Bill C-124—is the hon. member taking this down—be not now read a third time but that it be referred back to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration for the purpose of reconsidering clause 2. If he moves that amendment, he will get in the House, if he wants to, a recorded vote expressing the views of hon. members on clause 2. So I do not think we should waste too much sympathy on the hon. member being in a difficult position simply because he did not know how to draft his amendment.

With respect to the amendment itself—and I think we can be brief on it—I submit that it has the same flaws that amendments No. 1 and No. 2 had in that it goes beyond the bill to the act and that it goes beyond the confines of the Royal recommendation. When I was on my feet before, I read the first part of the Royal recommendation but I did not read the latter part because I was waiting until we reached amendment No. 3. The latter part of the recommendation reads:

... and to provide that the amount authorized under Manpower and Immigration Vote L30a of Supplementary Estimates (A) 1972-73 shall be deemed an advance under that section and not an appropriation described in paragraph 133 (b) of that act.

That is a very clear recommendation. How you can propose an amendment that suggests the very opposite and say that that is within the terms of the Royal recommendation is really beyond me. So there are two points: first, that it goes beyond the bill to the act, and second, that it is outside of the terms of the Royal recommendation.

I submit that there is a third problem. My friend, the hon. member for Peace River, is still only a private member of this House. Things can change around here. He might be over on the other side some day, you know, but how can a private member move something that involves an appropriation—and that is what he is doing—asking that some \$450 million which at the moment represents only a loan, be an appropriation charged to the Consolidated Revenue Fund? I submit that if he is going to do that, he has to have the Royal recommendation, but I do not think that he has as yet the authority to announce that he has the Royal recommendation. So, I think that this amendment is even more out of order than the other two and that the Chair should not be influenced by the plea that there is no way for members of the Official Opposition to show their displeasure with one or the other clause of the bill. It takes only a little ingenuity to achieve that situation.

Mr. Nielsen: I will not be making any submissions of length to you, Mr. Speaker, except to reserve a position which perhaps should be raised at this time so that on third reading I am not met with the same argument that I was met with on second reading before the bill went to committee. I refer to the resolution and its terminology and the clause in the bill itself and its terminology, the use in the first line of clause 2 of the word "authorized". Clause 2 uses the language of the resolution. It reads: