

In no way do we on this side advance our arguments to the detriment of those who are entitled to benefits after having paid into this fund. This situation results from the trickery and the devious methods of both the government and my friends to the left, because we are attempting to uphold the law. I would think that anybody involved in parliament or even those who are acquiring benefits would want us to uphold the law. We are in no sense developing these arguments because we are trying to hoodwink someone or in any way trying to deprive those who are rightly entitled to payments under the Unemployment Insurance Act. But we must follow the law. I say there are two laws involved here. Perhaps I am getting away from the subject now.

• (1630)

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Alexander: Hon. members should not laugh. I am developing an argument because I heard hon. members saying that there was one law to ensure that those who are entitled to it receive their benefits. I say there is another law which indicates that the ceiling should not be broken. However, I am getting away from the matter at hand.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Alexander: Hon. members should show some patience. I know they would like to rise and express their views in the way that I can articulate mine. However, since they know they do not have the opportunity to do so at this time, they are straining at the bit.

Let me say in conclusion that the point is certainly well taken. We are dealing with a bill that is unlawful in the first place because it states that what we are dealing with in the Miscellaneous Estimates Committee has been authorized. I state respectfully that it has not been authorized and has not been approved. Therefore, let me say with all due respect that the motion of the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) must be accepted in the way it is drafted. I hope sincerely that hon. members will be able to approach this matter in a non-partisan way and that they will accept the motion in order to ensure that we proceed in an orderly fashion. I see that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) is here. I hope he can appreciate the argument which has been placed before the House by the hon. member for the Yukon.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I should like to hear contributions from as many hon. members as possible on the point that has been raised, but first I should like to ask the hon. member for Yukon if he would confirm to the Chair whether I am faced with one request or two requests. Am I faced simply with making a ruling upon the amendment that has been presented or is there also a suggestion, previously made by the hon. member for the Yukon, that the Chair should withhold further proceedings on this measure because of the point of anticipation that he had made? Is he asking for a ruling by the Chair on both points, or simply on the amendment that has been presented?

Mr. Nielsen: I thought I had made that clear, Mr. Speaker, and this is the reason that I raised the point of order in

Unemployment Insurance Act

the sequence that I did before presenting Your Honour with the amendment. As far as I am concerned, my participation in the debate is concluded.

In speaking to the point of order, I suggested to Your Honour that now the Chair is seized of it the House may be disposed to accede to the suggestion of Your Honour that you will wait until eight o'clock before handing down your ruling and that in the meantime the debate will proceed to fill in time. But if Your Honour agrees that the point I raised is a valid one and comes to the conclusion that we are out of order in discussing the measure, then of course that time would be wasted time by the House.

On the point of order, may I say that there was one matter to which I omitted to refer Your Honour and which might be of assistance. I would ask Your Honour to note that estimate L30a in Supplementary Estimates (A) is misleadingly entitled "Non-Budgetary". This classification anticipates that a proposed amendment to the Unemployment Insurance Act will be passed, which proposed amendment is in itself an admission that the vote is budgetary. Section 137 of the Unemployment Insurance Act authorizes the government to make non-budgetary advances to the Unemployment Insurance Commission up to \$800 million. Any amount in excess of that amount is a budgetary appropriation under section 133 of the Unemployment Insurance Act. Here we have the item entitled "Non-Budgetary" in the Supplementary Estimates, which leads me irresistably to the conclusion that we are anticipating that the amendment will be passed.

I suggest, for the consideration of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lang) as well as that of the well noted expert on the rules from the NDP, that the proper order should have been first, to deal with the supplementary estimate item L30a, second, the passage of an appropriation bill to support that item, and lastly, the passage of Bill C-124 with which we are dealing now, because I cannot conceive how the second clause in Bill C-124 can be passed in its present form without the estimate having been approved and an appropriation bill having passed parliament.

Mr. Baldwin: The government is like the rabble retreating from Moscow.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair will make a ruling on the two points of order and will now ask for contributions.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say, particularly in response to the last remarks of the hon. member for Yukon, that the Supplementary Estimates are very frequently anticipatory in the sense that items are described in the way they will be at the conclusion of the passage of those estimates. If the hon. member will look at the item in the Supplementary Estimates to which he refers as being described as non-budgetary, he will see that, in itself, it contains a reference to a requirement to be repaid. In that sense, it is non-budgetary in its nature. As I indicated to the House in my earlier remarks, clause two of the bill may clarify a situation in relation to obligations, permissions and powers of the fund to make the repayment if such a clarification were necessary but hardly changes the characterization of the amount being voted which, in the terms of the appropriation in the estimates, is described as being repayable.