

Mr. Penner:—which shows an over-all increase of 1.3 per cent for that month, including an increase in the total food index of 3.2 per cent.

Since the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) has not proceeded with a similar motion, notice of which has stood in his name for some time, I ask the unanimous consent of the House to move, seconded by the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Blais):

That the second report of the Special Committee on Trends in Food Prices, presented to the House on July 25, 1973, be concurred in.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The motion proposed by the hon. member requires the unanimous consent of the House.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

An hon. Member: Who said "no"?

An hon. Member: It was over there.

Mr. McGrath: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I refused unanimous consent to proceed with this motion because we intend to proceed with it in due course. In the meantime we did not want to proceed with the motion today so that the country would know that this government is bankrupt of ideas to deal with inflation.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege affecting the privileges of all members of the House.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nielsen: They do not care about that judging from the derision over there. It is an abuse of the rules and procedures of the House for an hon. member on the other side of the House to get up and propose a motion which he knows is clearly out of order by reason of the fact that there is another motion in precisely the same terms on the order paper now.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CHILE—OVERTHROW OF GOVERNMENT BY MILITARY—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43. In view of the tragic and deplorable suspension of the democratic process as a result of military terrorist activities in Chile I move, seconded by the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom):

That the Canadian government refuse recognition of the Chilean military junta and forthwith withdraw any financial or other support which this government presently provides.

Mr. Speaker: This motion also requires unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Family Allowances Act

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimity and the motion cannot be put.

* * *

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORT—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, in the hope that the law of averages is in my favour I present the following motion under the terms of Standing Order 43. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas):

That the Minister of Manpower and Immigration be asked to table as soon as he receives it the report of the Unemployment Insurance Advisory Committee on its study of the benefit control operations of the Unemployment Insurance Commission from the viewpoint of unemployment insurance recipients.

Mr. Speaker: The motion proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre also requires the unanimous consent of the House as it is proposed under Standing Order 43. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Andras: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. As the minister responsible I would be perfectly agreeable, but in any case I would assure the hon. member that it is my intention to table this report as soon as I receive it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That is hardly a point of order. What is required is not the consent of the minister but the unanimous consent of the House.

* * *

FAMILY ALLOWANCES ACT

On the order: Introduction of Bills:

July 19, 1973—Mr. Stackhouse—Bill intituled: "An Act to amend the Family Allowances Act".

Mr. Speaker: When the notice of introduction of the bill proposed by the hon. member for Scarborough East first came up last July 23, the Chair expressed some concern about the regularity of the bill. Yesterday it seemed that the hon. member concurred in my suggestion that this bill touched upon the prerogative of the Crown in relation to expenditure from the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

The purpose of the bill, as indicated in the explanatory note, is to provide for the payment of family allowance benefits to a group or class of children not covered at present under the terms of the Family Allowances Act. A bill, or an amendment to a bill, cannot propose the expenditure of funds without a recommendation of the Crown. Since the hon. member's bill is not accompanied by a