

*Unemployment Insurance Act*

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** It has not been announced by parliament.

**An hon. Member:** Right on.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** And yet the government simply says—

**An hon. Member:** Tell that to your constituents who want to collect benefits.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** If hon. members opposite have dined well, perhaps they could go elsewhere and enjoy themselves.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** In that connection there was a great deal of argument in committee.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** There was argument on that particular point. I know that hon. members opposite who find this situation amusing have not even looked at the proceedings before the committee. They have not even bothered to inquire. They want to be able to say as they used to, "Mr. Speaker, we want to pass this bill." But the bill must make sense, and it does not.

I invite Your Honour to consider the arguments we proposed the other night on a point of order. We were then told that perhaps we were anticipating something, but now is the moment of truth. I invite Your Honour to consider carefully the language of the bill and the language of the item in the estimates which will form part of an appropriation bill, because neither the Chair nor any member of this House can guarantee that the appropriation bill will come forward soon or next month. Actually, there is no indication that the appropriation bill will be brought forward at all.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Baldwin:** Or the Senate could turn it down.

**An hon. Member:** It will be introduced next.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** In short, we are asked to approve language saying that a certain item authorized in the appropriation bill shall be deemed to be an advance within the meaning of section 137 of the Unemployment Insurance Act. That part is an abuse of language and is totally out of order.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I thank hon. members for their contributions. Earlier today, when Bill C-124 was called for third reading, the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) raised a point of order to the effect that Bill C-124 could not be proceeded with at this time. It was the hon. member's contention that since certain moneys were to be provided under vote L30a, and since that money could not be authorized until the passage of a supply bill incorporating vote L30a, the wording of clause 2 of Bill C-124 was meaningless and invalid. The hon. member suggested that the word "authorized" as

[Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West).]

used in clause 2 of Bill C-124 meant authorized by an appropriation act. While the Chair dealt in a preliminary way with the point of order on January 25, as will be found at page 661 of *Hansard*, it should be said that the question of considering concurrent or interdependent bills, if that phrase may be used, has been raised on other occasions in recent years.

On April 20, 1970, as recorded in *Hansard* at pages 6046-7, the hon. member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse) raised a point of order relating to Bill C-204, an act to amend the Fisheries Act. He contended that it was defective inasmuch as that bill incorporated, by reference, certain provisions of two statutes which did not then exist, namely, the Canada Water Act and the Northern Inland Waters Act. The hon. member went on to say that presumably those references related to Bill C-144, an act to provide for the management of the water resources of Canada including research and the planning and implementation of programs relating to the conservation, development and utilization of water resources, and Bill C-187, an act respecting inland water resources in the Yukon Territory and Northwest Territories, both of which were before standing committees of this House for clause-by-clause consideration.

• (2020)

"We cannot be asked," he said, "to assume that these bills will come out of committee unamended or pass through the necessary further proceedings in this House and in the other place unamended. We cannot even assume that the similar provisions in this bill and the other two bills will come out in the same legislative form. They will be dealt with by three different committees; the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works, the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development and the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry. Until these other two bills are in perfect shape as statutes, this bill must be considered to be in imperfect shape". That is the end of the quotation from the argument of the hon. member for South Shore. It was suggested on that occasion by the Chair that the hon. member's point of order was very interesting and not without merit but, as suggested, it might have been premature. The matter did not arise again.

I might also refer hon. members to *Hansard* for July 30, 1958, at page 2872 to 2874 wherein a discussion is reported in relation to other companion bills, that is, bills with interdependent provisions. On that occasion, bills to amend the Excise Tax Act and the Customs Tariff Act were being considered, and while no decision was made by the Chair it would be fair to suggest, I think, that it was felt at that time that it was not a question of order but, rather, a matter of how best to achieve logical progression of companion or interdependent bills through the House.

There is little doubt in my mind that many examples could be found where companion bills were being considered concurrently by the House. For example, I am sure that interrelated provisions can be found almost annually in the budgetary taxation bills. Other recent examples would be the bills in 1967 relating to the revision of the Bank of Canada Act, an act respecting banks and banking, and the Quebec Savings Banks Act were being con-