

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 inter-related 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 considered concurrently by the House at one stage or another.

In the same session, bills in relation to the Public Service Employment Act, the Public Service Staff Relations Act, the Financial Administration Act, and the Statute Law (Superannuation) Amendment Act, all with interdependent provisions, again were being considered concurrently by the House. In that regard, I suggest that reference be made to the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Joint Committee on the Public Service of Canada in the 1966-67 session.

In the 1968-69 session, reference might be made to amendments to the Financial Administration Act and An Act respecting the Organization of the Government of Canada, both of which received Royal Assent on March 28, 1969.

I have spent some time on these examples because I was asked to do so by the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), and I know other honourable Members share his interest.

It could have been suggested that the bill and the related estimate, which in fact form an integral part of and a preliminary stage in the passage of a supply bill now before the House, were not considered by the same committee and that substantive provisions of one of them could be or could have been altered or amended so that one would not have been consonant or consistent with the other. That question, I suggest, is one that could and must be resolved at the Committee of the Whole or report stage on the second bill to reach either stage.

What would be the alternative? It would be, surely, to set aside consideration of this bill and take in all its stages the item in the supplementary estimates. This would not only involve the approval of the estimate, as it now exists as Item 5 at page viii of today's Routine Proceedings under Notice of Motion pursuant to Standing Order 58(4)(a). This would also in effect mean the amendment of a Statute of Parliament through an item in the estimates. This procedure in the past has always been vigorously resisted by Members of the House of Commons.

That is, in effect, what the Chair was trying to say on January 25, as reported at page 69 of *Votes and Proceedings*, and I gave earlier the reference to the page in

*Hansard*, when I stated, in part, "that the authorizing bill must become law before the authorization of the relevant estimate by the Appropriation Act". May I draw attention to the use of the words "authorizing" and "authorization" as used in that citation which was taken from May's 18th Edition at page 731.

Given the choice, I feel that the Members of the House would expect that the Chair would favour the method that members themselves have advocated consistently on past occasions. The Chair has always agreed with this position and it is to be consistent with past rulings that I suggest that the procedure now before us is the desirable one. Accordingly, the third reading will proceed.

---

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. Andras, seconded by Mr. MacEachen,—That Bill C-124, An Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971 (No. 1), be now read a third time and do pass.

And debate continuing;

*(Proceedings on Adjournment Motion)*

At 10.01 o'clock p.m., the question "That this House do now adjourn" was deemed to have been proposed pursuant to Standing Order 40(1);

After debate the said question was deemed to have been adopted.

---

*Changes in Committee Membership*

Notice having been filed with the Clerk of the House pursuant to Standing Order 65(4)(b), membership of Committees was amended as follows:

Mr. Olivier for Mr. Yanakis on the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Blaker for Mr. Thomas (Maisonneuve-Rosemont) on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

---

*Returns and Reports Deposited with the Clerk of the House*

The following papers having been deposited with the Clerk of the House were laid upon the Table pursuant to Standing Order 41(1), namely:

By Mr. Andras, a Member of the Queen's Privy Council, —Report of the Government Annuities Branch for the year ended March 31, 1972, pursuant to section 16 of the