

Port Wardens Act

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Knowles: On division.

Motion agreed to on division, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

* * *

[Translation]

QUEBEC AND MONTREAL PORT WARDENS ACTS

MEASURE TO AMEND

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Transport) moved that Bill S-3, to amend an Act to provide for the appointment of a Port Warden for the Harbour of Quebec and to amend an Act to amend and consolidate the Acts relating to the office of Port Warden for the Harbour of Montreal, be read the second time and referred to Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Ethier in the chair.

[English]

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): When shall the bill be read the third time?

Mr. Knowles: By leave, now.

Mr. Pepin moved third reading of the bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order please. It being 4.15 p.m. the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business listed on today's order paper, namely, public bills, notices of motions, private bills.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. Order No. 4. Second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works of Bill C-204, an Act to amend the National Energy Board Act (provincial representation and sunlight provisions).

[Translation]

Mr. Claude-André Lachance (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State (Trade)): As it is already pretty late, Mr. Speaker, that is, past the normal time for consideration of private members' business could you tell us in advance at what time we are expected to adjourn, following consideration of private members' business?

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. The hon. parliamentary secretary is seeking accurate information on what time the debate will end. I thought it was understood in the prior commitment that we would not see the clock at four o'clock and that we would give one hour to private members' business. The House will therefore sit until 5.15 p.m.

Shall order No. 4 stand?

Some hon. Members: Stand.

* * *

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT, 1971

AMENDMENT RESPECTING MATERNITY BENEFITS

Mr. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport) moved that Bill C-205, to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971 (maternity benefits), be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. There has been some doubt over the years respecting the ability of members to introduce bills amending the Unemployment Insurance Act without infringing the financial prerogative of the Crown, the benefit of which was given to the member.

Currently, the government shares the cost of the first two phases of the regular unemployment insurance benefits with the private sector, that is, initial regular and labour force extended benefits, on the basis of a cost sharing formula which features an eight-year moving average of unemployment rates, also called the threshold rate of unemployment. In accordance with this formula the government finances the cost of such regular benefits that is attributed to the excess of the actual rate of unemployment in a calendar year over the "threshold rate" of unemployment. The government also finances the cost of benefits paid during the third phase of benefits, also called regional extended benefits, the net cost of benefits paid to self-employed fishermen as per subsection 146(2), and the cost of benefits paid during any extension granted under sections 38, job creation, and 39, training.

The above points clearly to a scheme which is sustained not only by contributions from the private sector but also by charges on the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

When a private members' bill provides for an extension in the benefit period, for an enlargement of the class of possible claimants, or for an increase in the benefits payable under the act, the charge on the Consolidated Revenue Fund would consequently be increased. Therefore, in my view, any such bill