

Unemployment Insurance Act

application for sick benefits which are only available now during the initial benefit period, and there is a determination that the initial benefit period has expired—therefore there are no sick benefits available to the claimant. Under this amendment the claimant would now seek to claim sick benefits and the possibility of benefits under the initial benefit period or reconstituted initial benefit period, but would not now have access to this. Under the proposed amendment in motion No. 10 the claimant would have access to the sick benefits to the full amount as indicated in Table 1 of Schedule A, being the full 15 weeks.

As another example, if the initial benefit period had expired, the claimant under the present statute would be entitled to that portion commensurate with the unexpired benefit period corresponding to Table 1. With the amendment the claimant would be entitled to the full benefit, namely, 15 weeks, although the portion of reconstituted initial benefit had expired, just as long as the claimant was entitled to the extended benefit period under Section 34.

I draw your attention in this instance to Citation 246 (3) of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition which states in part:

The guiding principle in determining the effect of an amendment upon the financial initiative of the Crown is that the communication, to which the royal demand of recommendation is attached, must be treated as laying down *once for all* . . . not only the amount of a charge, but also its objects, purposes, conditions and qualifications.

May I call it six o'clock.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Once and for all it is six o'clock.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, when we adjourned for dinner I was citing sub-paragraph (3) of citation 246 in Beauchesne. I indicated that I was coming to the juicy part which reads in this way:

In relation to the standard thereby fixed, an amendment infringes the financial initiative of the Crown, not only if it increases the amount, but also if it extends the objects and purposes, or relaxes the conditions and qualifications expressed in the communication by which the Crown has demanded or recommended a charge.

I stress:

... if it extends the objects and purposes, or relaxes the conditions and qualifications expressed in the communication . . .

In this instance the Royal recommendation sets out that this bill is authorized to provide in the manner prescribed for changes in qualifying periods, benefit periods, entitlement to benefits, and rates of benefits. One of the prescriptions is section 29, sub-section 5. There is an attempt by the government pursuant to the Royal recommendation to extend the benefits for sickness or pregnancy to those who are not only in the initial benefit period as previously, but also in the reconstituted benefit period. What motion No.

[Mr. Blais.]

10 seeks to do is extend that entitlement not only to the 39 weeks under this particular bill but away out to the 51-weeks that would be available under the extended benefit period.

I simply want to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the cases I cited before dinner where there is an additional burden on the general revenue, as there would be in respect of this proposed amendment. It would entitle a greater number of individuals who otherwise would not have access to sickness or pregnancy benefits. In that sense it is not prescribed by the Royal recommendation and any attempt to deal with it infringes the rules and the precedents. It also infringes Standing Order 62 which speaks of this House not dealing with any measure or bill which does not contain an appropriate Royal recommendation. Inevitably the Royal recommendation in this instance which I have read to Your Honour does not include the extended benefit from 39 to 52 weeks.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I do not want to impose on hon. members but it is my feeling that motion No. 10 has some procedural relation to motion No. 13. Unless members have different opinions I wonder whether the procedural discussion on both of these motions could not be taken at the same time, and then I would make my ruling.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the only point I wish to make is to draw your attention to the fact that, when we commenced the report stage of this bill, Mr. Speaker gave his view both in general terms and in specific terms concerning the report stage amendments. He found only two of them definitely out of order although he expressed his concern about a third one. The two he felt were out of order were motion No. 4 and motion No. 6. Then he said that he had some concern about motion No. 13. What he said, as reported at the bottom of the first column on page 10006 of *Hansard*, was in these words: "The remaining motions seem to be in order." A little later, when he was lining up the debating and voting on the motions, he said:

● (2010)

Motions 9, 10, 16, 21 and 22 ought to be discussed and voted on separately.

I am reading that from *Hansard* of yesterday. I realize that it is not part of the record, but he was good enough to send around to us his memorandum regarding the various motions and in that memorandum there is a reference to a string of motions, including motion No. 10, as appearing to be in order. I do not want to press that too hard. This was not a final decision, but certainly we started debate yesterday on the understanding that what Mr. Speaker said would apply, namely, that he would find it difficult to accept motions Nos. 4 and 6, and he would find some difficulty with motion 13, but that the remaining motions seemed to be in order. I think it is a little unfair to have that plan upset by this point of order being raised at this time.

Mr. Andras: Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Blais) has placed before us very cogently the reasons why motion No. 10 appears not to be acceptable. You, Mr. Speaker, have