

government would be responsible for devising programs to put these people to work.

The situation in the United States is much more serious than ours. Their depression has been much more severe than ours. If Senator Humphrey can propose full employment for the United States, surely we should be discussing, planning, and implementing proposals for full employment in Canada. We should not be passing bills which have as their basic principle the concept that large numbers of people in this country do not want to work, and that they have to be penalized and driven back to work, I suppose by hunger. I do not accept that argument and I think the minister is moving completely in the wrong direction.

● (1750)

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I should just like to indicate that I agree with the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) that we cannot support this amendment.

When we studied this matter in 1971 we pointed out our great reservations about this idea of the three-week period. At that time the period was increased from one week to two weeks, and the suggestion that the three weeks be used as a sort of a lump sum seemed to nullify the savings obtained by the change from one week to two weeks. By eliminating this change it would make the bill somewhat better as a truly insurance scheme, and should not in any way take away from the individual who is unemployed and genuinely seeking work. I think it is better if it is done this way.

It has been my experience that people living in rural areas have not had the opportunity of collecting unemployment insurance because of the application of the residency rules. This is obviously the result of officers, probably as a result of departmental prodding, attempting to hold the line. This is difficult to argue one way or the other, but certainly there are a great number of people paying unemployment insurance premiums who will not likely ever collect under these rules. That may be unfortunate but it is true. This change will make this a more true insurance scheme. Therefore I cannot agree with the amendment proposed by the hon. member.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner (London-East)): Is the House ready for the question, which is on the motion by the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters), that Bill C-69 be amended by deleting Clause 8?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner (London East)): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner (London East)): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner (London East)): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Unemployment Insurance Act

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner (London East)): Pursuant to Section 2 of Standing Order 75, the recorded division on the hon. member's motion stands deferred.

An hon. Member: Six o'clock.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner (London East)): Order, please. Is the House ready to proceed with motion No. 10, or would members prefer to call it six o'clock?

Mr. Peters: Six o'clock.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner (London East)): Is the hon. member rising on a point of order?

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North) moved:

Motion No. 10.

That Bill C-69, to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971, be amended in Clause 9 by striking out line 36 at page 4 and substituting the following therefor:

"thereof and the extended benefit period (described in section 34) shall not exceed the maximum".

Mr. J.-J. Blais (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order in respect of motion No. 10, on the basis that the said motion exceeds the Royal recommendation as contained in this particular bill. I draw your attention to the fact that motion No. 10 seeks to change Section 29 of the said act. Proposed sub-section (5) of Section 29 reads as follows:

"(5) Where benefits are claimed under this Act by reason of

(a) pregnancy, or

(b) any prescribed illness, injury or quarantine, or

(c) pregnancy and any prescribed illness, injury or quarantine,

the maximum number of weeks for which such benefits may be paid in an initial benefit period and the re-established portion thereof shall not exceed the maximum number of weeks for which initial benefits may be paid pursuant to Table I of Schedule A."

Motion No. 10 seeks to amend that sub-section by adding at line 36 the words:

—thereof and the extended benefit period (described in section 34) shall not exceed the maximum.

Effectively what the amendment seeks to do is add an additional category, namely, a benefit that can be claimed not only during the initial benefit period or the re-established portion of that period, but also during the extended benefit period, and by allowing a claim for any extended benefit period this would infringe on the Royal recommendation.

What occurs is that presently one can obtain benefits if one is a female and pregnant for a period within the initial benefit period, but that benefit is not available during the extended benefit period as otherwise provided under the act. My submission is that the amendment proposed for making that extended period of benefit available to the claimant, namely 15 weeks, which otherwise would not be available under the present statute, would increase that particular benefit with a resulting additional impost or duty imposed on general revenue.

In effect there are a wide number of claimants who otherwise would not be eligible but now would become eligible. As an example, there are a number of members here, who make representations on behalf of their constituents. Let us take the case of an applicant who makes