

claimants receiving a pension if their claim was based on employment obtained after the start of the pension.

This provision, honourable senators, takes into account the fact that there is a difference between people who retire and leave the labour market and people who retire and begin subsequent careers. These people should be treated fairly and equitably as active members of the labour force. Should they become unemployed, they will be entitled to full unemployment insurance benefits based on their income, regardless of their previous pension income.

Finally, to ensure fairness and equity in the treatment of separation payments, this bill will allow the CEIC to extend either the qualifying or benefit period of any claim for UI benefits when separation payments prevent the payment of UI benefits or delay the start of a UI claim.

Under the present regulations, separation pay can delay the start of a claim and can, in certain cases, reduce the number of insurable weeks that CEIC counts to establish a claim for benefits.

The passage of Bill C-50 will allow the qualifying period or the benefit period to be extended by the same number of weeks represented by the separation pay, up to a maximum of 104 weeks. This will ensure that most people do not lose the protection of the Unemployment Insurance Program.

In conclusion, honourable senators, these changes to the pension legislation are consistent with the government's belief that persons who have retired from the labour market should not look to unemployment insurance as a supplementary source of income. At the same time, we are assuring that those people who retire to undertake a new career are treated in a fair and equitable manner, considering that they continue to take an active part in the labour market.

I do not know whether honourable senators want this bill referred to committee or whether you want to debate it here on Tuesday and conclude all stages in the house, so I await your direction.

**Hon. Royce Frith (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Honourable senators, Senator Marsden will be speaking on this bill for our side. She is not here today; she is in Quebec City. We expect that she will speak to it on Tuesday, and that is the normal time to decide whether it should go to committee or not. I believe that she intends to have a word with Senator Robertson and discuss that.

**Senator Robertson:** Fine.

**Senator Frith:** We will be open to whatever motion they settle upon, either for third reading without committee study at the next sitting, or for reference to the committee, in case they feel there is an advantage to have a committee study.

On motion of Senator Frith, for Senator Marsden, debate adjourned.

[Senator Robertson]

● (1520)

## INTERNAL ECONOMY, BUDGETS AND ADMINISTRATION

CONSIDERATION OF SIXTEENTH REPORT OF COMMITTEE—  
DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Frith, seconded by the Honourable Senator Langlois, for the adoption of the Sixteenth Report of the Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration (budget of Agriculture and Forestry), presented in the Senate on 9th June, 1987.—(*Honourable Senator Frith*).

**Hon. Royce Frith (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Honourable senators, I now have the information that I did not have yesterday with respect to this report in answer to some questions raised by Senator Roblin. I am quoting from the Report of the Subcommittee on Budgets, which is a subcommittee of the Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration. That report is dated Thursday, June 11, 1987—today—and I can report to honourable senators that the main committee adopted this report today.

I quote the report as follows:

The total amount of committee budgets approved by the committee for the fiscal year 1987-88, including the two aforementioned budgets . . .

That is, the Standing Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources on the study of natural gas in Canada and the study of the production and use of coal in Canada, those two budgets being \$22,964 and \$73,774 respectively.

. . . is \$1,791,288. As stated in other reports of your Sub-Committee, the total amount allocated for committees in the Senate Estimates is \$1,075,000. If committees spend 100% of their budgets, the expected shortfall is therefore \$716,288. However, as your Sub-Committee has also noted, during the last few fiscal years, committees have only spent between 60% and 70% of the total funds allocated to them. Your Sub-Committee recommends that the budgetary situation regarding Senate Committees be reviewed later in the fiscal year.

So the decision and the recommendation of our colleagues on that committee are that, since historically we do not spend the full amount of the allocations, at the moment no problem exists in terms of availability of funds, and that, therefore, they do not recommend that the government seek supplementary estimates at this stage to look after the possible shortfall based on the difference between the amount approved of \$1,791,288 and the budgeted amount of \$1,075,000.

In case Senator Roblin has some further questions, I have detailed breakdowns that I do not propose to put on the record now. Also, I do not intend to ask for adoption of the report if anyone feels that we should wait until Senator Roblin is present. As was the case yesterday, I think it would be better for me to adjourn this order again in my name, so that Senator