

religious convictions, I am nonetheless obliged to dismiss her appeal”.

This involved a lady who had worked in the hon. member's riding and who had encountered difficulty with her employment because she did not want to work on her religious holiday. She did not want to continually work on Sunday. She quit. The judge said: "I agree. However, you have seven weeks of disqualification”.

As the hon. member just pointed out, under the criteria this is not just cause. The hon. member knows that under this legislation all of those people will, of course, get no unemployment insurance at all because their reason for quitting although as the judge pointed out is justified, does not meet the restricted criteria under the legislation.

I want to congratulate the hon. member and ask him if he has anything further to add.

* * *

INCOME TAX ACT

NOTICE OF ALLOCATION OF TIME TO CONSIDER SECOND READING STAGE OF BILL C-92

Hon. Mary Collins (Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister of State (Environment) and Minister Responsible for the Status of Women): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

I would just like to advise the House that an agreement could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Order 78(1) or (2) with respect to second reading of Bill C-92, an act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Canada Pension Plan, the Income Tax Conventions Interpretation Act, the Tax Rebate Discounting Act, the Unemployment Insurance Act and other certain related acts.

Under the provision of Standing Order 78(3), I give notice of our intention to move a time allocation motion at the next sitting of the House for the purpose of allotting a specified number of days or hours for the consideration and disposal of proceedings at second reading stage.

Government Orders

[Translation]

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES RESTRAINT ACT, 1993 NO. 2

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Mazankowski that Bill C-113, an Act to provide for government expenditure restraint, be now read the second time and referred to a legislative committee in the Human Resources envelope; and the amendment of Mr. Bevilacqua (p. 16117).

Mr. Blackburn (Jonquière): Mr. Speaker, in response to my colleague's comments, I would tell him that in practical terms when someone does not meet the criteria set out in the Act, it is evident that he or she cannot receive UI benefits.

• (1840)

There is also the issue of interpretation by the officers and the people who will go to arbitration. That is why I was looking for a middle of the road solution, a way to avoid penalizing people by giving no benefits at all, because it could happen that some people are above the welfare level. What will they do then? What will they live on?

I think after this legislation has been voted on it will be up to members from both sides of this House, to look at how it is administered and when we find a problem, be open and generous enough to make the necessary corrections if indeed it turns out to be a little too harsh.

Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I am speaking tonight on behalf of the men and women of Abitibi who I have represented in this House since 1984.

I had the opportunity to discuss Bill C-105 with my constituents during the Christmas holiday. I had the opportunity to talk with employers, nurses and other workers. I toured my riding of Abitibi in January and visited its largest towns as well as its rural areas. I learned that Bill C-105 would be very hard for workers, especially those quitting voluntarily in remote areas.

The reduction of benefits from 60 to 57 per cent is also very hard on workers. One has to realize that a worker in the North who has a gross of \$500 a week will get only 57 per cent of his pay after April 4. This is a \$15 cut. We