

possible, just because hon. members are on the government side, to get around that by putting down the recommendation of the Governor General. This, it seems to me, is an important rule. It was applied to at least one of the report stage amendments in the bill we have just been considering with respect to unemployment insurance. I think it should apply here. The House may find some way to get around these things, but surely the case is clear. I support the view Your Honour has taken that all but No. 3 should be ruled out of order, it being up to the House to decide where we go from here.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the government is not disposed to quarrel particularly with the arguments put forward by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) or to question the judgment Your Honour has tentatively put forward, namely, that all except the third one of these motions would be out of order on one ground or another—those proposed by the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) on the ground of irrelevancy, and those proposed by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert) on other grounds. I do hope, however, that it would be possible that an explanation be given to the House of the purpose of these amendments so that we could seek leave of the House to proceed with those motions, which otherwise would be out of order on the ground of irrelevancy, by unanimous consent.

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) with respect to the relevancy of these particular amendments. I agree with his argument and that of Your Honour. I wish to indicate to the government House leader that the suggestion the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre made with respect to the ability of this House to deal with these matters is acceptable to us.

I am not sure what Your Honour will have to say with respect to an explanation of some motions and some clauses about to be ruled out of order. I am not sure of that, but in order to expedite the matter, we do support the argument which the hon. gentleman from Winnipeg North Centre made. It was made clearly in committee and the precedents for it are well established. If we can find a way to accommodate the government House leader's desire to have an explanation of the clauses about to be ruled out of order, I welcome that, but it is not necessary.

Mr. Lloyd Francis (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I should like to offer some explanations with respect to the motions before us in the name of the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien).

The first motion is required to clarify the definition of "salary", as a result of questions raised in a recent case in the Federal Court. The new definition does not affect the special types of payment to which the court decision applied, as such payments are no longer being made. The new definition and the related regulation making power are proposed simply for clarification purposes to confirm its present application in other regards.

State Pensions

As has been indicated, motion No. 2 is required as a result of the amendment proposed in the new clause 2(1). It is consequential.

Motion No. 3 inserts a new subclause (3), which will extend benefit coverage under the Public Service Superannuation Act, the Government Employees Compensation Act, and the Aeronautics Act to the members of the staff of the Parliamentary Centre for Foreign Affairs and Foreign Trade. The former subclause (3) is re-numbered (4), and a consequential amendment is made to include reference to the centre.

With regard to motion No. 4, the new subclauses (1) and (2) are proposed in order to extend coverage under the Supplementary Death Benefit Plan to certain members of the reserve force of the armed forces of Canada in the category described, a number of whom are serving in the Middle East. Under that plan life insurance coverage equal to the salary of the participant is provided.

Motion No. 5 again is consequential to the previous amendment, an extension of supplementary death benefit coverage to members of the reserve force proposed in clause 45. These members currently are protected by a death benefit of two months' pay under regulations made under the National Defence Act. This amendment will not increase the cost to the government in that respect.

The last motion I should like to comment on is motion No. 9. This motion inserts a new clause 104 and re-numbers the present clauses 104, 105, and 106 as 105, 106, and 107.

The new clause 104 is proposed to permit the Governor in Council or the Treasury Board, as the clause provides, to resolve the anomalous situation whereby many longservice employees whom the government wishes to retain can lose prospective pension benefits if they remain employed after years such as 1975. This loss occurs because the level of such employees' basic pensions on retirement in 1976 or later will not be enough to bring them up to the level of the indexed pensions which they would have been receiving following retirement in December, 1975, with basic pensions which would be increased by 11.3 per cent in January of 1976.

The joint parliamentary committee reviewed this problem, and while it was not empowered to make a specific recommendation, it discussed at some length an approach whereby any such employee would be given a guarantee against a lower ultimate pension level if he or she remained in employment one year or less after he or she passed the peak of the pension build-up. Treasury Board approval for extension of the guarantee into the second and later years was contemplated under that approach.

While the government initially was inclined to favour that approach, it was decided to require approval of the guarantee by the Governor in Council or Treasury Board, as appropriate for the first as well as for the second and subsequent years. The retention of the present inducement to retire in the majority of cases will facilitate the government's objective in restricting the growth of the Public Service and reduce the number of cases in which employees might otherwise have had to be laid off.

With these explanations, I hope that the purpose of the motions in the name of the President of the Treasury Board will be clear to the House.