

*Proceedings on Adjournment Motion*

capital agree on the importance of the subject of height control of buildings in the central part of the city. The city of Ottawa has a by-law governing height control and the federal authority tries to work within it.

The whole subject of height control is of such concern that I expect it will be dealt with by the committee that will be examining into the operations of the national capital commission. Rather than try to develop in an extended way—it is impossible to do so in three minutes—what the situation is, I hope that the subject will be dealt with by the committee, which will have plenty of time to do so before the building is proceeded with. The subject can best be examined by this body representing the House of Commons.

I should add that the question of height of buildings is also related to distance from the Peace Tower. The concept of height cannot be in absolute terms across the whole city. Heights of buildings in close proximity to the Peace Tower are lower than would be tolerated for buildings farther away from the Peace Tower. The particular building under discussion will be some 4,450 feet from the Peace Tower, which is close to a mile, and it will be erected on low ground. It is true that the plans call for the building to be higher than the Peace Tower by some 38 feet, but as I say, I am quite agreeable to having the whole subject examined by the committee when it is set up, which I hope will be very soon. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, nothing will happen to affect the position in any way.

PUBLIC SERVICE—COMMITTEE REPORT ON  
PENSIONS OF RETIRED CIVIL SERVANTS

**Hon. R. A. Bell (Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, never have I been more sorely tempted to breach the rules of the house and discuss the subject which has just been concluded, but I must refrain from so doing and deal with the question of increased pensions for retired public servants, including the R.C.M.P. and the armed forces. This was the subject of my question on Monday last to the Prime Minister and is the subject upon which my complaint is focused tonight.

Tonight the Prime Minister is in London becoming a freeman of that great city. I am sure all of us extend to him our congratulations, coupled with the wish that he will understand the position of some of those who are, as he is, a retired civil servant but are less fortunate in respect of the honours and emoluments that are his.

In his absence, Mr. Speaker, under normal circumstances the President of the Treasury

Board would reply. I want to thank that genial gentleman for having indicated to me at 9 p.m. this evening that he was about to leave for Vancouver and could not be in the chamber to reply to my representations.

As you are aware, sir, on May 8 of this year, which was the last day of the first session of this parliament, a special joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons reported unanimously in favour of an increase in the pensions of retired civil servants. In their report the committee said:

● (10:20 p.m.)

In the committee's view, the government should do what it reasonably can to protect and preserve, or failing that, to restore in some measure the original purchasing power of the contributory pensions which, under the Public Service Superannuation Act, and similar enactments, it has provided for its retired employees.

With this consideration in mind, your committee recommends immediate action by the government, to up-date and extend the provisions of the Public Service Pension Adjustment Act (1959).

Then it went on:

The committee recommends that any plan to improve the position of these retired employees should conform to the following requirements:

(a) it should be capable of quick and early implementation in the form of legislation in the next session of this parliament;

(b) any adjustment in pensions should not be limited to a particular date of retirement and should be in addition to any other increase already granted under the Pension Adjustment Act of 1959;

(c) it should maintain the principle contained in the present legislation that benefits should be related to length of service;

(d) it should conform to the principle that any adjustment formula should take account also of the time which has elapsed since retirement;

(e) it should take into account the increase in living costs during that period of time; and

(f) it should increase the ceiling in the 1959 Pension Adjustment Act.

Sir, as you well know, the expectation of members of the special joint committee was that early action would be taken in accordance with the unanimous recommendation. A decision one way or the other ought to have been anticipated. What has been the subsequent history of this unanimous recommendation. Sir, to all the questions that have been asked about this matter the answers have always been in the same context—"under consideration", "decision in due course", "still under advisement". That, sir, is a contempt of parliament and a denial of the role of committees and the rights of the private members in this parliament. The time has come when the government ought to stop this contempt of parliament.

**Mr. Knowles:** Hear, hear.