

as evidence of good faith in terms of their fishing rights in the Restigouche area.

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICE

CONTRACTUAL STATUS OF FORMER SENIOR OFFICIALS

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Madam Speaker, you will recall a question I asked the minister responsible for Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation with respect to the number of senior officials who have cashed in their optimum pension rights to change their status from that of employment to contractual arrangement. I thank the minister for a letter he wrote to me saying that only three of the former senior executives of the corporation have entered into this kind of arrangement.

I would like to address a question to the President of the Treasury Board with regard to the issue of persons receiving dual benefits in terms of pensions and salaries. Could he tell me whether the practice, now obvious in Canada Mortgage and Housing, is widespread throughout the Public Service? To refresh his memory, the question is with respect to senior civil servants who cash in their optimum pension rights and change their status from that of employment to a contractual arrangement, receiving two salaries from the Public Service.

Hon. Donald J. Johnston (President of the Treasury Board): Madam Speaker, the practice has been, and continues to be, that where public servants are hired on contract after retirement, care is taken to ensure that they do not receive a benefit beyond that which they would have received had they continued as employees of the federal government. That has been the practice in the past. If the hon. member knows of other circumstances in that department, I would be glad to take this question as a representation and ask my colleague responsible for the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation to look into the matter.

REQUEST FOR MINISTERIAL INVESTIGATION

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Madam Speaker, it would not be in anyone's interest for me to give names of people in several departments of the Public Service who are not only receiving the optimum pension rights but contractual payments which are higher than their salary was before they changed their status with the corporation. Unless the minister provides us here with a more positive answer, namely, that he will look into the situation and stop it, I will have to name some of these public servants who have entered into these arrangements with several departments of the federal government.

Hon. Donald J. Johnston (President of the Treasury Board): Madam Speaker, I would invite the hon. member to speak to me privately on the matter. I have told him what the policy of the government is and what the policy of the Treasury Board is. I have just explained to him that maybe that

Privilege—Mr. Crosbie

should not be the case. Obviously there are public servants who are very valuable and should be maintained on contract. However, they should not, by virtue of that arrangement, receive more than they would receive had they continued as employees in the Public Service. That is the policy. If there are abuses which have not been brought to my attention, I would like to know what they are. I invite the hon. member to bring them to my attention privately.

* * *

● (1500)

PETITION

MR. ROBINSON (BURNABY)—ALLEGED CIA INTERVENTION

Madam Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has laid upon the Table the two hundred and forty-fifth report of the Clerk of Petitions stating that he has examined the petition presented by the hon. member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) on Wednesday, May 19, 1982, and finds that it meets the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

MR. CROSBIE—ALLEGED MISLEADING STATEMENT BY MR. CHRÉTIEN

Hon. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West): Madam Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege of which I gave you notice this morning and which arises out of events which occurred in this House on Tuesday and Wednesday of this week.

All the precedents and authorities indicate that it is a breach of the privileges of the House for a member deliberately to mislead the House and, in particular, for a cabinet minister to do so. Incidentally, I will move a motion when I conclude my remarks, which I trust will be succinct and to the point.

As I understand it, what I must do now is establish a prima facie case that this House was deliberately misled by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Chrétien) and then, if Your Honour finds that the motion I will move is in order, there would be a debate on it and a vote as to whether this matter should be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Madam Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member worded his notice to me very carefully, and I ask him if he would very kindly avoid referring to "deliberately misleading" the House. The hon. member can expose any facts he wishes to put forward without mentioning those words which, of course, I must consider to be unparliamentary. There have been numerous occasions when allegations of the kind the hon. member now wants to bring forward have been brought forward, and hon. members have been able to expose their questions of privilege without using this kind of language. Such language