

Canadian Forces Act

reduced to the point where there would not be a deficit. But when it was found in 1952-53 that the deficit had gone up to \$133,000 and that, in spite of technological improvements which had been made to reduce the rate of deficit, it was not being reduced and that the business was growing—and as someone said in another context, if I dare refer to it, you cannot lose money on every unit and make money on the whole operation—it was felt that the time had come to follow the policy of the government, sir.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 2 and 3 agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill, by leave, be read the third time now?

Mr. Knowles: No.

Mr. Speaker: Next sitting.

CANADIAN FORCES ACT

AMENDMENTS TO DEFENCE SERVICES PENSION ACT, NATIONAL DEFENCE ACT, CANADIAN FORCES ACT, ETC.

Hon. R. O. Campney (Associate Minister of National Defence) moved the second reading of Bill No. 80, respecting the Canadian forces.

He said: This is a bill to amend a number of statutes which affect the members of the defence forces. Speaking to the resolution preceding this bill on December 10 last, as reported in *Hansard* at pages 795 to 799 inclusive, I reviewed generally the scope of the bill and endeavoured to cover briefly its salient points.

The clauses of the bill are not related to each other and the bill does not deal with a single specific subject, so that I would think that the usual practice of debating the principle of a bill on second reading is hardly applicable to this bill. I would suggest, therefore, that it might expedite consideration of the bill and be more helpful to hon. members if the bill could be given second reading now, after which we might proceed in committee to consider the several clauses which make up the bill.

Mr. G. R. Pearkes (Esquimalt-Saanich): When the resolution preceding this bill was before the house I called attention to the unusual character of the bill, namely, its being one of those omnibus bills, embracing a great many amendments to five different acts of parliament. I do feel that it is unfortunate that the minister persists in introducing this omnibus type of bill, because it

makes it very difficult for many people to find the amendments to the various bills referred to. If the minister has found difficulty in defining the principle of this bill, I say that the principle of the bill is entirely unprincipled. With that I will have to agree with the suggestion that we deal with the bill clause by clause as we proceed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Applewhaite in the chair.

On clause 1—*Short title.*

Mr. Noseworthy: Mr. Chairman, I want to raise a matter for discussion and I think perhaps it should be raised under this clause. I have discussed this with the minister and some of his officials. Under the Defence Services Pension Act as it now stands certain classes of permanent service personnel who are compulsorily pensioned for economic reasons are subject to a one-third reduction in their pension if they were in the permanent force before June, 1944. Those who became members of the permanent force after June 1944 and are compulsorily retired after ten years may receive their full pensions without any reduction.

The actual result is as follows: A member of the permanent force who joined before June, 1944, and after being twelve years in the force, with say six years overseas, was then compulsorily retired for treasury board reasons with eighteen years' service, would be subject to a one-third reduction in pension. That would wipe out entirely any pension for the six years which he had served overseas. He gets two-thirds of his pension instead of the full pension. He gets a pension equivalent to twelve years' service instead of eighteen years'. That one-third reduction just wipes out the pension for the six years he was overseas.

But take a man who joined the services after June, 1944, and who had six, four or two years overseas—because there is no fixed minimum required for that category who joined the service after 1944. This man would have served two years overseas and ten years in the permanent force. He is then compulsorily retired but receives exactly the same pension as the man with twelve years in the force plus six years overseas.

That seems to me to be unfair and I think the minister himself will consider it is a bit unfair that a man with twelve years' permanent service before the war, with six years overseas, a total of eighteen years, should draw exactly the same pension after