

Government Organization Act, 1970

and universities subject to the animal care people who, in turn, shall be responsible, under this legislation, to the Minister of Agriculture.

I commend my bill to this House, hoping very much that this time the "talker-outers" will be absent and will allow this legislation that is long overdue to be placed on our statute books.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Will all those in favour of the motion please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Will all those opposed please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): In my opinion, the nays have it.

Mrs. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, there are not enough members on this side of the House to stand up with me.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Order, please. I declare the motion negatived on division.

Motion (Mrs. MacInnis) negatived.

Mr. Mahoney: Mr. Speaker, may we call it six o'clock?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Is it the wish of hon. members that we call it six o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Since it has been called six o'clock, I do now leave the chair. The House will resume at eight o'clock this evening.

At 5.22 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION ACT, 1970

PROVISIONS RESPECTING DEPARTMENTAL REORGANIZATION, MINISTRIES OF STATE, PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES, ETC.

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Drury (for the Prime Minister) that Bill C-207, respecting the organization of the government of Canada and matters related or incidental thereto, be read the second time and referred to the committee of the whole.

[Mrs. MacInnis.]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, when I commenced my remarks on Bill C-207 just before five o'clock I indicated that my concern about this bill is that it has too many cases of the good and the bad, too many coins that are beautiful on one side and ugly on the other. I believe in my remarks before five o'clock I pinpointed the two examples of this that bother me most. I am prepared to confine my remarks to those two examples. The first is in the field of public service superannuation. Before five o'clock I said most of what I wanted to say on this point. However, there are a few more words that should be added.

I pointed out this afternoon that this is a clear case of a coin that is beautiful on one side and ugly on the other. The beautiful part is that the possibility of early retirement is extended. This is something that our society will have to face before long. Public servants who have a certain number of years to their credit and have attained a certain age may, if they wish, retire and receive a pension beginning at the moment of retirement even if they are only between 50 and 55 years of age. In so far as this bill permits public servants to avail themselves of this privilege, it is good and I welcome it. I want to see this provision on our statute books.

The other side of that coin is that part VII of the bill gives the government, as employer, the right to retire—in more realistic language, the right to fire—public servants and put them on pension between age 50 and 55 whether they want to retire or not. I am not impressed by the argument that this is a matter of equality, or that it is a two-way street which makes it possible to have the initiative on either side. You do not equate one lone employee, trying to sort out his finances and his old age security, against the weight and power of an organization as large as the government of Canada. It is not fair to say that because an employee has the right to retire at an early date if he wishes, the Canadian government has the right to force him to retire even if he does not want to do so.

● (8:10 p.m.)

I pointed out before five o'clock, and admitted I was taking the minimal case I could work out from the formula contained in the bill, that it would be possible for the government to force into retirement a public servant who was 50 years of age and who had 20 years of service, on a pension of only 20 per cent of his average salary during his six best years. To require a public servant to retire at age 50 on a pension of only 20 per cent of his salary, whether he wants to retire or not, is—pardon me for repeating the word—ugly. I do not like it and I do not think it should be in this legislation.

In the same area, the government provides in the bill before us what has already been described as a special privilege for those who attain the rank of deputy minister or deputy head: this is a phrase which I assume will include a secretary to a minister of state where that minister has been given, by proclamation, a department over which to preside. If such a deputy head has been in the public service for ten years and chooses to leave, or is turned out, he is given the privilege of continuing to