

which said statute came into force, upon proclamation of the Governor in Council, on the 1st day of October 1967;

That section 18 of the said statute provides that the Cape Breton Development Corporation shall, by by-law approved by the Honourable the Treasury Board, establish, manage and administer pension arrangements for the benefit of persons, among whom are your Petitioners, employed or formerly employed in certain coal mining and related works and undertakings on the Island of Cape Breton, and for the benefit of the dependents of such persons;

That the said Corporation, purporting to comply with the said section 18, has put into force and effect a "Pre-Retirement Leave Plan", so-called;

That the Pre-Retirement Leave Plan is an income supplement scheme and is not a pension arrangement; and the benefits paid thereunder are designed and intended to supplement other forms of assistance received or to be received so as to raise the total assistance received to—but not above—certain dollar amounts fixed under the said Plan, with the result that the assistance paid by the Corporation decreases or ceases as other assistance is increased;

That the said Plan specifies that assistance received by way of unemployment insurance benefits is assistance within the meaning of the Plan; and the Plan requires that persons who are on pre-retirement leave under the Plan must use up their full benefit entitlement based upon their unemployment insurance contributions;

That the Government announced on the 3rd December 1970 that, effective the 3rd January 1971, unemployment insurance benefits will be increased by ten per cent;

That your Petitioners and their dependents will not benefit by the said increase in unemployment insurance benefits inasmuch as the Cape Breton Development Corporation will deduct, to its own use and benefit, the amount of such increase from the amount of the supplementary assistance paid by the Corporation within the income ceiling fixed by the Plan;

That this loss to your Petitioners and their dependents will commence on the 3rd January 1971;

That except by petition to your Honourable House no remedy is available to your Petitioners whereby they may obtain relief of this grievance before the 3rd January 1971 or at all;

Therefore your Petitioners HUMBLY PRAY that your Honourable House will find means of prevailing upon Her Majesty's Government and the Cape Breton Development Corporation:

1. To revoke the Pre-Retirement Leave Plan and to substitute therefor pension arrangements based upon pension principles; or ALTERNATIVELY, to provide for improved early retirement benefits for your Petitioners and their dependents based upon the principle

already approved by Her Majesty's Government and referred to in the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor General which is printed in the Notice Paper of your Honourable House at page 3, for the 9th December 1970, and which recommends legislation to improve early retirement benefits for certain categories of persons employed in the Public Service; and

2. To provide an immediate remedy for the present personal grievances of your Petitioners that, commencing the 3rd January 1971, they and their dependents will suffer financial losses not intended by your Honourable House when providing, under section 18 of the Cape Breton Development Corporation Act that pension arrangements must be made by the Cape Breton Development Corporation, with the approval of the Treasury Board, for your Petitioners and their dependents; and

3. To provide such further and other relief in the premises as to your Honourable House seems just and meet.

And your Petitioners, as in duty bound, now prayeth and will ever pray,

And your Petitioners have, and each of them hath, signed at Glace Bay, on the Island of Cape Breton, in the Province of Nova Scotia, this 6th day of December, in the year of Our Lord One Thousand Nine Hundred and Seventy.

(Signed):

Angus MacDougall
Thomas H. McDonald
Charles MacQueen
Edison Clements
A. Archie MacAuley
Peter Murray

Joseph M. Matheson
William Pittman
Colin Matheson
Stanley Nash
Edwin M. Matheson
Alex Yanisiewicz
Thomas Daye

Mr. SPEAKER: This is perhaps where we reach the point which the honourable Member had anticipated a moment ago concerning whether a motion pursuant to the petition filed can be entertained at this time. The honourable Member has correctly referred to Standing Order 67(8) thereof which reads in part as follows: "...or if it complain of some present personal grievance requiring an immediate remedy, the matter contained therein may be brought into immediate discussion."

As honourable Members know there are very few precedents in modern times in respect of the House having adjourned its business for the purpose of considering a petition. The only precedent which I could find and which I looked at, in view of the fact that the matter was brought to the attention of the House yesterday by the honourable Member through the filing of the petition is the Raymond Rodgers case reported in the *Journals* of the House of Commons for Friday, October 19, 1962.

The *Journals* record that by unanimous consent the petition received the previous day and read to the House