

*Retirement Age for Senators*

dispute at the Victoria Airport. This situation arose from arrangements within the collective bargaining agreement between the employer and the unions which is, of course, a matter under Provincial jurisdiction. There is no policy on the part of Federal Departments which would have the effect of upsetting these collective bargaining arrangements. May I advise my hon. friend that the dispute is settled and the matter has been cleared up. The subcontractor involved presumably has decided to respect the collective agreement about which apparently he had not been fully informed.

● (12:00 noon)

**THE SENATE****ESTABLISHMENT OF RETIREMENT AGE FOR SENATORS**

**Hon. G. J. McIlraith (for the Prime Minister)** moved the second reading of Bill C-98, to make provision for the retirement of Members of the Senate.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. McIlraith:** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Speaker:** Did I hear one hon. Member say no?

**Mr. Churchill:** The Minister has risen to speak.

**Mr. McIlraith:** Mr. Speaker, there is not much which can be added by way of explanation of the Bill on second reading which was not said at the resolution stage of the debate on April 26 and 27. The Bill involves one very simple question of principle, and it is a very specific and narrow point which is at issue.

The question of principle involved is simply whether a member of the Senate will be eligible to hold his place after attaining the age of 75 years. Therefore on the question of principle there is not a great deal which needs to be developed one way or the other because of the very nature of this specific and narrow point. This question of principle involved in the Bill is dealt with in three different ways, as will be seen from an analysis of the Bill. Of course the specific provisions will be discussed in detail when the House goes into Committee of the Whole to deal with the clauses in the Bill.

The first part of the Bill merely provides that a Senator who is summoned to the Sen-

ate after the coming into force of this Bill will be eligible to hold his place in the Senate only until he attains the age of 75 years.

The second part of the Bill changes the provisions of the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act, which heretofore was applicable only to Members of the House of Commons, and provides that Senators appointed in the future shall contribute under that Act and be eligible for pension on the same basis as Members of the House of Commons.

Part 3 of the Bill merely provides that any present member of the Senate who has attained the age of 75 years may retire and receive an annuity equal to two thirds of the salary he is paid as a Senator.

It will be seen, then, that the scheme of the Bill is quite simple, and I would think this is the practical and realistic way to deal with the subject in a fair way to all. I say this because the Senators presently in the Senate have been appointed under the provisions of section 29 of the British North America Act, which states simply that:

A Senator shall, subject to the Provisions of this Act, hold his Place in the Senate for Life.

Anyone who was appointed to the Senate heretofore would have the right to expect that provision to be carried out, it being originally enacted in the B.N.A. Act in that form.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether there is much more I need deal with at this stage of the Bill, because as I indicated at the commencement of my remarks the principle involved is a very narrow and specific one, namely whether or not Senators shall be eligible to hold their place in the Senate after having attained the age of 75 years.

**Mr. R. W. Prittie (Burnaby-Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, I notice that the Bill is in the name of the Prime Minister, and I realize he is a very busy person, but it is disappointing that he is not in the House during the discussion of this Bill. I am wondering whether the ex-University of Toronto history teacher is so ashamed of this type of bill that he does not want to be around during its discussion.

On rereading the debate at the resolution stage of the Bill, Mr. Speaker, I noted that the motives of the members of the New Democratic Party in advocating abolition of the Senate were questioned by two Members, the hon. Member for Edmonton West and the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona. I should like to refer briefly to what they said. First, the comments of the hon. Member for