

Civil Service Superannuation

board power for purposes of superannuation to designate certain other groups. So far so good. It goes farther: it stipulates conditions which these other groups must meet in order that the treasury board may so designate them. But the thing it does not do is to declare that all groups who meet the specifications set down in subparagraphs (b) (i) and (ii) shall be so designated. That is the reason why some of us are asking questions.

Let me be concrete. Let me name two groups of persons who, I feel, meet the requirements of subparagraphs (b) (i) and (ii). First of all, there are my own colleagues over at the printing bureau to whom I have referred on two or three occasions. They are in receipt of salary or wages which in a year amount to at least \$600, so that they meet subparagraph (b) (i). They are also required to devote the whole of their time to that work, and there is not sufficient time left in the year for them to engage in some other remunerative occupation; so that they meet subparagraph (b) (ii). In other words, the treasury board may designate the printing employees as for the purposes of this act entitled to superannuation. Now we would like to know whether they are to be so designated. Maybe the minister can tell us; maybe he will say that we shall have to wait until the treasury board decides, but I hope the former is the case.

Let me refer to another group; I have already referred to them in the course of the debate on this measure—the men doing char work in this building. They receive a salary during the course of the year which is at least \$600; therefore they meet subparagraph (b) (i). They also meet—at least some of them do—subparagraph (b) (ii), for they are employed the year round except for two or three weeks' holidays; at any rate they are employed a sufficient part of the year that they cannot go somewhere else and engage in some other remunerative employment. In other words, they meet subparagraphs (b) (i) and (ii) exactly as do the employees over at the printing bureau. Yet, there are rumours around—we do not know where they come from, but they are in circulation—that the treasury board will bring the printers under this legislation, but that the men doing char work in this building are not to be brought under it. I hope the former rumour is true and the latter one false, and that the minister may be able to give us some statement as to what is the likely action with respect to these two groups.

While I am speaking of various groups let me refer also to some that I referred to the

other day when the minister, prompted by a minister who was sitting behind him, made the comment that this bill was not designed to bring everybody in Canada under civil service superannuation. I refer to the stenographers who work for members of the House of Commons.

I should like also to refer to another group, the amanuenses who work up on the third floor—those charming young women, if I may say so—who type out the speeches made in this house after they have been taken down in shorthand on the floor of this chamber by the *Hansard* reporters. Those young ladies, along with the stenographers who work for members of the house, work only the part of the year that the house is in session. Therefore they do not meet subparagraph (b) (ii), although they may meet subparagraph (b) (i). Therefore, even though the treasury board might be interested in these people, under the terms of this act they cannot become eligible; yet I believe that they should.

If I may take a moment on the side, I was interested in learning that when this House of Commons first started, that term, "amanuenses", fitted the employees who bore the name a little better, perhaps, than it does to-day. Seventy years ago the *Hansard* reporters took down in shorthand the speeches that were made in the House of Commons, and the amanuenses were young men outside the chamber who transcribed those notes into longhand—this was before the days of satisfactory typewriters—and then *Hansard* was printed from that longhand.

Here is the case. The *Hansard* reporters—so far as I am concerned, very deservingly so—are put on an annual basis. They are permanent employees; they receive an annual salary, and they are covered under the superannuation act. But since parliament is not sitting the whole year, they have the privilege, when parliament is not sitting, of engaging in some other remunerative employment, such as court reporting, for example. Technically they would not meet subparagraph (b) (ii), and they would be debarred from superannuation if they were not already covered as civil servants in receipt of a stated annual salary. Yet there is this line of distinction between the reporter who takes the shorthand notes here on the floor of the house and the amanuensis who puts them into typescript on the typewriter. I feel that some consideration should be given to them, that they, too, should come under civil service superannuation. We expect them, as we expect the stenographers who work for members, to come back year in and year out. Some of them have been here for a good many years and