

Superannuation

• (1220)

Mrs. Catterall: May I have further clarification Mr. Chairman? As I read this section, in fact we may have two surviving children in university, one of which was out of university perhaps to support the family while the parent was in a last illness, and is now back in university. That child is ineligible for a pension, but another child who never took that year away and went straight to university from high school is eligible. Is that the case?

Mr. Crosby: Mr. Chairman, my understanding is yes, that situation could arise. I have already indicated that it is a matter being considered and would be part of a further pension revision. At the present time, the President of the Treasury Board and the Government are simply trying to extend the benefits as far as they can, knowing the obligation which might be incurred. We appreciate the Member's attention and I am sure it will be noted for the future revisions.

Clauses 23 to 29 inclusive agreed to.

On Clause 30—

Mr. Hovdebo: Mr. Chairman, my question probably should have been posed on an earlier Clause. Could the Parliamentary Secretary tell me why there was no particular action taken, back in 1984, and again in 1987, when we had a commitment from the Solicitor General and the President of the Treasury Board that Canadian Correctional workers would be allowed to retire after 25 years of service. It was a bit of housekeeping. It was not in Bill C-33. Consequently, it was going to be brought in as an amendment to Bill C-33 but we know what happened to Bill C-33. It would have fit in this kind of an Act. I just wonder why it is not in there, particularly.

Mr. Crosby: Mr. Chairman, I am sure the President of the Treasury Board and the Government would want me to indicate that the purpose of the Bill now before us is simply to correct what is now regarded as unfairness in past legislation with respect to the disqualification because of remarriage. While it is amending legislation, it is only intended to deal with that specific situation. The concerns of the Member are noted.

I understand the specific concern which he raises about prison workers and members of the Correctional Service. It will be taken into account in future proposals for pension reform. The Government and the President of the Treasury Board is certainly aware of the commit-

ment mentioned by the Member for Saskatoon—Humboldt. It is now part of the record, so there is another reminder on record.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 31 agreed to.

On Clause 32—

Mr. Gauthier: On this question of recovery of lump sums pursuant to appeal provisions, if I understand the Clause:

A spouse or other person was paid an amount as a final payment pursuant to Section 59—before the coming into force of this section, the Commission may retain that amount by way of deduction from any subsequent payments on account—

Any lump sum amount paid to a person as a settlement, because of his or her ineligibility to receive the spouses' allowance because of the remarriage, does that mean that that amount itself will have to be collected in total, that is, all of it, or it will be spread over a period of years?

Could you tell me if the repayment of the sums of money would be based on an actuarial formula, or will it be strictly pay-up and that's it. Because, if it is pay-up, whatever one got eight or nine years ago, I am sure a lot of those people would not be able to cope with it. I am just asking the Parliamentary Secretary what kind of message he will give these people to satisfy, I would think, an element of justice and equity?

Mr. Crosby: The Hon. Member for Ottawa—Vanier's question relates to the Pension Act which deals of course with veterans. The Minister of Veterans Affairs will address that particular concern.

In broader terms, as it relates to the restoration of other pension benefits in the other legislation, there will be a provision for part repayment. That is to say, the repayment of the amount previously received will be spread over a timeframe and that will be the subject of regulations or ministerial directive.

The intention is that the amount that was paid out will be repaid, interest free, at no extra cost to the recipient of the pension benefits over a timeframe. I think the timeframe will be extended so that it will not be a great burden.

I asked the officials before to give us an average, and I understand that the average benefit that will be paid out on it on an annual basis will approximate \$4,900. The average payments which will be required will be, on