

We can look at this further, in view of your concern. It was partly a drafting difficulty in spelling out the situations that would have to be covered. There were no ulterior motives.

Mr. KNOWLES: That satisfies me if the experts will make sure that the commitment given to persons who have achieved the right to retire on full pension before 65 is not lost.

The Co-CHAIRMAN (*Mr. Richard*): It is now 11 o'clock. Is it the wish of the committee to adjourn so that the members may attend the House of Commons?

Hon. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Senator FERGUSSON: May I ask if the example supplied by Mr. Clark will be part of the printed proceedings or not?

The Co-CHAIRMAN (*Mr. Richard*): It was not intended that it should be but it can be printed as an appendix, and I will accept such a motion.

Senator FERGUSSON: I so move.

Motion agreed to.

The Co-CHAIRMAN (*Mr. Richard*): I suggest we adjourn until 2.30.

The committee adjourned until 2.30 p.m.

AFTERNOON SITTING

The Co-CHAIRMAN (*Mr. Richard*): Order, please. We will now resume the discussion where we left off this morning with Dr. Davidson and Mr. Clark.

Mr. BELL (*Carleton*): Mr. Chairman, when the committee rose this morning we were at what I think is perhaps a critical point of the situation under the provisions of section 9, as they appear on page 13, and I have had some qualms about whether there is not a very genuine problem here.

I understand fully the situation as to the person who retires at age 62 and from age 62 to age 65 is entitled to his full pension under the Public Service Superannuation Act. At age 65 that pension under the Public Service Superannuation Act is reduced by the amount of the Canada Pension, and if he is then employed he does not then receive the Canada Pension payments, of course.

If this were to be started *de novo* for all persons entering the public service as of this point, I could feel this was fully justified. I am wondering whether there is any element of a breach of contract with those who have entered the public service with the act as it has stood up to now, who had every reason to anticipate that at age 65, when in 20 years' time Dr. Davidson goes out at age 65, he would be entitled to be employed again, or figure that he could, and draw a full superannuation. Are we depriving the Dr. Davidsons and the Mr. Clarks of something which was virtually an assurance given by statute to them?

This has, I confess, as I have meditated upon it over the lunch hour, concerned me very much, as to whether this provision ought not to be suspended until such period of time as you get a completely new group of people in the public service.

Dr. DAVIDSON: Mr. Chairman, could I perhaps offer one or two tentative comments which may verge on expressions of opinion?—and I apologize for that, if I stray too far into the opinion area.