

try to make sense out of it and get more confused than ever.

If someone—I would like to have an answer on this point first of all—gives us, say, \$20 or \$25 cash, a bank note bearing the royal effigy, can we at least issue a receipt and register it?

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** Madam Chairman, I must admit that I do not fully understand the position of each party in the House. But I think it should be pointed out at this time that it is the result of an agreement concluded between the four parties of the House, including the Social Credit Party of Canada. I think that this is entirely possible and that the hon. member is right, but the present discussion represents an agreement, a compromise to which the four parties agreed. For that reason, I presume that it is just enough for the hon. member.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** Madam Chairman, if I could draw the attention of our colleague for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier) to page 7 of the bill, subclause (4.1) of the French version, the member will read as follows:

... «contribution» signifie un montant versé à un parti enregistré ou à un candidat sous forme d'argent liquide ou au moyen d'un effet négociable...

That means a cheque. Then the cash or the cheque represents an amount contributed.

**Mr. Gauthier (Roberval):** Madam Chairman, we of the Social Credit are told that cash deposits are no good any more.

[English]

**The Assistant Deputy Chairman:** Order, please. Shall clause 12 carry?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Clause 12 agreed to.

Clauses 13 and 14 agreed to.

● (2050)

Title agreed to.

Bill reported.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** When shall the bill be read the third time?

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Next sitting of the House.

**Some hon. Members:** Now.

**Mr. Peters:** Madam Speaker, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) indicated the next sitting of the House, and that is mandatory.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Why?

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** But there is no need to do it.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** I am sorry. I did not hear the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

### State Pensions

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** Madam Speaker, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) made it clear to me that he would not agree to third reading this evening, so under the circumstances we agree that it should be considered at the next sitting, and perhaps we could go on to other business at this point.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** Is it agreed that third reading be delayed until the next sitting of the House?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### STATUTE LAW (SUPERANNUATION) AMENDMENT ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND VARIOUS STATUTES TO PROVIDE FOR CHANGES IN PENSION CONTRIBUTIONS, BENEFITS, ETC.

**Hon. C. M. Drury (for the President of Treasury Board)** moved that Bill C-52, to amend the Public Service Superannuation Act, the Canadian Forces Superannuation Act, the Defence Services Pension Continuation Act, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Superannuation Act, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Pension Continuation Act, the Diplomatic Service (Special) Superannuation Act, the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act, the Governor General's Retiring Annuity Act, the Judges Act, the Tax Review Board Act and the Supplementary Retirement Benefits Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

[English]

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe that hon. members on the treasury benches will recall that earlier this session the government House leader agreed that after this bill had been given second reading it would go to the Special Joint Committee on Employer-Employee Relations in the Public Service rather than to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates. That has been confirmed by the government House leader in meetings of House leaders several times. I wonder if that understanding could be included in the motion.

**Mr. Blais:** Madam Speaker, the statement made by the House leader of the New Democratic Party is accurate. I recall that statement having been made by the government House leader—

**An hon. Member:** And you have no objection?

**Mr. Blais:** And we have no objection.

**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):** Madam Speaker, I should like to have clarification of the point raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). It is my recollection that the Joint Committee on Employer-Employee Relations was a special committee set up to discuss the Finkelman Report, and that once that committee has reported it is *defunctus*, and there would have to be a special resolution to set it up again in order to deal with this legislation.