

Canada Pension Plan

Mr. Munro: It appears as though hon. members opposite have really strong feelings with regard to this particular provision but it should be remembered that 51 sittings of the committee were held during the recess at a sacrifice to members of all parties in this house, and during that time not one question was asked with respect to this matter, nor was any objection taken either when the clause was being explained or when we were drafting the report.

Mr. Chatterton: That is a most specious argument, and the most illogical I have ever heard. Does the hon. gentleman mean that because we did not raise this question in the committee we cannot do so here? I did not raise it, simply because I did not catch the implication. I am not a lawyer. This is the first time I have realized the implications of clause 26. If the hon. gentleman says we cannot discuss it here because we did not raise the matter in the committee, we might as well quit now and have no further discussion.

Mr. Munro: My suggestion is this: There were lawyers present in the committee. The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka was there.

An hon. Member: He just said he was not.

Mr. Munro: Senator McCutcheon was at the meeting. I am sorry. The hon. member was not there. But there were other lawyers there, I am sure. Surely we should take account of the fact that we have gone on for an hour and a half talking on this question after there has been, as mentioned by the Minister of National Revenue, an agreement that we would go through the clauses and then stand the clauses on which there might be considerable argument. We consented to this arrangement and now we find we are spending an hour and a half on this clause. Subsequent speakers on the other side have been repeating what earlier speakers have said. You have got your point across.

Some hon. Members: Filibuster.

The Chairman: The parliamentary secretary has the floor at the moment—

An hon. Member: The chairman is on his feet. You sit down.

The Chairman: I suggest to hon. members that we are now embarking on a procedural argument; we have got away from the substance of the clause before the committee. I appreciate that hon. members on my left may have strong objection to what may have
[Mr. Churchill.]

been said but I think it would be helpful if we were to abandon this procedural argument and resume consideration of the substantive question before us.

Mr. Munro: I had the floor, Mr. Chairman. The reason I point this out is this: Presumably the purpose of holding so many meetings was to go into matters such as this in order that we might be prepared for our discussion later. The fact of the matter is that this subject was not raised once. The government and the opposition parties having worked together in this way, it can hardly be suggested that because the Minister of National Revenue does not want to accept an amendment the government is being arrogant. That is the only point I wished to make.

Mr. Benson: On a point of order. Having been requested by the official opposition to stand this clause and having indicated that we have already agreed to stand certain clauses, let me say that certainly the government does not wish to move from clause 26 to clause 27 and have clause 27 stand. I should like to ask whether there are any other clauses which the official opposition would like to have stood in addition to the list they gave. If there are any others of which they have knowledge, I trust they will inform us. I hope this will not be a repeated process because we do not wish to find at the end of the day that we have stood just about all the clauses.

The government would be agreeable to standing this clause and the officials would meet with members of the official opposition and other opposition parties who are particularly interested in it and talk about its implications with regard to the administration of the act involved, and I would be prepared to meet reasonably with proposals put forward with regard to it.

Mr. Aiken: We seem to have come to a misunderstanding about the nature of the agreement entered into when we commenced discussion of this particular bill in committee of the whole. We have clearly stated as a party the points at which we wish to make amendments. We have four substantive amendments which have been made public and, as we have stated several times, we have two other amendments relating to students and one relating to employees of foreign governments. In principle these are the six substantive amendments with which we wish to proceed. It was to avoid our