

Canada Pension Plan

That is a stated opinion of the special joint committee. As the Minister of National Revenue knows, the point was made this morning by the legislative committee of the running trades brotherhoods, and as both ministers know, this is the position taken by the Canadian Labour Congress. I am wondering whether the government has given any thought to ways in which this desirable objective might be achieved.

Miss LaMarsh: Mr. Chairman, we have given a great deal of consideration to it, as members of the committee will remember. One of the first things that was raised in the discussion of the implementation of the Canada pension plan, and from various quarters, was what would happen to already existing private plans. I pointed out, as has the Prime Minister and a number of spokesmen for the government on a number of occasions, that the constitutional rights of the federal government are limited to a number of different classifications. One of these classifications, of course, relates to members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the military, and the committee has already dealt with this question. It would have to be done by way of amendment to their superannuation acts. The same is true of the civil service.

As I have pointed out a number of times to the committee and the house, a great deal of work has gone into figuring this out and dealing with the different groups which represent civil servants across the country. In addition of course there is a very large group of Canadians who are employed in federal enterprises, where the federal writ ordinarily would apply. Some of these that come quickly to mind are such enterprises as the railways, perhaps the C.B.C., perhaps the banks and other similar groups. There are many of them. I am thinking particularly of those where—say Polymer or the C.N.R.—the federal government is in a sense the *qua* employer.

In other cases it really does depend, I would think, on whether or not there has been a trade union agreement negotiated between employer and employee, where there has been agreement in the past as to what proportion of the total contribution is paid by the employer and what by the employee; whether it is all paid by the employee—which I think is a very rare case, if it exists at all—or by the employer.

It would seem to me that this must be left to a greater or less degree to management

and labour, depending on what their previous history has been. There are a great many variations in private plans. One of the largest industrial plans in the country, in which the federal government has no jurisdiction whatsoever, is one of the automotive plant plans, where I understand the contribution is paid entirely by the employer; although, of course, in the contract between employer and employee it is a part of the fringe benefit and might be construed by many to be thus a part of the wages. There is no direct deduction from individual workers for their contribution; it is all paid by the employer. In cases where a federal entity is the employer, this may be what happens, or it may be a matter where both groups, employer and employee, share equally, as under the general law for all Canadians coming under the Canada pension plan; or indeed they might share disparately in the required contribution. However, it is not a matter with which the federal government, will have to deal *qua* a government; but the individual crown corporations or crown entities will deal with it in their own specific sphere according to the kind of labour relations they have had in the past. I would not think there is any jurisdiction for the federal government as such to introduce that kind of legislation here.

With regard to the C.N.R., I remember, as a former member of the railway committee for a number of years, that representatives of the railway unions approached the committee asking for an amendment which would take care of those employees who during the depression years were laid off and could not thus contribute to their pension plan. This was never the subject of any amendment to railway legislation. I think it may often have been the subject of representations made by at least private members to the C.N.R. management itself, but it did not form a part of the legislation. I would think, therefore, that this is a matter which those who are not directly employees of the federal government will deal with on an *ad hoc* basis in accordance with the way their employer-employee relationships have grown up for some years in the past.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, may I thank the minister for her statement. What she has said does relate to the precise point I was trying to make rather than to the broad question of integration. I am not at this point arguing that there should be integration or that there should be decking rather than integration, although that is the direction in which I lean. I am simply arguing that before