

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion
THE SENATE—INQUIRY AS TO REFORM
MEASURES PROPOSED

mitted to us as a basis for the pension plan gives a rather fair idea of the possible economic repercussions of implementing the pension plan. There does not seem to be any reference to accumulated funds, but rather to the possible effects on the economy of the country of the benefits eventually to be paid to the pensioners under the pension plan. But I sincerely believe that, in addition to providing security for the Canadian workers, the Canada pension plan, or the Quebec pension plan, can really become an instrument in the hands of the provinces attempting to secure their economic freedom.

I believe that the pension plan could be included in the legislation already in force within the framework of fiscal decentralization, such as:

1. The provinces' growing share of the personal income tax, which from 5 per cent in 1954 will reach 24 per cent in 1967; and the provinces' larger share of the estates tax, which has risen from 50 to 75 per cent.

2. The return to the provinces which so desire of the joint programs coming under provincial jurisdiction.

3. The pension plan may also follow the same principle, in the sense that it makes considerable amounts of money available to the provinces.

[Text]

Mr. Willoughby: Mr. Speaker, may I call it ten o'clock.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the house leader whether the business is unchanged for tomorrow.

Mr. McIlraith: There is no change, Mr. Speaker, and should by any chance this bill be finished before tomorrow night we would call perhaps some of the smaller bills on the order paper; item No. 7, a bill to amend the Merchant Seamen Compensation Act, item No. 58, measure to amend the Coal Production Assistance Act, and item No. 51, second reading of Bill No. C-137, to authorize certain capital expenditures of Canadian National Railways.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved.

Mr. D. M. Fisher (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I asked the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) a question arising out of the wide and critical comment that has developed over his latest Senate appointment, and particularly as it reflected upon some of his previous appointments to the other place.

I asked the Prime Minister whether it was his intention to proceed with item No. 40 on the order paper, and whether that was the extent of the government's intention for reform of the other place. His reply was almost typically evasive, that the government in due course would go ahead with this piece of legislation.

One of my reasons for raising this question on the adjournment motion, not that it will do much good, is not only to point up the fact that my colleague from Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has a bill on the order paper which would abolish the Senate, but also to underline the phyness of this so-called new politics, about which the Prime Minister talks. This is the party that was coming in with new politics. Well, here is an example of it, Mr. Speaker.

I should just like to read from the Liberal party program for the general election of 1962. This statement is tucked away at page 22, about reform of the Senate. It says:

A new Liberal government will discuss with the provinces a constitutional reform—

We are not quite sure what that means, but it has something to do with the Senate. The program then states:

—and will propose, for example, that future Senators be appointed for 15 years or to the age of 75.

I point out that this bill on the order paper only affects senators at age 75. At least if we had this 15 year provision contained in this program we would not have this picture of a young lawyer from Toronto, Mr. Aird, at 41 years of age, with a promising career in front of him, at \$15,000 a year until he reaches age 75. Rather, he would be disappearing from the picture at age 56. However, this is another example of the new politics.

One of the efforts often made by young Liberals—and I see one sitting over there from Hamilton East (Mr. Munro), who likes to take this stance of a radical, go ahead party—is to scorn our Conservative friends to my right, because of their reactionary approach to things. I point out to those individuals that here we have an example of our friends to the right of Mr. Speaker coming