

*Canada Pension Plan*

**Mr. Benson:** Quebec could come in if it chose to, and if the parliament of Canada made the necessary amendments to the legislation.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Perron:** Mr. Chairman, the explanations we have heard for the past half hour are not quite clear. Several times, we were told that the transferability of contributions under the scheme is quite constitutional and the Minister of National Revenue has pointed out quite often that the pension plan will in no way infringe upon the vested rights of the people. Therefore, I wonder whether we, who know nothing of the agreements signed with the province of Quebec which intends to set up a scheme similar to the federal plan, are not in the process of authorizing the federal agency to collect contributions from the citizens of a province and whether it would not have been better to bring in amendments when it was time to accumulate contributions for the purpose of establishing an unemployment insurance scheme.

There again, it is a constitutional vested interest, both for the citizen of a province and for social security. A citizen of any province should not be required to contribute under a federal enactment, without the consent of the provincial authorities concerned and without proceeding to amend the constitution.

Therefore, I ask the minister to make it quite clear whether the federal government is authorized by a constitutional amendment to require Quebec people to contribute to the Canada pension plan. I would like to get a clear and definite answer as to whether the constitution has been amended so as to allow contributions to be collected from Quebec residents under Bill No. C-136.

[*Text*]

**Miss LaMarsh:** The hon. member was present in the chamber when the constitutional amendment to 94A was enacted last summer. However, the provision itself was an act of earlier date—about 1950—for the purpose of old age security. That legislation has nothing to do with the question which the hon. member has just asked. The amendment provided that in addition to old age pensions there could be additional survivors' and other benefits. That was why the constitutional amendment was enacted last summer and went to the parliament of the United Kingdom. If now we did not have a rule that certain individuals resident in Quebec who

are employed in Ontario would be a part of the Canada pension plan and had reciprocal rights with Quebec, my hon. friend would find that when his Canada pension plan contributions were deducted from his parliamentary indemnity and an election came along and he was no longer a member of this chamber—

**Mr. Langlois:** That is not likely to happen.

**Miss LaMarsh:** —he would have to wait until age 65 to get the small benefits to which his short time in this chamber would have entitled him; and they would not in any way mesh with the contributions which he would thereafter have to make while he was a permanent resident of and working in the province of Quebec.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Perron:** Mr. Chairman, this does not answer my question. Reference is made to the pension fund set up exclusively for federal members of parliament. Now, I feel that contributions paid directly by the employee or the employer are not the same as an exclusive or private plan, as one might call the plan set up for members of parliament.

[*Text*]

**Miss LaMarsh:** Mr. Chairman, I do not want my hon. friend to think I am talking about the exclusive pension plan established for members of parliament. I am talking about the Canada pension plan, which includes every member of this chamber and every member of the other place below the age of 70. My hon. friend, if he has not heretofore been aware of it, will be a part of the Canada pension plan as of January 1, 1966—if he is still here.

**The Chairman:** Shall the clause carry?

**Mr. Langlois:** One last question, Mr. Chairman. I will not anticipate clause 115, which deals with the Northwest Territories and the Yukon but there is a mathematical possibility, although it may not be too hypothetical, the way we are going, that in a few years from now all the provinces will move out and will have their own schemes, because they may realize one day that it will be more profitable for them to have their own schemes rather than to be part of this federal plan. I am not anticipating the situation with regard to the Yukon and Northwest Territories, because we will be considering that question later; but if they all move out and just the Yukon and Northwest Territories stay in, will the minister