

Canada Pension Plan

ever, I am sure we can only surmise as to the amount of administration expense which will be entailed in the Canada pension plan itself as compared with the administration expense now involved in paying old age security. Here is where I have considerable hesitation in being too enthusiastic about the plan as a whole. I support this sort of payment even though it is going to cost a certain amount of money, and even though a lot of people who do not need it will receive it, and I do so because I know that the government is not going to run into a tremendous amount of extra expense just because the age is lowered from 70 to 65 or as a result of this progressive lowering. Once the scheme is set up and in operation I do not think that the added administrative cost will be very substantial. I can find no reason which assures me that the administrative cost of the Canada pension plan itself is anywhere near that determinate. In other words, the question of contributions is one which we can all understand. While we want to avoid the government paying this out of its own pocket, the payment still comes out of the taxpayer's pocket. Old age security payment is made out of general revenue. We are saving money on administrative costs, and I am not at all sure that the government should not take another look at this plan—or shall I say these plans, because we have had two or three plans before the bill which is now before us, and even that bill has been changed quite a bit. Therefore, perhaps I am not too far out of line in suggesting this, because there is another way of looking at it and perhaps we should look at the matter a little longer.

May I call it five o'clock?

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether I could make an appeal on behalf of the ordinary members of the house. Some of us would like to see the actual amendments which are going to be made to part IV of Bill No. C-136, but by rule they cannot be given to us until this resolution is passed. I wonder whether, if the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona is nearing the end of his remarks, and if he is the last speaker, we could carry on for two or three minutes and pass the resolution, so that we could see the amendments. This would make our discussions on Monday much more intelligible.

Mr. Nugent: I am agreeable to that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Langlois: No.

The Chairman: Shall the resolution carry?
[Mr. Nugent.]

Mr. Langlois: No. May I call to your attention, Mr. Chairman, that it is five o'clock. I think the hon. member for Beauce still has a contribution to make and we have some more members in our group who wish to speak on this resolution.

The Chairman: It being five o'clock shall I rise, report progress—

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. member for Mégantic a question? Do he and his colleagues not realize that they can discuss those things to which the hon. member for Beauce was referring during our consideration of various clauses in part IV? Surely we would all be in a better position to consider this bill after we have been given the actual amendments that are being proposed in respect of part IV.

Mr. Munro: Those subjects can also be discussed during our consideration of clause 1.

Mr. Knowles: Our discussion of clause 1 will also give an opportunity to discuss the matters referred to by the hon. member. I will defend the rights of that group to make their speeches in respect of those things during our consideration of other clauses, but I do think we would be better off if we could be given the amendments proposed to clauses of part IV.

[Translation]

Mr. Perron: Mr. Chairman, it is precisely at this stage of the resolution that some of my colleagues who are not here this afternoon intend to present arguments. In such circumstances, may I be permitted to call it five o'clock?

[Text]

Progress reported.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being five o'clock the house will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely public bills and private bills.

IMMIGRATION ACT

AMENDMENT RESPECTING ADMISSION ON RACIAL GROUNDS

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood) moved the second reading of Bill No. C-69, to amend the Immigration Act (racial discrimination).

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of Bill C-69 is a simple one. It is to eliminate racial discrimination from the immigration laws of Canada as passed by this parliament. The members of this house may be surprised or