

*Canada Pension Plan (No. 2)*

In other words, it is very clear that not one cent can go out of the federal treasury, out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, for the payment of any of the costs of the Canada Pension Plan, whether it be the paying of pensions or other benefits or whether it be the paying of administrative costs. This has been argued a number of times. It seems to me that the arguments that took place in 1964 and 1965 on this point were not really conclusive, because there was a mixed bag at that time, but since then the expenses involved in getting the plan going and any expenses that were paid prior to the starting of the plan, have been paid back.

A more recent discussion of this point is one that took place on April 20, 1971. I am looking at a number of pages in *Hansard* for that day, pages 5093 to 5097. I may say at the outset that I find it interesting in addressing you, Sir, as Mr. Speaker, that two of the persons who took part in the debate that day were a predecessor of yours, the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), and the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants, who is now the occupant with you of what he calls that lonely plateau.

Since both of these esteemed gentlemen, one a former speaker and the other the present Deputy Speaker, made statements about the matter I think it will be interesting to have Your Honour's view on the matter as well. When I first looked at these pages I thought that maybe my quoting of these two gentlemen would be offset by the fact that you said something that day. But no, Sir, you were not in the chair that day. It was Mr. Honey, deputy speaker in the last parliament who was in the chair. So, Sir, this is your golden opportunity. You have not ruled on this point yet, and you have such excellent authorities as the hon. member for Edmonton West, a former occupant of the chair, and your present colleague, the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave).

On that occasion the bill being discussed was a private member's bill which had been presented by the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) and the arguments I have given today in brief were given then by all of us who took part on the side of private member's rights. In the end Mr. Honey ruled against us, but I draw attention to the fact that he based his ruling almost exclusively on the fact that Bill C-34 in that session, a bill in which the hon. member for Hillsborough sought to amend the Canada Pension Plan in a certain way, did include a clause which said:

Expenditures under this Act shall be provided under section 104 of the British North America Acts, 1867 to 1970.

There was that element of weakness in the bill that was before the House on that day. But, Mr. Speaker, I point out that there is not one jot or one tittle in Bill C-224 now before us that says anything shall be paid as provided under section 104 of the British North America Acts, 1867-1970. In fact Bill C-224 does not touch at all the sacred provision of section 110 of the Canada Pension Plan Act which says that not one red cent—I will come back to that phrase in a moment—shall be paid out of the federal treasury for the purposes of the Canada Pension Plan. Therefore it seems to me that this bill is not a money bill in the normal sense and that the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde), in whose name it is,

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

should be able to proceed with it without the royal recommendation.

Let it be quite clear that one of my motives in raising this matter is that I want to protect rights that I think we have as private members. Once this bill is before us of course the Canada Pension Plan is open, and I think we should have the right to make suggestions, and even to move amendments that would make improvements in the Canada Pension Plan if we can demonstrate that this can be done without involving any charge on the treasury.

I realize that any such amendments which we might make would have to be considered when they would come along, but of course we are locked outside to begin with if it is ruled that this is a money bill and that there has to be a royal recommendation, because then we are faced with the citation that says that the royal recommendation lays down once and for all the terms of the bill.

• (1610)

I said earlier that we had an interesting debate on April 20, 1971. I should like to quote a few words from one of the authorities who spoke that day. In the present context he is probably the one whom we should most like to quote. As recorded at page 5095 of *Hansard* for April 20, 1971, the hon. member said:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to join briefly in the arguments that have been presented to Your Honour and to recall some of the wording in the resolution that was presented to the House when the Canada Pension Plan was introduced on October 28, 1964. But before I read portions of the resolution, I agree that up to that point the moneys had been spent by government departments with reference to the setting up of the plan, particularly with reference to the studies that had preceded the setting up of the plan, in that very special sense, involved an expenditure of tax moneys, of Her Majesty's revenues, in relation to that legislation. These moneys had to be spent so that the expertise established for publication of these ideas could be incorporated into the Canada Pension Plan itself.

As the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has recalled, the then member for Rosthern raised with the prime minister of the day the question of why there should be a resolution when the Canada Pension Plan was to pay its own expenses. There were exchanges between them, and perhaps I should read what the prime minister said then:

The hon. member then quotes Mr. Pearson as follows:

The fact is that it will cost some money to get this plan into operation, as my hon. friend must know. Afterwards, when the plan is in operation, the expenses will be borne by the fund.

It is no secret that the person whose words I am quoting, as recorded in *Hansard* of April 20, 1971, is the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants. He went on, from that basis, to argue that the resolution as attached to the original Canada Pension Plan bill was there purely for technical reasons but, now that the plan is paying its own way, it should be possible for a private member to move amendments to the legislation. As the hon. member pointed out, no money was to come out of the federal treasury.

I alluded awhile ago to "not one red cent" coming out of the federal treasury. Of course, I was in part repeating what the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants had said. Discussing the bill on that occasion and pointing out that it did not involve any charge on the treasury, the hon. member put it this way:

When could there be any requirement whatsoever that so much as