

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

The government, of course, does not determine the employment termination date in any union agreements or pension plans. This is a matter between the unions and employers. The hon. member for Kootenay West must know that the Canada Pension Plan, to which he heartily subscribes, provides that a person who desires to work beyond the age of 65 may do so and collect his pension at age 70, and at age 70 may continue to work while still receiving payments under the Canada Pension Plan.

This matter of retirement and the integration of older people into our society after retirement was of chief concern to the Senate committee which studied the problem. In the Senate committee report it is stated:

One of the most serious and difficult problems faced by society in relation to old people is that of helping them maintain some satisfying foothold in the community and with it a sense of self-worth.

The report goes on to explain that arbitrarily cutting a man's income off at age 65 does not always work in his best interests and may be discriminatory. The very fact that we say "You are finished" when a person reaches 65 years can be harmful.

It is no surprise to my colleagues in the trade union movement that on occasion I have had to fight to keep members working after age 65, members who had little or no pension. I put up a terrific fight on their behalf, and I am thinking in particular of older people employed during the war and who did not have the opportunity to build up a pension fund. It is people like that I am concerned about, not those who are to some extent adequately cared for by present pension plans. I believe it is an arbitrary measure to say to a man, "You are finished as of your birth date."

I am sure the hon. member for Kootenay West agrees with me in practice if not in theory because, according to *Hansard*, on two occasions he announced his own retirement. Yet at the age of 71, which is not by any means a venerable age, he still graces the benches of this house.

Mr. Herridge: At the request of the people of Kootenay West.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): Order please.

Mr. Byrne: I am sure the hon. member will agree—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret): Order please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member for Kootenay East replying to the hon. member for Kootenay West, but the time allotted him has expired.

Mr. Byrne: My apologies, Mr. Speaker.

● (10:20 p.m.)

FARM MACHINERY—INCREASED PROFITS BY MASSEY-FERGUSON COMPANY

Mr. Howard Johnston (Okanagan-Revelstoke): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many of the farmers in western Canada were reassured a few weeks ago when a statement was attributed to the Minister of Agriculture to the effect that there would be an investigation into the cost of farm machinery. Since then we have not heard too much about that subject. However, the other morning in reading the *Globe and Mail* I was a little disturbed by an article there headlined "Massey profit soars; SEC bars comment". I would like to quote briefly from that article:

Massey-Ferguson Ltd., international farm implement maker, yesterday reported sharp gains in sales and profits for the first quarter ended Jan. 31, 1966. The company said, however, that it is forbidden by the Securities and Exchange Commission in the United States to discuss reasons for the profit jump.

Sales rose 29.3 per cent to \$179,500,000 from \$138,000,000 in the year-earlier period.

It states further:

Sales gained in all major geographic areas of the company's operations except Australasia, where there has been severe drought. Largest sales gains were in North America (to \$76,600,000 from \$51,800,000).

Then there is this comment:

The SEC will not permit comment on the profit rise because Massey has yet to give full details of a rights offering announced Feb. 16.

Then it goes on to say what Massey said, and we get a sort of inverse reasoning here, because a company can make an omission, or error, and then it would seem to be almost rewarded for it. I was concerned by this because I did expect that the minister was sincere in his intention to have an inquiry into the prices of farm machinery. I would like to ask, first of all, whether it is the intention of the minister to refer the subject of farm machinery prices to the Standing Committee on Agriculture. I am sure the farmers in the western provinces in particular will be interested in obtaining reassurance that this investigation is going to go ahead.

In recent years there has been a feeling in western Canada that we pay a high subsidy