

Pension Rights

in such pension plans should be the responsibility of the federal government. In a number of industrial fields, particularly the mining and forest industries, there are a number of people who have no possibility of ever working for one company for the length of time necessary to establish a normal pension. For such people a pension plan should be put into effect on a compulsory, contributory basis whereby the employee and the employer would be compelled to contribute to a fund which would be administered by the federal government in a manner not inconsistent with the method used in dealing with unemployment insurance.

In the mining industry there is a great need for mobility. The needs of the Canadian people for metals vary from time to time and the worth of a particular type of metal changes. We have seen this happen in the case of silver, cobalt, gold, asbestos and iron. In these cases when certain developments take place miners have to leave an area and a particular company. If there is a pension plan in effect they lose all their rights under that plan when they leave.

Many companies in the lumbering and mining industries in my area do not last for 20 years which is considered to be the average length of time required for a pension plan to operate properly. I think it is time that these companies should not be allowed to hide behind the fact that they have a tendency to have a limited life. Companies may move into a bush area and only last for five, six or ten years with the result that a great deal of the pressure that would be brought to bear on them to put a pension plan into effect is eliminated.

In the pulpwood industry particularly we have in the north a great number of people who move from place to place continually. They move not only from one company to another but from one camp to another. They have been trying for some time to establish a satisfactory pension plan. I suggest it is time that the federal government took a look at the situation. We find it more and more difficult to look after our older people. As the cost of living continues to rise there will come a time when we will not be able to provide these people with a proper standard of living following the methods being used now. It seems reasonable to me and I think it seems reasonable to those people who would have to make payments that they should be making contributions over the years they are working towards a pension plan which will go with them, not only from bush camp to another bush camp, from one company to another or from one mine to another but from one industry to another

[Mr. Peters.]

during their working years. Then at the end of 20 years, if they have worked in six or seven different areas or even in different provinces, they will have a pension contribution book provided by the federal government under a plan supported and financed in some degree by the government. They will have this record of the contributions they have made during their lifetime while working in industry and they will be able to retire knowing that they have a vested interest in a pension and that that interest is being looked after by the federal government.

I suggest that the government should take a close look at the situation as it affects industry today. I am sure we will find that there are a great number of people who have been in a particular industry for some time. Automation may change that industry and their contribution would be much greater if they could move to some place where better use would be made of their talents and experience in the interest of the Canadian economy. I suggest that if the government would instigate a transferable industrial pension plan and administer such a plan great benefits would accrue to Canadian workers and also to the Canadian people as a whole.

(Translation):

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION—
PROTEST AGAINST PRESENT POLICY

Mr. Guy Rouleau (Dollard): Mr. Speaker, before voicing my grievance to the house this evening, I want to congratulate your honour for the gentlemanly courtesy and ability you have shown in directing the debates in this house.

Having said this, I would like to take the opportunity afforded by the motion to go into committee of supply to express a grievance I am holding since June last, i.e. that we have a Progressive Conservative government in this country. I am sorry to have to voice this criticism, but my conscience would trouble me if I did not tell this house how concerned I am to see this country ruled by a minority government elected under false pretences and inconsiderate promises. Though aware that his party was a minority group in this house, the leader of the Progressive Conservatives, Mr. Diefenbaker did not hesitate to accept the offer of forming a government made to him in June, and so to become the Prime Minister of a minority government.

Having read the various speeches made in the House of Commons during the last parliament, I was very much surprised to see the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Fleming) accept the post of Minister of Finance in the Diefenbaker cabinet, after having said what he did say in this house on June 4, 1954. The estimates for the C.B.C. were being dis-