

the House the question of whether or not this is an insurance plan or a welfare plan.

Now, what about the universality concept? All of us have received letters by the hundreds from school teachers all across the country who complain about being included in this new plan. If the minister wishes to make this a universal plan, then I suggest that everybody should be included in it, even Members of Parliament if you like. If it is to be universal it should include all professions such as doctors, dentists and others. If there is to be universality, the plan should be applicable to all professions. If it is not to be applicable to all professions, then the teachers should not be included. We should not make fish of one and fowl of the other. They should be all treated alike and I believe the teachers have a very good argument. If they are to be forced into the plan, then they are right in saying all the other professions should be brought into it as well.

There is no provision in this plan to take care of the taxi driver, the self-employed person, or the man running the corner variety store who is struggling to make a living. He is not insured by this plan but is just as entitled to be covered as is anyone else, and perhaps even more so because he must slave away in an attempt to keep the wolf away from the door.

In talking about teachers I might mention that in my area, the Wellington County Board of Education area, I believe the figure in respect of the cost of insuring teachers is something in the area of \$75,000, half of which, or roughly \$38,000, will be borne by the school board. The only way this \$38,000 can be raised is by taxing the poor property owners who are now burdened to the hilt with taxation. Now, by insisting on the teachers entering the unemployment insurance scheme we are placing an additional burden on these taxpayers. At a time when we are trying to relieve the property owners of extreme burdens we are about to add another burden which will virtually break their backs. We are close to that point now.

Each of the 1.2 million more people who are to be brought into the plan will have to pay, I think, \$62 per year. Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe I have said enough about universality. If we are to have universality it should go all the way; if not, then we will have a real problem on our hands in respect of the teachers organizations.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It being five o'clock it is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the question to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment is as follows: The hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall)—National Parks—Bonne Bay—Letting of contract for survey work.

Canada Pension Plan

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

CANADA PENSION PLAN (PENSION INDEX)

AMENDMENT TO INCREASE PENSION TO FULL EXTENT OF INCREASE IN COST OF LIVING

On the order:

Second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs of Bill C-34, An Act to amend the Canada Pension Plan (Pension Index)—Mr. Macquarrie.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I wonder if the Chair might apologize to the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) before he begins his remarks by stating that it would seem to be incumbent upon the Chair to refer the hon. member for Hillsborough to the procedural difficulties in respect of the particular bill standing in his name. I shall ask the hon. member, and other hon. members who wish to do so, to assist the Chair in respect of the procedural point before a ruling is given. I might point out, however, to hon. members and to the hon. member for Hillsborough, that in a statement by Mr. Speaker of October 20, 1970 near the commencement of the present session of Parliament His Honour referred to this and other bills as bills in respect of which he had some doubt concerning their procedural acceptability.

I might read briefly from His Honour's statement at that time. He said:

Another aspect of the matter is that there is an increasing tendency to include money provisions in private members' bills. Honourable Members know that the time honoured practice has been to include such proposals in the form of a private Members' motion rather than in a bill.

In many cases in the past, in order to meet the convenience of honourable Members, the consideration of the Second Reading of such bills was entered upon. It seems to the Chair that such procedure is not good Parliamentary practice.

His Honour then went on to refer to several bills, including the one standing in the name of the hon. member for Hillsborough. Then, he continued:

● (5:00 p.m.)

The Chair considers that in drafting of bills more care should be exercised to ensure that financial provisions are not included in such bills. When the aforementioned bills and any others which, on closer examination, appear to contain financial provisions are called for debate, I propose to examine the question of whether or not such bills are in order from a procedural standpoint.

At that time hon. members who have sponsored these bills will have an opportunity to satisfy the Chair that the bills are in order from such standpoints before proceeding to a substantive argument about the merits of the bills.

In the light of His Honour's statement I would have to say to the hon. member for Hillsborough, as Mr. Speaker did some months ago, that there seem to be serious considerations about the procedural acceptability of this bill and that it would seem to be in conflict with the procedures in the Standing Orders relative to imposing a charge or impost. Therefore, I would like to invite the hon. member for Hillsborough and other hon. members who would like to assist the Chair to do so from a