

Canada Pension Plan

authority the present member for Parkdale speaks on behalf of the Minister of National Health and Welfare? I understood, and I am subject to correction, that there had possibly been a falling out somewhere along the line.

In order to emphasize the general outlook of the Conservative party, I would recommend as excellent reading a book entitled "The Conservative in Canada" written by Mr. George Hogan. In the portion to which I specifically refer, he has been writing about Conservative philosophy on social welfare and what it implies. I quote from page 98 of this book:

It may be said that the Diefenbaker government's record of expanding social services coupled with recurring budget deficits contradicts everything I have just said.

I would dispute this on two grounds. First of all, this government, as its opponents never tired of pointing out, was faced through most of its first term of office with a condition of economic recession. This recession had already started when the Conservatives came to power, and in line with the concepts we have been discussing, they deliberately budgeted for deficits in order to counteract it.

The author goes on to say:

The two remaining fields where the contributory principle might be applied are old age pensions and health services.

I am quoting, now, from page 101 of this book which I think it would do hon. members opposite a great deal of good to peruse.

The Diefenbaker government announced in the speech from the throne of January 1962 its intention to implement a contributory old age pension plan. The introduction of this plan depends upon certain constitutional arrangements with the provinces.

The present government knew all about this when they were advertising their election campaigns of 1962 and 1963. Here is another interesting quotation:

The objective, as we have said, is simply to meet the need; to make it possible for every Canadian to have a satisfactory pension plan if he wants one. The proposed plan of the Diefenbaker government meets this need. It would be, in the first place, voluntary. No one will be forced to join it. In the second place, to quote from the speech from the throne, it "will take into account private pension arrangements". In other words, as Mr. Diefenbaker said, it "should not require additional contributions by those already contributing under satisfactory private arrangements." This proposal offers us as clear an example as we shall see of the essential difference between socialism and Conservative social justice.

Mr. Chairman, the philosophy of the Progressive Conservative party in this whole field is that we must care for those who cannot look after themselves. The action of Quebec in refusing permission for an amendment of the British North America Act was a body blow to our pension scheme. I am told the same old Liberal propaganda and rumour mongering is going on, now. I am given to understand on very good authority

that the whispering of an election campaign is on and that people are being told that the Conservative party is against contributory pensions. Yes, it is the old story. It has been done before by the party opposite. Even some sections of the press, I believe, are falling for this type of information. It is the same old story. I recall being told in 1953 when I was first campaigning in my home constituency of Perth—the Liberals had been in power for 18 years—that they were spreading rumours to this effect: Elect Monteith and you will lose your old age pensions and family allowances. What utter rot.

Mr. Nowlan: The same in Nova Scotia.

Mr. Monteith: I understand it is not permissible to read from previous debates in this house in the same session, but it is obvious that even the Prime Minister is not above trying to mislead the people of Canada. As will be borne out by reading page 55 of *Hansard* of this year, the right hon. gentleman did his best to leave the impression with the people of Canada that the Conservative party was against this plan. That is an absolute falsehood. Fortunately, the Leader of the Opposition was in his place in the house and was in a position to rise and refute such a statement. I simply repeat that the government to which I had the privilege of belonging did more in less than six years of office by way of bringing social benefits to Canadians than had probably been accomplished in 50 years of Canadian history. That is true. I suggest anyone interested should make a comparison of the estimates of the Department of National Health and Welfare for the year 1956-57, which was the last year in power for the Liberal government of that day, with the estimates of 1963-64, the last year for which we prepared estimates. The public will see that an increase of at least 100 per cent took place in that period.

I have read in detail the Prime Minister's press release of January 20, 1964, the letter to him from the premier of Ontario on February 13 and, in turn, the Prime Minister's last letter dated February 25. As I said at the beginning of my speech, I do not believe this is the time to go into all the details of the plan. There are so many questions to be answered. I believe we should get the bill before us, and we should like to see this done as soon as possible.

An hon. Member: Well, sit down.

Mr. Monteith: I must say, I am receiving a really courteous reception from across the way. It is typical of the old line Grit government of 1956.