

*Canada Pension Plan*

I suggest that the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh) should take that into consideration and make sure that the amounts paid in the past will be added to those to be paid in the future, so that the worker who will retire in five or six years will benefit from what he has paid in the past, in short, that this will be added to the pension plan.

Then, the province of Quebec will probably be pleased to count on the co-operation of the federal government, since the latter can use its influence in this field to bring back to Canada the dues paid to unions now established outside this country.

Before ending my remarks, I have a word of advice for the members from the other nine provinces who want this pension plan to be adopted as quickly as possible. It has been suggested that this bill be referred to a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons. Well, the experience I acquired while sitting on two committees only leads me to tell you that referring something to a joint committee on which senators sit is practically a waste of time, a needless delay. Since senators are always on holiday, how can you expect them to undertake the study of that pension plan and finish their work before Christmas? That is why I advise you to refer it to a committee of the House of Commons. If some minor bills have been pending for six months in the other place because they have not found time yet to complete their study of them, how can they complete in time the study of a bill as important as the one now before us? You will give them heart trouble, or else make them sick with work, I am not sure which, for the study of this bill will just be too much for them.

So, if you want action, if you want things to get going or to keep going, let us amend the motion in such a way as to refer the bill to a committee of the house where work stands a chance of getting done more expeditiously.

A joint committee, in my opinion, is one where the work is done far too slowly, where ideas are put forward which are two centuries behind times, where there are representatives of finance companies and banks who are more concerned with their own interests or the interests of their firms than those of the people, for their own interests have priority over those of the nation. The bill would run the risk of being consigned to oblivion. So, here is a bit of advice: let us try to send this bill to a committee of the house.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I am happy to see that nine provinces in

Canada will take advantage of a pension plan established according to their wishes, since they are on the way to centralization. On the other hand, we are glad to see that the province of Quebec will have its own plan, since it is its desire to administer its own scheme and that its pension plan meet its own aspirations and characteristics.

Let us keep on passing such pieces of legislation applying to nine provinces, with Quebec adopting its own legislation. But in return let us give to the province of Quebec the sources of revenue which are imperative; let us give back to Quebec the revenue from direct and indirect taxation, so that this province will not be a hindrance to the development of the nine other provinces and so that it might develop properly. When this is achieved, when the federal parliament will legislate for nine provinces and the Quebec parliament for the other, then we will all agree, there will be no more quarrels and we will no longer hear the fanatics which are heard now. And everybody will be happy in Canada.

I hope that this year a precedent will be repeated in the years to come and that before long—in the shortest possible delay—the constitution will be drastically changed so that two associate states will co-operate and show good will in a number of fields, while each goes its own way in others.

[Text]

**Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of National Revenue):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Monteith) stated this afternoon that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Gordon) and I were to back up the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh), but I would like to commence by stating that after the knowledge she displayed this afternoon my colleague needs no backing from either of us. On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is the hon. member for Perth who needs the backing of informed members of his party.

For one who claims paternity for the Canada pension plan and who has had in addition access to Bill No. C-75 for several months, to the white paper preceding Bill C-136 since August, and to the bill itself for six days, he displays—

**Mr. Monteith:** There are no actuarial figures at all.

**Mr. Benson:**—either a surprising lack of knowledge of the plan or else he can find little in it to criticize.

**Mr. Monteith:** It has taken you all dinner hour to figure out that one.