

and it militates against the worker when he wants to negotiate wages. On the other hand it is offset against the corporation's tax, so in two ways they benefit, and it places the management of the fund completely in the hands of the industrialist himself. He works out his own regulations and fixes the scheme according to his ideas. The worker has no representation in that, and no say in the making of the regulations or the distribution of the fund. In that way most of the schemes across the country are undemocratic and ineffective.

I am going to give you an example. The Dominion Steel and Coal Corporation back about 20 years ago established a non-contributory pension fund and set aside a certain amount of money for that purpose. As I said, that was charged to the operating cost of the industry, and the retiring age is 65. The fund is administered by a board of company representatives. The maximum amount paid at age 65 runs around \$75 a month, and it is as low as \$19 a month. I think it would work out, on an average, to about \$35 a month. There are hundreds of men who have gone out of that industry after many years without any pension. I know of a case of a man who had as much as 50 years' service in the industry, but because he was laid off sick he was not retired, and as a result he gets no pension. There are hundreds of men who have gone out of that industry in that way and despite their service, because they are laid off sick they are not entitled to a pension.

Within the past few months that company has taken this kind of action. They have notified the mine workers' union that as of a certain date, about two months ago, they are establishing a means test in their pension. If a person is retired at \$75 or \$35 or \$40 a month, whatever the amount may be, when he reaches the age of 70 and obtains the government old age security pension, that \$40 will be deducted from his company pension.

In my opinion that is a pretty backward step, in view of the fact that the president of that company, Mr. Lionel Forsyth, during the time the discussion was on in the country about the removal of the means test for the old age pension, went on record in the public press as advocating the removal of the means test in the old age pension. I presume now, from the action that has been taken within the last few months by that company, that he wanted the government's means test removed so he could establish a means test in the company pension, because that is exactly what they did.

Now, that is as secure as any industry pension may be, and I hope the time will come when the government of this country, and the industrialist who is fair-minded, will establish a national pension for the whole country. There is duplication of administration now and millions of dollars are wasted. In the final analysis it does not mean any security for the industrial worker, because it is all dependent on the balance sheets of the companies.

There is another angle to the industrial pension, and it is the matter of the older worker not being able to secure employment. The policy of the industrialists across this country today, and since 1945, is that they do not employ anyone over 40 years of age. Why do they make that decision? Why is it nation-wide? They did it for this reason. During the war most of these industrial pension schemes grew up. It was better to establish funds than to pay excess profits tax. When the war finished these companies found themselves with these pension plans in operation, and they decided they would have to adopt a policy under which they would not take on anyone over 40 years of age because those people were not going to be able to contribute enough to the fund to enable a pension to be paid by the time the worker reached 65 years of age, which is the retiring age in most of these schemes.

So, arising out of the insecure industrial pension in this country there has arisen another problem, the problem of industry fixing that 40-year age limit. I have advanced this argument in the house before, and I received support from the opposition and from the government side of the house. I also received letters from quite a few small industrialists in many sections of Canada. They told me that I was on the right track, that the industry which they operated was not big enough to establish a pension plan; and they felt kind of mean that they were not able to follow the lead of the bigger organizations.

I am leaving that idea with the minister because it would not be hard to organize this matter. He has all the machinery in the Department of Labour to handle it. The annuities branch could set up the kind of plan I have in mind, a national plan contributed to by employer, employee and the government, and I am sure you would not have to set up any additional machinery in your department. Your unemployment insurance branch could handle the job along with the work they are doing today because, in my opinion, it would not be a very big job.