can go into all of these various angles. I hope that as a result of that discussion we will be able to make improvements in the bill where improvements are called for, and also that we will be able to play our part, as a committee, in doing a public relations job to help the Canadian people understand the full import of this legislation.

The other comments I should like to make include, first of all, a reference to those who are already 70 years of age or over and who are receiving old age security payments of $75 a month. Let us not forget them. Let us not assume, once we get this plan in operation, that those who are now receiving $75 must get only that amount by way of a pension for the rest of their lives. It is good to know that partial pensions under the Canada pension plan will be available in January, 1966. It is good to know that by January, 1975, it will be possible, if the scheme goes through on time, for some people to draw the full benefit. And when that happens, two, or eight, or ten years from now, when some of our people are getting $80 or $90 or over $100 a month as a result of this plan, it will not be good enough to say to the people who were 70 and over in 1964: You got your $75 then and you will have to live on that for the rest of your lives. We say: Keep these people in mind, too. Let us envisage that as we improve the Canada pension plan we shall have to improve the basic federal old age security rate as well.

A few months ago, discussing ways in which we might celebrate Canada's centennial, I suggested that one way of doing so would be to raise old age security payments, getting them up to $100 a month by 1967, the year of our one hundredth birthday. I shall not go into any detail. I merely want to say that in improving the position of those who retire in two, eight, ten or 20 years from now, we should not forget those who have already retired.

The other comment I had in mind to make is this: we must also give active consideration to the position of survivors, dependants and others—greater consideration than seems to have been indicated in today's white paper. May I say that I regard this white paper as more useful in many ways than the one we had last July because it gives more information and shows a fuller appreciation of the subject. However, on the question of survivors and dependants it seems to say less than was said by the minister in her speech, or in the white paper of last year. Maybe this is because of the discussions which have taken place with the provinces in the meantime. But I urge that we should not think that we have done the job in the field of social security when we have adopted in principle a fairly good plan for retirement pensions. There are still these other groups to be considered—survivors, dependants and people who have been obliged to retire early on account of ill health or accident. We have come a long way from the days when we did not have any plan for meeting the social security needs of our people. We have come a long way during the political lifetime of some of us who are still in this house. But there is still a good piece to go.

As far as the Canada pension plan itself is concerned, the principle is good and it is our responsibility to the Canadian people to try to get it into effect at the earliest possible date.

**Mr. Patterson:** We appreciate the fact that, with the exception of one extensive political diatribe the debate so far has been kept on a most objective level. I feel that when we are facing an issue of the kind we have before us tonight it is as well for us to remember that it will require all the concentration and consideration that we can bring to it, if this measure is to be acceptable and workable.

The resolution which was introduced last year preceding the introduction of the pension bill gave rise to lengthy debate. I do not think it is either necessary or desirable to enter upon an extensive debate on the resolution which is before us this evening. The main consideration should, I believe, be to get this bill before the appropriate committee at the earliest moment so that every aspect may be given careful scrutiny. My remarks will, therefore, be restricted on this occasion.

Objection has been taken to the minister's statement on the ground that it contained too many details. It was also stated that the statement made today by the hon. lady differed in many respects from the one made on a previous occasion. Perhaps I have not been long enough in politics to understand these things, but it seems strange to me that we should prod and urge ministers to make changes in proposed legislation and then, if they do make changes, beat them over the head for doing so.

As I suggested before, I believe that in the situation in which we find ourselves in this house it is well for us to pool our resources and suggestions in order that the best possible legislation may be produced for the benefit of the people of Canada. I would say there is a desire across the country for some means whereby people, when they reach the age of retirement, can be assured of an adequate income upon which to maintain themselves at a decent standard of living. Just how this wish is to be realized and what plan is to be adopted in order to accomplish