

*Canada Pension Plan*

**Miss LaMarsh:** Read the record.

**Mr. Churchill:** For the minister to stand here and lecture the committee, which started off at eight o'clock being very co-operative, is surely not the way to get a bill processed through this chamber. I think the minister should learn a little by experience.

**Mr. Kindt:** She will never learn.

**Mr. Churchill:** She should avoid this partisan discussion to which she is so prone and should accept the fact that other members of this house who speak on this bill are in possession of some knowledge of the facts.

**Miss LaMarsh:** On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, is the hon. member speaking on clause 3?

**Mr. Churchill:** Mr. Chairman, here we have an interruption by the hon. minister. She was speaking on clause 2 and the amendment in regard to clause 2 for half of her speech.

**Miss LaMarsh:** I was speaking to clause 3.

**Mr. Churchill:** She was not called to order by the Chair, and she made all these extraneous remarks earlier with regard to the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich and the other hon. members who sat on the committee. Now she wants everybody else to be restrained because she has had the privilege of getting her partisan comments placed on the record.

**Mr. Knowles:** Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question? It has nothing to do with the discussion of the last few minutes, but it does relate to clause 3. We had some discussion in the special committee about the fact that this clause seems to some of us to be a one-way street. It has in it provisions for provinces to opt out. The provisions spell out the techniques very fully. The question I raised in the committee was this: What about a provision for a province to opt in or to opt back in?

**Mr. Churchill:** I thought you were dropping that word in committee.

**Mr. Knowles:** I beg your pardon?

**Mr. Churchill:** May I ask the hon. member a question, Mr. Chairman? Reading the committee reports, I gathered that the hon. member withdrew the use of the phrases "opt out" and "opt in", and so on.

**Mr. Knowles:** Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend and neighbour from Winnipeg South Centre has just given me one of the finest

[**Mr. Churchill.**]

compliments I have ever had from him; he has informed me that he has been reading what I said in committee. He is perfectly correct. I suggested that the phrase "opting out" is a misnomer, but it has become rather common language and most people know what it means. There is provision in clause 3 of the bill, if I may take the hint from the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, for a province to indicate that it is going to set up its own plan and therefore to put the federal government in the position where its legislation will not operate in that province. I would like to know whether further consideration was given to the possibility of putting in the bill provisions under which a province that had done this could reverse its position and come back under the provisions of the bill.

**Miss LaMarsh:** Mr. Chairman, I should like to say to my hon. friend that what he suggests is perfectly correct as to what occurred in the committee, but there is no machinery set out in the bill for a province, which has opted out for some time and is desirous of coming back, to come in under the Canada pension plan. I think the reasons were explained by the draftsmen of the legislation from the Department of Justice, namely that it is almost impossible to guess at any point of time what the circumstances might be for the province concerned, whether it might have been at some time in the Canada pension plan, then gone out and then come back, and whether it had had its own legislation and then come back. It was impossible to determine how much of a divergency there might be between the federal legislation and the legislation of the province. Accordingly, it was considered that there could be so many computations and permutations that it would be virtually useless at this time to set them down in legislation.

I should like to say, however, that considering the fact that all hon. members of the house have expressed themselves, whatever their political colouration, as being so firmly of the view, as have all provincial groups, that there should be legislation which is portable and universal in its application, I think I can say, even for those dim shadows who may sit in these seats 20, 50 or 100 years from now, that their inclinations for a universal scheme would also be as great, and legislation to fit the circumstances of that time will be readily put through the committee of that day.