

Canada Pension Plan

plans and the Canada pension plan, and he indicated that plans have already been worked out for the integration of the civil service superannuation plan. If that is so, it seems to me that this house or the committee should be given a fairly detailed accounting of how the superannuation act is going to be amended, since Bill No. C-136 now includes civil servants. As I explained earlier, it could happen that a civil servant could retire with a greater pension than his earnings. I believe therefore the minister should advise the house or the committee as to the changes proposed in the superannuation act in order to integrate the civil service pension plan with the Canada pension plan.

Yesterday the Minister of National Revenue referred to clause 87 of the pension bill and said that the pension appeal board would hear disputed cases if the provincial law provided for that. In this way a common jurisprudence could be developed. My question is, if a province that opts out does not pass such a law, will the appeal board then not have jurisdiction in those disputed cases and will we then lose this common jurisprudence? I would appreciate an answer to that question.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, the minister will give these questions consideration. In closing my remarks I again appeal to the government and to the minister to seriously consider amendments to this plan so that those people who need it most, the retired people, will get some benefit from the plan.

[Translation]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, the motion for second reading of Bill No. C-136, to establish a comprehensive program of various pensions in Canada, is rather interesting, and the bill is particularly fat.

The Canadian people will get their money's worth trying to find their way in this hodge-podge nobody seems to understand. Since people on all sides are asking the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss La-Marsh) for explanations, the bill must be confusing.

But if you study the schedule which deals with the monthly pension which varies according to age, you see that at 65 the amount of pension will be \$51 and that it will be increased by 40 cents each month until 70, that is over five years, when the pension will reach \$75 a month.

Mr. Speaker, we sincerely believe that the Canadian social legislation should be improved considerably. We believe that the Canadian people could benefit more from

[Mr. Chatterton.]

Canada's economic development. That is what we have been maintaining for the past 20 years. Now, this pension plan introduced by the minister would have the Canadian people and parliament believe that the government is prepared to help elderly persons in Canada. We are told that this plan will improve social legislation, social benefits, when the main purpose of Bill No. C-136 is to permit the government to find the necessary funds to administer its social legislation, and nothing else.

The purpose of this pension plan is to permit the government to force the ordinary Canadian citizen to give money to the government all his life, money which the government will probably never return to that Canadian citizen.

As a matter of fact, this is a glaring example. The Canadian who is 25 or 30 years old and who works in a factory or in an industry will start paying, because this is a compulsory plan. He will start to make his contributions to the government in order to get a pension at 65 or 70. All his life, that is for 40 years, this Canadian worker will be making contributions to the government and when he will have reached 65 or 70 he will not then get back the money he is now contributing, because the government will then be taxing the children of this chap who, today, is 25 years old, in order that a pension may be paid their father when he reaches 65.

We could call that a sort of national "barbotte". Pay now, and you will not be reimbursed the money you will have paid in; instead we will give you the money that your children will contribute for 40 or 50 years. That is what we will use to give you pensions of \$51 to \$75—in between, there is an increase of 40 cents a month.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I listened to the hon. member for St. Maurice-Lafèche (Mr. Chrétien) commending the government for wanting to impose a plan on all, in order to create a fund for the economic development of the country.

It is taxing workers today in order to create a fund for the future economic development of Canada, by promising a pension to those workers when they are 65 or 70 years of age.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the whole thing means an allotment of poverty that is being collected today under this Bill No. C-136. That is the kind of proposal which is put to us today in this bill: to tax the earnings of workers who can hardly meet their obligations and whose salary is mortgaged for three, four and five years; to