

Canada Pension Plan

gest they would not all have to be raised. Is the government getting all it can out of the corporation tax structure compared with the situation in some other countries? Has it looked at the question of depletion allowances for companies in the oil drilling field? Has it looked at the question of a partial capital gains tax such as exists in the United States? Has the government looked at the question of what I consider to be still a very large defence budget for the results obtained? I am sure if the government really wanted to do so it could find more money in that area.

This is the typical attitude taken over the years, in that whenever we suggest something we are told that the cost is astronomical and it cannot be done. I suggest that if the government wants to do these things they can be done.

Mr. Macdonald: Like magic.

Mr. Prittie: However, Mr. Chairman, we are very pleased that this change has been made. I will conclude by saying that I was amazed with the rapidity of action in regard to that particular change, but it is the results that count.

Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a few things at this stage of the debate. I too am very pleased with the introduction of part IV of the legislation and the objective set forth in the resolution. I must say that I did not follow the deliberations of the joint committee too closely but I was somewhat perturbed when I noted that in the course of their discussions an amendment was moved by the representatives of the Conservative party which in effect would have given every Canadian citizen \$100 per month at age 65 but it was turned down. I heard my colleague to the left say that he and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre were the only two who voted for a flat \$100 payment at age 65, but I also note that they did not support the amendment put forward by my colleagues on that committee.

Mr. Knowles: You know why, too.

Mr. Winkler: It does not matter to me.

Mr. Knowles: It does not matter?

Mr. Winkler: No, it does not matter. I said on a previous occasion that my position on this question was that I wanted all citizens at age 65 to receive an old age pension of \$100 a month, and I will say why. Although, as I stated, I support the legislation completely and entirely, I believe that the pay-

[Mr. Prittie.]

ment should be \$100 a month at age 65 across the board from January 1, 1966.

The minister stood in her place and tried to take great political kudos for the presentation of all this welfare legislation. In doing so she reminded me very much of the stumping politician. She wanted to take all credit for anything for which credit could be taken and to accept none of the responsibility for the fact that things were not so well accepted by the general public with her party in power. We do not have to go back too far to find examples of what I am talking about. She almost shed tears over the way that things were being presented.

Let me say again that as early as 1960 I placed before the house a contributory pension plan and at that time suggested that \$100 a month be paid at age 65. I have not changed my position since. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre says there is a reason why they did not support our position during the sittings of the joint committee. Let me put this forward to the committee, Mr. Chairman, in the light of the legislation that is before us. The \$75 a month which will be paid across the board at age 65 in 1970 would have been augmented by \$25 from the Canada pension plan.

Again, someone has mentioned this afternoon that there has been a lot said about the area of additional benefits, the inequality of the current structure and the windfalls that will occur for those now age 45 to age 60. I think that Canadians generally are sufficiently responsible to justify me in saying that this age group would have been satisfied to receive a more equitable pension when they are eligible; but everybody is the same these days. If you are going to give something to one person he is certainly not going to turn it down. I believe that the minister must accept this responsibility because I think that the cost of living will increase sufficiently in the ensuing years after the establishment of this plan that \$100 will certainly not be too much.

The minister quoted this afternoon those tremendous words in the white paper about security and dignity and all the rest of that bunk. I say to the members of the committee that if even today the payment was \$100 a month anyone having to live on that sum of money would find it a very difficult chore to make ends meet. I realize that the government may be looking ahead and thinking about medicare and other things, but these things are far in the future.