

I realize that the next time for these pensions to be escalated is January, 1974. Maybe I shall be told to keep my shirt on and it will be done before that. However, I have been around here long enough to know that if one keeps his shirt on, it takes a long while to get these things through.

In the hope this will have been changed so that the escalation that takes place in January, 1974, will be to the full extent of the rise in the cost of living, I appeal to the President of the Treasury Board to announce here tonight that the government will do what it says it is prepared to do, to what it says it regards sympathetically, and do it without waiting until action is taken with respect to the Canada Pension Plan.

I understand and welcome the government's sympathy. I understand that the government is with us. I understand that the boards and bodies that deal with these matters have made recommendations that call for implementation at this session. In fact, it looks as though everyone is in step but the President of the Treasury Board. I hope he will get in step tonight.

**Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board):** Mr. Speaker, I have heard the hon. member's eloquent appeals, the latest one tonight. As the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) pointed out, this is his latest and he hopes it will receive a positive response. I will not say that the appeal has fallen on deaf ears, but perhaps the expression in the press would be "it will not have the result the hon. member hopes for".

I think the hon. member is as fully aware as I am that between now and the end of the normal period of the session there is a very crowded schedule. While the suggestion is that everyone is in favour of it except the President of the Treasury Board, and consequently it will have quick passage, I listened to the debate tonight on a bill on which I understand everyone is also in favour, but we do not seem to be able to make much progress.

I admit that by handling the Canada Pension Plan and the amendments to the escalation of civil service, armed forces and police superannuation, it will be proceeded with at an earlier date and more expeditiously if the two are done together rather than at separate times, one now and one later in the year. The hon. member pointed out that it would be difficult to make this operative before January. I am glad to say we still have some period of time before that date.

The principle of escalation at a rate higher than 2 per cent for the Canada Pension Plan is being strongly advocated by the federal government in relation to the provinces. The government feels the same way about escalation at a higher rate than 2 per cent in respect of this particular superannuation plan. However, while the hon. member says there is nothing in law to prevent the two being put together, I thought it was clearly understood that when the question of escalation of the superannuation plan was discussed with the employees, the present contributors to the plan, it was made quite clear to us by the employees that what they were agreeing to was the same rate of escalation as the Canada Pension Plan. I thought there was a clear understanding that in return for their contribution of one half of 1 per cent to match the

### Adjournment Debate

one half of 1 per cent put up by the government, the escalation benefit would be limited to the same rate as the Canada Pension Plan.

● (2210)

There is, therefore, not an overriding or compelling reason for keeping the two in step. But there is at least the element of obligation entered into when we introduced the joint financing by present contributors and the government of the present plan. I should like to repeat: I do not think any time will be lost. The hon. gentleman suggests that I am the only one who is opposed to this. I am not opposed to the proposal, but merely to the timing of the introduction of the bill at a time when the House calendar is, as I think all hon. members realize, very crowded indeed.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Will it be done this year? He said yes, Mr. Speaker.

### SOCIAL SECURITY—SUGGESTED INCREASE IN FAMILY ALLOWANCES AND GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTION UNDER CANADA ASSISTANCE PLAN BECAUSE OF WELFARE SITUATION

**Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough):** Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the minister, of whom I am a shadow, is here tonight to reply to me. On March 12 I asked the minister the following question:

Can the minister tell us whether, in the light of what he called the disgraceful welfare situation in some of the provinces, he is prepared to assist by an early introduction of legislation to raise family allowances, hopefully before Easter, and by increasing beyond 50 per cent, the government's contributions to the Canada Assistance Plan, at least with respect to those areas and provinces where there is acute need as noted in the hon. gentleman's address?

Since that question was asked we have been told that the family allowances bill will be presented to the House before June 15. For some weeks, I and others in the chamber have been urging the minister to move more quickly toward the introduction of the legislation. It was my hope that as a measure of income redistribution this measure need not be delayed of implementation until January 1, 1974.

On May 8, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) advised my colleague from Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall) that had the FISP bill been passed into law last September the plan could have been put into effect by January, 1973. Surely, if under that administrative monstrosity such speedy delivery could be made of the allowance cheques, much more rapid movement could come from the contemplated measure of the minister. When the minister presented his orange paper on social security he ranged far and wide over a broad spectrum of issues affecting the health and welfare of Canadian citizens. He advanced numerous propositions which will involve multitudinous conferences and discussions. To mix my colours, if not my metaphors, the orange paper is a blue-print for possible, and possibly distant social change.

Nor do I demur from the suggestion that we need a thorough examination of our social welfare programs. But what of the interim? What of the thousands of Canadians who cannot cope with a cost of living which is rapidly