funds to entice older workers who have a better pension to retire and leave their jobs to the younger workers. Hopefully that could be done.

I would like to point out to the Member opposite that one of the recommendations which we did make on the Canada Pension Plan, which deals in a peripheral way with his question, was agreed to by the Minister of Finance. Until now, the Canada Pension Plan has operated on the theory that a person entering the work force at the age of 18 will stay there until the age of 65. In other words, his maximum benefits are calculated on the basis of 47 years in the work force. I do not think that anyone in this room would suggest that the emerging work pattern means that people are going to stay in the work force for some 47 years. As a result of that, we made recommendations to change the requirements under the Canada Pension Plan from the maximum of 47 years to 35 years. This would better reflect the public pension plan and the situation which exists in private pension plans. More important, it would give more Canadians maximum payments under the Canada Pension Plan. Only 18 per cent of Canadians who retired in 1983 qualify for the maximum payment under Canada Pension Plan. That position has been accepted by the Minister of Finance. Hopefully, it will be adopted by our provincial counterparts as well.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Sudbury was speaking about the GIS increases. I would like to mention a case in which a person, who is allegedly going to get a $25 increase, is actually going to have a decreased income. That is because the workmen's compensation contribution is going to be considered, which was never done before.

There are three payments under compensation. One is regular compensation. If I am working in a mine and a lump of coal hits my shoulder and dislocates my shoulder bone, I will receive regular compensation until that is healed and I can go back to work. That payment is not likely to affect people who are 65 or older. The second payment is called temporary partial disability. If my shoulder does not heal in the regular length of time and I have therapy for it, I am put on a temporary partial disability pension. That will not likely affect most older people either. The payment which is going to affect most people over 65 is the third one; the permanent partial disability. An example of that is a person who loses his hand or foot. After it is healed, he still does not have his hand or foot. He must go through life without it. That is a contribution he has made to industry. That payment is not wages. The regular compensation is in lieu of wages. Permanent partial disability has nothing to do with wages because he has lost part of his body in industry. That should not be considered as income under any circumstances.

I raised this point with the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mrs. Erola) a few weeks ago. She was going to discuss it with the Minister. I have not heard from her or from the Minister as yet. I would like to raise this matter with the Hon. Member for Sudbury. It is a real injustice for someone who has a permanent partial disability to have a reduction in income because he lost a hand or foot and is now being paid for that loss. Would the Hon. Member comment on that?

Mr. Frith: Mr. Speaker, the Member opposite raises a valid point, which perhaps an all-Party committee of the House could investigate. It is not only the area of workmen's compensation which confuses the Canadian public. For the purpose of testing, veterans' allowance does not qualify for purposes of the guaranteed income supplement. Yet we do that now for workmen's compensation and not in the case of veterans allowances. If our system is going to require some kind of income testing, the rationale should be the same for all. We have now created a sort of hodge-podge of regulations. This matter must be reviewed by an all-Party committee which can hold hearings across the country. It certainly needs clarification. The Hon. Member has pointed out a glaring example of an inequity which should be addressed.

I would like to give you an example, Mr. Speaker, of a sentiment which was expressed before our task force by a number of people who are now pensioned. They were pensioned on plans which did not have any indexation factor. As an example, the CN pensioners made a very compassionate case for retroactive lump sum payments from their funds to pensioners. The committee agreed that this should be done. We felt that if there is one glaring example of an injustice in this country, it is what has occured to pensioners under the CN plan.

The difficulty which we have under the guaranteed income supplement system is that if we were to convince CN to give a lump sum payment, or at least to increase the monthly payments to their pensioners, almost half of it would be lost because they would be losing their qualification for the guaranteed income supplement. Our recommendation was that it should lie outside for purposes of income testing. That is another example of something which must be rationalized in the system. I think it would be a worthwhile pursuit for all three political parties.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): Are there any more questions?

Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I have only one more question. The point which the Hon. Member made with regard to the guaranteed income supplement is a good reason why we should reduce dependence on the GIS. My Party and I were surprised by the generous provision of up to $15,000 in tax assistance for upper income individuals. This means that an individual making $86,000 could deduct $7,500 from income tax, if he were at a 50 per cent tax rate. I know that the Member shared the concern of the task force about how much assistance should legitimately be given to higher income individuals. Is the Member aware of any cost estimates which this limit of $15,000 is going to put on the tax system when fully operational in 1988?

Mr. Frith: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that when it is fully operational from 1988 onward, government estimates would be somewhere in the area of $250 million. It is fair to