

Well now, says the prospective retiree, 130 per cent is quite interesting, I will think about it.

I have the figures. As I said, the maximum paid to a Quebecer aged 65 is \$486.11. The reaction is predictable: Well, I will follow the Government's recommendation, go on working or stay home but wait before applying for QPP or CPP benefits because they told me I would get 6 per cent more. I am told I will draw \$515.28 at age 66. Mr. Speaker, he figures he will get \$29.19 a month or \$350 more a year if he waits until age 66. But what they are not told—and I suspect no Member will urge a constituent to wait until age 66 or 70 to draw his or her pension benefits—is that a person has to agree to do without a monthly income of \$486 for one year beginning at age 65. To get \$350 more a year, he or she has to accept a \$5,833 loss, and this money stays in the Government coffers.

Mr. Speaker, what do you put in a Bill which is nothing more than window-dressing? It provides no benefit unless someone with a lot of money says: I shall not take my pension benefits immediately because my taxation level will be very high. However, Mr. Speaker, you do not legislate for the most wealthy.

Let me give you an example of someone in Quebec who waits one year and, instead of retiring at 65, decides to do so only at 66. He loses \$5,800 to earn \$340 the next year. However, the Government is saying: The system will be more flexible between the ages of 60 and 70. Under 65, you lose 6 per cent a year, which means 30 per cent in five years. You lose \$1,749 each year throughout your life because your pension will always be indexed all your life on the basis of the low amount which you received the first time.

The publicity tells a different story, even though the Prime Minister will certainly pat himself on the back at the end of the session in spite of the recent scandals because he succeeded in passing two good Bills for pensioners. Look at what will happen according to the Conservative Government. Even though you retire, you can decide to receive your benefits under the Quebec or the Canada Pension Plan at the age of 70. This means that, at 70, instead of having \$486.11, you will get \$631.94, or \$145 more each month. However, during those five years, you will have to do without \$29,000 in income that you will have left in the pension fund to be entitled to receive \$1,749 more each year.

Mr. Speaker, it makes no sense to include in a Bill something that no one here would recommend. Let us suppose that someone who is 65 years old goes to the Office of the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Epp) and asks for some advice: "Should I retire now since I have my private pension plan and you have passed some new legislation? I do not need that much money right now as I can make both ends meet. Would it be better to invest as you have said and leave my Canada Pension Plan benefits in the pension fund and wait until I am 70 to receive 30 per cent more? It sounds interesting. Is it like at the bank?" Would the Minister honestly and sincerely be able to tell this person: "Yes, the legislation tells you to leave your money where it is and you will then receive

30 per cent more." It is not true. The Minister cannot tell me that he would say to someone: "Do without \$29,000 in income and leave this money in the fund so that we can give you \$1,700 more later." It is impossible. It is illogical, Mr. Speaker. It was unacceptable in Quebec where the PQ passed similar legislation. Very few people take this option. It is window-dressing. It is only camouflage, Mr. Speaker. This is the problem with this Government. It is the same for the way the pension entitlement is shared when a couple separates.

A while ago, the Minister introduced the Spouses' Allowance Bill to help widows and widowers and be discriminated against single, separated and divorced people. Now, as he wants to make up for it, he gives more money to someone who is separated than to someone who is not separated or to widows and widowers.

Mr. Speaker, all this has been done thoughtlessly and illogically. All the Members of the Opposition, the NDP, the Liberal Official Opposition and even some Conservative Members will admit that they have been pressed to pass this Bill. It is true that it will result in some improvement. But, Mr. Speaker, is there one Conservative Member—

Mr. Ricard: What improvement!

Mr. Malépart: Is there one Conservative Member, yes, of course, there is the Hon. Member for Laval (Mr. Ricard) can he tell me, when a man of 65 drops in his constituency office and says: Tell me, you are the expert, you voted for a legislation, you said it was very good, it is right here in this press release. Would I be better off if I waited till next year to draw my Pension Plan benefits? If that question was put to me, my answer would be: Grab it immediately, otherwise the Government will get away with \$5,000 and you will get \$340. Unless one is a swindler, a Government swindler who would say to his constituents:

Mr. Speaker, as an individual each one of us will be ready to advise people to do differently than what is being offered. Why then should we act as hypocrites and put that in the legislation? Why did the Minister accept that such a thing be included? Why did he not say that people between 60 and 65, as my colleague suggested earlier, why did he not leave them with the same amount? Why deprive anyone of \$340.28 a month, Mr. Speaker? Can anyone live on what is left? Look at what will happen! Government coffers will get fatter because those are hidden tax increases. The Minister will reply: No, that is a contribution to the Pension Plan. But people get nothing in return. Millions and billions of dollars will go into the fund, and that money is lent to provincial Governments, people do not pay back, do they go on increasing contributions? This is like merry-go-round.

On top of that, people who depend on social welfare in Quebec get \$456 a month, and this is paid 50/50 by the Federal and Provincial Governments. So these people are forced to draw Pension Plan benefits because they have contributed. Let us say the maximum amount, \$340. So those \$340 are deducted from \$456, and that person remains poor.