

Canada Pension Plan

Besides, this was stated clearly enough by Mr. Gerin-Lajoie, and we could read in *La Presse* of July 3 last:

—it is reported that the minister of youth, Mr. Gerin-Lajoie, already plans to set up a school credit board which would feed on the pension fund of Mr. Lesage. This board would make loans or would in turn allow school boards to borrow from the fund in order to build schools with repayment conditions in keeping with their means.

If there is no opposition today on the part of the ministers of the province of Quebec, it is perhaps an intimation they may benefit, within the limits of 45 to 55 per cent, from the contributions made by the inhabitants of the province to this pension plan. But, if the question is simply a matter of dollars, for Mr. Lesage as well as the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss LaMarsh), who is introducing the resolution, to allow Canadian citizens in the year 2015 to have bread, I wonder why this plan should provide that in 1970 heads of families with an average income of \$2,000 to \$3,000 deprive themselves of bread to allow Canadian citizens to have some in the year 2015.

Is this a matter of dollars? Unless it is intended to impose on us merely a problem of a plan? If it is simply a problem of a plan, at which some N.D.P. representatives in this house are adept, I may say that we are right on the subject; we shall make plans.

But if it is a need for dollars which prompts the provincial government to participate in or agree to this plan, or to initiate its own plan in order to ensure greater benefits for the taxpayers of the province of Quebec, I believe it is normal we should put forward here, as Creditistes, our own point of view in the field of pensions, particularly as concerns the plan submitted to us today.

If it is a matter of dollars, let us see what our old people need and what they shall want in future, this year and 10 or 20 years from now. Nothing but a bit of comfort, in accordance with what their country's productivity can offer them for their old age, to wit, appropriate medical care and a sound and reasonable well-being, as concerns food, clothing and housing, in keeping with the standards of living of this 20th century.

To sum up, this is what our older people will wish in the year 1970 or in the year 2000, or even in the year 2015, and nothing else.

Today, under the pretext of establishing a plan which would offer all that, the salary of the average worker, of the small industrial wage earner is again to be drained by taxes in order to establish a universal, compulsory and contributory pension scheme.

I think that the hon. Minister of National Health and Welfare who gets a considerable

percentage of the annual budget—more particularly when we realize that 15 per cent of the budget will be used to pay the dictators of finance instead of helping production—should try to find a formula to improve the security of those older people who built up this country and, after 25, 30 or 40 years of of hard work contributed to the economic development we know today.

How will our young people of today and tomorrow, who will reap the benefits of automation and scientific progress, while productivity is ever increasing, be made to contribute to that plan?

Statistics show that the trend is more and more to free man by the use of machines.

Therefore, if it is only a financial problem, why not seek a solution elsewhere?

In the last several months, we have been making many suggestions in order to review the monetary policy of our country, and permit the establishment of a single social security program.

To date, they seem to have understood nothing, absolutely nothing. And yet, we are not the only ones urging for a revision of our monetary policy in order to make way for the development of a social security plan.

I have here part of a speech made by Mr. Benoit Michaud, an hon. member for Madawaska-Restigouche—a Liberal member, if you please—on June 24, 1947, in which reference was made to the increase from \$25 to \$30 per month in the old age pension. After pointing out that the government could not make the increase larger because the financial system did not permit it, Mr. Michaud suggested a reform of the monetary system to do away with the national debt charges which, at that time, came to \$434 million.

Now, the interest on our national debt, which was less than half a billion dollars in 1947, has now gone beyond a billion dollars, according to the budget just put before us. In short, the interest on the debt has doubled since 1947.

How can you predict 50 years in advance what benefits the worker will receive, when you cannot do it for 30 or 35 years to come?

Mr. Chairman, we are being asked today to accept a principle which is illogical in its application, following which other bills bearing the same inconsistencies will be imposed upon us.

A few years ago, the unemployment insurance fund was set up to ensure the security of workers. At one time, accumulated funds totalled more than \$900 million. At the time, actuaries had established the amount of the contributions to be paid by both employees and employers.

[Mr. Perron.]