

*Canada Pension Plan (No. 2)*

**Mrs. MacInnis (Vancouver Kingsway):** Where does she get the money?

**Mr. Penner:** To conclude, Mr. Speaker, in passing this bill we are increasing the level of Canada Pension Plan benefits now being received by some 500,000 Canadians, and we are raising the level of Canada pensions and other benefits coming into pay in the future. In brief, we are improving a government-sponsored plan, a part of our social security system, a part which benefits Canadians who hold to the value of independence or self-dependence. Most Canadians expect to meet their own needs through their own efforts and they expect others to do their best to do the same. The new, improved Canada Pension Plan helps to make that possible. This plan is no welfare scheme but is an earnings-related plan which benefits those who contribute to our economy and so also contribute to the plan, thereby providing for their own retirement and their own future.

**Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, I feel somewhat inadequate in speaking on this bill tonight following the deliberations of my two illustrious colleagues, the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), both of whom have a record in this distinguished chamber of speaking on this matter many times before over the ages—and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre goes as far back as confederation! Of course, I have not such a record in this House, but I am happy tonight to be able to join the crusade to which the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has referred.

I also feel somewhat inadequate because the preceding speaker from the Liberal Party outlined all the answers and all the problems. I am not so capable, nor is any member of my party nor anybody else in Canada. I must give that hon. gentleman credit for taking so much for granted.

Let me join my colleague the hon. member for Hillsborough in congratulating the minister for this bill. I hope its passage will be swift. I am particularly happy that he is able to assure the House of such an eloquent record of consultation with the provinces and such unanimity in his approach to this further step in the over-all field of security. I have some reservations. The minister said he requires the assurance of the provinces that they all agree to waiving the consent provisions, but he admitted in his speech that he does not have this assurance. I hope the deliberations and discussion in this House will not be meaningless if it should happen that the provinces do not agree to waive this provision. I am also happy that this bill and the one to come are designed to restore parallelism, as the minister calls it, with the Quebec Pension Plan. That will certainly be a step in the right direction.

● (2140)

We are again indulging in what I am sure will be a long debate. We will be discussing a broad range of benefits, welfare matters, social matters, old age pensions, security of the underprivileged, and so on. There is, however, another segment of our society to which I should like to refer. This includes those people who formerly depended on their savings, such as perhaps housewives or persons

[Mr. Penner.]

who were fortunate in their early years and did not fulfil the 60-year commitment to the Canadian labour force. Of course, because of the inflationary trends in our economy, the savings of such people are eroded and eventually they will have to look toward a pension plan to provide for their future.

I came across an interesting article by an illustrious Canadian economist who speaks about such savings. In one paragraph he says one should never buy government bonds. He states that the cost of government will escalate, that there is a limit to the tax burden people will carry, and thus that governments will finance to deficits through the sale of bonds to those innocents who will buy them. He says that these people will be taxed on the interest they receive and will be paid back in devalued dollars. Further, he states that the more the government borrows, the more it will contribute to inflation and the less real purchasing power it will pay back to the unhappy bondholder. He suggests the bonds should be left to people who can afford to lose money.

A previous speaker touched on these unfortunates who have lived the dream that one could accumulate some savings in this country and provide for oneself. Eventually they have to live on some kind of social assistance handed out by some form of government. This bill certainly is an improvement. I cannot argue with the legislation it provides. However, the bill, again, is designed by the same people whom I sometimes call intellectual socialists. I define these people as those who think that the provision of money is the solution, really, to all problems in Canada and in the world. They believe, in other words, that if there is a social problem, the question is how much does it cost to make people happy; or if there is any other kind of problem, how much does it cost.

We talk about old age pensions and argue whether the amount of the pension should be \$95, \$100 or \$105 and each party takes credit for suggesting the greatest amount. I recall the other day when the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre said that if it were not for him and his party, the old age pensioner would still receive \$35 a month. It disturbs me that we should be talking about money all the time when we also talk about a comprehensive plan such as the minister has called social security. These intellectual socialists are people who simply do not recognize that in Canada there are such fundamental inequities as hunger, illiteracy and exposure to the elements. They refuse to believe there are small towns in Canada the economy of which is based, to the extent of from 30 per cent to 50 per cent, on some form of social assistance which its citizens receive every month.

These intellectual economists refuse to believe that one-third of our population lives on some kind of social assistance, and that we are wasting 20 per cent of our human resources by not demanding and ensuring that they achieve some stage of life in which they can be productive and make a contribution to the life style which we have established for ourselves.

If we continue to use money as a basis for a solution to our social problems, it seems to me we must motivate some more people to work, particularly the 20 per cent to which I referred a little earlier. It would seem that only if more people in Canada become productive can we generate or