

Old Age Security Act Amendment

in the nature of a handout. It is something for which the people are paying. What is taking place here is a most retrograde and unjustifiable course of action. I should like to know who coined the euphonious and deceptive phrase—"an income test".

It is interesting that on October 17 Senator Croll knew what parliament did not know. He was connected with the Senate committee on aging. He wrote a letter on October 17 containing these words:

The legislation with respect to those 65 and over will provide for the payment of \$105 without a means test or a needs test but only an income test.

He knew on October 17, but parliament could not find out. Then he goes on to say:

That means that those who are single and have less income than \$1260 per year will receive the benefits.

What this legislation, as well as the further legislation and taxation, will mean is that Canadians will pay for a pension to which they will not be entitled unless their income falls to a level picked by the minister. This is unfair. What is the reason for this?

I do not know who worked it out, but it is of interest that on October 16, 1965 the Prime Minister dealt with the matter of pensions in a speech he made in Charlottetown. He said:

If you pay \$100 at age 65 out of tax revenue that means \$850,000,000 more out of the budget—*income tax will go up.*—

Was that statement about \$850 million true? Today, if I heard the minister correctly, he said the increase would be from \$260 million to \$280 million. During the election campaign, when it was expeditious and beneficial to raise a bogey, the Prime Minister said the cost would be \$850 million, and that was noised across this country by every Liberal candidate. It is interesting to note that he said he would not engage in an attempt to purchase the votes of people—"far be it from me". He said:

This is the old election auction using your money.

Then he used these words:

How easy it would be for us to say I will give you \$105. But I don't believe in that sort of thing and I'm not going to participate in it.—

The figure which came to his mind was \$105. Before the election was over, however, old age pensioners believed they had been promised up to \$200 a month. It all depended on who the candidate was, and the part of Canada in which the candidate was speaking. There will be grave, and justifiable disappointment, now that this legislation has been

explained by the minister. We stood and continue to stand in respect of the increase to \$100 a month. There is nothing which will demean the Canadian people more than having to go through this catechism, and catechism it is. The minister says, "Oh, they have just to fill out a document; we will make it simple".

● (4:10 p.m.)

Why did the minister not explain the purpose behind the establishment of a court of appeal? If the government is going to accept a simple statement by the prospective pensioner, then why is the government setting up a court of appeal? It can only be setting up this court to deny the individual his entitlement, on the basis of his own statement. What a snooper's paradise will be created and what a multiplication of bureaucrats will take place.

All this is being done because the government is trying to save face. They know they should increase pensions and they know the only justifiable course is to increase them to \$100 a month, but to do so would be to go back on the stand the government has taken against the motions proposed by Her Majesty's opposition over a period of a year and a half. The government has arrived at a plan which to us is inadequate and a denial of justice.

Civil revolutions have taken place over the right not to be taxed without representation. That was the essence of the revolution of the 13 colonies in the United States. In this case, taxation will be imposed on everyone, but entitlement will be restricted to those who come within the narrow confines of the bureaucratic formula which has been placed before the house.

Therefore, sir, I move:

That all the words after 'that' be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

The government give consideration to introducing a measure to amend the Old Age Security Act, effective with respect to months beginning with January, 1967, to provide for the payment out of the consolidated revenue fund and for charging to the old age security fund under that act of an additional monthly amount of \$25 to all pensioners thereunder".

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to delay the opportunity of the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam, or the spokesman for that party, of speaking at this time, but I do want to raise a point of order in respect of the irregularity of this amendment. I suggest it is out of order and cannot be