

Supply

on the assumption that the entitlement sharing provision is enacted, whether the spouse is a contributor or not, he would also receive a personal retirement pension based on half the pension entitlement. I am certain that people find this complicated and confusing, but we shall have some answers after the committee has heard submissions from interested parties during its meetings throughout Canada. The surviving spouse would therefore receive up to 80 per cent of the Canada Pension Plan benefits paid to the couple before the death of the other spouse. The present ceiling of combined benefits would cease to apply. As for the spouse under 65, the Green Paper recommends a two-level structure which would involve transition benefits and a lifetime pension. Permanent benefits would be the same as for survivors over 65, namely 60 per cent of the accumulated shared pension. The transition benefit could be a more substantial amount, for instance an amount equal to the Old Age Security Pension, and could be paid to the survivor for either three years or until the age of 65 is reached, whichever is shorter. Survivors with children could be entitled to the transition benefit for a longer period, for instance, until the youngest child reaches seven. A two-tier structure would help young widows in re-adjusting their lifestyles immediately after the death of their spouses, and would provide them with some kind of help for later on. The Green Paper further suggests that marriage should no longer put an end to the benefits paid to the surviving spouse.

As I said earlier, the special committee will soon initiate its consultation process, holding hearings all across the country. I would ask Hon. Members from both sides of the House to encourage women groups in their constituencies to avail themselves of their freedom of speech and submit presentations at those hearings.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I hope my remarks on pensions reflect the Government's concerns on this issue.

Mr. Kilgour: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my question to the Parliamentary Secretary, for whom I have a good deal of affection and respect. Does she feel that the federal Government should invest any money in the film *Videodrome* which, as she will know, advocates pornography and violence against women, and also, since she referred to battered wives as if there were a link between pornography and wife-beating men, does she feel that the law should be clarified respecting pornography?

Mrs. Killens: I believe that most Hon. Members know my feelings on this. I must agree with the Hon. Member that pornography is conducive to violence and even rape, and I could not support any kind of active participation by this Government in the promotion of pornography. This goes without saying, and certainly there can be no doubt that I am sincere when I stress that were it proven that this Government in some way or another is helping to promote pornography with the knowledge that this is conducive to violence, I would be the first to denounce it. Until I have such proof, I must be on the alert.

• (1530)

[English]

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, I have a short question for the Parliamentary Secretary. The implication of her comments about pension-credit splitting was that she is content with the view that married persons shall be entitled to half the pension to which they would be entitled if they were single. Was that the thrust and intent of what she was saying?

Mrs. Killens: Mr. Speaker, that is not what I said. There were 60,000 women who participated in the regional conferences. I attended many of them in Montreal. I heard women come to the microphone and express the wish that the pension be divided, asking why they should be penalized if they stayed married and yet if they were divorced, they got half the pension. Some men in the audience became so excited that I thought they would have a heart attack because they were so much against it. The question is not settled at all. A committee will be studying it along with other items.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I have a short question. I appreciate the Hon. Member's concern regarding pensions. I understand that she will be on the Pension Committee. I look forward to working with her on that Committee.

How does the Hon. Member feel about Government intervention in pension schemes? In particular, does she believe that the pensioners in this country should have any confidence in the Liberal Government in view of the fact that, under the six and five program, the basic Old Age Security Pension was capped at six and five? In the Public Service, the RCMP and the Armed Forces, not only were those pensions capped but additional funds which individuals had specifically put into those programs to protect themselves from inflation were also capped. The Hon. Member was critical of the private plans because they are not protected against inflation. I would rather not have the reply from the Hon. Member that because inflation is down to 8.3 per cent, the impact will not be as severe. The principal point is that those pensioners expected to be protected against inflation. Those pensioners paid an indexation fee. They expected to be protected against inflation, not undermined by Government decree, as was implied and in fact as occurred under the six and five program in Bill C-124.

Mrs. Killens: The Hon. Member asked whether I thought the people had confidence in the Liberal Government. They have proven that. They have demonstrated it for the last 11 years and will do so again. Therefore, they do have confidence in us.

I am glad to answer that question. When the Hon. Member spoke of Bill C-131 this morning, I was going to raise a question with him. He seemed to imply that the Government was imposing six and five on pensioners. Last week the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin) was asked a question about this in the House. She replied that with the rate