## The Address-Mr. Neil

retirees in the management of the plans and full reports to the employee and spouse on the financial standing of plans. In addition, we suggested that enrichment of benefits for active employees should be matched with comparable enrichment for retirees and deferred pensions in plans.

We also suggested that all future pension accruals receive substantial inflation protection, which would usually be the increase in the consumer price index, minus 2.5 per cent per year. All pension plans should vest benefits after two years. We also recommended the creation of a registered pension account, RPA, which would phase out existing RRSPs. The RPAs would be fully locked in and on leaving one job for another the employee would have a number of options that would include transferring his vested pension into an RPA, which would make his pension benefits portable and have them continue to grow at the same time.

Better protection for spouses is also the result of our recommendations regarding splitting of credits and survivor benefits in occupational pension plans. We also stated that coverage for regular part-time employees must be offered where the full-time employees and occupational pension coverage. Equal benefits for men and women with the same earnings, which in some cases would mean using unisex actuarial tables, were also approved by us.

In Chapter 8 of our report we discussed the present tax treatment of retirement savings and made some general recommendations in this highly technical and very sensitive field, while stating that further specific public consultations could be made here. Unfortunately, I do not have time to go into the details now.

As mentioned earlier, the lack of private pension coverage for large portions of private sector employees is a matter of serious concern. The task force proposals regarding earlier vesting, portability, inflation protection, credit splitting, survivor benefits, regular part-time employees and RPAs with a 40 per cent tax credit rather than a tax deduction would certainly help increase coverage in private plans.

Also, our recommendations regarding homemakers, credit splitting and survivorship would improve CPP coverage. The majority of the task force, however, recommended against mandatory expansion of coverage by public and private plans, with the caveat that if our recommendations have not brought significant improvement in private sector coverage within three years, the question of mandatory expansion be examined by a parliamentary committee.

My dissent from this recommendation is detailed in the third full paragraph on page 71 of the report. I agree with the arguments of labour and an overwhelming majority of women's groups that an expansion of the CPP is the simplest and fairest way to solve coverage problems. All workers, part-time, full-time and homemakers, would benefit from such an increase. The CPP is fully indexed, fully portable, vests immediately and can be introduced quickly. However, a doubling of the CPP to 50 per cent of the average industrial wage would add about 8 per cent of payroll to the CPP contributions which, with the 8 per cent to 9 per cent that is already

required for a proper pay-as-you-go CPP, would be too much of a financial drain on employees and employers. Accordingly, my recommendation was that the CPP be increased from 25 per cent to 35 per cent of the average industrial wage on a gradual basis, eventually increasing CPP contributions to between 3 per cent and 4 per cent.

There has been extensive debate on pension reform in recent years. There will be continuing debate in the future, but now is surely the time for our federal Government to take the lead and initiate some meaningful and widespread pension reforms along the lines that I and our pension reform task force have recommended.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): Ten minutes for questions or comments?

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to participate in this debate this morning. I listened with considerable interest on December 7 when the Speech from the Throne was read in the other place. Quite frankly, I could find very little in its content to fill me with any degree of optimism.

Over the past decade and a half since the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) took the reins of power, we have seen massive increases in spending, massive deficits and an overwhelming burden of public debt. In fact, I understand that at the present time the national debt is over \$140 billion. Unemployment remains at about 10 per cent. In fact, on the date of the Speech from the Throne it was 11.1 per cent. The most disturbing and disheartening fact of unemployment is that the youth of our country is the group which is hit the hardest. They will live with this sense of hurt and frustration for many, many years to come.

In the 1980 Throne Speech, the Government stated:

One of the essential objectives of this Government is to put more people to work. Young people, women, natives, and the handicapped face special problems in finding jobs. To meet the needs of these groups, my Government will expand its employment program while using its resources more efficiently. There will be an increased effort to develop critical trade skills so as to better prepare today's labour for tomorrow's jobs.

Despite the rhetoric, nothing has been done by this Government to create permanent jobs. There have been many makework programs, but little if any attempt has been made to create permanent jobs to ensure that young people coming out of schools or universities will have the opportunity of permanent employment. I quote further from the 1980 Speech from the Throne:

Members of Parliament will have a major role in advising on the selection of job creation projects, and my Government will enter into a new partnership with voluntary agencies and local organizations in a program of community service.

• (1200)

As a Member of Parliament, I have not had the opportunity of participating. Neither have Members of Parliament on the Opposition benches. I would suggest that that paragraph should have read: "Liberal Members of Parliament will have a major role in advising". According to recent press reports, we understand that last year each Liberal Member of Parliament