

*Canada Pension Plan*

to be, that is 11 per cent, in Canada it is going to be difficult for the Canadian industrial worker and for many of the firms. Would it not be a wiser thing to pay it straight across the board at age 65, even if the costs were covered by a sales tax? This plan would be more equitable because the people who have money would be spending it on those things upon which a tax is collected, but everyone would receive benefits. As the plan is now, it is certainly not going to be equitable because the \$75 at age 65 is going to be paid to the person who, as the minister says, will be living in security and with dignity, whereas the maximum that one might be receiving from the plan and old age security is \$254. This would be provided, of course, that the husband and wife both live to collect this pension. Now, I would say that is quite a discrepancy. I do not believe the government should back away from increasing this payment from \$75 to \$100.

I would be very pleased, if the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre or some other member moved an amendment to increase the payment to \$100 per month, to stand up and support the amendment.

**Mr. Benson:** May I ask the hon. member a question? He said he would stand in his place and support an amendment to increase the payment to \$100 per month at age 65. Would he also stand in his place and support the necessary increase in taxes to cover this increase, which would be a responsible act? I have suggested it might mean a sales tax of 3 per cent, an income tax of 3 per cent and a 4 per cent corporation tax.

**Mr. Winkler:** There is no doubt about that. I will support the financial measures required to produce the \$100 per month.

**Mr. Chatterton:** There have been a few speeches between the speech made by the Minister of National Health and Welfare and this moment, so that I have had an opportunity of drying my tears and recovering from the emotional impact of the words at the end of her speech. The hon. lady is obviously motivated by maternal instinct for this baby of hers. I am inclined to think, however, she is either a fickle or a careless mother because one of the first offspring which was delivered last April, I believe, was either abortive or rejected. Then, the second offspring which was delivered I believe in July of last year was also rejected. From my experience, mothers usually have the greatest concern for the first offspring, but in this instance it

[Mr. Winkler.]

appears that the hon. lady has most concern about the third one.

**Mr. Pepin:** A beautiful baby.

**Mr. Chatterton:** I heard a comment about a beautiful baby. This is not the description I heard of it, according to the evidence given before the joint committee. The hon. lady has attempted to beautify this baby because she has already made some changes.

The third plan which we are considering provided for a reduced amount of old age security at age 65, so it is a little more beautiful now than it was. The minister paid some glowing tributes to the Prime Minister, including a reference to his patience. Now, with that, Mr. Chairman, I agree completely. I cannot understand the patience of the Prime Minister, particularly with the Minister of National Health and Welfare. I do not know if he calls her Judy or not, but he must have said to her, "Look, you had your first chance in April and your second chance in June or July. I don't care how bad the third one is, but I am not going to give you another chance." Furthermore, the Prime Minister must have said to her, "Don't forget the veracity force, the birds, and pictorial art normally read by children, and certain interference in a provincial election." Indeed, I agree with her that the Prime Minister has patience to an endless degree. Of course some people believe it is not patience but lack of decision, and this refers not just to one minister but to many others.

The hon. lady made a speech before one o'clock that was the most political type I have heard on a subject like this for many years, and no doubt it prompts some response along these lines. The government's proposal to provide old age security pensions in due course at age 65 is one which will be supported by this group, and certainly by me. But I think it was a political decision.

In the first place, whenever you introduce a flat rate instant benefit there is bound to be a certain amount of inequity. In other words, if you say, "We will provide this benefit as of today," somebody will say, "Why didn't you provide it yesterday?" That is understandable to some extent. But when a government says, "We will provide \$75 a month to those who are aged 65 but not until 1970," then immediately those who are aged 65 now will say, "Why not now? Why only in 1970?"

In that respect the proposed measure with its progression of benefits by years is very unfair and will cause grave feelings of dissatisfaction among those who will not be 65