

Canada Pension Plan

Another hon. member referred this afternoon to the people who come to see him. I have had the same experience. When I return to my constituency each week end most of the cases I have to deal with are welfare cases. I know that when I go home tomorrow I will have five or six or maybe ten welfare cases to deal with and, as the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond said, in many instances the age of these people is well below 65, which indicates quite clearly that there is a distinct need. Now, the Minister of National Revenue quoted at length a tremendous number of figures concerning the cost. Again, they are the people who are doing the proposing. Therefore, as he said, they have to act in a responsible manner in regard to raising the money. With this statement, I totally agree.

However, at the same time, Mr. Chairman, I believe that when we are going into this field now it will not be so easy to act in a sensible and responsible manner at a later time, and there will be few opportunities for the people who are in this position to get anything more. At election time, however, we know the government has a tendency to lean a little farther. The initial government proposal would have reduced the pension at age 65, that is if the contributor wished to take it, and it would have been \$51 per month and the \$75 old age security, of course, would have been left out. The proposal we have before us is one which was made in the committee by the members of the Conservative party. I suggest that is the reason we have this legislation before us. Let us make no mistake about that. In other words, once again the opposition forced the government into a move which, all of a sudden, the government finds responsible. I think many of the other amendments which have been suggested here have been equally responsible, but the government has acted in its usual way and accepted none of them.

In so far as this resolution is concerned, I may say that I am expressing my own view. I have said this earlier, and I do not believe all of the members of my party would support me. I do not intend to introduce an amendment, but I understand and I hope that an amendment will be introduced to increase this payment immediately, as of January, 1966, to \$100 per month. I will stand in my place and support that amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Miss LaMarsh: It will be out of order.

Mr. Winkler: Naturally, everything the opposition does is out of order. You told us that a few minutes ago.

Mr. Munro: That is the only reason you are making it.

Mr. Winkler: Have you ever heard anything so ridiculous, Mr. Chairman? The parliamentary secretary says that is the only reason we are making it. If this is the only contribution he can make to Canadians who find themselves in this position today, then he had better go back home and enter into practice. He is of no value here.

I should like to say something to the Minister of National Revenue who referred to the imposition of the 11 per cent sales tax. He made a peculiar statement this afternoon. He said, had it not been for the imposition of the 11 per cent sales tax this plan would not have been possible. Let us have a look at how long this 11 per cent sales tax has been in effect. It was based on a 4-4-3 formula, if I remember correctly. I believe the government took a lot of money out of circulation during the period of time this tax has been in effect.

Mr. Benson: Will the hon. member permit a question? Does he realize the additional 3 per cent was effective only on January 1 of this year, that is the old age security tax portion?

Mr. Winkler: I am well aware of that. You have imposed the 11 per cent tax over what period, how long?

Mr. Benson: Since January 1, of this year.

Mr. Winkler: Obviously you have collected a substantial sum of money in that period of time. It seems to me that from the viewpoints which have been put forward in regard to the Canada pension plan, we have almost reached the stage where it might not be a bad idea to change our thinking. As has been stated before, there will be a substantial number of people added to the bureaucracy. They are going to have to be paid. I believe somebody said they would number 3,000, but I do not know if this is correct. In any event there will be quite a bill for the taxpayer to meet, and make no mistake about it, the cost is going to come out of the taxpayer's pocket.

We know from the United States experience that in due course the contributory portion is going to be a lot greater than the percentage that will be collected when the plan becomes effective. If it does rise to the point which it is projected in the United States it is going