

First of all, I have been wondering why Members of the Progressive Conservative Party were opposed to a Bill that placed restrictions on increases in old age security benefits.

He had both passion and compassion at the time, Mr. Speaker.

The Hon. Member spoke earlier about discrimination. Obviously, whenever we set certain limits, there is bound to be some kind of discrimination.

I worked in the school system when the age of admission was set with November 30 as the cut-off date. However, because of pressure from all sides, we had to move the date up to October 1. That took time. First of all, because of all the parents who got involved, and by that time the children were old enough—they went to school eventually! But the measure was finally adopted. Some people would have had me say it discriminated against children who were born on October 2. You have something against kids born on October 2!

In this particular case, the Government is to be congratulated, first of all because it is taking the kind of action it can afford instead of acting according to the philosophy of the Party in power under the previous Government, which was to act across the board. The pension plan started at seventy, then went down to sixty-nine and so forth. The eligible age is now sixty-five, and there was a commitment to lower it to sixty-four, with the guaranteed income.

The present Government has decided to act vertically in a major age group, according to need. This means that we can make considerable headway from top to bottom within the group. Of course, they can always say we are discriminating against those who are not in that group. It was not our intention to do so. However, we consider that the people in this particular group are those who are in greatest need at this time. We must not forget that.

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Hon. Member for Beauharnois-Salaberry (Mr. Hudon) for his comments. I could not agree more that we must provide protection for those who need it and in my speech, I was speaking up for those who need protection but are not covered by this measure.

● (1500)

That is the substance of our message to the Hon. Member. I would suggest that he learn to be patient when his Government is criticized, because the House is not a place where compliments and words of praise are the order of the day. We must all learn to be critical and to accept criticism with good grace. I appreciate the Hon. Member's comments because he speaks my language. We are speaking about the same subject, which is to provide protection for those who need it, but unfortunately, Bill C-26 which is before the House today, while protecting those who need protection, neglects another group of Canadians who have the same need and are in the same age group but lack this protection. That is why I read, in the course of my

Old Age Security Act

speech, the letter from the organization "Womenspirit", which used the word discrimination.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Questions and comments. The Hon. Member for Richelieu (Mr. Plamondon).

Mr. Plamondon: Like my colleague before me, Mr. Speaker, I am surprised as well by some of your remarks and those of the Hon. Member who was fiercely defending his views and who earlier today handed out to Hon. Members his famous document on the three ladies—Mrs. Brown, Mrs. Gray and Mrs. . . . well, the only one missing was Mrs. Black—anyway, he handed out those three documents and was surprised to see that our Government had not shown any concern.

I should like to point out that our Government made a promise during the election campaign, a promise with respect to that sector: this Bill was to be introduced, and here it is, less than six months later.

Besides, when it comes to promises, Members of the Official Opposition are not in a position to lecture us because, in 1980, they did make some promises which led to the defeat of the Government. It cost \$105 million to defeat the Government in 1980—they campaigned against a proposed increase in the price of gasoline, yet less than six months later they raised the price by 65 cents. With respect to promises, Members of the Opposition are ill-advised indeed to lecture us. We keep our promises. We said that widows and widowers aged 60 to 65 would get the allowance, and get it they will. As to the Hon. Member who is concerned about women of 62, he should remember that if his Government had been elected, only women of 60 and men of 64 would have received the allowance, so his three ladies would have ended up with nothing, whereas now at least one of the three will get something. It is sheer demagoguery on your part to harass the Government this way and to make that kind of comments. Instead of sleeping in your seats when you were in office between 1980 and 1984, you should have been wide awake to apply the virtuous principles you are advocating today.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Questions and comments. The Hon. Member for Montreal-Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart).

Mr. Malépart: As a follow-up to the comments made by my colleague, and in reply to the last speaker. I think he has just shown his complete ignorance of this issue. If he had read the speech of his Minister, he would have noted . . . I would like my colleague to tell me—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): The Hon. Member for Gatineau (Mrs. Maily) on a point of order.

Mrs. Maily: Mr. Speaker, I believe that, according to our rules, a Member should not comment on what another Member has said about a speech. I think that the Hon.