

\$100 a month would have lost their children's respect. They were laughing at us, the Creditists, we were crazy.

Mr. Chairman, today the Liberals are introducing a resolution increasing that pension to \$179.16.

Mr. Chairman, this will be reported in *Hansard* tomorrow. In 1973, that is 11 years later, the Liberals have become \$77.16 a month crazier than they were in 1962.

We are asking a \$200 monthly pension at 60 years of age because at 60 a man or a woman can no longer find employment. We all know that. At the present time we see a pensioner of 65 with a wife aged 61 trying to make both ends meet with \$150 or \$160 a month. If the mother asks for assistance, she is told: "You should apply for public welfare".

I have seen cheques of \$1 a month addressed to a 61 year old mother of a family, as adjustment payment on a pension of \$160. That made a total of \$161. The social welfare added a dollar to get this total of \$161.

Mr. Chairman, there are women of 55 or 60, mothers of families in Hull and Ottawa who have to scrub floors at night in public buildings, even in Parliament buildings, because they don't have a pension that would enable them to live decently. If only they could have a pension at the same time as their husband.

Mr. Chairman, some young men would cheerfully do this type of work without much effort and they would be happy to have something to do. But no, women of 55 or 60, mothers of large families are compelled to work hard all their life, scrubbing floors in public buildings.

**An hon. Member:** And when they do, their husband's pension is reduced.

**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):** That is true, Mr. Chairman. If they work at night scrubbing floors, the husband who is 65 years old has his pension reduced and is told: You are receiving another income.

Mr. Chairman, another hon. member had something to say yesterday. It is the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Wagner), a former Liberal. He nearly became a Créditiste but is now a Progressive Conservative. As we may read on page 6270 of yesterday's *Hansard*, he said and I quote:

In any case, Mr. Speaker, this bill pertains only to those 65 and over. In support in that regard of my colleagues of the Social Credit I ask the government in the expectancy of a guaranteed minimum income for all, to refer to the committee of the House that whole question of the 60 and 65 year olds. Is this financially possible? What are the true objections? What are the statistics concerning this? How can this be interpreted in the various areas of this country? What decisions should be taken and can the budget warrant such a decision?

● (1650)

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Wagner) should have said: I support the request of the Créditistes, instead of: With the support of my colleagues of the Social Credit, I ask—

The hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe never asks anything with our support! And this is so true that he voted against the amendments we moved. It is so true Mr. Chairman, that his own leader—

**An hon. Member:** Which one?

### Old Age Security

**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):** The hon. Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) has never talked yet of paying the old security pension at 60. He was asked about it in western Canada and he said: I will consider the matter. As he is not quick, he will not be quick about it.

Mr. Chairman, one must be honest, after all. Some Progressive Conservatives say one thing, others say the opposite, they do not agree, they are afraid to take position. The hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe mentions the matter because he heard me speak about it in his riding. It seemed to register and he said to himself: In that case, I shall bring up the matter. However, when he proposes the payment of a monthly pension of \$200 at 60, as we are urging, he cannot get the support of his own leader. So, I call them jokers, hypocrits. It is as clear as that.

The New Democratic voted against our proposals and they said today: We are the ones who asked for higher old age pensions. Liars! They voted against our motions to this effect and the people of Canada know that the Créditistes are the first to have called for the payment of a monthly pension of \$200, \$350 for a couple, throughout Canada.

**An hon. Member:** At 60, and you support this?

**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):** At 60! It is true, Mr. Chairman. I must give his due to the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) who supported our motions, and now—

**Mr. Olivier:** He will support anything!

**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):** The hon. member for Longueuil (Mr. Olivier), where is he? I do not see him.

**An hon. Member:** He never proposes anything.

**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):** That is true. The hon. member for Joliette cannot support the hon. member for Longueuil since he never proposes anything.

Mr. Chairman, some people say that the hon. member for Joliette will become a Créditiste. I urge him to do so. As for me, I was a Liberal at one time, like those I see before me. Then, when I had enough, I at least had the heart to dump the Liberal party and go elsewhere. At that time, I became a Créditiste. I was fooled for a while, but I was not fooled all of the time. According to an old saying: "You can fool all the people some of the time, and some of the people all the time, but you can not fool all the people all of the time." This is not true!

**Mr. Godin:** Mackenzie King used to say that!

**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):** You are right. It was the leader of the Liberal party, the Right Hon. William Lyon MacKenzie King, the father in spirit of all those before me, who used to say that. We should say the same thing. In any event—

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** He was a bachelor.

**Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue):** The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) tells me that he was a bachelor. He would still receive a pension of \$179.16 a month under the new legislation.