

This goes back to 1962, Mr. Speaker. The government has been in power since January, 1963. It has had lots of time and its ministers are supposed to be such a brilliant group of administrators, so why has nothing been done about this?

The report goes on:

The department is engaged in a continuing effort to improve its information control system and to upgrade the quality of data supplied. The audit office is co-operating with the department in monitoring the effect of any changes that are made.

You can see that they simply have not been tackling any of the recommendations in the Auditor General's reports. The only reason they are getting around to doing something about it now is the old Liberal camouflage—because the Gallup polls are down.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. McKenzie:** I saw a perfect example of this last night.

**Some hon. Members:** Order, order!

**Mr. McKenzie:** Mr. Speaker, you are losing control of the House. I am on the floor.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** Order, please. I would refer hon. members to Standing Order 35 which reads as follows:

No member shall speak disrespectfully of Her Majesty, nor of any of the Royal Family, nor of His Excellency or the person administering the Government of Canada; nor use offensive words against either House, or against any Member thereof. No Member may reflect upon any vote of the House, except for the purpose of moving that such vote be rescinded.

I would suggest to the hon. member that he is skating a very thin line.

**Mr. McKenzie:** Mr. Speaker, I am only quoting from the Auditor General's report, and I should like to quote some very recent statements made by the Prime Minister outside this House. He said that in the last federal election they lied to the Canadian people. He made that statement in Saint John, and recently in Montreal he said "Sure, we blundered." I am just quoting from the Auditor General and statements made by the Prime Minister outside the House.

Before ten o'clock I should like to give an example of what is happening within the Liberal party. The Retail Merchants Association of Canada invited a number of members of parliament to a reception last evening after their annual meeting here in Ottawa. Over the last four years when any organization of this size sent invitations to members of parliament they were only accepted by Conservatives. Last night, however, at this meeting six Liberals showed up—a cabinet minister, four parliamentary secretaries, and a backbencher. It just floored me when this group showed up, and besides they read out a speech from the Prime Minister saying what a wonderful bunch of people is the Retail Merchants Association of Canada. The word is out from the Prime Minister and the cabinet, Mr. Speaker, to all the boys and departments that when they get such invitations they had better show up.

### *Adjournment Debate*

At the meeting I explained that it was something unique for a group of Liberals to show up. From now on we will be watching, and the Liberals will be showing up at these little receptions. This is how devious they are. May I call it ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker? I will continue tomorrow afternoon.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

### CANADA PENSION PLAN—PROPOSED EXTENSION OF COVERAGE TO ALL HOMEMAKER SPOUSES

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday as recorded in *Hansard* at page 1224, I put a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) regarding the government's proposed amendments to the Canada Pension Plan. I prefaced my question with a reference to the spouse's allowance. In doing so I expressed the hope that the government would not make a mistake in its amendments to the Canada Pension Plan similar to the mistake it made when it brought in the spouse's allowance.

What I had in mind in making that preface was that the spouse's allowance has proved to be a matter of great disappointment to many Canadians because it provides pensions to persons between 60 and 65 years of age—true, on a means test—but only to persons who are married and living with a spouse of pensionable age. The result is that a great many persons in the age bracket between 60 and 65, spinsters, widows, bachelors and widowers, are left out. That is the mistake I had in mind in the opening words I used in my question yesterday.

My concern is that when one amendment in particular is brought in to the Canada Pension Plan, a similar mistake is going to be made in that a great many persons will be left out. I know that the government plans to introduce two types of amendments to the Canada Pension Plan affecting women in particular. I am not taking time this evening to discuss the one which has to do with the splitting of benefits in the case of marital breakdown. Rather I am discussing the proposal for giving some benefit to married women who stay at home for a while to raise their children. This has led to the notion, and the impression was actually created by the Minister of State for Fitness and Amateur Sport (Mrs. Campagnolo) in her speech of October 14, that something generous is to be done in response to urgings that greater benefits should be provided for housewives or homemaker spouses, as we prefer to call them, under the Canada Pension Plan.