

Committee on the Status of Women, contributes a great deal to the work of our committee.

Coming from Newfoundland and having been a member of Parliament for ten years, I can understand her concern for those three women, all aged 62, who fall into different categories. I am sure that, if she were to visit Newfoundland, she would encounter many women in that unfortunate position. However, these women could not be included because of the problem of financing. This problem has existed over the years not only for the present government but for other governments.

I have appealed on many occasions to governments to include those 80,000 people who are not now included and who should be.

Senator Flynn: Is it only women or both men and women?

Senator Marshall: Single men and women.

Senator Flynn: They want to lower the age to 60?

Senator Marshall: It is hoped that, with a better economy, more people can be included, including those Senator Marsden and I wish were included.

Senator Bonnell, who, unfortunately, is not here today, asked several questions to which I now have answers. He asked, out of an estimated \$50 million in War Veterans Allowance and Civilian War Allowance benefits, how much would be saved as a result of this amendment. In regard to this figure of \$50 million, he asked how it would be distributed by province. The response is that an estimated savings to the Department of Veterans Affairs would be of the order of \$54 million in 1985-86 and \$64 million in 1986-87. The estimated distribution of possible savings by province is not available.

However, I would like to make an observation on that question, which has to do with the fact that the war veteran who is entitled to War Veterans Allowance at the age of 60 is much better off on War Veterans Allowance because of the other benefits he gets that the OAS citizen does not. As an example, he is allowed to earn an extra \$4,200 per year and is entitled to all of his drug benefits. This question would not apply because I do not think it would be beneficial for any widower, who qualifies after age 60, to go on the OAS or GIS when he is better off with WVA.

Another question asked by Senator Bonnell referred to how many of the new 85,000 spouse's allowance beneficiaries will be in receipt of Canada Pension Plan benefits. The answer is that it is estimated that approximately two-thirds of the 85,000 new spouse's allowance beneficiaries are in receipt of a surviving spouse's benefit under the Canada Pension Plan or the Quebec Pension Plan.

He also asked how much the provinces would save as a result of this amendment. Under the CAP, the federal government shares with the provinces the cost of financial assistance and social services provided to persons in need. Federal and provincial costs, under the Canada Assistance Plan, may decrease as much as \$30 million.

His last question was: How will the 85,000 spouse's allowance beneficiaries be distributed by province? Based on the

current distribution of spouse's allowance beneficiaries, the response is as follows: Newfoundland, 3,200; Prince Edward Island, 800; Nova Scotia, 4,500; New Brunswick, 3,900; Quebec, 26,000; Ontario, 24,000; Manitoba, 4,200; Saskatchewan, 3,900; Alberta, 5,400; British Columbia, 8,800; Yukon, 100; and Northwest Territories, 200.

Honourable senators, I thank both Senator Marsden and Senator Bonnell for their interest and for their input regarding this bill.

I believe we should now be prepared to complete the debate and pass this bill because of the need to pass on its benefits to those who will qualify.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Honourable senators, when shall this bill be read the third time?

On motion of Senator Doody, bill placed on the Orders of the Day for third reading at the next sitting of the Senate.

● (1630)

FISHERIES ACT

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING

Hon. Jack Marshall moved the second reading of Bill C-32, to amend the Fisheries Act.

He said: Honourable senators, I am pleased to move the second reading of Bill C-32, which proposes a number of very necessary changes to the Fisheries Act, one of Canada's oldest acts, extending back to the early days of Confederation.

Bill C-32, as most honourable senators will be aware, was the subject of many hours of debate in the other place over a period of nearly four months. It was the subject of a very extensive debate at the second reading stage and underwent even more intensive scrutiny during committee discussion, with one marathon session lasting right through the night. This bill was also discussed during seven days of hearings by the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry of the House of Commons in the course of visits by that committee to various communities on the west coast. And, of course, the bill has already undergone pre-study by the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry.

The amendments proposed to the Fisheries Act in Bill C-32 are essential to the effective management of Canada's fisheries. Recent court decisions have called into question the government's traditional power of allocating fish to particular users so as to protect their supply. These amendments reaffirm this management authority for the immediate future and otherwise clarify the scope and intent of the act.

The amendments also refine the federal government's management practices. They will give fisheries officers more flexibility to make on-the-spot openings or closures, in response to local conditions. In another important change, the amendments recognize the role in fisheries management of consultation with user groups.

And finally, honourable senators—and this is a revelation which arose yesterday—we are being asked to approve these