

the word "immediately". I took it the bill would be tabled today or tomorrow.

The government House leader has since sent word to me that the bill has not been finally drafted and, therefore, it will be a few days before it is presented. I am not complaining about that. In fact I welcome the fact that there are those few days. I hope that in those few days the government will consider a point some of us have made a number of times.

I understand that the proposed bill is to include what was promised in the Speech from the Throne, namely, a pension under the Old Age Security Act for a person between the ages of 60 and 65, if that person is the spouse of a person who is already 65 or over and hence receiving the pension, the whole arrangement to be subject to an income test. However, it is quite clear from what has been indicated to us thus far that the only persons between 60 and 65 who will be able to get a pension under this proposed amendment are those who are spouses.

I plead once again the case of single persons, spinsters or bachelors. Likewise, I plead the case of widows and widowers. To offer to pay a pension to persons between 60 and 65 who happen to have a spouse, but not to pay that pension to a person in that same age bracket who does not have a spouse is a case of unfair discrimination. It will lead to endless trouble and difficulty. There will be women or men of a certain age getting a pension. Others of the same age who are out of the labour market and who are in need will not get it.

My grievance is that thus far the government does not appear to have paid attention to our pleas in this connection. I urgently plead with the government. I am glad to see the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde) here at this time. He is back from the same committee I was attending earlier. I plead that, between now and the filing of that bill, it be made a pension at age 60 for all those out of the labour market, not just for those few who happen to be spouses of pensioners.

I hope, too, that the question of an income test will be reconsidered. In other words, in the two or three days that are yet to elapse before the bill is introduced, I hope it will be improved along the lines that some of us have been arguing for a long time.

[Translation]

**Mr. Lalonde:** The hon. member once more returns to a theme he has already dealt with a number of times previously. This government went to the electorate a year ago and made commitments to the electorate. One of these commitments is specific: we will help spouses in cases where both pensioners would be forced to live on one pension. We said we would solve the problem; we were committed in the Speech from the throne to introduce a bill effective October 1st 1975. That bill will be introduced during the coming days and I hope, with the cooperation of this House, that it will be in force on October 1st 1975.

I repeat that we have a commitment to the electorate. This government was reelected, it honors its commitment to the electorate, and the bill to be introduced will meet that commitment.

As regards "the few" referred to by the hon. member, may I remind him that they number approximately 83,000

### Adjournment Debate

in Canada. May I state once more that with this legislation, we wish to help couples where one of the spouses is over 65 and both have to live on one pension. The aim is not to solve the problems of widows or single people. That is another problem altogether. I said previously it should be solved through an overall guaranteed income program, and not through pension plan extensions. Because the problem of widows aged 60 to 65, although serious, is no more so generally than that of widows aged 55 to 60. The latter also need help.

As regards allegations of discrimination referred to by the hon. member, this argument is only intended to confuse matters and repeat the hon. member's old stories on this issue. Many people over 65 who do not receive, for various reasons, and particularly for reasons of residency, neither the old age security pension nor the guaranteed income supplement. There are now people over 65 who do not receive the old age pension. Therefore, when this bill is passed, there will be people between 60 and 65 who will not receive the special benefits provided for spouses. This bill aims at solving a specific, serious and grave problem which, as I said earlier, affects over 80,000 Canadian citizens; but we do not pretend to be able to solve all the problems at once. Other problems mentioned by the hon. member will be solved generally through a guaranteed income program.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the bill which will be introduced in the House will be in accordance with the commitment of this government, and this government will continue to meet its commitments to the voters.

---

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

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

● (2200)

[English]

SUPPLY AND SERVICES—POLICY OF DEPARTMENT IN  
AWARDING CONTRACTS—REASON FOR AWARDING CONTRACT  
FOR SURVEYING ON WEST COAST TO TORONTO COMPANY

**Mr. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South):** Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week, as recorded at page 5908 of *Hansard* I addressed a question to the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Goyer) with respect to a contract for survey work on the west coast of British Columbia.

After the question had been asked—and the minister obviously had no knowledge of the particular contract I had in mind—I notified the minister of the contract number. Tonight, for the purposes of the House I can say the contract concerns a second order triangulation trilateration survey over the Queen Charlotte Islands, west coast of B.C., south to the northern end of Vancouver Island. As far as I know this is the first contract for a survey of this type which has been awarded by the federal government in 30 years.