

Old Age Security Act

incorporation of Canadian family farms, and in view of the fact that the budget has provided no capital gains tax relief for this particular type of family farm, what steps has the minister taken to correct this inequality?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, in the first place, I do not agree with the premise of the question. I do not think there is the inequality that the hon. member says there is.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

OLD AGE SECURITY ACT

AMENDMENTS TO INCREASE BASIC PENSION AND TO CLARIFY BASE YEAR IN ESCALATION FORMULA

The House resumed, from Tuesday, March 27, consideration of the motion of Mr. Lalonde that Bill C-147, to amend the Old Age Security Act, be read the third time and do pass.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. I would invite hon. members who want to hold conversations to leave the chamber. The hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle).

[*Translation*]

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I should like to continue my remarks in the same vein as last night while overlooking, if possible, the jarring notes we heard towards the end of the sitting. May I point out to the House that my contribution is certainly not intended to waste the time of the House.

I believe that this law should take into account the importance of the problems, and I think it is normal and logical for any member to claim the maximum of services it can ensure to elderly people.

Therefore, if some people wanted to claim that yesterday some members tried to waste the time of the House, maybe they should think that other members or other political bodies have done the same in the past. A simple glance at *Hansard* for 1971-72, containing debates over Bill C-176, will reveal enough.

I say this without spite, Mr. Speaker, and further to what I said yesterday in the House I would like to add at once that I do not intend to repeat my arguments of yesterday about the age of eligibility for the old age security pension at age 60.

As I was saying when we adjourned, I intend to propose an amendment, and this is what I will do in a few moments.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to say why I shall introduce this amendment.

First, because I believe the legislation now before us is entirely inadequate since the proposed increase in the old age security pension does not even correspond to the

[Mr. Jarvis.]

increase in food prices which the aged had to face last year, not to mention the cost of housing and several other essential services.

Second, on behalf of thousands of Canadians, it is my duty to severely condemn this government for its refusal to grant the old age security pension at 60, at least to spread it over a five year period.

Finally, I could move my amendment as a last effort to enable the opposition parties to force the government to introduce a legislation which would significantly the rate of reduce unemployment in Canada.

Yesterday I spoke about the effects that old age pensions at 60 would have, as other hon. members have done for several years. It is important that the people of Canada know the attitude of hon. members on that issue. I would also like, with this amendment, to allow the opposition parties to make their attitude known to the people of Canada.

We know the position of this government. They will perhaps be content with saying that this bill contains a sufficient number of interesting proposals in view of the amounts of money required. The proposed increases are valid but do not go far enough for the reasons I gave a while ago.

What is the position of the Progressive Conservative party? I think my amendment will allow it to express its views freely on the possibility of greatly improving that bill. I know for sure that some Progressive Conservative members are in favour of old age pensions at 60. I see the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Wagner) who has already made his views known and I would like to say to him while he is here that I was very pleased to hear him advocate old age security at 60 during the election campaign. As far as I am concerned, I promised my electors that I would support the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe when the occasion would arise and I will do so with great pleasure at any time.

I indeed hope that my amendment will be put to the vote and thus enable us to know the NDP's position. We are aware of the respect they have always shown for the aged, and we know what principles they have always upheld in the House. So I consider that I am giving the New Democrats an excellent opportunity today to support their principles and to honour their commitments. If they should fail to do so today, I should be most surprised, although they have changed their mind on some principles since the start of the session; I leave it to the people to judge their sincerity on this, the sincerity of those who, not so long ago, were so bravely making lists of all the things we ought to do for people in this category.

As for the Social Credit Party, I shall not speak for long about their position, since I think they demonstrated it very brilliantly yesterday. In fact, everything points to their supporting old age pensions at 60.

• (1510)

In conclusion, I will repeat certain words that my liberal friends know very well: Together, we can do something for society. Are we going to let such an opportunity escape us? I hope not. I for one am convinced that the request that I submit to the minister in favour of paying