

aside a few thousand dollars. Today, they are being penalized for their thrift.

This man invested his savings through a bank, in bonds and shares in companies. He therefore receives interest or dividends on his investments. He has to pay income tax on this income. Furthermore, he and his wife are denied the supplement to which others will be entitled and which, under the new legislation, would amount to some \$1600 a year for the two of them.

Mr. Speaker, the government penalizes those who save money during their lifetime and takes possession of those savings.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this is an injustice for these persons, and this is why we ask that this pension be granted to any person aged 60 or more, without discrimination.

The same situation exists in the case of people aged 65 or more who want to keep on working. For instance, one individual in my riding had a contract for the distribution of mail. After I had considered his case with him, he found out that he was working for nothing, that is, the guaranteed income supplement that he and his wife were losing was roughly equivalent to the amount that he would have earned distributing mail for 52 weeks. Once again, Mr. Speaker, this is unfair for an individual who wants to serve his country.

I think that Canada can and must grant our senior citizens a decent pension enabling them to live as they wish, to keep on being happy as they wish and they must not be deprived of this.

Lastly, the chairman of the Canadian Pacific, Mr. Crump, has retired. I assume that after spending more than 50 years with this company, including more than 20 years as chairman, Mr. Crump does not have to worry about his financial status or his leisure. However, Mr. Speaker, there are not very many Canadians in the same situation as the chairman of the Canadian Pacific. Most

Old Age Security Act

people have been taxed during most of their working years and reach retirement age with no income, except for a few of them. And when they do get some income, when they have saved something, they are penalized one way or the other.

This situation must cease as quickly as possible, and this is why we have introduced these amendments which have been rejected. I think that the people of Canada will accept these amendments in approximately two months from now.

[English]

Mr. Baldwin: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I see the time is rapidly approaching 6.30, which was the magic hour; I do not think we can really complete this business tonight. I have had discussions with hon. members in other parties and we are agreeable, if the House wishes, to an order of the House being made now, which would provide that all questions be put to dispose of the third reading tomorrow after not more than one hour of debate.

Mr. MacEachen: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Is that agreed?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Although we would still be prepared to continue to sit and finish this bill tonight, if that is not possible we are prepared to agree to this order being made. I would hope that in the hour's debate tomorrow I might get five or seven minutes.

Some hon. Members: Me, too.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger): It being past six o'clock the House will adjourn until tomorrow at 2 o'clock p.m.

It being twenty-eight minutes after six o'clock the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.