

Adjournment Debate

parliamentary task force on pension reform. It has not brought in the recommended \$102 per month increase in the guaranteed income supplement which was suggested. Instead, there will be a \$25 increase, on July 1, we hope, and another \$25, we hope, on December 1. We have, belatedly, half of what that all-Party task force recommended. By providing only half of what is necessary, this administration is failing to provide for the needs of those who fall into this category. We have also failed to address the problem of the near elderly, those between the ages of 60 and 65. In many ways, they are the most unfortunate of all. They, in particular, have fallen between the cracks.

There is no provision for those who were receiving spousal allowances and whose spouse died before the age of 65. All widowers and widows should be eligible for this kind of supplement between the ages of 60 and 65. I personally would favour the reduction of the qualifying age to 55.

Finally, in the last few moments left to me, I want to make a plea for the introduction of homemakers' pensions. Women who have remained in the home have made a substantial contribution to Canada throughout its history. Perhaps it is even more necessary now in times of economic restraint that we have such support within the home. Such women have earned the right to their own independent pensions and this is something which the House must address with great dispatch. Therefore, I strongly support the motion which calls upon the Government to change its priorities and to make the entire question of pension reform a matter of great urgency.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): Order, please! It being six o'clock, it is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 62(11), to advise the House that the proceedings on the motion have expired.

• (1800)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 45 deemed to have been moved.

POOLS—SPORTS POOL—PROVISION OF FUNDING FOR MEDICAL RESEARCH. (B) REQUEST FOR FIVE-YEAR FUNDING PLAN

Hon. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, on May 8, as recorded at pages 3503 and 3504 of *Hansard*, I asked the Minister of State for Fitness and Amateur Sport (Mr. Olivier) to indicate how much money medical research would be receiving from the sports pool.

When Bill C-95, the Bill which established the sports pool, came before the House, the Government knew it had a very

sticky wicket because it was trying to get back into the lottery business, the gaming business and the gambling business. At that time, the Government decided that it needed to put some moral ribbon around the issue. It decided it needed some justification for returning to the gambling business. In typical Liberal style, it came up with something which at the moment looked good, but which upon second thought was as empty as the promises that were made. The Government said that any profits from the sports pool would first go toward the federal Government's obligations to the Calgary Olympics which are to be held in 1988. It is interesting to note that when the Calgary Olympics committee made application to host those Winter games, the federal Government committed itself to an expenditure of \$200 million, but at no time did it say that that \$200 million was conditional upon a sports pool being established.

That was not a good enough reason to get into the gambling business once again so the Government came up with two other reasons which it thought were foolproof. It indicated that money from the sports pool would go to arts and culture groups, such as symphonies, which are always strapped for money. As well, the Government became even more moralistic and said that it would put money from the sports pool into medical research. That, Mr. Speaker, was the moral element of an immoral Act.

There has been much controversy raging over the sports pool in the last few weeks. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the provincial Governments have taken the federal Government to court. In some cases, provincial Governments have been unplugging computer terminals in stores which sell Loto 6/49 and the sports pool. A counter-action has been taken by the courts which in some cases have asked the provincial Governments to restore those terminals. Suffice it to say that the Government has always put forward the sports pool concept as being one which would make good things like medical research happen.

This week the President of the Medical Research Council appeared before the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs. At that time I asked him how much money the MRC had been promised by the Government for 1984-85 from profits from the sports pool. The answer was one which I expected, Mr. Speaker. He said that they had been promised nothing. Additionally, the MRC has a five-year plan, because in the field of medical research one needs forward planning. I then asked the President of the MRC how much money he will be getting from the sports pool for his next five-year plan. Again, the answer was interesting. He said that he is not counting on getting any money.

I thought that answer was valid until I asked the Minister of State for Fitness and Amateur Sport how much money would go to medical research. After all, Bill C-95 was passed by the Government, against the opposition of the other two Parties. I asked the Minister how much money would go to medical research for 1984-85 and for the five-year plan. The answer was very interesting. The Minister did not say none because he did not have the courage to say none. He might as well have said none because that is what his words meant. He said: "Oh,