

and worked very hard for 30 or 40 years, maybe as a labourer, one should be able to retire. Therefore, those people should enjoy full retirement benefits and not get, as it is the case now, one third or one half of their pension if they retire before the compulsory limit of 65 years of age.

Retirement and sufficient income for people who would choose early retirement are all matters that need to be examined.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I commend the Hon. Member for his deep generosity, but I would like to hear from him a real commitment to participating in any review on compulsory retirement for Canadians. I suggest that he considers the means to provide sufficient income for senior citizens so that they become more financially independent than they are now. In the past, 35 workers supported one individual unable to work. Today, that equation is three workers for each individual who is either too young, too old, handicapped or too ill to work. And according to statistics, that proportion could fall to one worker having to support one other person unable to work. Perspectives in that area are such that one must obviously encourage and help Canadians to secure now income for their old days so they could lead an independent life without being a burden for the government.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for this opportunity to speak on that subject.

Mr. Raymond Garneau (Laval-des-Rapides): As my colleague from Montreal-Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart) stressed at the outset of his remarks, Mr. Speaker, we did not plan to put up more speakers on this motion simply to see what approach the Progressive Conservative Government would take on such an important motion concerning 80,000 needy Canadian citizens who are either divorced or separated and who will be subject to discrimination with respect to the way the spouse's allowance is granted.

Mr. Speaker, having listened to the Hon. Member for Gaspé (Mr. Marin), the Hon. Member for Beauharnois-Salaberry (Mr. Hudon), the Hon. Member for Nipissing (Mr. Mantha), and the Hon. Member who has just resumed her seat—

An Hon. Member: The Member for Gatineau.

Mr. Garneau: The Hon. Member for Gatineau (Mrs. Maily). It was a brilliant idea to introduce this motion, because we have just heard the most praiseworthy comments on policies adopted by the Liberals in the past fifteen years or so, particularly from the Hon. Member for Gaspé, the Hon. Member for Beauharnois and the Hon. Member for Nipissing. But if we analyze their speeches to praise the evolution of social measures which were implemented by the Liberal Party and by Liberal Governments, we come to the conclusion that the bottom line is just a question of money. We could come to an agreement if it is a question of money. What I am saying and what my colleague is saying is that we have to make a

Adjournment Debate

choice. We on this side do not understand, particularly the Hon. Member for Montreal-Sainte-Marie who has been interested in social issues for so many years and who, although not fully at ease in English, has received support from Halifax, Yellowknife, Saskatchewan and even from the Canadian Association of Gerontology where the Hon. Member for Gatineau will be having dinner this evening. He has received a lot of support. But all that is a question of choice.

I conclude my remarks because it is getting close to six o'clock. Notwithstanding the fact that the debt is huge, and we will get back to this issue later, the Progressive Conservative Government has decided to give away \$2.4 billion to the multinationals, not only once but year in and year out. And now, what do we hear from the Hon. Member for Gaspé, the Hon. Member for Gatineau, the Hon. Member for Nipissing, the Hon. Member for Salaberry-de-Valleyfield? We have no money! Multinational oil companies will get \$2.4 billion, and the government does not have the money to extend the spouses allowance to single or divorced people, as they did not have any money to improve equalization. They made a political choice. The hon. member for Gatineau who mumbles in her place should not tell us today that she has no money, that her government does not have any money, and that they blame us for the deficit when they give out \$2.4 billion. If they have money to reduce taxes for multinational oil companies they should have the money for needy divorced or single people.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hour provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired.

● (1800)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*Translation*]

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

HOUSING (A) DECISION TO CUT BUDGET FOR HOUSING RENOVATION PROGRAM. (B) REQUEST THAT GOVERNMENT GIVE SUPPLEMENTARY FUNDING

Mr. Jean-Claude Malépart (Montreal-Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, I should have chosen answer to a question other than the one I chose this evening because I would have been able to reply and to show how disappointed I am with my colleagues who spoke earlier. Let us now come back to the subject of housing.

An Hon. Member: Well, it is as bad!