

*Transport and Communications*

Unfortunately the figures for two important years, 1969 and 1970, are not yet available so I am not in a position to prove just what happened. I am sure the minister is aware, apart from any awkwardness in proving what the net income is, that there is not very much net income. We have today heard Dominion Bureau of Statistics' figures quoted which show that net income is down.

I listened very carefully to the minister this morning because I hoped that somewhere in his remarks on payments and stabilization of income he would talk about the relationship of income to cost. If he made any such comments, I did not hear them, so he must have said them very quietly or just thought them. Any discussion of agricultural income without a discussion of agricultural costs would be as ridiculous as it would be in regard to any other industry. Obviously, costs will increase. A royal commission has studied the cost of farm machinery. However, costs have increased so much that by the time we receive the commission's report the data will be "old hat." I suggest to the minister that any discussion that does not take costs into account is no good to the farmers and I hope the farmers in his constituency tell him so.

It is obvious that the stabilization plan will increase the costs. One per cent of \$15,000, on the basis of the old PFAA, was obviously \$150, but now at 2 per cent it is \$300. I use the figure of \$15,000 because it is the maximum allowed under the plan. I give the minister credit for accepting the principle of limitation of payment in respect of any one farmer. I think this is one of the problems in the United States with stabilization of income or agricultural subsidies—it has got out of hand. They would not have had as many complaints from taxpayers if they had accepted this principle and done something about it. I think there is a valid reason for doing this and I would be prepared to accept it. I will not argue whether \$960 is adequate, but if we are to subsidize anybody let it be these with the greatest need.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it four o'clock?

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, I should like the consent of the House to revert to motions so that I may move the reference of several reports to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard):** Does the minister have unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

---

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**
**TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS**
**REFERENCE OF ANNUAL REPORTS OF AIR CANADA AND  
CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS TO STANDING  
COMMITTEE**

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council)** moved:

That the Air Canada annual report, 1970, the Canadian National Railways annual report, 1970, and the auditor's report of the Canadian National Railways for the year ended December

[Mr. Thomson.]

31, 1970, be referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, we would be happy to agree to this motion. If the minister would like to add to it the annual report of the Canadian Pacific Railway and Canadian Pacific Airlines, we would agree to that as well.

Motion agreed to.

\* \* \*

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

**Mr. Bell:** Mr. Speaker, can the government House leader confirm the business for Monday?

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, I confirm that the business I announced shall continue, namely, agricultural stabilization, with the Wheat Board following. Tuesday and Wednesday are opposition days, and on Thursday there will be a debate on the reference to the special committee of matters relating to public order legislation.

[Translation]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard):** It being four o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's Order Paper, namely notices of motion.

---

• (4:00 p.m.)

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES OF  
MOTIONS**
**OLD AGE SECURITY ACT**
**PROPOSED SIMULTANEOUS PENSIONS FOR HUSBANDS  
AND WIVES**

**Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi)** moved:

That, in the opinion of the House, the government should consider the advisability of introducing a measure allowing the spouse of a person receiving a pension by virtue of the Old Age Security Act to be entitled at the same time as his partner to the pension even if his age is lower than the present act demands.

He said: Mr. Speaker, once again I am introducing this motion with the hope that ensuing discussions will bring this government to follow up on it with an amendment to the Old Age Security Act, in order to enable husbands and wives—generally, it is wives—to receive the pension at the same time even though both have not yet reached the age now set at 65.

During debates on a similar motion a few years ago, one member said that if no age limit was established for this pension, this could perhaps encourage some men to abuse, that is, they would marry younger women in order