

son). For example, a man who is 65 or older and who is married to a woman who is considerably younger could have several young dependent children and might well need extra assistance. Therefore, if he loses his source of income from his work by being pensioned off at 65, and if his wife is much younger, his income may take a drastic slump. In such circumstances this motion would have great merit. However, I think it is inadequate in certain respects.

If the motion were tightened up and made more realistic, I would support it, Mr. Speaker. Therefore, I present two suggestions to improve it. The first is simply that the motion ought to be acted upon provided the spouse of the pensioner will have reached the age of 55 years and, in addition, provided that the first partner of a marriage to become a recipient of old age security will have been—this is the crucial point—the principal wage earner of the home over the five-year period immediately preceding. This would require a spouse to apply and that a family is in a position where both partners are forced to live on the income of one of them, all of which assumes—

Old Age Security Act

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Order. The hour set aside for consideration of private members' business has now expired. As it is five o'clock, this House stands adjourned until Monday at 2 p.m.

[*English*]

Because Sunday is Mother's Day I thought the following lines might be a gentle reminder:

They say that man is mighty
He governs land and sea,
He wields a mighty sceptre
O'er lesser powers that be
But a sovereign—gentler, mightier,
Man from his throne has hurled—
For the hand that rocks the cradle
Is the hand that rules the world.

Mother or ruler, no one can take her place. She is our provider of life and love. Thanks a million, mothers! God bless you and make us worthy sons.

At five o'clock the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.