

By the time this volume is completed at page 135 I did not have an answer and by the time I filed subsequent questions I still did not have my answer. Let me continue outlining my puzzlement. Mr. Campbell continued:

I do not know that I could give you a satisfactory answer, but I think perhaps it should be noted that this bill does not purport to control rates. It requires that they be exposed to public scrutiny but...

Then, I said:

Mr. McCleave: Well, then, perhaps this is in Mr. Henry's field since there was a study made, and presumably the study did dig into these rates and I think found out that they were the same though there was that 300-plus nautical mile difference, which would be more than a day's travel for, I suppose, most vessels.

Mr. Henry, who was the director of the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission and of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, came in with this answer:

Mr. Henry: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I do not have the answer with me on that. I will have to get it and refer it to the Committee.

Then, later, on May 14, Mr. Henry writes to the chairman of the committee and in this letter states in part the following:

I find that we have no information on the point and the question could not be answered without further research.

Then, he refers to the proceedings in which Mr. March made his submission. After Mr. March made his statement there were some questions, and Mr. Henry in his letter refers to the following statement by Mr. March:

I know quite well the Conferences have good reason for maintaining the rate to Halifax the same as it is to Montreal. For one thing it is historical. It has always been that way.

Then, he continues the quotation as follows:

The Chairman: Is there any other reason, Mr. March?

Mr. March: It is historical. There may be some good reason for doing it, I don't know. But I am afraid at this time, sir, all I can do is present the predicament to you objectively. I think the solution must come from the Conference.

Mr. Speaker, obviously, armed with the basic question and the type of answer one gets in looking into it, the matter is worthy of further examination which I propose to give at eight o'clock this evening.

Mr. Speaker: It being five o'clock the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business, namely, notices of motions and public bills.

## Old Age Security Pensions PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

### PENSIONS

#### MEASURES TO IMPROVE CONDITIONS FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

**Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey)** moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should give consideration to improving the economic and social status of Canada's senior citizens by (a) increasing the income tax exemption to \$2,000 for single persons and \$4,000 for couples (b) lowering the old age security pension age for women to 60 years (c) exempting old age security pension payments from taxable income (d) supplying the full cost of living increase bonus to old age security pensions and making this bonus effective immediately each time the cost of living index advances by 2% (e) restoring the \$500 a year income tax exemption for old age security pensioners at 65 years (f) giving the right to all pensioners receiving the Guaranteed Income Supplement to earn up to \$300 a year (g) continuing the pension for a period of six months, following the decease of an old age security pensioner, payable to the survivor (h) increasing the old age security pension to \$150 a month.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon a number of proposals were made to adjourn the House to discuss some matters of urgent and pressing national importance. For the reason Mr. Speaker gave at that time, these were not accepted. I wish to say that in my view the motion we are about to discuss is certainly one of urgent national and pressing importance. I put it forward in the way of a motion in the many parts Mr. Speaker read out so well in the hope that it would do something to meet the emergency of poverty which is engulfing many thousands of our older people. It is estimated, particularly in respect of those on the Old Age Security pension and the supplementary assistance allowance, that there are approximately 800,000 Canadians involved.

• (5:00 p.m.)

The situation in which those people found themselves last year was bad, but the situation in which they find themselves at this time is worse and is getting worse due, on the one hand, to the lessening of the purchasing power of the dollar through inflation and, on the other hand, to the failure of the government to act to increase their pensions. These people are now worse off than they were at the time when the supplementary assistance program was begun. By failing to act and to improve their pension base we are literally taking money out of their pockets at the rate of about \$10 a month, and we continue to do