

Council. The six labour members on that council did sign that report. It says that we must proceed over the next few years on the basis that increases in transfer payments should not exceed 11 per cent per year.

During the next election campaign, whenever it might be, I would, quite frankly, be sorry if a debate should take place on what has been done about pensions at age 60. I should hope that members of all parties would rather debate before the Canadian people what has been done for people in need in this country of all ages and in all categories.

This is a point I have been trying to impress upon various groups across this country and upon my colleagues in this House. The hon. member referred to people age 55 who feel not enough has been done for them and that they should be entitled to retire from the work force. I suggest

*Adjournment Debate*

that dropping pensions to age 60 will not answer the problems of those people. The hon. member refers to the spouse under age 65, but then we will have to consider the spouse under 60 and what we should do for her.

Let me repeat that what we must try to do is approach this question on a broader basis through income supplementation and guaranteed income, and in that way we can solve the problems of those age 60 and 65. Whether this is done through guaranteed income, through OAS-GIS payments or in other ways is, I submit, rather irrelevant to those people provided they get what is a fair deal in terms of guaranteed income or income supplementation. I think the suggestion that we should limit our attention to the idea of making pensions eligible to those at age 60, as if this were a panacea, will only create trouble and once more will represent a piecemeal approach.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.06 p.m.

---