

the hon. member for Saskatoon as the "MacEachen test". I hope the minister will give some consideration to that suggestion in order that we can be helped out of the dilemma with which we are now faced as to whether or not this measure involves a means or a needs test.

I should like to refer to two other points regarding the measure we have before us. I have tried to refer to the universality aspect, and I see no moral basis whatever for the exclusion of certain people. There is no economic reason why these people should not be included. Indeed, the money that would be paid would be money paid in by those people. We would not be giving them something for nothing, but something to which they indeed have a right.

Let me now move to this one final observation. Now that we have reached this stage of social welfare, I am wondering whether or not the government will give some consideration to the appointment of a welfare council to look into all welfare programs that touch upon the spectrum of the social needs of our people.

● (5:50 p.m.)

I ask whether the government should not consider the feasibility of bringing all these things together for administrative purposes, for a better determination of the economic principles involved in each of them and to better determine the most equitable distribution of our national wealth in the areas where need is the criterion. I ask the government whether this is not the time to give active, very serious consideration to this type of proposal that has been made many times in the past and dismissed because it was felt it was perhaps easier to administer the various acts under the federal and provincial departments.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I reiterate that we have not felt in the past, and do not feel today, that there is any need for any kind of test. It does not matter what you call it; it is still a determination of income upon which will be based the decision of whether supplementary benefits will flow to our aged. Also, the \$100 payment is not beyond the economic capability of Canada today; the government could accommodate this payment. Finally, I draw attention to the discrimination that continues in the denial of this benefit to thousands of Canadians, and also the discrimination that arises with respect to the ability of some provinces, such as the province of Nova Scotia, to maintain the same standards that

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

are achievable economically by the provinces of Ontario, Quebec, British Columbia, Saskatchewan and others.

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe East): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Before the hon. member for Simcoe East (Mr. Rynard) proceeds with his remarks perhaps he would permit me to read the adjournment proceedings for this evening.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED UNDER ADJOURNMENT MOTION

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to provisional standing order 39A, to inform the house that the questions to be raised at the time of adjournment tonight are as follows: the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond (Mr. Prittie), Canada Elections Act—reappointment of experienced returning officers; the hon. member for Queens (Mr. Macquarrie), National Parks—Prince Edward Island—location of new parks; the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. McCleave), news report—naval intelligence investigation.

Mr. Starr: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, before the hon. member for Simcoe East (Mr. Rynard) continues his remarks I wonder whether it would be agreeable if we adjourned for an hour for dinner.

Mr. McIlraith: That would be quite agreeable, Mr. Speaker; but in view of the hope of many hon. members to get a Christmas recess as quickly as possible I ask the house to consider sitting an extra hour after ten o'clock if we have not finished second reading of this bill by that time. If we have not completed the second reading stage by ten o'clock, is this suggestion agreeable to the house?

Mr. Starr: I do not think that, without the proper consultation, the house is able to commit itself at this moment that we would complete second reading of the bill if we sat an extra hour. I think that is asking too much.

Mr. McIlraith: I did not put it that way.

Mr. Starr: Then, there would be no point in our sitting an extra hour.

Mr. McIlraith: I meant that if we had not completed the second reading stage by ten o'clock we perhaps could sit an extra hour in order to accommodate hon. members who wish