

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It having been agreed that the house will sit beyond ten o'clock, I understand that the two bills which are to receive priority are those set out in order No. 93 and order No. 100 on today's order paper.

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It seems a little difficult to make an order on this, but I understand that if possible consideration will be given to orders numbered 79, 96, 104, 110 and 117.

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Knowles:** But it was decided that—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The government house leader also asked the consent of the house to sit beyond six o'clock tomorrow. Again, does the suggestion of the house leader that we sit beyond six o'clock tomorrow contain no time limit?

**Mr. McIlraith:** Until ten o'clock tomorrow night. From six until ten o'clock tomorrow night.

**Mr. Starr:** Or sooner.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** So that there will be no misunderstanding, may I go over the different points again. Following this discussion we will have third reading of Bill C-251. We will then discuss items 93 and 100 on today's order paper. If there is time remaining we will consider items 79, 96, 104, 110 and 117. The house will sit after ten o'clock this evening with no time limit specified. Tomorrow the house will sit from six o'clock to ten o'clock. Does the house agree that it be so ordered?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

#### OLD AGE SECURITY ACT AMENDMENT

##### PROVISION OF GUARANTEED INCOME SUPPLEMENTS AND DETERMINATION OF PENSIONERS' INCOMES

**Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare)** moved the third reading of Bill No. C-251, to amend the Old Age Security Act.

**Mr. Eric A. Winkler (Grey-Bruce):** Mr. Speaker, in order to conform to the geniality which exists I will be as brief as possible in making my point. First of all, I think I should bring to the attention of the house the fact that in the course of this session we have passed a very substantial amount of business

#### Old Age Security Act Amendment

and legislation. I understand we have dealt with 100 items, which is far in excess of the amount of work done in one or possibly two normal sessions. Be this as it may, and inasmuch as we are dealing with the supplementary payment to old age pensioners, I should like to say to the house and through the house to the country that it seems that quite a substantial number of senior citizens will benefit from this legislation, with which principle I heartily agree, but regrettably a good number of those who will benefit from it will be placed in a position of prejudice.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that if I thought for one moment the amendment would carry I would move that we stand this bill and return it to committee for the consideration of a flat payment to all recipients of old age security today. All these people have assisted in the growth of this country and we are now enjoying the fruits of their efforts. All these people have assisted in making a contribution to our society and our economic position in the world today. I think they should have the right to share in this. They unquestionably pay for this privilege because those who have the income or who have the money behind them are assessed accordingly. I feel it would not cost the taxpayers the money that this bill and the resultant mini-budget will cost the taxpayers of Canada.

I know this whole question has been discussed, but I think we should consider a few ways in which prejudice will take place. Since this legislation has been under consideration I have received calls from many people. In particular I should like to mention a few just to indicate what it will mean. A lady who has passed the age of 70 and is very adept in the art or craft of dressmaking probably makes \$40 or \$50 a month under present circumstances. Of course it will be to her advantage to stop doing the work she is doing. Then there is the elderly gentleman who finds it beneficial to do a job after he has reached age 70. Now he will say to himself that it is no longer right or good for him financially to do this, and he will quit. So, as has been said, in my humble opinion this legislation will be a detriment in these cases. These people are discriminated against and will be prejudiced as a result of this legislation. I have heard these people say that they are prepared to settle for less than \$30 a month provided it is on a flat rate basis. Surely the people who are concerned are the people who should know.

● (8:20 p.m.)

The government has taken the position that this is not the case. They have said no. It