

Adjournment Debate

society is difficult to achieve, and we all know that dream solutions can rarely be easily adapted to economic constraints. While this may sadden us, it is useless to ignore the gap there generally is between what is desirable and what is possible. It is unfortunately when they must be translated into available dollars that wishes become utopias. All those who have been part of a Government are certainly aware of this fact, otherwise, how could we explain the fact that all assistance programs are not yet perfect?

Should we once again remind the Hon. Member for Montreal—Sainte-Marie of what the spouse's allowance program was like before we made this improvement which he keeps questioning? Can the Hon. Member sincerely deny that there has been an improvement for all new beneficiaries? Could he convince these people who are now eligible for a minimum income to which they were not entitled before that the Government was wrong? And that it should not have helped them because it could not help all the others as well?

This argument does not make sense and we can understand why. It is sad enough not to be able to help all needy people without being cruel to the point of denying assistance to those whom we can help.

There was nothing arbitrary about our decision to give special assistance to widows and widowers aged 60 to 64. We simply followed the recommendation made in 1963 by the parliamentary task force on pension reform on which all Parties were represented.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I cannot contribute to this debate as much as I should like to, but I can assure you that the only way to succeed, sometimes, is to proceed step by step, and that is what we have done and will continue to do.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 11.00 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 3(1).

The House adjourned at 6.42 p.m.
