

pointed out that the first duty of a government is to see that each individual has the necessary means to live honestly and adequately. That is stipulated in the Bill of Rights which was introduced in 1960, and was included in the universal bill of rights discussed by UNESCO. But when this principle is ignored the government's objectives are wide of the mark and completely useless.

• (5:00 p.m.)

I do not agree with the suggestion made today by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Pickersgill), that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre was trying to be a politician when he moved his amendment. This was the interpretation I took from the words of the minister. If he has any corrections to make on that, he may get up and say so and I will gladly accept his version of it. That however is the understanding I had of his words. The Minister of Transport constantly suggests that such amendments are political, and that we act as politicians in bringing them in. Where does the category of statesmanship come in? For my part I think the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, when making this amendment yesterday and when speaking on his amendment, spoke like a statesman; he spoke honestly. If hon. members in this house will take the time to read his speech, I think they will recognize this, all the way from A to Z. He mentioned the Bill of Rights that was presented in this house in 1960. If there are any members who wish to say that that Bill of Rights has anything wrong with it, it is up to them to say so now. He was talking about principles; he was not talking of election platforms. I can remember what some of the members who are mumbling over there said during some of the recent election campaigns. I do not know whether or not they said the same things before, because I was not around then; but they made promises that they would implement an increase in the old age pension to \$125.

I heard these things in the 1963 campaign. They forgot about it between 1963 and 1965 and then remembered it in the 1965 campaign. The only difference in the two platforms was that a new hole was cut in the one in 1965, and that probably was because they lost some cabinet ministers in the shuffle. Then they forgot about it after 1965. It is funny how they can remember, and then forget again. I am not making a political

Business of the House

speech; I am a layman. God knows that sometimes the truth hurts; and if it hurts, fine, because I am going to speak the truth. I am sure the government does not want to pass a piece of legislation while members sit quietly and do not say a word about it, and then expect to finish the following night all the legislation they have on the order paper.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Perhaps this is a good time for the Chair to call it five o'clock.

Mr. Langlois (Mégantic): I started at five minutes to five, Mr. Speaker, and I will gladly sit down if I have assurance that I will be allowed to continue my speech.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. When the debate is resumed the Chair will permit the hon. member for Mégantic to finish his remarks.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, there has been some discussion on the point that tonight we might forgo the private members hour, and that rather than sit tomorrow night until ten o'clock, we sit tonight. It has been suggested that we adjourn tomorrow night at six o'clock instead of ten o'clock. Since this discussion, a suggestion has been made that tonight we might wish to rise for the dinner hour from six to seven, and then sit from seven until eleven so that there would be no loss of time. If this suggestion were followed, hon. members would be able to make their travel arrangements for tomorrow night after six o'clock.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask for a little clarification of this proposal. If we are to adjourn tomorrow night at six o'clock, then the presumption behind it is that there shall be no private members hour tomorrow. Am I correct?

Mr. McIlraith: I had not dealt with the point of private members hour tomorrow. If the hon. member has any views on this, I would be glad to hear them.

Mr. Howard: If we do adjourn at six o'clock tomorrow, there will be no private members hour; we cannot do anything about it and there is no disagreement on my part. It is agreeable, so long as the understanding is clear and it is made an order of the house.

Mr. Knowles: My colleague spoke about one aspect of the proposal with respect to the hours of sitting for today and tomorrow. As I under-