

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: I think the minister should consult the law officers on the wording of the clause and report to-morrow.

Mr. HEENAN: I consulted the law officers and heard as many arguments about the different classes of widows as we have had discussed to-night, and ultimately the gentleman who drafted the bill decided to leave the clause in its usual form. We feel everything is covered.

Mr. STEVENS: I think a word or two would make it perfectly clear. This is a late hour to continue such an important subject.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 8 carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Subject to amendment.

Mr. MANION: That will only take a minute to-morrow when you have straightened it out.

Mr. CANNON: The clause could easily be amended on the third reading. It is a matter of very minor importance. Why hold up the clause? We have been discussing it practically all evening. I can assure my hon. friends that I will look into the matter, and if necessary I will bring in an amendment.

Section agreed to.

On section 9—Maximum pension \$240, etc.

Mr. IRVINE: Mr. Chairman, I am proposing an amendment to this section which I hope will be carried before it is ruled out of order. My amendment is:

That all the words after the word "interest" in the fifth line of subsection 2, be struck out.

I do not agree with the principle that the property of anyone who receives a pension shall vest in the pension authority after the pensioner's death. We give pensions to judges and to military men, but we do not think of selling their houses after they are dead and transferring the proceeds into the coffers of the state. As this is not a charity affair, as was emphasized by the minister to-night, I do not see the reason for this subsection.

Mr. ERNST: Subsection 2 apparently provides that where a person qualifies for a pension his real estate must be transferred to the pension authority before the pension can be received by him. If that is intended, I want to voice an emphatic protest against the subsection. In my constituency I know a large number of people who own small homes that will not yield an income of \$300,

perhaps not even \$100 a year. If they have to transfer their property to the pension authority they will be discriminated against in favour of those who live in idleness and have not accumulated anything. I see no reason why the industrious and thrifty person should have to transfer his property to the pension authority. This was one of the most viciously attacked provisions of the pension bill during the election, and on behalf of those in my constituency who would be affected by it I voice this protest, whether it will be accepted by the government or not.

Mr. COOTE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could not again appeal to the minister to allow the rest of this bill to stand over until to-morrow. There are still eleven sections to be considered. It is a very important bill. I think the minister will be well advised to postpone further discussion until to-morrow.

Mr. HEENAN: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that before we adjourn we dispose of half the twenty sections. In answer to my hon. friend, I may say that the purpose of the bill is to give old age pensions to certain classes of people. One of its provisions is that they must not be in receipt of \$365 a year. If living in his own home a pensioner might be better off financially than if in receipt of actual income. All that is intended is to equalize matters. When a pensioner dies the pension board will take over the property.

Mr. ERNST: That is just what I am protesting against, Mr. Chairman. Under subsection 3 of this section a debt due by the pensioner to the pension authority is simply a debt against his estate. In the other case the pension authority is a secured creditor of the real estate. Advantage is being taken of the fact that a person has real estate to appropriate it for the use of the pension authority.

Mr. CANNON: If my hon. friend will allow me, the principle underlying all these clauses is the same. Under clause 8 we say that if a person is receiving \$365 a year he will not be entitled to a pension. In clause 9 we allow an income of \$125, which with the pension of \$240 brings the total income up to \$365, the amount mentioned in the preceding clause. Would it be fair or just to lay that down as our guiding principle throughout the bill and then depart from it in this case? We cannot do so. What is fair in clause 8 is also fair in clause 9. I fully realize that it offers inconveniences. During the debate last year, I recollect distinctly, the leader of the opposition of the time pointed out