

the ceiling. I understand that in some provinces, like British Columbia and Alberta, where supplemental allowances are being paid, the ceiling does not apply.

Mr. ILSLEY: It is not regarded as income.

Mr. KNOWLES: According to the terms of an amendment made to the act.

Mr. ILSLEY: By reason of an order in council amending the regulations.

Mr. KNOWLES: Yes. We do not know what a province such as British Columbia may do under the new provisions. They may continue to pay the supplemental allowance of \$5, or they may allow this \$5 to take its place. Supposing British Columbia drops the \$5 it is now paying and takes this \$5 instead, a pensioner who is at present drawing the additional \$5 because the ceiling does not apply, will lose some of his income under the dominion arrangement. It is now possible for a pensioner in British Columbia to be drawing \$25 a month and have \$125 income additional.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. KNOWLES: But if British Columbia adopts the present legislation and pays the pensioner his \$25 on the basis of the announcement made by the minister this morning, the person who has \$125 other income because the ceiling would then apply would not be allowed to draw the full \$25; he would draw only \$20 a month, and in that way would be \$60 a year worse off than he is at the present time. That is a hypothetical case, but it is a possible case.

Mr. ILSLEY: I think that is correct, yes.

Mr. KNOWLES: I am asking that when the regulations are drawn up the minister will watch this kind of thing.

Mr. ILSLEY: I do not anticipate that British Columbia will drop this \$5 additional.

Mr. KNOWLES: I certainly hope not, and I hope Manitoba will not drop its \$1.25, but I trust the minister will watch this kind of thing. I should like now to refer to another matter. At the present time a pensioner who draws his pension from Manitoba but happens to be living in British Columbia does not get the supplemental \$1.25 from Manitoba, because he is not living there, or the supplemental \$5 from British Columbia, because he is not a British Columbia pensioner. Vice versa, the British Columbia pensioner living in Manitoba would get neither the \$1.25 nor the \$5. I realize that this is a matter of arrangement between the two provinces, but it also suggests what the hon. member for

Vancouver-Burrard was arguing, that it is desirable that there should be a federal policy with respect to the whole matter of old age pensions.

Since the order in council referred to this morning will involve dealing with the Old Age Pensions Act and the regulations, I urge the minister to give consideration, even at this time, to the regulation that requires twenty years' continuous residence in Canada. I have in mind one case of a man who came to this country from England in 1907 and has lived here the whole time except for four years which he spent in England. In 1926 he went to England for a holiday, but circumstances of health made it necessary for him to stay there longer than he had intended to. The result is that the date of his coming back to Canada is the date taken into consideration by the authorities, and he is not entitled to a pension although he is seventy-three years of age and has resided more than twenty years in the country and has lived his entire life either in England or Canada. This is a matter of regulation under the dominion act, and I should hope the minister would give attention to these matters when the order in council is being drawn up shortly as is intended.

I hope that consideration will also be given to deductions made from the \$20 and to the liens which are placed on the properties. To many people this is a source of irritation and in many cases has actually deterred people from applying for something which is their right. I hope the minister will give attention to these matters and that in the not too far distant future we shall see a higher rate of pension and a lower pensionable age.

Mr. MUTCH: For a considerable part of this session I have refrained from reiterating that which I have said before about the present standing of these pensions. On account of the pronouncement made this morning, I am concerned momentarily with the matter of age. It has been recognized by industry generally and by the government itself that sixty-five years is the nominal age of retirement. There is a hiatus between sixty-five and seventy years which falls less heavily upon some than on others. Since the minister is reopening the question and is probably going to deal with these matters by orders in council, I urge even at this late date that he gives some consideration to this aspect of the matter.

It is passing strange that any discussion of this question of old age pensions seems to turn into a political discussion, when to my mind it is the one subject that should not be political. On account of the general recognition