

ness or health, even when they have the chance to retire on a large pension they do not wish to do so. A sheltered job certainly has a great advantage, but the worker in the plant has no such thing. His job at all times is precarious. In my time in business I have seen that statement borne out many times. In addition to that, as everyone knows, in its draft conventions the international labour office stated that the age limit for drawing old age pensions should be not over sixty-five.

Then, as was mentioned this afternoon by the hon. member for Grey-Bruce (Miss Macphail), there are many who are badly crippled in one way or another. At the moment I have in mind a man sixty-three years of age, who is looking forward to his seventieth birthday so that he may draw an old age pension. Through spinal meningitis or some other disease of that kind he became a terrible cripple when he was a boy, and since that time he has been unable to stand up. During all his lifetime he has had to walk on his hands and knees. That is only one example of cripples of one kind or another who would welcome the reduction of the old age pension age limit from seventy to sixty-five years.

We have the examples set by other nations, to which reference has been made by previous speakers. The United States measure of 1935 was a federal one. The federal act was adopted because prior to that year the states had adopted old age pension acts which were somewhat different in each state. To ensure uniformity, in 1935 the federal government passed the federal measure by which they granted, to each state adopting the federal measure, fifty per cent of the cost of operation.

It has been stated that there is a contributory scheme in the United States but, although I have read the act carefully, I cannot find it that way. However, that may be the case. The federal government pays fifty per cent of all operating costs, and the states are supposed to raise the rest of the money. Perhaps hon. members would understand the situation better if I were to read section 124-a of the laws of New York, as published in 1936. This New York State act is copied from the federal act, and reads:

124-a. To whom old age assistance is to be given. Old age assistance shall be given under this article to any person who

(1) Shall have attained the age of 65 years.

The age of sixty-five is, as far as I know, the age limit under all state acts. I believe nearly every state of the union has adopted that age limit. To continue:

(2) Is unable to support himself, either in whole or in part; and has no children or other person able to support him—

I am convinced that that is an important point. If children in Canada can support their parents, without hardship to themselves, they should be compelled to do so. Pension acts were never intended to support parents of men who have ample means to take care of their parents. Then:

(3) Is a citizen of the United States;

Then, paragraph 4 is different from the provision in Canada. It reads:

(4) Has resided in the state of New York for at least five years during the nine years immediately preceding his application for old age assistance.

In other words, as I understand legislation in the United States, any United States citizen of nine years standing is eligible to draw an old age pension in that country. In Canada the period is twenty years, a provision about which I shall speak in a short time. Then:

(5) Has resided in and been an inhabitant of the state for at least one year immediately preceding the date of application.

With respect to the provision that a man or woman must be a United States citizen for at least nine years, let me point out that the British act states that a British subject residing in Great Britain for twelve years will be eligible to draw old age pension. I know many old country people and people from Newfoundland, a British possession, who have been residing in Canada for longer periods of time, but who do not receive the benefit of old age pensions. I have two old people in mind, one of whom has been here fifteen years and the other eighteen years, and both of whom are more than seventy years of age. Under our system, notwithstanding their great age these old people—and they are only two among many—are denied the benefits of old age pension. That is one matter I would urge the government to consider when it has amendments to the act before it. I should like to see this consideration given to people of British citizenship—and I use that expression only because similar stipulations were made in the English and United States acts—when the government is considering lowering the residence provision. Probably the government would consider reducing the residence period by two or three years, so that the period might be brought down to around fifteen years, and would thereby be made to conform more with the British and United States acts.

As the mover of the resolution has said, in nearly every country of the world where old age pension laws exist, the age limit is sixty-five years. We realize that the English measure