

Mr. MacNICOL: I believe the hon. member, who just took his seat (Mr. Neill) referred to administration, and someone speaking earlier also said that there is a great deal of room for improvement in the administration of the act. I am convinced of that. There is a lot of chiselling in connection with this act. I might give two or three examples that I have come in contact with myself, and I have no doubt the number throughout Canada is legion. I have in mind an executive in a large manufacturing company who draws a large salary, but his mother, an aged widow, is an old age pensioner. If the act permits that, it is too bad. That certainly falls below what we should expect of Canadian citizenship.

Another instance I know quite well is that of a big merchant, whose mother and father are both on old age pension. One would think if that man had any pride in himself or in his country he would not permit that. Another instance I know, is that of a family in which there are three sons; they all belong to the professions and appear to be doing very well; they live in three fine houses, but their mother and father are also on old age pension. That is what I call chiselling. These are only examples of a large number. Any man in circumstances such as these who permits his parents to be on old age pension does not measure up to the standard a real Canadian should have. That is chiselling, and I am sure a great deal of money is wasted in this way.

Some hon. member said something about the Australian act. My memory is that in Australia the old age pension act covers everyone who reaches the statutory age, which I believe is sixty-five; but it is necessary to apply for the pension, and of course a large number of people who are comfortably off and able to take care of themselves do not make application. Another hon. member referred to workers under the railway unions and made a comparison between them and the ordinary working man. There is in fact little or no comparison between a conductor or engineer or fireman on a railway, belonging to the most powerful of the labour unions, which look after the interests of their members at all times, and a workman in a factory who is subject at any time to be laid off owing to a falling off in business. The cases are in no way parallel. Someone says that the railway pension schemes are contributory, but I know that railway conductors are retired at a certain age and have not contributed at all. I know some myself; whether or not that is general I do not know.

51952—57½

Then someone asked, "Where would the money come from?" Of course that is an important problem. In looking over the old age pension legislation in ten of the United States, I observe that where the state has to raise fifty per cent of the cost of old age pensions, they have in some instances imposed new types of taxes to support this scheme. In one state they have added two cents a gallon on gasoline, and the federal government has added a tax of one cent a gallon on gasoline throughout the whole United States. It is certain that if this government does at any time embark on a scheme covering people reaching the age of sixty-five, no taxation should be considered that will add to the taxes on land, which is the municipal tax, or the taxes on business, both of which to-day are already overwhelmed with taxes.

The other Toronto members have doubtless all received to-day schedules such as the one I have received. Glancing over it I note what the city of Toronto has paid for unemployment relief in the last four years: 1933, 1934, 1935 and 1936. The gross expenditure was \$34,308,585, of which the federal and provincial governments paid \$21,981,029, leaving a net charge for the city to bear out of the only means of taxation it has, land, incomes and business, amounting to \$12,327,556. I see further that while the city at the commencement paid unemployment relief out of yearly income, during the last four years they found it impossible to do that, and have funded the unemployment relief by five-year serial debentures to the amount of about \$10,622,242. That means merely deferring the payment. So that this government, when it does embark on a scheme in accord with the resolution certainly should not levy taxes on either land or business, because business to-day is struggling under a heavy burden, and taxation on land is so high that scarcely anyone can be persuaded to buy property and build on it. One of the great causes of unemployment in the cities is the fact that there is much idle land on which no one is building because the tax rates are so high.

Then I find that a great many of the workers who have been unemployed during the recent years of depression, and who were not old enough to draw old age pensions, are losing their homes. It seems strange that when a man is out of a job and is without any income, everything he has to do adds cost to him. I have in my hand a bailiff's statement to a gentleman of my acquaintance. I shall not give the name; that is neither here