security payments, which are statutory. I wish to raise one point with which I think the minister is rather familiar by reason of the fact that I have taken it up with him on two previous occasions. I have reference to the possibility, and I hope it is a probability, of being able to pay the old age security pension to those old age pensioners who find they cannot reside further in Canada for one reason or another, reasons which I think are quite legitimate and should be given some consideration.

In the first place I had the matter brought to my attention a year or two ago, and I wrote the minister about it. He answered very courteously and explained that an old age pensioner could be out of the country for three months each year without losing any pension. Of course if he were out of the country the last three months of one year and the first three months of the next year, then he could be away for a period of six months without losing his pension. Well, that is all right, but that did not cover the case I had in mind.

At the commencement of the present session I put a question on the order paper asking if the government expected to make any changes along this line. The reply I received was simply a quotation of the present law governing the case, which was not what I wanted. I knew what the regulations were, but I wanted to know if there was any hope of these regulations being changed. I shall give two examples of cases which I think are quite deserving.

The first one that was brought to my attention was that of an aged gentleman who had lived in Canada nearly all his life, who had homesteaded in Alberta and had had some difficult times. Perhaps his land was poor, I do not know all the reasons. Eventually, during the depression he borrowed money on his land, found he could not pay it back and so lost his farm. He went through hard times and was not successful in keeping his farm, through no fault of his own but because of external circumstances. As time went on he managed to get a little work here and a little work there. Sometimes he lived with his children. The time came when he applied for and obtained the old age pension.

This gentleman was not in the best of health and went down to the United States. He was a widower by this time, and he remarried a woman in the United States who owned her own home. I do not believe she had any income to speak of, but she was a United States citizen. He resided not more than about a hundred miles across the border, but he lost his pension. He could not continue to live there with his wife and receive his pension. It meant that his wife either had to sell her home and come to Canada or he would lose his pension. I suppose she did not want to do that by reason of the fact she had lived in this home all her life; she had her friends and social connections there.

Now, of course, he did not have to marry. He could have stayed here and kept his pension, but that is not reasonable. He wanted the companionship of a nice lady in his declining years and she wanted the companionship of a husband. There was no reason why they should not marry. By reason of the fact he has to live in the United States, or feels he has to, he has lost his pension. I ask, is that reasonable? It would not cost any more to pay his pension if he lived here or on the other side of the border, but because he lives on the other side of the border he cannot receive his pension.

The other case is that of a gentleman who also pioneered this country. He came from England in the early days and ran a little general store in a very small community. He was the postmaster in that particular place and had the post office wicket in his store just as you find it in these rural places. Eventually he retired, his money ran out and he went on the old age pension. He took ill and the doctor said that perhaps if he tried some other climate he might get better. He visited some of his relatives in England and found he was quite a lot better there. Of course if he stayed there more than three months, he lost his pension. He came back here, and the moment he came back he took ill again. He finds that about the only place he can live, and in addition where he wants to live with his relatives, is in England but he loses his pension. Now, it is not going to cost any more to send the pension to him in England than if he gets the pension here.

There is another matter in this connection I should like to bring to the minister's attention. I am not going to accuse anybody of going around a corner in order to receive his pension and live away from Canada. I could not prove it even if I wanted to do so, but there is a rather strong rumour that it is done. I said to one young gentleman to whom I was talking about the matter, "Well, I am not going to advocate that a man live on the other side of the border or in England, and have his cheque sent to someone with a power of attorney to bank it for him, because that would not be complying with the regulations." The young fellow said it is being done. I said, "Well, I cannot help it but I am not advocating that it be done. Eventually some inspector will come around and you will have to lie about it or they will catch up with you".