

the period of residence to less than ten years, because that would mean a charge on the Treasury and I am not saying that it should be done, but I think it should receive the consideration of the Government. If a person becomes naturalized in five years, why should he not be eligible for the old age pension then, if otherwise qualified? If a person does not want to become naturalized, it might be a different thing, but if he becomes naturalized and obtains every other right as a citizen, why, I ask, is he debarred from the old age pension? Now, I do not think it would amount to very much in dollars and cents. How many people come to this country at the age of 65? Very, very few.

Hon. Mr. Reid: They would not contribute very much.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: If they come here at the age of 65 the chances are a hundred to one that they come to be with their younger children—and their younger children are paying taxes, and paying their share toward a future old age pension.

Hon. Mr. Quinn: But the younger ones often bring their older parents.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: Yes; that is the point I am trying to make. May I say that, as far as I am concerned, I am glad there is to be a reduction from 20 years to ten years in the qualifying period.

With regard to the other provisions of bill, I have nothing to say except that I am in accord with them.

Honourable senators, unfortunately it will not be possible for me to be present on Monday next when the Old Age Assistance Act, the Blind Persons Act and the Disabled Persons Act may be considered. I had hoped that those bills would be discussed today, but the senator who is to explain them is unable to be here. I wish to say now that having read the three bills, I am in favour of their provisions, as indeed I am in favour of the provisions of the bill now before the house, and I hope all four bills will receive unanimous support in this house.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Haig: In view of the fact that the honourable gentleman cannot be present on Monday, I can assure him that the three bills to which he has referred will not receive the consideration for third reading until Tuesday next.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: Thank you.

The motion was agreed to, and the bill was read the second time.

THIRD READING

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, when shall this bill be read the third time?

Hon. Mr. Monette: Honourable senators, with consent I move, seconded by the Honourable Senator Méthot, that this bill be read the third time now.

The motion was agreed to, and the bill was read the third time and passed.

INTERNAL ECONOMY

REPORT OF COMMITTEE—DEBATE ADJOURNED

The Senate proceeded to consideration of the second report of the Standing Committee on Internal Economy and Contingent Accounts.

Hon. Mr. Aseltine, Chairman of the Committee, moved that the report be adopted.

Hon. Jean-François Pouliot: Honourable senators, I have a few remarks to make with regard to this report, and I hope they will be favourably considered by the Leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Haig). They are about the char staff of the Senate. They do their work very well, but I am always sorry when a differentiation is made between the employees of the Senate and the employees of the House of Commons. These Senate employees are doing a painstaking job very well; they have to come here at all times, and look after the Opening of Parliament, and have to move all the furniture. We live in the Senate. We are in a house of Parliament which is well kept, and we owe it to them; at least, we count on them; and they have to count on every dollar that they make. There is a difference of \$18 per year between the amount that is paid to them and the amount paid to similar employees of the House of Commons. When a member of the char staff has a large family and has to send his children to school, he needs every cent of his salary. The char staff of the House of Commons receive a salary of \$2,832, plus \$150, which makes a total of \$2,982; in the Senate the annual rate for char staff is \$2,964, or \$18 less than that paid by the House of Commons.

I submit this case to the honourable Leader of the Government. He may think it a small thing, but if it is small it is so much the easier to grant. I hope my defence of the members of the char staff on this side will receive favourable consideration.

Some Hon. Senators: Question.

Hon. Mr. Croll: Honourable senators, is there not some explanation or some reason why there should be a difference between