

There is only one remedy, and that is a form of old age annuity starting at sixty years, without the means test, contributed to by the pensioner from the age of twenty-one. This will not be called an old age pension, because the beneficiary would contribute to this fund as well as the government. If we take, for example, and only for example, that each person pays \$1 a month, starting at the age of twenty-one, these payments over thirty-nine years, with compound interest at three per cent, would amount to \$892.81. We will say that the government duplicates this amount. This would mean \$1,785.62.

With living, rents and education for one's family, it is impossible for the average wage-earner, farmer or citizen of any group, to educate a family and keep enough for old age. The government can borrow money at three per cent—and now we hear that it may be less—but one can hardly live on the income on \$10,000 invested in government bonds. For that reason and for humanity's sake, something must be done for all people, when they reach the age of sixty.

Then, again, to carry the idea one step further:

1. To ensure employment for others, it would be advantageous for the government and a benefit to the country to reduce the available labour supply in a few years by providing adequate security that will permit people to retire at the age of sixty. Toward this objective, people could start now to contribute to such a government pension fund and then, in years to come, they would themselves provide for their future security and not, as is the case now, have to look to the state for aid.

2. The government would have the use of the huge fund and save on money they have to borrow.

3. The security policy could be enlarged to include medical benefits and hospitalization.

4. The policy would be contributory for the group under sixty at the start, and would absorb all over this age who apply.

5. The insurance companies would still compete in the field, covering largely the deathrate element.

6. This rate of a \$1 a month to be uniform throughout all Canada.

Last, the administration of this act, if passed by this house, could be administered through the county councils cheaper than in any other way and the county council is closer to the people.

Mr. KNOWLES: I wish to add my protest to those which have been expressed several times during the course of this session at the [Mr. McNary.]

failure of the government to do anything this year about increasing the amount of the old age pension. The case is one which hardly needs to be made; it has been made repeatedly in the house in former years, and also this year in other debates. The simple fact that \$25 is the maximum pension payable under the act as amended by order in council certainly makes it clear that we are not doing sufficient for our old people.

The fact that there have been increases in the cost of living is well known to all of us, and I am sure every hon. member is receiving letters from elderly people expressing their amazement that the government does not see that they need an increase in the amount of their pension, not two or five or ten years from now, when they are dead and can no longer use it, but now when they are alive and in desperate need of it.

I know the arguments and answers which have been given to our arguments for increasing the old age pension, such as problems arising out of dominion-provincial relations, and all that sort of thing. But it seems to me that the minister gave an even weaker answer to-night when he simply said there was not much he could do about the matter, because he was only speaking on behalf of the Minister of National Health and Welfare, who is out of the country at the present time. We have not said much about that in the house, but it does seem too bad that there should be so many ministers of the government away at the present time. I know that even in writing letters on matters which come before us we are sometimes presented with a problem in trying to find out to whom we should write for attention to the problems of our people.

Mr. MITCHELL: Take a look at your own party; lots of your people are away.

Mr. KNOWLES: Our party does not happen to be in the position of responsibility that members of the cabinet are.

Mr. MITCHELL: Thank goodness, for the Canadian people.

Mr. KNOWLES: The Canadian people will express themselves about that in due course.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: They did, in 1945.

Mr. KNOWLES: Yes, in 1945 the Canadian people gave the Liberal party and the government now in power a job. They thought that one of the jobs to which the government was going to give its immediate attention was the improvement of old age pension legislation. Correspondence we are receiving and views being expressed across