

or grandchildren, but the fact is it is much better that youth and old age should be separate.

As I advocated in the few remarks I made last year, I believe that the government should assume full responsibility for the payment of old age pensions. At the present time these pensions are administered by the nine different provinces. This government pays seventy-five per cent of the cost and yet does not have as much to say about the administration as the provinces that pay only twenty-five per cent. That is not just or fair. Of course there are chisellers, but in all walks of life you are going to find chisellers.

An hon. MEMBER: Even among members of parliament.

Mrs. BLACK: Do I hear "even among members of parliament"? That may be so, but I would not like to accuse the members in the far corner of being chisellers. I believe that one government should administer old age pensions. That would be more economical than the present method and there would be less danger of chiselling.

As I said before, some people of thirty-five years of age are as old as others at seventy or seventy-five years. The former member for the Yukon had a letter written to him not long ago by a man whom he had known in his early days in New Brunswick. This man said: "I think I am old enough to retire and you may be able to find out how old I am; I come from King's county and it may be possible that my birth certificate can be found." King's county was written to and the man's birth certificate was found and sent back. This man who thought he was old enough to retire discovered that he was eighty-three years of age.

Mr. DUNNING: He did not know it until then?

Mrs. BLACK: He did not know it until then. He thought he was around seventy years of age. When he discovered his real age, his friends were afraid that he would realize how old he was and become so exhausted that he would shortly pass away.

Of course I have always felt quite keenly about the administration of old age pensions in the Yukon. It is not a pension there; it is a dole. The Northwest Territories are administered directly by the federal government and the \$20 per month is given as a dole, not as a pension. This is very irritating to self-respecting men or women. When they have paid taxes for perhaps forty or fifty years, they do not like having money handed out to them by the government, and have it called a dole instead of a pension. When

Yukoners who have lived in the country for forty or fifty years feel that they want to retire, if they are able to work they do not get a pension. If they are unable to work they are given this so-called pension in the shape of a dole. If they say, "My family lives in Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia or one of the other provinces and I would like to go there where I could live near them and my former friends on \$20 a month," do they get that amount of money? No. If they go to any one of the provinces and live there a year or two they will receive a dollar or two a month, and until they have lived in the province for twenty years they cannot get the pension. That is neither fair nor just. They could live much more comfortably on the outside, and there are former Yukoners in every province of this country who are suffering under that injustice and who have asked time after time that it be removed. They have been a credit to the Yukon territory and to Canada as a whole; so why in the name of justice should they not be allowed a pension when they have moved to some other part of Canada? I asked the government to consider the administration of old age pensions in the Yukon on exactly the same basis as they consider the administration of old age pensions in the Northwest Territories.

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): I agree with the remarks of the hon. lady member who has just sat down, as regards men living in the Yukon. I have come across instances of gross injustice due to the conditions to which she refers.

I propose to support this resolution, not only because I was pledged to it in the campaign, but because I have always been of that opinion. I see that I made a speech in this chamber in January, 1935, setting forward the proposal made this afternoon in almost the same terms.

The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Dunning) has dealt fully and very fairly with the question of the increased cost. I accept his condition that it would be necessary, if we lowered the age, to put on a contributory basis that portion of it which applies to an age lower than seventy. I think that is the way it is managed in Britain; after seventy it is non-contributory, but between sixty-five and seventy it has to be contributory.

The minister held out—rather prominently, I thought—the bugbear that we could not get the provinces to agree to any further expenditure. That same argument was used here ten years ago, that the provinces would not come in; but we left the door open; we said, "You do not need to come in unless