

It is a fact that when you compare the percentage of Americans and Canadians in various income groups, you find that there are just too many Canadians in the low income groups.

In Canada, from zero to \$4,000 there are 43.5 per cent, as against 30.7 per cent of Americans. Those with incomes between \$4,000 and \$7,000 total 38.5 per cent in Canada, as against 23.8 per cent in the United States. But look how it changes when you move above \$7,000. Only 11.8 per cent of Canadians enjoy an income between \$7,000 and \$10,000, compared to 20.9 per cent Americans. Then comes the staggering figure. People who make over \$10,000 in Canada comprise only 5.8 per cent of the population, while in the United States they comprise 24.5 per cent.

Honourable senators, I will not go into the details with you. I have spoken for far too long—

Hon. Mr. Martin: You have made a good speech.

Hon. Mr. Everett:—but I want to say that when you examine the difference in tax rates at what we call the managerial level—the level of the brain power that runs the machine—you are amazed at the difference. But, it is easily explained when you figure that 5.8 per cent of the population of Canada carries the bulk of the load as against 24.5 per cent in the United States.

Any Canadian would pay a price to stay in Canada. All I say is that we have to take care not to make the price differential so great that even the man who loves his country and wants to stay here says that, having regard to his family, he can no longer afford to do so.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Macdonald, debate adjourned.

RULES OF THE SENATE

MOTION FOR ADOPTION OF FOURTH REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE—ORDER STANDS

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Molson, seconded by the Honourable Senator Smith (Queens-Shelburne), for the adoption of the Fourth Report of the Special Committee of the Senate on the Rules of the Senate.—(Honourable Senator McDonald).

Hon. Mr. Langlois: Stand until Wednesday next.

Hon. Mr. Choquette: I should like to have an explanation of why we are asked to agree

to that. Like many other honourable senators, I was under the impression that this house, as well as the other place, would conclude its business on Friday and adjourn for the summer recess. If we start standing orders until Wednesday next it means that we will be getting into the month of July, and we do not know how far this will go. I should like to hear something from the honourable Leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Martin) on this. I think that all these items should stand until Friday next in order to give us at least a ray of hope.

Hon. Mr. Martin: Senator Choquette's question is quite justified and understandable. I have been in communication with the leader in the other place, and it now appears that we will likely be here next week. We will, I hope, have a royal assent on Friday. There are some pieces of legislation that should be assented to at the earliest possible moment.

Hon. Mr. Beaubien: Which Friday?

Hon. Mr. Martin: This Friday. I would hope that we shall not be here a week from Friday, but we shall have to be here this Friday. From the program now being unfolded in the other house it seems that we will be here next Wednesday. I wish that I could report otherwise.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is it agreed?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.
Order stands.

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT (AGE OF VOTERS)

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING

The Senate resumed from Tuesday, May 27, the adjourned debate on the motion of Hon. Mr. Argue, for the second reading of Bill S-24, to amend the Canada Elections Act (Age of Voters).

Hon. Keith Davey: Honourable senators, I have followed this debate and studied it with considerable interest. It occurs to me that every conceivable reason for voting against Bill S-24 has been used except the one which I suspect motivates much of this opposition, namely, fear—fear of the unknown, fear of the unpredictable, fear of more than 10 per cent new and untested voters. I have concluded this because we are faced with what I regard compelling reasons for supporting an eighteen-year old vote.

We have listened to a list of negative arguments that have ranged all the way from the