

five per cent at all, but we are leaving it permissive for them, if they so please, to make such an arrangement with the provinces.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil): In view of the ruling given this afternoon by the Deputy Speaker, and in view of rule 170, as set out at page 43 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, I do not think the amendment is in order. Rule 170 reads:

The committee of supply cannot increase a grant which has been recommended by a message from the Governor General. It is also irregular to increase any item in a resolution. But any motion to reduce a grant will be always in order.

Mr. NEILL: Before you give your decision, Mr. Chairman, will you take into consideration the point made that it is not compulsory but entirely permissive for the government to take such action? They might even lower the amount.

The CHAIRMAN: My opinion is that it opens the door to a grant of seventy-five per cent and that is beyond the intention of the resolution. Therefore, unless some other hon. gentleman wishes to speak, I shall have to declare the proposed amendment out of order.

Mr. LADNER: Why not overcome this impasse or difficulty? I would ask the Minister of Labour himself if he would not move that the words "one-half" be struck out, and the words "seventy-five per cent" be substituted therefor.

Mr. HEENAN: What I am afraid of is that the old age pensions bill may be killed through the kindness of its friends. The old age pensions bill was defeated in the Senate last session because of the fact that it was estimated that it would involve an expenditure of approximately twelve million dollars.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

An hon. MEMBER: No, but because the provinces were not consulted.

Mr. HEENAN: How does my hon. friend know that? I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the chances of this bill going through the second chamber this year will not be enhanced by adding one-third to the proposed contribution. If the bill is allowed to remain in its present shape it will have a better opportunity of passing the Senate because the people have pronounced on it. Furthermore, if anything should unfortunately happen to the measure in the other chamber it will raise the question as to how many times the upper house can throw out a bill which has been passed by the House of Commons. This is not going to be the last word in old age pensions legis-

lation for Canada. If any defects are revealed in actual operation such defects can be cured by amending the law.

Mr. LADNER: Does the minister mean by that that the government might be disposed to consider the federal authority assuming the entire obligation?

Mr. HEENAN: I will explain what I mean. One hon. member stated, just as a member of the upper house did last session, that this scheme was going to cost Nova Scotia so much money. He seems to take it for granted that everyone in Nova Scotia who is over the age of seventy years will come under the bill. I submit there are quite a number of people over that age in Nova Scotia who will not come under the bill at all because they have a certain annual income. We can all guess, but no one knows just how many people will come under this scheme in British Columbia, Ontario or any other province, and after we get the bill in working order we can amend it in the light of the experience gained. Consequently I cannot agree with my hon. friend because of the fact that I am more desirous of getting this bill on the statute books than of doing anything else.

Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): I would like to ask a question. The minister says there is a better chance of getting this bill through the Senate with the 50 per cent clause than if we made it 75 per cent. I see him nod his head in assent. I wonder if he will again nod his head when I say that there is a better chance of getting the provinces to come under this bill if the federal share is increased to 75 per cent.

Mr. HEENAN: Will you let me answer that question?

Mr. EDWARDS (Frontenac): Certainly; that is what I want you to do.

Mr. HEENAN: I fear that my hon. friend as well as other members of this House have forgotten for the moment that this burden of caring for the old, indigent people is at present borne by the provinces alone. Surely if that is the fact the provinces will accept 50 per cent of these expenses in order to lighten their load to that extent. I take it for granted that, as good business men, the members of the provincial governments will welcome a contribution of 50 per cent of that cost which they now pay themselves. It may not be so welcome as a contribution of 60 per cent or 90 per cent, but if you ask a man to-day if he would like \$40 a month for the rest of his life he will nod his head. If you ask him to-morrow if he would like \$50 a