

I do not know that you could have anything plainer than that. Has the Prime Minister interviewed the province of Quebec or the province of Nova Scotia? If you are in earnest about this and do not wish to continue to fool the people, why not call the premiers together now—it is not too late—and get a uniform measure? The present course of the government will entail a lot of expense on the part of a few provinces which will accept the bill, in the shape of creating administrative machinery, all of which will have to be cast aside. When you have laid down the terms and conditions on which the provinces may accept this bill, if a province does not want to accept it has simply to meet the views of any delegation which holds other views. Take British Columbia; they will go to our premier and say, "We think you should have a sixty-five age limit", and the premier of that province, an old and tried politician, will say, "you are perfectly right, I am going to put in the sixty-five year age limit". What happens? The operation of the bill is deferred for another year. He is pleasing those who want the sixty-five year age limit, and he knows that he is not going to burden British Columbia with an expenditure of half a million dollars. Our leader has said that this should rather be a federal responsibility, and if you are in earnest and do not want a lot of discussion, which would mean the postponement of the measure, then you should make it a federal bill and expunge this clause.

Mr. HEAPS: We should not rush this discussion too rapidly. It is nearly six o'clock, and I think the government should have two hours to consider this question. I feel keenly on this matter, because I believe the whole operation of the bill hinges upon the clause we are now discussing. The government has been urged by several members of the House to amend this section. I know that there is a feeling among my friends opposite in favour of a larger contribution from the federal treasury. I fully realize the position of the minister when he says that the Senate may be an obstacle if we insert a provision in the bill that the government shall contribute seventy-five per cent, but I would like to impress upon him that whilst there is one obstacle in the Senate to the seventy-five per cent provision there are nine other obstacles in the country which will not accept the measure favourably unless that provision is inserted. I should like to have this percentage provided for in the bill, have the provinces coöperate with us, and take chances of trouble in the

Senate. I am not afraid of the action of the upper chamber, because after the pleasant things which were said about them and the way they acted they will probably understand the situation. I think the Senate is to a certain extent susceptible to public opinion, and will realize that the whole of the people of Canada are anxious to have this measure placed on the statutes of the Dominion.

The situation in the House in regard to this measure is not altogether edifying, as far as parliamentary institutions are concerned. We have a majority of members in favour of amending the bill in a certain way, and yet these gentlemen cannot give expression to their views on this particular occasion. I believe if we had a vote on this question, and if every member were free of the whips and able to express a candid opinion, the seventy-five per cent provision would carry by an overwhelming majority. If that is the case, and if, as I suggest, the Senate is also susceptible to public opinion, why is the government not agreeable to test the feeling of the House on this question? I do not see why they should object to that. They have not said why they object to such a provision. The only reason given is that they would run the risk of the measure being defeated in the other chamber if this provision were inserted. I would urge the government to let it stand, because if they do not I think some ways and means will be found of testing the feelings of the House. I do not think it can be avoided. I believe with the lawyers we have in the Labour and Progressive groups we will be able to find some means of overcoming the difficulty which prevents the House giving a free expression of opinion. Can I be furnished with some reason why the government objects to seventy-five per cent as against fifty per cent. If I were a member of the Liberal party at the present time I would urge for a larger contribution, in order to make sure that the bill would become operative. I cannot understand why the government object to that. If the bill becomes law in its present shape, there may be many provinces in Canada where it will not be put into effect, and the government will be assuming a responsibility which might be very disastrous for them at the next election. During the last election nothing appealed more to the people of the country than the old age pensions. I do not think there was a constituency in Canada where the question was not discussed from every angle and where the proposition of an old age pension did not meet with the approval of the people of the Dominion. The government is coming forward with the same