

Hon. Mr. HAYDON: May I ask the honourable gentleman a question? Did England make her country a place where her children stayed?

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: Well, I suppose I am not obliged to discuss all the ills of poor England in order to show how it is that in that country it is now found necessary to adopt a national policy—

Hon. Mr. HAYDON: I do not want to interrupt the honourable gentleman—

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: I am always pleased when the honourable gentleman puts a question.

Hon. Mr. HAYDON: May I ask one more question for my own information, and in order to understand the honourable gentleman's point of view. Would he say that Great Britain would not have lost any of her population had it not been for the fact that she adopted the policy of Free Trade?

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: I am quite prepared to say this, that she would probably stop a very large loss of her children at the present time if she did have the courage to change her policy. And do not forget that I am not saying that on my own responsibility. A great man—one of the greatest men, I think, that England has ever produced—the Prime Minister of England, Mr. Baldwin, has said so. But for generation after generation Englishmen have been brought up to look for free bread and free tea, and they will not stand for a tax on their food.

Hon. Mr. HAYDON: Will any people stand for it?

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: I do not know that I should go any further than that into the subject. I think the situation in England is self-evident. So many intelligent statesmen on both sides of politics have lamented it that we have a fairly good idea of what is going on. At all events, we know that, for the purposes of sound argument, no comparison can be made of the situation across the sea in the old Mother Country and that in Canada.

When I heard the Speech from the Throne I asked myself: "Is it true that this Government has given us material prosperity?" I am going to touch on another subject, which to my mind is perhaps more serious. Has this Government worked to maintain the moral welfare of this country? That is what I want to know.

In 1927, as honourable gentlemen will well remember, when the Old Age Pension Bill was brought before this House, the pre-

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN.

ponderance of opinion on this side, I think, was that ultimately the Government must take the full responsibility for this measure. Its members had gone through the whole length and breadth of this country declaring that they were in favour of old age pensions, but, forsooth, the Senate stood between the honest and generous gesture of the Government and the people. Well, the Senate's arm got tired keeping the Government in the straight and narrow path, and that arm which was a protection to the Government, as well as to the country, has withdrawn its support. What has happened? Just a few days ago, officially, in the Legislature of Quebec, the Prime Minister of that province stated that the legislation passed by the Federal Government concerning old age pensions was unjust and impracticable; and immediately afterwards, the Provincial Secretary, the Hon. Mr. David, stated that it was anti-social legislation. They both stated very clearly that old men in Quebec are regarded with affection and reverence by their children, who recognize that they are but following a natural law, which has been implemented by civil law in our province, in providing for them when in need. But the old men are going to be made paupers; they will have to stand before this country, turn out their pockets, and beg for alms. And the children will no longer have the sobering responsibility of keeping their parents. We have in French a principle which is very true: "Père et mère tu honoreras, afin de vivre longuement." That principle has permeated the soul of Quebec. No man in that province would be looked up to or respected in society if, having the means of looking after his parents, he allowed them to live in poverty.

Well, honourable gentlemen, this nefarious law is now going to eat into the moral fibre of the Province of Quebec. The child need not look after his father. The child has received life, education, everything he possesses, from his father, but the Government say: "We will look after him; you are freed from that responsibility." But it is such salutary responsibilities that preserve the family, and the family develops the very tissue of which the manhood of our country is made.

Furthermore, the Prime Minister of Quebec said that that province could not, if it so desired, make use of the law creating old age pensions, as it would entail an expenditure of at least \$3,000,000. And now the Government are applying legislation by which only certain provinces will receive the benefit of old age pensions, but all provinces will have to pay.