

area of the country. I cannot see how a point or two yielded on the income tax can take care of this problem in any of the Atlantic provinces. I suggest to you that you are familiar enough with the Atlantic provinces to know that they would not meet the requirements of the provincial governments.

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): Will the honourable senator allow me to deal with this point? There is no suggestion in the debates on this bill in the other place that at the end of five years, when the fiscal review is made, there would not be adequate compensation given by way of tax adjustment so that the provinces would not be in any worse position than they are under this measure.

Hon. Mr. Phillips: I am very happy to have the assurance of the Government Leader in the Senate in this regard, and while I do not wish to say that I hope he is still a member of the Cabinet in five years' time, because I would rather see the situation reversed—

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): I will say that.

Hon. Mr. Phillips: —I hope the honourable senator is still there, so that I can remind him of the assurance of protection which he has given here today.

The sponsor of the bill stated that it would be referred to a committee, and I would like very much to see this done. However, I think it should be referred to the Standing Committee on Public Health and Welfare. We have a tendency to refer most measures to the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce, which is an excellent committee with a very capable chairman. But why have a committee on public health and welfare if we are going to refer this bill to another committee? As I said earlier, I would like to refer to Senator Gershaw. He is a respected physician and one who has long experience in public life. He is chairman of this committee, and I cannot think of any greater reason for referring this measure to that committee, where we will have the benefit of his experience both in practice and in public life.

I thank you, honourable senators, for your attention, and again let me thank the Leader of the Government in the Senate for his assurance.

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): Free legal advice on behalf of my colleagues.

Hon. Mr. Phillips: I do not expect him to be in the Cabinet in five years time, but should

that be the unfortunate situation, politically, I shall remind him of his assurance given here today.

Hon. Arthur W. Roebuck: Honourable senators, may I have the privilege of answering a question asked by honourable Senator Phillips in the early stages of his remarks? He said he had been looking up the early history of the subject in question and had seen the book by Mr. Pickersgill, which had not much impressed him. Perhaps he will give more credence to a statement by one of his own colleagues who speaks from personal knowledge of what took place a very long time ago. I have had on my shelves for 47 years a book entitled "The National Liberal Convention, Ottawa, August 5, 6, 7, 1919." I turn to page 126, where I find a resolution on the subject of Labour and Industrial Relations, moved by one Honourable W. L. Mackenzie King, in which I find this paragraph—and I would like to place it on the record, as well as answer the question put, for the benefit of all senators and others, because this same question has been raised in the House of Commons—

And Further Resolved:

2. That in so far as may be practicable, having regard for Canada's financial position, an adequate system of insurance against unemployment—

I pause there to say that I am rather proud of the fact that I was a member of the committee which brought in the bill that established unemployment insurance.

The resolution continues:

sickness—

It is 47 years ago that the Liberal Party, in convention assembled in the City of Ottawa, adopted the principle of the bill that is now before us.

Hon. Mr. Choquette: It took them a long time!

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: It took them a long time, that is true; and during all that time there has been no wavering, so far as I know, from the general principle of paternalistic, shall I call it?

Hon. Mr. Choquette: "Socialistic."

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: No, it is not socialistic at all. Call it "paternalistic," if you like, but it is not socialistic by any definition I know of "socialism."

Hon. Mr. Brooks: It might be "politicalistic."