

*The Address—Mr. Hansell*

to bring into existence a better health scheme. It is hailed as a progressive step; but let us not forget that in that progressive step, because of the adherence by this government to a taxation system, a process of dispossession is taking place. Take our old age pension scheme. I do not even like to mention that they are old age pension schemes; they are glorified relief schemes, glossing them over with a certain respectability. I shall prophesy something. I prophesy that, when the Minister of National Health and Welfare brings in a new old age pension scheme, under which the old age pensions may be larger, and under which there may be some attempt to grant them without a means test, any new legislation he brings in along that line will be on a contributory basis. I make that prophecy, and I shall turn to this particular page of *Hansard* and read it to him when that day comes. If his scheme is to be on a contributory basis, then it will mean that this process of dispossession is gradually fastening itself upon the people.

During this session we have heard a good deal about pensions for the incurables. I happen to be greatly interested in that, for a couple of years ago I was instrumental in having something to do with the organization which now numbers its membership in the thousands, and is growing rapidly throughout Canada. I know something of what the minister will have in mind when he brings down some sort of relief for incurables. What he has in mind is that it must be on a contributory basis. In the first place, an incurable has not the wherewithal to contribute. Nevertheless, if it is to be on a contributory basis, then the process of dispossession is taking place.

We have other schemes. There is unemployment insurance. I am not going to say that under the present system of taxation an unemployment insurance scheme has not some merit in it; but I do say that that is also a part of the process of dispossession. We hear a familiar phrase being used in labour circles with respect to their pay envelopes. The phrase is "take home pay". We have so much "take home pay". All I ask is: "What is the matter? What do you mean by take home pay? Don't you take it all home?" My answer is: "Why not; is it not yours?" The answer I get is: "There is a deduction for this and a deduction for that and a deduction for the other thing. And now that our union has gone into politics there is a deduction for this and a deduction for something else", and so on and so forth. "All I have now is my take home pay." I ask: "What has happened to the rest?" The answer I get is that it has

been taken from the labourer legally. But he did not say that they could take it. Did they consult the labourer? Do they consult the populace when they want to take this money from them? No, of course they do not. I say that the process of dispossession is taking place. If it goes far enough the take home pay will result in an empty envelope. There will not be anything for us to take home. If the process goes still further and we are dispossessed of our homes we shall take nothing home because we shall not have any homes to take nothing home to. That will be the situation.

Unless we get at the basic and fundamental origin of what all this fight is about, we shall never solve anything. It is a little secret. We have to learn that these forces which are out to wreck humanity are, in the first place, out to dispossess us of that which we have; and, when once we are dispossessed, we, the human race, become the slaves of a huge bureaucratic state. Let us make no mistake about that. Dispossession by means of debt, interest and taxation is a deep-seated plot to enslave the human race. Look at what we are headed for: state medicine. That is what we are headed for. State distribution of foods; that is what we are headed for. State labour; that is what we are headed for, if it keeps on. Under the socialization of industry, labour toils for the state. Let us make no mistake about that. When that process is complete, you have the human race in a state of slavery.

I do not wish to go out of my way to refer to socialist Britain. I am going to refer to it, however, because it appears to me that Britain, which we once called Great Britain, is no longer great. At least she is not great in the sense of being a great economic factor in the world.

**An hon. Member:** Nonsense.

**Mr. Hansell:** My hon. friend says "nonsense". I shall not break up my speech to answer all the interjections; but I have heard them often. These socialist gentlemen who say that should have been sitting in the house thirteen or fourteen years ago, when some of us first came here. I am not going to take time to reply to these interjections; but the debate on controls is not yet over. The last word has not yet been said. Someone will answer my socialist friends who sit immediately to my right.

I am not blaming them for Great Britain's state. I do not know that we should place too much blame upon the British socialist government today; I want to be fair. But what I am saying is that in this battle of the ages one of the objectives in the minds of