

in New Jersey and also in Calgary, Alberta, confirm the fact that, contrary to what most Canadians continue to believe and which our culture tends to support, aid to people in the low income bracket does not take away or diminish initiative.

I think if we are going to talk about this we have to recognize that our culture, as it is today, still has a kind of hangover or legacy from the day when it was accepted that it was good to work and bad to be unemployed or shiftless and not to work. Therefore people, even if they wanted to work but could not find employment and were forced to go on any welfare scheme, because of the nuances of our culture, were prodded very quickly to go to work again. This is not a personal opinion. I can substantiate that statement very thoroughly by the excellent study done by the University of Wisconsin through an organization known as Mathematica Incorporated of Princeton, New Jersey. It can also be substantiated by the work done in Paterson, Passaic and Trenton as well as a number of other places including Princeton, New Jersey. These studies revealed that when people were given more assistance they helped themselves and moved away on their own initiative from the poverty line.

It might be worth while to read their conclusions. The data suggests there is no evidence that work effort declined among those receiving income support payments. On the contrary, there is an indication that the work effort of those receiving payments increased relative to the work effort of those not receiving payments. The study goes on to state that a number of in-depth interviews of participants in the project were conducted in order to determine the attitudes of individuals toward work. These interviews clearly indicated that low income people are strongly motivated toward work. The majority of those interviewed indicated that they aspired for better jobs and were willing to move to another city or take training even if it meant a pay cut, on a short term basis, in order to get the jobs. The majority also indicated that they were willing to work at two jobs in order to support their families.

Research in England has also shown that high tax rates on those of high income, and this is putting a lie to another widely held opinion in our culture, does not lower the incentive to work. It seems to me if you combine that with the Calgary research, which indicates that about 95 per cent of those who receive assistance did merit it, a fairly substantial case can be put forward for saying that assistance does not diminish the work effort of people.

However, there is one question still unanswered toward which we have not directed our attention, and that is: What would happen in a culture where everybody thought it was a respectable thing not to work and pay your own way? This is really an unanswered question, but this is an area which leaves me with some doubt. The work incentive was the subject of the New Jersey and the Calgary research and other projects, but did these projects produce the results they did produce because those, studied were a microcosmic group within a total culture that still continues to be work-oriented? I suspect they did.

Old Age Security

We cannot simply assume, since in a work-oriented culture most of the people are providing themselves for their advanced years and putting some money aside, that if we help some who are, shall we say, honestly poor through no fault of their own and they take the aid they receive and use it to better themselves because they want to be like the majority that the same would happen in a new culture. We have to ask a more profound question. You see, this would be a turnabout, a different issue altogether. What happens when the majority is in the position of being the recipients of guaranteed incomes and it is only the minority who are the producers, the workers or self-motivators? What would be the cultural pressures at work then? Would research like that in New Jersey produce the same results?

I think that the principle this bill suggests is a good one because it says that we in society have an obligation to help those who are indeed poor and who cannot help themselves. But we also have an obligation to continually encourage people to help themselves. It is one thing to help someone who cannot help himself, but it seems to me it is another thing to take any steps which would prevent a person, who could very well help himself, from doing so. In spite of the problems inherent within the selectivity scheme, and in spite of the fact that there will be times when people will be dishonest, as the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) pointed out this morning, and in spite of the fact we are going to have this divisiveness mentioned by the previous speaker, namely that it will be possible to have two persons receiving old age pensions, one, of whom will be receiving a lot of supplement and the other receiving hardly any, I do not see any better way now available to us in Canada to help those who genuinely need to be helped short of a guaranteed income across the board.

If we provide a guaranteed income across the board we must again ask how high we are prepared to go? If we put it too high, we are going to be in the position of literally changing our culture. I am not afraid of turning the culture around. It might well be that the time has come, again in a modern age, when we ought to turn the culture around and look at it from the other side. But before we do turn it around so that we conclude that to look after one's self is no longer the ideal, let us remember that in Canada at this moment there are many hundreds of thousands of citizens, whom we all here represent, who feel very strongly that there ought to be more of us stand in this chamber and say: Look, Mr. Citizen, you also have a responsibility for yourself.

And that too is important. As an hon. member has mentioned, I am in my third profession, but one of them is being a clergyman. When I went to my first parish in northern Ontario, before I lived in the residence for two hours I had 20 transients at my door. So, you have to do a lot of thinking about whom you do or do not help, who is in need and who is not. Then, you begin to take seriously how you help people who are transients off a rail line. You have to ask yourself a more searching question.

I used to say this to the men who would come to my door: Do you really think I should help you to keep doing