

Interim Supply

income in such a way as to make possible a health scheme or a social welfare scheme in this country.

My experience so far in the political field, and it is a short one, has been that often those people who have smaller incomes object the least to the paying of their share of taxation. I find that the people who receive larger incomes are usually the ones who grumble a great deal about taxes, and may try to find ways of avoiding them. The great bulk of the Canadian people, it seems to me, are quite well aware of the fact that it is through the payment of taxes that we get a redistribution of income and all the benefits. Indeed, to quote a famous justice, it is through the paying of taxes that one buys civilization. I do not believe the people think that one should simply take away taxes, and then let them do all the worrying about health care, and other provisions for their later years. Surely most citizens believe rather in a social welfare scheme of things whereby they will be able to make some contribution during their working years through taxes, and whereby they will be able to make a contribution more or less in accordance with their incomes that will then enable all members of the society to have a decent standard of living and, if necessary, of social security, including old age pensions, and so on.

To revert for a moment to the use of the word "free", as I say it does imply, whether or not the hon. member intended it, a kind of condescension of those who have to those who have not, which to my way of thinking is quite contrary to the way we really feel about matters in this country. I believe that all of us, no matter what our incomes, really want to make some contribution to the total welfare system.

This brings me to the final point I should like to make, and I will not say much about it because other members have mentioned it. It is that we do want to have in this country a universal system whereby all people of all ages, children as well as adults, will have contributed to a general health and welfare security scheme which will include them and of which they will be a part. Indeed, it is my hope that before the four years are up that we will be in power we will have introduced such a scheme in the health sphere to complement what we have already done in the hospitalization sphere, and what we are now in the midst of doing in the old age pension sphere.

Mr. J. E. Lloyd (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I find myself in agreement with those critics of the wording of the resolution who have indicated that it leaves unanswered a number

of questions as to the scope of its application. I believe the resolution perhaps fails to guide the government in that it refers in its wording to all federal government pensions. Here is a point where one finds a most serious omission. Indeed, if the resolution were passed the government would have to send it back to the house for clarification and identification of the thoughts that were in the minds of members of the house when they passed such a resolution. In essence, therefore, if the resolution were passed we would indeed be occupying the attention of the government to no avail, and this would simply result in a waste of time.

I share the concern of other speakers that certainly our society in 1963 must look at every avenue possible to provide social justice for its citizens. Indeed, the things we are now engaged in in many ways in trying to protect the free world are such—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hour appointed for the consideration of private members' business having expired, the house will revert to the consideration of the business interrupted at five o'clock.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Lamoureux in the chair.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, in winding up my remarks on the recent federal provincial conference I wish to say something in greater detail than I have up to the present on one matter which caused very considerable interest and some controversy; that is the formula which the federal government announced to alter the equalization payments to the provinces.

I admit we could have adopted a formula which would have equalized the revenues from the tax sharing sources up to that of the highest province, and if we had done that there would have been, presumably, no criticism that we were not carrying out a formula to which we had been committed previously. But if we had—and the conference certainly showed this—we would have been criticized by some members of the conference in other ways.

This was a conference, as I said at the beginning—and I quoted this afternoon from my words to that effect—at which