

tonight, because there is just one point in Mr. Hillier's very fair and honourable speech of yesterday, one point on which I wish to offer a word of comment. It was what he said about Canada's old age pension scheme. Now I happen to know that Mr. Hillier is deeply interested in the subject of our senior citizens, our old people. I agree with Mr. Hillier absolutely when he says that the pensions should start before a man or a woman gets to be 70 years of age. I think he's perfectly right. And I'm sure that he'll agree with me when I say that 75 is a criminal and shameful age limit to place on our senior citizens before they are entitled to the old age pension. And that's the age, 75, an elderly person has to reach in Newfoundland today before we pay him the pension. At least Canada is five years better off in that way than Newfoundland because she gives the pension at 70. And I agree with Mr. Hillier that \$30 a month is not a cent too much to pay to our worn-out toilers, but surely he'll agree with me when I say that \$30 a month for one is a lot better than \$30 a quarter for two. That's what we pay here in Newfoundland for two elderly persons, \$30 a quarter for the two of them, \$10 a month. Just compare two elderly persons in the two countries. In Newfoundland they have to live to be 75 before they get the pension, in Canada 70. In Newfoundland we pay two persons \$30 a quarter between them, in Canada they pay \$30 a month to each of them. What's the difference? The old people in Canada get \$60 a month between them, whereas two old people in Newfoundland get \$10 a month between them. The old couple in Canada are \$50 a month better off than our old couple, and that's \$600 a year.

I won't go over the question of a pensioner's property again. I've already explained that several times. It's enough now to say this, that if that bit of property is worth \$2,000 net or less, the pensioner is free to do whatever he likes with it, give it to whoever he likes. It covers the vast quota of the 10,000 old people who would receive the old age pension if we go into confederation. I would ask Mr. Hillier to cast his mind over his own native home, and the other settlements he knows in his district, and ask himself how many persons of 70 and over have property that would fetch over \$2,000 cash if it had to be sold. For that matter, I would ask all our members, apart from those from the capital city and perhaps Grand

Falls and Corner Brook and one or two other places, I'd ask all our members to cast their minds over their districts and ask themselves the same question. And don't forget, Mr. Chairman, that if an old age pensioner has property that would fetch over \$2,000, the sons or other relatives still have a way to get that property when the old age pensioner passes away. They can contribute regularly and reasonably to the support of the old age pensioner for at least the last three years of his life. That's fair enough, isn't it?

Now, I have only two more points. Ever since the confederation terms were laid before us, speaker after speaker amongst the anticonfederates has harped and harped and harped on the matter of taxes. It's been almost the second word in every speech. The impression aimed at is that our people would be smothered by taxes, that they'd be taxed to death if we enter confederation. There may be a country somewhere in this world where they have no taxes. If there is, I've never heard of it, unless it's a country without a government. All countries have taxes, as we know so well here in Newfoundland. They say there are two sure things for all mankind — taxes and death. I certainly don't say that if we enter confederation there'll be no taxes. Now there are many principles of taxation, but the greatest principles are these two. First, that there should be equality of sacrifice in paying taxes. The second principle is that it's not so much how much taxes you pay, as what you have left after you have paid your taxes. These are the two greatest principles of taxation. I know of no country in the world that offends against those two principles as much as our own Newfoundland does. Our chief way of raising taxes in Newfoundland is through the customs tariff, the customs duties on our imports. This is called indirect taxation. Of course there are other kinds of indirect taxation as well as customs duties, but what do we mean by indirect taxes? If a government sends a bill to a man for a certain amount of money as his share of paying the cost of running the country, and if the man knows exactly how much it is and puts his hand in his pocket and pays the government himself, then that is direct taxation. It is paid directly by the person who is supposed to pay it. It goes direct from the taxpayer to the government, so to speak.... But with indirect taxation you have something altogether