

Disabled Persons Act

I could go on and refer to the various promises which were made at the recent meeting on the general subject of social security. There has been a tremendous change—subject to change without notice. In 1956-57 hon. members opposite said "We cannot afford more than \$40". They had a tremendous surplus, but they could not afford to do more than that. If there were needy people they were to look to the municipalities or to the provinces for assistance. Well, do hon. members remember that in 1957 the provinces said they were not receiving fair consideration? That was the reason for one of the promises we made, that we would increase substantially the amounts available to the provinces so they might be able to carry out their responsibility. That we have done.

I have followed with interest the various changes which have taken place in the last few weeks on the subject of pensions. I shall deal with that matter a little later, possibly, if the opportunity presents itself. Suffice it to say that the announcement made on January 11, in respect of which literature was sent all over the country, was changed as soon as it was ascertained during the debate on the speech from the throne that the amount of the increase will be \$10. That changed the policy of January 11.

Then the party opposite brought in the reformed policy at the end of January. In the argument which was advanced there was again a reference to the need for a contributory system. I am not going into the subject of a contributory system now, because that has already been dealt with at length. However, if the hon. gentleman wishes to get me into that I shall be glad to enter the lists immediately.

I do want to say this. When I read and study the promises, or rather the hopes, expressed in the policy initiated by the Leader of the Opposition and those associated with him, I can only say that it is one of the most prodigious hoaxes in all history. From pretending that they were going to pay \$75 they have advanced to—what are the figures? I have them here. One of them predicted \$390, though they have been thinking about putting a ceiling on it so the old people will not get too much. They are going to do all this, and they are going to do it without new taxation and with a budget that is balanced. I think I shall have an opportunity to deal with that. What did Mr. Kent say?

An hon. Member: Mr. Kent is not the leader.

Mr. Diefenbaker: No; he is the leader of the leader.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Apparently that was generally agreed with.

Mr. Brassard (Lapointe): So is Grosart.

Mr. Diefenbaker: In any event, here is what he said at the conference at Queen's.

Mr. Pearson: Body by Fisher.

Mr. Diefenbaker: May I say that "Body by Fisher" is a great deal better than "Brains by Kent"—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker:—if this is an example of the thinking that dominates the Liberal party today. At this conference on September 14, as reported by Mr. Harold Greer—and he certainly is not antagonistic to the Liberal party—we find this statement. He deals with the conference at Kingston. I am not going to read the heading.

An hon. Member: Oh, read it.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I shall read only the beginning of it, which is as follows: "Endorsation of a Political Disaster". Then it refers to the conference, deals with the various items, and states as follows:

Item: Tom Kent, the former editor of the *Winnipeg Free Press* and adviser to Mr. Pearson who now works for a Montreal corporation, presented a 66-page paper which left little to be said on how social welfare should progress in Canada, but his main proposal for financing it consisted of a 50 per cent tax on advertising expenditures.

I could read on, but I shall content myself with reading the concluding paragraphs. With a bow to the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate the second last paragraph states as follows:

It was almost inevitable therefore that the Kingston conference would not be allowed to break up without a warning from the practical politicians—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate smiled with satisfaction at that distinction, Mr. Speaker. The press report continues:

—a task which was performed in a summing-up session on the final day by the master practitioner of them all, John Whitney Pickersgill.

Possibly some time when history is being written, that will be said; I might just interpolate that remark. The report concludes as follows:

What Mr. Pickersgill said was off the record, but the point of view he expressed will be discussed in a second article.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Chairman—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.