

Disabled Persons Act

at the time the Civil Service Act was revised. It seeks to amend the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act and, thereby, to deal helter-skelter with this whole question. I think that term is more applicable than the one I used before.

Mr. Howard: Six o'clock.

Mr. Pallett: It seeks to amend Section 38 of the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act so that the crown would be placed in the same position as any private employer in the country. Over the years we have tended to regard the crown as a more benevolent employer than most—one which sought in its dealings with its employees to consider many factors which are not usually considered by those in the private field. Indeed, the government has been described by many, as a model employer.

I see it is six o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: If the house will permit me, I shall not leave the chair for a moment.

The hour for the consideration of private members' business having expired, the house will revert to the business which was interrupted at five o'clock.

DISABLED PERSONS ACT**AMENDMENTS TO INCREASE PAYMENTS AND ALLOWABLE INCOME**

The house resumed consideration in committee on the following resolution—Mr. Monteith (Perth)—Mr. Martineau in the chair.

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to amend the Disabled Persons Act to increase to sixty five dollars per month the maximum amount of allowance in respect of which payments may be made to the provinces under the provisions of that act, and to increase the total amount of allowable income, inclusive of allowance, by one hundred and eighty dollars a year in the case of an unmarried person and three hundred and sixty dollars a year in the case of a married person.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Pearson: This afternoon, Mr. Chairman, at five o'clock I had begun to deal with the question of shared programs which was raised at some length by the Prime Minister in his contribution to the debate this afternoon. During his speech he said that he would give me an opportunity, of which I wish to take advantage, of saying whether our shared program policy as a party is that which was enunciated in the resolution at the Liberal rally of January, 1961, or as stated by me in a speech in Quebec a few months ago.

As I recall his words, the Prime Minister said that conditional grants, according to the Leader of the Opposition—he was referring to me—are to be taken from the provinces, that such was our policy, that shared programs are no longer to exist and that they are, in the words of the Prime Minister, to be allowed to phase out. He asked what would happen to the individual in the provinces in which those programs were to be allowed to phase out if our alleged policy was put into effect. Then he concluded that part of his remarks by asking or begging me to reply and say whether I was opposed to shared programs.

Mr. Monteith (Perth): He asked you if you wanted to reduce them.

Mr. Pearson: I hope to answer that question and to do so in some detail in order to make the record clear so that it will not be possible for the Prime Minister or other members of the government to misrepresent or distort that record. I will say at once that this party is not against shared programs. It is not against co-operation with the provinces in such shared programs. If and when it feels it desirable to withdraw federal financial participation in such shared programs, that is something that would be done with the consent and the approval of the government concerned; and if it were done by agreement of that kind, full compensation would be made to the province in question so that the program could be carried on by the province.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): What does that mean?

Mr. Pearson: I therefore ask the minister or any member of the government whether he objects to that shared program policy.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Nobody can understand what the Leader of the Opposition is saying.

Mr. Pearson: It would be quite impossible to explain it to the satisfaction of my hon. friend. I am aware of that fact. In order to make the record clear I am going to repeat what I said on this matter first in Winnipeg, then in Quebec and then in Guelph, Ontario, in order to remove this stupid and baseless charge made by the Minister of Justice, that I have said in one part of the country something which I am afraid to repeat in another part of the country. Let me say that I will now repeat the three speeches. Then we shall see how much there is to the charge made by the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Monteith (Perth): Right.

Mr. Pearson: I know the minister is obliged to intervene in this debate because, after all, he is in charge of the debate.