

Disabled Persons Act

create catastrophe and inflation, and heaven knows what else, in the typical fashion of these prophets of gloom. This is the answer:

Even this threat of inflation, though, has been magnified by wolf-crying critics. This year Canada is running up the biggest peacetime deficit ever, yet prices are stable. In the past four years the total budget deficits of the federal government are over \$2 billions, and prices have gone up only 6½ per cent. Between 1948 and 1957, on the other hand, we accumulated surpluses of more than a billion and a half and yet we did have inflation—a price increase of 25 per cent.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Campbell (Stormont): He continues:

Deficit financing is not inevitably disastrous, and this is a fact of recent experience that every voter knows. Oratory to the opposite effect is therefore unconvincing.

I contend that this type of legislation, which is so typical of the present government, can be justified, apart altogether from its necessity, apart altogether from humanitarian grounds, on a sound economic basis, because there is nothing that does more to help business and to improve business conditions than increasing the consumer purchasing stream. These elderly people, immediately their pensions are increased, need to spend it on necessities, on consumer goods. They dash down to the corner grocer and buy something more to eat. This money is always kept going around; it increases the consumer purchasing stream and keeps the economy going. On that basis alone it can be more than justified.

One can get into very intangible areas when making projections into the future; but I believe that in future it is inevitable that we have more leisure, that working hours be shorter. We are now approaching what might be called a bureaucratic revolution. Originally we had an industrial revolution, but now, with automation, mechanization and what have you, we are getting into a bureaucratic revolution. Go down to Montreal or Toronto or any of the big cities on this continent and you will see these great, new skyscraper office buildings; these human filing cabinets, if you want to call them that. This is the type of thing that indicates the trend or the direction in which society is going inevitably in this day and age of the twentieth century. Because of this it seems inevitable that labour will become less and jobs, in a physical sense, will become fewer and fewer.

This is a long term economic trend independent of any government or anything that governments can do. Therefore it seems the part of wisdom to provide that if there is to be an almost continual shortage of employment, those in the prime of life, those who are supporting families should have first priority. This may involve lowering the age qualification for these pensions to 60 so that older

people can be prepared and will have the knowledge that they will be able to live the latter part of their lives in security, and they can plan and act accordingly. This, of course, has no immediate relevance but to my mind this is the trend of the future, and this type of legislation is consistent with this trend.

Therefore I once again heartily endorse this legislation which is in such striking contrast to the chaotic, jumping back and forth program that was brought in by the official opposition and then scrapped when they heard that a more practical one was proposed by the government. I contend that this legislation is the best that is available at this time, consistent with the other responsibilities of this government, and I very heartily endorse it.

Mr. Brassard (Lapointe): Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Campbell (Stormont): Yes, surely.

Mr. Pickersgill: He would love it.

Mr. Brassard (Lapointe): Was it not a Progressive Conservative member of parliament who was named by the Speaker on July 29, 1944 at a time when he was objecting to the family allowances legislation?

Mr. Campbell (Stormont): I did not understand the question. Would the hon. member mind repeating it?

An hon. Member: Is your name Courtemanche?

Mr. Brassard (Lapointe): Is the hon. member aware that it was a Progressive Conservative member of parliament who was named by the Speaker on July 29, 1944 when he was objecting to the family allowances legislation?

Mr. Campbell (Stormont): I was not in the family allowances legislation. That was in Ontario, was it not?

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Stormont. I may say that his Gallic fervour, his quotations from scriptures, his physical animation and his pretentious diction gave an appearance of substance to what was, in effect, pure wind.

Mr. Campbell (Stormont): Can the hon. member inform us who is responsible for the impure wind which is emanating from that quarter of the house?

The Chairman: Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. Herridge: I see the hon. member for Greenwood is very anxious to commence. He usually waits until I have finished pain-ing him and then tries to knock my ninepins over.