

Disabled Persons Act

directions, there is no doubt they would have been given, and there is no doubt that as soon as the government is in a position to do so it will provide more adequately for those in need. The government's actions have been completely consistent with the policies and traditions of this party, and I am saying this for the benefit of the hon. member for Port Arthur.

It is an historical fact that it was the Tory party in England which relieved excesses in the early days of the industrial revolution, thus preventing the kind of revolution which occurred in France. This was the Tory democracy of Disraeli and the great Tory philanthropist Lord Shaftesbury. This was a continuous stream in the history of the Tory party in the old country, where our origins are, and I am glad to see the measure of consistency that is evident in that respect in this house tonight. It is also consistent with the social legislation brought in by our predecessors, the Bennett government. I am speaking about such things as legalizing trade unions, the eight-hour day, the 48-hour week, the fair trade practices legislation, national minimum wage legislation and unemployment insurance. It is also consistent with the great public utility ventures, public service ventures established to serve the state of Canada, introduced by this party in former times. I am referring to such organizations as the C.B.C., the C.N.R. and the Bank of Canada which were all established by Tory governments.

Mr. Pickersgill: Are you boasting about the Bank of Canada?

Mr. Campbell (Stormont): To listen to some of the hon. members speaking for the opposition one would think that these great organizations which have played such a constructive role in the development of our country were their own private preserve. They merely regard it as their private preserve in their endeavours to pervert it to their own use, but only in that sense could it be regarded as being their private concern.

I think this is also consistent with the attitude the official opposition and their supporters are taking within and outside this house toward this very beneficial, useful and necessary social legislation. I have heard consistent criticism from some of my Liberal friends in Montreal, at home and elsewhere, about this. They have been continually carping critics of this type of legislation. That, too, is consistent with the policy of that party, especially in recent years. All the great vested financial and moneyed interests have become enamoured of the late minister of

trade and commerce; they have become disciples of his and are still supporting his group.

The policies of that particular party are naturally conditioned by those vested interests which are supporting them and this tendency will only be exaggerated and amplified by some of the newer and foremost candidates who are coming forward. The Leader of the Opposition mentioned some of their names earlier. No doubt there are other august personages of a similar calibre in the wings who will more and more dictate the policies of that party.

May I, in criticism of those policies and to illustrate how obsolete they are, how inconsistent they are with the needs and the demands of this urbanized, industrialized twentieth century, cite some criticism from a most distinguished and able journalist, one who is by no means hostile to the official opposition.

An hon. Member: What is his name?

Mr. Campbell (Stormont): His name is Mr. Blair Fraser, one of the most respected journalists in this country. I will read from an editorial of his in *Maclean's* magazine of February 10, 1962. I wish to quote a couple of paragraphs which I think are very relevant to this matter.

Mr. Habel: The date of his birth?

Mr. Campbell (Stormont): He says:

Businessmen should resist the temptation, in an election year, to fire rhetorical shotguns at government spending on welfare. They have no effect on platforms or policy... but they do have an effect on the status, repute and political influence of the business community. If free enterprise is to survive the twentieth century, its advocates had better stop using the language of the nineteenth.

He goes on:

Take old age pensions, which all political parties say they plan to increase. The care of retired people, rich or poor, is a charge on the current economy. They do not work, they do consume, so they are supported by those who are still working. The purpose of a universal, tax-supported pension is to make sure that the benefits are fairly distributed—that everyone, not merely a well-to-do minority, shall live out his retirement in decent independence, and not be forced to rely on relatives or on public charity.

Then he goes on to deal with hospital insurance and other things. But this is the important point; this is the point about which most exception has been taken regarding this very necessary and beneficial legislation. The writer of this article is referring to the point about which exception is usually taken, that it is going to cost too much, it is going to