Disabled Persons Act

is guilty.

Mr. Denis: The minister is doing it now.

Mr. Pearson: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your effort to give me a quiet floor. Now that the hon, minister is writing away perhaps I can proceed.

Mr. Monteith (Perth): I am just writing a letter to my wife.

An hon. Member: What about the United Nations?

Mr. Pearson: In respect of the contributory pension plan it is now obvious that survivors' benefits and disability pensions—the portability of a scheme—has to be brought into effect in co-operation with the provinces. That requires provincial consent and perhaps a constitutional amendment, but the basic contributory pensions can be brought into effect without any kind of constitutional amendment because the constitutional amendment to cover the basic provisions of the pension fund was secured a good many years ago.

An hon. Member: Nuts.

Mr. Pearson: I hope my hon. friend's eloquent interruption gets into Hansard. The government have been seeking for some way to delay such a scheme. They have delayed it for years in spite of their statements in 1957-58 that if they could get a constitutional amendment they would do it. Now they say they cannot do it without a constitutional amendment, but that is wrong. It is a defeatist attitude. That is the attitude they should have taken five years ago, and so not have deceived the people of Canada.

Now that we are awaiting an election we have an obligation to tell the people how we would do it. We have done that. We ask the government to do the same.

Mr. Jones: The Leader of the Opposition has the obligation whether there is an election or not.

Mr. Pearson: That was a silly, juvenile interjection.

Mr. Campbell (Stormont): After listening to the most eloquent address by the Leader of the Opposition I am reminded of my own Scottish grandmother who was addicted to the Scriptures. After one particularly childish prank, at the age of about seven years, she instructed me to look up Proverbs, chapter 17, verse 28. I was going to save this particular verse for the hon. member for Essex East. I was going to commend it to him on one of those occasions which we have come to regard as typical of his contributions, but I think in all charity and kindness I ment's duties and responsibilities in other

Mr. Balcer: The hon. member for Laurier should commend it to the Leader of the Opposition for his edification and instruction tonight as it seems singularly appropriate. Verse 28 says this:

Even a fool, when he holdeth his peace, is counted wise: and he that shutteth his lips is esteemed a man of understanding.

I have only one more comment to make about the speech of the Leader of the Opposition with regard to the great increase in productivity during the post-war years, the great years of Liberal boom. Of course he attributes this to the acumen and abilities of the men who guided the destinies of our nation at that time. However, I contend it was due to certain fortunate peculiarities. In the first instance it was due to the accumulation of purchasing power over the four years of war during which the people could not spend any money. It was also due to the accumulated veterans grants which were finally spent all at once. It was also due to the fact that the economies of Western Europe and Japan were devastated, and we were in the fortunate position for some years after the war of being able to sell whatever we produced at whatever prices we asked. Then finally, just when the bloom was coming off the rose, along came the Korean war with the tremendous United States defence spending which it engendered.

In addition to all that, there was the great influx of foreign capital, particularly United States capital, largely to take advantage of British commonwealth preferences, and to such an extent that 51 per cent of our secondary industry is owned outside the country. That was the cause and origin of the tremendous post-war boom. It was due to these fortuitous circumstances over which no one here had control.

My remarks on this particular topic tonight will be brief and extemporaneous.

Mr. Pickersgill: The better for both.

Mr. Campbell (Stormont): I commend the minister and the government for this legislation and the increase which it provides. It is not as large as I would like to see. Personally I would have raised the level to \$75, but much more would I prefer to see the age for eligibility for normal pensions being lowered to 60 years. I shall give my reasons in a moment, but just now I wish to say the minister and the government have given every evidence of their solicitude for social welfare. This government has given two substantial increases in four years, increases unprecedented in the history of our country.

If there could have been any larger grants made at this time, consistent with the govern-

[The Chairman.]