

Disabled Persons Act

Minister. If that rule had applied also to the Prime Minister in his speech we would only have had to listen to him for about five minutes instead of for an hour and five minutes.

As I was saying before the hon. gentleman so gallantly came to the rescue of the Prime Minister, it is not part of the dignity of debate in this house to single out by name people who cannot defend themselves, misinterpret their views, misquote their remarks, and then have someone else get up in the house when an attempt is made to reply to this kind of attack and say that is out of order.

Mr. Jones: Are you referring to the speech you made against Alvin Hamilton?

Mr. Pearson: When the Prime Minister introduced this subject and introduced these men by name, and talked about them and their activities during the war, referring to them as bureaucrats, he forgot that one of them was leading his brigade across Europe at that time. He was not in Canada at all; he was abroad. Then the Prime Minister talked about the Liberal conference at Kingston, at Queen's University, and talked about a member of that conference daring to advocate a tax on advertising in a paper which he gave to the conference.

The Prime Minister keeps referring to this matter. I know it is very difficult indeed for the Prime Minister, and it is difficult for most members of the Tory party, to understand how a conference of that kind can be held at which ideas are encouraged and not throttled. In so far as this particular proposal was concerned, which I will say I did not think was a very sensible one, it seems odd to find the Prime Minister attacking it, as he has done so many times, when he is now about to introduce into this house a measure which would impose a 25 per cent tax on advertising.

However, that is not the only inconsistency in the Prime Minister's observations. This afternoon the Prime Minister showed an almost morbid, certainly a passionate pre-occupation with the past; and by "past" he means the fairly immediate past, going back to 1957-58. It is quite clear, Mr. Chairman, that the Prime Minister tried to concentrate on 1958 so that he would not have to concentrate on 1962. In view of what is going to happen to the Prime Minister and his friends in 1962, I can understand his passionate determination to return to 1958.

He does not, however, go very far beyond 1958 when he talks about social security, social justice and the development of these things in our country; because if he did, if he wanted to go over the whole history of

the development of social legislation now on the statute books, he would find that practically every piece of legislation in that field was once opposed by his party. Almost all these social security measures, including children's allowances, were once opposed by them, but in the course of time they saw the error of their ways. They realized that if they continued to take that Tory approach to these progressive measures they never would leave the opposition.

Perhaps it is a compliment to the Liberal party which introduced these pieces of legislation that now, in principle at least, social security is non-partisan. All parties approve of it. In his efforts to show what he and his government have done to improve our social security structure in recent years, the Prime Minister of course dragged out, as he has done before and no doubt he will again, but I hope not for very long, and manipulated his selective statistics, his phony and incomplete returns. All the figures which he put on the record this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, have been put on before and they have been dealt with by this side.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Were they not correct?

Mr. Pearson: They were not correct. They were incomplete and incorrect and, as the Prime Minister has opened up the subject, we on this side of the house will take all the time required to correct the figures and complete the record. It is part of that educational process which should be so rewarding to hon. gentlemen opposite.

An hon. Member: Which ones would you eliminate?

Mr. Pearson: The Prime Minister, among other things, referred to some of the proposals we have been making on this side, and in particular he referred to our plan for contributory old age insurance as a gigantic hoax. I recognize the authority of the Prime Minister to talk about hoaxes.

Mr. Jones: He has been studying Liberal hoaxes for a long time.

Mr. Pearson: In this field what greater hoax could there have been—

Mr. Walker: Than Lester Pearson.

Mr. Pearson: I know that hon. gentlemen opposite, when they get a little harassed, descend to the low level of personalities. That is their stock in trade.

Mr. Bourget: It is typical of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. Pearson: That is the way these hon. gentlemen are governing the country—

Mr. Jones: Nonsense.