

Disabled Persons Act

Mr. Fisher: You are hitting a high level.

Mr. McDonald (Hamilton South): In the Conservative party today there are many people who support the workingman. They do not look down upon him or try to use him for their political advantage. In the Conservative party today we can have private enterprise with social justice and welfare, and we do not need nationalization by any socialist party.

I should like to speak a little about the legislation that is before us, dealing with disability pensions. I am not a specialist in a lot of things like the members of the New Democratic party and the Liberal party, but I know something about disability pensions. These people deserve a good break all the way down the line. The members of the official opposition tell us that they have done everything. The hon. member for Essex East brags and boasts about all the pieces of social legislation that he has put on the statute books, but when they had a surplus of well over \$250 million in 1957 what did the Liberals do for the old age pensioners, disability pensioners and blind pensioners? They gave them a \$6 increase.

Mr. Brassard (Lapointe): We instituted them.

Mr. McDonald (Hamilton South): The hon. gentleman from Lapointe is always interrupting. Get up on your feet and talk about this thing. Find out what is going on. When the government goes to the country the next time it will go with a clear conscience that it has tried to do its best in the social welfare field throughout Canada, and has not tried to buy votes as the official opposition are trying to do with their program of political juggling.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, I had not, of course, intended to participate for a second time in this debate on disability pensions. However, you will know, Mr. Chairman, that the debate has now been opened wide by the Prime Minister. It is now possible, according to the Prime Minister, who was permitted to do so, to talk about anything in the world and under the sun. I assume we will be given the same liberty the Prime Minister was given. He spent about an hour and ten minutes on his speech, and only about three minutes of that was on the resolution before us.

During his statement he indulged, as he did the other day, in a good deal of derisive, personal attack on individuals who are not able to speak for themselves in this house. It is a characteristic tactic of the Prime Minister—

An hon. Member: Bill of rights.

Mr. Pearson: Yes, the author of the bill of rights; he attacks in this house, by name, those who cannot defend themselves in this house, just as last session his government attacked the governor of the Bank of Canada in this house without giving him a chance to defend himself. It is one way of dealing with the serious problems that confront the country at the present time. It is the method which seems to appeal most to hon. gentlemen opposite. They get a great deal of encouragement and support from their supporters as they put on this kind of performance.

I think it goes a little too far, Mr. Chairman, when the Prime Minister of this country will single out men by name, as he has done and as indeed he did today, and accuse them of being bureaucrats, of having throttled the liberty of the country during the war, of being responsible for orders in council—

Mr. Pallett: The Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Pearson: The hon. gentleman can sit down.

Mr. Pallett: The Prime Minister at no time—

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. Is the parliamentary secretary rising on a point of order?

Mr. Pallett: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Robichaud: Make a speech on your feet for a change.

Mr. Starr: Stop the closure, boys.

Mr. Pallett: The point of order, Mr. Chairman, is this. There can be no misquotation, direct, intentional or accidental, of a speech made immediately prior in a debate. The Leader of the Opposition cannot point to any remarks made by the Prime Minister with reference to any bureaucrat, any veteran service or anything of the like, as the Leader of the Opposition has just now done. This is the point of order I raise, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Robichaud: That is closure.

Mr. Pearson: I take it, Mr. Chairman, you are going to deal with this so-called point of order.

The Deputy Chairman: I do so very briefly. The point raised by the parliamentary secretary is one of debate, and I cannot recognize it as a point of order. I would therefore ask the Leader of the Opposition to continue.

Mr. Pearson: The point the hon. gentleman was trying to make was that there could be no misquotation, misinterpretation or misstatement on my part of a statement that had been made just previously by the Prime