

(b) The Tories vs Family Allowances:

When this great measure was proposed five years ago, the opposition was led by Mr. Drew, who was then Premier of the Conservative Government in Ontario and by Mr. Bracken, Conservative Leader of the Federal Opposition. Some of the phrases that Mr. Drew used to describe this Act have become well known in Canada:

"outrageous bribe offered to the people of Quebec";
"not worth the paper it is written on";
"unsound and unworkable".

However, in spite of Mr. Drew's most determined efforts, he failed to stop this measure from becoming law and I was able a few weeks ago to extract from Mr. Drew a promise that if by an unlikely chance he should become Prime Minister of Canada he would not repeal the Family Allowances Act. Of course, I am sure you agree with what Prime Minister St. Laurent said a few days ago - that any government that attempted to repeal Family Allowances would not last a week.

(c) Tory Record of Failure in 1930-35:

I suggest to you, as one who has watched the Tories over many years and at close hand, the best way to get the attitude of the Progressive Conservative Party towards measures for social security is not to pay any attention to their recent promises but to take a very searching look at their record. An ex-leader of the Tory Party, for example, the Rt. Hon. Arthur Meighen, formerly Conservative Prime Minister, believes that "social security is a false creed for government". Nowadays, most Conservatives profess to believe in social security but they still fail to practise it to any noticeable degree. Anyone who has read the Tory platform and listened to Mr. Drew's speeches recently in this Province would be under the impression that the Tory Party has been reformed. We all hope that this is so. However, let us not forget its record in the depression years, 1930-35, in which it held power in Ottawa. During this period, the Tory Party succeeded in doing the following things:

- (1) It cut federal health department expenditures by 44%
- (2) It abolished the only national health grant to the provinces.
- (3) It took no action to increase pensions for the aged or to institute pensions for the blind.
- (4) It reduced federal grants to private health and welfare agencies.

.....10