

they promised the people in 1930. We never said that we could deal with unemployment insurance or old age pensions or anything of that kind except in cooperation with the provinces and I say that the hon. member for East Essex (Mr. Morand) the other evening, unconsciously or unintentionally I hope, but as a matter of fact placed a wrong interpretation upon the platform of the Liberal party. The hon. member, in reading the Liberal platform of the 1919 convention, stated it in this way:

That in so far as may be practicable, having regard for Canada's financial position, an adequate system of insurance against unemployment, sickness, dependence in old age, and other disability, which would include old age pensions, widows' pensions, and maternity benefits, should be instituted by the federal government—

The hon. member stopped there. That is not even the end of the sentence, because it goes on to say:

—in conjunction with the governments of the several provinces.

Mr. MORAND: Why did my hon. friend not do it?

Mr. HEENAN: We did.

Mr. GOBEIL: What did the hon. gentleman do?

Mr. HEENAN: There is no reason that the hon. gentleman should have stopped there; he had the book in his hand. I am inclined to think, knowing him as I do, he did that unintentionally, but whether he did it unintentionally or unconsciously or otherwise, it is a misconstruction or misinterpretation and there was no need for it. As I say again, not only has this government a mandate to deal with this matter on a national scale, but the present Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett), when they were in opposition, declared that they had the power. At that time we were discussing the question of what we could do with industries that were not conforming to fair hours of work. I think we were dealing with the steel industry in Nova Scotia. They said to the government of the day: Parliament has the power; shall we use it? This parliament ought not to go a step further until we say to those industries that are deriving the benefit from our tariff measures: You shall provide thus and so, hours of work, wages, a fair standard of living, or we shall not give you tariff protection. So that if the Prime Minister and the members of this government had the power then, or thought they had, they have it to an even greater extent now, because they have

had a mandate from the people in addition. Does this government mean to say that if it wanted to do as it promised, deal with unemployment relief on a national scale without the assistance of the provinces or the municipalities, either the municipalities or the provinces would object? Does it mean to say that if it wished to pay old age pensions one hundred per cent from the federal treasury, as it promised, any of the provinces would object? Does it mean to say that if it wanted to construct a national highway from coast to coast and pay for it from the federal treasury, as it promised to do in 1930, any of the provinces would object? Of course they would not. Neither would they object if this government instituted an unemployment insurance scheme. There would not be the slightest objection so long as it was an adequate and workable scheme. And I may say in support of the resolution that the way it proposes is the only way that unemployment insurance can possibly work, either in Canada or anywhere else, but more particularly in a country like Canada where workers are going to and fro among the various provinces.

So this government has two ways in which to institute this much-needed reform; it has the way that the hon. member for East Calgary (Mr. Stanley) advocates, that is in co-operation with the provinces, which is the proper way. I am satisfied that if that method were followed every province in this country would be satisfied to participate in an unemployment insurance scheme headed by the national government. And there is the other way, advocated by my hon. friends themselves when they were in opposition. They told us that we could say to the industries of this country; We will give you tariff protection sufficient to enable you to maintain a fair standard of living, to reduce hours of work and increase wages to provide for that standard of living, but if you do not fulfil these conditions you will not be protected by the customs tariff. I am in favour of the former system, but at all hazards I am in favour of one or the other, and I am satisfied that this government can put such a scheme into effect.

We talk about being a progressive nation, but in this respect we have not followed the mother country, which adopted a scheme of this kind twenty-three years ago. Of course the scheme made provision for old age, sickness, and many other matters in addition to unemployment. That scheme was introduced in Great Britain in 1911. Since then Italy, Australia, Bulgaria, Germany, Poland and Switzerland have followed, while within the