

work might be provided, that the revenues themselves might be increased and that we might have the means whereby to carry out some of our social ideas.

Let me recall the Prime Minister's question asked at Montreal: "If you don't want your old people cared for then vote for Taschereau and King?" Here is my answer to the falsity of an assertion of that character. In April 1924, on the records of the house, there is a statement that a special committee was appointed on the motion of Mr. Mackenzie King to make inquiries into an old age pensions system for Canada. It was recommended that the provinces should be communicated with in that connection. In other words, the Liberal party proceeded, as it always has in social as well as in other matters, on the basis, not of seeking to stir up enmity between the dominion and the provinces, not of making such appeals as, "Are you going to support Taschereau and King," but of endeavouring to have the provinces and the dominion work harmoniously together for the purpose of furthering great social objectives. We have sought to communicate with the provinces and to secure their good will in matters of the kind. We succeeded in getting it with regard to old age pensions, but we had to act within the lines that the officers of the crown told us were possible. On May 1, 1925, the special committee was again appointed. On June 16, 1925, the committee recommended in favour of setting up a scheme but also that an effort be made to receive cooperative action on the part of the provinces. In 1926 the bill, after much debate and criticism from the then Conservative opposition, was adopted in the house. The Conservative party, however had a majority in the Senate and the bill was defeated in that chamber. Such was the initial fate of this Liberal measure of social reform. I wonder what the fate is going to be of these measures of social reform, when they go to the Senate, should they ever get through a Conservative majority in the house. I hope the electorate will bear in mind the complexion of the Senate as it was all the time the late Liberal administration was in office and is likely to be for many years to come, and I hope it will remember the Senate's action on the first extensive measure of social reform that was introduced by a Liberal government—an old age pension measure passed by the House of Commons under Liberal administration and defeated in the upper house by a Conservative majority. The matter, however, was not allowed to drop there. The following year, after the general election of 1926, a bill identical in terms was

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

introduced in this house by the then Minister of Labour, Mr. Heenan. After considerable discussion it passed both houses and received royal assent on March 31, 1927. There in part is my answer to the Prime Minister as to whether as a Liberal I have done my share as opportunity has presented itself to further social and labour legislation in this house and in the country, and as to whether, when I was Prime Minister, I sought to give practical effect to the principles laid down in the work on industrial reconstruction to which I referred this afternoon.

There is one other measure to which I should like to refer but which is not mentioned by the Minister of Labour in his report. It is significant that it is a measure of social legislation. With the exception of the relief measures, it is the only social legislation that this government has passed since it came to office. I refer to the Act for the promotion of vocational education in Canada passed by the House of Commons on July 23, 1931. There are some of us here to-day who will remember the discussion on that measure. At the time it was introduced I said to hon. gentlemen opposite that I thought they were in for a pretty large outlay in connection with their unemployment relief schemes; that they had better have a conference with the provinces to discuss the financial relations between the provinces and the dominion and the financial circumstances of the provinces and of the dominion in regard to these matters; that before they went in for making further grants in aid of one kind or another to the provinces, they had better find out if they were prepared for the taxation and revenues necessary to meet those obligations. But, no, they were persistent, they were going to have this measure upon the statute books. Well, it is there, just as the Prime Minister said it was important that the people should have on the statute books an act pertaining to elections whether its provisions were available for use or not. What happened in regard to the vocational education measure? In the report of the minister there is no mention of the act. It is not there because it is buried. The government sent a communication privately to the different provinces to say it could not be carried into effect. There was to be a payment of \$750,000 annually for fifteen years; that was what they were committing themselves to. I do not know how much they are going to commit themselves to on their social projects; probably they may run into many millions of dollars, but if they do not mean more than this measure, let the Lord help those who are expected to benefit by them and those who are in suffering and in need. Here is