

will receive, so far as they may receive anything at all. There is not even a guarantee of the extent to which this measure of relief is to be carried out.

Plans for the reestablishment of the unemployed in various parts of the country are in preparation—

What does that mean? It may mean absolutely nothing. Plans may continue to be in preparation for years to come, and in all probability will if the problem continues to be dealt with in the future as it has been dealt with in the past. When will they become operative?

—and will become operative as soon as, in the opinion of my ministers, the public expenditure incident thereto will be productive of commensurate benefits.

They will become operative only when “in the opinion of my ministers” something happens which may never happen while they remain in office. I think by this time the country knows what in the opinion of hon. gentlemen opposite is likely to be an occasion for quick and effective action in the matter of relief.

The statement in the speech from the throne setting forth the government's policy with regard to unemployment must be read in the light of previous declarations by those who are now members of the ministry, and more particularly by the Prime Minister, with respect to what the Conservative party would do if returned to office, and what its policies would be in dealing with this great problem. I should like to read to the Prime Minister a few extracts from the speeches he made during the elections of 1930 when he appealed to the unemployed from one end of the country to the other to support him and a Conservative administration. He told them he was going to call a special session of parliament and that session would be called, for what purpose? To end unemployment. I ask hon. members to compare the statements which I shall now read with the statements made in the speech from the throne. Remember the speech indicates that the present policy will be one of the dole, which is the equivalent of no policy at all.

At Victoria, British Columbia, in 1930, the present Prime Minister said:

You have my promise that if the Conservative party is returned to power that as soon after July 28 as possible parliament will be called together to deal with the problem of unemployment by providing, not doles, but work.

At Calgary, Alberta, he said:

I propose that parliament shall formulate a definite plan for permanent relief, and that parliament shall deal with this national

problem. . . . I am convinced this unemployment has now ceased to be local and provincial and has become national in its importance.

At Edmonton, Alberta, he said:

I will call parliament together, at the earliest possible moment, to provide at once the remedy—employment for all who can and will work.

At Moncton, New Brunswick, he said:

The Conservative party is going to find work for all who are willing to work, or perish in the attempt. I promise to end unemployment.

At Sarnia, Ontario, he said:

Some one is responsible for unemployment; not individuals, but governments. Governments by their majorities in parliament are responsible for enacting all legislation.

At Quebec City he said:

What you want is work, not conferences, and you are going to get work.

Those were the speeches made by the leader of the Conservative party by virtue of which he holds to-day the position of Prime Minister of Canada. Those pledges have been wholly ignored and are now repudiated. The speech from the throne declares that all the government is going to do is the thing which the leader of the Conservative party, the present Prime Minister of Canada, said explicitly he would not do, namely, give doles instead of work.

There is another phase to this matter even more serious. When the Prime Minister was leading the Conservative forces during the campaign of 1930 he took the position that unemployment was a national problem and, as appears in one of the extracts I read, that what was needed was a national scheme to deal with the whole question. The speech from the throne indicates that the government has abandoned altogether the idea of a national scheme if indeed it really ever seriously entertained such an idea. It not only abandons the idea of a national scheme, but it now disclaims that in matters of unemployment there is a national responsibility. Stop for a moment and hear what the present leader of the government said when speaking in Calgary on June 12, 1930. His words were as follows:

I propose parliament shall formulate a definite plan for permanent relief, and that parliament shall deal with this national problem. . . . I am convinced this unemployment has now ceased to be local and provincial and has become national in its importance.

Now compare these words with the words uttered by the Prime Minister as recently as September 6 of this year when speaking in Calgary to a delegation from the western cities and provinces:

“So far as I'm concerned, the administration of relief does not lie with the Dominion