manufactured by the government itself or under the complete control of the government, with profits eliminated", Hon. Dr. R. J. Manion, leader of the National Conservative party, said last night at the annual banquet of the Commercial Travellers' Association of Canada.

"In addition there should be complete control of profits in the manufacture of arms and munitions of all kinds for the United Kingdom", said Doctor Manion.

"These proposals are fair", he said, "because they leave plenty of opportunity for private enterprise; they give a real opportunity for service to Canada; they assure cooperation and a fair deal to the empire and thereby assure Canadian producers of their share of the immense British contracts for munitions and armaments which are required."

Doctor Manion said he offered government control and elimination of profits as an alternative to complete nationalization of armament manufacture, because "I don't like to see the governments getting too much into business and because of the large capital expenditures complete government manufacture might involve."

That statement expresses my opinion to-day. It is open to modification in detail, but again I say I do not wish to quarrel with the proposal of a defence purchasing board. I do want to know the set-up and the ideas back of it and the principles on which it will work.

The next paragraph of the speech from the throne refers to the trade agreement with the United States. Even in the speech from the throne there is a certain amount of propaganda on behalf of that trade agreement, propaganda which was put out on a very large scale as soon as the agreement was signed. It was signed on November 17, and on the following day and for many days thereafter the press was printing the fortysix pages, I think, of comment handed out by the government, all of it commendatory. A little later I shall deal with that in a very general way, but I want to say that in my opinion there is too much propaganda being put out by the government in regard to such things as the trade agreement and other matters. It is being put out over the radio on various occasions; in fact I made it my business to try to get a list of all the ministers who have been speaking on the radio across Canada for the last six or eight months. I have here a list of some ten or twelve ministers who have been speaking on the air, supposedly explaining the workings of the various departments of the government and, of course,-perhaps justifiably, since they are on the air-throwing in the odd word which would show their great work in looking after their various departments.

I suggest here, sir, that in future, whether it be the present government or the one which will succeed it next year, when we want propaganda of that sort put out, the men who write the statements should read them, because I venture to assert that not one of the ministers wrote the statements which they so carefully read over the radio. I speak with some authority and knowledge, because I did that myself on one occasion. At any rate I have the idea that it might be well if the deputy minister or the assistant deputy minister or the secretary, or whoever writes the statement, should read that address, in order to avoid the impression-which is probably false—that some of the ministers might try to put over a little political propaganda. I mention this partly as a result of what I was going to call the action of the government, but according to the statement made by the Prime Minister I willingly refrain from blaming it on the government. However, I do want to refer very briefly to the incident which occurred as between the radio corporation and George McCullagh.

It strikes me, sir, that this censorship, because that is what it amounts to, is not appropriate while all the time we-all of usare talking so much about our democracy. We all talk a great deal about the value of free speech, a free press, free religion, free assembly, and so on; I have done it many times myself. But with all due respect to the officials of the radio corporation, and with all due respect to the statement made by the Prime Minister this afternoon, I submit that in this country it is not sufficient that any one man should have the power to say who shall or shall not speak over the radio. We all know that in Italy, Germany and Russia no one may have the freedom of speech we have here, but I resent the idea that any prominent man who is a law abiding citizen, who does not advocate anything in the way of revolution, who does not offend any great body of people, whether in connection with religion or in any other way, should be forbidden to speak over the air, when other men have been given that privilege.

Take the example of Mr. George Drew, who was recently elected leader of the Conservative party in the province of Ontario. According to a statement which I read in one of the Toronto papers just yesterday or the day before, George Drew said he was permitted to do what George McCullagh was not allowed to do. Mr. Drew stated that it was put up to him that he should have the backing or endorsation—I have forgotten the exact word—of some organization, such as the Conservative party, for example; but he said he refused to ask for any endorsation and spoke as a private citizen. I do not mind saying that I do not