

twenty years the democratic British parliamentary institutions in which we believe will be in very great danger of being completely wiped out, and our whole democratic system is likely to disappear. To my mind those who do not see this are blind. They are people without vision, and when the leaders of a country have no vision the people are in danger of perishing. More and more the well-to-do middle class are realizing the truth of that very statement, and after long, deep consideration I say solemnly that not since 1867 has Canada had a government that has so completely failed to realize the needs of the country or a government with more limited vision as to the methods by which we might cure the defects of democracy, such as unemployment, absence of security and lack of opportunity for youth—the cure for which must be brought about if we are to preserve not only confederation but our whole social system.

As everyone knows, youth is demoralized in our country. Never has there been a time when our youth have been so completely demoralized, being fed by relief and, in many instances, driven to crime. We were criticized for putting the single unemployed men into camps. Where are they now? A great many are being put into gaol because they cannot earn a living. A great many have drifted into lives of crime. I say this is a national calamity, and again I am going to quote a published statement of the Canadian Welfare Council under date of January 5, 1938. I am going to quote this at some length because it expresses the danger better than I can. They say:

#### A Grave Danger

But now, as for the first sustained period in many years, there seems a breathing space, there emerges, in too many quarters to be disregarded, a danger as grave as the crisis which has shaken us. It takes its rise, in part, in the increasing docility and indifference reported among the recipients of public help in the face of continuing or threatened idleness. A "spiritlessness" and a loss of essential dignity perhaps could not but be by-products of our emergency mass treatment of individual human lives. But more and more, there are signs that the old, loyal and proud submission of the subject to constituted authority is giving way, in fear and insecurity, to a cringing subservience, and unwillingness to venture or to risk. The sense of uncertainty and dependency is sapping at the very foundations of individual initiative, of self-reliance, of an appreciation of the values of spiritual and intellectual freedom. Freedom, to-day, of itself is too generally regarded as a quantity to be despised and scorned as "freedom to suffer and to starve."

There are not wanting signs, in certain quarters, that authority is tightening rein and threatens to ride hard. Ruthlessness alone will not revive broken men. If through our mass

[Mr. Manion.]

treatment of individual disaster, we have destroyed personal enterprise and independence, and if, realizing this, we fail immediately to take measures to retrieve and preserve these qualities, then there slips away the very bulwark of our democratic life. We are indeed a lesser people if the depression has taken from us our appreciation of our ancient liberties,—of thought, of belief, of speech, and of action,—as verities of greater value than life itself.

What did the right hon. gentleman do when he appointed the Purvis commission? That commission was appointed in 1936; that was one promise at least he partially carried out. This was to have been a continuing, administrative body, but instead of that the Purvis commission was dissolved about a year ago. Perhaps I have no right to mention this, but the fact that it was intended to be a permanent body is obvious to anyone who takes a look at its personnel. Mr. Tom Moore, for example, was a well known labour leader who gave up a permanent position to become a member of that board. Did Tom Moore understand that at the end of the year he was going to be dropped? He thought it was going to be a permanent commission. Apparently that was the intention.

Mr. ROGERS: May I correct my hon. friend? Mr. Moore was a member of the social insurance commission appointed by the previous administration, and while a member of that commission was transferred to the national employment commission.

Mr. MANION: I am not quarrelling with that. I simply say that probably he would not have taken the transfer if he had thought that at the end of a year the Purvis commission would be dissolved. I believe he had a permanent position, but he transferred to this one because he was interested in social security, and thought he was going into a permanent position. I wish to make it absolutely clear that not in any shape or form am I quoting Mr. Moore. I am drawing that conclusion from my knowledge of Tom Moore.

However, the commission was dissolved, and their recommendations have not been carried out. I shall read twelve of them briefly, as I find them in their report. Only two of these or, at the outside three of them, have been touched. They are as follows:

1. A great national cooperative effort to end unemployment.

That was one of them.

2. Employment services to be national.

None of these has been carried out.

3. Commission to be administrative, not just advisory.

4. A proper registry of unemployed and their classification.