

is necessarily highly confidential. To make it public would require the consent of the governments concerned. I shall be glad to communicate at once with the British government to ascertain to what extent, if at all, they think the correspondence which passed between the Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs and the Secretary of State for External Affairs in Canada should be made public, and I shall be glad to inform my hon. friend and the house of the result of the communication.

May I add that I am sure my hon. friend and the house will realize at once that the correspondence referred to contains many references to other countries as well as to Great Britain and Canada; and I believe it is the practice where other countries are referred to in confidential correspondence not to have any such correspondence produced. I make that statement at once so that the house will understand the limitations on the government.

Mr. MANION: I fully understand that, and I excluded confidential information when I put the question. I am speaking in entire good faith, but I do feel that in view of the references to the subject by the Prime Minister himself in his speech yesterday and the probability that the matter may again be discussed during the session, hon. members should be familiar with the situation. There are of course certain matters which should not be made public, but I accept the right hon. gentleman's assurance that so far as the correspondence can be brought down it will be made available to hon. members.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Monday, January 16, consideration of the motion of Mr. J. E. Matthews for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Manion.

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, as I have moved about from place to place in Canada this year I find that the underlying thought expressed by men in the cities and in the country is this: "democracy is a failure. And the democracies supposed to be the greatest are the greatest failures." Now I submit, without committing myself either for or against that statement, that the prime task of this parliament is to see that democracy shall not be a failure, that it shall succeed.

Why do men feel that democracy in Canada has failed? The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Manion) yesterday gave some in-

formation, as reported on page 23 of *Hansard*, which I believe should be a challenge to every hon. member of this house. He said he found that Germany, Italy and Japan, taken all together, were only just a little greater in area than the province of Ontario, and that in those three countries there are cooped up, so to speak, 200,000,000 people, while in Ontario there are only 4,000,000 people. Now if the province of Ontario under the guidance of this government and the government at Toronto cannot support 4,000,000 people with a reasonable standard of well-being, while those distressed nations to which we have referred are struggling to keep 200,000,000 people, the evidence seems conclusive that something is radically wrong with the type of democracy we are trying to apply in this dominion.

As evidence of the extent to which we are succeeding in Ontario and in Canada, let me refer to a Canadian Press dispatch from Toronto dated January 11, containing the following statement of Hon. Mr. Cross, minister of public welfare for Ontario:

Mr. Cross said he believed that unless there is a pronounced improvement in business conditions during the current year, Ontario's relief bill for 1939 will be well above the 1938 figure.

He estimated that by the end of this month approximately 283,000 Ontario citizens will be receiving direct aid as against 253,430 during the same month last year. Expenditures during the fiscal year 1938-39, which ends March 31, are expected to exceed the 1937-38 year by at least \$1,000,000.

The astonishing thing to me, Mr. Speaker, is that so many people who are placed in high positions in this country, who are reasonably well to do, seem not to find anything very seriously alarming in a situation of that sort, and seem not to feel that there is any particular responsibility resting upon them because those conditions exist. The truth, I think, is quite the opposite. The simple fact remains that when in a country as rich as Canada, with such a small population, conditions are so contemptibly and shamefully bad, the people will realize that certainly there must be something wrong somewhere.

Another bit of knowledge which fires a man's blood as soon as he acquires it, is conveyed by Harold Loeb in his book called *The Chart of Plenty*, published in 1935, concerning conditions in the United States. He points out that without any change whatever in the industrial equipment of the United States, that country could produce enough goods and services to supply every family in the country with \$4,400 a year. Any person with a disposition to face things as they are naturally asks, "Well, why don't they do it?" That is common sense. Why don't they do it? Where is the fault?