

not some help along this line given nearly four years ago? Someone who was most unkind has whispered, "Do you not know there is liable to be an election this year?" That information may be authentic, but I do not know.

I understand the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Mackenzie) has originated some scheme of financing our defence costs over a ten year period. This may help the Minister of Finance (Mr. Dunning) out of some of his difficulties. Apparently we are not to get the full effect of the blow until a year or two from now. I noticed the hon. member for North Battleford (Mr. McIntosh) has again introduced legislation to change our flag. I suggest that he defer any action this year in order that we may have an opportunity to realize what the union jack means to Canada and what it has meant down through the centuries. Perhaps if we pass safely through a few more crises, we can adopt a suitable ensign for ceremonial purposes. If 200,000 of the unemployed are again called to arms—and God forbid that they should be—I do not imagine they will mind standing shoulder to shoulder with British tommies under the union jack. The history of Canada is such that every right-thinking Canadian cannot help but realize that, after all, we are a part of the British empire.

Many people in this country are tired of camouflage. They have had enough evasion. They are wondering how long it will be before we come out and tell the world where we stand. We are being asked to vote \$60,000,000 or \$70,000,000 for defence. So far as I am concerned, if it were necessary I would say, make it \$160,000,000 or \$170,000,000. But I do urge this government to make haste in taking armaments out of the political pot. Let us not have half measures; let us be honest with these young men who are unemployed. How we shall need their services if we are forced to spend perhaps \$100,000,000 or more on defence!

I plead with this government to see that in the spending of the next \$10,000,000 or \$12,000,000 there is no need to smear Canadian defence records with another investigation. Perhaps some hon. members will rise in their place, and say that there was no need of an investigation. But the report is being read; it is now in the hands of the public. I suggest to all members of the government and to all others who do not think in terms of Canada and the empire that they tune in on what is on the air. This is one broadcast that cannot be controlled by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation of the present government.

[Mr. Lockhart.]

In this connection may I say that I am one who favours the reasonable regulation of broadcasting period. Wave-lengths must be controlled and distributed. The broadcasting of obscene programs must be made an indictable offence. There are many other matters that must and can be controlled as they are being controlled by other countries in the handling of radio broadcasting. Let us consider the system that has been built up in Canada, as it has been made evident in the last few weeks. This system has been financed largely by taking \$2.50 from the pockets of each individual radio owner in this country. This is just another broadcast that will deal a death-blow to the government when the next election comes round. I say to the people of Canada that it will not be long now. If I am in this parliament when that time comes, I shall move to have this unfair tax taken from the statute books. All this has been described to me in a rather amusing way, which is perhaps worth repeating, as the broadcast from LPSO. When I asked for an interpretation of that station name, I was told it was the "Liberal party signing off," to return to the air, we hope, at some later date.

I desire to say just a word about unemployment. We have had this time-worn reference to unemployment in previous speeches from the throne. How we have played checkers with this problem during the last three years! Hundreds of thousands of dollars were spent on a commission—of course it must be by a commission—to have the underprivileged set up in new categories and classifications. I opposed the setting up of this commission, but I am quite frank to admit that I am less critical to-day. That commission did make a number of good recommendations with which I am mostly in agreement. But, I ask, how many of them have been acted upon in the speech from the throne delivered in 1939? I expect that Mr. Purvis will have now concluded that such a report as followed the Bren gun inquiry would have served the same end as the one which he so ably submitted to this parliament.

The hon. ministers of the government know or should know, and every hon. member of this house knows or should know, that unemployment is a burning problem in 1939 just as it was in 1936. This government said this before last election. Has it not been held up to our eyes in every speech from the throne since 1935? When no tangible solution has