

I say we are much safer in the hands of a man like George McCullagh than in the hands of men such as the two groups I mentioned a moment ago. And so I suggest that if there is to be any censorship such as this, the right hon. gentleman should forthwith have something in the way of a censorship broader than that which can be afforded by one man, no matter who or how able that one man may be.

I furthermore suggest, in view of other things which are being said about the radio corporation, that we should have set up this year a committee of the House of Commons to deal not only with the question of censorship but with other matters as well which affect the broadcasting corporation.

I now come to the question of unemployment. I shall deal with it more fully later; at this time I shall confine my observations to one paragraph in the speech from the throne dealing with that subject. The statement is made that under the British North America Act the responsibility for unemployment and the solution of its problems is necessarily divided. The legal responsibility is perhaps divided, but, sir, to a large extent the solution of the problem is the duty of this government and parliament. It was pointed out even by the Purvis commission appointed by the right hon. gentleman opposite—and I shall speak of it in greater detail later—that the financial responsibility for unemployment is a direct responsibility, and that that financial responsibility is federal, not provincial. The relief question, of course, is another question. But they have pointed out what I have now stated. So that when the suggestion is made that the responsibility is perhaps divided, I may agree so far as the question of legality is concerned, but I do not agree in toto so far as the responsibility for the cure of the condition is concerned.

I shall next deal with the paragraph referring to the royal commission on dominion-provincial relations, which is as follows:

The report of the commission on dominion-provincial relations will be presented to parliament in the course of the present session. In accordance with the purpose for which the commission was instituted, its report will provide the basis for, and the material essential to the deliberations of a national conference, at which, among the important subjects to be dealt with, will be the problem of unemployment and social services generally.

This government has been in power nearly four years. We find that at the expiration of that period the government says, "We are going to call another national conference to

[Mr. Manion.]

tell the government and the members of the house what we must do about unemployment." This is the same government, led by the same right hon. gentleman, who was going to cure unemployment, and attacked us because we had not cured it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. EULER: It was the other government.

Mr. MANION: I do not know what hon. gentlemen are cheering about. If they are applauding me, I appreciate it; but I did not catch what they said.

I repeat that this is the very government—all its members, and the right hon. gentleman particularly—which attacked us, over and over again in the house for our inability to cure unemployment. And now, after four years of power, it is going to call a national conference to tell it what to do about the problem! Well, I think almost any conference could tell it to do something much better than that which it has done. I make that statement frankly. It is a reflection upon itself to put it into the mouth of His Excellency the Governor General that it will have to call a conference.

Hon. gentlemen opposite reiterate their faith in unemployment insurance. Somewhere in the bible it is stated that faith without good works is dead. The right hon. gentleman opposite and his group for a long time have been reiterating faith in unemployment insurance, but this is still a faith without good works.

Another paragraph in the speech from the throne is in these words:

It is also proposed to undertake, with provincial cooperation, to provide assistance to municipalities which, as an alternative to the provision of direct relief, desire to expand their normal programs of civic improvements.

May I point out to the right hon. gentleman that to-day very few municipalities in Canada can afford to do any such thing? Certainly all municipalities are taxed to death, because of relief costs. Certainly all municipalities are unable to cooperate financially with the dominion government or any other government in connection with a program of public works such as is proposed in the speech from the throne. I repeat what the Purvis commission said, namely, that the responsibility for the cure of unemployment is not municipal or provincial; it is federal.

I now come to another statement in the speech from the throne, and because I question it I shall read it. I know that if I am right in my conclusion the right hon. gentleman is mistaken, in good faith. If I am