

a combination for unlawful purposes. Ordinarily I would think that that word would be considered as slander and I think Hon. Mr. Hepburn is quite within his right in asking for something by way of explanation of the word "conspiracy." I hope, when that explanation is given, my hon. friend will lay it on the table of the house.

I have one or two words to say about royal commissions. While this government has not cured unemployment, it has appointed at least nine royal commissions. These are:

- Rowell commission.
- Veterans assistance commission.
- National employment commission.
- Textile industry commission.
- Wheat marketing commission.
- Penitentiary commission.
- Lobster and smelt fishing commission.
- Coal commission.
- House of Commons committee on farm implements.

According to a press report under date of April 13, 1938, the total cost of royal commissions prior to that time was \$1,123,000. I do not know what the total cost would be to the present time. What has been the result of the appointment of these royal commissions? Were they created to provide jobs? Very little attention has been paid to any of the recommendations made. May I interject here that I think now as I have thought for a long time, even when we were in power—the same thing was done then—that there are too many lawyers throughout this country drawing \$200 a day to appear before royal commissions. In many instances it would require a great stretch of the imagination to think that these lawyers could earn \$200 a day, and yet they are put on these commissions. In addition to that, they are given very liberal allowances—living allowances, although liberal is probably the word I mean.

Our magnificent country, with its tremendous area, its rich resources, and its small population, should be able to rid itself of unemployment, relief, social injustices and the demoralization that goes with youth unemployment. I am a Canadian. When I say that, I mean that I am interested in the nine provinces of this dominion. I am just as much interested in the welfare of the prairie provinces and the maritime provinces as I am in the welfare of Ontario and Quebec. I make that statement because of propaganda, I suppose put out by friends of this government, to the effect that I had decided to take no interest in the prairie and maritime provinces. That propaganda was spread throughout western Canada, particularly in the prairie provinces. The imagination of the writer bloomed like a rose, and he put out that information for all the papers of western Canada.

I believe that every province of Canada is complementary to every other province. We are one big family. One province should help to take care of another if it is in difficulties. I am just as much interested in western Canada as I am in eastern Canada. Our country has survived many trials and tribulations. We have a magnificent future provided we have no fear of being great. But we need vision and courage. We need not regimentation, but long term planning. Let me illustrate what I mean. About a year or a year and a half ago Great Britain allocated £500,000,000, or \$2,500,000,000, to provide housing after the completion of armaments. That is an example of long term planning.

I believe that this government has failed utterly to realize the needs of this country, and I desire to move the following amendment, seconded by the hon. member for St. Antoine-Westmount (Mr. White):

That the following paragraph be added to the said address:

"We desire respectfully to express regret that the government has failed, since its accession to power in 1935, to show a proper realization of the serious economic conditions existing in all sections of Canada, as evidenced by unemployment and insecurity for hundreds of thousands of Canadian people, lack of opportunity for youth, and widespread distress in agriculture; and has failed to take appropriate measures to relieve such conditions."

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I hope my hon. friend will not deem me discourteous if I do not try to follow him in all that he has said to-night. I prefer rather to seek to follow the speech from the throne in what it indicates of the business before parliament during the present session. I am happy, however, that my first words may be those of agreement with my hon. friend on many of the things which he has said, particularly with remarks made at the opening of his address. I should like to thank him at once for his courteous references to the mover and seconder of the address, and for his characterization of their remarks on this occasion. I agree with my hon. friend that the two addresses to which we have listened, made by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Matthews) and the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Chevrier), were two of the best addresses that have ever been made by hon. members in moving and seconding the address.

The hon. member for Brandon has come to the House of Commons without previous parliamentary experience, but he has devoted his life and time industriously to the study of public questions. He has taken his part in educational work and has had experience in