

have grown since 1921—I mean unmanufactured wood—by some \$38,000,000, and that does not include the export in the more advanced stage, which has grown by vast sums besides. The latter, of course, is not to be deplored, but the whole results in a reduction of the irreplaceable resources of this country, of any reduction of which we must take very serious account. In addition to an increase in wheat exports alone from 1921 of 68,000,000 bushels and some \$38,000,000 worth, as I say, in unmanufactured wood, we find raw mineral production going out in tremendously increased quantities. That is not in itself in all respects unsound, but nevertheless it is something for which the government has not the least occasion to credit itself—something which results not only from the enterprise of the Canadian people, but, so far as government is concerned at all, from the enterprise of provincial governments. Our gold, for example, has grown from an export of \$2,500,000 in 1921 to \$28,500,000 in 1924, and almost similar figures pertain to any of those things which in the main, account for the surplus of our trade—none of them going to the making of work for any appreciable number of the labourers of our country. For none of them in the least degree is any policy this government ever initiated, or continued, responsible.

When I have referred to external trade I have referred to what undoubtedly is the most attractive feature of conditions at the present time. May I ask, Mr. Speaker, are we to hesitate in this parliament to disclose what the actual condition of Canada is? Are members of this House to be cowed by the practice and the threats of hon. gentlemen opposite—I refer to members of the government—when they call a man “no patriot” and “traitor” if he tells what the real state of the people of Canada is? Is it an answer to a demonstration of fact to be described in the language of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) as a “Jeremiah”? Have we got to the stage when the people of this country are afraid to know the facts, prefer to bury their heads in the sand like the most brainless of animals? How is parliament to determine what the right course or the right policy is to be if we are not to take account of the state of affairs which surrounds us, by the results of policies in effect? Is this government to be permitted to place on the record of parliament such statements as this, that as a consequence of the government's policies, as the Prime Minister so often describes them, this thing has resulted and that thing—

“substantial progress” in 1922; “substantial progress” in 1923; “substantial progress” in 1924; and is no one to be permitted to show that such a statement is not true at all? I do not propose to be deterred. I think the Canadian people are in a serious mood. I do not think the Canadian people think that even in the face of the repeated bounties of Providence we have enjoyed real progress at all.

Now I proceed to make inquiry into what the evidence is of what the government claims as “substantial progress” throughout the year 1924:

The records of production, trade, transportation, employment and public finance have been uniformly increasingly favourable throughout the Dominion.

It will be noted that of all these records only one is dared to be mentioned this year, that of trade; and even our trade in its total is less than for the year 1923.

The state of general employment has been distinctly better.

I will read another.

The volume of business has steadily increased. Especially has the country reason to feel gratified at the expansion to a notable degree of its public revenues and decline of its expenditures.

Do you realize, Mr. Speaker, why none of these are mentioned this year? For the simple reason that the condition in every instance is distinctly the opposite: instead of a decline in the public expenditure and an increase in the public revenue there has been to date a decline of \$50,000,000 odd in the public revenue and an increase of \$2,300,000 in public expenditure. Passing back to the speech of last year:

The state of general employment has been distinctly better.

Since the House prorogued last year no less than 94,000 people in this Dominion have gone out of employment. That figure left alone is not fair. It is usual in this country—I think it is inevitable—that in the later months of the year there is a diminution of employment. The minister cannot point to a diminution equal to what has occurred since we prorogued this House. I have the figures before me—and this is a fair comparison: In the year 1924 the diminution of employment was approximately 39,000—it was that much less on the first of January, 1925, than on the first of January, 1924. This is all according to the employment records, not of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock), but of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Low), the author of that celebrated piece of Liberal propaganda circulated at the expense