

not familiar with his language, but the second (Mr. Barber) seemed to me to make a very temperate speech. He had a very difficult subject to handle. The one outstanding feature of his remarks was the fact that while lumbering and mining in British Columbia had enjoyed some improvement, the dairying and fruit industries were not in so happy a position. The policies of this government have been to provide assistance for the secondary industries with a consequent demoralizing effect upon the primary industry of agriculture. That is true all over Canada. The Prime Minister takes a good deal of credit for the increased sale of fruit enjoyed by the apple growers of the Annapolis valley. I do not see how the British Columbia fruit grower is enjoying any benefit from the policies of this government, because on the prairies we are buying apples cheaper than ever in my experience. That may be attributed to better shipping facilities, but that is the fact nevertheless, and in consequence the fruit growers of British Columbia, as admitted by the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Barber), are the sufferers.

I shall not have time to cover in detail all that has been said, because the situation has been very ably dealt with by my leader. He spent four hours dealing with the question and the Prime Minister devoted about the same time to a reply. So far as I can see, though he made a splendid speech in defence of his position, what he said did not in any sense answer the statements made by our leader, that the country is in a deplorable condition. I understand that members of the government regard as *infra dig* any reference to the state of affairs in the country to-day. Well, it was not always so; it was not so in our day, and I propose to deal with some of the statements made by the present leader of the government in 1930, when conditions were not nearly so acute either in agriculture or in the manufacturing industry. Employment, we are told by the Department of Trade and Commerce, is in a much better situation than it was at the zero hour in 1932. I will not go into details. I have no quarrel with the statisticians who prepare the reports, but I will say that, with mighty few exceptions, and we might as well know it, throughout Canada to-day, there is more unemployment in the municipalities than there was at that time. There are more people on relief, and if that is true, how in the world can there be an improvement in the situation?

What did the Prime Minister say about unemployment? He complains about our dealing with this matter just now; he says that

we are unfair in our statements. I simply take the records of the commissioners of relief in the various districts throughout Canada as an indication, to show the state of unemployment to-day. It must be borne in mind that during last year the government has had to put a very considerable number of people on relief employment, and they are credited in the statistical statement given by the Department of Trade and Commerce as persons employed. The statement is made that 146,000 more are employed to-day than in 1932. I reiterate that if the statements of the commissioners of relief throughout Canada are true, then that statement is not correct. And I do not see how the situation will be remedied if the policies pursued by the present government are to be continued. We cannot expect any other state of affairs, despite what my hon. friends to the left say, as to the need of a complete new system. I do not agree with that, but I certainly agree that we need many changes in the present fiscal policy of this government.

The complaint is made that we are making a great deal of the unemployment situation. What did the Prime Minister say in 1930? He said that unemployment existed then on a scale never before known in the history of this country, and this by reason of the policies of the Ottawa government. If the Ottawa government was responsible for 117,000 unemployed in 1930, then the Ottawa government is responsible to-day for 1,500,000 unemployed.

An hon. MEMBER: You are wrong there.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I am stating facts. The statement of the present Prime Minister in 1930 was that the Ottawa government was responsible for unemployment. He said something else. He said that unemployment was then on a scale that demanded that it be treated as a national emergency. Has he treated it as a national emergency? What else did he say? He said that the Liberal party was trying to evade its responsibility. He was going to give work, not doles; it was a national matter, and as such it was to be taken over by the federal government. Well, he has not kept that promise in one particular. He ridiculed the statement of my leader, that unemployment was first the responsibility of the municipality, secondly, the responsibility of the province, and, if necessary, that relief should then be furnished by the federal government. But what has this government done? After ridiculing the proposal of my leader, the Prime Minister has not departed in any respect from that