

despite the fact that extraordinary powers to deal with unemployment have been repeatedly secured from parliament, the present administration, after nearly five years of office, has not yet submitted to parliament any definite or effective policy to deal with widespread actual unemployment or distress which continues to be Canada's most urgent national problem.

The situation to-day is practically the same. On reference to the figures given in the Labour Gazette of January, 1937, I find that there were more people on relief in November, 1936, than there were in November of 1935 or 1934. That being so, surely the urgent problem facing this country to-day is not national defence but unemployment.

In the course of his speech the hon. gentleman referred to various other motions that were moved in the house during the session of 1935. He quoted a motion made by his leader, the present Prime Minister, speaking in the debate on the address on January 21 of that year, asking that there be no further discussion on the address but to let the house get on and deal with unemployment. On January 28 of the same year the then leader of the opposition made the following amendment to the motion to go into supply:

That all the words in the motion after the word "that" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"This house is of the opinion that the immediate consideration of present conditions of unemployment and the introduction of measures of social and industrial reform should not be delayed or postponed by a consideration of supply in advance of the consideration of government policies with respect to unemployment and the introduction of measures with respect to social and industrial reform.

Yet, as I have said, although this government has been eighteen months in office there is not a word about unemployment or about social reform, but we have here an increase of 130 per cent in the military estimates. Surely the hon. member for Vancouver North (Mr. MacNeil) was entitled to bring that fact to the attention of the house and of the country.

The minister also criticized the hon. member for having drawn to the attention of this house the plight of many returned men who fought in the last war. I quite understand why the hon. member did so, because I know that he meets these men continually when he is home in his own constituency. I know, too, that he is meeting them here, and when he is not meeting them he is hearing from them.

Mr. FINN: You are a mind reader.

Mr. MacINNIS: I would say further that he is not meeting the same class of returned men as is the Minister of National Defence.

He does not meet those men in the lobbies of the Hotel Vancouver and the Chateau Laurier; he meets them in other places.

Mr. FINN: Where?

Mr. MacINNIS: On the bread line.

Mr. FINN: Where is that?

Mr. MacINNIS: My hon. friend's understanding of conditions in the dominion is worse than I thought it was if he does not know the whereabouts of a bread line in any city in Canada. In the Vancouver Province of January 23, 1937, I noticed this item:

Returned soldiers and their families are urgently in need of underclothes and shoes. If donors will phone the Returned Soldiers' Club, Seymour 7570, contributions will be called for.

Those are the men whom the hon. member for Vancouver North meets and who bring their problems to him. Those men are not concerned with the matter of military dress, which was the subject of a military order that was put on Hansard by the present deputy speaker (Mr. Sanderson). These men do not care whether ties are thirty-one inches long or not. They are concerned about the question whether they are going to have a shirt or a pair of shoes to wear. There is undoubtedly a difference between the returned soldiers with whom the minister, on the one hand, and the hon. member for Vancouver North, on the other, come in contact. In the military orders issued and put on the records of this house in 1935 by the present deputy speaker I find this item:

Paragraph 49, Dress Regulations for the Canadian militia, 1932, prescribes a black bow tie, and this paragraph is being amended by adding thereto the words "with square ends." Ties with pointed ends should not be worn, and the edges of the bow should be straight and parallel.

Mr. FINN: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacINNIS: Then section (C) reads:

Particular attention should be paid to the dimensions of the tie, which should be about two inches wide at the ends, and the length of the tie, in inches, should be twice the size of the collar, namely, an officer wearing a 15½ collar should wear a tie approximately 31 inches long.

The returned men the hon. member for Vancouver North had in his mind are not concerned whether the tie is thirty-one inches long or forty-one inches long. They are more concerned with having a shirt, with having a coat, with having shoes in which they can walk about in the Vancouver rain. These are the men he is interested in. It is no wonder he brings their troubles and miseries before