

attach any importance to an observation made by the leader of the opposition a short time ago. In the midst, I think, of a speech on disarmament. I believe the right hon. gentleman desired to make it known to the people of Canada that they now would be disarmed from the opposition which he had previously taken against the agreements which have served this country so well.

So I say that on all counts, if ever a country should be proud of its achievements in a period of great depression—and you will observe I say a country—under the policies of a government that was not slow to realize the difficulties and dangers that threatened our whole commercial fabric, that country is Canada. Most Canadians, I think, feel that sense of pride and express it except when they are on the hustings or in this chamber. Then they think it their duty to decry Canada by decrying the government; they decry the government and so decry Canada, and preach blue ruin and ruin of all kinds to this dominion. I think no good purpose is served by that. It certainly is not the position that was taken by the opposition in my time. I do recall, and I say it with great frankness, that when this country went off the gold standard owing to the export of \$40,000,000 of gold, it is a matter of record amongst my own supporters at that time that I asked caucus not to make any observations in the house lest they might embarrass the administration and the country. That is a fact that can be verified by reference to any hon. member who was then in this house. There are times when matters arise which are far more important than any question of party advantage. When I find this country being held up to the people of the world as a country whose trade has fallen off and been destroyed through the actions of the government; then when I turn to the figures supplied by the League of Nations and other independent statisticians and find that these ten and a half millions of people occupy fifth position among the trading nations of the world, I say to hon. gentlemen opposite that they should be ashamed of themselves for putting forth observations of that sort.

That reminds me further that yesterday the right hon. gentleman twice referred to the fact that there are a million unemployed in this country, whereas there were only a hundred thousand unemployed in 1930. The figures given in 1930 were the best that could be supplied at that time, and it was indicated by the department supplying them that they were very uncertain. However, it is clear that the million referred to were those re-

ceiving relief, men, women and children, not the unemployed. On the contrary the figures show that the number of employed in this country, as indicated by the reports from industrial and other sources, has steadily increased instead of decreasing during the last few months. There is no evidence to support any such figure as one million, for as I have said that includes men, women and children receiving some form of relief in this country, from any source. It is well known that 160,000 people or thereabouts are receiving relief in the drought areas of Saskatchewan. They should not be regarded as unemployed in the real sense of the word. That condition was not brought about by the government, though I understand that an effort has been made to induce the people of those areas to believe that the government was responsible for the drought.

I recite that fact merely that it may be clear in the minds of the people that when he spoke of 1,000,000 unemployed in this country the right hon. gentleman was doing his country an injury and a wrong, for there is no warrant for any such figure unless you include every babe in arms and every child from babyhood to the age of sixteen or seventeen as being among the unemployed.

Mr. YOUNG: What are the correct figures?

Mr. BENNETT: It has been exceedingly difficult, the department states—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BENNETT: It is less than half a million in any event, but the department states that it is exceedingly difficult to make any statement that would be exactly correct, because we have no method by which we can make such a computation. Mr. Cudmore of the statistical department has made a report in which he has indicated his view as to the number of unemployed, from the information in the hands of that department. He says:

In view of the uncertainty mentioned above an effort was made at the census of 1931 to collect complete information on the matter, as for the date of the census by securing from every wage earner in the country a statement whether he was or was not working on June 1, 1931, together with the reason for not being at work. On that date approximately 395,000 of the 2,570,000 wage earners of Canada had no job while 43,000 more were temporarily laid off. This figure of 395,000 gives us a basis for subsequent estimates as to the number of unemployed, though certain observers claim that the 43,000 temporary lay-offs should also be considered as unemployed. On the basis of the combined figure of 438,000 on June 1, 1931, it was estimated in a paper prepared by Professor Jackson and others of the University of Toronto that 726,000 were unemployed in