

ferring to? The New York State Department of Labour reported a decrease of 66,000 factory wage-earners in that state alone. The federal Department of Labour reported unemployment throughout the whole of the United States at five per cent less than in 1926. The percentage of employment in Canada—let my hon. friends follow this—in 1924 was 85.3 per cent; while in the United States it was 90.3; in 1925 our percentage was 86 as against 91.2 in the United States. But in 1926 our percentage jumped to 92.1, an increase of six points, while that of the United States remained almost stationary. In 1927 the percentage rose to 95.6 per cent in Canada, a gain of fourteen points over the first year I have mentioned, while in the United States the percentage fell to 88.5, a decrease of 3.4 in that highly protected country. The leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) speaking in the town of St. Stephen, New Brunswick is reported to have said, on this question:

It was only this afternoon that I learned—

This was August 17, 1928.

—the cotton industry of Milltown was operating on part time, and I looked up the trade report to seek a reason. I found that the importation of raw cotton for the past year had decreased, while the importation of finished cotton had increased. That, to my mind, was one of the reasons why the cotton industry was only able to work part time.

I am glad he acknowledges that.

Employment was given to the people of the countries from which Canada was importing, and that is one of the reasons why Canadian young men and women were obliged to leave home and seek employment in foreign lands.

He condemns the foreign country because it is not sending raw material to us to give employment to our people, and he condemns us because we allow our raw material to go to other countries.

There were thousands of Canadians ready to return if they could get employment.

I do not believe that the leader of the opposition, when speaking in St. Stephen, realized the place he was in. St. Stephen is situated right across the border, a river separating it from Calais, in the state of Maine. There are two international bridges crossing that river. There is a cotton factory, there is a candy factory, and there is an axe factory at St. Stephen and Milltown, and every morning in the vicinity of from 550 to 600 Americans—residents of that highly protected country—have to come across the border to earn their living in the cotton factory and in the candy factory on the Canadian side. Is it any wonder that, as I am informed, when the hon.

[Mr. Veniot.]

gentleman was making that highly protective speech at St. Stephen someone rose in the audience and asked him what he was going to do for the consumer and he was not able to give an answer.

I have only a few minutes left, but in those few minutes I wish to touch upon the question of immigration and emigration. I wish to quote again from the leader of the opposition—and I am quoting him frequently to-day because I followed him with deep interest while he was making that tour in the maritime provinces. He spoke at several places there, and when he came back to Ontario he addressed a meeting at Oshawa on July 23, when, according to the newspapers, he made this statement:

Since 1922, 573,000 people have been brought to Canada from all over the world. In the same period 591,000 have gone to the United States. In other words, since the Liberals achieved power 18,000 more people have left Canada to go to the United States than have come into it from all the world. Why? Because there is no work for the Canadians.

What are the facts? Why did not my hon. friend show both sides of the medal and tell the people whom he was addressing on that occasion that while it is true that a number of Canadians did leave the country it is also true that some 474,000 of them came back into Canada and are to-day residing in this country? Why did he not at the same time say to the people at Oshawa that while a number of persons left Canada to go to the United States there were somewhere in the vicinity of 147,000 people, residents and natives of the United States, who came across into Canada and are to-day permanent residents of this country? Why did he not treat the question as it should have been treated? As I say, why were not both sides of the medal shown? What is the record? We find that since the termination of the war 270,066 settlers left the United States—American subjects, American born—and came across into Canada to settle, being to-day permanent citizens of this country. Are we to infer that they had to leave the United States, that highly protected country, and cross the border in order to earn the living which they could not earn under high protection? And in the last fifteen years what do we find? We find that 524,772 Americans have left their native land and are to-day loyal and true citizens of the Dominion of Canada, earning here in a moderately protected country the living which they could not earn at home under a highly protective tariff. This is where my hon. friend was unfair. These facts should be known to him, if they are not. And the