

time there are at least 500,000 unemployed. In a nutshell, the situation is just about this—and I use these figures in relation to what we are told as reasons for congratulation on “increasing employment”—there are at the present time 500,000 or half a million unemployed; there are 1,000,000 or more on relief, and, prior to the time the Prime Minister spoke in the west, the government had spent \$131,462,000, all of which represents additional taxation, on relief of unemployment in this country. In the light of these figures, how can anyone accept a statement such as appears in the speech from the throne, that there is reason for congratulation on “increasing employment” and particularly on our country being among the number where there is evidence of a return to permanent prosperity? Were the public to accept that statement, it would have very little conception of what those figures really meant.

Let us consider the amount that has been spent on unemployment relief in the time that the present government has been in office. It is equivalent to the total amount it took to meet the expenses of the government of Canada for an entire year in the last year of the Liberal administration of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. It is greater than the gross debt of the Dominion government for the fiscal year 1872-73. It would be strange if, with all that amount of public money being spent for relief purposes and the like, there were not evidences of some increase in employment, but to call employment brought about in that way evidence of prosperity, or “increasing employment” in the sense in which that word is understood by the public generally, is entirely wrong and false, and it should not be countenanced.

I believe, if we were to get figures from different municipalities, we would find that far from conditions having improved at all in the last year, the facts would be entirely to the contrary. Let me give the figures just for this city of Ottawa, which are the ones most easily verified. I obtained them from the office of the organization that deals with these matters. What are the figures? They are as follows:

Date—	Families on relief
November, 1932.. . . . .	3,525
November, 1933.. . . . .	4,714
December, 1932.. . . . .	4,316
December, 1933.. . . . .	4,949

This shows that even at the present time, in Ottawa, which is more favourably situated  
[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

than other cities, instead of the numbers on relief lessening, they are materially increasing.

The comparative amounts spent by Ottawa on relief are as follows:

Date—	Amount
November, 1932.. . . . .	\$ 82,000
November, 1933.. . . . .	156,000

These are figures from the social service department of the city of Ottawa, and I venture to say that figures showing similar or larger increases will be obtainable from almost any city in this country. So much for the statement in regard to “increasing employment.”

The speech from the throne refers to “improving revenues.” How have the revenues improved? Let me give the revenues as they were three years before the present administration took office, and the revenues as they have been since. I am discussing the statements in regard to the evidences of approaching permanent prosperity.

The figures are as follows:

Fiscal Year Ending March 31	Total revenue
1928.. . . . .	\$430,000,000
1929.. . . . .	460,000,000
1930.. . . . .	446,000,000
1932.. . . . .	337,000,000
1933.. . . . .	311,000,000
Nine months ending Dec. 31, 31, 1933.. . . . .	245,000,000

This last figure should be set off against an amount of \$351,000,000 for the nine months ending December 31, 1929. When revenues are cited to show improving conditions in relation to permanent prosperity, it is the total amounts rather than the small percentages to which it is desirable to look. But even here the revenues afford no grounds for what is said in the speech.

But yet another statement is made. We are told not only that there is “increasing employment” and “increasing revenue,” but that there is “expanding trade.” What are the figures in regard to expanding trade? Let me take the three years before the present administration came in and the three years since. These are calendar years:

Calendar Year	Total trade
1927.. . . . .	\$2,306,000,000
1928.. . . . .	2,572,000,000
1929.. . . . .	2,481,000,000
1931.. . . . .	1,233,000,000
1932.. . . . .	946,000,000
1933.. . . . .	933,000,000

Or a continuous drop, showing that the trade of the country in 1931 was less than half