

particularly until the budget came down, and the government's new taxes came down, the time the government's brand new modified tariff policy was produced, the figures ran just the same as the year before: 3,015; 2,780; 3,323;—coming to April 5,309, and then 5,253. The end of the year though witnessed a figure of seven thousand for the first time in many a long day. The average for the year 1922 was 5,198 per month. Hon. gentlemen will see that the clouds were not passing away; on the contrary, towards the end of the year they were thickening and bringing little comfort to my friends opposite. In 1923 for the first three months the figures were 7,863; 7,312; 8,896. About then came the second budget, and I ask that these figures be considered by themselves. Commencing with April 1923 they run 16,317; 18,658; 18,879; 16,310; 16,685; 16,874; 15,858; 20,988; 17,552, or an average from April on of 17,595 per month. This is the fine fruit and flower of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, this is the bright illuminating sun that dawned as soon as they got their stride and a chance to implement their glorious policies!

Nor did these figures tell the whole tale. Everybody knows—none know it better than the members of the government themselves—that the actual number of those who have gone from our Maritime provinces, from our central provinces and from our West as well, even in the face of a multiplied farm production, is far vaster than those figures reveal. This is the state of affairs we are labouring under now, this is the crowning evidence of that prosperity proclaimed in the Speech from the Throne and in the address of the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. Kelly).

Did hon. gentlemen make any other effort last year to bring about better conditions? If so, what has been their success? I often wonder if this session is to witness a repetition of the grotesque futility of the sessions that have gone. We have had some legislation from this administration. I do not see much reference to it in this remarkable Speech from the Throne. For example, we had Wheat Board legislation from this government in an attempt to relieve conditions in the West. They were going to answer the demand of western Canada as it ought to be answered, and they put on Wheat Board legislation which was to help the western farmer to get his crop to the market at the lowest expense and secure him the biggest return. So they passed the Wheat Board bill for one year, with power to renew it for

another year. There it stayed for a year, and then they passed an order in council to renew it for another year. They empowered themselves to appoint a board to take care of the wheat of the western farmer. Well, I do not need to say this board was never appointed. The legislation remained there, but nothing further was ever done, and now I do not see any promise that it is going to be renewed.

Do hon. gentlemen to my left realize the horror of this situation? With what shrieks of despair the clouds would be pierced in western Canada if the farmers there understood that that precious jewel of legislation, the Wheat Board Act, was going to pass into outer darkness! How frightful the prospect! No more Wheat Board legislation from the government of Hon. Mackenzie King. The farmers have to handle the thing themselves, and do the best they can, abandoned by the administration that promised them so much. If ever there was a gold brick palmed off on innocent electors, it was the Wheat Board legislation of this government.

Then they tried their hand again. They passed last session what I think is called an Inland Freight Rates Regulation Bill, by which they were going to control freight rates on the Great Lakes. I wonder how many hon. gentlemen have read the tragic history of that legislation. Of course, it was preceded by a commission—such has been the orthodox plan ever since this anti-commission government came into power—and with the customary flourish of trumpets the bill became law. This bill compelled all those transgressors, those iniquitous vessel-owners, who they said had been extorting money unduly from the western farmer, those men who in 1922 took millions in addition to all that had been paid for freight carriage on the lakes in 1921; those who had absorbed the Crowsnest pass reduction and put it in their pockets, the bill compelled all those transgressors to file their tariffs with the Grain Commission before they could charge anything. The Grain Commission was to have power to reduce them to such a level as they thought to be just to the man who raised the grain. Well, the early consequences all of us recall. The American boats, not being under the jurisdiction of Canadian law, simply refused to comply. They fled the field; they confined themselves to American traffic. The business was thus given to the Canadian boats, and they had a monopoly. The whole traffic they had and a monopoly they enjoyed; and the Minister of Labour, with that Com-  
bines Investigation bill, sat silently in his