

mendable. I submit it might be commendable where every dollar can be satisfactorily accounted for, and where there is no danger or evidence of overlapping. However, the kind of thing which happened at Sturgeon Falls, and which the minister did not include in his picture, although it has been featured most prominently in the press in the last few months, does not seem to me to be a justification for governments administering public funds without rigid and careful supervision. The picture the minister has given is one of increasing expenditures. There is, however, something more unfortunate than that.

Mr. GORDON: It is not increasing; it is decreasing.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, any decrease is due to the fact that the government has stopped certain construction work, and thereby lessened employment, in other words, increased unemployment.

Mr. GORDON: The decrease my picture disclosed was the difference between \$46,000,000 and less than \$25,000,000, or a decrease of about fifty per cent.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: On public works.

Mr. GORDON: Not at all.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I draw attention to the fact that, in order to obtain a true picture of the situation, the figures given by the minister to-night must be studied in relation to the estimates placed upon the table of this house, as well as the estimates placed before different provincial bodies. Some estimates which ought to have been presented to parliament in the regular way under the estimates of the Department of Public Works, for example, and other departments, were not so presented, but moneys for the purpose of carrying on those works were spent out of the relief fund. Some works are now being paid for out of departmental appropriations that were formerly paid for out of relief moneys, or are not being undertaken at all. Therefore, I say that to study the whole picture it is necessary to see what now appears and what has previously appeared in the public estimates as well as what appears in the minister's statement.

But the all-important question is: Have the numbers of unemployed lessened in this country, have the policies of the ministry been of a nature to lessen unemployment? In order that the picture may be complete with respect to what is really taking place, may I read to the house what the Prime Minister said on September 10, 1930, in re-

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

gard to the unemployment situation as it was then? That was shortly after the present government took office, and we were discussing the matter for the first time. The Prime Minister gave an estimate of the numbers of unemployed. I think my hon. friend the minister will agree that the Prime Minister did not minimize the numbers; he made them just as large as in the circumstances it was possible to do. This is what the Prime Minister said as reported at page 64 of Hansard of September 10, 1930:

It will be observed that the present number is something over 117,000 and it is believed that that number will approximate 177,000 during the winter. If the measures which we submit to this house are productive of the good which we anticipate, we hope that that number will steadily decrease, rather than increase, and that the maximum anticipated number of 177,000 will not be reached.

The Prime Minister said:

If the measures which we submit to the house are productive of the good which we anticipate.

Well, the ministry will hardly deny that they have had a perfectly free hand with respect to the measures which they wished to introduce; they have been allowed all the freedom which any ministry could possibly desire. What is the result? If we are to judge the fruits of their policies by the number of unemployed, the indictment against the government could hardly be stronger. What are the figures to-day? Are they 117,000? The minister has just given us a statement of the numbers that are receiving unemployment relief. He gave the figure as 1,357,262.

Mr. GORDON: Not unemployed.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, but the numbers receiving relief. May I give the figures as to the number of unemployed as they have been given officially within the last month or two? A statement was given recently by the High Commissioner for Canada in London as to the number of unemployed in Canada. This statement was given out officially as representing the condition of unemployment in this country, and the figure given by the commissioner was that the total number of unemployed amounted to 800,000. That was the official count of the unemployed, and is I believe what the minister himself will give if he is asked for the number at the present unemployed. But that does not take account of many others who are unemployed, as the minister's figures do not give the total of those who are actually receiving direct relief. These 800,000 are men known to the government who are ready and