

have passing from Canada, in these three years of substantial progress, no less than 600,000 of our people. The Prime Minister says there have returned, in the last nine months, some 37,000. I have already stated my reasons for questioning the accuracy of that return, but assuming it to be correct what does it amount to? Why it means this: That there are at least four and one-half going out for every one who came back during these years of "substantial progress". All through these years when Canada has been reaping the rich reward of what are called "government policies" immigration diminishes. If I may be allowed to compare what has taken place in this respect in the three years that have gone with the three years that preceded them I shall present a few figures all taken from the government returns. Commencing with March 31, 1922, when, I suppose, this government had got fairly under way, the number who have entered Canada since, up to the end of 1924, according to the government records, is 322,017. The number who entered in the previous three years during exactly the same dates was 355,812. To bring in those 355,000 there was spent \$4,713,000. To bring in the 322,000 in exactly the same period under this government the sum of \$9,102,000 was voted. And while the three years preceding were passing, while the 355,000 odd were coming in, this country returned to its shores and absorbed in civil life no less than 400,000 of its soldiers from overseas. After they have returned, after they are all absorbed in civil life, this government spent over nine millions to bring in 322,000 immigrants; and while those 322,000 have been coming, 600,000 have been going from Canada to one country alone. This is the "substantial progress" which resulted from the enactments of the policies of this government.

Now, I want to make some reference to a publication which has gone out with the signature of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, gone out at very considerable expense. The title of this publication is: Canada is coming through! Stand by her; in your faith lies her strength.

None of us fail in faith in Canada, but do not let anybody confound faith in Canada with faith in Canada's government. Here is proof of the case. I will read a few of the statements made. In commenting on these statements I do not pay any attention to outside opinions, especially those expressed in after-dinner speeches. The House will note I have not quoted any. I believe in quoting facts based on the best authority that can be

[Mr. Meighen.]

reached. Now to test the accuracy of the minister's proclamation:

Employment: Canada began the year 1924 on a considerably lower level than the United States, but has ended the year considerably above the latter. In January, 1924, our index number was 88.7. In November it was 93.0.

Does the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Low) say that is true? He says it is. Well, his department says it is not. The official figures of his department state that on January 1, 1925, our index number of employment was 83.9.

Mr. LOW: Use the same dates.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am doing that very thing. So on January 1, 1925, our index number was 83.9 whilst the index number of the United States on the same day was 89.4.

Mr. LOW: The leader of the opposition is quoting January 1, 1925?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly.

Mr. LOW: I was not quoting January 1, 1925.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Ah! But the Minister of Trade and Commerce says that Canada began the year 1924 at a considerably lower level than the United States but ended the year at a figure considerably above the latter. How do you end the year 1924 until you get to the first of January 1925?

Mr. LOW: Stick to the dates I have quoted, and you will find the figures are correct.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What does the hon. minister mean? Why did he tell the public that at the end of the year 1924 we were higher than the United States? We were nothing of the kind. That is the statement I am contradicting. One needs only to take our own government reports, the report of the minister himself, to show that the conditions of employment in the two countries are not comparable at all. In the last report I have in my possession, published by the minister for January, 1925, he said that there was last month a heavy reduction in employment. It also shows that we have lost in the year approximately 38,000, and the same report shows that taking the United States—and numbers of them are quoted here—during the same period there was improvement in employment. These reports are published by the minister himself. In the face of reports of his own department which I hold in my hand, he tells the public, at the public expense—because he charges them for the misrepresentation—that though we began the year worse