

the combined working force had dropped, not to 972,537 as in the year before or 1,023,033 in the year before that, but to 789,321. Whatever the number of unemployed in Canada to-day may be, these records alone reveal a decrease of 234,000 between the date of the special session called for the purpose of remedying unemployment—really for the purpose of increasing tariffs—and the present time. These figures are perhaps as illuminating as any possibly could be because their source is those industries which were expected to reflect favourably this government's tariff policies. The fact is that they indicate how disastrous these policies have been. May I here insert the statement in tabular form:

	No. of firms Supplying Data	Combined Working Force
September 1, 1930..	7,334	1,023,033
September 1, 1931..	7,798	972,537
September 1, 1932..	8,007	789,321

I should like to refer to the question of unemployment in the light of the index numbers as made up by the bureau of statistics covering all industries in the country. As of August 1, 1930, the index number was 118·8; on August 1, 1931, it was 105·2; on August 1, 1932, it had fallen to 86·3 and on September 1, 1932, it had fallen to 86—in other words, a drop from 118·8 on August 1, 1930, to 86 on September 1, 1932.

The following are the figures in tabular form:

Index Number of Employment (1926=100)	
All Canada	All Industries
Aug. 1, 1930.. . . .	118·8 (Liberal)
Aug. 1, 1931.. . . .	105·2
Aug. 1, 1932.. . . .	86·3
Sept. 1, 1932.. . . .	86·

That indicates the nature of employment in all the industries of Canada during the time hon. gentlemen opposite have been applying their remedies for unemployment in the way of increases in the tariff. I am stressing the point of the tariff having had this effect for the simple reason that the Prime Minister, in what he has put into the lips of His Excellency the Governor General, has clearly said that the policy of the government was to cure the evil of unemployment by raising tariffs. That is the note that runs through the various speeches I read this afternoon, continued with the statement that conditions were improving.

May I say that it has not been only since hon. gentlemen opposite have put their policies into force that we have seen the inevitability of the errors which they were

bound to make and have been making. During the time the Liberal administration was in office and my right hon. friend was emphasizing the necessity of increasing tariffs, at a time that our government was bringing in a budget which we believed would be helpful in relation to the Imperial conference that was to take place in England in 1930, my right hon. friend was most emphatic that we should increase tariffs instead of lowering tariffs in order to increase the British preference and to divert trade to Great Britain from countries that were not trading with us as much as we thought they should. I endeavoured then to point out what I believed would be the consequence of their policies if put into force. May I read from a report in Hansard of April 3, 1930, at page 1242, what I said at the time. It will be agreed I think that it would have been difficult to forecast a situation more accurately than as stated in this particular paragraph.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend says "hear, hear." I am glad he draws attention to it, because the accuracy of the statement will become doubly apparent in view of his kindly remark. This is what I said on that occasion:

Hon. gentlemen opposite are fond of talking about the home market; it is not the home market they are thinking about so much as a monopoly of the home market for the benefit of a few of their privileged friends. Does my hon. friend know we will be able to have a home market in this country only as we have purchasing power, and that we will get purchasing power only as we are able to sell our products in the markets of the world? The wider your foreign trade, the better will be your home trade. I tell my hon. friend that by his policy and the policy of his friends no ships will be going out of Vancouver or Halifax harbours. When we get what my hon. friend spoke about a moment ago, a tariff wall around this country which will keep everything from coming in and as a consequence prevent everything from going out, you will soon have again the condition of stagnation and unemployment which we have witnessed in previous times.

In that statement there is only one error which I can see at the moment and it is this: I refer to a condition of unemployment and stagnation of trade such as we had in previous times. I had reference, of course, to the close of the old Conservative administration prior to the time Sir Wilfrid Laurier came into office, and the end of the Conservative administration prior to the time the late Liberal administration took office. What I should have said was that we would have a condition of unemployment and stagnation worse than