table. If the right hon, gentleman will be kind enough to have the orders tabled the house will be grateful.

Mr. BENNETT: Perhaps the hon, gentleman would not wish us to go to the trouble of filing them all. Orders that have attached to them long and tedious pages of accounts from the provinces, I should not think the hon, gentleman would wish to have; but we will file such as deal with matters other than ordinary questions of relief. If there are others which he wishes we will see that they are produced. I was under the impression which the hon, gentleman himself had until I looked into the matter and found that it was not necessary to table the orders passed during the recess.

## GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Wednesday, January 31, consideration of the motion of Mr. Gobeil for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, the amendment thereto of Mr. Mackenzie King and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Gardiner.

Mr. T. A. THOMPSON (Lanark): In rising to resume the debate, I wish at the outset to congratulate the mover (Mr. Gobeil) and the seconder (Mr. Barber) of the address on the splendid speeches they made, reflecting great credit not only upon themselves but also upon the constituencies which they have the honour to represent.

I listened very carefully the other day for over four hours to the speech of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) and I was very much disappointed when he was through. During that entire time there was no constructive policy, there was nothing put forward by the right hon, gentleman but fault-finding. He found fault with the present administration, and I began to wonder whether these men sitting on the treasury benches, grown old in the service of their country, were attempting to pull down and ruin the reputation of Canada, or whether after all they did not have some business judgment and there was not something that they had done that could find approval from the leader of the opposition.

The right hon, gentleman made the statement that we had a million on relief and a million and a half unemployed, a statement which is not borne out by the facts. I have received a report from the Deputy Minister of Labour giving the figures for the months of November and December of 1932 and 1933 respectively as to the number of families on

relief, and that I submit is the fairest way of estimating the number of people on relief in this country. A bread-winner is out of work and goes on relief. He may have a wife and family of half a dozen children, but it is not right to suggest that his wife and children should be numbered amongst the unemployed. He is the head of one family, one bread-winner who has gone on relief. I am therefore giving the number of families that have been on relief, which as I say is the fairest way of arriving at an honest conclusion.

In November, 1933, there were 17,783 less families on relief than there were in November, 1932, and in December, 1933, there were 25,679 less families on relief than there were in December, 1932. That shows conclusively that we are to-day in a better and not in a worse condition than we were a year ago. I cannot understand therefore what good purpose is to be served by public men decrying and blackening the reputation of their own country at a time when every loyal citizen is straining every effort to pull the Canadian people out of the morass and entanglement in which they have found themselves.

Yesterday we listened to another speech, this time from the hon, member for West Edmonton (Mr. Stewart), in which he denounced the tariff policies of this government. He waxed very eloquent and worked himself into a great fever, holding up his hands in holy horror. I thought at the time he was longing for a tambourine or a little tin drum on which to beat the death knell of protec-Whatever it may be, he charged the Prime Minister and the Conservative party with being responsible for all the ills that exist in this country at the present time, and especially did he charge that the policies of the present government were responsible for our unemployment situation. These statements are not borne out by the facts. I claim that the greatest factor in causing unemployment in Canada was the unbusinesslike immigration policy of the Liberal government from 1921 to 1930. During those years they brought in 1,187,319 immigrants against the protests of the provinces in which those people were placed and against the business judgment of our most able Canadians. In the last two years during which they were responsible for immigration, and at a time when our own men were unemployed and when every man who had any insight into our future knew it was a wrong policy, they brought in 331,000 immigrants, of whom 99,000 who came in during the last year were single men who immediately went on relief. Had the former Liberal administration followed the same