

The point I wish to make and which I think my right hon. friend will recognize as pertinent is that he has been using the terms "factories" and "industries" very freely all over the country, but while doing so he has carefully kept from the people the information that the figures which he said he had in his possession, which he stated were authoritative were quotations from Dun's reports of failures, and that he was speaking without regard to the way in which those particular statistics are made up. My right hon. friend, as I have said, was trying to create the impression that those failures were the result of the tariff changes made last session. That was the point of his attack. It was bad enough to describe as factories the many small establishments which had gone into bankruptcy according to Dun's reports, but it was infinitely worse for him to try to make it appear that the legislation introduced by the government last session changing the tariff had brought about such a condition. Moreover, and this is much to the point, my right hon. friend never mentioned that the number of failures, according to the report that he himself was quoting, was fewer last year than the year before, and fewer the year before than in the year again preceding.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They are getting fewer to-day, so there are fewer of them to fail.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Let me add, he also endeavoured to create the impression that the manufacturing failures in this country were much greater relatively than the failures in the United States. When trying to create that impression he did not read this paragraph from Dun's report:

Unlike the statistics for the United States, the Canadian returns for last year show reductions in both number and liabilities of commercial failures. The numerical decrease reached nearly 24 per cent, but the falling off in indebtedness was only 2 per cent. Numbering 2,474 and involving \$64,000,000, the Canadian defaults compare with 3,247 for \$65,000,000 in 1923, and with 3,695 for \$78,000,000 in 1922. There were fewer defaults last year than in 1923 in manufacturing, trading and other commercial occupations. Geographical analysis of the Canadian statement shows that a smaller number of failures occurred in all of the ten provinces included in the record.

So, taking the total failures, not closing of factories, in this country, commercial, manufacturing, trading and others, as reported by Dun's—the small and large failures generally throughout the country in 1922—a year for which this government cannot be held responsible because the failures then were pretty largely the result of what had taken place in the years preceding—there was a total

of 3,695 contrasted with 3,247 in 1923, contrasted again with 2,474 in 1924. Of the so-called manufacturing failures that my right hon. friend speaks of, according to Dun's there were 857 with liabilities of \$39,000,000 in 1922—just a year after he had gone out of office and before this government had any chance to get under way with its policies. In the year following there were 792 failures with liabilities totalling \$31,000,000; and this last year there were only 625 failures with total liabilities of \$36,000,000. This shows conclusively, if statistics mean anything, that conditions so far as manufacturing is concerned have been steadily getting better since this government came into office, and according to Dun's report, which my right hon. friend brought into the House this afternoon to quote from as authoritative, were never better than they were last year.

R. G. Dun & Co. has a report on failures in the United States, and we find from it in contrast to conditions in Canada, that instead of getting better from the point of view of numbers of failures, conditions in the United States in the last two or three years have been growing worse. Here is the statement in the Dun report in that connection.

The third quarter of 1924 breaks the record with the heaviest volume of failure liabilities for that quarter in the history of the United States.

That helps to illustrate the condition of manufacturing in the United States in the last quarter of last year.

The month of March, 1924, holds the country's record for the largest volume of failure liabilities for any single month. The 1924 total of commercial failures was 20,615 in number and \$514,225,000 in volume of failure liabilities. This is an increase over 1923 of not quite 2,000 in number and \$4,000,000 in volume. Although 1921 and 1922 slightly exceed 1923-24 in number and volume of failures, the year 1924 easily holds the banner over the twenty-five years preceding. It exceeds by a fairly wide margin the combined totals for the years 1919 and 1920, and very largely exceeds the total of the panic of 1908.

This is Dun's record of failures in manufacturing, commercial and trading establishments in the United States. Now, may I add to that the record of bank failures in the United States? We have had one or two recent bank failures in Canada, but I do not recall any of record this last year. Here is the record so far as the United States is concerned:

There were 613 banking failures in 1924, the largest number of any year during the present generation. Liabilities of the 613 banking failures were \$202,000,000, which has been exceeded only twice in twenty-five years. The table found on page 10 of Dun's Review for January 10, gives the number and liabilities of bank suspensions in the United States for the twenty-two-years, 1903 to 1924 inclusive.