

loans, and also to protest against the departure from the plain understanding that it was a relief and not a loaning policy that was being introduced by the federal government.

Let us look at the designation of the bill. If it were to be a loan, would the bill not be called a loaning and unemployment bill? I venture the assertion there is not one hon. gentleman, including the ministers present or absent, who ever anticipated that this would develop into a loaning policy under the conditions to which I refer. Will the Minister of Justice say that he permitted that?

Mr. MANION: What is the difference—and I am asking this because I do not know what it is—between loans along this line and the loans for seed wheat? As my hon. friend knows, loans for seed wheat were made for many years under both the late government and the government preceding it. What is the difference between lending money under the present conditions and lending money for seed wheat, which money was charged against the land? By the way I may tell my hon. friend—and he knows this—that ever since we came into power we have been cancelling these loans, and I am sure his government when they were in power did the same thing. They were loans which we knew we could not collect and which we cancelled rather than register them against the land. Will the hon. member explain the difference for the benefit of the committee?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is a reasonable request. Back in 1908 is the first time and later in 1915 I can recall a relief measure was administered and in the case of lands patented mortgages taken on the land; in the case of lands not patented, mortgages were filed against the homestead until the lands were patented. That was not preceded however by any intimation by the federal government, such as was made by the Prime Minister on July 1 last. The inference and statement had gone out that this was relief, and not a loaning policy.

Mr. MANION: My hon. friend would not deny that a supply of seed wheat was in the nature of relief?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I could read the exact words of the Minister of Agriculture, but I do not think I need to. When the minister began to investigate conditions in the west after prorogation of this house had taken place last summer he was waited upon by a deputation of probably a dozen or half a dozen farmers. They took the ground that inasmuch as their lands were free of mort-

gage; that they had no indebtedness and yet could not borrow sufficient money to supply themselves with seed, feed or anything else and they did not wish to accept charity from the government. They did not like that idea, and I am not surprised. The Minister of Agriculture said that that was the first time this question had come up of being permitted to pay back relief advances. Up until that time it was anticipated that the aid to the farmers was to be a relief measure, the same as the five cents per bushel was. Those farmers who had crops received in the aggregate money to the extent of \$10,000,000. The deputation which waited upon the minister, however, wanted the opportunity to pay back any help they received, because they did not wish to accept charity. We have to respect the stand taken by those people. The Minister of Agriculture asked the house—I do not remember his exact words, but I think I can state his version—if hon. members would not have done exactly as he did, and if they would not have given an opportunity to pay back the loans or relief contributions. As a result we have the introduction of the policy of promissory notes. That was the beginning of the provision for repayment. We have the spectacle of well-to-do farmers with crops of 10,000, 15,000 or 20,000 bushels receiving large federal contributions, running up to one thousand dollars each, while the poor fellows who had not enough grain to feed a chickadee or enough straw to make a hen's nest could not get enough flour to fill a thimble or enough clothing to go around their little fingers without giving some kind of guarantee, mortgage, caveat, seed lien or promissory note. I am sure the government does not wish to finish this session with that ghastly disparity between the treatment accorded those who had and those who had not crops. I have heard the statement made in this house dozens of times that relief should go to the most needy. According to the statement of the government expenditures have been made to the extent of about \$10,000,000 to those who had a crop, while those in need of relief are treated in the manner I have described. If the government really knew the tremendous amount of dissatisfaction which has been caused throughout the west by this outrageous discrimination in favour of the farmers who least needed relief, they would not sleep restfully until they had taken steps to redress that disparity.

I am trying to present the facts as accurately as possible. The few ministers present gabble like a lot of magpies and blackbirds, and those hon. members in the house who