

*Unemployment Continuance Act*

He then said that the present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Weir) should have resigned rather than to allow his estimates to be cut. The former minister has made a great contribution to agriculture. The following report appeared in *The Leader-Post* of Regina, on October 19:

That a fresh foundation had to be laid for agriculture in Canada both east and west if the country and towns are to be saved, was the statement made Saturday morning by Hon. W. R. Motherwell, of Abernethy, Minister of Agriculture in the King administration.

The task ahead is beyond the lone effort of any individual or any government, according to Mr. Motherwell. He believes a royal commission can get at the facts, can find out how other countries have met the physical problems confronting Canadian agriculture to-day, and will have prestige enough to cause the country to take note of what has to be done.

He acted for thirteen years as provincial Minister of Agriculture and for nine years as federal minister, and yet he says that a new foundation has to be laid for agriculture and a royal commission should be appointed to find out the facts. I do not know anything about the facts, and if I did I have not the prestige to get the people to listen. The hon. member comes along and says to the Minister of Agriculture that he should have resigned rather than submit to a cut in his estimates. He looked over at the minister and said: I resigned once from the government and I stayed resigned until I got what I wanted. That is true. He did resign. As I watched his face the other evening, I just wondered whether he had seen the joke or whether he thought we had not. The fact is that he stayed resigned and when he handed in his resignation to the government, the government got what it wanted. Consequently, it withdrew the obnoxious measure, but held it in readiness lest the cat should come back. Ever since then the hon. member has been a little slow about resigning, and that perhaps accounts for the fact that he did not listen to the pleadings of his present leader when he wanted to use him as an instrument to redeem his long-forgotten pledge to reform the Senate.

There was one other matter to which the ex-minister referred, and I should like to mention it. He said that we on the back benches, along with the ministry, must share the responsibility of standing behind the Prime Minister, and he threatens us with political extinction, political death if we do not rise up and by our resignations compel the Prime Minister to take some other course than the one he has taken. Well, you know there are some leaders who need to be bullied in that

[Mr. Beynon.]

way. Then there are others who are in a position where they do not need bullying. If there is some question as to whether the leadership should remain in Prince Albert, or be taken to Nova Scotia, or perhaps out to Vancouver, then a leader is very sensitive and responds very quickly to any threat of resignation. But if a leader has a good, substantial and loyal following; if he has personality and force of character, and if he outlines a policy that will appeal to his followers, he has not very much to fear in going ahead and carrying it out; and even the admonitions from the other side are not likely to do him very much harm.

The hon. member wanted to know why we took promissory notes; and further, what authority we had for taking them. He said that the people of Canada had not urged this. I hold in my hand a clipping from the *Leader-Post* of February 18, 1932, and one would almost think it had been prepared by the hon. gentleman himself, because the body of it is so very far from the headline that it sounds quite Liberal:

Farmers deny Bennett statement they asked to sign relief notes.

That is the headline. Then it goes on:

There are scores of farmers receiving relief in the drought areas of Saskatchewan, who do not agree with the statement from Ottawa, quoting Right Hon. R. B. Bennett, Premier of Canada, as saying Wednesday that "the system under which drought sufferers in southern Saskatchewan who obtained government relief were required to sign promissory notes was adopted at the request of the beneficiaries themselves."

Just listen to this:

Two of many such are F. C. Parchman and J. H. Hicks, Laféche,—

An hon. MEMBER: They found two.

Mr. BEYNON: Yes, and they are down in the constituency of the hon. member for Willow Bunch (Mr. Donnelly).

—who told the *Leader-Post* Thursday morning that they had not made any such suggestion, even to the municipal officials, when these officials started to organize for relief in June, 1931.

So there are two men in Saskatchewan who had not suggested that.

Both Mr. Hicks and Mr. Parchman said—

It is qualified here.

—they had no recollection of suggesting promissory notes in payment of relief—

Listen to what follows.

—but—

This sounds like the hon. member for La-belle (Mr. Bourassa).