

Unemployment Continuance Act

not have been a wise thing to do. The Prime Minister could deal with the situation instantly, because he was given the necessary powers during the last session of parliament. The hon. member might agree that in this instance we could cite the old axiom "Gouverner, c'est prévoir." The Prime Minister would not have been the statesman he is if he had not foreseen, when the bill was before the house last year, that the time might come when such power would be needed, and I am not surprised that our Liberal friends are dissatisfied because the government is doing so well in keeping Canada in safety.

Perhaps it would be refreshing for all of us to find in the speeches of hon. members opposite good reasons for holding to the stand we have taken. Speaking in Quebec, when the election in Three Rivers-St. Maurice was proceeding, the hon. member for Quebec East condemned the remedial legislation passed last year with regard to unemployment. He eloquently appealed to the passions of the masses, and among other things he said:

"What can be said about those who have just voted \$15,000,000 to give a premium on wheat to the western farmers, when they do not give a cent to the Quebec farmers whose butter does not sell?"

The hon. member does not deny having made that statement; he repeated it in Three Rivers, and it went all over the province during the campaign. I have great admiration for the hon. member for Quebec East, and I must say that he is faithful to the doctrines he has often enunciated in the province of Quebec during elections, and he has been faithful to the tactics of his party and orators who are accustomed during election times to arouse province against province and race against race. The hon. member is too wise to repeat those words in this house or in western Canada.

There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers of Quebec are suffering, but they are not unmindful of the sad plight of the farmers of the west. We members from Quebec, however, are handicapped in our efforts to aid the farmers by such statements as those made by Mr. Taschereau at St. Raymond on June 15 last, when he said:

It is agreeable for me to be able to say to the people that we are able to help the province without compelling it to fall in debt. When Ottawa is found with a deficit of \$75,000,000, and facing a deficit of \$105,000,000 for the current year; when Ontario and the other provinces of the west are bankrupt, the province of Quebec has a surplus of \$5,000,000.

In 1930 Mr. Taschereau stated there was no unemployment in Quebec; in 1931, by the [Mr. Gagnon.]

words I have just quoted, he implied that his province did not need any help from Ottawa. A few days ago, when the governments of all provinces were asking civil servants to accept reduced wages, the premier of Quebec said that the credit of the province of Quebec was still good, suggesting thereby that it was not necessary to practise economy. I say to the hon. member for Quebec East and his friends sitting opposite that we do not receive any cooperation whatever from the Quebec government. How can we tell the leaders of this government that the farmers of Quebec are ruined while the premier of that province boasts of a surplus of \$5,000,000? When the hon. member for Quebec East spoke in Quebec on August 7, Mr. Taschereau was present, and he cheered the remarks of my hon. friend. What logic! what consistency! The hon. member for Quebec East, during the course of his eloquent speech, said "Bennett does nothing for Quebec," while Mr. Taschereau says "We do not want any help from Ottawa." I ask you, Mr. Speaker, which of the two leaders voices the sentiments of the province of Quebec?

I have a great liking for the hon. member for Quebec East; but I would like to refer to another part of his famous speech delivered in the city of Quebec on August 7 last. Speaking of the remedial legislation of 1931, he denounced the so-called autocracy of our chief and the wickedness of our policy. In referring to the Unemployment and Farm Relief Act he said that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) referred to it as being sovietism, the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) referred to it as being fascism, and he added "I call it Bennettism, which is a mixture of fascism and sovietism."

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. GAGNON: I am not surprised at hearing hon. members opposite cheer the words of their leader. Unfortunately some of them cheer too often when the word "sovietism" is mentioned in this house. I ask myself if the great Liberal party of Canada will not, as has the Liberal party in England, some day fall into sovietism and communism. Now, with all due respect to the hon. member for Quebec East, I contend that he was wrong when he tried to associate two contradictory terms such as sovietism and fascism. A study of what is going on in Germany, Japan, China and Russia will convince one that some day we may have to choose between sovietism and fascism. Speaking for myself and for my friends on this side of the house, I prefer Bennettism, because in these days of struggle