

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Eleventh Legislature
31st Day

Thursday, March 15, 1951

The House met at three o'clock p.m.

INITIAL WHEAT PAYMENT

Moved by Mr. A.L.S. Brown (Bengough), seconded by Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena):

“That this Assembly urge the Federal Government to immediately raise the initial payment, paid through the Wheat Board, on the 1950-51 crop to \$1.75 per bushel, basis No. 1 Northern at Fort Williams, and further urge that the final settlement be made on the basis of parity.”

Mr. Brown: — Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion about wheat in this House, and I think this could almost be referred to as a ‘farmers’ field day’ in this Legislature.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that last Tuesday we discussed the Resolution as it affected the question of the settlement of the five-year pool, and I notice that on the Order Paper we have also another resolution dealing with wheat in relation to the International Wheat Agreement, and the resolution which I propose to move, this afternoon, is a resolution referring to the initial payment made on the 1950-51 crop year, together with a proposal upon the basis of which final settlement should be made.

I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that any apology need be made for any discussion which may take place in regard to that important commodity or to the marketing of wheat in Canada, and for taking up time of this House in discussion of that question. I doubt if there is any single commodity the marketing of which is of more primary importance than is the marketing of wheat. I realize that the marketing of other agricultural commodities and other primary commodities is also important, but the cash returns which we as individual farmers and the cash returns which Saskatchewan as a province receive are much greater from wheat than from any other commodity.

Also, Mr. Speaker, realizing that Saskatchewan is still primarily an agricultural province, in spite of the fact that we have had considerable industrial development within the last few years, agriculture is still important and is still possibly the most important industry and will remain so for some period of time. Realizing too, that it is from the agricultural industry and particularly from wheat that we here obtain our wealth, it affects us not only as individuals but it affects us in our governing bodies be they on a municipal level or be they on a provincial level. I think that any stand that we, as members of the Legislature take, has a direct bearing upon the wealth, in the final analysis, which will come into Saskatchewan, and I suggest that on these issues we should stand unanimous in this Legislature in urging and asking and, if necessary, demanding that the agricultural industry in Saskatchewan and in the west gets a fair deal.

March 15, 1951

The resolution which I propose to move, Mr. Speaker, is divided into two parts. In the first instance, I am suggesting that the initial payment for the crop year, 1950-51, should be immediately raised to \$1.75 per bushel, basis No. 1 Northern at Fort William; and secondly, that the final settlement that is made should be made on the basis of parity. I will attempt to divide my remarks, this afternoon, into two parts — the first part dealing with this question of the initial payment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what does an initial payment mean? An initial payment means that amount of money which the farmer receives for his wheat, in this case, when he delivers it to the elevator. Out of that initial payment received at that time, he must pay the immediate costs of his farming operations; he must pay for the costs that are involved in placing that crop in the ground and for taking that crop off. In addition out of the initial payment, he must pay the taxes and provide for his immediate living conditions. The initial payment has a direct relationship, therefore, not only to the extent that the individual farmer is able to pay for his farming operations, but it has a distinct affect upon the ability, for instance, of the municipalities or the school districts to carry on their immediate and necessary programmes.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that we had, during the last five years, operated on the basis of a five-year pool, in which we had an initial payment made at the time of delivery, and that we were to expect a final payment sometime in the future. You will recall further, Mr. Speaker, that when this initial payment was first inaugurated to cover the crop year 1945-46, it was set at \$1.25; it was later raised, through an interim payment, to \$1.35 and that \$1.35 then became the initial payment. Later, it was raised to \$1.55 through another interim payment, and that \$1.55 then became the initial payment for the crop marketed thereafter; and then, in the spring of 1949, it was raised to \$1.75, and from then on the initial payment, for the remainder of that crop year, and for the crop year 1949-50, was set at \$1.75.

Since that time, through amendments to the Canadian Wheat Board Act, there have been certain changes made in relation to the marketing of our wheat. For instance, Mr. Speaker, the Wheat Board Act was extended to cover a three-year period, but it was not suggested and not incorporated in the Act that, during that three-year period, we should have a pool — that each year would be pooled separately — which means that we will have a separate pool for the crop year 1950-51, a separate one for 1951-52, and a separate one for 1952-53. Then later, Mr. Speaker, you will recall that, by order-in-council, it was deemed advisable to separate the grades into a pooling system, at least for this year, so that is the position we are in at the present time. The initial payment which is being paid at the present time is assured only for the crop year 1950-51. We have no assurance, as we had during the five-year pool that the returns which we received for our wheat would be spread over a five-year period; with the net result that we have no assurance as to what initial price we may receive following the completion of the present crop year.

When the amendments to the Canadian Wheat Board Act were before the House, in Ottawa, last June, the announcement was made as to what the initial payment would be for the crop year 1950-51, and it was announced

by the Government at that time that the initial payment would be \$1.40, basis No. 1 Northern at Fort William. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that this caused quite an uneasiness among the people out here in Western Canada, and that it was to a degree at least bitterly resented by those people engaged in farming and also by those people who, by virtue of their occupation, were directly dependent upon the farming industry here in Saskatchewan. It was fortunate, however, that we had some members at Ottawa who realized the necessity of having a higher initial payment to meet the increased costs of production, and who pointed out very clearly that there was certainly no justification for reducing the initial payment from \$1.75 to \$1.40.

The C.C.F. members at Ottawa, at that time, on June 5, 1950, moved an amendment to the Wheat Board Act which would have had the effect of referring back the Canadian Wheat Board Act to the Government for further consideration, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer directly to the resolution which was moved at that time by Mr. Coldwell, "That Bill No. 252, (that is the Canadian Wheat Board Act) should not now be read a second time, but that it be resolved, that, in the opinion of this House, consideration should be given to the provision of an initial payment for the periods covered by this Bill, that is for the period 1950-51, of \$1.75 per bushel for No. 1 Northern Wheat, basis in store Fort William, Port Arthur or Vancouver".

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, they were not asking the House at that time to adopt the principle of paying \$1.75 initial payment, but that they were asking that consideration should be given to that question, and we find that all the Liberal members from Saskatchewan, who were in the House at that time and voting, voted against the suggestion that even consideration should be given to the question of retaining the initial payment at the point where it was for the crop year 1949-50. I think that clearly indicates, Mr. Speaker, that we need in the House at Ottawa, a representation from Saskatchewan that will speak in the interests of the farmers and not necessarily and particularly in the interests of the Liberal Party.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that, following this announcement and the disturbance and uneasiness it created in Western Canada, the Saskatchewan Liberals held a convention here in Saskatchewan, a convention which was held in the early part of November, and we had, at that time, had an initial payment put into effect of \$1.40, for that crop year. We find that Mr. Gardiner, coming up from Ottawa, attempted to defend the stand which the Liberal Government took in reducing the initial payment from \$1.75 to \$1.40, and quoting from the "Star-Phoenix" of November 14, quoting from a speech which the Hon. James G. Gardiner made, as reported in the press, from that convention, it reads as follows:

"The C.C.F. claim that the farmers of Western Canada have lost \$100 million, this year, because of the initial payment being lowered from \$1.75 on No. 1 Northern to \$1.40, was good arithmetic but poor logic."

Later, Mr. Speaker, I intend to suggest that it was not only good arithmetic, but it was equally as good logic. And further, from the "Star-Phoenix", referring to Mr. Gardiner's statement, it reads:

March 15, 1951

“There never was an initial payment of \$1.75 under the five-year pool. It was, first of all, \$1.25 — the next year an interim payment of 10 cents a bushel was paid, then 20 cents the following year, and another 20 cents the year after, bringing the figure, for the five-year pool to \$1.75 last year.

“He reminded farmers that the Wheat Pool’s determination not to reduce the initial payment on wheat in the difficult years of the ‘30’s had left it with a \$3 million deficit. Saskatchewan Wheat Pool had been forced to borrow money and repay its share of the debt over a 20-year period.”

And he adds:

“With that experience behind us, it is clear that the initial payment should be a payment that everybody knows can be made. Next year, I presume, the initial payment will be \$1.30, and the following year, \$1.20. We are not working under a five-year contract any more; it is only a one-year arrangement.”

Well, I doubt, Mr. Speaker, that in a short report — and I presume that the report is an accurate report of the speech made by Mr. Gardiner — there were ever so many mis-statements of fact made. In the first place, he suggests that there never was an initial payment of \$1.75. Well, I suggest, that by virtue of the interim payment, which was made in the spring of 1949, bringing the payment up to \$1.75 for the remainder of that crop year, we did have an initial payment of \$1.75, and for the entire crop year of 1950-51, we had an initial payment of \$1.75, and by virtue of this Act which was taken in the Federal House, the initial payment was reduced from \$1.75 to \$1.40. Secondly, he states that we are not working under a five-year contract any more. Well, that may have been a slip of the tongue. It was never a five-year contract; it was a five-year pool arrangement in which was incorporated the four-year contract of the Anglo-British Wheat Agreement. But he refers in this statement to the deficit incurred by the Wheat Pool due to the fact that they had set too high an initial payment. Well, I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that the Wheat Pool or any farmers’ organization could not be expected to have control, or be able to influence, the economy to the extent that our Federal Government can, and the Federal Government is well able to make an initial payment, or to make any final payment, on the basis of a cost-price relationship which is favourable to the farmers; for, by means of a price control, particularly as prices affect the cost of production, they can maintain a price level so that the payment which they make does bear a direct relationship to our cost of production, and which can be construed as parity.

I would also like to point out that, in this speech, he forecast what we can expect for the future. He pointed out very definitely that the initial payment had been reduced from \$1.75 to \$1.40, and then he forecast,

Mr. Speaker, that, next year, the initial payment will be not \$1.40 but \$1.30, and the year following that, it will be not \$1.30 but \$1.20. That indicates very clearly, in my opinion, what we can expect in the future, as to the initial payment which we will receive, out of which we must pay our immediate living and farming costs of operations.

I suggested, Mr. Speaker, that I was going to attempt to prove that this \$100 million which the C.C.F. claim the farmers of Western Canada had lost, was not only good arithmetic but was equally good logic, and when the interim payment was announced in January, it was suggested that the Federal Government had reduced this loss to farmers of \$100 million, by some \$60 million. Well, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, due to the inflationary period which has existed from the time that initial payment was announced, last June, up until January, that if we were going to maintain the same cost-price relationship that was in effect in June, 1950, there was justification for making this payment even if the initial payment had been set at \$1.75. This interim payment should not have brought the initial payment up from \$1.40 to \$1.60, but rather brought it up from \$1.75 to \$1.95, to keep us in line with the increased costs of production and increased costs of living.

May I point out, Mr. Speaker, in that respect, that from June 5 up until the present time, the cost of living has increased from approximately 169 to 175 index, and when we relate that, in terms of the cost of production index, this 20-cent interim payment cannot possibly take care of the increased cost of production and the increased cost of living. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that \$1.75, at that time was no more than was necessary to meet their immediate obligations, and at the present time, I suggest, that the \$1.60 is equally too low to meet our present immediate requirements and our immediate needs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, referring particularly to the last part of the resolution in which it is urged that the final settlement be made on the basis of parity. The Liberal Party has on numerous occasions advocated the principle of parity when they were out on the hustings, but as soon as they were in a position to put that principle of parity into legislative terms, they have consistently refused. They have refused to recognize in legislative terms the principle of parity. They did out on the hustings suggest in relationship to other agricultural commodities outside of wheat, that they were prepared to inaugurate the principle of parity, and they referred to the Agricultural Prices Support Act, which, when it was introduced into the House at Ottawa, they undertook to lead the people here in Saskatchewan to believe that, through the medium of this Agricultural Prices Support Act, they were placing a floor price under our agricultural products which would maintain them somewhere near the cost of production, or bear a direct relationship to the cost of production. But what happened after they were in power, Mr. Speaker? By enunciated policies from the Federal Government at Ottawa, they suggest now that this Agricultural Prices Support Act is not intended to give the farmers parity. They say it was never intended to give us parity; yet on the hustings, they had argued that it was. Now they suggest that the Agricultural Prices Support Act is similar in scope to the unemployment insurance. I doubt that at any time was there a group of people sold down the river to the extent that the farmers of Western Canada

March 15, 1951

were through the medium of the misrepresentation which was made by the Liberal Party in connection with the Agricultural Prices Support Act.

Now this principle of parity can be applied to agricultural commodities, and it can be applied to a commodity such as wheat, and you can refer down to the United States where they have injected into their economy a means whereby they guarantee to the primary producer 90 per cent of parity. If we could have that principle adopted, where we were guaranteed 90 per cent of parity, I am satisfied that we would be well along the road to security. I suggest that there is a means where the principle of parity can be recognized. I will admit, Mr. Speaker, that the factors are different in the United States, for a large portion of the commodities which they produce in the United States, particularly agricultural products, are consumed within the United States, and as such are on the domestic market; but nevertheless, as far as wheat is concerned they are an exporting country, and when they can undertake and underwrite 90 per cent of the parity in connection with wheat, I suggest that we here in Canada can do likewise through a medium of planned economy and orderly marketing, and that we can guarantee to ourselves at least 90 per cent of parity, and I suggest that if we want to carry it to an ultimate conclusion, we can guarantee ourselves 100 per cent of parity.

I would further point out, Mr. Speaker, that when the United States undertook to put the price controls into effect, they did not put them in in such a manner that they would affect this principle of parity. They put them in, in such a way, or proposed to put them into effect in such a way, as to retain as far as the primary products which are produced in the United States are concerned, the parity principle.

Now what does parity mean, Mr. Speaker? Parity means that we should not necessarily get the highest price for our products, but it certainly means that we shall not get the lowest price for our products. It does mean that we should get for our products a price which can be related to the cost of production and a price which has some relationship to the value of the goods produced. In other words, Mr. Speaker, we are asking for the establishing of a principle of parity, so that we shall have a cost-price relationship for our commodities that bears a direct relationship to the cost of production, which means that if the cost of production goes up and the cost of living goes up, the commodities which we are producing shall go up. If the cost of production go down and the cost of living goes down, then it is only equally right that we should expect the returns which we get for our commodities to come down in comparison with the other goods. Further, Mr. Speaker, a principle of parity should mean and can mean that those people engaged in that occupation can get compensation in relationship with other occupational groups. I suggest that farming, today, is a skilled operation, and that a person employed or engaged in that occupation is entitled to a standard of living and security equal to that of other skilled occupational groups be they lawyers, be they doctors or be they skilled labour men or what have you; that we are entitled as a return for our labour to a standard of living commensurate with those other occupational groups.

Further, Mr. Speaker, when we undertake, as we have here in Canada, to allow our national Government to undertake the marketing of our goods, I suggest that that is a sound and a good principle applied not only to wheat but as applied to other primary products. So when they undertake to market or control the marketing of our goods, it is the responsibility of Canada as a whole, through the national Government, to see that we get somewhere near parity. As I have suggested, when it is applied to wheat, it is equally true as applied to our other primary products, not only in the agricultural industry but primary products in other industries as well.

What is parity as related to the commodity immediately under discussion — and that is the commodity of wheat? Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that the stand which we have taken as to what parity means, as related to wheat, is the same as it is related to other commodities; but speaking specifically in terms of dollars and cents, what is parity in connection with wheat? Well I think the resolution which was passed at the C.C.F. convention, last fall, placed on record what we thought parity was in relationship to wheat, when we suggested that, for the crop year 1950-51 or any subsequent crop year, the cost-price relationship which we received for our wheat should be not less favourable than would be enjoyed if we had received a settlement of \$2.00 a bushel on the five-year pool. I think we are prepared to accept that, in dollars and cents, as being somewhere near parity, and the C.C.F. members at Ottawa inaugurated and enunciated a similar proposal at that time.

Now, translating that into dollars and cents at a present cost-price relationship and at the present inflated dollar value, it brings parity for wheat somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$2.50 a bushel; but I suggest that in general terms, Mr. Speaker, while it is difficult to state a specific term due to the changing value of our dollar, due to the changing cost of production, due to disorderly inflationary inflation, it is difficult to set any figure which is not out of date, or certainly not out of date two or three months from now. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that to get this parity we have to be prepared to extend the principles and the idea of a planned economy, and one of the things which must be incorporated in that planned economy is a system of equitable price controls as they affect the cost of living and as they affect the cost of production.

Mr. Speaker, I suggested, at the outset, that it was important that we here in this Legislature, and that we here as farmers and as people who are directly depending upon the agricultural industry, should stand together on this principle of parity, and that there should be no question of difference on that question and there should be no difference on the question of what we should receive as initial payment when we deliver our products to the elevators. I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the agricultural industry is not receiving the consideration that it should be receiving. It appears to me that the Federal Government has come to the conclusion that the agricultural industry is not necessarily very important, and to make them realize the importance of our agricultural industry, I suggest that we have a responsibility to stand together and to impress upon them the necessity and the importance of that industry, not only Saskatchewan, not only for Canada, but for the world at large.

March 15, 1951

I think we can point out, Mr. Speaker, to prove that the Federal Government does not consider that agriculture is necessarily as important an industry as it was some time ago, that for this year, they are reducing or proposing to reduce the amount of money expended on the agricultural industry in Canada from some \$81 million down to \$53 million. That would indicate that we are not considered to be as important as we were some time ago, and I think that that lack of realization of the importance of the agricultural industry is directly reflected in the initial payment which was set last fall, and is directly related to the fact that the Federal Government has refused to recognize the principle of parity.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move the resolution, seconded by Mr. Dewhurst (Wadena), which appears under my name on the Order Paper, and as already read.

Mr. Dewhurst: — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate on this motion which I have the pleasure to second, I don't intend to take too long, but I do want to point out a few of the facts relating to the farm economy of this province. I agree with what the mover has said that farming in this province is very important to the economy of Saskatchewan. Not only is it important to the economy of Saskatchewan, but it is equally important to the economy of the Dominion of Canada. We can go over the histories of any countries and we will see that where they do not have a good agricultural economy that country has a very low form of living in most cases, where they are fully dependent on industry. Any country which is fortunate to have a good agricultural economy, if that agricultural economy is developed to its ultimate, maximum production, that country can enjoy a decent standard of living providing that agriculture is given a fair share of the national income.

I would like to give a few figures to this House, Mr. Speaker, as to what the trend has been in this past five or six years. We take the general farm index costs, taken from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics — and as you are well aware, Mr. Speaker, the index is based on 1935-39 to equal 100. We find that from 1946 to 1950 inclusive that the cost of the things that agriculture has to buy in order to maintain agricultural economy has increased by 33 1/3 per cent, yet, on the other hand, we find that the income to the agricultural economy of Saskatchewan has only increased by 12.1 per cent. That shows that we have consistently each year been paying more for the cost of our production in relation to what we are receiving for our products when marketed. Every year, there has been a consistent increase in the cost to the farmers.

Saskatchewan's main agricultural product is wheat. I would like to deal with that one commodity a little more fully than with the general commodities of the farming population of this province. We may remember at the outset that Saskatchewan's economy is roughly 70 per cent agricultural of the income of this province, while in Eastern Canada agriculture is not so important to them. Their agricultural income only accounts for about 30 per cent of their income. Yet we find by checking the Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures, that the increased cost to Saskatchewan has been

greater in the past five or six years for agricultural equipment than it has been — the increase in Eastern Canada has been less than it has been in the West. The increase for agricultural equipment from 1945 to 1950, taking all the figures for each year — I have the figures for each year; it has increased 51 points in Eastern Canada, but in Western Canada it has increased 54.7 points, or a total increase of 48 per cent. In other words, we are paying 48 per cent. In other words, we are paying 48 per cent more for our binders, drills, and other equipment today than we were doing in 1945.

There has been consistently every year a steady increase in agricultural equipment, and this figure does not take into account the cost of repairs for machinery. We know that repairs for machinery have gone up far more than that on a percentage basis. But the Dominion Bureau of Statistics booklet (which I have here) does not separately give an account of what the increase has been on repairs. But I know a farmer near me at home in 1946 bought a sleeve and piston and rings for a tractor — just the one sleeve — and he paid \$12.50 for that one sleeve, piston and rings. Two years later he put in a complete set — a set of four. He bought the four sleeves, pistons and rings and the cost had increased so that the complete set cost him over \$148, so that was almost 300 per cent increase on that particular style of piston and rings and sleeves. It appears to me that the implement manufacturers are deliberately trying to make repairs for older types of machinery harder and more costly to get in order to make the farmers do away with the old ones and buy the later tractors. I don't think they will need to put on any method like that to make them change over to modern equipment. All they have to do is to help us to fight for a parity price for farming products, and the farmers will try and keep themselves abreast of the times and have up-to-date machinery. No farmer likes driving old worn-out machinery if he can have new machinery. So, as I have pointed out, since from 1945 to 1950 inclusive, machinery has gone up 48 per cent. These statistics were taken as of August, 1950. They do not include the cost of machinery which went up last fall.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that in August last year we had a very devastating frost that took the major portion of the crop of this province. Yet, after that frost that froze all our crops, combines, for one example, went up over \$300 apiece. A lot of combines were on the tracks or in dealers' hands, or being held up by the railroad strike which came at that time, and yet those combines, etc., which were in transit went up \$300 since that time. This last increase has not been included in the August cost of farm implements. And as I mentioned earlier, the latest statistics available at this time were as of August 1950.

Now, on the other hand what have the farmers received for wheat this past five or six years? These figures I have here, Mr. Speaker, are the average prices paid to the farmers of Saskatchewan. They are not the Fort William prices or the seaboard prices, but they are actually what the farmers received at their local elevator point. In 1945 the average per bushel of wheat of money received by the farmer was \$1.56 a bushel; in 1946, \$1.54; 1947, \$1.55; 1948, \$1.55. In those four years, 1945 to 1948, it had been holding pretty well even. Then, in 1949 it was down two cents to \$1.53. So you can say the average on those five years was about \$1.55,

March 15, 1951

or between \$1.53 and \$1.55. What do we find for 1950? We find that even after adding to the initial price that we set last year of \$1.40, including the 20 cents which has been paid now, the average price received by the farmers for the 1950 crop has been \$1.18, or a decrease of 24.61 per cent. That is very significant to the farmers of this country. On the one hand the implements in the same period of time have gone up 48 per cent, but the prices that they received for the wheat which they had to sell have fallen by over 24 per cent.

The farmers of this province cannot continue to maintain a decent standard of living for themselves and their wives and families and give their children any decent standard of education and at the same time keep production up. On the one hand the cost of production is greatly rising; on the other hand it is falling off. I could give the same statistics very much for other farm commodities and they would bear the same relationship. We could give them the commodity such as beef and we would find that they are receiving more now than they were in 1945 and 1946. And while the farmers are getting a better price for their beef, the farmers will admit that it is out of relationship. They feel that it is too high now. But the effect that is having on the economy of this province is that it is causing a lot of farmers to liquidate their herds because they are afraid what may happen not now, but this summer or next fall. Consequently, we find that there is a shortage of beef and dairy products in this province. So the dairy income, or the beef income, only affects a small portion of our farmers; but the wheat affects all the farmers and our whole economy in this province. That is why I will stick more to wheat than to other products. Not only does it affect the farmers' standard of living, it also affects the merchant in the town — these small merchants, whether they be in grocery business, dry goods, hardware, implements, garage or what have you. If the farmer does not have the purchasing power they cannot sell to the farmers. Our whole economy in this province directly comes back to what the farmer receives. The worker in the villages, towns or cities, if the farmer does not have the money in order to buy the products which they are creating, they cannot sell. Therefore, they must either become unemployed or take a lower standard of living. And it is about time that Eastern Canada woke up to the fact that agriculture is important in this country.

I would just like to add a little strength to what the member for Bengough said when he pointed out what happened with the resolution as proposed by the national leader of the C.C.F., Mr. Coldwell, when he asked for \$1.75. Every Liberal who went from Saskatchewan to Ottawa, who were present in the House and voting, voted against \$1.75 for the Western farmers' wheat. But, how many of those same Liberals voted to keep down other prices? When the price of freight rates comes up in the House not one of them gets up and raises his voice to say that if we are going to keep the price down to the farmers we shall also have to keep the costs down. That could run away — nothing was done about it. We had 14 Liberals go from Saskatchewan at the last election. Not one of the 14 have had courage enough to stand up in the House of Commons and back up at Ottawa what they said they would back up while campaigning in Saskatchewan.

The parity price is a thing that we should have. I am not going into statistics of parity price, as the mover has already done that. But, if the farmers of this province cannot maintain a parity, if their income is going to be held down, so will follow their living standards. We not only want a parity price for our products, we want a comparable standard of living, a comparable standard of comfort for our rural dwellers. We often hear, "Why are the farmers leaving the farm, moving to towns and cities and so on? — Less people on the land". This is the main reason why the farmers are leaving the land. It is not because they don't have telephones or power or some other modern conveniences. It is because they do not have the wherewithal, or no hope of getting the wherewithal, in order to purchase those comforts of life. I talked to numerous business men, last fall, after the frost came. Some of them told me they had over \$60,000 out on their books. They had let farm machinery out, repairs and other incidentals, and they did not know how they were going to carry on until this following crop came out. The frozen crop with a lot of the crop under the snow, aggravated the situation. It is bad enough having the frozen crop and not getting the crop off, but to have to take less for our products on top of it makes it considerably worse. The information which is available shows that even with the low grades of grain from this province, it would have been quite possible for the Federal Government through the Wheat Board to pay a higher price for the 1950-51 crop than they are doing at the present time.

Lots more could be said, Mr. Speaker, and no doubt will be said before the vote is taken; but I cannot urge to strongly on this House and the members here that they get behind this motion and ask for at least \$1.75 now for the farmers, not sometime later on. Now is when they need it; their standard of living is falling. At the same time we want to ask that we have fair play with the rest of the producers of this country, manufacturers, industrial workers and what-have-you. We should unhesitatingly back up a parity price for Canadian agriculture, the same as they have in the States. I take great pleasure in seconding this motion.

Mr. N.L. Buchanan (Notukeu-Willowbunch): — Mr. Speaker, seeing that I represent a purely agricultural constituency, I could not help but associate myself with this resolution calling for \$1.75 as initial payment on the 1950 crop and the basis of settlement on parity. My people, unlike some of the constituencies in the province, are directly engaged in agriculture, and their primary product, of course, their most important product, is wheat and the price of wheat to them is all-important. Their entire livelihood and the entire livelihood of everybody else who lives in Notukeu-Willowbunch depends upon what farmers are going to get for their wheat.

I could tell a long story about the difficulties of farming. I could spend hours telling about the difficulties that farmers have to overcome. I was raised on the farm. I have been actively connected with farm communities for all of my life, and I have seen at first hand what farm people have had to go through. I could say, and truthfully, that

March 15, 1951

within the period of my active memory, some 20 or 30 years, I do not know of very many occasions in which the farmers received parity price for his products. That being the case it means that farmers have been on the whole struggling along, particularly in the south and south-western part of this province on a sub-marginal or below-standard living. Never at any time have they, by and large, taken as a whole, been able to feel entire security with the possible exceptions of those few periods I have mentioned.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that during the course of my remarks on this resolution, you will be somewhat lenient with me as I suppose I will be skating on the thin edge between being in order and out of order, because I intend to go over some of the arguments that were used the other day when we were speaking of the 25-cent final payment on the 5-year pool. However, I believe that arguments that were used then, and the experience that we had during the course of that five-year pool, give us good grounds for supporting \$1.75 initial payment on wheat today. So I state once again my hope that you will not be too strict in censoring me during the course of my remarks.

The 5-year pool, and its effect on wheat farming, has a direct bearing on the initial price of this year's crop. The 5-year wheat agreement was entered into with the United Kingdom in 1946. It was entered into, Mr. Speaker, with the support of people from all political parties, with the support of people representing agriculture and closely allied with agricultural interests. And I believe, by and large, that all people at that time were agreed that it was a good thing. And, if it should turn out badly, — I am not prepared to say that it did; but if it did turn out badly, who are those people who at that time agreed that it was a good thing, who are they to complain now when some people claim that it has not turned out as well as it might have. It was entered into for a two-fold purpose: first, to give price stability to wheat for the farmers of Western Canada, and second, to give the Government of the United Kingdom an idea of what they were going to have to plan for in the way of food for a long period of time. So it benefited them in that way and it benefited us. And we, in the C.C.F., have always believed in orderly marketing. At the time that this 5-year pool agreement was entered into with the United Kingdom it was generally assumed that the price of wheat on the world's market would drop. Mr. Coldwell was one of the few speaking . . .

Mr. Tucker: — On a point of order. I understood that the motion in regard to the very matter which the hon. member is now discussing was to come up today. Now, I understand it is arranged that this motion for the initial payment of \$1.75 should replace it. I am referring to the motion that I adjourned which is found on the Order Paper on page 6. This is the motion there:

“That this Assembly endorses the resolution passed at a joint meeting of the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture and the Executive of the Western Agricultural Conference held in Regina on Wednesday, March 7, 1951, as follows: —

“That the Government of Canada be asked to pay on the five-year pool settlement at least \$48,000,000 as a return of the subsidy paid by producers on domestic wheat, plus a

further substantial payment in addition to the \$65,000,000 token payment already announced in consideration of the “have-regard-to” clause of the Canada-U.K. Agreement”.

Now then, what the hon. member is discussing now, is the motion made by the member who moved it. The matter that he is discussing can be fully discussed on the motion of the hon. member for Lumsden. I submit it would be much more in order when he is discussing why the Canada-U.K. Agreement was entered into, and whether it was successful or not and so on. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that you should restrict discussion on that particular matter to the motion which was moved by the hon. member for Lumsden, and that this motion that is being spoken on now respecting the initial payment in regard to wheat delivered on the 1950 crop, does not involve the Canada-U.K. Agreement at all. If we are going to have any order in debate at all, I suggest that the hon. member should restrict his remarks to the resolution now before the Assembly.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I would like to point out that the hon. member, in commencing his remarks, was starting out to prove that the Anglo-Canadian Wheat Agreement and the prices paid under it had a direct bearing in supporting his contention, as borne out in this resolution, that the initial price should now be \$1.75. I think he is using the Anglo-Canadian Wheat Agreement as a supporting argument, and not dealing with a question of the final settlement of the five-year pool. It seems to me that until he has advanced that argument it would be very difficult to say that he was out of order.

Mr. Speaker: — In my judgment, the hon. member who is speaking is trying to put forth his argument, but he is also encroaching upon the resolution that was adjourned by the hon. Leader of the Opposition; so I would ask the hon. member to confine his remarks as much as possible to the motion before the House.

Mr. Buchanan: — I should have expected the hon. Leader of the Opposition to object to me using some of the arguments that I intended to use. However, I am only using the United Kingdom Wheat Agreement for the purpose of showing that the effect that that agreement had upon farmers is just and good reason why, today, the Federal Government should through the Wheat Board set an initial payment of \$1.75 a bushel. I realized, at the outset, that I might be treading on soft toes, and I want at some length to explain my purpose in using these arguments, in mentioning the United Kingdom Wheat Agreement.

Now that Agreement was entered into, as I said, for a two-fold purpose. The United Kingdom's economy was in ruins as a result of the war. None of us will argue that point. We belonged to the British Commonwealth of Nations, and we, through our Government, were anxious to do something to help that country. It was only natural that that Agreement should, at the instigation of the United Kingdom and of Canada, have in it a ‘have-regard-to’ clause which has been mentioned so often, that when the settlement was made for the last half of the contract period, regard would be taken of the world prices in relation to what was paid during the first part of the contract period.

March 15, 1951

Now, it was expected, as I said, at the outset, that the price of wheat was going to drop. Actually it rose. The United Kingdom officials no doubt wanted to be in an advantageous position, and I cannot blame them. We now go on to the 1950 crop year; the contract is over. The world price average during that period was above the contract price — and there is some argument, today, as to whether or not the United Kingdom has failed to keep its part of the agreement. Mr. Gardiner and the Leader of the Opposition maintain that . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. You will have to leave that remark out. It has already been discussed in the House and there is also a resolution dealing with it that is ahead of yours.

Mr. Buchanan: — Mr. Speaker, I will try to keep in order from now on.

Whether the United Kingdom kept its part of the contract or not is neither here nor there, and which side of the argument is correct is neither here nor there. The farmer knows, no matter how it goes, that he is going to come out on the short end of the deal anyway. Prices paid during the first few years of the contract bore some relationship to the cost of production, and, during those years, farmers on the whole were able to get ahead. Western economy was more or less stable during those few years, and farmers were advancing. They got out of debt; they built up their homes, their houses, their barns, their machine sheds; they brought their machinery up-to-date, in good repair, and new machinery wherever necessary. They had something approaching parity during those years. Then, due to Federal policies, inflation set in and the price of wheat no longer bore the favourable relationship to the cost of production, and so, today, farmers are going behind. They are going behind to such an extent that they will not be able to carry on very much longer without having worn-out machinery and homes and buildings that are in a very bad state of repair, and sub-normal standards of living.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that, when the Federal Government set the initial price for wheat in the 1950 crop year, they have regard to the losses sustained by farmers during the period of the United Kingdom-Canadian Wheat Agreement. Many of us have gone over those losses time and time again — I can't do any better than quote what those losses were, from Hansard, on page 3179 of the issue of June 5, wherein Mr. Argue states:

“I have before me the last report of the Canadian Wheat Board. It shows that in the first three years covered by the United Kingdom Wheat Agreement, class 2 wheat sold for \$2.39 a bushel. During the period of the United Kingdom Wheat Agreement, up to that date, we had sold to the United Kingdom 339 million bushels at \$1.55 a bushel, or 84 cents a bushel less than the average price for class 2 wheat. During the same period we sold 146 million bushels to the United Kingdom at \$2.00 a bushel — 39 cents a bushel less than the price of class 2 wheat. That represents a substantial contribution by the agriculture producers of our country.

“Moreover, not only were our farmers called upon to make sacrifices because of the United Kingdom contract, but

they were called upon to make sacrifices because of . . .”

Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats): — On a point of order, I would suggest that the hon. member adjourn the debate, if he wants to write another speech about the United Kingdom Agreement. If he cannot leave that out of his speech, I would suggest that he take the privilege of adjourning, and write another speech that will fit the resolution.

Mr. Buchanan: — Mr. Speaker, I maintain that I am not out of order.

Mr. Tucker: — He has been violating your ruling all along.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would like to submit that the hon. member is now pointing out that there were certain losses in a certain period of time suffered by the wheat growers, and that those losses should now be taken into consideration when setting the initial price for the crop year 1950-51 as set out in the resolution. It seems to me that he is supporting a perfectly valid argument for the resolution which he is sponsoring.

Mr. Speaker: — I think the hon. member is trying to make the case for a different objective than is contained in the resolution, that is, that there should be some consideration given by the Government to establish a parity price at the present time; but I would ask him not to encroach too much.

Mr. Buchanan: — Mr. Speaker, it is exactly as the Premier outlined. I have shown, and I intend to continue to show, that the Federal Government is morally obligated to raise the initial price of wheat on several counts — one of which is the loss sustained by farmers under the Anglo-Canadian Wheat Agreement. I do not see where, in that, I can be out of order, regardless of the fact there are several resolutions on the Order Paper dealing with somewhat similar subjects. I am using that purely and simply to develop my argument, and I believe that I am perfectly within order when I do so. I would, therefore, like to have your ruling on the member’s question of order.

Mr. Speaker: — I have already ruled. I think you have used the quotation that you are making, but I am asking you to keep as far as possible from the resolutions already before the House.

Mr. Buchanan: — Very well, Mr. Speaker. When this was used by Mr. Argue, M.P. for Assiniboia, in support of a resolution on the Order Paper at Ottawa, calling for \$1.75, those were the arguments that he used, and he was not called to order by the speaker at Ottawa, and he was not challenged by Opposition members at Ottawa, and I intend to reach exactly the same conclusion that he reached.

When the amendment was put, as has been stated before, calling upon the Federal Government to pay \$1.75 a bushel, there was not one Liberal member in the House voted for this resolution. Now, Mr. Speaker, these western Liberals are going to point out, also, that there weren’t very many of them voted against it. In fact there were only two — Mr. Gardiner and

March 15, 1951

Mr. Studer. You all remember Mr. Studer. He evidently has not a great deal of love for the name of Saskatchewan because he wants to divide the province down the middle and make one half of it Manitoba and the other half of it Alberta. However, Mr. Studer and Mr. Gardiner voted against this resolution calling for \$1.75 wheat. It seems peculiar, Mr. Speaker, but in going through Hansard at that particular time I find that there was an agricultural committee of the House sitting at the time this important question was taking place — an agricultural committee on P.F.R.A., and members from the west, from Saskatchewan particularly, can argue out in their constituencies that they could not attend the Session that was dealing with this important question because they were members of the agricultural committee and could be present at only one of them. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is not good enough; that is not nearly good enough. That is the excuse that is being used in one way or another all the time.

Another reason why it is important that we place agriculture in a more favourable position than it is today, is because the farmers of Western Canada are the nation's greatest consumers of manufactured goods, and it is only fair and only just common sound horse-sense that a Federal Government in the Dominion of Canada see to it, for the benefit of its national economy, that agriculture, and western agriculture particularly, is in a good financial position, because when we fail to buy machinery, when we fail to build up our homes, when we fail to buy automobiles, when we fail to buy clothes and the various commodities that we use so much of here on the prairies, then industry in the east suffers a depressing influence. So I say again, it is just good common sense that we do this for western agriculture.

Looking at farmers as a whole gets them out of the realm of intimate contact. I would prefer to look at them as individuals — to look at the individual farmer; to look at him as a person that I know. I know lots of them; all hon. members do. True, during the immediate post-war years, as I stated before, farmers as a whole and individually, were progressing. Today, that is no longer true; they are going backwards. I know from my own people, people who are adjacent to my own town. During a few years, they were getting out of debt, they were building themselves up, but they are no longer doing that. Today, they are going into debt and they will continue to do so as long as the price of wheat does not bear a fair relationship to what they have to buy.

Then, too, as was stated by the member from Wadena, last fall we had an exceptionally bad year. We had frost over the major portion of the province; in a lot of the province there is wheat still under the snow. We had, too, a shortage of box-cars. Why that shortage existed, I am not going to attempt to debate. I suppose I would be out of order once again, Mr. Speaker. But we had a shortage of box-cars which cost the farmers thousands and thousands of dollars. It cost them millions, no doubt. They had a large crop even though it was of a poor grade. They couldn't load it into the elevators and they piled it in their fields, they did not have enough granary space. Many of them figured that it would only be a week or so until this situation had righted itself and they would be able to haul that wheat into the elevator and sell it. But, no. In our little community I believe we only had 10 box-cars come into the town from the time that we started to harvest until Christmas. I do not believe there were more than 12 came in there during the whole crop season, to take that crop out. What was the result? The wheat lay out there in the fields; the wet fall spoiled it; it

got damp, and so they had to take another rap in the price which they received for their wheat.

I am not going to suggest for a minute that \$1.75 initial payment for wheat is the complete answer. The main answer, Mr. Speaker, lies in price control. You know it does not make a great deal of difference what the amount of money that you have is, or the amount of money that you receive for your products. If what you have to buy is going to take more than all of that money, you are still going to come out 'in the hole'. And so I am suggesting that price control would have been a far better answer than jacking up the price of wheat, and to keep jacking up the price of wheat. We will never be able to get the price of wheat jacked up as high as the cost of the things that we have to buy.

During the past few years we have a number of things that have gone up, to the farmers. The increase in freight rates, increase in farm machinery, increase in building supplies, increase in everything that he has to buy — and no increase in the price of the things that he has to sell. It has been suggested at Ottawa that the initial price paid out of a pool should be approximately 60 per cent of what they expect to receive for the goods when they sell them. Here the member for Bengough has brought up the question of the Wheat Pools, and Liberal speakers have suggested that it is not good policy for a pool to pay too large an amount as an initial price because the final selling price may even fall below the initial price if it is too high, and, therefore, it would spoil the pool. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is good enough and is correct and wise for a voluntary organization where people gather together, voluntarily, and join together and pool their product and sell it as a group. They have to do this sort of thing. On the other hand, where we have such an important commodity as wheat brought into a compulsory pool where we all have to put it in — and I am not objecting to the compulsory pool or to the Wheat Board handling our wheat; but where we have that, and where agriculture is such an important section of our community and the production of agricultural products is such an important industry in relation to the entire national economic picture as a whole, then we have to do differently. If it is necessary that this be subsidized, let us remember that the farmers — and, Mr. Speaker, I am going to take just a little dodge out of order again — during the Anglo-Canadian Wheat Agreement subsidized the Canadian consumer somewhere over \$149 million. We did not object to the Canadian consumer at that time getting cheap wheat, but what we did object to was that one section of the Canadian community was called upon to subsidize that cheap wheat for the entire Dominion. What should have been done was that the Canadian people, through their Federal Treasury, should have done this subsidizing, and it would have been fair; but the farmers lost \$149 million on this subsidy. Well have they not got reason then, Mr. Speaker, to expect, in return, if it is necessary to subsidize an initial price of \$1.75 a bushel, that it be subsidized?

Then, too, Mr. Speaker, we have the prices received for the wheat that has already been sold in this 1950 crop year. From August 1, 1950, to February 25, 1951, the initial price was \$1.40. The Wheat Board received \$1.92 on the contract agreement, \$2.14 on the world market price — that is No. 1; No. 2, \$1.37 initial price, \$1.89 contract price, and \$2.11 world price; No. 3, and so on, down the line, from No. 1 Northern the initial price was \$1.40 and feed was \$1.00. The No. 1 was sold under the contract price at \$1.92, and feed was sold at \$1.59. In other words, there was a total spread in the initial price paid to the farmers between No. 1 and feed of 40 cents a bushel,

March 15, 1951

where, already, the Wheat Board has sold wheat at a total spread of only 33 cents a bushel. Farmers are dissatisfied with this tremendous spread between their grades, particularly in a year when we have a lot of low-grade wheat.

Mr. Speaker, I was not able to give all the arguments that I wanted to give as to why we should receive \$1.75 a bushel for our wheat; but I believe I have given sufficient indication that anything less than an initial price of \$1.75 will not be enough. Remember, I am not taking into consideration the 20-cent initial payment already paid. You know, when I first heard about that it reminded me of some unfair parent who had given his child \$10 to go to a party with, and then the day that his son was going to the party, the parent took the \$10 away from him and then, to make the son feel good, he gave him back \$5. That is the same effect that this has had — it was dropped from \$1.75 initial payment to \$1.40, and now, in order to make the farmers feel good (that is what they hope, anyway), they made an interim payment of 20 cents a bushel. In this \$1.75 initial price, Mr. Speaker, I do not support the idea that that 20-cent interim payment is a part of this \$1.75 initial price.

Mr. J.W. Horsman (Wilkie): — I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is probably one of the most important matters that has come before the House so far this Session, but I think what the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Buchanan) said implies that they have lost sight of the fact that the initial payment of wheat bears no relation whatsoever to the final price. I think that is what they have lost sight of, and I think, in order to put up any kind of an argument on this, we should review, shortly at least, the history of the orderly marketing of wheat in this country.

We could go back to the time the Wheat Pool was organized. We all remember that very well, and we know why the Wheat Pool was organized. It was organized for the purpose of marketing wheat at cost, and also to get away as much as possible from the speculative trading in grain which we had always had up to that time. The purpose of the Wheat Pool, of course, was to return to the farmers, or the growers, as large a portion as possible of the price of that product, and no farmer who joined the Pool, or joined any other thing of this kind, ever expected to get the highest price of the season for his grain; but he did expect to get the average price of the whole year — a fair average price. In order to do this the Wheat Pool adopted the policy of making an initial payment on wheat at the time of delivery, and if the crop was put on the market — and it was supposed to be put on the market in an orderly manner — as some of the wheat was sold interim payments were made throughout the year, and when the entire crop was sold, then, of course, there was a final payment made. It was always recognized, and is yet, that the initial payment bears no relation whatsoever to the final price of the product.

I have always understood, and I think this policy was generally followed, that great care should be taken in the initial payment on wheat not to set the price too high. Every person understood this and knew that the initial payment, as I said a moment ago, bore no relation whatever to the final price. We know too well, and remember too vividly, what happened to wheat in 1929, when the bottom fell completely out of the wheat market, and people suffered a great loss. The Wheat Pool suffered a great loss on

the initial payment alone. It was far from being able to make an interim payment, and they lost heavily on the initial payment, and the Wheat Pool was an organization, surely, that was in a position at that time to have a pretty fair idea of what the wheat market would do. The Wheat Pool was not the only organization that guessed wrong at that time either. Hundreds of farmers who were on the option market lost heavily, lost their shirts. One or two grain companies in the west went absolutely broke gambling on the wheat market, and the Pool would have gone bankrupt if the Government of the day had not come to their assistance; and we know well enough that it took the Pool up to about a year ago to pay off that debt.

I do not wish to be pessimistic, I do not wish to be a pessimist or prophesy disaster — I see the hon. member for Bengough smiling; I must be saying something that is amusing him very much. I am very glad if I can amuse him because I always like to amuse anyone I can; I like to see a person happy. I do not wish to be a pessimist, or a prophet of disaster. We have had too many of them here now. I remember well, the first year I sat in this House, speaker after speaker on the opposite side of the House got up and told us that we were losing our markets for grain, we were losing our agricultural markets, the price of meat was going down, the price of hogs and bacon was going down, the price of wheat was going down. To hear them talk you would have thought that inside of a year every farmer in the west would be bankrupt. Well, they guessed wrong. I am very glad and very happy that they did guess wrong, but at the same time, Mr. Speaker, I do not think it would be wise to lose sight of the fact that history might repeat itself. It sometimes does repeat itself. As far as I can remember, back in 1929 no one had any idea that the bottom was going to fall out of the wheat market, and the best evidence of this was, as I say, the number of people who were long on wheat at that time, the number of people who lost money on it. I would think in the light of experience that it would be only good business to be careful not to set the price of wheat too high; that is, the initial payment.

Another thing is the initial payment paid on wheat, last year — \$1.40 — was raised by 20 cents, making it \$1.60. This was a raise all the way across the board, on all grades; and I am quite sure that, at the time, most farmers did not expect 20 cents more on their feed wheat. I know one farmer — I mentioned this before — a man — if anyone in this House was in a position to know, or have a fair idea what wheat was going to do, it should have been he; but our Minister of Agriculture said that anyone who had taken the initial price on feed wheat had had all they were going to get. I don't wish to say anything that would hurt the Minister on that. I don't mean to ridicule him — he was not the only one. Thousands of farmers thought the very same thing. They thought when they got the initial payment on feed wheat that that was all they would ever get. Now they have got 20 cents more already, and it would seem only reasonable to me that we should not expect very much more on the low grades of wheat. And suppose the initial price of wheat was raised to such an extent that we would lose money on the grades, where would they make up the money from? There is only one place it could come from, and that would have to be from the higher grades of wheat — it would have to be taken from them. I do not think any reasonable person expects the Government to pay us a subsidy on this wheat. I do not think they do.

I might add, also, that the Canadian Wheat Board was established at the request of the growers of wheat: it was not forced on them; it was at their own request. I do not think the Government was anxious to handle this wheat, but there was so much pressure put on them by the growers that they did agree to do it, and the reason, as I say, was because the growers did not

March 15, 1951

want to be at the mercy of the speculative market. We are all agreed on that, I think. We remember, years ago, before we had any other system but the open market and the prices would start to drop, and unless you were in a position to hold your wheat until the next summer, you took a very greatly reduced price from what it was early in the fall. That is what led up to the system, and that is why the farmers fought for many years to get some kind of a system of orderly marketing. Now that we have it, we should be sure to protect what we have. I think this, too, Mr. Speaker, that if the growers of wheat, in this country, had not had considerable confidence in the Government, they would not have put so much pressure on them for the re-establishment of the Wheat Board.

I think, too, that the farmers are a good deal better off when they do not get too much money at one time. I am quite sure of that, and I know that that applies with equal force to other people too. I ask you, what would happen to the average salaried man or labourer if he got his whole salary in one cheque, at one time in the year? What I think would happen is that about 90 per cent of them would be 'broke' for about 10 months out of the year. That is just the way the farmers used to be. I think they have learned from experience that that is the case . . . I see the Provincial Treasurer laughing there, too. I know that he does not get his salary in one cheque; he gets his, I suppose, monthly . . . But that is the way it works out, anyway.

I am quite sure, too, that if it had not been for the 20-cent payment which the farmers will receive on this wheat sometime between now and spring, and the few cents (which none of us think is enough) that they may get on the 5-year pool, most of them would be broke this spring and would not be able to put their crops in. I think that many of them would be in that position if they got that 20 cents last fall instead of this spring, and I say they must have had a good deal of confidence in the Government or they would not have placed their business in the hands of a government Board. And having done this, I think it is in the best interest of the farmer that we should not try to dictate to, or set up a policy for, the Wheat Board to follow. I think, if I were a member of the Wheat Board, I would resent the fact that any person, or group of persons, tried to dictate to me the policy that the Board should follow. They were appointed, and you asked, and we asked, them to handle that wheat. We can't expect to set the policy for them. We have to rest assured that they know more about it than we do. I think we should continue to have policy in this system, and be careful, as I say, not to do anything that might cause any disruption in the orderly marketing of our wheat. We know just how important it is.

This resolution that we have before us, today, asks the Government to immediately raise the price of wheat. When you say immediately, that is a demand. I think if we are going to send a resolution in, or pass a resolution of this kind, it should be in the nature of a request, not in the nature of a demand. For the reasons which I have mentioned, which some of you no doubt think are not strong enough, I should like to move the following amendment to the motion, seconded by Mr. Loehr (Humboldt).

“THAT the word ‘immediately’ in the first line be deleted, and the words, “as soon as possible” inserted after the words “Fort William.”

That would make the resolution read as follows:

“THAT this Assembly urge the Federal Government to raise the initial payment paid through the Wheat Board on the 1950-51 crop to \$1.75 per bushel, basis No. 1 Northern at Fort William, as soon as possible, and further urge that the final settlement be made on the basis of parity.”

Mr. Speaker: — The debate is now on the amendment.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to speak very long on the matter. My main objective in rising is to draw attention to some things that were said that I think should be further clarified.

One of the matters mentioned by the hon. member for Bengough in speaking about the question of the way the Wheat Board is administered, was to make a reference, which has been made many times in the past by C.C.F. speakers, to the payment of 20 cents which was made in 1949, bringing the payment up to \$1.75. Twenty cents was made at that time on the whole five-year pool, and it was made pursuant to the request of the farm organizations all over the country, that the farmers needed the money very badly. They estimated that there was enough money on hand to make that payment. When the time came to make the payment, Mr. Speaker, it was found that in order to make a twenty-cent payment it was going to cost \$213,445,000, so in order to make a payment of 20 cents (in round figures) the Wheat Board actually borrowed \$5 million, so they were able to make a payment of 20 cents. Had they not borrowed \$5 million, they would have had to make a payment of 19½ cents. Now, everybody wanted that payment to go out to assist the farmers in their farm operations, and they were quite right in feeling a payment should be made when they had approximately enough to pay 20 cents; but just as soon as that payment went out, we had a hue and cry up and down this country on the part of the C.C.F. that the Wheat Board had borrowed the money to make this payment to the farmers. Now, the hon. member for Bengough nods his head in agreement with that; he says that it is wrong to pay out 20 cents when you have 19½ cents on hand.

Mr. Brown: — Just before an election.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, the money was paid out because it was the farmers' own money; what does its being before an election have to do with it?

Here we have the amazing situation. They find fault, Mr. Speaker, with borrowing enough money to make it an even 20 cents when they had 19½ cents on hand, and make an outcry up and down the country about it, this terrible thing of borrowing \$5 million so they can pay out \$213 million in all. But what do we find today? We find today, the C.C.F. making a motion that the initial price is raised at once to \$1.75, when we know that a considerable proportion of the wheat, probably at least half of the wheat, is unsold. Does the hon. member suggest for a moment that there is enough money on hand to pay this \$1.75? Would not more than half of this money have to be borrowed to make this initial payment of \$1.75? It was wrong, according to the C.C.F, to borrow \$5 million in order to pay out \$213 million, but it is quite all right to borrow over half of the amount necessary to carry out this proposition. Anything at all to make political capital, it seems to be.

March 15, 1951

I just wonder, Mr. Speaker. Mention has been made of an election, I presume that that is the only reason they think the members of the Government can have in their minds, not concern for the farmers getting the money that belongs to them. When the wheat is not sold, the money is not there to be paid out. Why are the C.C.F. making this play at the present time? If it was wrong in 1949 to pay out the money that the farmers had on hand, if it was wrong to borrow a little bit to make a round sum of 20 cents payment, then what about this present move today? Of course, the C.C.F. would never resort to any motion for political purposes. Oh, no, oh, no! They have halos, all of them, on their heads! Only the Liberals ever think about the political effect of a resolution! And, of course, their very reaction to this shows how ridiculous the thing is. They practically admit by their action that this is nothing but a political manoeuvre. Every one of the C.C.F. that I have ever heard speak will say, in one breath, "We have every confidence in the Wheat Board; we want the Wheat Board to handle our wheat;" but whenever they see a chance to make a few votes, of course, we get such manoeuvres as we had today.

The hon. member for Bengough dragged in the usual C.C.F. misrepresentation this afternoon. They cannot keep away from it; it seems to be part of their very make-up. He referred to the fact that Liberal members, as he said, had voted against an initial payment of \$1.75.

Mr. Brown: — I did not.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, he read out from Hansard, and I have the Hansard he used. He read out the names of Mr. Gardiner, and he read out the name of the hon. member Mr. Studer.

Mr. Brown: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. I do not think the hon. member should be referring to me, it was the member from Notukeu-Willowbunch who read them out.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, you were referring to the fact that they had voted against it and he tried to prove you were right; so you are both in the same boat together.

What are the facts, Mr. Speaker? Well, the facts were that this was a motion for second reading of the Bill to amend the Wheat Board Act. What was the purpose of that Bill? The purpose of the Bill, Mr. Speaker, was set out by the Minister of Trade and Commerce very carefully. He pointed out — I will read from Hansard, April 20, 1950. Here is what Mr. Howe said:

"I refer in particular, having the facilities to deal with our customers in whichever way they wish, I think we should also give consideration to the views expressed by representative producer organizations on the way in which their member-producers prefer to have their crops marketed."

I think it is an admirable policy that, in regard to farm products, the Government should consult the representatives of the farmers as to how they want their products marketed — and that is the policy laid down by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and he says:

“I refer in particular to the representations made to the Cabinet on February 8th of this year by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture following their annual convention at Niagara Falls.”

The first two recommendations on the subject of wheat are as follows — this is April 20, 1950 — in regard to this very resolution that the Liberals were condemned for supporting. Here is what the Canadian Federation of Agriculture said:

“Believing in the soundness of the principles of International commodity agreements as exemplified in the International Wheat Agreement, we urge the Government to maintain its active support of the Agreement . . . the provisions of the Canadian Wheat Board Act of 1935, as amended in 1946, provide that the Canadian Wheat Board is the sole marketing agency for wheat, expired July 31, 1950” . . . (I am still reading from the Canadian Federation of Agriculture) . . . “We are convinced a very great majority of the farmers of the Prairie Provinces have a strong preference for the present system of marketing their wheat. We therefore urge the Government to extend the present power of the Wheat Board so it may continue to be the sole marketing agency for wheat.”

That is the recommendation of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture. The Minister of Trade and Commerce said this:

“Thus we have the principal organization of producers recommending that the Government continue its active support of the International Wheat Agreement, and also that the present power of the Board be extended so that it may continue to be the sole marketing agency for wheat.”

That was the purpose of this Bill. The powers of the Wheat Board to handle wheat exclusively expired last July. The Canadian Federation of Agriculture asked that those powers be extended. Trade Minister Howe went on to say this:

“By renewing the powers which at present expire on July 31st next, for wheat, we also make possible the continuation of the Wheat Board as the sole marketing agency for oats and barley.”

In this regard, the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, in its representation of February 8th, recommended as follows:

“The powers granted the Canadian Wheat Board to act as the sole marketing agency for coarse grains expires on July 31, 1950. We recommend that the Government extend those powers so that the Board may continue to be the sole marketing agency for coarse grains.”

Here was the Government, Mr. Speaker, introducing a Bill to carry out the wish of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, and if this Bill

March 15, 1951

had not been passed the powers of the Wheat Board would expire, wheat would go back on the Grain Exchange, oats and barley would be handled entirely by the Grain Exchange instead of through the Wheat Board; and here is a Bill that the C.C.F. up and down the country . . . If this Bill had been killed and wheat had gone back on the Grain Exchange . . .

Hon. Members: — Oh, oh!

Mr. Tucker: — Well, that would have been the effect of the Bill being killed.

(Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! The hon. members will kindly keep order. This debate is not concluded; there will be lots of opportunity for them to reply.

Mr. Tucker: — They just hate to hear the truth, Mr. Speaker, that is the whole thing. I have read from the speech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the members across know that what I am saying is right . . .

(Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. members will have the opportunity of speaking.

Mr. Tucker: — They know they cannot answer, Mr. Speaker. That is why they are trying to confuse the issue now. They cannot answer. At least the Minister of Agriculture knows if nobody else on his side knows, these emergency powers expired July 31, 1950, and if this Bill had not been passed, the power of the Wheat Board to handle wheat exclusively would have lapsed.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Well, anybody knows that.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, the Minister says, “Anybody knows that.” Well, now, the other members have been jeering at that suggestion. Better get your members together and instruct them a bit. That is the whole trouble, apparently the only person over on the other side who seems to know anything about this matter is the Minister of Agriculture, and even he goes off the rails every now and again; it is a very amazing state of affairs. But, not knowing anything about the situation, they proceed to make motions like this, instructing the Wheat Board which has the confidence of the producers of grain all over Western Canada. And, in order to bolster up their position, they find fault with the Liberals who upheld the second reading of this Bill. That is what they did. Had the C.C.F. succeeded, this Bill to amend the Wheat Board Act, giving the Wheat Board power to handle our wheat exclusively, and handle our oats and barley, this power would have lapsed.

Premier Douglas: — Bunk!

Mr. Tucker: — Well, you say “Bunk”. It is not bunk, it is true; it is right in the Dominion Statutes, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Premier reminds me of that foolish old king who thought that by saying

to the waves “keep back”, they would keep back. He thinks by saying something is not true that it makes it not true. I often wonder if his conceit carries him so far, Mr. Speaker, that he thinks he can put it across if something is plainly white and he gets up and tells his adoring followers it is not white, “it is really, in my opinion, pink.” And then, if somebody says, “But really, look at it, it is white,” the Premier says “Bunk”, and that settles it.

Premier Douglas: — Will my hon. friend permit a question.

Mr. Tucker: — I suggest the Premier sit down.

Premier Douglas: — Will my hon. friend permit a question?

Mr. Tucker: — No.

Premier Douglas: — I thought you were frightened. I knew you were scared.

(Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker: — Order, Order!

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I rose and asked the hon. member if he would permit me to ask him a question.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. Premier will have the opportunity to reply, and he may be able to keep the waves back.

Mr. Tucker: — But, Mr. Speaker, the trouble is he knows he cannot reply to this. He knows what I am saying is true, and so all the contribution he can make is “Bunk” and that sort of nonsense . . .

Premier Douglas: — Answer the question.

Mr. Tucker: — That sort of thing has been going on in this province for several years. The Premier thinks that he can wave his hand over something and say it is not so, that is all.

Premier Douglas: — I know a lie when I see it in broad daylight.

Mr. Tucker: — I ask you to note that the Premier says he knows a lie when he sees it in broad daylight; but if I say anything that reflects on him the poor little fellow gets up and says: “Mr. Speaker, make the Leader of the Opposition withdraw.” But it is all right for him to suggest that I am engaging in lies. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to just note the sort of thing that is going on. I know you cannot control him, but I just ask you to note it, that is all.

(Interruptions)

Now then, if I may go on and deal with these facts — and I notice, Mr. Speaker, that this is a common habit of the C.C.F.: if they see facts being brought forward that they know they cannot answer, they proceed to act just as they are acting today. This is not the first time it has happened. It is very clear that whenever you are getting on to

March 15, 1951

some point that they cannot answer, they engage in tactics like this; and everybody is beginning to realize the symptoms of it.

Now, here was a motion for second reading to do the very thing I have mentioned, and the Premier cannot contradict it, because these powers did expire July 31st 1950. And had this Bill not been passed, then the Wheat Board would not have had the exclusive right to handle wheat. And what do the C.C.F. do? Their usual manoeuvre, Mr. Speaker. Here is the Motion:

“That Bill No. 252 should not now be read a second time . . .”

There it is, “but be it resolved,” now here is the resolution that they are going to make. It has no more effect than if they went up to the top of the Peace Tower and whistled in the wind, the resolution passed by the C.C.F. after they killed the Bill itself.

Hon. Member: — Read it.

Mr. Tucker: — I will read it. Sure I will read it. The operative part is that the Bill be not now read a second time. Now you know, Mr. Speaker, that if a motion is made here that a Bill be not read a second time and the House supports the motion that it be not read a second time, that kills that particular Bill.

Mr. Speaker: — Under certain circumstances.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, it always kills it, Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances here. I am ready to argue that out with you, Mr. Speaker, any time you want. I will read the whole thing and then I submit to you that this would have killed the Bill:

“That Bill No. 252 should not now be read a second time, but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this House consideration should be given to the provision of an initial payment, for the periods covered by this Bill, of \$1.75 per bushel for No. 1 Northern Wheat basis in store Fort William, Port Arthur or Vancouver.”

The hon. members applaud that, but the effect of that resolution, if it passed, would be that that Bill would have been killed. It would have been absolutely killed, no question about it. And unless the Government saw fit to bring in some other Bill, that Bill would be dead for that Session. And if the Government's Bill was killed at this particular stage of proceedings, on June 5, 1950, of course, the Government would have been defeated; it was Government policy. That would have meant an election. Does anybody suggest that that would not have done away with the Wheat Board? Of course it would. And because the Government members support this Bill to extend the power of the Wheat Board, and there is an amendment moved that would have killed that Bill, then the members of this Government get up and say “They voted against the \$1.75”. Trickery, trickery; nothing else! The actual effect of that amendment would have been to kill that Bill. What was added on, in addition to that, was just bait — the way you catch a fish; that is all. Furthermore, I have no doubt in the world that it was moved with the idea in mind that good, faithful C.C.F.'ers could go throughout the country and say, “Here is what we tried to do, and the

Liberals voted against \$1.75 wheat.”

Hon. Member: — And they did.

Mr. Tucker: — The Liberals voted to carry second reading of this Bill so the Wheat Board could handle their wheat, and nobody but a person with a twisted mind would think otherwise, Mr. Speaker.

There is the situation. It is not the first time the C.C.F. have pulled this sort of a manoeuvre, but they have been exposed so often, Mr. Speaker, that they do not indulge in it with the same certainty that they used to, because people are getting wise to them, Mr. Speaker. That is all.

(Interruptions)

Well, you are an expert on specious arguments all right, judging by your tactics which I have just outlined — an expert. There speaks an expert in specious arguments; he sits in judgment.

I have dealt with the strange attitude of the C.C.F. We know that of this low-grade wheat, from anything we can find out, there is probably not more than half sold. Six months of the crop year have gone. There is probably half of the rest of the wheat sold. But right away, according to this resolution, what is estimated to be pretty close to the total payment which this wheat will sell for is to be paid “at once” to the producer. Does not that mean borrowing at least half of this money, Mr. Speaker, or perhaps more? And yet, as I pointed out already, when the farmers needed the money badly in 1949 and they had money on hand in the wheat board to the amount of \$208 million, and the suggestion was made by all farm organizations throughout the country that this \$208 million should be disbursed, and the Wheat Board thought it would be easier to make the payment in a round figure of 20 cents a bushel, and borrowed \$5 million to add to the \$208 million . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Just before an election.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, but the fact remains that they could have paid 19½ cents out of the farmers’ money. Was the farmer going to be bought up for \$5 million spread all over this country? Such a suggestion is an insult to our constituents.

Mr. Egnatoff: — They are judging everybody by themselves.

Mr. Tucker: — Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, \$208 million in the hands of the Wheat Board that belongs to the farmers and because . . .

(Interruptions)

Can you imagine anyone more injured, if we started to interfere with him when he is speaking. Oh, my goodness! How he runs for protection to you, then, Mr. Speaker. But of course, when I am speaking and telling them something that they do not know the answer to and they know it is quite true, they indulge in heckling and so on. Well, as far as I am concerned I do not care, Mr. Speaker. The fact is that when they start talking like that and acting like that, I know that it hurts, Mr. Speaker, and it does me

March 15, 1951

good to see it.

Here is what we have — the amazing attitude of the C.C.F Party; \$208 million on hand which belongs to the farmers; the farm organizations say, “We would like to have our money.” The Wheat Board said, “Well, if we borrow \$5 million we can make a round payment of 20 cents.” Right away the C.C.F. Party, when the Board is paying out 20 cents of which 19½ cents belongs to the farmer and the farmers know it, run around and say the Liberals are trying to “bribe” the farmers, paying them 19½ cents of their own money and \$5 million borrowed. That is their opinion of our great agricultural industry and the great people in it. Yes, — that if they borrowed \$5 million and added the \$213 million and pay it out together, that is bribery. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a higher respect for the intelligence of our farmers who knew they were getting their own money, and this borrowing was borrowing against the Wheat Board on hand. They knew it was their own money. It is just an insult to the intelligence of the farmers to suggest that in any way they were being bribed with their own money. But anything at all to try to keep going the poor-broken-down old C.C.F. Party; anything at all, because, after all, they know that people are getting fed up with their idea of a planned economy.

Well, we had a good example of what happens with planned economy in New Zealand and Australia, and some other places too; but it will not hurt their feelings so much if I refer to Australia and New Zealand. They used to be proud of Russia in days gone by, but they no longer are proud of Russia.

Mr. Speaker: — Might I draw the hon. member’s attention that he might as well keep to the resolution at this point.

Mr. Tucker: — Yes. I am keeping to it a good deal closer than the members on the other side, Mr. Speaker; but, of course, I am trying to keep to it, and I think I am. I am answering the argument that a planned economy is the answer, and I think I am keeping to the resolution, Mr. Speaker, when I refer to other planned economies. You cannot speak of planned economy without the Soviet Union; everything is planned there, 100 per cent planned. So I think I am keeping to the resolution, Mr. Speaker, a good deal closer than the members on the other side, when I repeatedly asked you, and other members on this side asked you, to try to keep them to the resolution. You did not succeed very well, Mr. Speaker, I do not blame you; you did your best in that regard.

Now then, this planned economy: they tried it in New Zealand and we used to hear about New Zealand. Oh, that was the paradise! Mr. Speaker, you know what a great paradise it was. It was such a paradise that the government that was in there for twelve years was thrown out because the people were fed up on the so-called planned economy.

Premier Douglas: — They are going back in.

Mr. Tucker: — The hon. member says they are going back in — he knows better than anybody, even those in New Zealand. How does he know they are going to go back in? I would not be a bit surprised if they are beaten worse next time than they were last time. I do not think the hon. Premier is any expert on what is going to happen in New Zealand, I do not think he is able to judge what is going to happen in Saskatchewan, let alone

New Zealand. As a matter of fact, I do not know whether the Premier indulges in prophecy or not, but I well recall, before the 1948 election, his desk-mate, in whom he has such confidence, the Provincial Treasurer, went up and down the country saying that the Liberals would be lucky to keep even the five seats they already had. That shows what great prophets they were. And now they are going to prophecy about New Zealand. Well, the farther away they get from home, of course, the less they probably know, although it is the other way around with certain people; they can pretend they know more about things that are far away.

But, in regard to the planned economy, I just wish to make this observation about it. A planned economy will be run by the will of the majority; that is what will happen. That is what they found out in other countries that have tried it. But the farmer is not in the majority in most countries today, and a government tends to satisfy the majority; and when it starts satisfying the majority who, after all, gets the worst of the deal — the majority or the minority? That is one of the weaknesses of the planned economy. Some human beings have got to decide how much each particular group gets, and if, under organized pressure of the majority, a government accedes to that (as it must in the long run), what happens to the minority group in this so-called planned economy? That is a big weakness, Mr. Speaker. Maybe you can make it work in a set-up like the Soviet Union where you have a dictator who imposes his will and who sees to it that there is no opposition. But what is a democracy to do in that stage? Well, it finally goes according to the will of the majority. And where you have, for example, a majority closely organized, I think that the people who are in the minority, such as the farmers are in this country, should stop, look and listen before they give too much power to the State.

Now then, just the effect of that. How is our working population divided? Well, I have here a speech delivered to the Ontario Fruit and Vegetable Growers' Association by Professor McDougall, School of Commerce and Administration at Queen's University. I would like to read this to you, Mr. Speaker, because it bears on this question. Here is what he says:

“I say to you with all the force that I can muster, that those who propose this resolution can not have pondered on how much a system must inevitably operate in a democracy. I will even question whether they have absorbed the lessons of the short war. If there is to be control over economic distribution, then inevitably, voting power is going to have a powerful effect on the decisions made. Remember that the fair selling value of the cabbage is not written in the stars, it has to be decided by some man or men.”

And he asked the farmers;

“How well equipped are you to enter into a hurly-burly with other groups? As you make up your mind on that point, I ask you to note one pertinent fact. In 1949 there were 1,091,000 people with jobs in agriculture — a little over one million people with jobs in agriculture as against a total of 3,888,000 in non-agriculture employment, of whom 3,339,000 were paid workers. They were distributed as follows:

March 15, 1951

Farm operators (these are the farmers themselves) — 672,000
Paid workers — 144,000
Unpaid family workers — 275,000.”

That is, engaged in farm work. And you can see that is a little over a million. Therefore (and this is a very significant figure to those who want to have everything run by the State) there are 4.97, almost five paid workers drawing wages or salaries outside of agriculture, for every farm operator. It is overlooked in Saskatchewan, I often think, the exact economic make-up of our Dominion. That is a figure that should be pondered by everybody — that there are almost five paid workers for every one person engaged as a farm operator. In a democracy, if it gets right down to handing out things on a political basis, I wonder if the farmers are going to be able to dictate the share they are going to get. It is something they should consider when they are contemplating whether they want a planned economy such as they have in the Soviet, or any other planned economy, whether they want that or not. And they should, as this Queen’s University professor says, “stop, look and listen.” Here is what he goes on to say:

“Now put yourself in the position of a Cabinet which must think in terms of its own re-election, and then ask yourself which way they would tend to lean when the relative claims of food producers and of food consumers come up for decision. I think if you face that question honestly you will come to the conclusion that when you ask for controls you are monkeying with a buzz-saw, you are very likely to get controls working against you, controls used to hold down the cost of food-stuffs and so on.”

Now then, so far as the Liberal Party is concerned in a question like this, it believes in being an arbiter and endeavouring to try to see to it that those who are unable to protect themselves are protected against any group that tried to exercise too much control for its own benefit. If it gets engaged in the picture itself it cannot act as an arbiter.

That is shown by the actions of the Crown Corporations: for example, the action in regard to the Woollen Mill. What do we find there? We find that they are taking advantage of the highest prices they can get in selling their wool products; no attempt made . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — What has that to do with the resolution?

Mr. Tucker: — It has a lot to do with it. Other people are condemned for the rise in prices, and they say, well, “We have to pay these wages;” they say, “We are paying very good wages.”

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Is it your opinion that the hon. member is in order?

Mr. Tucker: — I am asking this question on the suggestion that what we need is a planned economy, and I am just leading . . .

Premier Douglas: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: what has the resolution to do with the planned economy? Where in the resolution is there mention of a planned economy?

Mr. Tucker: — The argument is made on the other side that what we need to handle this thing is a planned economy, Mr. Speaker. You have heard it argued over and over again, and I am just answering it.

Mr. Speaker: — The point of order is very well taken. Both the resolution and the amendment have nothing at all to do with a planned economy; they are simply asking — the resolution says: “urge the Federal Government to immediately raise the initial payment, through the Wheat Board on the 1950-51 crop to \$1.75 per bushel . . . and further urge that the final settlement be made on the basis of parity.” That does not imply a planned economy of necessity. The amendment now being discussed simply has the change of words in that resolution. So I would ask the hon. member who is speaking to stay a little closer to the motion.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, I am obliged to you for your interpretation of this resolution, but I would point out to you that one of the basic ideas in it is this idea of parity, and the speakers interpreted that as being the sort of thing that you would have in a planned economy. Now, of course . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I might draw to the hon. member’s attention, when that point was being discussed it was being compared with what was happening in the United States.

Mr. Tucker: — I am comparing it with what is happening in other countries (Why should we confine ourselves?) and right in our own country. Now, of course, I have no doubt parity was interpreted by speakers opposite as having to do with some sort of a planned economy . . .

Premier Douglas: — Are you opposed to it?

Mr. Tucker: — . . . and the point of order is just an attempt to try to put me off. I assure the hon. members that you will not do so. And it is quite impossible to suggest . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Yes, but I cannot see where the operation of the woollen mill has anything to do with the planned economy.

Mr. Tucker: — Yes it has. I will explain it to you then, Mr. Speaker; I was trying to explain it when I was interrupted. I said, once the state gets involved in the operation of handling these operations itself, as it is in the planned economy, and I said it is like the wool factory, that they say, “Here are the wages we have to pay and, therefore, we have to charge more for these goods.” Instead of then looking on as an arbiter and trying to say whether the price is too high or not, the State is out there to see to it that it gets enough money to pay the wages it has decided to pay.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, further on the point of order. I think I want to withdraw my point of order because I realize now that wool has a very close relationship to the Liberal wheat policy.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, that is some point of order. It is very smart. It is the sort of thing that the C.C.F. have done in the past, attempted to make jokes and try to answer our argument that way when they cannot answer it otherwise; and, of course, people are getting wise to them. They are not

March 15, 1951

getting away with it any more, and that is why they are trying to raise up all kinds of Federal issues, Mr. Speaker. I do not mind discussing them because I think it is a good thing to discuss them. But all these rumours of an election based upon Federal issues, which would not be decided in a provincial election campaign, of course, shows that the C.C.F. are afraid to meet us on their own grounds.

(Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker: — Well then, I must call the hon. member to order on that. He is out of order, bringing in the question of an election on these motions.

Mr. Tucker: — All right, Mr. Speaker. Do I take it you are ruling that the motives of the people who raised these resolutions have absolutely no political basis?

Mr. Speaker: — My ruling is that there is no basis of bringing in a political discussion on these motions.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, I must accept your ruling that these resolutions have no political implications at all, that there were absolutely none, especially when they attacked the Liberal members of Parliament and how they voted and all that sort of thing. That had nothing to do with politics at all, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Might I draw the hon. member's attention that that was not my ruling. I do not rule on what may be implied or otherwise; I do not know what is implied. My ruling is that you cannot discuss the question of an election on these motions.

Mr. Tucker: — Oh! Well, my hon. friends across the way discussed how the Liberals voted in the House of Commons and spoke about how the Liberals let the farmers down, and so on; of course, that had nothing to do, I know, with a possible election or anything like that. They just are discussing that because they feel that their devotion to truth makes it necessary for them to deal with those things. So I must bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Now then, I come to this business that was emphasized to us, that this setting of the initial price at \$1.40 lost the farmers \$100 million. That was emphasized by the Premier in radio speeches — which, I understand, some people have indicated to him they did not approve of very well, because, in this system of pooling . . .

Premier Douglas: — Who indicated it?

Mr. Tucker: — You know yourself. I do not need to say.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. gentleman either to withdraw that statement or substantiate it. No person at any time made any such statement to me.

Mr. Tucker: — All right, I am . . .

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I am raising a question of privilege. My hon. friend need not bother imputing motives; he has been doing that all afternoon and getting away with it. There is no imputation whatsoever. I am making a categorical statement that no one made any suggestion to me that they did not like those radio broadcasts, and I ask my hon. friend either to withdraw that or to state who it was, because he is making a statement that is not true.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, I can say I must have got on some tender toes because when I said I believe the hon. member has had representations that did not approve of that attitude, I believe that, and I do not have to start enumerating who I think has made those representations; he knows as well as I do. I state that on my own responsibility, that is my opinion.

Premier Douglas: — On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. My friend says that I know it. I make the statement I do not know it and I ask him to accept my statement that I do not know it.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, if you say that you do not know who they are, then I have a good idea that representations must have been made to you, because people believe in the pool system of marketing grain.

Mr. Speaker: — As I understand it, this controversy between the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier is that you made a categorical statement, he asked for the name, you refused to give it and accepted it on your own responsibility, and he exactly asked you to accept his statement on his responsibility, and I think you both got an acceptance.

Mr. Tucker: — Now, after we have that all settled, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier makes the assertion that nobody objects in any way to this suggestion that the farmers have lost \$100 million.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member just put it straight; he has great difficulty keeping words straight. I meant that no person made representation to me. My hon. friend said representations had been made to me and I knew by whom those representations had been made. I say no representations were made to me, and I do not know of anyone making such representations to me.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, what I said, Mr. Speaker, was that I am satisfied representations were made, and the Premier says, “Who made the representations?” I said, “You will know better than I do.” What is wrong with that, Mr. Speaker? And the Premier says that no representations were made. All right, I accept his statement. What is all the excitement about?

Premier Douglas: — There is no excitement at all.

Mr. Tucker: — That is not nearly as bad as saying, as the Premier did not long ago, that I lied. But you see what tender little hearts they have, Mr. Speaker.

I was going to say, Mr. Speaker, when the Premier came up with his alleged point of order or question of privilege or something like that — it is hard to know.

Premier Douglas: — I am sure you could not tell the difference.

March 15, 1951

Mr. Tucker: — No, I could not; nobody else could either, except in your own devious mind. But, what I would say, Mr. Speaker, is that anyone who gets up and says that, because an initial payment of \$1.40 is made, that means that the difference between that and the price at which it is expected the wheat will be sold is lost to the farmers; if the Premier is able to make that statement and not have somebody object to it who believes in the pooling system of handling grain, then I am surprised. Anybody who is engaged in the pooling operation knows that just because you set an initial payment of 70 per cent of the initial price that does not mean you have lost the other 30 per cent; it means that you will get it later. And I repudiate the suggestion that that money that was not paid out at once was lost. It fits in very well with grain Exchange propaganda to say that it is lost, though. Yes! Speeches like that are quoted by the Grain Exchange to prove that people should not support the pooling system of handling grain, because if that pooling system means that the money is lost, and if people believe it, they are going to turn their backs on the pooling system of handling grain. And I just cannot understand, Mr. Speaker, with a statement like that made, that somebody has not made representations to the Premier that he should not continue, whether he intended to or not, to undermine the faith of the people in the pooling system of handling grain. That is the effect of it.

Now I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that so far as we are concerned, we have faith in the present Wheat Board system of handling grain, we do not think that it did lose the farmers \$100 million. We think that it is going to save them millions and millions of dollars. I wonder what would have happened, Mr. Speaker, if we had not had a Wheat Board to take the low-grade wheat off the market last fall, if it had been thrown on the market and bought up in the open market; people having to buy wheat that they probably could not have any hope of getting rid of for two or three years, wheat that they must realize might spoil before they could get rid of it. The head of the Wheat Pool suggested that had it not been for the Wheat Board handling this grain, the price of feed wheat last fall would have dropped to 40 cents a bushel. That would have been all the farmers would have got for it. And when this 20 cents comes out they will get over a dollar a bushel, right at the farm, for feed wheat. That system of handling wheat has saved our farmers millions of dollars, not lost them \$100 million as alleged by the Premier.

I think I have dealt with that loss of \$100 million that was referred to, adequately. Oh, they will repeat it again! But I would say, Mr. Speaker, that whenever people make statements that are taken up so gladly by the Grain Exchange, they should ask themselves whether they are helping the pooling system and the Wheat Board system of handling grain or not, if they really are sincere in their desire to uphold this wheat board system of handling grain. And I suggest that if they made a mistake before, they cease repeating it, because it is not increasing the faith of our farmers in this Wheat Board handling of grain.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. If the hon. member is implying that we are not sincerely behind the Wheat Board I would ask him to withdraw that statement. He has been throwing inferences around here all afternoon.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, I said, if they are sincere I suggest that they do

not continually make these statements that do undermine faith in the Wheat Board system of handling grain.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Ah, bunk! It is you who are undermining it.

Mr. Tucker: — If the cap fits the hon. member, I cannot keep him from cramming it down on his head. But I did not make any implication against him or anyone else, I simply said that if they are sincere let them stop making statements that are taken up by the Grain Exchange and used in a campaign that is going on today to undermine the farmer's faith in the Wheat Board and pooling system.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — We know the record of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Tucker: — You see, there you are: the shoe is beginning to pinch again, Mr. Speaker. I am getting in a point where they know that they are in the wrong and so they begin to make a noise and rise on points of order and so on.

(Interruptions)

There was a suggestion made by one of the hon. members who spoke this afternoon. His argument was — I will paraphrase it, I will not purport to give his exact words; I took down a few words just so I would not overlook it.

Opposition Member: — They have been making these cracks all Fall.

Mr. Tucker: — One of them said that when the Canadian Government undertook to market our wheat at the request of the farm organizations, they were under an obligation right away to make a payment which he was trying to estimate as parity. Now then, I just put it to all the hon. members: had we asked the Federal Government to set up the Wheat Board to handle our grain? As I point out before, we have 20 members from Saskatchewan out of 262 in the Federal House, and if we were to go to them and say, "If you undertake the marketing of this grain it means that you are responsible for the demands that may be made in regard to anything we may decide on as parity," does anybody think that we could persuade all the rest of the country to continue marketing our grain? The head of the Wheat Pool pointed that out when he was speaking about demands that were being made. He said (and most hon. members, I think, must realise this in their own hearts) that in our attitudes on these matters it is more important to preserve the Wheat Board system of handling grain (bearing in mind, for example, the millions it saved us on our feed grain) than to kick up a disturbance out of all proportion over something with which we are finding fault.

Now I am ready to join with other members in trying to get all that we can possibly hope for for the farmers, but I also draw to the attention of the hon. members that we cannot dictate to the rest of Canada. We only make up a very small part — one province out of 10; and if we get it into our minds that we are going to really throw our weight around, then the danger is, as pointed out by the head of the Wheat Pool, that the Federal Government will say, "Well, you feel that you can handle this thing much better than we can, why does not your Provincial Government handle it, or the Wheat Pools themselves?" But already suggestions are being made that

March 15, 1951

if the farmers are not satisfied with the Wheat Board, if they really think that it has lost them \$100 million, then the best thing to do is to let the farmers handle their own grain. I understand that some Eastern members of Parliament are beginning to suggest that. And the fact that the C.C.F. Party with their (how many have they got in the House, 13 or 14?)

Hon. Member: — Thirteen.

Mr. Tucker: — I suppose they think they could dictate to the other . . .

Gov't Member: — We should have 16 more though.

Mr. Tucker: — Yes, but you only got them there now by the will of the Canadian people.

Gov't Member: — We will have a lot more next time.

Mr. Tucker: — Here we have the cause of your attitude; you have been able to elect 13 people to the Federal House.

Gov't Member: —Using the big stick now.

Mr. Tucker: — I know I am stepping on somebody else's toes now. You see there, Mr. Speaker, it bothers them. But there is the situation. Does anybody think that group of 13 there, elected by the Canadian people, as against almost 250 elected by people believing in other parties; does anybody think that the 13 should dictate the policy of the whole of Canada?

Gov't Member: — Wait until there are 200.

Mr. Tucker: — Now then, there is something that we have to always bear in mind.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — We can put the fear of God into you.

Mr. Tucker: — We have got to convince the rest of Canada of the justice of our cause. We cannot go down there thinking we are going to dictate. We, like any other part of Canada, have to go to them, as the farm organizations have gone.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — We only want justice; no dictation.

Mr. Tucker: — I remember some great thinker, when somebody said he wanted justice, said he should get down on his knees and thank God that he did not get justice . . . And perhaps that might apply to the Minister of Social Welfare.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Are you talking about the farmers now?

Mr. Tucker: — No, I am talking about you.

Now, I was saying, Mr. Speaker, when interrupted by the cry for "justice" by the Minister of Social Welfare, I was just trying to say that we must go down there and satisfy them that we have a just claim. And I say

that if we do satisfy them of that we will get justice. But we have to be reasonable in our approach, and we have to be ready to give them good arguments as to why things we want should be done. And the best guarantee that we will get consideration is the very Bill that I have mentioned. Here the Minister of Trade and Commerce gets up in the House of Commons and reads what the Canadian Federation of Agriculture just passed, that this Wheat Board power should be extended, and he said, "Because we believe the farmers' wishes in handling their product should be observed, we, representatives in the Parliament of Canada, are introducing this Bill to extend these powers so that the farmers can have their wheat and their oats and barley marketed as they want." And because Liberals supported it, their actions are twisted in this House as having some other effect altogether. Well, I am glad to know, Mr. Speaker, that we live in a mature democracy and that sort of sharp practice is convincing fewer people all the time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in this amendment we are supporting the Wheat Board, expressing a vote of confidence in it, because that is what the people who sent us here would want us to do. We believe they are doing a good job of handling our wheat, and we are asking them, in this amendment, to pay the money out to the farmers as soon as possible. That is a vote of confidence in the Wheat Board. To say that they should pay \$1.75 out whether they have got it or not, even if it means borrowing millions and millions of dollars; no matter what, that they should pay it out at once, and we pass on that without knowing the situation at all, well I submit, Mr. Speaker, so far as the Opposition are concerned in this Legislature, we have faith in the Wheat Board, we think we should confine ourselves to asking that that money should be paid out as soon as possible in their judgment, and I think in voting that way we are voting as the great farming population of this province, that has laid the foundation for the province we have today, would want to have us vote, in the interests of their present welfare and their future welfare as well.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to take any part in this debate, but after watching this grotesque spectacle, this afternoon, I thought probably I should say a few words with reference to the remarks that have just been made by the Leader of the Opposition. It could have been called a sort of a 'comedy of errors', or it could be called 'Falstaff trying to get out of a straitjacket'.

The Leader of the Opposition has spent a good part of the time discussing almost everything except the resolution, and doing everything possible to dig the now desperate Liberal Party out of a very bad political hole. Of course, he is an expert at that. My hon. friend has spent almost all the years that I have known him to be in public life, trying to explain to people that, although he had voted against \$1.00 a bushel for wheat, in 1942, he really was not voting against \$1.00 a bushel for wheat, he was voting because the particular amendment might stop the farmers from getting 90 cent; and he spent most of his time explaining that, although he voted to tax the co-operatives, he really did not mean that he wanted to tax the co-operatives, although I noticed, in that particular debate . . .

Mr. Tucker: — On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker . . .

March 15, 1951

Premier Douglas: — Who has the tender toes now, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Tucker: — I am just correcting a statement of fact of the Premier's. He said I voted to tax the co-operatives. As he knows, I voted to take more taxation off than was put on.

Mr. Speaker: — Might I point out to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that he interpreted a vote in the House to suit himself, and the present speaker has the opportunity to do likewise.

Mr. Tucker: — But the Premier . . .

Premier Douglas: — The hon. member stood up and said, "I don't know what I should do", but if he only had a dozen Liberals down there to help him, things would have been different. Well, they got the dozen Liberals — they have 14, as a matter of fact, now. Now he stands up and says, "What can 20 Liberals do? — There are all those other 200 down there". I wasn't aware that they were going down among enemies. I thought those 14 Liberals in Saskatchewan were going down to join other Liberals, who were part and parcel of a party that subscribed to a programme. Now we find that the Saskatchewan representatives go down there and fight with the whole Liberal Party to get justice for the farmers of Western Canada. That is a terrible admission, Mr. Speaker, a terrible admission. What can 20 do, from Saskatchewan? Does that mean that the rest of the Liberal Party has a different stand on the question of the marketing of wheat and a fair price for the western farmers than the Saskatchewan Liberals have? Is the Liberal Party now divided into sections — one, for the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan, and a totally different programme for the Liberal Party down there? Now, the excuses of the Leader of the Opposition — he wrings his hands and he says, "I know we should get \$1.75; I know we are not getting a square deal, but what can so few of us do with this great big Liberal majority down in Ottawa? We can't do anything with them." Well, Mr. Speaker, that is the saddest statement that has come from a political leader in this province for many a day.

The only reason I got into this discussion was because I interjected the word "bunk" and my hon. friend took very strong exception to it. Well, I want to repeat the word "bunk", because . . .

Mr. Egnatoff: — Bunk!

Premier Douglas: — I never can tell whether the member for Melfort is saying 'bunk' or whether somebody just patted him on the head; but I do know that I heard a hollow sound . . .

Mr. Egnatoff: — I want to tell the hon. Premier that I did say 'bunk'.

Premier Douglas: — My interjection, Mr. Speaker, had to do with this debate which took place in the House of Commons on June 5, last. It is true, as the Leader of the Opposition has said, that the Bill before the House was to extend the powers of the Wheat Board, and I want to say here and now, Mr. Speaker, that this party does not need to prove the stand which it has taken, over the years, on the Wheat Board. We were fighting for the Wheat Board when some of my friends opposite were making speeches for the Winnipeg Grain Exchange.

Opposition Members: — Bunk! That is a good word “bunk”.

Premier Douglas: — The Leader of the Opposition will remember the statements being made in the Canadian House of Commons, in 1936-7-8 by the Minister of Agriculture, when Mr. Coldwell and myself were battling to have the Wheat Board handle the farmers’ grain, and the Government allowed it to go on the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. Every farmer in this country knows that.

My hon. friends, now, of course, have become champions of the Wheat Board because the farmers are so solidly for the Wheat Board that they have to talk Wheat Board to get a hearing. They know that perfectly well.

Mr. Deshaye: — Who established the Wheat Board?

Premier Douglas: — The Bill being brought in was to extend the powers of the Wheat Board. The powers which the Wheat Board then had did not expire until July 31st. This debate was taking place on June 5th. Mr. Coldwell introduced an amendment, on the second reading, as follows:

“THAT this Bill, No. 232, should not now be read a second time . . .”

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear! That is what he said and did.

Premier Douglas: —

“. . . not now read a second time but that it should be resolved that in the opinion of this House consideration should be given to the provision of an initial payment for the period covered by this Bill, of \$1.75 a bushel for No. 1 Northern wheat basis in storage Fort William, Port Arthur or Vancouver.”

Now what is the effect of that?

Mr. Egnatoff: — Bunk!

Premier Douglas: — My hon. friend here tries to tell this House, and expects the country to believe, that the effect of that would have been to kill the Bill for extending the powers of the Wheat Board . . .

Opposition Member: — It sure would have.

Premier Douglas: — What utter nonsense! Does he expect anybody to believe that? Not even a Liberal member at Ottawa got up and suggested anything so fantastic as that . . .

Mr. Tucker: — But that doesn’t make it wrong.

Premier Douglas: — . . . Because, Mr. Speaker, all the Government had to do was one of two things — either say, “if the hon. member will withdraw his amendment, we will place the \$1.75 in the Bill” — that is the first thing. The second thing they could have done was, if the House passed “that it be not now read a second time” and that consideration be given to putting \$1.75 in it, they could simply have withdrawn the Bill and introduced

March 15, 1951

a new Bill. This was on June 5th There were almost two months to go before the powers of the Wheat Board expired. They had ample time to have re-introduced a substitute Bill with \$1.75 in it . . .

Mr. Tucker: — That wasn't the question involved.

Premier Douglas: — It was the question involved. I will tell my hon. friend what the question involved was. The question involved was whether the farmers would get \$1.40 a bushel or \$1.75 a bushel, and my hon. friend has not got the courage to admit that he and his party sold the farmer down the river on that day.

Opposition Members: — Bunk!

Premier Douglas: — They sold the farmers down the river, and now my hon. friend is going up and down the length and breadth of the country trying to wiggle out of a dastardly betrayal. Now he said, "Why, if that had passed, the Wheat Board would have expired" . . .

(Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker: — Order! We don't want to make this place a bedlam . . .

Opposition Member: — Why didn't you stop them then?

Mr. Speaker: — All right, there was opposition from that side against any interruptions and I kept the interruptions down and I am going to keep them down now, as much as possible. Will you kindly keep them down?

Opposition Members: — Oh! . . . Bunk!

Mr. Danielson: — Bunk!

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, apparently the member for Arm River wasn't told, when he was a small boy, that it is bad manners to point.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Premier Douglas: — Those are the facts, Mr. Speaker; that the fate of the Wheat Board was never for a moment in jeopardy — never for a moment.

Mr. Tucker: — Because there was a good Liberal majority there.

Premier Douglas: — And nobody knows that better than the members opposite . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Because there was a good Liberal majority there.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Premier Douglas: — There was such a good Liberal majority that the farmer got \$1.40 instead of \$1.75, Mr. Speaker. That is what happened. If the Liberal Party had one ounce of courage in this issue, or if the Saskatchewan Liberals had had one ounce of courage, they would have

stood up and said to the Government, “This amendment is now before the House; we don’t want to vote against the Government, but unless you indicate your willingness to put \$1.75 into that legislation, we are going to vote for this amendment”. Did they do it? No . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Because they . . .

Premier Douglas: — No, they stayed out of the House and didn’t even vote — only two of them had the courage to come into the House and vote.

Mr. Tucker: — Throwing mud again! The champion mud-thrower!

Premier Douglas: — I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the soft toes are not being stepped on, as the Leader of the Opposition said. The difficulty is that some people are soft at both ends.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! hear! That is sure true, all right . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Premier Douglas: — Let me point out just one or two inconsistencies in the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition.

He went on to explain why the Wheat Board, with the approval, of course, of the Federal Government, had borrowed money to make that 20 cent interim payment, just before the last Federal election, and I have never quarrelled with them borrowing money to make that payment. It was rather significant, I think, that the borrowing was done just before the election; but, Mr. Speaker, what I have said repeatedly is that if they could have borrowed money to make the 20-cent payment in 1949, then there should have been no difficulty whatsoever in making the \$1.75 payment, last fall, even if they had had to borrow money to do it. But, as a matter of fact, they would not have needed to borrow money. They had been selling that wheat at \$1.88 and \$1.89 and higher — an average price of somewhere around \$1.89. They could easily have paid the \$1.75. They would not have had to borrow. But even had it been necessary to borrow, Mr. Speaker, that could have been done, and yet my hon. friend here, today, and the member from Wilkie said that you can’t pay out too much at the beginning because you don’t know whether you will get it back. But you can’t have it both ways: You can’t, on the one hand, argue for paying out money you haven’t got, by borrowing, and, on the other hand, say you can’t pay it out until you get it. What we are doing is . . .

Mr. Tucker: — That is consistent.

Premier Douglas: — What we are doing is saying that \$1.75 would have been a fair price and they could easily have paid it. Now the Leader of the Opposition says that it was quite wrong to say that the farmers lost \$100 million, last year . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear! It is wrong.

Premier Douglas: — . . . because the initial payment had been cut from \$1.75 to \$1.40. Well, Mr. Speaker . . .

March 15, 1951

Mr. Tucker: — Worse than bunk — it is nonsense.

Premier Douglas: — . . . it is very apparent that the purchasing power of the farmers who sold wheat, last year, was reduced by 35 cents a bushel . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Who's wiggling now?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Premier Douglas: — And whether they get it now or next year, the fact is that last fall, when the farmers of Western Canada, and Saskatchewan in particular, because of the frost, required purchasing power, the Liberal Government at Ottawa cut their purchasing power by 35 cents a bushel. No amount of making it up to them now, in piece-meal bits when the farmer is mad and no amount of coming along later with a death-bed repentance, is going to make the farmers of this province forget that they were cheated out of 35 cents a bushel, last fall, at a time when they needed it.

May I now make reference to one other matter. My hon. friend said that, because this resolution advocates not only the payment of \$1.75 a bushel initial payment, but a final settlement on the basis of parity, therefore this resolution is asking for a planned economy — a planned economy like Russia, or Australia, or . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. I said that argument was supported by the argument that they needed a planned economy. I didn't say you couldn't pay a parity price without a planned economy.

Premier Douglas: — When I rose on a point of order and asked what this resolution had to do with a planned economy, my hon. friend pointed to the parity price. Now, if he takes a parity price, and he went on to boast of his argument — quoting from Professor McDougall, who goes on the radio, I believe, for the Winnipeg Grain Exchange — my friend is in good company, very good company . . .

Hon. Member: — He's a friend of yours then, I guess.

Premier Douglas: — He went on to point out the danger of these controls and the danger of these restrictions. What else could that have to do with except parity? Are my hon. friends opposed to parity?

Mr. Tucker: — No, of course not!

Premier Douglas: — I challenge them to stand up and say they are opposed to parity. And yet at the same time they are talking against it . . .

Mr. Tucker: — We are not talking against it.

Premier Douglas: — Oh, yes. You are against a planned economy — it is like my hon. friend, the other evening, who said, "anybody who says you can put on price controls by an act of parliament is economically

ignorant", and three days later he becomes an economic ignoramus by voting for price controls in this Legislature so, today, parity means a "planned economy"; but every member across there is going to vote for parity. You watch, Mr. Speaker, in just a little while. They will all get up and vote for it . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Of course, we will. That is not a planned economy though.

Premier Douglas: — . . . because now they can be on both sides. They can go out to their free enterprise Grain Exchange friends and say, "You see, we are opposed to a planned economy", and they can say to the farmers, on the other hand, "We are in favour of parity prices, we are in favour of price control." . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Getting funnier every day!

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Premier Douglas: — They are now getting on both sides.

Mr. McCormack: — What will we tell the Peace Council?

Premier Douglas: — Well, the member for Estevan needn't introduce the Peace Council.

Hon. Member: — He needs a Peace Council around Estevan.

Mr. McCormack: — You will need one, too.

Premier Douglas: — If he wants to take part in a debate about peace, he has only to introduce a resolution and I would be very glad to answer any statements he wants to make, particularly the ones he tried to make over the radio, a short time ago, with reference to an international policy.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that we, on this side of the House, and the party with which we have been associated, have, through the years, supported the Wheat Board and the principle of the Wheat Board marketing. My hon. friends opposite now say that they are in support of the Wheat Board, but in the very same breath, they are saying to us, "Don't criticize the price, because you may lose the Wheat Board." Now what do they mean by that? Is the Liberal Party trying to blackmail the farmers of this country into stopping all criticism against the price of wheat, on the threat that they will lose the Wheat Board? That is exactly what it amounts to, Mr. Speaker. "If you criticize the Wheat Board you will lose it" . . . "if you say the price is too low, we will take it away from you. — You be good little boys or you won't get any candy."

The member for Wilkie kept referring to the confidence in the Wheat Board. Well, I have confidence in the Wheat Board; but does anybody here think the Wheat Board sets the price? The price is set, Mr. Speaker, by the Cabinet at Ottawa. They are the people who decide what the price will be; they are the people who set the policy of the Wheat Board. The Wheat Board itself is an administrative body. In its personnel I have confidence; in the principle behind setting up the Wheat Board, I have complete

March 15, 1951

confidence; but my hon. friends here have so little confidence in the Liberal Government at Ottawa that they say, "If you criticize the Wheat Board, they will throw it out the window."

Well, Mr. Speaker, we will continue to support the Wheat Board, and we will reserve the right to criticize the Federal Government if it sets an initial payment that is too low, and if it does not move toward establishing a parity price. Neither my friends across the way nor the Saskatchewan Liberals at Ottawa are going to be able to hide behind the fact that there are only 20 members from Saskatchewan. The Liberal Party must have a policy with reference to Western agriculture — not just the Saskatchewan Liberals; the Liberal Party at Ottawa must have a policy with reference to Western agriculture.

Mr. Tucker: — It has.

Premier Douglas: — It has a policy? It has a policy that is so jittery that the Leader of the Opposition says that if we criticize it, we are liable to lose the Wheat Board. They have a policy that is so uncertain that he says the 20 Liberal members — even if they had 20 Liberal members from Saskatchewan — they would not be able to influence that Government down there into doing the things that are fair and just for the western farmers.

Mr. Tucker: — If the people do not want it any more, why should we force it on them?

Premier Douglas: — The farmers want it, Mr. Speaker. That is the sort of double-talk that my hon. friend is trying to use to wiggle himself out of the unholy mess that he and his party are in. "If the people do not want it, why force it on them?" he said. Mr. Speaker, the people do want it; but the fact that they want a Wheat Board does not mean that they want an initial price 35 cents a bushel lower than what they are entitled to. The two things are separate and distinct. They want a Wheat Board, but they also want parity price — and they want a government that will give them parity price. My friend says, "Oh, parity price is a planned economy." I took the words down: "Don't give too much power to the state." Is parity prices giving too much power to the state?

Mr. Tucker: — No, it is not.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I challenge the Leader of the Opposition and those who sit behind him to carry out the implications of his own argument that if price controls and parity prices for farm products mean a planned economy, I ask him to get up and vote against this resolution. There is not a man opposite has the courage to do so.

The question being put on the proposed amendment, it was negated by 27 to 18.

Mr. Speaker: — The debate is now on the main motion.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few observations in regard to the main motion. Now, I have already said, and we made our position very plain when we said, that we wanted \$1.75 paid out as soon as possible. That indicates, Mr. Speaker, that we are quite consistent: we want the Wheat Board to sell our wheat to the best possible advantage, and then turn the money over to the farmers as soon as they are able to do it.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, is, in effect, a vote of lack of confidence in the Wheat Board. It implies — it certainly looks very much that way, anyway — that we think they have the \$1.75 on hand and that they, therefore, should pay it out immediately. I don't think it could be taken with any other interpretation, because, when the C.C.F. made such objection to borrowing \$5 million in order to pay out \$213 million, it is not likely that they would want perhaps half the payment, the extra payment of 15 cents, to be borrowed; so it must be that the Government is trying to give the impression that the Wheat Board has farmers' money on hand, and that they should pay it out.

Now, firstly, Mr. Speaker, I do not think the farmers of this province have lost faith in the Wheat Board. Certainly, the Opposition have not lost faith in the Wheat Board. We have faith that the moment that the Wheat Board have money on hand they will pay it to the farmers, and they don't need any direction from this Legislature; and the less political interference there is with the Wheat Board, the better it will be for it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Tucker: — Yes — and it is political interference when motions are made by legislators who have not the facts on hand. There is not a person in the House, today, who knows how much wheat the Wheat Board has on hand, unsold; nobody knows, because the Wheat Board does not make it public. Yet here we are, without any of the facts, undertaking to direct the Wheat Board as to what they should do. So far as I am concerned, if this Legislature has a right to direct the Wheat Board, the Manitoba Legislature has a right to direct the Wheat Board, the Alberta Legislature has a right to direct the Wheat Board and what comes of us appointing a group of competent men to run this Wheat Board if we are going to interfere with them, without knowing what the facts are.

I say that there is not a man here who knows whether one-quarter of the wheat is sold, or whether half the wheat is sold, or whether three-quarters of the wheat is sold. The Premier says, "Most of the wheat is already sold at \$1.89". He doesn't know what he is talking about, Mr. Speaker.

Government Members: — He didn't say that.

Mr. Tucker: — He did say it. Certainly he said it. Now then, of course, we know . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, a member should be very careful not to misquote a member when he is absent.

March 15, 1951

The Premier actually said, "Most of the wheat that has been sold has been sold at \$1.89". He did not say most of the wheat has been sold.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, I understood the Premier to say that most of the wheat had been sold at \$1.88. Obviously that only means the wheat that had been sold. It would not be sold at anything unless it was sold. The interjection made by the Minister of Natural Resources is just about as foolish as any interjection I have ever heard made in this Legislature. Obviously, the only wheat that can be referred to as being sold is the wheat that has been sold — and there is the interjection made by the Minister of Natural Resources.

Now then, if he does not know how much was sold, his statement means nothing at all. What is the use of saying that perhaps 1/10 of it was sold for \$1.88 or \$1.89 (whatever it was) and, therefore, \$1.75 should be paid out on it all? There is nothing in that argument. The suggestion certainly was left by the Premier that the wheat delivered had already been sold — most of it, for \$1.88. Well, that was the impression. If that isn't the argument made, then what right have we to say to the Wheat Board, if it has not sold most of the wheat it had on hand, that it should pay for it, which means, maybe, a big loan and paying interest on it? That is what it means, if the members of the Government admit that they don't know how much of this is sold.

In that regard, I would just like to read what the Wheat Pool had to say about this matter, Mr. Speaker, when they made a submission to the Government. Here is what the Wheat Pool said in the submission they made about this initial payment, March 4, 1950:

"It would be advisable that the amount of the initial payment to be made by the Wheat Board for the crop season 1950-51, should be made public as early in the season as possible. We are recommending that, for the crop season 1950-51, the initial payment for wheat should be established at \$1.60, which is close to the minimum price under the international wheat agreement for the next 10 years."

Now when the further 20 cents, which is already authorized, goes out, the payment will be \$1.60, and I point out to the House the comments of Mr. John H. Wesson, president of the Wheat Pool, and a man I submit, Mr. Speaker, who, by his long service to the farmers of this province and his long experience as head of the Wheat Pool, is one of the most highly respected farm leaders in all of Canada — I don't restrict it to Western Canada; I say that he is one of the most highly respected and most competent farm leaders in all of Canada; and here is what he said on January 25 last when this 20-cent payment was announced:

"The Wheat Board may be taking some chance in including feed wheat in the 20-cent boost, but that, of course, is its responsibility."

Now, of course, if this goes through, it will apply to all grades, and if the Wheat Board is taking some chance on paying 20 cents, it certainly would be taking a real chance in paying 35 cents. Yet this Government, for

whatever it thinks it is going to gain by it, I don't know — if I said what I thought I would be made to withdraw it — is ready to rush right in here and say, in the face of that opinion of Mr. Wesson that it is taking a chance when it pays 20 cents, that it should pay 35 cents. Talk about these people saying that they favour the Wheat Board method of handling grain. Yes, this is a nice way to show their support for it — interfering with it without knowing the facts. But so far as we are concerned, Mr. Speaker, we stand behind the farm representatives in their attitude in this matter. We say that we have faith in the Wheat Board, and when we vote as we did this afternoon, that we were in favour of having this money paid “as soon as possible”, that was a vote of confidence in the Wheat Board, and when you vote that you want \$1.75 paid, whether the Wheat Board recommend it or not and whether you know they have the money on hand or not, it is a vote of lack of confidence in the Wheat Board. As far as we are concerned, we propose to stand by the Wheat Board, and vote confidence in it, and if the Government sees fit to interfere politically with the Wheat Board, we are ready to fight the Government, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Member: — Well! Well!”

Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley): — Would the hon. member have us believe that the Wheat Board decides the amount and the time that all payments are made to the farmers?

Mr. Tucker: — I would have the member believe that the Wheat Board has the facts, and recommends to the Government; “Here, we have so much money on hand, and we are ready now to pay it out”; and I submit that the record of the Wheat Board down through the years is borne out by that — that they pay the money out just as quickly as they are able to do it. This is nothing more nor less than a vote of lack of confidence in the Wheat Board.

Hon. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, I did not expect to participate in this debate at all, until the hon. member for Rosthern got himself into a dither and talked for over an hour trying to prove that the change of one word in this resolution was of primary importance. Furthermore, in his talk, just before he sat down, he indicated that supporting the resolution as it is, is a vote of censure on the Wheat Board. Well, you have to be a pretty good lawyer to skate on ice that thin, and I would suggest to the hon. member for Rosthern, in view of his — well, he isn't a light man — he should not attempt to skate on too thin ice.

Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Now, the hon. member raises a good many objections to the interim payment being raised to \$1.75. He argues that all the grain should be sold before that is done. The grain is never all sold . . .

Mr. Tucker: — I didn't argue, Mr. Speaker . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The hon. member has . . .

Mr. Tucker: — On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker: the hon. member said I argued that \$1.75 should not be paid until the grain was sold.

March 15, 1951

I say I didn't argue that at all. I said it should be left to the Wheat Board.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — All right. The hon. member says it should be left to the Wheat Board, but the hon. member knows, as well as anyone else knows, that it is the Federal Government that sets the policy of the Wheat Board, and not the Wheat Board, and this particular resolution is no censure whatever on anybody, neither the Government or the Wheat Board — perhaps it ought to be a censure of the Dominion Government. Instead of that it is a very generous resolution.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition says, "Well, we shouldn't have 'immediately' in here; we ought to say "as soon as possible"". I can say to the hon. members on this side of the House that the Premier of Canada and the Leader of the Liberal Party, the Hon. Mr. St. Laurent says that C.C.F'ers are "just Liberals in a hurry". We are just in a little more of a hurry than hon. members opposite.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member when he said that.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — And, Mr. Speaker, I say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, you are six months late now. There was no justification whatever, in my opinion, for an initial payment as low as \$1.40. I could readily understand, though, the psychology of the Government at Ottawa, last fall. When I was down to the production conference, Mr. Speaker, they were all running around there with faces just as long they could eat oats out of a churn, and this embarrassing surplus was accumulating — they didn't know what to do with the surplus. Of course, now, since the development of the Korean situation which has pulled them out of a mess, these are all 'strategic reserves' — overnight; but, again, they were faced with that enigma which they were faced with during peacetime, before World War I: they don't know how to distribute surplus food commodities on an equitable basis and guarantee our farmers that they will always get parity prices.

I want to tell the Leader of the Opposition that when the farmers insisted (as they have for years) and pleaded with both the Conservative and Liberal governments to give them a Wheat Board, they did so for two reasons — one, to get away from the speculative Winnipeg Grain Exchange; and the up-and-down fluctuations in the prices of agricultural commodities; and, secondly, they wanted a price that would give them the cost of production. In other words, they wanted a parity price, and any government that doesn't complement the Wheat Board system of marketing by support of the principle of parity to our producers, is not doing justice to the producers, and is weakening the entire economy of the province — when they take that attitude.

They don't need to think that, when they export wheat either through the international Wheat Agreement or under the four-year U.K. contract, they can also export their responsibility. That is exactly what they have been trying to do, and that is exactly what they are commencing to do in this international Wheat Agreement, Mr. Speaker. Before this International Wheat Agreement was ever ratified and signed, I said then it ought to contain a provision that would guarantee our producers at least parity prices.

Mr. Tucker: — We never heard it.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — If that could not be obtained by international agreement, then it was up to the Dominion Government to assume that responsibility, and that is something, Mr. Speaker, they are very reluctant to do. That is why the hon. Leader of the Opposition had to spend an hour, like the lawyer that he is, trying to make a mountain out of a molehill, and he made a very poor case of it.

I want to say that there is no objection to paying another \$1.75 before any grain is sold. The announcement has been made, that at the end of each crop year, whether the grain is sold or not, the farmer will receive complete settlement.

Mr. Tucker: — Liberal policy.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Yes, and that punctures your argument all to pieces — like a whole lot of your other arguments, this afternoon; they were just like a sieve, they won't hold water.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been a good deal said and the hon. Leader of the Opposition wants to leave the inference that this C.C.F. movement is undermining the Wheat Board.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — That, Mr. Speaker, is precisely, in my opinion, why the proposed amendment to this resolution was made, because it does not make sense. They would like to go out in the country and say, "Look what these big bad C.C.F'ers are doing! They wanted to present an impractical resolution. They want something that is going to embarrass everybody" . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . It won't embarrass the Wheat Board. It will only embarrass the Liberal Party at Ottawa, and no one else. Mr. Speaker, I have never listened to so much piffle in all my life, and so little common sense.

Mr. Tucker: — Are you listening to yourself?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — If there is any weakening or any undermining of the Wheat Board, it will come from the fact that the Federal Government does not see fit to assume its responsibility to the agricultural producers of these western provinces. We are entitled Mr. Speaker, to a parity price, and any government that doesn't work for that is not working in the interests of the agricultural producers, and that has nothing to do with the Wheat Board principle of marketing — that is the marketing or administrative set-up; the handling of wheat and following it to where it should go; that is the agency that actually does the job. I sometimes think, perhaps, that if they were given a free hand, without interference, they might do a far better job than they are doing at present.

March 15, 1951

The hon. Leader of the Opposition mentioned, too, that the C.C.F. was going to embarrass the whole status of the Wheat Board, when they suggested an amendment, in June, before the matter of extending the powers of the Wheat Board were up for revision at all. Why, that certainly is stretching imagination; and he mentioned this. He said, 'and your coarse grains wouldn't have been marketed either, if that amendment had gone through' . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Now, let us take a look at the record of the Liberal Party as far as wheat boards are concerned, as far as marketing coarse grain through the Wheat Board is concerned. The record is plain and clear — they were the ones that took out of the Wheat Board Act, when they assumed power after the Conservative government, that provided for the marketing of coarse grains through the Wheat Board. They were the ones who, in January, 1947, ridiculed the C.C.F. resolution that would have amended the Wheat Board Act to permit the marketing of coarse grain through the Wheat Board. It was only after pressure from the Canadian Federation of Agriculture and everybody else that they finally came in with an amendment to the Wheat Board Act that would permit the marketing of coarse grains under the Wheat Board — but, with this stipulation: that all three western provinces had to pass complementary and conjoint legislation. They thought that would never happen, I assume; and that they would never have to market coarse grains under the Wheat Board. But, it did happen and it has happened, chiefly, by the pressure of the organized movement and the pressure of this Government here in Saskatchewan.

Opposition Members: — Oh, Oh!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — We were the first province to pass that legislation; the ink was hardly dry on the Bill at Ottawa when we passed it in the House. It was Alberta and Manitoba that refused to pass it, and today, the hon. Premier of Manitoba — a Liberal Premier — is now suggesting, after the people's representative had passed this legislation, that it ought to be put to a plebiscite, and the whole thing is torn wide open again, and if we get an adverse vote on the plebiscite, Mr. Speaker, it simply means that the farmers of Manitoba have also made the decision for the farmers of Saskatchewan and the farmers of Alberta as well. Now they talk about their support. Well, the records are clear. I could enumerate many more, but I don't intend, Mr. Speaker, to stay on my feet too long — I don't think it is necessary.

I might mention, too, that for the 12 years from 1930 to 1942, the average price of wheat was around 57 cents a bushel, and in all that period of time, the farmers were pleading for a proper Wheat Board, and I would suggest to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that he brings his influence to bear that he have an advisory committee to the Wheat Board that is sympathetic to the Wheat Board system of marketing — and then we will be quite certain that we have a permanent Wheat Board. Mr. Gardiner went up and down this province and said that it had been proven over and over again that wheat could be raised 40 cents a bushel, and with all the gloom that prevailed last

fall, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that that \$1.40 initial price had some relationship to the minimum price set out in the International Wheat Agreement. I think they were fearful that they wouldn't get any more than \$1.40. Be that as it may, when you look at the cost-of-living index, when you talk in terms of parity, there was a greater need for \$1.75, last fall, than there was the previous fall, a far greater need. I was looking over the commodity and services index used by farmers, and I noticed, for instance, back in 1946 that index stood at 157 — this is taking the basis period 1935-39 as 100 — the cost of services index, to the farmers stood, in 1947, at 170.4, and the price from field crops stood at \$1.79 — quite in relationship; but when we look at the figures for August, 1950, we find that the income from field crops stands at 160, and the commodities and services index used by farmers stands at 215 — all the more reason that the initial payment should have been \$1.75, last fall.

In addition to that, we had a frozen crop. The hon. member from Wilkie (Mr. Horsman), I think, is one who would complain that municipalities were unable to discharge their obligations, the tax collections were bad; we were headed for the doldrums of another depression, in Saskatchewan; everyone was alarmed. As I said, until the worm turned and the international situation developed — and then, the other fact was, Mr. Speaker, we were able to send a whole lot of our frozen into United States to good advantage, because the price down there was pegged at \$1.98, and we sold a whole lot of feed wheat at good advantage. And, with the brightened situation, a further initial payment was made of 20 cents a bushel; and then, of course, the hon. Leader of the Opposition went into an ecstasy of political joy, and again he said, "Why, those C.C.F.'ers have been criticizing the Board — they are saboteurs!" . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — You just let the Liberal Government handle this Wheat Board long enough, and they will be the ones that will sabotage and break the faith of the farmers in the whole principle of orderly marketing. And believe me, Mr. Speaker, I can say that the fear of most of the leaders in the farm movement is that, if anyone criticizes too loud, the Liberals might finally start to get rid of that whole system of marketing . . .

(Interruption)

Mr. Tucker: — You will be embarrassed.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Just as fast as they came out with the further payment of 20 cents — 'the C.C.F.'ers are all saboteurs!'; but, Mr. Speaker, if there was justification for paying an increased price of 20 cents when they did, there was all the more justification that it should have been paid in the first instance. The Liberal Party are pretty good at this kind of thing. When they get a good swift kick in the pants from the farmers, they immediately turn around and start patting themselves on the back, and 'oh, what jolly good fellows they are'; and then they proceed

March 15, 1951

to condemn the C.C.F. for any criticism — the criticism, by the way, that had brought the result. I was even accused of having a hand in this, and, Mr. Speaker, if I was instrumental at all in bringing an additional 20 cents, I will take a bow to the farmers of Saskatchewan.

I think, Mr. Speaker, though that they hoped this additional 20 cents would act as a sop for the 8.3 cents that we have got on the final payment. But it didn't work that way, and I think that is what makes the hon. Leader of the Opposition so jittery. I think that is the reason he gets up and talks well over an hour about a whole lot of nonsense. I think, Mr. Speaker, this is a good resolution, and I would like to see some immediate results because 'immediate', in Liberal terms, means a long time; and if you say 'as soon as possible', that means never. I will support the motion.

Mr. A. Loptson (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to support this motion, just for the simple reason that was expressed by the Minister of Agriculture that this is a deliberate attempt to 'needle' the Federal Government into a position where they will kick the Wheat Board overboard. This Government will be responsible for it, if they do . . .

Mr. Tucker: — That is what they want.

Mr. Loptson: — . . . and that is what they want. They are endeavouring by underhanded means to aggravate the Government at Ottawa, until they say, "Well, if you think you can run this Board better than we can, go ahead and run it"; and that is what this government is wanting to do. You further undermined the payment under the 'have-regard-to' clause in Great Britain.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Loptson: — You have done that. Now you want to undermine the Board by aggravating the Government in Ottawa until they will be through with it. Then you will go out and say, "Well, we are the Samaritans. We will take it over and run it for you for a while. We can run it better". You have a Redistribution Bill before this House, now, set up for an election, in the hope that the Federal Government would not have given any money into the Board to supplement the amount that was in the Board.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — That is an idea. I never thought of that.

Mr. Loptson: — Now that they have got five cents more than you expected they would get, you are weakening a little; but you are hoping, by all means, by bringing in a resolution here, for 25 cents a bushel additional, which you knew very well they could not consider. You tried to aggravate them by doing that, in the hope that you could stop any money coming from the Federal Government to the Board to supplement the amount that was already there.

The whole thing is a scheme that has been figured out during the last six or eight months. We have got wind of what has been going on, and so far as negotiation in Great Britain was concerned; and this Government and the C.C.F. Party is directly responsible for checking any further payment coming on that. And you cannot deny it, if you tell the truth. Now this is the last issue — the last chance that you have to aggravate the Government into throwing over the Wheat Board, and I propose to go out in the country and tell the people just exactly what the hon. Minister of Agriculture let drop out of the bag when he said he hoped that they would throw the Board overboard.

Mr. Benson (Last Mountain): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words in regard to this resolution. I often wonder, when we introduce resolutions in this Legislature and send them to Ottawa, what good they do. I don't think I remember any resolution, of all the dozens that have been passed here, that had much effect on the Government at Ottawa, and I don't think this resolution is going to have very much affect on the Government at Ottawa, either. They will regard it no doubt as a political resolution passed by the legislature that is opposed to the government at Ottawa, and that is about the amount of notice they will take of it.

So far as I am concerned, I remember when we first organized the Wheat Pool and started out making initial payments, then another payment before spring and another before harvest, and while that scheme was in affect it was one of the best schemes up to that time that had ever been introduced in the marketing of wheat in Canada.

If we could get by, in the fall, on the initial payment which we received when we delivered our wheat, and then could get by in the spring on the interim payment that we received during the early spring months, and then again, in the harvest, it had a tendency to put agriculture in this province on a pay-as-you-go basis. I remember talking to merchants at that time, and they agreed that it was the best marketing scheme that had ever been introduced. I remember, too, when we came to the time of the overpayment on the initial payment. It was just last year, I think, we finished paying that \$13¾ million which we had overpaid on the initial payment at that time. I received my share of that over-initial payment, and I paid back my share of that debt, over the next nearly 20 years, and I think it is always a mistake for any real organized marketing service to make too big an initial payment on the start. If we can get the agricultural industry operating so that they can carry their full expenses on the initial payment that they receive, and then get a couple of others — one in the spring and one just before harvest — then we are putting agriculture on a sound basis. We are putting it on a basis of pay-as-you-go. As far as the resolution is concerned, I thought that the amendment that was introduced, this afternoon, was a very fair proposition. I am not one of those guys who try ever to hold a club at the head of anyone from whom I want to get something. I believe that a reasonable attitude in regard to these matters is always the best attitude. Perhaps we are entitled to a payment

March 15, 1951

of \$1.75 initial payment at the present time. I haven't any information in regard to what the Wheat Board has sold — I am not in a position to judge; but I can see the use that can be made of this resolution if anyone votes against it. I know that the farmers at the present time would be very glad to accept \$1.75, if they can get it — I don't know any farmer, in fact, who would say, "No, I don't want the \$1.75"; I don't think there are any in this House, anyway, that would do that. But I don't think we should be unreasonable, and I always like to follow the lead that is given by my own organization, and that is the Wheat Pool organization.

I always regret when I see other organizations going contrary to what the Wheat Pool organization of this province advocates. We have seen that, here in Saskatchewan, during the past month and past weeks where we have had the Wheat Pool for instance, asking for 15 cents (which I thought was a reasonable request) and other organizations going out and asking for 25 cents, which I believe most of them felt there was no possibility of getting. And I was a little bit afraid that when we, as farmers, make unreasonable requests to the Federal Government, we might go so far as to antagonize them and they will tell us, "All right, you can market your own wheat; we will throw the Wheat Board, as my hon. friend says, 'out the window', and throw you back to the Grain Exchange". Now I do not want to go back to the time of selling our wheat through the Grain Exchange. I have had enough of that. I remember too well the years, in the early '30's, when I sold wheat — or at least it was sold for me — at 21 cents a bushel. I don't want any more of that.

I think if the mover of this motion had accepted that amendment, this afternoon, we were making a reasonable request to Ottawa, and I do not like to be one who is pointing the gun at anyone's head in order to get what I consider might be an unreasonable demand.

But, then, there is also the proposition of the political angles of this question — that, if I say by my vote here I don't want \$1.75 a bushel for the farmers, they are going to go out and say that I don't want \$1.75, that I voted against it, and the important point, to me, in this resolution is the parity price part of it. What I get in the end is what matters to me, and I think that is what matters to most of the farmers in this province; and I just want to make my position clear in regard to this:

I am not going to say that \$1.75 is too much, but as long as we get in the end what is fair and square for the farmers of Saskatchewan in comparison to what the other people in this Dominion get, then I think the farmers will be satisfied, and I can tell you that I am sure that I will be.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Mr. Speaker, like others, I did not intend to take part in this debate at all. I have listened to a lot of arguments here today. There has been some heat and some light generated, Mr. Speaker. I am not going to attribute all of either one of those very useful commodities at times to either side of the House. But I do think it might be well to deal with one or two things that have been mentioned.

The Leader of the Opposition, during his discussion on the main motion this evening, was particularly emphatic in stating that this was a vote of lack of confidence in the Wheat Board. I have not been trained in the intricacies of legalities, but I have read a lot of words in English and, occasionally I believe I understand them. I want to read the resolution:

“That this Assembly urge the Federal Government . . .”

Where is the gun? I would ask the hon. member for Last Mountain, where is the gun? I am asking the hon. member for Last Mountain who said he didn't like holding a gun to anyone's head. I am reading the resolution.

“That this Assembly urge the Federal Government . . .”

Where is the gun? And where is the Wheat Board in that? I'm going to read it all.

“. . . to immediately raise the initial payment . . .”

I have “urged” many people in my time, and I expect when he was a young lad maybe he “urged” some young lady to accept his affections. He didn't hold a gun to her head, did he? — in “urging” it. There is no gun. There is no suggestion of a lack of confidence in urging someone to do something you would like them to do. So the Assembly, if they vote for this, will

“. . . urge the Federal Government to immediately raise the initial payment, paid through the Wheat Board . . .”

The only mention of the Wheat Board in there is that we make use of the vehicle of the Wheat Board through which to make the payment, because everybody knows that the Wheat Board has never made its own policy since the old advisory committee was abolished after the advent of the Liberal Government. I am not going to even quarrel with that today. Someone mentioned it might be better if it did. Maybe it would; I won't debate the point just now. Personally, I think the responsible party is the Federal Government, and therefore, they have the right to make the policy. I have a right, of course, to object to their policy, but I think it is their job. So they make the policy for the Wheat Board to follow. Having established a policy they say to our agency, the Wheat Board, “This is it; proceed to put it into effect.” So we say we “urge” them to raise the initial payment through the Wheat Board immediately.

“. . . to \$1.75 per bushel, basis No. 1 Northern at Fort William, and further urge” (“urge”, mind you) “that the final settlement be made on the basis of parity.”

Now, as I said, I can't see where the hon. Leader of the Opposition or the member for Last Mountain can either one find anything in that to substantiate the kind of arguments that they used. One said that to vote for this was to vote for a lack of confidence in the Wheat Board. It is no such thing.

March 15, 1951

Mr. Tucker: — Will the hon. member permit a question?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Yes, if it is going to be a question, and not something else.

Mr. Tucker: — I want to ask the hon. Minister why he voted against the Wheat Board paying that ‘as soon as possible’? Did he think they could do it any sooner than possible?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Mr. Speaker, I am not going to generate any heat tonight. I am going to generate some light, if I can. I voted against that because I wanted to vote for this. When the asinine sounds from over there subside, perhaps I’ll proceed. Mr. Speaker, I pointed out, before I was interrupted, that the Wheat Board’s policy is made by the Federal Government, and I can’t understand the attitude of the member for Last Mountain using the words “pointing a gun to their heads,” nor can I understand the Leader of the Opposition saying that there is any suggestion of want of confidence in the Wheat Board. I am going to make a categorical statement on behalf of every member on this side of the House . . .

Hon. Member: — Take it down, now.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — I am going to. That consistently and sincerely throughout the years we have supported orderly marketing and the establishment and continuation of a Wheat Board. Now, I am making that categorical statement for the record. I do not want it ever said by anybody that we ever said anything to the contrary in this House. They can argue that our actions may not produce the result we want. That is debatable. They have a right to that opinion, if they want it. But the fact remains the statement I have made is a correct statement of fact. It should be supported 100 per cent by everybody on this side of the House, and I think I can speak for them all in this matter.

Another thing I want to mention, Mr. Speaker, in connection with this is the difference between the Wheat Board and the voluntary pools. I would like if I had time, to deal with a few things mentioned by my hon. friend for Saltcoats for whom I have the greatest amount of personal respect although I know his philosophy. His philosophy is ‘winner take all’. He does not believe in this kind of thing. He could not conscientiously get up in this House and make the same kind of categorical statement that I made just now. I’ll dare him to get up now and state the unconditional . . .

Mr. Loftson: — On a point of privilege: I cannot see why my hon. friend has any right to dictate my conscience or my convictions. At least, he explained them, I do not know if he knows them any better than I do. I have never said at any time, and no one ever has been able to say, that I was against orderly marketing of wheat. But I can soundly say that I have been against the screwball Socialist way . . .

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Mr. Speaker, a personal privilege. He started out fine, but he kind of lost the track.

Mr. Speaker: — Will the hon. member continue to speak, and not “dare” anyone?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — I’ll withdraw the dare. I’ll invite him sometime to make as categorical statement as I have. I want to deal with the difference between the orderly system of marketing wheat as it was manifested by the Wheat Pools in the days when they actually engaged in the pooling of wheat, and in the operations of the Wheat Board, and why it came about. It was because the Wheat Pools discovered, first, in the years from 1920 to 1923 — the organized farmers, I should say at that time, discovered that at that time they were unable to prevail on the Federal Government to re-establish the first Canada Wheat Board which was established during the latter years of World War I. Because of that they did the next best thing. They said, “We’ll try it ourselves.” And the Wheat Pools were organized as the various provincial Co-operative Wheat Producers Limited, with the intention of pooling the wheat, paying an initial payment, selling the wheat on whatever market offered itself and later on paying back in interim payments and final payments the proceeds of the sales. They discovered, through their experience — up until the year 1929 things went well; but they discovered in those years and when the world price changed in the fall of 1929, that the voluntary system of marketing did not contain sufficient powers to influence the trade and commerce of this country, which is handled from a Federal department in Ottawa. Neither did they have any control over fiscal policies in this country. The result is that it was at that stage that they reverted to their position of 10 years previous to that and then asked for an orderly system of marketing grain under the control of the Federal Government wherein the power of trade and commerce and fiscal policy lay. That was the reason for asking for this Wheat Board. The Wheat Board was finally established. I’ve gone over that before and I won’t repeat it. And the Wheat Board is here, and all of us who have lived through the campaign and the promotion work and the agitation (as it used to be called) to bring about the position of the Wheat Board as we have it now in operation, remember those conditions too well ever to want to do anything that would jeopardize our right to have a Wheat Board in this country.

We want that Wheat Board; but, again Mr. Speaker, I want to point this out. In the resolution, and in countless resolutions of farm bodies and public meetings in this country and farm organizations, there has been stated time and time again the belief that the farmer is entitled to a parity price for the things that he sells. The price of the things he is compelled to sell for his livelihood should bring him a return equal to the cost of production, every single year — not once in a while but every year, the same as every other business expects to operate. I want to remind the House of this. I believe it was in 1945 when the Rt. Hon. Mr. Gardiner, the Minister of Agriculture, stated — and I never dispute his figures because I have no data to go on to say he was wrong — that at that time we were receiving a parity price for wheat. He may have been right; I am not going to argue the point. But up until that time, throughout the years of wheat producing and marketing in this country, there have only been three years of actual wheat producing in this country when wheat has brought the cost of production and slightly more. Those were the years when the Wheat Pool was operating: the years 1926, 1927 and 1928.

March 15, 1951

I make that statement based on the studies given at that time in the Manitoba Free Press by Professor V.C. Hope at that time in the University of Manitoba, who himself examined something over 800 farm units in order to establish the cost of production and to weigh that against the income of the farmers. Those were the only three years when a parity price, or slight form of parity, can be said to have been gained by the wheat producers in this country. It may have been so in 1945, but if it was, the increase in the cost of living and production since 1945 have certainly thrown out of balance any statement or any computation that may have been used by Mr. Gardiner when he made the statement in 1945 or 1946 — I have forgotten the year — that we were at parity. Therein lies the difference: a voluntary association cannot affect the fiscal policies or the trade policies of this country. The result is that we asked for a Wheat Board.

Now, in asking for parity we do two things. We say we want the Wheat Board in order to market our grain as well as possible, not only in the interests of the farmers, but in the interest of the national economy, because, if the grain is well-marketed, if it is well sold, and the farmers get all that the Wheat Board can get out of it and the Wheat Board gets all the markets it can provide in the sale of that wheat, then the national economy is that much better off than if it goes on the speculative market. But, if the Wheat Board is unsuccessful in getting sufficient for the farmers to give them a parity price for that wheat, then we say the Federal Government has a responsibility to find another source of produce, whether it is Consolidated Revenue or whatever they like, to supplement the amount that the actual sale of the wheat brings in and to add that to the amount until the farmers have reached the parity they have asked for in this resolution.

By no stretch of imagination, Mr. Speaker, can it be said that there is any expression of want of confidence in the Federal Government or in the Wheat Board in this. We “urge” the Government, through the Wheat Board to do this very thing. I will tell you what I am afraid is happening here by the members of the Opposition. They are in closer touch with the Federal Government. I would vote for this, and will vote for it as it is written, after having listened to their debate. If this did express lack of confidence in the Federal Government, I would still vote for it, after listening to their debate. This is what I am afraid is happening, Mr. Speaker, and I say this sincerely. Knowing the Liberal Party and some of their leaders as well as I have known them in the past, who have been time and again opposed to this system of marketing grain as it is set up by the Wheat Board now, they want to get rid of it again. They have got a ‘hot potato’ and they are endeavouring now to lay the ground . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Nonsense!

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — . . . so that some day they can say, when they do throw it overboard that the fault lies on the C.C.F. Government of the province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, I have watched some of their

diabolical actions in the past — those people who are opposed to the orderly system of marketing grain. I have watched some of them squirming and twisting, and the way they have misstated farm leaders whom they eulogize so much tonight. I have listened and watched their actions in the past, and I am quite convinced that back of all this they are being told and they are working for the day when the Wheat Board can be abolished and they can lay the blame on somebody else. So again I make the categorical statement. I make it for this purpose that everybody on this side of the House is sincerely and earnestly and determinedly intending to support, as they have in the past, the continuity of the Wheat Board. That will not prevent us, at any time we feel it necessary, from criticizing its operations or urging that it does something different from what it may be doing if we think it is better, or taking any act in any legal or lawful or democratic way we can think of to help the Wheat Board do a better job for the people it is supposed to serve, that is, the producers of cereal products in these western plains.

Mr. V.P. Deshaye (Melville): — When the member for Last Mountain was speaking, who is a good practical farmer as far as I know him, I was very much impressed with his words when he said that it did not matter when the farmers got their payment, so long as they received it. I believe that is a very sound statement. Reading in tonight's 'Leader-Post' I see where Mr. Gardiner has told the reporter of that paper that the farmers will receive by this spring, \$220 million — that is the \$65 million and the \$55 million and then \$100 million under the 1950 crop, and it also says that Mr. Gardiner has committed the Government, speaking on behalf of the government, that this amount would be paid by seeding time.

Hon. Member: — I don't believe it.

Mr. Deshaye: — Oh, yes, I do. Maybe you don't, but I do. In listening to all this debate this afternoon, and with the Government's great urgency to have this amount paid, I can't for the life of me understand what their terrific hurry is. We have the commitment from Mr. Gardiner that \$220 million will be paid by seeding time, and I cannot see what purpose this resolution has except to be a purely political stick that they are trying to wield at the Federal Government. I would just like to put this question to the Government: What is their big hurry to have this payment made when we know now that the farmers of Saskatchewan will have received \$220 million before seeding time.

Government Member: — Where are they going to get it?

Mr. Deshaye: — You'll get it. You'll get the \$220 million.

Mr. G.H. Danielson: — I did not intend to say anything in this debate at all, but after listening to the Minister of Public Health

March 15, 1951

and some of the other members who have spoken, I am not going to take very many minutes with what I have to say. I am a farmer and I have been supporting the Wheat Pool and the Wheat Board. I was a delegate to the Wheat Pool at one time, and I happen to know a little bit about ordinary business, and our first payment on the 1950 crop, Mr. Speaker, was \$1.40. Between the one and the sixth at that is a spread of 40 cents. In 1929, I think it was, the Wheat Pool had a spread of 52 cents and we were under contract to deliver to the Pool. The farmers didn't say anything about that. They accepted it as a matter of good business judgment. We knew there was a risk involved and we have learned by experience since that time, Mr. Speaker, but the caution was very well taken. Now we have \$1.40 on the basis of No. 1 Northern, and we are getting another 20 cents making \$1.60 a bushel basis Fort William.

There are 60 million bushels of this crop of 1950 spread over the Saskatchewan prairie and the prairies of Western Canada under the snowdrifts, Mr. Speaker, that has never been threshed: 60 million bushels is the best estimate that qualified experts tell us is left that has never been threshed. Then there are hundreds of millions of bushels of damp, tough grain in bins along the ground, in the cars on sidings en route to Fort William. Now that is the situation. I think that the Wheat Board or the Government — I don't care who controls the plan or marketing system we have at the present time; but I will stand firm about this, Mr. Speaker, that there are no Cabinet decisions made at Ottawa without they call in the Wheat Board members and get their advice and consult with them as to what they should do and what they should not do before this act is done by Order-in-Council or anything else. Any person who knows anything about business — and this Government, why have they got all these planners and advisers and all this sort of thing; I wonder if they don't call them in and consult with them sometime. Or what do they pay them for? No doubt in the world they do, if they have any brains at all, and sometime I wonder if they do have any brains, because they have to hire all these men to advise them.

I am sure that Mr. McIvor and all the men who are in this business — and he has been there for the last 10 or 15 years; he is a great Wheat Pool man with long experience and some of the best grain men in Western Canada and in all of Canada are operating the Farms Division now. That is in the Department of Trades and Commerce, it is true, but I am absolutely right when I say, Mr. Speaker, that before anything is authorized by the Government in regard to policies of payment of any kind, whether it is initial payment or interim payment, they tell the Government what to do, and the matter is put in along with that business and has been done that way for all these years. Don't let us make ourselves more ridiculous than we are now in this respect. Let us all have more sense and approach this from a sensible point of view.

Now, then, we get \$1.50 a bushel for our wheat, or will have in a few days; some is coming through now, and another payment is going to come through; but I am not so much concerned about the eight cents or nine cents a bushel, whatever is going to come from the pool. We'll get that; we'll get it soon enough. But, don't forget this, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that it

costs money to issue those cheques in 1949. I think the cost at this time was almost half a million dollars. Now, we get 20 cents in in cheques now, but we are asking them for an immediate payment of 15 cents and we incur another expense of \$250,000 on the Wheat Board with the issue for Western Canada, because they are the fellows who are going to pay for it. This other cheque didn't start to be issued — this was 2 months ago; this “immediate” request in this resolution might not be quite so ridiculous as it looks at the present time. But it is ridiculous now. If I did not have any more brains than you have I wouldn't have made that request. They don't know any better.

Now that is the situation. They get up on the floor of this House, Mr. Speaker, and say “Here is the Wheat Board handling your money and my money” — and I think it will cost the farmers of Western Canada probably two or three million dollars if they should issue these cheques and then they should turn around and issue another 15 cent cheque. In view of the fact that we have now the assurance of the Government that immediately after the 1st of July they are prepared to close off these books — that is only a few months, only a short time and we will have that money; perhaps they will come out before the farmer cuts his crop or threshes his crop, next fall. That's what we are going to have, and I think this whole thing — this “immediate” request — is ridiculous. It is just simply politics of the cheapest kind. It hasn't even any common sense, Mr. Speaker.

This motion has been brought in here by that group which sits across the floor of this House. And that is the only salvation they have; their only means of salvation is to stir up trouble and resentment and strife among the people of Saskatchewan so that they may possibly win a few votes in the next election. That's the whole thing. And they are going to spare nothing to do it. They are going to do it regardless of the impressions of the farmers of this province. Whether they are going to sabotage the Wheat Board or anything else, they are going to do it. This isn't a surprise. No, we have seen this coming for the last few months, ever since last November, Mr. Speaker. They have been complaining, and complaining, and that is how they do it. Don't think that we don't know anything about it. And we are going to go out on the highways and byways and platforms of this province and tell it. There will be no holding back. And you can't come out and deny it. You'll find more than you expect.

Mr. Speaker: — It is my duty to inform the Assembly that the mover of this motion, the hon. member for Bengough, is about to exercise his right to close the debate. Any member desiring to speak should do so now.

Mr. A. Brown (closing): — Mr. Speaker, when I introduced this motion I had no conception of the furore I was about to raise, because I could not conceive of a legislature in an agricultural province in any way raising any objection to what was suggested in the resolution which was introduced by myself and seconded by the member for Wadena. In closing

March 15, 1951

this debate, Mr. Speaker, I will just confine my remarks to one or two of the objections raised by the members of the Opposition.

The hon. member who has just taken his seat suggested that to make this payment would require a great deal of expense to issue these cheques. Well, if they had accepted the recommendations which they received from the C.C.F. group at Ottawa and placed this initial payment at \$1.75, they would have eliminated any other additional expense in the issuing of the 15-cent additional payment, as well as any expense involved in the issuing of the 20-cent payment for which cheques are, I understand, at present in the mail. But the hon. member who has just taken his seat more or less reiterated the attempt that his Leader made here to suggest that we were discrediting the Wheat Board. I think that issue has been covered very clearly. I just wish to add this much to it. There is nothing that can discredit a national marketing scheme as can an adverse fiscal policy of the government that is administering that Wheat Board. There is nothing can weaken the confidence of the farmers of Saskatchewan in the Wheat Board more than to have it administered in such a manner and in such a way that it does not work in the interests of the farmers and does not work in the interests of the people of Canada as a whole.

As my hon. friends take objection to this word “immediately” in the resolution which I submit, I refer you back, Mr. Speaker, to last fall when the initial payment was announced as \$1.40. Who got in a hurry that time, Mr. Speaker? It was the hon. Leader of the Opposition who rushed down to Ottawa in a mighty big hurry and came back and suggested to the people of Saskatchewan that he hoped that they would give something more than the \$1.40 for the initial payment. If the hon. Leader of the Opposition thinks it is in the interests of the Liberal Party he can get in a hurry, too. But his hurrying oftentimes doesn't make much difference. Even the politicians — they can go up and they can go down, and it is not necessarily very important; but it becomes important when they have to be pushed, and the only time the hon. Leader of the Opposition has ever gone there in a hurry is when he has been pushed by the people of Saskatchewan into a hurry in an attempt to get something for them, from the party with which he is associated.

I would also like, Mr. Speaker, to make one brief reference to the remarks made by the hon. member for Last Mountain. He suggested that a resolution passed in this House has no effect on Ottawa or the people at Ottawa. If that statement is true, Mr. Speaker, it is a reflection, I believe, on the democratic system which we have set up here in Canada. A resolution coming from this Legislature, representing an agricultural province and in connection with agricultural matters, I think should have some weight upon the powers that be at Ottawa. It is a reflection upon democracy and a greater reflection upon the Liberal Government at Ottawa if they are not prepared to accept what is here, in Saskatchewan, the voice of the people.

My hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, made reference to some of the remarks made by the President of the Wheat Pool, and he used

them to bolster his argument that there was no necessity, no need of an immediate raising of this initial payment to \$1.75. I have the greatest respect for the President of the Wheat Pool and the present officials of that organization; but I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, when the Wheat Pool was speaking and when the President of the Wheat Pool was speaking, it was not speaking in an attempt to change the fiscal policy of the government and that is what we are doing through the medium of this resolution — asking the Federal Government to change their fiscal policies and accept the principle of parity.

I would further point out that in 1941 and the winter of 1942, the Wheat Pool organized a mass-delegation to Ottawa asking for exactly what we are asking for in this resolution — a parity price. At that time, Mr. Speaker, they asked for \$1.00 a bushel initial payment. Translate the terms of the purchasing power of a bushel of wheat in 1941 up until 1950, and \$1.00 a bushel in 1941 is no different from \$1.75 in 1951. The Wheat Pool are consistently supporting the principle of parity price and when the issue is before them I am satisfied they will face it again.

It is on that, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side of the House should support the principle of orderly marketing, that we should consistently support the principle of a Wheat Board, that we should consistently support the principle of parity price, for after all, Mr. Speaker, you and I came from the organized farmers and we on this side, as a political wing and a political arm of the organized farmers of Saskatchewan and the organized farmers of Canada, should support it.

My hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition — and this is mainly the reason I rose to close this debate, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Leader of the Opposition and also the hon. member for Arm River suggested that I had some political motive in bringing this resolution before this Legislature, and, Mr. Speaker, I resent that implication. The people who sit on the opposite side of the House may be prepared to use any means at their disposal to advance the interests of the Liberal Party; they have in the past and no doubt will do so in the future. But, Mr. Speaker, the C.C.F. to me is simply the political expression of the philosophies and ideologies on which I hold very strong views, and when I moved this resolution, Mr. Speaker, I moved it and introduced it because I believe in certain principles of philosophy and certain ideologies — and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, because I am a Socialist, I am prepared to advance the ideology and philosophy behind the Socialist Movement. That philosophy and ideology was expressed by such people as the late J.S. Woodsworth and the late George Williams here in Saskatchewan. I am going to use every opportunity at my disposal to advance that, be it in the form of a resolution here in this House or be it out in the country I am prepared to do it to the extent that we may reach that day when we will have what they visioned in their day.

Mr. Speaker, when I suggested that through the medium of a planned economy we could have parity price, I did not mean that we could not get it without a planned economy in the terms of which I think of planned economy, but one thing I did mean, Mr. Speaker: when we have got this planned economy

March 15, 1951

and when we have got this Socialistic viewpoint, which was expressed by men such as Woodsworth and Williams, in effect we will have parity price.

The question being put on the motion, it was agreed by 25 to 16.

The Assembly adjourned at 11 o'clock p.m.