

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Twelfth Legislature
16th Day

Thursday, March 4, 1954

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

CANADA GRAIN ACT

Moved by Mr. Brown (Bengough), seconded by Mr. Dewhurst:

“That this Assembly requests the Government of Canada:

- (1) so to amend the Canada Grain Act that allocation of boxcars among the various elevator companies may be on the basis of the preference indicated by the allocation in each producer's permit book; and
- (2) to instruct the Transport Controller to make a more equitable distribution of boxcars as between shipping points, the allocation to be on the basis of need.”

Mr. A. L. S. Brown (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, the motion which I am about to introduce deals with a problem which has faced the producers of grain, in the marketing of their grain, for a goodly number of years. It is a problem which I do not think can be considered as a temporary one, but rather it is a problem which, if we continue to produce in the manner in which we have been able to produce in the last few years, will be before us for a goodly number of years, particularly in view of the fact that at the end of the last crop year we had in Canada the largest carryover of grain that this country has seen for many years. With the marketing system as it exists at the present moment I think we can assume that there will be a congestion as far as the shipping of grain is concerned during at least a portion of the crop year for a number of crops.

The resolution which I propose is one that has received consideration not only in this House but it is a resolution the subject matter of which has received the consideration of the Federal House as well. Because it has received the consideration of both of these Assemblies it does indicate to me that this question of the allocation of boxcars for the purpose of moving our grain from the elevators to the point of market is indeed an important one.

This resolution deals with the question in two manners; it has been divided into two portions, the second dealing with the general distribution of boxcars as between shipping points. We are suggesting that, in this respect, the Transport Controller has it in his power to make a more equitable distribution of boxcars as between shipping points. The history behind the appointment of a Transport Controller is rather recent history; it has only been in the last few years that we have had a Transport Controller. I think, Mr. Speaker, you will recall that this Legislature to some extent at least can claim the credit for the fact that we initiated the move towards the appointment of a Transport Controller.

March 4, 1954

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, at that time we were asking that a Transport Controller be appointed for the purpose of making a more equitable distribution of boxcars not only for the purpose of the shipping of grain but also for the purpose of making a more equitable allocation among the various people who use our transport system. I think we were justified in feeling, at that time, that insufficient boxcars or train facilities were being made available for the moving of our grain. The Federal Government saw fit to accept the suggestion – although I am not claiming that it was on the request of this Assembly alone that the Transport Controller was appointed; but nevertheless they did appoint a Transport Controller and they did give him relatively wide powers. I think I am safe in saying that the Transport Controller does have the power to make equitable distribution of boxcars as between shipping points. I will accept that as far as the allocation within a shipping point is concerned that is outside the jurisdiction of the Transport Controller. But this fall, as in previous falls, we have seen where one shipping point will obtain an unusually large number of boxcars for the shipping of grain, while at the same time a shipping point immediately adjacent to it may not and does not receive the same number of anywhere near proportionate number of boxcars.

We have also seen this Fall, as in previous Falls, that certain areas of the province will receive what might be considered an unfair amount of boxcars, while another area is apparently discriminated against. I appreciate and realize, that in the moving of grain there may be justification at times for the fact the certain areas obtain a greater number of boxcars than do other areas because I realize that the moving of grain is not a simple matter. It is a complex matter; but I do suggest that the Transport Controller can put into effect a policy, if he is so instructed, by which in the overall picture we can get a more equitable distribution than we have in the past.

I think a significant point about this is that as we take an analysis of the areas and the points as to the number of boxcars they receive at any given time, the allocation is not on the basis of need. Some other factor must have entered into it; and we are suggesting here that, in that allocation as between shipping points, they take into consideration what I think is a very important factor, and that is the factor of need for boxcars at any one particular shipping point at any given time.

The other portion of the resolution is one which, as far as the individual producer is concerned, is possibly even more important than the portion to which I just referred. In it we are suggesting that the Canada Grain Act be amended so as to make it possible for the boxcars to be allocated to the elevator companies at any given shipping point in relationship to the preference indicated by the producers. It can be argued that there are ways in which the producer can indicate his preference other than through the permit books; but we have here in western Canada established and accepted the principle that we shall market our grain through the medium of a permit system. We have accepted our present marketing situation as it affects grain in Canada, I think we are safe in assuming that we will be continuing to market our grain under a permit system for many years to come. We can decide, as we proceed, whether or not we will continue that system in the future.

We are suggesting in this resolution that the Wheat Board use the established medium, the permit book, to give the producer an opportunity to indicate his preference through that medium. I think no one would dare suggest that this request has not originated from among the farmers themselves. It has originated among the farmers as individuals; it has originated among the

farmers as organized farmers. I can refer you to a resolution which was passed at the Wheat Pool annual meeting in the fall of 1953, where the Wheat Pool, in outlining future policies, enunciated this policy in this respect, when they suggested "a workable plan for the equitable distribution of cars between elevators and shipping points throughout the three provinces on the basis of the amount of grain handled." That was to be on the basis of their past experience; but here I think is the significant part of their suggestion: "Or to be handled during the season to the end that the growers may be able to deliver grain to the country elevator of their choice and at the same time preserving for the individual grower his right to order cars under the car order book section of the Canada Grain Act." They are there suggesting to the Federal Government that they work out a means by which it can be possible to indicate ahead of time the place at which the producer wishes to market his grain.

Another organization to which I could refer is the Inter-provincial Farm Union Council which, we are aware, meets with the Federal Government fairly frequently for the purpose of presenting to that government the views of the producers of primary products, in this case the producers of agricultural products. Their latest presentation to the Federal Government, after reviewing its previous representation and requests, makes this point. They suggest to the Federal Government "that they proceed to immediately review and revise the Canada Grain Act so as to add a new section providing the farmer the opportunity to deliver his grain to the elevator of his choice."

The president of the Wheat Pool, in his address at the annual meeting of Wheat Pool delegates, had this to say in further enunciating the position of the Wheat Pool on this issue: that as far as the Pools were concerned, "Our main interest was not to eliminate the car order book section but to do something by an amendment to the Act (referring to the Canada Grain Act) to deal with the distribution of cars when the car order book section could not function under these conditions; to deal with the distribution, not by regulation of the Board of Grain Commissioners, but by a definite amendment to the Act." And it is in line with these requests that our resolution is asking the Federal Government to implement an amendment to the Act so as to make what these farm organizations have asked for, possible.

It is not only the Wheat Pool organization which has asked for this. The Saskatchewan Farmers' Union, in their convention, have asked for it. Every Wheat Pool committee, I imagine, has at some time or other forwarded resolutions asking that something be done, and I doubt if I have ever attended any meeting of farmers, for any purpose, at which the question was not raised, that our present grain marketing system prevents us from having the opportunity to deliver our grain to the elevator of our choice; and what is possibly more important, it has denied us the opportunity of patronizing our own facilities.

In this resolution we are not suggesting that the car order book, as such, should be eliminated or that it should be changed. The Canada Grain Act, as we are all aware, has come to be regarded more or less as a Magna Carta among the wheat producers of western Canada. It is something they sought for year after year to the point where they had some protection under the Canada Grain Act, and one of the greatest protections they have under the Act is the car order provision section, which does give to every producer the right if he so desires, to take advantage of the opportunity to either load his car over the platform or load it through the elevator of his choice. Now that is true in bulk sales if an individual has a carload himself, or if he can cooperate with his neighbours to reach a point where they have a carload between them, and that is the right that the producer has today. That is something

March 4, 1954

we must keep, and I think in all our representations to the Federal Government we must make the point abundantly clear that that provision must remain. But, under our present system of marketing grain, that does not give us the opportunity to do what we are asking – that, in itself, does not give us the opportunity unless we are prepared to do it in a manner which, as has been suggested by many officials, is both clumsy and to some extent out-dated.

In our present system of marketing grain there must be a more simple technique than the using of the car order book if our main desire is to market our grain through our own facilities or through our own elevators. It is true that, in certain areas, the farmers have been able to take advantage of the car order book to the point where they have been able to deliver their grain through their own facilities; but that is not a general situation throughout the west at the present time. I think that, at this time, we are more than justified in asking for this because (as I suggested a few moments ago) this issue has been raised in the Federal House. It has been introduced as a private Bill by the people who are advocating it, on two occasions. It was introduced by Mr. Argue, M.P. for the constituency of Assiniboia; and on both occasions, Mr. Speaker, the arguments which were advanced by those supporting the Bill were arguments advanced in the interest of the farmers of western Canada.

The only arguments which were advanced against it, were advanced, not by representatives of western Canada, but by the Hon. G. D. Howe, Minister in charge of the Canada Grain Act. His only argument against the implementation of this, at least his only argument which could be construed as valid, was that there was already sufficient provision in the Act by which it can be done, if he suggests that we, today, can deliver our grain through our own facilities if we so desire, then why is he objecting to making it absolutely certain that we can do it and do it in a manner which will be flexible enough to allow the producer to indicate, beforehand, his choice; and at the same time give that producer the right to change his mind if he sees fit after having started to market his grain?

I think a strong argument which can be advanced against the argument put forward by Mr. Howe is that there have been abuses made of the car order book in the last few years. I am in no way suggesting that these abuses were necessarily intentional, but the car order book was put there for the specific purpose of giving the producers the opportunity to ship their own grain from their farms to the terminals or to the place of market. That is what it was primarily intended for, but the abuses have resulted because the producers have been attempting to use this provision (that is the car order book) to market their grain through their own elevators, for they have undertaken to assign the cars which they are provided with under the car order book to some particular elevator. True, it is perfectly legal to do this, under certain conditions. It is certainly not contrary to the Act, as this procedure was legalized in 1944 when the Canada Grain Act was before the House at that time. But it was not the primary intention of it to assign care to a particular elevator when you were not necessarily putting in your own grain, although the producer that previously delivered grain to that elevator which may be sold or unsold at that particular time; and because we have had to abuse a privilege, then we are suggesting that this is a proper means of finding a solution.

You will note that we are suggesting something rather definite in this amendment. The reason we are doing that is that in this Legislature we have often been accused of asking the Federal Government to do something in the Act but are not suggesting a proper solution. Well in this we are. We are, in effect, asking the Federal Government to implement the Bill which was

introduced by Mr. Argue on two different occasions – a Bill which was defeated by the heavy majority of the Liberals of Ottawa, a Bill which was defeated by the combined vote of the Liberal members from western Canada, including every Liberal member from the province of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Member: — Not Tucker, surely!

Mr. Brown (Bengough): —Yes, you will find in the ‘Votes and Proceedings’ of the last time this Bill was before the House the name of Mr. Tucker, who was to be the champion of the western farmer, voting against the interests of the farmers to the extent that by supporting this Bill he could have given them the opportunity of using their own facilities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting that with the implementation of the subject matter of this resolution, we will solve all the problems in relation to the marketing of our grain. I think we realize that, in the final analysis, a true solution in the marketing of our grain lies in obtaining markets for our grain among the hungry peoples of the world. This will not solve the problem of providing money, of putting spending money in the hands of the producers of western Canada to any great extent. It is true that the implementation of the subject matter of this resolution would bring some economic gain to the producers of western Canada; it would bring economic gain insofar as by using our own facilities we are creating a service for ourselves as producers and as such we would get some economic gain out of it. But I think there is a right, Mr. Speaker – and we have heard a lot in the past few weeks and months about the question of defending our civil rights and our civil liberties. I suggest it is a civil right and a civil liberty for the farmers of this province or of western Canada to use their own facilities if they so desire to use them, and anything that can be construed as an attempt to curtail our civic liberties and rights as producers of grain in western Canada.

I suggest that if it is not to be done through the medium of the permit books then the onus is upon the Federal Government and particularly upon those people in the Federal Government who profess to represent the interests of the western farmer, that they undertake to find a system that would improve upon that which we are suggesting through the medium of this resolution. For there must be a better system of allocation of boxcars rather than leaving it to the preference of the railway companies, as apparently has been done in the past.

I am indeed proud to associate myself with the organized farmers and with the individual farmers of this province in asking the Government of Canada so to amend the Canada Grain Act that the allocation of boxcars among the various elevator companies may be on the basis of preference indicated by the application in each producer’s permit book and to instruct the Transport Controller to make a more equitable distribution of boxcars as between shipping points, the allocation to be on the basis of need.

I therefore move this resolution, seconded by Mr. Dewhurst.

Mr. F. A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to second this motion, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to associate myself with the remarks of the mover. Like the hon. member for Bengough I myself have had considerable number of occasions to meet with farmers and farmer organizations where these problems have been discussed, and I want to assure the House it is a problem which the farmers of this province feel quite deeply

March 4, 1954

about. The farmers of this province, after facing the hazards of nature and other things in order to get a crop off, feel that one of the smallest things of all that could be done by the authorities responsible, is to give them the right to be able to market their products as they see fit through their own organizations. They do not appreciate any actions on behalf of any controller or the transport board or the Minister of Trade and Commerce, to be able to stop them from delivering to their own organizations, which they built themselves, the grain which they would like to deliver there.

The fight of the farmers of this province has been a long one on the grain situation. We can go back in the records and in history and we will find that, before the turn of this century, the farmers were having a very difficult time to market their grain and get a fair, just return for the farmers. We found innumerable spread between one grade and another grade. The price we found was always depressed. As the mover pointed out the Canada Grain Act remedied some of those situations. By making available the boxcars on the car-order book it did give the farmers the right to be able to order a car for themselves, have that car spotted at the elevator platform (that is, the loading platform), and they could haul their grain, shovel it from their wagons or trucks – and very few had trucks in those days when they first started this method of loading their grain. They would load it from their loads direct to the boxcar. I know that is what was done because I have, in the past, helped to load a considerable number of cars by that method from the loading platform direct to the car.

In the early 'twenties the situation was so bad that the farmers of this province decided that if they were going to get away from this 'racket' in the grain business, they would have to organize a company of their own. By 1924, we saw come into being the Pool Elevator system of this province of which, today, everybody is well aware. There is hardly a town in this province you can drive by but what you do not see a Pool Elevator there, to the credit of the farmers who went out to fight their own battles.

I do not think they appreciate restrictions being put in their way. In the late 'twenties and the 'thirties, they did not have a quota system then; it was not necessary. It appeared at that time that regardless of what amount of grain the farmers wanted to deliver, the railroads could find the boxcars; the facilities were available to deliver that grain. The year 1928 was one of the heaviest crops and for a good long time was the all-time record production of grain from this province. It is only this past few years that we have surpassed in actual bushels the amount of grain produced in 1928. At that time, as a young fellow I was working in the western part of the province, on the prairie, and it was my job to haul grain from the threshing outfits to the elevators. While it was true we did not have the big trucks that we have today, I can well recall seeing a lineup at elevators a quarter of a mile long of single teams and 4-horse teams, waiting to deliver their grain to the elevator. But there was never at any time a shortage of space at the elevator. The cars kept coming in and coming in, and the elevator agent was able to load the cars after supper, or get an assistant, and could keep room for those loads.

I can well recall the point I was hauling to was called Whitepool – it is in the constituency of the hon. member for Kerrobert-Kindersley. It is on the C.N. and the elevator on the C.P. line – the two lines run parallel and are only about 100 yards apart at this particular point and what they called Aston on the C.P. line in those years when I was there. That elevator never opened because it could not get the grain away from the Pool elevator on the C.N. line. There were eight elevators within a radius of three or four miles, from Whitepool point, and this one elevator at Whitepool, the Pool elevator,

took in more grain than the other eight surrounding it. Under the present system he could only get 12 per cent. The number of elevators would have to be taken into consideration, and the cars allocated accordingly.

As I mentioned, in the 1930's we did not have a quota system. I am of the opinion that we have been definitely let down in the west on the handling of our facilities. We hear it said that we have better locomotives on the lines today, better equipment, better facilities. But I point out that in those years we did not have to have a quota. In the first three months of the 1928 crop year, I believe I am safe in saying that at least 75 per cent of the entire crop was marketed by those who wished to market their grain. Two years ago, in the first three months, we had not in western Canada here, marketed a 5-bushel quota let alone 75 per cent of the production as we did in 1928. Today we continue to see a lineup at the elevators, and it is a very serious lineup, Mr. Speaker. I know of many occasions where a farmer would send his truck into town first thing in the morning with a load of grain, as soon as room is available, and the truck would not return until 4, 5 or 6 o'clock in the afternoon, waiting to get out of the lineup. A lot of farmers would leave home at 4 o'clock in the morning trying to beat the other farmer to the elevator. Those are serious situations, and we should not have to be faced with that kind of difficulty in the marketing of our products.

Last fall in my district, there were five combines came in from Texas; they came in to help take off the crop. A lot of farmers badly wanted to make use of that additional available equipment, but they could not do so, not because they did not have the crop to take off, but because they knew that they could not market their grain and these people from Texas would need to be paid in cash so they could return home. Consequently, a lot of the farmers had to wait, taking a chance on the weather breaking, until they could get some of their neighbours to help them, because they knew if they paid their neighbours the amount of the actual gas, the neighbour would wait until the quota opened.

These are things which the farmers are up against all the time. Prior to 1950 the Wheat Pool handled over 50 per cent of the grain marketed in this province. These last three years they are handling only somewhat around 46 per cent – there is a drop of at least four per cent and it could be more. I have not got the latest figures from the Wheat Pool, but the figures I had from them a while ago show at least a four per cent drop on the average.

We know that in some towns where there are several elevators, the Wheat Pool in the past, when there was no quota system and the cars were available, handled over 50 per cent of the grain in competition with three or four or five other elevators. They are only getting their share today of one-third, one-fourth, a fifth or a sixth as the case may be on the number of cars. Last summer, when they threw the quota open it worked a great hardship on a lot of the farmers in my part of this province. At that particular time of the year we had a lot of rain. It rained pretty near every day, and only those who were fortunate enough to live close to a gravel road could get to market with their grain. Consequently, when the rain finished what we found was that farmers from 40, 50, 60 and 80 miles away brought their grain to our points and filled our elevators with the grain from miles away. When we were able to get ours out as soon as the roads dried, there was no more space. In order to deliver our grain we had in turn to haul another 60 or 70 miles in another direction. The elevator men from around Naicam tell me that they estimate there was over 150,000 bushels of grain from the Naicam district, last summer, that was hauled

over towards Humboldt, Dixon, Lake Lenore and that part of the province to be marketed.

You see what this does to these farmers, Mr. Speaker. It not only triples his cost of trucking charges to get the grain to the elevator, but in addition it puts him in a higher freight rate area, because when you get to Humboldt and Dixon and those points you are in a higher freight rate area than you are at Naicam. Consequently, the farmer paid to have his grain hauled away from the market by the truck, and had to pay the railroads additional to have it hauled back again.

I have one town in my constituency where, a year ago last fall, the farmers told me they did not know what they were going to do to market their grain. They live 10 and 12 miles back from town, some of them on unimproved roads, and they found when the 3-bushel first quota opened in the fall, naturally they could not get trucks in to haul their grain out, and if they hauled with horses they could only delivery one load in a day, which meant nothing to getting grain out. Before they could get the trucks to get their grain out, they found the elevator space was filled. Yet, at the start of their marketing year that was their delivery point and no other. Consequently, they could not haul any grain. When the additional quotas opened in mid-winter, their roads were blocked by snow, they could get no grain out, and they could not get the trucks in because the roads were blocked. Then in the spring of the year their roads were all mud and water and when the spring quota opened once again they found themselves in the same position; they could not haul any grain.

I was talking to those farmers in the first part of June, last year, and they told me they did not know what they were going to do, because they said, "First thing we know, before we get our grain in they will declare our point an open quota delivery point, and what will happen to us? When it becomes open quota naturally those who have the big trucks will go where the roads are better, and once again we will be left out. We won't be able to get our grain to our own point." That, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what happened. Those farmers got little or none of their grain to their own point.

I do not agree at any time that we should have those open quotas. I believe that the Transport Controller should be able to make cars available regardless of whether they are C.N. or C.P. cars. He has the authority; he could send C.N. cars on C.P. lines or vice versa and, instead of those farmers having to haul their grain for 50 or 60 miles away from home, the cars should have been sent to their point. They should have the right to deliver to their own point.

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, the municipal secretary tells me that it caused them a lot of trouble and grief; that they have in some of the municipalities some farmers (fortunately a very few farmers; a small minority) who will not pay their taxes. They have a difficult job getting taxes from them. So the municipalities put up in the elector offices the posting of the arrears of taxation. That is fine and dandy providing the farmer has to deliver the grain to that point. But when open quota comes and he hauls his grain 60, 70 and 80 miles away, and the grain is sold, they are left without taxes. Some of the municipal secretaries told me, last fall, that they can show instances where people for four or five years have not paid taxes through getting away under that device. They would like to see things amended whereby the taxes could be collected at any elevator. The Minister of Municipal Affairs may be able to amend The Municipal Act, but if we could have the proper control of the marketing of our grain, that would take care of itself. The farmer should have the right to market at any elevator he sees fit and also the point of

delivery he chooses and that one only, then the municipalities would know where the farmer had to pay the taxes if he would not come to the office.

At the present time it is the station agent's responsibility to allocate boxcars to the elevators. When some of the farmers go to the agents to find out how they can go about ordering a car on the car order book, some agents are very co-operative; give them all the information they want and help them to learn how to order their car out of the car order book. Other agents, on the other hand, throw cold water on the idea and tell them that it upsets all their work, that it is quite difficult for them to administer. This makes it difficult for everybody concerned, and if the farmer is not persistent he just goes away from the station without ordering his car.

As this motion requests, if the farmer could declare in his quota book which elevator he would like to deliver his grain to or what percentage of it, the farmer could say, if there were three elevators in the town, that he would give $33 \frac{1}{3}$ per cent to each elevator, or he could give it all to one, or any portion he saw fit. But, while they have the quota book and the farmers have to sign those quota books and take those quota books out, I see no reason why it would not be quite simple and feasible for the farmers to indicate what elevator company he wanted to handle his grain, and cars should be allocated accordingly. Hence, if we found that some elevator agent had more cars allocated to him and he became uninterested in the farmers and the farmers were not satisfied with him as their buying agent, there would be nothing to stop them, the following year, from going to another elevator. It would keep the elevators and agents on their toes. If the government at Ottawa really believe in free enterprise, why do they impose restrictions on the farmer when the farmer is asking for nothing, only a square deal? I am not trying to argue for a moment that this is the idealism of free enterprise. Far from it; it is just only fair play and the farmer should get it.

A little while ago, at Quill Lake, the pool elevator built a huge elevator there, larger than the average elevator. Due to something unforeseen (I do not know what all the difficulties were), this elevator as soon as it was filled up, they noticed it was starting to break in one place. There must have been some faulty timbers or something used in the construction. So the Transport Controller did allocate to that elevator all the cars necessary to lower the grain until the elevator could be emptied enough to be repaired so the elevator would not collapse and fall over altogether, which the people and the Pool officials appreciated very much. But that elevator could not then get any more cars until the other elevators in that town had had so many cars as it had had. If the people of that district wanted to patronize that elevator in preference to the others, even if it had had several cars ahead of them, they would only be having the right to haul to an elevator of their choice.

If the motion which the hon. member for Bengough has moved and I have the pleasure in seconding is carried and would be acted on by Ottawa, then in a case like that, if that elevator is handling 50 per cent of the grain, it would get its cars but that would go off its percentage of cars; it should not bar it or bring it down just to a flat basis, when the percentage of grain it would handle is far more.

Now, Mr. Speaker, lots could be said on this motion, and I hope that this motion will be carried by this House unanimously. As the member for Bengough pointed out, when this Bill came up at Ottawa we find, much to our amazement, that all the members from this province who were present and voting on the Bill at Ottawa, the C.C.F. members every one voted for the farmers, but

the four Liberal members who were present in the House (Mr. Gardiner was not there for the vote and neither was Mr. Diefenbaker), but the other four members, Mr. Harrison, Mr. Mang, Mr. Studer and Mr. Tucker voted against giving the farmers the right to market their grain where they saw fit. It rather amazes me to go over that list, because we were told in the press and over the radio that one of the main reasons Mr. Tucker had consented to go back to Ottawa was because he felt he could do more for the farmers of the west at Ottawa than he could here. I am amazed to see people from Saskatchewan voting against what the Wheat Pools and the farmers' organizations of this province want, knowing what the situation is, I know that Mr. Tucker is well aware of the situation in this province.

I do not blame the eastern Liberal or Conservative members for voting against it. I see Mr. Drew's name is among those who voted against it. I do not blame the eastern members. Naturally, if the members from the west here who sit in the government office, or in the government at the House at Ottawa, do not have enough courage to get up and support a motion in the House of Commons which we know is in the interests of western agriculture, just because it is moved by a man from the opposition in Ottawa, and they will sit with their colleagues and vote against it and will not bring out the points in favour of it, I do not blame the eastern members for voting against it. But I do blame men like Harrison, Mang, Studer and Tucker because they know better. I know they know better, because they have been among the farmers here enough to know that the farmers are not satisfied with the allocation of the cars at the present time.

The Hon. Mr. Howe, speaking in the House a year ago, when Mr. Argue brought up this Bill, said that it was his information that the Wheat Pool gets twice as many cars as any other elevator company in this province. That information may be correct. The Wheat Pool may get twice as many cars as any other elevator company but I don't know how many elevators other companies have in this province. I know the Pool have over a thousand elevators. I do know there is no other company in the province over a thousand elevators. I do know there is no other company in the province with as many elevators as the Pool has; but if the next largest elevator company in this province had 500 elevators and they were both getting car for car at various points, then it could be that, with the Pool having twice as many outlets, they could have twice as many cars as any other elevator company. But the inference which is left that the Pool got two for one of all the other elevator companies is not correct. They may have got twice as many as any other one company, but not twice as many as all the other companies put together, which Mr. Howe's statement in Hansard would lead one to believe.

So, Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure in seconding this motion, and I hope to see this House carry it unanimously.

Mr. G. H. Danielson (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out a few things that have been said here. I am going to vote for this motion, and I think my friends around me here will do the same thing.

This is not a new problem. It is a problem which has been before the farmers of western Canada for many years and the peculiar thing about this is that the problem never appears until we get some wheat to sell and have a big crop; then there is a shortage of cars.

During the last few years this problem has been accentuated by certain conditions. One of the conditions is that, in the old days when we used

to haul with a team and horses, we never had the time to haul a load of grain to town and weigh it until threshing was over. We were busy threshing and hauling wheat into our granaries and bundling up our sheaves. Then we got busy and pecked away at hauling the grain all winter, and sometimes after seeding, the following year. In other words, we took about five, six or seven months to sell our wheat. Now we try to rush it all in within about seven or eight weeks, with the consequence that we have a congestion in our elevators. That is one of the reasons.

Another reason of course, at the present time is the enormous crops that we have produced here during the last six or seven years: I think we can say seven years. I don't think we have had more than one poor crop in the last five years, at least not in my district. So we have that problem.

I heard the hon. member say something about what the Liberal members did in the House at Ottawa. As he told it they voted against certain resolutions by some C.C.F. member in that House. I think they did that; I think it is on record; but he did not tell us what the resolutions were. I don't think the member for Bengough (Mr. Brown) did either. If he did, it missed me. There was a resolution introduced there, and Mr. Howe was asked on that occasion if he had any recommendation from the Pool, from the western elevators in Saskatchewan, and the Alberta and the Manitoba Pools, and he said he had none up to date. I happened to notice a statement by one of the Pool officials a day or so after, that they were going to meet and decide on recommendations to submit to the Government on any changes that were contemplated in the Canada Grain Act covering this particular problem. That was at that time.

I am not so sure if I had been in Ottawa, if I would not have voted against the resolution which proposed no solution, and neither does this resolution before the House today. We know all the troubles that we are up against and they are still there. I want to admit that quite frankly. But neither the member for Bengough nor the member for Wadena has made one statement that will relieve the situation. I think this thing could very safely be left to the farmers' organizations whose problem it is, and who have proven themselves, during the years that have gone by, to be alive to the needs and have been able to advance profitable solutions for many of the problems. I think they will find one for this, if there is any solution to be found.

I want to try to picture to you, Mr. Speaker, a situation that is in effect all over this province and in other provinces of western Canada. I was in my elevator just about a few days after Christmas and I was talking to the Pool elevator man there and he was deploring the conditions. We have seven elevators in our town, including two Pool elevators, one of which is an enormously large elevator built last year, a very splendid structure. I asked him what percentage of the grain shipped out of this town should go to the Pool elevator. He was not so certain. I am not going to prove his statement as being correct, because I did not know and he didn't either; but he said he thought there was around 60 per cent and even a little more that was tied up to the Pool. Now, let us assume we have approximately 110,000 bushels (I don't think it is any more) of Pool capacity in that town and there are five other elevators of 30,000 and 35,000 bushel capacity, and one or two of them bigger than that, with big annexes built beside the elevators, here is the situation: When that Pool elevator is full what will the farmer do, Mr. Speaker, except haul his wheat into the elevator where there is room, so he can get some money to pay his bills, take care of his family and pay his taxes. He does that, and he continues to do so, and under the Canada Grain Act every elevator agent is compelled to take delivery of any grain that is offered to him, subject to

certain emergencies, of course. But he does that. He goes to work and he dumps his wheat in the other elevators, half a dozen of them, then, when they are full, what is going to happen? I am going to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I think in my town (and I know there are some towns probably more so than my town) there is probably more Pool wheat in the line companies than there is in the Pool elevators. How then, what is the condition? After every elevator is plugged in that town (and there is always somebody to put a carload of wheat in the elevator immediately the Pool elevator empties one out), would it be right to say, "Here, you got 63 per cent of the sign-up, or 60 per cent of the sign-up, and you are only entitled to a certain percentage of the cars"? What about these other families, more in number perhaps than this one having grain in the Pool elevators? Would it be right to say that because he is a Pool man and wants his car to be spotted at the Pool elevator, it should go there? What about the congestion that you have in the five other elevators in that town? What are you going to do about it? It is just right and proper that they get their share of the cars; and the Pool elevator wheat goes all through the line just like it goes out of the others.

I am convinced from my own observations – I know there are a lot of fellows who won't agree with me – that this is a system that will never righten until you have an elevator capacity to take care of the grain that flows into the elevators from the farmers. When you get to that point, you don't need it when you have empty cars, or plenty of cars to take the grain, then you do not need this thing at all, because every person who wants to patronize the Pool elevator will do so; but at the present time there is no solution to that problem. If they have anything I am sure that the farmers' leaders of this province, both the Farmers' Union and particularly the Wheat Pool, which has been up against this thing, would wish to adopt it. This is not a new thing. How did we carry over practically two-thirds of the 1942 crop? I only marketed I think 14 bushels to the acre in 1942 and I had about 38 bushels to the acre on my farm. We were up against the same thing. I carried 8,000 bushels on my farm for four or five years because we could not sell it.

If these two gentlemen who have spoken to this resolution have suddenly discovered some magic cure for this problem they haven't told us about it. They said there are certain rights given to the farmer in the Canada Grain Act. Nobody disputes that fact. They were put there a long, long time ago, and they belong to the farmer. I am sure that, when the condition returns that those rights can be exercised by the farmers, the farmers who belong to the Co-operative organizations in this province will take full advantage of them. That is all I have to say, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. A. McCarthy (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I wanted to bring up a few of the things the hon. gentleman from Arm River already has mentioned, but seeing he has covered them I shall not go into them.

I would just repeat what the hon. member from Arm River said, that this is not a new problem. It is a serious problem, and I shall support this motion. But I want to point out that the language of this says that they should deliver the cars where they are needed. Well, when we have all our elevators full, and we all have grain on our farms, why wouldn't we need it everywhere? But what he actually said was to deliver the cars where they are needed. Well, they are needed all over. If they were not needed all over, we would not have this problem.

The other thing I want to say is this. I was in this country before they had a car order book and I was there when Miller and Partridge and Quigley and Green (I have forgotten the rest of their names) went to Ottawa and had

this car order book established. It was not established to get our grain into elevators. It was established so we could get our grain to Fort William without putting it into an elevator, because the elevators of that day were giving us a real bum deal. The car order book was established so that the car could be spotted at the platform so we could use that and get our grades and weights and everything else at the terminal.

A little later on we developed the pool system; before we had the Pool we had the Grain Growers. I was surprised the gentlemen over there did not mention that because that was the first system of farm elevators we had. We had the Grain Growers, and in spite of what anybody in this House wants to say to the contrary, I want to say here and now that the Grain Growers in their early days were a powerful good in this province. They probably did more good than any other one has since. They had more conditions to correct, no doubt; but they probably did more good than any other one has done since, and I have a lot of respect for the ones we have had since.

This Grain Act is the Magna Carta of the farmer so he can get his grain to the head of the lakes; get his own weights and his own grades if he wants to use them, irrespective of how he wants to use them. I think we should be very careful, when we start amending it, not to so amend it that we will find ourselves in a worse position than we were in before. I can see a lot of difficulties, some of which the member for Arm River has pointed out.

Suppose I go into the Pool Elevator or any other elevator – it does not matter which one – and say, “I am going to draw all my grain in here during this year.” He would be entitled to the cars I was entitled to as they came around. Well, it is possible in these times that he would not be able to take the grade of wheat that I have. We have various grades of wheat down there. It is possible I would not be satisfied with the grade he was giving me for my wheat. So, I think we ought to be very careful when we start amending this Act that we do not ask for something that is going to put in a worse position than we are in now. As I said before, I am going to vote for this motion, but I do see the wording of it leaves a lot to the imagination.

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Mr. Speaker, I am surprised at the attitude taken by the hon. members for Arm River and Cannington. It is well known – and I know of that about which I am talking – that the Co-operative Elevator Association is not getting its fair share of cars.

Mr. Loptson: — They are, down our way.

Mr. Kramer: — They have not as a general rule, and the Wheat Pool officials will back me up. The way they are treated now is if the Pool elevator is full it goes to the line elevator. A farmer has to have cash, so he goes there. Even though the Pool elevator would normally take much more than half the wheat, it is treated as if it were just another elevator company and it would seem to him, and it does seem to him I have reason to know, that they are asking for something for themselves, rather than something which is fair and proper to the patrons of the Pool elevator system in western Canada.

Mr. Brown (Bengough) (closing debate): — In closing the debate on this question I was rather amused and possibly even somewhat surprised by the attitude which the member for Arm River and the member for Cannington took. They suggested that they were going to support the motion,

but at the same time they spoke against it. That possibly is typical Liberal tactics in reverse, because at Ottawa they talked for it and voted against it. Apparently in this House . . .

Hon. Mr. Darling: — Too close to home to do that.

Mr. Brown: — Just what I was going to suggest. Apparently in this House the Liberal members feel they are a little closer to home and their vote may be recorded somewhat more convincingly than the votes of their cohorts at Ottawa.

I wish to touch on just one or two of the matters raised by the member for Arm River. I think the point made by the member for The Battlefords is very well taken. Certainly Pool members haul their grain to line elevator companies and certainly there is a lot of Pool grain in line elevator companies at the present time. I will agree with anyone who suggests that in our present situation we must use to the utmost all storage facilities that are made available. I will agree with them; but just why is there room in the line elevators when there is not room in the Pool elevators? Is it because of the fact that they have received the preference in the boxcars which are allocated among the various companies?

The hon. member for Arm River further suggests that this proposal which we are making should have come from the Pool Elevator Company if they deemed it advisable and necessary. I suggest that the president of the Wheat Pool made his position abundantly clear in the quotation which I gave you from abstracts taken from his speech at the last annual meeting of the Wheat Pool. He says this:

“To deal with the distribution of cars not by regulation of the Board of Grain Commissioners, but by a definite amendment to the Act.”

We are following out the suggestion made by the president of the Wheat Pool in his address to the annual meeting, and the onus is upon the legislatures of the land to implement the requests in the form of legislation that is made by other organizations – that is, if they are prepared to implement legislation in their favour. The Federal Government were asked by the Wheat Pool to implement by amendment a means by which we could get a more fair and equitable distribution.

It was something definite that was introduced to the House at Ottawa. It was in the form of a Bill and, as my hon. friend is well aware if he has read the explanatory notes that go along with this Bill, it is very definite:

“The purpose of this Act is to provide a new section of the car order book, a rule for the fair allocation of boxcars among elevator companies at marketing points, where the car order book as presently constituted is not in effect. By allocating their seeded acreage among the elevator companies at marketing points producers themselves will determine the distribution of boxcars at that point.”

How in the name of all that is good is it possible to have anything more definite than that to place on the statute books, because as has been

suggested, this would do exactly what we are asking in our resolution! For them to justify the action of the Liberal members from Saskatchewan at Ottawa who opposed this on two different occasions, to suggest that it is not something definite is in my opinion indicating rather a low opinion of their colleagues at Ottawa.

Both members suggested that the proposals we make here will not work. That, I think, is an attitude which has been adopted by the Liberal Party not only here in Saskatchewan, but throughout Canada. They adopt a defeatist attitude. "We do not know the solution, and we are not prepared to find one"; that is their attitude. Maybe what we suggest is not a solution, but at least it is our proposal as to a solution. If our hon. friends opposite, or their cohorts at Ottawa who purport to represent the western farmers, can suggest something better, then let them make the suggestion rather than just vote down every proposal which we from the C.C.F. make on behalf and in the interest of the farmers of western Canada. 'Do nothing' is exactly the attitude which they are prepared to adopt.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I have covered the points which I wished to deal with relative to the matters raised by the members of the Opposition.

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg): — Is this proposal, as suggested by the members opposite, to move wheat faster, or to allow the farmer to deliver his wheat where he wishes to deliver it.

Mr. Danielson: — What is the member asking?

Mr. Walker: — The question is, is this proposal to move wheat faster, as suggested by the members opposite, or is it to allow the farmer to deliver his grain where he wishes?

Mr. Brown: — The answer to that question asked by the member for Gravelbourg, I think the member for Arm River did suggest that by implementation of this resolution, we would not necessarily be moving the grain from the farm any faster than we are under the present system. I will agree that that deduction may be entirely true. I will agree that this in itself might not do that, but that is not what we are after. We are asking that the farmers be given the privilege and the right to deliver their grain to their own elevators, and the suggestion he is making in that respect is simply evading the issue. Either you want to see the farmers have the opportunity to deliver their grain to the elevator of their own choice in their own right and in their own way, or else you are opposed to it.

Mr. Loptson: — We agree with you. You can't convince us any more; we are agreeing with you.

Mr. Brown: — My friend suggests that they are agreeing with me. Certainly they said they were going to vote for it; but at the same time every one who spoke from the Opposition side spoke against what we are suggesting here. They spoke against it on the grounds that, first, it wouldn't work; second, if it did work it would not be any good; and third, it would not move the grain off the farms of western Canada any faster.

Premier Douglas: — And in the place where the vote could have counted, they voted against it.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

March 4, 1954

Mr. Browne: — And they both attempted to defend the fact that in the place where the vote would have done any good, their supporters and cohorts voted against it. I suggest that we have on this side the right to answer the arguments which are put up in that respect. But, I am indeed glad to see that, in spite of what they say, they are going to vote with us.

Mr. Danielson: — I was on my feet before the hon. member took his seat. I would like to ask him now — I cannot agree that the Act as it is at the present time prohibits the farmer from hauling his wheat wherever he likes.

Mr. Speaker: — I don't think we should enter into any debate on the question at all.

Mr. Loptson: — It is just a question.

Mr. Danielson: — And I was on my feet before he took his seat.

Mr. Brown: — I am certainly prepared to answer the question, Mr. Speaker. I said in my opening remarks that the Canada Grain Act does provide certain protection by which the farmer can undertake to deliver his grain to the elevator of his choice over the loading platform or any other means if he so desires, under the provisions of the car order book. But I did point out that, in our present system of marketing grain here in Canada today as was realized by the president of the Wheat Pool, the car order book is outdated (as he referred to it), and it is certainly a clumsy method and, what is even more important as I pointed out before, we have had to abuse the privilege of the car order book in an endeavour to get even the small amount of grain that we were able to get through the Pool elevator. The farmers of western Canada are sufficiently honest that they do not want to abuse that privilege; and that is something that we here in western Canada cannot afford to do.

The question being put, it was agreed to unanimously.

FEDERAL AID FOR PROSPECTIVE FARMERS

The Assembly resumed, from March 2, 1954, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Swallow:

“That this Assembly urge the Federal Government to give consideration to the setting up of a loaning agency, or alternatively, to the improvement and extension of present loaning agencies, in order to provide the necessary financial assistance whereby young men who are qualified and wish to farm, may be given the opportunity to establish themselves on economic farm units.”

Mr. R. A. McCarthy (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, in the few remarks I am going to make on this resolution I want to say that I am in favour of the objective of the resolution, but I am not so sure that I am in favour of the methods the hon. gentlemen propose to apply to relieve the situation.

There is no doubt that we have a large number of young farmers in this province who are not able to start farming because of the fact that they are not able to finance their operations and that is, I suppose, part of the evidence that we are growing up in this province. When I started on my homestead, years ago, all a young man needed was a pair of oxen, a plow and a few other things and \$10, a lot of muscle and a little bit of will, and he could start farming. When I unloaded to go to my homestead in Zealandia in 1909, I drove to Rosetown, and there wasn't any Rosetown there; there was just a bunch of tents, and two-thirds of the locomotion of that day in Rosetown was oxen, the other third was probably horses. The fellow who had a horse was a capitalist. I don't think there were any Socialists, but we sure envied the guy who had the team of horses because two-thirds of us had oxen; and as I said, if you had the oxen and \$10 to apply on your homestead, you were fairly well equipped. It used to be a standing joke that if the Dominion Government would bet you a quarter-section against your \$10 you could make a living out of it; but a lot of times the Dominion Government won because a lot of the boys left their homesteads.

That is one extreme. We have come along from there. Credit at that time was available; some people tell us it was too freely available. Possibly it was in some cases; at least a lot of us got into serious difficulty by accepting too much credit. Nevertheless, with all the criticism we hear of banks, insurance companies and financiers, I want to say that this country could never have been today what it is now if it had not been for those institutions putting money into this country and getting it started. However, that is water gone under the bridge and, as I said, there is a real problem in connection with our young farmers getting started on their own on a farm.

About the only lending institution that we have in Saskatchewan, today, which is prepared to lend money on farm land is the Canadian Farm Loan Board and they were set up not so much to cover the situation of the young farmers as to consolidate the debts of the man who owned some land and got it on a long-term programme so that he could have his debts consolidated and could carry on. I think they are fulfilling that function fairly well. It was not set up particularly to take care of this situation because before you can deal with the Farm Loan Board you must have considerable assets to put as security.

There are, so far as I know, no other lending institutions operating in Saskatchewan today which are prepared to loan money on farm property, and there is a good reason for that. This Government, when it came into office, passed certain legislation and created a lot of 'ballyhoo', and I think probably the ballyhoo created as much of an impression as the actual legislation did. At any rate the mortgage companies which were operating in this province at that time pulled out, and we have not got them. Consequently when older people – or not necessarily older people; but anybody who wants to sell a farm now has difficulty in getting cash for it. People are loathe to sell without the cash for the reason that most of those who have land to sell are people who have probably been farming all their lives; they have built up a farm home in town or something like that, but they have to depend on the revenue from that farm to keep them going for the balance of their lives. Nobody is prepared to finance it; that is, you cannot get a loan from the Farm Loan Board on land unless you are going to live on it yourself. So we have a situation where, when a man wants to sell his farm, about the only available place he has to sell it is to some large operator (or not necessarily a large operator) who has made a success of his farming operations and has some cash with which he can take over that land. Consequently, we have our larger units getting larger and we have fewer people living on the farms.

I do not think that is a good thing for Saskatchewan. I believe the best type of farming in Saskatchewan is the family farmer who lives on the farm. I don't think you can beat it anywhere. I don't think there is any better place in the world to raise a family than on the farm in Saskatchewan. This tendency of the farmers moving off the farms and going to the towns and cities, and farms going into larger units, even though it is a sign of the times, I do not think there is anything we can do particularly about it; but it does have an adverse effect on our rural life. It affects our schools, our telephones, our power installation, and it affects our municipal organization. It is a regrettable thing when it is carried too far. As I said, I am very much in favour of the objective of this resolution, to get the farmers' sons on the farm.

I was very much surprised at the mover of this resolution (Mr. Swallow) when he said he wanted the young men to own the farms. That is a real admission, coming from a C.C.F.er. I expected him to say he wanted the Government to make renters out of them because I understood that was the policy of the C.C.F.; but he either inadvertently spoke his mind or else he has had a change of heart. I do hope he has had a change of heart, because I do not think there are any better potential farmers in this province than the sons of farmers. They know the score, they have come through the difficulties and they know what to expect. I do not think that my parents and your parents came to this country with the idea that we or our children should become tenant farmers of any government and, as far as I am concerned, I am very anxious to see the young farm boys of this province go on farms with an opportunity to own their farm and not be indebted to the government or anyone else.

The mover made some remark about something that happened in this House, a couple of years back, and I just want to correct him on his statement. He said that we moved a resolution that would have turned the last virgin land we have in the northeast over to speculators. We moved no such thing! What we said was this: We said we wanted the Government to tell those returned boys when they went on those farms what the valuation of the farm was, and that they should have the opportunity to buy the farm when they were able. We did not do what the gentleman over there said at all. I just wanted to correct that in passing, and I want to say that, with all the criticism we had in that debate about the terms which were written into the V.L.A., into the V.L.A. Act, those boys up in the northeast would have been in much worse shape that they are today.

There is no doubt there is a need for credit in this province to look after these potential farmers – farmers' sons and anyone else who can qualify to be a farmer. The question is, what is the best system to adopt in order to arrive at that end. I want to say – and I think anyone who has had any experience along the line will agree – that, when you go into the business of lending money, and you are lending money in this instance, you are bound to have some losses. Nobody should go into it and think they are not going to, for, irrespective of how careful you may be, conditions will turn up where you are bound to have a loss. That is one thing we should consider when we are doing this.

The way this resolution proposes to do it is to pass it over to the Federal Government. As a matter of fact, if you pick up this Order Paper here, it is a C.C.F. platter – let the Federal Government do everything! I think with probably two exceptions there isn't a thing on here that is not asking the Federal Government to do something that, in my opinion, could very well and sometimes better be done by this province. Let us grow up and accept our responsibilities!

What about the position of this Government? I think before they start sending all these resolutions to the Federal Government they should consider the treatment they as a senior government are giving our rural municipalities. The rural municipalities of this province are in a similar position with regard to this Government as this Government is with regard to the Dominion Government, and I am sure, if you look up the records of this Government and previous governments, and see how much they have actually given municipalities, that it is not a very happy record. And it is more unhappy now, with the revenues that this Government has. So let us be fair about this thing.

Since this Government came into power it has spent a good many thousand dollars on socialistic experiments, and any of them that came into direct contract or direct opposition with private enterprises gradually go down the drain. If they are compulsory, then they are a monopoly, and, sure, they are done all right; their services are all right. I am not objecting to those, but when they start into these other things, I think they could have put their money to a much better use.

Let us take a look back into history and see what happened in this province previously in connection with credit. In the year 1917, the Liberal government of this province – and this was the ‘do nothing’ Liberal government we hear so much about, who had, at that time, I believe, a total budget of 5½ million. At that time we had a heavy mortgage debt in this province and we were paying on the mortgage debt eight and nine per cent, and the government of that day and the farmers got together and they created what was known as the Saskatchewan Farm Loan Board for very much the same purpose as the Canadian Farm Loan Board is now serving, for the purpose of loaning money and, from memory (I want to be corrected if this is wrong), the interest rate on those loans was six per cent. The average loan on farms at that time was eight and nine per cent. I know that, because I was paying it at that time. By doing that they saved the farmers of this province a great many thousands of dollars. I don’t know the amount but I know it was large, because we had an enormous farm mortgage debt in those days. They did that, with a budget of 5½ million. Compare that with \$120 million today, and I say to you people over there, “Why don’t you go out and do a little of this loaning yourselves?”

I am prepared to admit that mistakes were made in the Saskatchewan Farm Loan Board. There were considerable losses, but I do not think they were any greater than the losses of the private companies that were operating in this province at that time. For instance, to give you an illustration, in my own municipality in the ’thirties, a third of our land in the municipality came back to the municipality. The majority of that was held by private loan companies. It was not being farmed owing to economic conditions. The people who owned it had dropped it. It came back to the mortgage companies and the mortgage companies said to the Rural Municipalities, “we are not going to pay the taxes on that; you can take it and do what you like with it.” And we did, and they lost their mortgage investment. So I don’t think, if you look at the whole story, that the Saskatchewan Farm Loan Board lost any bigger percentage than any of the rest of them; I doubt if they lost quite as much, but I am not sure of that; but certainly they didn’t lose more.

We learned by trial and error; we have that experience before us. As an example, after World War I, the Dominion government set up a Soldiers Settlement plan and they ran into plenty of difficulties over that Soldiers Settlement plan, as many of you older members will know; but profiting by those experiences they set up, after the Second World War, the V.L.A plan, and I want to say it is second to none in the world for returned men. That

is an example of what can be done and what is being done, and I was glad to hear the member over there speak well of it, because it is an example for the world of how returned boys should be treated.

I am suggesting to the Government that they cease shedding their crocodile tears about the plight the young farmers of this province are in, and do something about it – do something on their own initiative; set up some machinery that will help. You would have the experience of the Saskatchewan Farm Loan Board (which you disbanded) to guide you. Take some of the millions you have in the socialized experiments and put them where they will do some good for the young farmers of this province. So, Mr. Speaker, I am going to move seconded by Mr. Horsman:

“That the word ‘Federal’ in the first line be deleted and the word ‘Provincial’ be substituted therefor.”

Mr. James Gibson (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. gentleman would permit a question: You made a comparison, you said that the comparison between this Government and the R.M.’s was a similar comparison to our position with the Federal Government – that is the Provincial Government’s position with the Federal Government. I wondered, when you made that comparison, if you had the figures handy as to the amount that the R.M.’s paid to the Federal Government in income tax, excise tax and so on, in comparison to the amount...

Mr. McCarthy: — Are you asking a question or making a speech?

Mr. Gibson: — I am asking a question ... as to the amounts paid by the R.M.’s to the Federal Government in the form of excise tariffs, income tax, etc., in comparison to the amount they paid to the Provincial Government in taxes or in any other way?

Mr. McCarthy: — I have been a member of the R.M. for a long time and I never knew them to pay income tax at all, so that question is easily answered. They simply don’t pay income tax; but in making those comparisons I took into consideration a great number of things. I took in the cash subsidy that this province . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! Confine your discussion to the amendment.

Mr. McCarthy: — Well he asked me a question and I was attempting to answer it.

Hon. C. M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, I regret that the hon. gentleman has seen fit to introduce what is undoubtedly a political note into this very important resolution. The hon. gentleman feels, of course, that he is going to embarrass the Government. May I assure him that it will cause us no embarrassment whatsoever. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that this province was left by the Liberal government, in 1944, in a broken-down financial position. We had not been able to borrow one five-cent piece on the open market since 1932; the last loan the province made, prior to 1944, except the ‘tin-cup’ loans, was the one in 1932 when the province paid an average interest rate of 6.8 per cent. Now what has happened since that time? We have been gradually building up the credit of the province, and I am very glad, today, that Saskatchewan is in a position where it can borrow money.

I would like to point out, though, that today we have a great many problems which the government of 1917 never dreamed of. They never dreamed for example, of electrification . . .

Mr. Loptson: — All the more reason why . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — If the hon. gentleman will contain himself, Mr. Speaker, he can reply all he likes afterwards. A rural electrification programme was unheard of. After 35 years in this province we had 138 farms electrified by the Liberal government; there was practically no generating capacity; there was practically no distribution systems whatsoever, in Saskatchewan. The telephone system was very small. As a matter of fact the \$9 million you are being asked to supply in capital funds, this year, for the telephone system is almost as much as the Liberal party spent on the entire system all through the years they had it.

Mr. Speaker, our highway system requires, today, approximately \$20 million a year. We are providing sums for the rehabilitation of our people on farms and providing money for conservation and development purposes. In addition to that, we were left a legacy of debt — the highest in the Dominion of Canada in 1944, when this Government took over. That was the situation that faced us. Now we are getting in a position where we can go out and borrow sufficient money to provide this unprecedented development that is taking place in connection with our highways. We are able to provide, next year, \$14 million for our Power Corporation; to provide \$9 million for our telephone system; to provide roughly \$20 million for our highways.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it takes a lot of money. The hon. gentleman is suggesting that we, a provincial government, should now go into the loaning business. We haven't the control of credit. Today we have in this Dominion . . .

Mr. Loptson: — You ruined the credit.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — . . . a central bank which has the power to create wealth, a central bank which has the authority and the right to determine, to a large extent, what interest rates are going to be. Until the last few weeks this province could not have borrowed money at less than about 4¼ per cent. On the other hand, the Dominion government could borrow much more cheaply. So much for the position today.

The hon. member referred to the great work that was done by his former Liberal government in connection with farm loans. I want to tell you there is not a more sorry history of any loaning agency ever written than the story of the Farm Loan Board. I want to say here, today, that the Farm Loan Board was, to a large extent, nothing but a political loaning agency. I want to say that loans were made without any regard whatsoever to the value of the property, without any regard whatsoever to the ability to pay those loans back again. I have given instances in this House and in Committee on more than one occasion showing where loans were made of several thousands of dollars on property that later wasn't worth the paper its title was written on. As a matter of fact, loans were made for five or ten thousand dollars, and yet we had to turn around and practically give the land away to the Agriculture Department to put into community pastures because it could not grow ever a bushel of grain.

When we took over in 1944 we found that that political machine was still in operation. Forty-six people employed by the Saskatchewan Farm Loan

March 4, 1954

Board had not made a single loan since 1932; yet they retained a Board of three members, they retained a staff of roughly 15 inspectors scattered all over the province. What for? Certainly not for the purpose of trying to do anything towards the collection of the revenues. There was a case where from 1917 on, they loaned approximately \$25 million, and yet . . .

Mr. Loptson: — That's not stopping you from doing something now.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — . . . by 1944 – oh, you just sit there and take it, Mr. Member from Saltcoats.

Mr. Loptson: — Such nonsense!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — By 1944, there was a deficit of \$8 million accumulated on the \$25 million loans.

Mr. Loptson: — You can learn by experience, and do a better job.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — But, Mr. Speaker, they never learned! That is the trouble; they never did learn. They kept that expensive organization with 44 to 46 employees, with this big band of inspectors and with the loans not coming in . . .

Mr. Loptson: — What has that got to do with this resolution?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, it has a great deal to do with it. I am trying to show my hon. friend that his Farm Loan Board that he claims did so much . . .

Mr. Loptson: — We are asking you to do something now.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — . . . for the people of Saskatchewan had a very sorry history, a very, very sorry history indeed.

Mr. McDonald: — Still has, according to you.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — We have today, in Ottawa, a Canadian Farm Loan Board that is in a position that it can lend money at probably 5 per cent or 4½ per cent – it could do it at 4½ per cent today with the way interest rates have gone own. They, of course, want approximately 2 per cent, and I think it is correct; you do need to have roughly 2 per cent in order to get by. Now, in Saskatchewan, as I have said, until recent weeks we could not have borrowed at less than 4¼ per cent. The last loan we made was in September of this year at 4¼ per cent; and I was delighted that on the day that Saskatchewan 1969 – 4¼ per cent bonds were purchased at par you could have bought all you wanted of Ontario Hydro Electric 4¼ per cent bonds, due in 1969 also at 99 1/8. Our bonds, for the first time, got up to where they were equal to those of the province of Ontario.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I sent down to get some material on these loans – I see I have everything except what I wanted; that is usually what happens. But if we borrowed money at 4 per cent for this purpose, then we would have to turn around and loan it to the farmers at 6 per cent, we could not do it any cheaper. The Federal Government, today, with its greater power of being able to borrow, should be able to lend that money much more cheaply than we could. And after all, why should we have two loaning agencies? The Canadian Government is lending money in other provinces. Why should we be discriminated against, in Saskatchewan, and have to loan money here as well to supplement that of the Federal Government? I cannot see that there is anything

to this except pure politics, to try to embarrass this Government.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly cannot support the amendment, and if my hon. friend had the interest of Saskatchewan at heart he would not either. He would know that this province has a big enough job right now to borrow money for the many things that we have undertaken - not to get into a field that the Dominion Government is already in. For those reasons I am certainly going to vote against his amendment.

The question being put on the amendment, it was negatived 32 to 10.

(Continuing debate on the main motion:)

Mr. Robert Kohaly (Souris-Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, the motion of the hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. Swallow) is very important as far as each of the members in this house are concerned. I am very confident that we are all very interested in seeing the subject matter accomplished — by who or what agency is apparently all the difficulty there is. The hon. members opposite feel that our Federal Government should be responsible for this problem here in our province. The hon. members on this side of the House apparently feel that the agency to do this work should be our own agency. That, of course, has been decided upon, and I do not intend to speak in connection with that matter at this particular time.

The principle is whether or not young men in Saskatchewan are going to have the wherewithal to get started in farming. No one here, I submit, will deny that these young people have to have some help. They just have to have it, it has got to be a tremendous cost and it has become a difficulty that they, alone, cannot face. I am sure that somewhere, somehow, we can assist these people to get started and to become better farmers and become an asset to the province of Saskatchewan and to swell our revenues even further.

The principle involved in the resolution of the hon. member for Yorkton is not a new one. It has been followed by the Federal Government through the Department of Veterans' Affairs and the Veterans' Land Act, for a specified group of people having particular qualifications — that is to say, they have qualifications through service during the last war. It goes back further into the first war, and we know the situation that existed at that time. I am not talking about the difficulties of administration of V.L.A. and of the Soldiers' Settlement scheme. There have been some things done that we would prefer to have seen not done, but they were incidental to the main principle. That principle was to get these men started on farms and to increase our revenue and productivity.

I feel that there is also a similarity between the educational grants that some of the hon. members in this House had the opportunity to accept and possibly to benefit from. They were young men who wanted to learn a trade or a profession, and the government and people of this province and of this Dominion joined together, handed in their hard-earned cash to a source which in turn paid it out to individual young men and women and they got the training that they wanted. Some of them are making better citizens and are now contributing in their turn to the wealth of the province and of the Dominion.

The problem, therefore, is only which agency is going to handle this. In Saskatchewan, despite the tremendous strides we have made in industry

and in the discovery of minerals, there is no doubt that agriculture is the basis upon which we still rest our economy. This is a question of furthering agriculture by renewing the young men on these farms. As the other farmers grow older and move off their farms out to British Columbia or into the towns, young men are getting to have to take over, and there is a tremendous cost involved which young men are not possibly able to handle. That is what this resolution, as I understand it, is intended to alleviate.

There can be no argument by any member on either side of the House as to the costs that are involved. Nor can there be an argument, I submit, that these young people, by virtue of being young and not having lived sufficient years, have not the money to buy; and if they go out and buy, they buy so as to leave a balance owing that is so high, so large, and the interest rates so difficult and the crop and weather conditions of this country so uncertain, that many of them go over their heads, and that is not a good business practice. If they can deal with some government agency where they can obtain an interest rate that is a little more easy, making it not so difficult during times of difficulty such as bad climatic conditions, then they can make a go of it.

The question, as I have mentioned, is whether the Federal or the Provincial government is to do it and it is obvious that there is a clear division in this House as to who is going to handle it. In the province of Ontario (I would like to point out to you, Mr. Speaker) there is such a fund. In my understanding it totals approximately \$4 million. Now that is not all the money in the world, especially when you look at a hundred and some million dollars being spent, capital and revenue, in the province of Saskatchewan, today. It is not all the money in the world. I spoke recently of, and was joined in this House and outside of it by some of the hon. members in, the idea that a development fund set aside as a fund from our mineral resources for self-liquidating projects would be of benefit to this province of ours. Here is a situation similar in the province of Ontario where it has been put into effect, and where, I understand, it is working to the benefit of the people we wish to benefit, and that is the young farmers of the province involved. It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that young men between 25 and 35 are entitled to make use of this fund in the province of Ontario – the very group of people we are likely trying to help through this resolution now before us. In addition to that, it is my understanding that such a person can make application for upwards to \$15,000 at 4 per cent interest. That is sufficient money for him to go and pay cash for his machinery. The interest rate is not so difficult and not so heavy; he has his own machinery, grows his own crop; he is not over-burdened by large payments to be met in the first year or two, but if he farms properly he has a chance to survive, support his family, educate the children whom he will be undoubtedly be educating and he contributes something very worthwhile to his province and to his country. All this comes about through just a little help from all the rest of the people in his province of in this Dominion. And that is the very thing the hon. member for Yorkton is suggesting.

The Provincial Treasurer mentioned the fact that the difficulties . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Is the hon. member speaking to the amendment?

Mr. Kohaly: — I propose, Mr. Speaker, to bring in a new amendment.

Mr. Speaker: — The amendment has been disposed of.

Mr. Kohaly: — I am speaking to the original amendment.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Don't refer to anything I said on the amendment then.

Mr. Kohaly: — I am sorry; I withdraw my remarks. I am sorry my inexperience led me on to make those remarks, Mr. Speaker.

It may be suggested, then, by some hon. members in speaking later that the province of Saskatchewan is not in a position to handle all of this.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, are we debating the ability of the province of Saskatchewan or are we debating the question of calling on the Federal Government?

Mr. Lopton: — Mr. Speaker, he is speaking to the resolution on the Order Paper. The Minister doesn't have to put words in the mouth of the speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member does know that he cannot speak on a subject which has already been disposed of.

Mr. Kohaly: — Mr. Speaker, I merely propose to speak to the resolution proposed by the member for Yorkton and that is to say that some other change should be made in this. I propose later to make a motion in amendment, and I am speaking to some of the arguments that might be raised to say that this resolution should not be put into effect. It is unfortunate that . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I must advise the hon. member that if his proposed amendment is the same subject matter that has already been disposed of, it won't be a proper amendment.

Mr. Kohaly: — I realize that, Mr. Speaker, but some member may think that the province cannot do this, in connection with this debate which is presently going on . . .

Mr. Speaker: — That has been decided.

Mr. Kohaly: — . . . and I would suggest that the hon. members then consult the interim report of the Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life that has been tabled recently. On page 28 the Commission apparently say that "It is assumed, of course, that all capital funds invested in a credit programme would be returned to the public treasury at a specified rate of interest, as the settlers become established." Therefore, this Commission, which was concerned with matters in the province of Saskatchewan are suggesting to this Provincial Government that there should be some credit made available. They go on and they make this specific recommendation — Item 84 (b):

"Farm improvement credit should be provided for the purpose of equipment, supplies, seed and livestock and farm housing . . ."

And it goes on in the very nature of some of the thoughts behind this resolution.

Now if that is not sufficient, Mr. Speaker, I should like to remind my hon. friends opposite of a report which purports to be the result of an

March 4, 1954

agricultural panel and power panel – Panel No. 1 of the C.C.F., 18th Annual Provincial Convention. This item purports to say that: “The second resolution of aid to young farmers was amended so that it resolved that the Provincial Government take the lead in promoting an establishment fund to help establish young men on farms.” Now that was the resolution probably, in the considered opinion of that group of people specifically gathered together to consider these things, decided upon.

Returning to the original statement I made at the start of my remarks, today, that the principle is apparently agreed upon by both sides of the House, but the question is, which agency? I wish therefore to move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by Mr. Carr:

“That the words ‘Provincial and’ be inserted before the word ‘Federal’ in the first line of the resolution.”

The end result of such a motion would be that the Federal and the Provincial governments join together to see that these things which we all want will be done. It is not the purpose of the hon. members on either side to discuss politics, and I hope that we can join together to see that these people do get what we wish them to get, and that is assistance in order to farm in this province.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Assembly has just voted on the question of the Provincial Government giving consideration to this. The Assembly has voted against it. Now the mover of the second amendment is asking that we should again express an opinion, the Assembly just recently having given their opinion that we should not. I could, therefore, suggest to you that we have already settled the question of the part of the Provincial Government by an overwhelming vote in which we have voted against the Provincial Government giving consideration to the setting up of the loaning agencies.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I would like to point out also in that connection that although this is worded a little differently, in that if it was carried it would read:

“That this Assembly urge the Provincial and Federal Government to give consideration . . .”

I would point out that these are two entirely separate agencies which would be acting separately and it is, in effect, asking exactly the same thing as the House decided on a few minutes ago, that is – well, look at it this way, it then would actually have to read like this:

“That this Assembly urge the Provincial Government to give consideration to setting up a loaning agency and that this Assembly urge the Federal Government to give consideration to setting up an agency . . .”

But I think there is actually no difference, that it is asking the House to decide the same question over again.

Mr. Lopton: — Trying to twist something – my learned friend. Mr. Speaker, I don’t think that you can, in any way, compare this amendment

with the first one. You may be asked, mind you, to take a load onto your shoulder by yourself and you may refuse to; but if I come and take half the load with you it would be an entirely different proposition, and that is what we are asking now. If they won't take the load alone, this new amendment asks that they take it in co-operation with the Federal Government, and it is an entirely different thing.

Mr. Speaker: — It is rather a hard thing to decide whether it is in order or not. This House has, definitely repudiated the idea of the Provincial Government accepting it alone. The second amendment is a qualifying resolution. It is not very well worded because you can take the interpretation put on it on the point of order by the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources. It also can be, as the Opposition will argue, that it does imply a dual responsibility; but as a matter of fact, how can this House expect any Legislature to accept a responsibility, or place a responsibility onto another? You haven't said in your amendment that you want them to combine. I am going to take this under advisement; it is pretty hard to decide whether it is a proper amendment or not.

(Ruling deferred)

(Debate continuing on main motion of Mr. Swallow:)

Mr. P. A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

FULL SETTLEMENT FOR TREATY INDIANS

The Assembly resumed, from March 2, 1954, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Berezowsky:

“That this Assembly requests the Federal Government to take necessary steps to grant the Treaty Indians of Canada full rights of Canadian citizenship without abrogating any privileges and rights provided by Indian Treaties; to modernize and expand existing educational and hospital facilities for Treaty Indians and thus enhance their security and provide equal health and educational opportunities for these people; AND FURTHER, that this Assembly urges the Federal Government to give favourable consideration to sharing with the Provincial Governments the costs of a comprehensive rehabilitation and re-establishment programme for Indians and for Metis, in order that the social, economic and racial problems of these underprivileged people may be solved at an early date and thus expedite their assimilation to and integration with contemporary Canadian society.”

Mr. H. C. Dunfield (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, I am very surprised to be speaking on Indian affairs in this House, but I was pleased to hear hon. members on the other side of the House show concern for the Indians of our province and our country. It is somewhat belated but very welcome nevertheless.

March 4, 1954

It is rather strange that there seemed to be very little public interest in Indian affairs until just a few years ago, when the Federal Government of its own accord decided to bring the Indian Act up to date with the realities of the day, and in order to do so they had to bring to public attention a great many of the difficulties of Indian affairs. Right then everybody wanted to get into the picture, some to make political capital and some because they were sincerely interested. A few years ago the estimates for Indian Affairs went through the House without a word of question, but, today, they constitute a very important part of the duties of Parliament.

I noticed that the hon. members on the Government side of the House, in speaking on this question, went to great pains to bring out all the sorriest aspects of the case, and even went back into history quite a lot. There are some of us in this House, today, who have lived a large part of the history of Saskatchewan and don't have to read to such an extent as they did.

Last week, in the city of Regina, there was a conference of 31 chiefs and councillors mostly from Saskatchewan reserves with a few from Manitoba. Some of the chiefs and councillors sat in the gallery of this Assembly and listened to one of the members from the Government side, and I noticed in the paper that they applauded; the report said these Indians applauded the remarks of that speaker. Well, I had no sooner got back to my hotel than I had a phone call asking me if I would go over there and discuss the speech of the hon. gentleman with them. They were very much incensed indeed, and I think probably even from the Indians themselves there will be more heard about it.

In that particular convention covering nearly a week, social leadership was the main theme. One of the remarks made by the hon. member was that the Indian Affairs Branch had killed all social life among the Indians, and this one whole week was spent on social leadership. The Indians went away from there not perhaps as qualified leaders, but they had the idea firmly in their minds and I think much will come of it. I was impressed with these Indians, because in their discussions, they showed a vigorous and intelligent outlook that promises well for the days ahead of them.

I just want to give you an outline on what is being done, because I have been more or less intimately concerned with Indian affairs in the north country through the Indian Department, and in some other places. In their convention, last year, just to show the strides they are making, they discussed education, taxation, alcohol, management of band funds, land use and budgeting, to give them a little training in business procedure. The Indians as a rule do not talk a great deal, and in that they have an advantage over some of us; but when it came to the question of taxation they were very brief – they said they didn't want any. In fact, some of the Indians objected very much that when they go off the reserve and take a job elsewhere once in a while income tax is deducted from their pay, and unemployment insurance, and so on. They don't think even that should be taken from them; so they are very much against taxation. Some of them wondered if it might be possible to have the vote and yet not be taxed. That is not possible. An Indian can leave the reserve any time he wishes and become a full-fledged citizen, but he loses all band rights and he also becomes eligible for taxation.

In the management of band money there has been a very great advance. It used to be that all moneys received by a tribe for the sale of land and so on, had to go into a fund on which they would receive only the interest. Today, there are many other sources of income accruing to a reserve

that in other days would have gone into the band fund. The Indians themselves decided that they wanted a wider use of this money that came in from sources other than land, and today half of such money is available for distribution as cash and the other half goes into the band fund.

There are other sources of revenue today, I want to point out. Quite a change is taking place on the farming reserves. Some of the Indians are farming and, in addition, they lease out land for a period of four or five years to get it cleared and brought under cultivation quickly. The first year's use of the land by a renter is entirely for the renter; for the balance of the four or five years, the Indian band, as a whole, draws one-quarter of the revenue from the cultivated land. At the end of four years, if the Indians so wish, or in some places I believe the agreement is for five years, that land again passes into the custody of the Indians themselves, and if they so wish, they divide it up and use it themselves.

Here is a most interesting item. They sell quite a lot of timber in some places, but in Saskatchewan in particular, they are now drawing a considerable amount of money from oil leases and I think their system of leasing – I don't know just who arrived at it, whether it was the Federal Government alone or the Federal Government in consultation with the Indians – approximates the very plan that we had two years ago. They issue permits from 10 cents an acre to \$1.00 an acre, good for one year, with an extension of six months permissible, and if the permit turns into a lease they get \$1.00 an acre that is good for up to 20 years. If oil is found they draw a royalty upwards of 12½ per cent; it varies somewhat according to the depth of the well and the quality of the oil. To illustrate what they have drawn from oil permits and leases I will give you the statement of one reserve alone, the Assiniboine reserve – 'Carry the Kettle Band' it is called. Oil leases on that one little reserve, not far from here, last year distributed among the Indians \$6,664. The total amount credited to the band was \$8,185.

Regarding building, this is what is being done among the Indians on this one reserve. They have built, in the five years 1949-53, a total of 23 new homes, at an average cost per home of \$2,000. I called the Indian Commissioner, just the other day, to find out in what manner that money was raised or who paid it, and he informed me that the policy of the government was that they wished the Indian to put up to \$400 or \$500 in labour and that the Indian Department, or the Government of Canada, paid for all the materials. I know that is true because I know of five houses on the Meadow Lake reserve that have been built within the last few years. They are excellent houses – two storeys, full concrete basements – and those were the terms under which they were built, and they are in much better financial position than is this band. The money distributed, last year, in this one small Assiniboine reserve was: annuity, \$1,960; oil lease, \$6,644; welfare, \$3,300, and family allowance and old age pensions, \$21,700.

The question of citizenship is one that has been debated at great length among the Indians, and I would like to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, one striking instance. My reference is to the Komowaga Indians in the east, an old tribe, they are among the wealthiest Indians in Canada, and they are counted among the most skilful and highly paid steelworkers on the North American continent. That tribe has been particularly useful in the steel trade; they have quite a name as expert steel men. Now they have been in treaty for 250 years but they would never give up their treaty rights to the state.

Under the Indian Act, an Indian over 21 years of age has the right to vote in Dominion elections provided he waives his right to exemption from

March 4, 1954

income tax; in no case have any Indians in Saskatchewan taken advantage of this privilege. In Alberta, a few years ago there was one whole tribe who decided to become citizens of Canada and Alberta, so they asked the Government to allow them to go out of treaty – that is the term they use when they want to absolve themselves of all Indian obligations. The land was sub-divided; the whole reserve was sub-divided, and they took title to each parcel of land individually. Within five years that land was all gone, through high pressure salesmen, liquor and mortgages. The band was completely broken financially and, after being disillusioned, they asked to be taken back into treaty. They were taken back and new land was found for them. Now this is the Indians' own opinion about citizenship. The great majority of western Indians are not yet ready for full citizenship. The experience of the Provincial Government in dealing with the Metis has been proof enough for them.

There is another item here regarding health, which I will deal with a little later.

In financing, one of the things they decided for themselves was this. They had the Federal Government set up a revolving fund, and this is the way it worked at Meadow Lake. The Meadow Lake band had a band fund of \$4,000 which they obtained from selling land to the C.P.R. railroad. They borrowed against that \$4,000 and, with an additional \$2,000 out of this revolving fund of several millions in Ottawa, they bought a tractor and plow for clearing and breaking land. That was seven years ago. Today they have 2,290 acres under cultivation on the Meadow Lake reserve. Last year they grew, in addition to their summerfallow (they had a lot of it summerfallowed) 17,900 bushels of wheat and 63,000 bushels, approximately, of barley. In addition to this, there are three white renters, who have something like 700 or 800 more acres just broken and under lease, which will eventually return to the Indians. They are making remarkable headway in that reserve, as they are in many others. In fact, there is quite a difference in their outlook. It is only a few ago that I said to an Indian who was working for me during a hot try spell, "My, I hope it rains," and he said, "I don't want to see it rain." I said, "why not? You have 30 acres of good wheat in full head and a good rain would improve it greatly." He replied, "Oh, I don't want to see it rain – my tent leaks." So what was his sense of values at that time. But to this same Indian whom I saw a few weeks ago, I said, "Jim, you have a wonderful crop, a little over 7,000 bushels of grain; I suppose you will be buying a big car?" He said, "No, no, to heck with that idea. I have to build a house and buy machinery, and my wife even wants a washing machine."

So they are advancing. But a sense of value is not much better among white people and Metis. I can remember one Metis coming into my place of business just after the last war, and saying: "I had terrible luck last night." I said, "What was that?" He replied, "I left a parcel in a restaurant and in it were my discharge papers, a shirt and my liquor permit and I forgot it; when I went back this morning, it was gone." I asked him what had been done with it, and he told me they had thrown the parcel in the fire. I was thinking of the discharge papers, and I said, "Isn't that terrible!" "Yes, losing that permit was bad," he said. So his sense of value also wasn't very good. I was reading Hansard, a short time ago, and we can't laugh at the Indians nor the half-breeds because I was horrified to see, in Hansard, that the people of Canada, last year, spent more in liquor and on tobacco than would have bought all of last year's wheat, oat and barley crops. So there is not much difference between us in some respects.

During the last year, this is the construction programme that has taken place for the Indians in Canada: 1,176 new homes built at a cost of

\$880,167, and 2,225 homes repaired at a cost of \$222,000. As I said, most of that is paid for by the Federal Government.

In addition to the various other funds that the Federal Government pays to them they also have the same family allowances, old age pensions and old age security as we have among the white people.

I think perhaps their greatest advances have been in education. I heard hon. members make remarks that, I think, if they had been better acquainted with the situation they would not have made. We heard mention of concentration camps, and that Indians could not travel freely and so on. I asked Chief Bird about his liberty to travel and he said, "I have more liberty than you have. I can go anywhere at all, anywhere in this Dominion and, furthermore, I can walk across the line anytime just by showing my band card, so I do not see that our movements are circumscribed in any way at all." That is quite contrary to what one of the members said.

This is the school programme that has been under way for some seven years. There are three types of schools: residential, which have been on reserves for many years, but now the Indians have decided among themselves that they want day schools. They want a choice, and these resolutions are certainly being listened to by Ottawa; they want day schools so that the children may live at home, not be away off at some distant school. They decided that they will approve of the teacher themselves because sometimes there is a little friction on religious matters so it is up to the Indians; they can decide as to the religion of the teacher themselves.

I heard it said that the Indians never got beyond grade V. It is rather interesting to know that, today, we have many Indian children in high schools. We have some right in Regina here. Some are taking up medicine, others lab. work and technical training. For any Indian child who shows a desire for higher education, the Government of Canada will pay for all of that education – not just part of it, they pay for all of the Indians' education. The teaching staff on the Indian reserve is today, I think, probably in a better position than in the whites' schools. The standard of teachers in Indian schools has been rising steadily. Salaries offered are above those of the Province. Minimum for first-class teachers is \$1,900, with free house and fuel. Now that is quite an asset – free house and fuel; and I know that many of these combination one-room schools and residences are very nice indeed. The maximum salary, is \$3,800 for first-class teachers. There are 51 schoolrooms in Saskatchewan residential schools, and a further 68 in day schools owned by the Department.

In health – I am going to be quite brief. I had intended to take longer but it is late, and I am going to be quite brief on the question of health. An interesting thing is that in dealing with the Indians' health the Dominion of Canada wanted the Saskatchewan Government to take over the health problem of the Indians for which they would pay, of course, through the Hospitalization Tax; but this Government turned it down, very definitely. Dominion health officials have endeavored, in this province, to make a deal with the Saskatchewan Government to take over the hospitalization of the Indian population under the present hospitalization scheme, but they turned it down flat.

The Indian Affairs Branch pays for all medical aid for Indians – everything from beginning to end, as they do for education. In Saskatchewan there are, today, under the Indian Health Service plan, two hospitals at

March 4, 1954

Fort Qu'Appelle, three fulltime doctors and 120 beds fully staffed, and more registered nurses in Fort San, and other services equal to its size in Regina. North Battleford has a 60-bed hospital. In addition, Indian Health Services has every hospital at its disposal and uses these continuously; the three sanatoria are also used.

When it comes to education in the far north, I think the Minister of Education will agree with me that this information is correct, namely, that there has been a great deal of splendid co-operation between the Federal and Provincial Governments and that in the north, where the population is nearly evenly divided, the Federal Government will pay half the cost of building a school and the Indian children go to a school that is operated under the Provincial Department of Education, according to the curriculum of our educational service; and the Indian Department pays approximately \$100 a year for each child. I do not know that you could have much better assistance than that. These Indians realize that it is not a question of helping them, but a question of helping them to help themselves, and that is the programme of the Indian Department today.

I could go on and quote a great many figures but I want to leave just one thought with you. I asked Chief Mousseau just what he thought of this concern that the hon. members were showing today. He said with a twinkle in his eye, "I think maybe we'll get the vote before the next election." I will leave that thought with you.

Mr. W. H. Wahl (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I have decided after listening to the hon. gentleman, that he has never been on an Indian reserve. I would like to take him on some that I am quite familiar with.

I received a letter this morning from a man in Alberta and this is what he says:

"It is established that in November 1949. on this reserve where the land is the best, there were no potatoes, no cabbages, no carrots, onions or turnips; no garden. There was no milk, no butter. Woman were in rags, and children. They lived in mud huts. The people on the reserve need a manager or a well-meaning dictator to direct their efforts."

Now that is in Alberta and I just received this letter this morning. It is dated March 1st.

About six years ago I was in the city of Winnipeg, one Sunday, and I noticed they were conducting a 'forum' in the particular hotel where I was staying, and I decided to attend. A lady social worker who was employed by the government in Manitoba was lecturing and this is what she said: "Near all the Indian reserves there are Metis problems."

She went on to describe what the word 'Metis' means. She said that the word 'Metis' is a Spanish word for mixed blood, and so, when you described these Metis people, when you say half-breeds you are not actually correctly describing these people. They are called Metis because they have mixed blood.

She went on to say that on this particular reserve there were illegitimate children and in the adjoining countryside to where the Metis people lived there was prostitution, drinking and all that sort of thing, and they were living in slum conditions.

I recall another observation she made. I noticed that several of the other members mentioned the illegitimate children and this was her description of them. She said if you take two babies, one illegitimate and the other born in proper wedlock, if you look at them you cannot tell the difference; the difference is in the people and the way they look at these children. Then they continue that on through life and that was part of the trouble that besets these Indians and Metis people. But, nevertheless, she wanted us to go out from that meeting and publicize the plight of these particular Indian and Metis people, and when I left that meeting I had never heard of this problem before. I thought there was no way I could publicize the fact, or probably anyone in the meeting and I watched the Winnipeg papers very carefully, as we get a Winnipeg daily regularly, and I never noticed anything more about that particular social worker, so I decided she probably gave up and got married.

The next thing I had to do with Metis and Indians was when I was nominated. I decided it was my duty to look over the constituency and find out what their particular problems were, so that if I was elected, I would be able to bring them to the attention of this Assembly. Looking over the constituency I decided that by far and large the average person in the constituency was reasonably well off, and that any person with any particular problems was looked after by the Department of Social Welfare in conjunction with the particular municipalities or towns or villages they lived in, in a reasonable manner. But I discovered that on the Indian reserves (and there are two of them) these slum conditions this lady in Winnipeg had spoken about six years before, existed; and as described in this letter I had from Alberta – no gardens, no nothing. I mentioned that before.

I went on to find out about the Metis problem. It is just as bad; in fact I believe it is worse. You can go to the town of Fort Qu'Appelle and it is a beautiful place; but there is a canyon there they call 'Hell's Canyon'. When you think of a canyon by that name you think of some place in the Rocky Mountains that you look down into probably a bottomless depth. Mr. Speaker, it is an obstacle that if you fell in there would be the finish of you. But this Hell's Canyon at Lebret describes the condition of the people that live in that particular valley – I am referring to one particular valley in that area. I visited this place in company with the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Brown) after the election, and we started visiting these particular homes, and the one home we went into I am going to describe.

Incidentally, the member from Meadow Lake could never have been on a reserve or seen these Metis people. I cannot visualize him speaking like he did...

Mr. Speaker: — It is time to adjourn. It is 6 o'clock. Will you move to adjourn the debate?

Mr. Wahl: — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

The Assembly then adjourned at 6 o'clock p.m.