

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session - Twelfth Legislature**  
**31st Day**

Thursday, March 24, 1955

The House met at 3 o'clock p.m.  
On Orders of the Day:

**CORRECTION OF PRESS REPORT RE LIVESTOCK MARKETING**

**Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to mention a certain press report which I have taken objection to: "Legislature Unanimous on Livestock Board". I don't know what the other members have received, but I have been in contact with people, this morning, from various places in the province, where this headline has definitely left the impression that this Assembly passed a motion unanimously supporting a Livestock Marketing Board. I pointed out at the time this resolution was being discussed that I was afraid that the members who were talking on it would leave that impression in the House; and I want here, speaking for myself, to say I don't want that impression to get abroad. On November 4, 1954, in the "Maple Creek News" in the constituency of Maple Creek, is a report of our convention, "Liberals Opposed to Compulsory Livestock Marketing Board":

"Liberals of the Maple Creek constituency meeting here, last Thursday, went on record as being opposed to any form of compulsory livestock marketing board."

If at any time I had any reservations as to compulsory livestock marketing, I have none today. I wish to go on record as definitely opposing bringing compulsory livestock marketing boards into this province and I will stand or fall on that commitment.

**Mr. A. Loftson (Saltcoats):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I would like to repeat the protest that I made on the Orders of the Day, yesterday. I was hoping that that protest would be announced in as prominent a way as the announcement that this House was unanimously in favour of a livestock marketing board, because in reality there was nothing said in that resolution about a livestock marketing board, and the impression that is given to the province is absolutely erroneous. It was endorsing a board of livestock commissioners.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member is just reiterating what he said yesterday.

**Premier Douglas:** — The matter is a question of privilege affecting the privilege of the House, which every member has a right to raise, and I simply rise for the purpose of saying that the resolution which was passed had to do with the establishment of a national board of livestock commissioners, which was passed unanimously, and members have already drawn attention to the fact that there was an error in the heading which appeared in the 'Leader-Post'.

**March 24, 1955**

I think it should be pointed out, first of all, that as most who are familiar with newspapers and their methods of operation are aware, the man who writes an article does not write the heading. What a reporter or correspondent does is to write an article. There is one man on the newspaper whose job it is to do nothing else but write headlines. He looks at the first few paragraphs of an article, gathers the sense of the article and then writes the heading for it. Men in the Press Gallery who are writing the articles are not responsible for the headings and sometimes, if you will read an article carefully, you will find the article and the heading are quite divergent in the views they express.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, and the House will permit me, I would like to take this opportunity — I have been wanting to do it for some time — to say that I think this House ought to express its gratitude to the members of the Press Gallery for the excellent work they have done in reporting this Session of the Legislature. I don't know any session when the Legislature has been as well reported as it has been this year. Members of both sides of the House have had good publicity, and I think very fair summaries of their speeches in the House have been given in the public press. While I do not agree sometimes with the editorial policies of some of the daily newspapers in this province, I think the reports of the proceedings of the Legislature have been fair and have been extensive, and I think the members of this House ought to express their thanks to the Press Gallery for the excellent coverage which this session of the Legislature has been given.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think that those who are responsible should correct the mistake.

### **BOX CAR ALLOCATION**

Moved by Mr. Wooff, seconded by Mr. Swallow:

“That this Assembly urge the Federal Government to implement a box-car distribution that insures the farmer the right to deliver grain to the elevator of his choice.”

**Mr. R.H. Wooff (Turtleford):** — Mr. Speaker, the motion before the House, I think, is brief and to the point. The problem of allocation of box-cars is an old one. It is as old, I think, as the western grain trade. It goes back beyond the history of Saskatchewan as a province, back to those colorful days of early railroading and the coming into being of the grain elevators. These elevators have become synonymous with prairie urban life. They stand like sentinels over every hamlet, village and town on our western plains. They are practically emblematic of western agriculture. I think that they have been both blessed and cursed throughout the years by those who have patronized them. Undoubtedly they have been both a blessing and a curse to many people.

Prior to the turn of the century and the coming into being of the Manitoba Grain Act, there were rumours of the odd time when box-cars were even auctioned off to the highest bidder. As early as 1887, which was one of Manitoba's bumper wheat crops, a distribution of box cars became a real problem. As the settlers poured into western Canada and the prairies were turned into waving wheat fields, it was not long before all the existing

facilities for moving wheat became choked, and the farmers were in a quandary. The stress of flowing gold became an impossible stream to cope with. This was the period when the railroad companies hit upon the scheme for building grain elevators at every loading point and, in order to encourage capital into the elevator construction field, they made certain concessions to these elevator companies. No farmer would be allowed to load grain into a car from any point at which an elevator operated.

History, of course, repeated itself, and these elevator companies which enjoyed this special privilege, little by little came to the point where they abused it by undergrading and false weights and cuts in prices, etc. etc. In any event, such were the complaints of the farmers of that day, and it was out of this situation that, at the turn of the century, a Royal Commission was set up to investigate the complaints and to make certain definite recommendations. I think like most Royal Commissions, they did a splendid job. They made recommendations out of which came the Manitoba Grain Act in 1900 or thereabouts. Among further recommendations by this Royal Commission was the right of farmers to load grain into cars and ship it without going through the local elevators. Quite naturally, of course, the elevators who had enjoyed these privileges, resented any intrusion by legislators laying down laws and regulations. Late in 1902 or the winter of 1902-03, the Territorial Grain Growers finally sued the C.P.R. company because they would not abide by the new regulations covering the loading of grain over platforms, and it was through this struggle, which was won by the farmers, that the car order book was given birth.

The primary use of this car order book was to provide the farmers with an alternative to being driven into the clutches of unscrupulous elevator companies. I would like to emphasize the fact that it was not to cover difficulties such as we face today (that is, the allocation of cars according to the farmer's choice of elevators, that the car order book came into being. It was merely to give the farmer the choice of loading grain over the platform and shipping it without going through the elevators.

Firstly, following the debates in the Federal House in recent years on what I believe is to many of us a very important issue, one becomes aware of the fact that there is either a lot of woolly thinking, or a lot of wishful thinking or downright evasion of facts and the desire to see that justice is dispensed on this particular problem. I would like to repeat again that the car order book was never intended to allocate cars as between elevators according to choice of the farmers.

Secondly, those speaking on amendment to the Act do not ask and do not want the section covering the car order book to be rescinded or to be taken out of the Act. Nor is there any reason that I can see, for doing so. However, I consider that, for meeting the situation today, it is a rather clumsy and inefficient method of allocating cars so that farmers may deliver grain to the elevator of their choice. If I placed my name upon the car order book and had sufficient grain of my own of that particular grade to fill the car, the difficulty is not very great, the inconvenience is small. If, however, I have to spend time trying to organize some of my neighbours to help me fill the car, either because I have insufficient grain of the right grade, or because my quota at that particular time is too low, then we

**March 24, 1955**

realize that to use the car order book method is both clumsy and I think stupid. Trying to apply a section of an Act to a situation for which it was never intended by those who drew it up always confuses an issue and this is no exception.

I think we all agree that a comptroller was necessary and he has done considerable to improve the general situation. However, there are still many points in the province that have not had sufficient cars to move even the 1952 and 1953 crops. It seems as though cars are allocated to certain sections or divisions of a railway system, rather than to given points or to specific companies.

There is a constant 'passing of the buck' (to use a slang term) between the railway company and the Wheat Board. If you contact the railway, they say it is the Wheat Board that carries the responsibility, and if you contact the Wheat Board, they claim that it is the railroad company's fault. But the Wheat Board and the National railway, at least, Mr. Speaker, are both creatures of the Federal Government, who should, I believe, and finally must, take the responsibility of satisfactorily settling this problem. I don't think there is any other group of people producing on the same scale as members of the Wheat Pool who are forced by circumstances and lack of legislation to bypass their own handling facilities with their own product and use channels which not only do not make them savings, but actually constitute an expense to them.

There are shipping points in the province that serve very good illustrations of the situation as it exists at the present time. I am only going to use one, that of Sintaluta. Sintaluta is a point of four elevators and, over a 17-year period, the Sintaluta district has delivered over 50 per cent to the Wheat Pool, and at the moment Sintaluta gets only 25 per cent of the cars that go to that point. Now, I think, over a period of time, by the use of the car order book, which, as I said a moment ago, I consider both clumsy and at times stupid in its application to this situation, they have been able to raise that 25 per cent quota to some extent. If Sintaluta were an isolated case in the province it would not be too bad, but it is rather the rule than the exception. Wheat Pool officials have estimated that there has been a loss of three quarters of a million dollars in patronage dividends and credits to Wheat Pool members because these members of this particular organization, who have built their own facilities, are not allowed to make full use of them.

I have just briefly raised some of the problems, and probably we will ask what are any suggestions in the overcoming of this particular difficulty. There have been suggestions made from time to time. Some of them — and this one I feel has real merit, and before I sit down I shall cover it just briefly. This suggestion requests that a new section be put into the Act in question, allowing farmers to indicate in their permit book the acreage they wish to deliver to a certain elevator company or companies. Where no preference is indicated in the permit book, that acreage would be divided by the number of elevators at that particular point. The total percentage delivered to a Pool Elevator at a given point would be the acreage indicated in the permit book plus one-quarter of the acreage not indicated by

the farmer in his permit book. There would be no compulsion in this section of the Act whatever. Only farmers wishing to choose their elevator need indicate their preference.

I feel that this suggestion has a possibility of solving this aggravating question of members of an organization that have spent years in building up these facilities, who because of the lack of legislation, quite apart from congestion, are in many cases unable to make use of the very facilities that they over the years have spent so much time and effort in building up so that they have some control over marketing and movement of the grain that they produce year by year.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by Mr. Swallow, the resolution standing in my name.

**Mr. A.P. Swallow (Yorkton):** — Mr. Speaker, the member for Turtleford (Mr. Wooff) has done a very good job in dealing with this resolution. I am sure he has given many reasons why all the members in the House should support this resolution. I feel that if every farmer in the province had a vote on this resolution, a very large majority would favour it. I am sure all the farmer members of the House have experienced the difficulties that farmers have in delivering their grain to the elevators of their choice.

I remember the Leader of the Opposition mentioned, the other day, that he was forced to take grain to another elevator rather than the one he usually deals with, and that, I think, is the experience of most of the farmers.

Last summer when the quota opened, I sold 600 bushels of very good No. 2 wheat for No. 3. The case was that I was either forced to take it to another company where I could have got No. 2, or pass up my own elevator, and I did not feel that, because of a very unfair distribution of box-cars, I should have to take it to a company that I had not dealt with before, and I therefore took it to my own elevator. The penalty was the difference between No. 2, and No. 3 wheat.

A few years back, when there weren't the problems we have today, there seemed to be a lot of room in the elevators; we can remember the towns where there were 4 or 5 elevators. Among the line companies there were some agents who received a very good handling and filled their elevators up. There were other agents who only received a very small amount, hardly sufficient to keep their elevators open. The agent possibly gave better services, opened his elevator earlier in the morning — I don't know about grades; but, in general, the public had more confidence in him. But, today, under the way the box-cars are distributed, every agent is assured that his elevator will be filled, and the true principles of free enterprise, fair competition and better service are absolutely removed today because of the distribution of box-cars.

I wonder what we would think of a system if our wholesalers who supply our retailers with goods, adopted the same methods. Supposing there were two hardware stores in a small town, Mr. Speaker. Suppose the member of Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) operated one and I operated the other; he operated a better store than I did.

**March 24, 1955**

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Naturally.

**Mr. Swallow:** — He was more popular, and maybe it was his Irish smile — I don't know what it was; but, anyhow, suppose when he ordered, say, 10 kegs of nails, or 10 lock sets, the wholesaler delivered the same amount to me. He kept his store cleaner, his stock better, and possibly he could get more credit than I could. The result would be that he would have to advise his customers that he had sold his quota, that they must come to my store, although I did not give the service. Now, Mr. Speaker, sounds silly; but it is not any more silly than the system we have through the unfair distribution of box-cars.

As I said before, I think every farmer has experienced what it is to pass up the elevator to which he has gone for many years. He gets his grain fanned there and gets all these services, but he is forced to take his grain to other companies that he does not wish to.

There seems to be a misunderstanding as to who is responsible for this. It seems a Pool committee within the province decided to do something about it, and they wired the Board of Railway Commissioners, and they received a reply back that the Wheat Board instructions require (this is not the exact wording, but very close) that empties be supplied equally when they have grain to ship to the elevators. That was the reply received from the Railway commissioners, and they immediately received another reply from the Grain Commission: "The board have no control over the distribution of box-cars, but will advise railways and hope that action will be taken". It seems to be hard to tell whose responsibility it is. It is passed from one to the other.

This resolution is not asking anything that is not fair. It is not even suggesting what amendment should be made to the Grain Act, and it is not suggesting the solution. But the feeling is that the authorities in Ottawa have advisers who are capable of solving it, if they wish to. Many other problems have been solved in the past: distribution of goods in time of war is much more difficult; and other times when they want to. But it seems that there is nothing done, and they do not wish to do anything about it. So, Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to second this motion.

**Mr. Wm. S. Thair (Lumsden):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words on the resolution. Members of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool are much concerned over the problem of box-car allocation as outlined in this resolution.

After some years of comparative quiet, the wheat growers of western Canada particularly, have become remarkably active in urging the Federal Government to face up honestly to the unfair distribution of box-cars for grain deliveries in western Canada. I might quote from a short article in the 'Western Producer' of December 9th, "Car allocations":

"When the Rt. Hon. C.D. Howe addressed the annual meeting of the delegates of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool one, and only one, matter evoked strong criticism. The criticism was unanimous and sharp. It was aroused by

the unfair method of car allocation, the basis that is presently used for the distribution of box-cars to country elevators, and it added this has been a bone of contention and the cause of much protest and deep dissatisfaction among the western farmers for some time.”

Mr. Speaker, because of the great elevator congestion in the country, particularly of Pool elevators, as well as at the terminals, and the restricted delivery, the quotas for grain, the proper operation of the car order book was inoperative and incapable of handling the situation of a fair distribution of box-cars under the car order book, and, slowly but surely this is cutting the yearly handling of the Saskatchewan Wheat pool, year by year. At the present time the railway company allocates cars to the elevators at shipping points on the basis of one elevator, one car. According to the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, this means that the farmers are not able, of course, to deliver their grain to the elevator of their choice, and actually forces the farmers to deliver to another elevator or keep their grain at home.

The ‘Western Producer’ has quoted some figures to show that an elevator which normally handles some 75 per cent of the grain at any shipping point in Saskatchewan, gets the same number of cars as one that handles some 25 per cent of the grain, and thus they are cutting down yearly on the handlings of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. Probably the same occurs in the other provinces as well. I would like to quote from a report of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool in 1954 wherein it states:

“The deliveries of grain to Saskatchewan Pool Elevators from the 1953-54 crop year are just over some 44 per cent of the total amount of grain delivered, or a reduction from the previous year of some .66 of one per cent. For 1949 and 1950 the Pool elevators handled over 51 per cent of the total Saskatchewan deliveries and since that date all handlings of grain by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool have decreased steadily to the low point of 44 per cent, or a little over, of the handlings of last year.”

I believe that, unless some immediate strong action is taken, it is only a matter of a few years until the handlings of the Saskatchewan Pool Elevators will drop to below the 40 per cent of the actual handling of grains, and may get down to 30 or 35 per cent if this continues. This is due to the manipulation of the box-car allocation, which has been put into effect and is controlled by or under the Canada Wheat Board Act.

I do not intend to outline the operations of the car order book since 1950; but, I would like to indicate what has been done by the Pool organizations of the three western provinces and why they have considered the plans which have enabled the farmers to deliver grain and to ship from the elevator of their choice. I would like to quote again from the annual report of the 1954 meeting of the delegates of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and I quote in this regard:

**March 24, 1955**

“It was finally agreed to ask for an amendment to the Canada Grain Act and the Wheat Board Act to provide that growers could indicate by ballot the choice of elevator to which they preferred to deliver grain at their regular shipping point, and that cars should be distributed by the railway company with the preference so indicated.”

I understand from the Wheat Pool that this plan was submitted as an amendment to the Canada Grain Act and was discussed with the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Inter-provincial Pool Committee in February, 1954. The Minister of Trade and Commerce advised the Committee that the Government was not prepared to accept the Pool's proposal at this time. At a later date, the same Inter-provincial Committee of the Pool recommended that a car cycle be installed, and that the crop year 1945-1946 to 1949-50 should be used as a basis for this purpose, as representing that period when they had free grain movement and the growers had been able to select the elevator to which they wished to make delivery.

Again, Mr. Speaker, they met the Transport controller, the Canadian Wheat Board and the Minister of Trade and Commerce during the month of July, 1954, and again the Minister of Trade and Commerce advised the Committee that he regretted that it would not be possible (these are his own words) “to bring the proposed car cycle into operation at this time.”

In the meantime, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, according to the report of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, November, 1954, had accepted the invitation from the Board of Directors of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool to attend and address this meeting on the grain situation and, as a result of this meeting, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. C.D. Howe) reported as follows:

“As a result of this meeting the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the Hon. C.D. Howe, . . .

I made a mistake here it should be the Saskatchewan Pool delegates —

“the Saskatchewan Pool delegates, last November, had a frank and full discussion of this matter regarding the allocation of box-cars and a good many delegates said exactly what they thought about the whole matter, and since that time the inter-provincial Pool Committee, made up from the three prairie provinces had continued negotiations with the Hon. C.D. Howe,”

I believe they have reported back very recently to the Committee that the allocation of box-cars is not by any means a dead issue and that the door is not closed to further negotiations. So it is the feeling of some of the Pool directors that at least they have made some little progress in the past year.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I report that there is very general support among the farm organizations in western Canada for this resolution, which includes the Farmers' Union of the three western provinces, the Canadian Federation of Agriculture the Association of Rural Municipalities, the three

western Wheat Pools and other organizations. I might also say that the Saskatchewan Liberal party in their convention at Saskatoon, last fall, urged a change in the Canada Grain Act (I am quoting from the 'Leader-Post'):

"To the effect that a change in Canada Grain Act be made to provide for the placing of box-cars at country elevators in accordance with the farmers' preference, so that they can deliver grain to the elevator of their choice and also, if necessary, retain for the individual growers their right to order box-cars under the car order book section."

I am sure the members on both sides of the House will heartily support this resolution. In closing, Mr. Speaker, I say that I am glad to support this motion.

**Mr. W.H. Wahl (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this motion, because there is a very important principle involved and one that I have often heard the Opposition express concern over and that is freedom, only they use a different term; they say 'compulsion', and accuse this Government of it on many occasions.

I was very glad to hear the member who moved the resolution mention Sintaluta as an example, because very close to Sintaluta is the No. 1 homestead of the province, and I always consider this part of the country, which is in the Qu'Appelle-Wolseley constituency, where much of the progress that is mentioned in this 50 years came from.

Again it is very interesting because the farmer thought that over 50 years ago he had this right to deliver grain to the elevator of his choice, or load it over the platform, and I think he was surprised, the old farmer, when he found that this was not true in the last few years, that he did not have freedom to choose where he wanted to deliver his grain. I have a little article here which illustrates this and it says:

"It is only in the movement of grain that the railways presume to interfere with the normal channels of trade. A railway does not tell a manufacturer or wholesaler that he may not have any more box-cars or additional supplies, and it does not tell a big department store that it cannot have another carload of goods because the small merchant across town is not also ready to receive another carload, and that is a very important point."

It seems to me that this resolution is tied up some way with the Opposition in this House, and I cannot help but feel that it is because of the point I mentioned — freedom and compulsion. If you go back to 1944, the people of this province, I believe, voted to destroy the government of that time because of its corrupt practices. I don't think they were so concerned . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order. The hon. member must withdraw that.

**March 24, 1955**

**Mr. Wahl:** — I have to withdraw? I withdraw. Nevertheless, I don't think they were so concerned about electing a socialistic government. In 1948, they were very concerned about strengthening the Opposition, and I think in 1952 again they were alarmed that they had strengthened the Opposition, and they turned around and elected this Government then and these 42 members partly because they didn't want the old Liberal Government, and partly because they commenced to like the programme which they connected with this C.C.F. government.

**Mr. Cameron:** — I thought he was going to say because of the box-cars.

**Mr. Wahl:** — But, after all that time and all those years, after listening to the radio broadcasts, the Opposition always kept harping on freedom and they did not like what they termed compulsion, which they attributed to this Government. But, nevertheless, this box-car allocation is not something that has cropped up in the last year; it is not new. They never expressed any concern about it. They thought it was perfectly all right for one elevator when it was usual for them to get 51 or 52 per cent of the grain, to lose 12 per cent of the deliveries because they could not get box-cars to get the grain out of their elevators. They never expressed concern about that.

I am told — in fact, here is proof of it; here is a letter from the Grain Commissioners to the Manitoba Pool, and this is January 10, 1955. They say there is nothing in the Canada Grain Act which instructs or authorizes the railway company to allocate cars between elevators on a car-for-car basis, when distribution is not made through the car order book. So, evidently the Board of Grain Commissioners can say where these cars can be allocated, and a very interesting point comes up here again. We have one of our opposition members who has a member of his family on the Board of Grain Commissioners and I was thinking that maybe the Liberals would correct this injustice because of him.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Is that the way the C.C.F. work? Is that the way the C.C.F. does things?

**Mr. Cameron:** — The right person in the right spot.

**Mr. Wahl:** — Nevertheless, this interesting example of freedom is at stake and it could very well, as the member from Lumsden (Mr. Thair) said, destroy the elevator that the farmer built, and that is the Pool elevator, because they could well get their bins low enough with this tremendous elevator system that they have, that they could not afford to carry on.

There is another very interesting reason, too. They probably think that the line elevators like this compulsion, but I am told, on good authority, by line elevator agents that they do not like this state of affairs either, because they say that the people who ordinarily haul to them — their elevators are full and they cannot take their grain. So, . . .

**Mr. Cameron:** — All in one happy family.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Getting balled up badly.

**Mr. Wahl:** — So, I am going to support this resolution, and I am expecting the opposition will, too, because I think they have turned down this

gross example of taking the freedom of the right of the farmer to deliver his grain to the elevator of his choice, away from him.

**Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River);** — Mr. Speaker, a resolution of this kind crops up every year. I hope it will crop up for a long time, because then we will have a good crop and lots of wheat in the elevators, because that is the reason for this problem.

After we have listened to three speakers on the other side, and I think they are all practical farmers (well, I wouldn't accuse the last member of being farmer, but I think the other two are), and they have not advanced any practical solution. The member who introduced the resolution very correctly said that the Canada car order book was no solution for this distribution of cars. I don't think it was ever intended to be a solution, because in those days the problem was not very great, if it was any problem; it was only increased by abnormal conditions.

First of all, we had this problem in the early days of the war when every port in the world that received grain shipments from Canada was closed, except the port of Great Britain. All the other ports were closed to commerce and ships and, as a consequence the wheat piled up in our elevators, and not only in our elevators in Saskatchewan, but on the ground. They built temporary storages to hold some (I think it was) 5 million bushels, just temporary storage. Then for a short time after the war there wasn't any problem, because immediately in the old lands there was a demand to get grain in there quickly, and the temporary congestion of our elevators was a problem of the past.

But, it recurred again, largely because farmers had three crops in two years. I say we had five good crops in 6 years, Mr. Speaker, and then we gradually built up until we are in the position we are now. Just now there is no immediate prospect of a solution. I hope there won't be any solution, because that means there will be another bad crop, and we don't want that under any circumstances, or a largely increased export demand.

I don't think anyone can accuse me of drumming-up business for the line companies or anybody else. I was a Wheat Pool delegate for several years, and I am a Wheat Pool member today, and all the wheat that I ever produced on the farm goes to the Pool until the last year or year and a half, and here is the situation. Take my own town of Davidson. I had a talk with several Pool men, and they do not have any solution for it. If they have, I have never seen it in print. What will you do, Mr. Speaker, when you have about 8 elevators in a town; you have 63 per cent of all the farmers in that town signed up as Pool members; the Pool has about 32 or 35 per cent of the storage space in that town. What will you do when you have all the elevators, except the Pool elevators, empty while the Pool elevators are full? What would you do? Well, they draw up into the other elevators, and there are just as many pool elevator members in the private elevators in my town as there are Pool members with their grain in the Pool elevators. Now they are all full; every one of them is full to the door. Some of my wheat is in another elevator, not because I want it there, but because that is the only place I could deliver it.

**March 24, 1955**

Now, when the cars come in, they give two cars or so to each elevator; sometimes one might get three and sometimes they come in 40 cars — like last Spring, 40 cars in two days. Then, of course, there's more cars to each elevator; but ordinarily they come along about one or two cars to each elevator. If they shoved all those cars to the Pool elevator to empty the Pool elevator, I certainly would protest and so would dozens of other farmers, because we happen to have been forced through circumstances to put our wheat in the line elevator. Now, what are you going to do for a solution of that kind of situation?

There is no solution. If the Government actually passed a law that will compel the Pool farmer to deliver his wheat to the Pool elevator, then he will sit with his wheat on the farm until enough cars are put into the Pool elevator to empty it. That's the only solution of it; I don't think there is any other solution. They tried the car order book up in my town and in other towns as well. There was pretty near a riot there one day. They started the car order book and it confused the whole situation, and the farmers themselves demanded that the car order book be taken away. I think it is back now again, but it isn't doing any good because, as I said, every elevator is full and there are no more cars except what dribbles in now and then.

Now, if you have plenty of space, you don't need any legislation for a situation of this kind. If you get cars enough in there to remove enough wheat out of the elevators and there is open space (not empty by any means, but a certain amount of space, where they have a 2,000 or 3,000 bushel space in each elevator), you don't need anything, because immediately they are going to draw in more wheat. But, again, there is this problem. If there is 34 or 35 per cent space in the Pool elevator in the town it will be filled very rapidly because there are about 63 per cent signed up as Wheat Pool supporters in that town. Well, when that is filled up without the cars coming in fast enough to keep open space in the elevator, you have the same condition again, and every elevator is filled up. But you are not going to stop the farmer, because he signed a Pool contract to deliver to the Pool, from hauling 6,000 or 8,000 bushels of wheat to the line elevator company to get money to get his fuel to go out and seed, and get oil for his family and to keep them warm or anything like that, because he needs that money. Where is he going to get the money to finance unless he can get that wheat in? And the only place he can get that wheat in is in the elevator where there is room, and that is not always in the Pool elevator. And that is a solution, but I don't know any legal solution.

One of the members over there suggested or mentioned something about that when a farmer gets his permit he should designate to what elevator he wants to deliver his wheat. I think that is a bad practice, because, you know, we have heard the story from the C.C.F. about what these elevator companies are trying to do to the farmers: they tried to cheat them on the grade and on the weight and everything else. If I happened to be in the position where I had to indicate that I was going to haul my wheat to the National elevator and that was the place where I had to take my wheat, then I might get stung, according to what we hear from over there. I don't think that myself, but no doubt it happened in the early days. When I came here in 1904 or 1905, the first crop we ever hauled out, we found out that there was only one elevator, and we were practically all forced to sell to that elevator. We never got the grade that we were entitled to. I remember one

morning we went there and he was weighing a small load; he didn't have over 50 or 55 bushels on, and I was standing right back of him looking on, and he said, "Mr. Adams, wasn't there another 20 pounds on this?" "Oh, yes, I almost forgot." But that was a common practice. We eliminated all that sort of thing because we went into business ourselves and rectified these things.

I am not afraid of the Pool elevator going out of business. I am sure when the time comes and it will be soon enough, when larger export demand opens our elevators, you will see that wheat that formerly went to the Pool elevators will go there.

**Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):** — Nature will take care of that.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I think I speak for all the farmers in that respect. What are the present conditions? I haven't found a person yet — and I talked to the elevator man up there; we sat down and talked it over one day; he wasn't very busy and we discussed this matter for about an hour and a half and he didn't see any solution to it, and I never found any one who really has a solution to that problem; and I said, "All right, You don't need any regulations." If there is no room and everybody is sitting back on the farm holding wheat and every elevator is filled to the door, the man who has to put his wheat in the private elevator or the line company elevator is entitled to just as much consideration and as many cars as the Pool man who has his wheat in the Pool elevator, and unless you do happen to find a solution to that, you haven't done anything.

I am going to support this resolution. I'm going to support it because it draws attention to a problem, but it suggests no solution. It is all very well for my friend over there to laugh. It is not a laughing matter for people who sit out in the country in snow and frost and rain and mud, with probably their granaries half full or full of grain from 1953, and they haven't been able to get it all in to probably even pay their taxes. I know people in my district who are just in that position, and in the Spring now when they need more money, we hope this wheat pool payment will finally come through on the 1953 crop, and there are some small payments on grain that are dribbling through; but after all, what they need is to get a few cars in so they can get some wheat in, and get at least \$500 or \$600 so they can go ahead and finance their Spring operations. So it is no laughing matter, and I say to you that the problem is there, and if there are any of these wise men who sit there and condemn everybody else, let us hear what they have to say. Let them give us the solution to it, and then let us discuss the practical thing.

I am going to support the resolution, and I think that some of my friends on this side of the House will, too, just because it is a thing that we never oppose. Who put the car order book into effect? It certainly wasn't any C.C.F. government. It was put there at the request of the farmers of western Canada — never mind who the government was; I don't know what the government was in that day, but it doesn't make one bit of difference. When you commence to deal with the problem of farming on a political basis, then you are treading on very, very dangerous ground and there has never been one solution that has been found to our problem but by federal legislation, and practically every problem that we have had has been remedied, or tried to be remedied, by legislation that has been passed by

**March 24, 1955**

federal action, and there is nothing done on a political basis. It has been done because it was of great public concern, and so it is today.

**Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) that this is no laughing matter, but I can assure him that we were not laughing at the problem which exists in the country. The laughing matter was the hon. member for Arm River who has been all around the world on this question, now arguing against it, saying it can't be done without compulsion and saying it won't work anyway unless there is a crop failure and a shortage of grain . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — That's ridiculous.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . and then he ends up by saying that he is going to support the motion. Mr. Speaker, he came awfully near to talking himself out of it. It is a good job he stopped when he did or he would have convinced himself that it was no good and he would have opposed the motion.

**Mr. McDonald:** — If you had been awake when he was speaking, you would have known what he said.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I remember when on Pool elevator in the town where there were four elevators would normally handle half of the wheat that went to market in that town. That has happened on many occasions in the past, and that was just as true, in those times, in years of big crops when there would be considerable periods when the elevators were plugged, as it was in years of small crops. Just as true one time as the other. My hon. friend from Arm River does not need to try to convince us, or the farmers in the province of Saskatchewan, that to remedy the situation which exists at the present time and to give to the farmer the choice of delivering his grain where he wants to, cannot be done without compulsion. It can be done. I don't think it is necessary to go into details. The authorities who are responsible for this know how it should be done; they have done it before. They have maintained conditions that allowed us to market the grain at the elevator of our choice.

The hon. member admitted in a town where the Pool elevator is full of grain, the other elevators all get full of grain, and in that town half the farmers want to market through the Pool. He never thought apparently of having the wheat go through that Pool elevator at a faster speed than through the rest, and it could go through that elevator at a faster speed, provided they get the box-cars to load it out. And that is exactly what I said, and that is what the resolution is talking about, but he says it cannot be done.

**Mr. Danielson:** — No, No, Mr. Speaker. I never said anything of the sort. I pointed that out when cars come in and the elevator has space, then the problem is solved.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member went into pretty good details.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, he went into enough details to get himself completely muddled up on this. There is no doubt about that.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Oh, no.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — He told us this could not be done without compulsion. That is what he said.

**Premier Douglas:** — Or a crop failure.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Or a crop failure.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I said the only way you could get the Pool member's wheat into the Pool elevators when they are all filled up would be by compulsion, that they should have the order to deliver it, but not if there are box cars . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I think that is about what he said — there had to be compulsion if it was going to work. He got up and he used that word just now and he definitely said you would have to compel the Pool members to deliver their wheat to the Pool elevators. Then he mentioned the suggestion made by the hon. member for Turtleford (Mr. Wooff). I don't know if it would work or not, but the farmer could designate on their permit book where he desires — not to put in the permit book a binding agreement; he did not say that — but his desires as to delivery. Naturally, the loyal Pool members, like the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson), might put down 'Pool Elevator' and then, on the basis of the choice of the farmers at that shipping point, the box-cars could be allocated to those elevators for that year, and that would certainly be better than it is now and well worth trying.

I hope this resolution can get the unanimous support of this House, because I think that the Liberal government at Ottawa needs some prodding about this thing . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — And a lot of other things.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — They are apparently more interested in giving advantages to the line elevator companies than to our own farmer-owned Pool elevators and, therefore, I am very interested in seeing this resolution pass this House unanimously.

**Mr. E.H. Walker (Gravelbourg):** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to take a few minutes to correct some statements of my hon. friend from Arm River (Mr. Danielson). Of course, his statement that crop failure is the only thing that would solve the problem is the usual argument that the Liberal 'old guard' uses: when we have good crops, it will solve all our problems and when we have poor crops it is going to solve it again.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege again. I didn't say any such thing. I said if you get a crop failure or a heavy export demand, you will empty the elevators.

**March 24, 1955**

**Mr. E.H. Walker:** — A crop failure is what I said, Mr. Speaker. The part I want to point out to the hon. member, if he is not aware of the annual report of the Saskatchewan Pool Elevators, where they point out that, throughout most of the province, the country elevators were badly congested and unable to receive all the grain offered. Thus, the percentage of receipts remained below 45 per cent total marketings. In the early part of the season receipts were below 40 per cent, and they have gradually come up. There is no question that, if the Pool members indicated their intentions that they wished to deliver their wheat to the Pool and cars were placed there accordingly, the wheat handled by the Pool elevators would be substantially increased.

I also want to mention the statement made by the hon. member that nobody has offered any plan to solve this problem. Of course, as usual the hon. member is a year or two behind — but, that is not bad; he is only two years behind the times . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Let's have it.

**Mr. E.H. Walker:** — By 1953 the Pool Committee of the three prairie provinces approached the Board of Grain Commissioners and urged that certain changes be made and they offered a plan, with amendments to the car order book in such a manner that the farmer could deliver his grain to the elevator of his choice. The Board of Grain Commissioners, after getting advice from the Federal Government at Ottawa, were told that they did not have the authority to do it, and, of course, the Federal Government was then approached, and they refused to act on the plan offered by the Pool in 1953. So, at the end of that year, the Wheat Pool organizations went back to the Federal Government with another plan, something similar to that mentioned by the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Brockelbank) under which the grower would have an opportunity to indicate his choice of delivery point. Once again, the Federal Government, through the Hon. C.D. Howe, turned down the plan which the Pool offered. The Committee again met with the transport comptroller some time after the month of July last year, and they are again working on some sort of a plan to give the grower an opportunity to deliver his wheat to the elevator of his choice. In this case and at this time they are apparently discussing a plan in connection with what they call a "proposed car cycle," in which they base the car distribution on the wheat deliveries of some periods when there was no congestion and when the grower could deliver to the elevator of his choice. Once again, I would suggest that, if they use a method such as that, it is going to mean that the grower will not have an opportunity to deliver wheat to the elevator of his choice, because it would be based on 10 or 15 years previously.

I think those are the only points I need to mention. I might mention that this was taken from the annual report of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, if my friends care to look it up. Of course, I am going to support the motion, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) stated that the only practical solution to the problem would be either a crop

failure or a very active demand for wheat in the export market. He overlooked one very practical solution to the whole problem and that would be advance payments on farm-stored grain, and that is the only manner under which we will get orderly marketing that will permit a farmer to market his grain casually, rather than everyone rushing in when the quota is opened.

That is the solution, and I would suggest to the hon. member for Arm River, too, that a crop failure is not going to provide a solution to the problem because this is the day of trucking. Everyone wants to deliver, and of necessity must deliver their grain as speedily as possible, and you will have the same congestion even though you have a normal crop, as you do when you have the kind of crops that we have had in the last few years. The only solution to that problem would be advance payment for farm-stored grain, as far as I can see.

The matter of basing the allocation of box cars on the amount of delivery indicated to each elevator should not be difficult, if there are box-cars available. It is just a matter, as the hon. Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Brockelbank) said, of speeding up the movement through that particular elevator. I know there would be some embarrassment to farmers if all tried to get their grain through one elevator very speedily, but this would be taken care of, if we had a system of advanced payments on farm-stored grain, which I believe is coming.

This problem is with us because of the rapid manner in which farmers can take their grain to market. We had orderly marketing before, for the simple reason that we had to walk behind a sleigh for 10 or 12 or 15 miles to deliver our grain to the elevator; now the grain goes in very speedily by truck. So this problem is going to stay with us, and the only final solution will be a system of advance payments on farm-stored grain. Adoption of this scheme will automatically bring about orderly marketing.

**Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena):** — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add a few words to this discussion. I was most amused listening to the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) talking about the solution being to grow less wheat. I thought if ever a solution was a very weak one, that was it. He pointed out that in his town of Davidson, 63 per cent of the farmers are Pool members. Why then don't they, by the same proportion, issue the box cars to those elevators? Why not send 63 per cent of the cars which come into that town to the Pool, if 63 per cent of the farmers would like to deliver to the Pool?

To say the only solution is compulsion by law — to compel the farmers to deliver to the Pool — that that is the only way we can do it, well, we have compulsion now, Mr. Speaker. We have compulsion to deliver to the elevator companies to which we don't want to deliver. We are compelled, through the distribution of box-cars of the present day, to deliver to the line elevator companies. That compulsion is done, and if it isn't done by the Commission or the government at Ottawa, it is done with their blessing and their amen, because they are doing nothing to prevent it.

He mentioned that with all the brains and the wise men on this side of the House, maybe we would come up with a solution. Well, I am

**March 24, 1955**

certain, after listening to the speech of the hon. member for Arm River, that there are no brains on that side of the House if he is representative of all the members over there in his contribution to this debate.

A year ago, in the federal House at Ottawa, a private member's Bill was introduced to amend the Canada Grain Act whereby a farmer could sign up with the elevators on a voluntary basis, as to which elevator he wanted to deliver his grain.

**Mr. McDonald:** — He can do that now.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — That member's resolution was killed by the Liberals who are at Ottawa. And they said it was the wish of the Pool that they didn't want to have such a Bill. Well, I don't know whether the Pool indicated their wishes to them or not, but I do know that the Wheat Pool, last year, at their annual convention went on record as passing a resolution in favour of a fair distribution of box-cars whereby the farmer designate to what elevator they wanted to deliver their grain, the box-cars to be so allocated that the farmers could deliver their grain. As for the town of Davidson, at which, the hon. member mentioned, all the elevators were filled, then out of this you would have thought if they gave the Wheat Pool 63 per cent of the cars and the others 37 per cent, each farmer could go to the elevator of his choice. At the end of the year, when the crop year was out, it would leave all farmers in the same position.

I know of numerous cases where the Pool elevators in a given town were filled to capacity at the start of the crop year, but the line elevators had a chance to get theirs out . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Where was that? What town was that?

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — I have seen it in my own town of Archerwill. If you check the records you will find it for yourself.

**Mr. Danielson:** — The Pool didn't get theirs out, and the others did?

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — Yes, the Pool didn't have the cars. In the town of Archerwill for many years there were two elevators, the Pool and the Grain Growers. The Pool had about 60 per cent of the business and the Grain Growers 40 per cent. The Searle Elevator Company built an elevator in there, but they got little or nothing. They were getting a very small percentage of the delivery of wheat until the box-car situation forced it on them, and now they get a third of it and each gets about a third now, where the Pool used to get about 60 per cent of it. You can check and find this information. The Wheat Pool will supply it for you.

I have before me, Mr. Speaker, a copy of the two Bills which were moved at Ottawa. One was moved last year and one again this year. It was moved last Session, but in November of 1953, Bill No. 3 was an Act to amend the Canada Grain Act. I don't want to go into details, but the explanatory note that goes with it says:

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

That Bill, Mr. Speaker, last year in the House of Commons, was killed by the Liberal majority, after Mr. Howe got up and made a few statements on it. There is a similar Bill before the House of Commons today, with identically the same explanatory note on the back of it. But, I am sure that if our friends at Ottawa, the Liberal Government, are sincere in trying to do for the farmers what the farmers of the west would like to see done, then I am sure, that if the wording of this Bill as such does not meet exactly the necessary changes in the Canada Grain Act, knowing what the idea and the wishes of farmers are, surely they could offer helpful amendments. With their majority, they could have amended the Bill to make it do what it should have done. If their attitude is that this Bill wouldn't do for the farmers of the West what it was purported to do, to give a fair distribution of box-cars if that is the case, then, with their majority, they could have amended the Bill so it would. But, what do they do? Rather than half a slice they take away the whole loaf.

They have been very famous all through the times for doing that to the farmers and the farmers' friends, and the speech we have heard here, this afternoon, from the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) is a pretty typical one. He said the only thing we would be doing here would be treating farmers on a political basis. But I would like to know how he gets that. Because we are asking for a fair deal for the Wheat Pool, does he mean to say that the Wheat Pool would be put on a political basis? I am sure that none of the elevator companies have officially opposed any politics, and the Wheat Pool is no different from other elevator companies; but I am sure that the Wheat Pool has been more discriminated against than any of the other elevator companies in the allocation of box-cars today. So, when he said the farmers would be set on a political basis where they are not now, I think the reverse would be true.

In 1928, where I worked in the western part of this province, there was no allocation of box-cars. The Pool elevator which was at a little siding called Whitepool (I believe it was Whitepool) yes, Astum was on the C.P. and Whitepool was on the C.N., right alongside of each other. The Astum line elevator on the C.P. never opened its doors year after year because the farmers were Wheat Pool members; never took in a bushel for a number of years. The record will bear that out. But this Wheat Pool elevator at Whitepool took in more grain each Fall, including this other one at Astum, than seven surrounding elevators thereabouts, because the people wanted to haul to the Pool and people were satisfied with that Pool elevator. But, today, under the present situation, all that fellow could take in would be one-seventh of the grain. The elevator which used to be closed down year after year at Astum, will now be operating equally as great as the Pool.

**March 24, 1955**

Those conditions, I submit, are not fair; they are not just. The farmers of this province are tired of tolerating that sort of a set-up. I think it is time that we passed pretty strong resolutions in the House, far stronger than this one, condemning the action of the Federal Government in delaying the necessary reforms for the wheat grower. We have suffered in a good many ways. Why suffer a way that we don't need to? I shall support this motion.

**Hon. T.J. Bentley (Minister of Public Health):** — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a word on this resolution, because I think there are a few things that need to be said; I won't take long to say them. When members on this side of the House, or anywhere in the country, state that there has been discrimination against the Pool and more than just the allocation of box-cars, they are stating the truth, and the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) if he wishes to be fair about, should know that is a fact; also, the other older members. I don't blame the younger ones, those who were not too keenly interested some years ago, of the younger ones who were away serving the country.

I want to remind my friends opposite that there has not been one single occasion in the history of the development of the Wheat Pool when there was a controversy between the Pool and the grain trade, the private grain trade, when the grain trade was not given some preference in treatment, and a good many of those years, definite lip support, public support by speakers for the Liberal party, including the Rt. Hon. Mr. Gardiner, Minister of Agriculture. I will give one or two illustrations. I will take you back to the year 1943, when I know every Liberal member in this House probably now has succumbed to the pressure of Liberal talk; but the Liberal government that year took it on itself to fix the price of wheat and to abolish trading in futures on the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. Maybe members over there honestly believe this. I would like to disabuse their minds by telling them the truth of what happened at that time.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — We all know.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — I don't know if my hon. friend does. If he does he can get up and correct me if I give a wrong illustration. The only reason the government at Ottawa finally acceded to the request of the farmers and the farm organizations by abolishing the futures trading in wheat, was not to agree with the farm organizations; it was not for any sympathy with the farmers; it was simply because the open market had got into such conditions during those war years, that it was impossible to deliver grain sold on the street against a future contract in any reasonable length of time. Wheat that was held by the private traders for the October or December delivery, could not be delivered in October or December, because of the war demands on box-cars. That is the only reason why the government at Ottawa at that time abolished trading on the open market.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Is that their stated reason?

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Their stated reason? No, because ever since Mr. Gardiner switched his position and ceased to support the Winnipeg Grain Exchange he has made it appear that he has always been a champion of the Wheat Pool, and don't let anyone here try to kid anyone else — certainly not me; I

was in it all the time. Mr. Gardiner spent many years apologizing and speaking as a champion of the open-market system and the futures market as against the Wheat Pool and the Wheat Pool system. I have said this in the House of Commons to Mr. Gardiner, and I will say it again when the occasion arises. Now, to another illustration . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask just one question? When you started speaking, you mentioned a year — I didn't get that.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — The year 1943; in September of 1943, when the trading in wheat futures was abolished on the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, and the price was fixed at \$1.25 a bushel.

Now, another illustration. During the years when there was a free movement of grain, the Wheat Pool and Pool elevators in this province enjoyed a delivery of approximately 50 to 51 per cent; occasionally down to 49 or up to 53, but around 50 per cent mark, which, of course, meant that about one-third of the elevators which were farmer-owned, the Pool elevators, were getting half the grain, about two-thirds of the elevators of those days, owned by private interests, were dividing the other 50 per cent among them, and it didn't suit them. Now, when I say 50 per cent, I don't mean that every point delivered 50 per cent to the Pool. They varied. In some places they were as low as 25 or 30 per cent. In other places they were as high as 90 and 92 per cent in double elevator or more points. In single elevator points, of course, they had 100 per cent, naturally.

The line elevators have always been anxious to have something happen which would provide them through some other mechanism than the farmers; choice, with the right to get what they think is their fair share of grain, equal to the Pool. The Pool people have never agreed. The Pool people have always stated that when they went to the trouble of building an organization, of putting their money in to the capital facilities, the physical facilities for handling their grain, they had a right to deliver all their grain to those facilities if they wanted to. The choice should be theirs.

Now, then, we come again to the war years, when again congestion was the order of the day, and it was necessary to store a lot of grain at the local points. Rather than build new elevators, a system was devised that was not a bad system. It was a good system for a temporary situation, namely to allocate the supplies of lumber for the building of temporary bins. Now, up to that point everything was fine. There was nothing unreasonable; it was a sensible thing for the government to do, to allocate building supplies for that purpose; but when it came to the actual allocation, they favoured continuously the line elevators right in some of the points represented by my hon. friend from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron), in the point of Prelate, to be exact. If you want some illustrations, I can give you more, or how, when line elevator companies were given allocations of timber to build these temporary bins, the allocation was withheld from Pool elevators.

I give these illustrations, Mr. Speaker, to show that every time there was a possibility of the Liberal government at Ottawa giving an advantage by legislation, or order-in-council, or through any of its agencies giving an advantage to the private owners of physical facilities or trading, that advantage was given. It is in existence yet today, when they will not abolish the private trading in other than wheat, oats and barley; flax and rye are still

**March 24, 1955**

trading on the open market. So, I say right up to this point of the allocation of box-cars, they have continually favoured from Ottawa any stem which will guarantee that the privately-owned elevators will get an equal portion of grain with the Pool, which is distinctly unfair.

I would like my friend from Arm River to get this point clear, that when government action results in such that is compulsion. That is compelling people to use a facility they do not want to use, for which their only choice is this — sell no grain and, therefore, have no money in their pockets, or sell it where space is available.

Our friends across the way, I believe — I was not in when this was mentioned, but it was mentioned by several speakers, so I assume it was alluded to here this afternoon — suggested that members on this side of the House are so wise that they can devise ways and means of doing something. I am not going to offer any solution, Mr. Speaker, but I am going to say this. We have had now in this province, and in the western provinces, big farm organizations who have devoted the last 30 years to the movement, the handling of their members' grain, the Wheat Pool, and I am convinced that they can at any time at all hand to Mr. Gardiner, Mr. Howe, to the Wheat Board, the Board of Grain Commissioners, Mr. Milner, or anybody, or the whole collection, a simple and an easy and a workable system whereby every farmer can deliver his grain to whichever elevator he likes. I am like my friend from Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst).

**Mr. Danielson:** — Very interesting.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — I think that the member for Turtleford (Mr. Wooff) has been very mild in the resolution he has offered. I am quite sure that no member of this House would dare to vote against it. I would hope that all members would vote wholeheartedly for it, and if the member for Wadena had offered the resolution in more vigorous terms, I would have been equally willing to support a resolution of that kind.

**Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek):** — Mr. Speaker, I sat through the debate and heard the member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) pointing out that, in his opinion, this would not necessarily be a solution to the problem, but it would draw to the attention of those in authority, that there is a problem. He said he was not well enough versed to know if this was the solution; that he had spoken to line elevator agents, and they were not sure it was a solution, and that he had spoken to Wheat Pool men and high officials of the Wheat Board, and they were not just too sure that this was the solution. I don't think that any of us can go out and say for certain that this will solve everything, that the minute they allocate box cars in this manner the solution is found.

That is what the member for Arm River was attempting to point out, and we are not so sure that it is a solution; but we are for any resolution which will bring the problems we are facing to the proper authorities and ask them to get their heads together and try to formulate some solution. Whether or not this is the only solution and the best solution, I am not in a position to state. I don't think anyone in the House is so firm in their commitment that this is the only solution to the problem. It may be; and if it is, we are all for it. It will bring to bear our opinion that we are facing this

critical situation and some solution must be found and for that reason we are all going to support it.

I don't think there is a member here who will not support it. It is definitely a problem, and I can say to the Minister of Health (Mr. Bentley) that even last Fall, when we had congestion and could not get box-cars, I suggested to some points with Pool elevators that they arrange to put the wheat on the ground. They contacted the officials and they got permission to do so. I can give you points in the same area that you mentioned where they put 60,000 to 70,000 bushels of grain on the ground. Then, immediately that was done, they brought pressure to bear to get the box-cars to move the grain that was on the ground, and they said that, 'due to the fact that that grain is on the ground you get first priority for all cars that come into that point' and they did; and the line elevators sat there with nothing until this 60,000 bushels had moved off the ground. Then they reverted back to the same system of a car here and a car to this one and a car to that one. The Wheat Pool did not lose those 20 or 30 box-cars which were necessary to move that wheat off the ground. They did not go back and say to the Pool Elevators 'we are not going to allot you any further cars until such time as the line elevators catch up.' They allocated a special shipment of cars to take care of that wheat on the ground; and I can think of several points that did likewise under those conditions, and received every co-operation in receiving cars.

We agree it is a problem, and if this is the solution, we are certainly going to support it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The mover of the motion is about to exercise his right to close the debate. Any member who wishes to speak, should do so now.

**Mr. R.H. Wooff:** — Mr. Speaker, I will just take a few moments. I might suggest to the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) that the motion does not make any suggestion as to an answer or a way out. It suggests that the Federal Government implement some policy whereby farmers may deliver their grain to an elevator of their choice.

I would probably be the first to agree with my hon. friend that it might not be a complete answer. I consider taking a stand such as that is talking all around the real issue. The hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) talked all around the real problem. He talked about carryovers and congestion, and we admit quite frankly that it is there; but that is not the point we are discussing. The point we want an answer to, the solution we are seeking is, under the stress of carryovers and congestion, that Pool members may deliver the percentage of their quotas to the elevator of their choice.

The member for Arm River said that Nature could give the only answer . . .

**Mr. Cameron:** — No. Let's be fair about this.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I said it would be a solution by crop failure or a great demand for export. How many times have I got to drive that back to you.

**March 24, 1955**

**Mr. Wooff:** — Well, I am sorry if I took him up wrongly; but I think he said that Nature had the only answer, but we didn't want it.

**Mr. Danielson:** — No that's what I tried to tell you . . .

**Mr. Wooff:** — That Nature had the only answer and we don't want it, and then he foresees a position in which we are always going to be in this jam (to use a slang term). Now, Nature was the only answer to the problem 50 years ago. It is admitted, quite frankly, that the only years at the turn of the century that there was not a congestion in the handling and shipping facilities were the crop-failure years. He had the farmers 50 years ago taken the position that this won't work, and there is nothing we can do about it, we would still be in the position we were in 50 years ago. But, they did do something. They said, "We want certain legislation" — and that is what we are asking for. And they did compel the railway companies and the elevator companies to allow farmers to load grain over the platform and by-pass their facilities if they wished to. We are asking that the Pool member be allowed to by-pass the line elevator and use the facilities which he has helped to build up over a period of years.

In closing, I want to say this. I am not suggesting that what I put forth this afternoon is a complete answer, but I will say that essentially it is what the Pool is asking for today. They believe the something like that is practical. The permit book is becoming an established thing and it is going to be permanent, and so long as there are quotas I think it will be; but to take up the position that this won't work or we cannot do anything about it, is merely wishful thinking and by-passing any solution that may be presented.

The question being put on the motion (Mr. Wooff), it was agreed to unanimously.

### **RE PRAIRIE FARM ASSISTANCE ACT**

Moved by Mr. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale), seconded by Mr. Feusi:

"That this Assembly respectfully recommends that the Federal Government introduce the necessary amendments to the Prairie Farm Assistance Act to provide that assistance to grain growers be given on a more equitable basis, and specifically providing that:

"(1) the benefits under the Act be increased;

"(2) where spring flooding has prevented seeding of wheat, the intended wheat acreage be taken into account along with the actual acreage seeded to wheat in estimating the average wheat yield;

"(3) the size of the area on which average yields are determined for payments be reduced."

**Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale):** — Mr. Speaker, the Prairie Farm Assistance Act has proved to be one of the most acceptable

Acts passed by the Federal Government in the interests of the farmers of western Canada. Passed primarily as a relief measure, it has become, in the minds of our farmers, synonymous with crop insurance. Farmers have accepted it as such, and have willingly paid their one per cent levy, even in the northern part of the province where awards under the Act have been few and far between. This year, awards were made to many farmers, who, in the past, never thought to benefit from P.F.A.A. Because of this widespread experience there has come a demand that the Act be amended so that the many inequalities that have become apparent will be remedied.

Members will recall the efforts of the Federal Government of the 'thirties to assist the hard-hit farmers of those days. In 1931, the Bennett government bonused the wheat producer by adding 5 cents a bushel to the price the farmer received for his wheat. The total cost to the Government of this bonus was \$13 million. Besides this, in that year, relief to the extent of \$10 million was paid to those farmers who had no crops. The Bennett government, too, made provisions for the Wheat Board before they were defeated, in 1935. The Liberals who were returned to office that year operated the wheat pool with the initial price of 87½ cents, and as a result of the price of wheat being below that figure, farmers received bonuses to the extent of \$6,182,000, in the crop year 1935-36.

In 1936, and again in 1937, the Liberals decided the Wheat Board would not accept delivery of grain unless the price of wheat fell below 90 cents a bushel, No. 1 Northern, f.o.b. Fort William. As the price for those two years averaged above this figure, the Wheat Board did not function as a buying agency during 1936 or 1937.

In 1938, the Wheat Board price was set at 80 cents, and the average price was in the neighbourhood of 60 cents, so bonuses to farmers were paid by the Federal Government to the extent of \$48 million, on account of Wheat Board overpayments. In the same year, relief was paid amounting to \$12 million. This was a grand total, for bonuses and relief in that one year, of \$60 million.

Because of the large amount involved and because farmers with good crops were receiving the maximum benefits, the Federal Government sought another way of assisting the farmers of western Canada in their time of need. As a result, the Prairie Farm Assistance Act was passed, in 1939. This Act made provisions to pay those farmers who suffered crop failures, the payments to be made on a cultivated acreage basis. An important provision embodied in the Act was that the farmers themselves should pay part of the cost of the assistance provided, by contributing one per cent of all grains sold by them, with the exception of flax. This principle of contributions by those benefiting from the Act was later written into the Unemployment Insurance Act of 1941.

Mr. Speaker, I will not go into details of the Act, except in connection with the recommendations made in the motion I am moving. The first recommendation — “that the benefits under the Act be increased” — should meet with the unanimous approval of the members of this Legislature. It is generally known that payments under P.F.A.A. to farmers suffering crop failure vary from a minimum of \$200 to a maximum of \$500, depending upon the degree of crop failure and the amount of land which the individual had under cultivation. A farmer, to qualify for the maximum, must have at least 400 acres

**March 24, 1955**

under cultivation. It is also generally known that benefits payable have not been changed since 1939, when the Act was passed, and I think that we would generally agree that those benefits were not too high, even in 1939.

Today, due to the inroads of inflation, there has been a tremendous change in the value of P.F.A.A. awards. Farmers' cost of production and costs of living have risen from 99.4 in 1939, to 225 in 1954. This, Mr. Speaker, is according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures, based on the period 1935-39 equalling 100. This means it costs the farmer now \$225, whereas in 1939 his cost for identical services and goods was just below \$100. In terms of P.F.A.A. payments, the minimum payment of \$200, compared to 1939 costs, has a value of only \$88.88. The maximum payment of \$500 will only do what \$222.22 would do in 1939. It has been estimated that the average P.F.A.A. payment, this year, will be \$250. In terms of 1939 value, this represents only \$111.11. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the time is long past when benefits paid under P.F.A.A. should be increased.

Those who argue against increased benefits quote the amounts the farmers pay into the Prairie Farm Assistance fund on account of the one per cent levy, and contrast it with the total amounts paid to farmers as assistance in time of need. It is true that farmers have, since the inception of the Act, received in benefits much more than they have paid into the fund. Since 1939, up to and including the crop year of 1953-4, farmers have paid into the fund a total of \$83,217,000, and have received, in awards, under the Act, the sum of \$146,312,000. Over this 15-year period there has been subsidization for the farmers of western Canada by the Federal Government to the extent of \$63,095,000.

This is not so great an amount of money when one considers that the continuing efficiency of the farming industry is so essential to the welfare of our country as a whole; \$63 million in benefits to the farming industry of western Canada, spread over 15 years, is not so large a sum when we compare it with the \$60 million in relief and wheat Board bonuses in the one crop year, 1938-39. Nor does it appear huge when we compare it to the \$248 million contributed by the Federal Government to the Unemployment Insurance Act fund, since 1942. It certainly does not appear great alongside the \$207 million paid, since 1942, for freight assistance on western feed grain for the benefit of livestock producers in eastern Canada and in British Columbia. And surely, the sum sinks in size when we realize that the amount paid to the gold mining industry, during the six-year period from 1948 to 1953, under the Gold Mining Assistance Act, was \$65,500,000.

Nor is the figure so alarming when we compare the first five years during which awards were made under P.F.A.A., with the experience of the last five years. During the first five years in which awards were made, farmers received a total of \$45,601,000; while the one per cent levy for the same years totalled \$16,561,000. For this period of low grain prices, awards were almost three times the amount of the levies paid in. For the last five years, 1949-53 inclusive, the one per cent levy realized \$43,559,000, while awards paid out were \$41,440,000. In that five-year period, farmers of western Canada paid into the fund \$2 million more than was paid out to them. These figures do not include this crop year, when it is estimated that \$25 million will be paid; but it doesn't include 1949 awards, when \$22,050,000 was paid out — the highest amount paid in benefits in any one year up to 1954.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that the awards paid under the Act were just about the same for the two periods — \$45 million for the first five years in which payments were made; and \$41 million for the last five years. The amounts paid into the fund, on the other hand, by the farmers increased from \$16 million to \$43 million. This increase is due to two things: first, increased production, and second, improved prices for our grain.

I would draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the difference between the awards paid to farmers and the total amount of the one per cent levy for the 15-year period. The difference between \$146 million and \$83 million is \$63 million of a difference — that much more was paid to farmers than they contributed over the 15-year period. This works out at a yearly average of \$4,200,000 paid by the Dominion Government to farmers who have suffered crop failures. This, sir, is not a large subsidy when we compare it with the \$18 million yearly average paid as freight assistance for the benefit of the farmers of eastern Canada and of British Columbia, or the \$11 million yearly average paid to the gold mining industry.

If the government at Ottawa had contributed to P.F.A.A. on the same basis as it has contributed to the gold mining industry the farmers of western Canada would not have had to contribute a single cent towards the cost of P.F.A.A. for the whole 15-year period. In fact there would have been money left over, as 11 times 15 is \$165 million, and awards paid out under P.F.A.A. were only \$146 million. Furthermore, if Ottawa's contribution to P.F.A.A. had been at the same rate as for freight assistance for the benefit of livestock producers in the east and the west, there would have been 18 times 15, or \$270 million for P.F.A.A. With that sum, benefits could have been very nearly doubled without any contribution by the western farmers. Surely there can be no justification of assistance under P.F.A.A. in 1954-55 on a scale drawn up to conform to 1939 conditions.

The second recommendation of this motion derives from a resolution passed at Tisdale, last summer, at the meeting of Provincial Cabinet Ministers and municipal officials. At that time there was a widespread fear in north-eastern Saskatchewan that the area would not qualify for P.F.A.A. payments under the present regulations, although spring flooding had caused considerable crop failure. As a result, the municipal officials proposed and passed unanimously a resolution requesting that where spring flooding had prevented seeding of wheat, the intended wheat acreage be used in determining average yields for the purposes of the Act.

Due to the spring flooding conditions in that area, to which reference has been made many times during this Session, the large acreage intended for wheat remained unseeded. On the other hand, neighbouring fields, which had not been flooded, were showing good stands of wheat which promised high yields. According to P.F.A.A. regulations the actual yield of seeded acreage determined the eligibility of the area.

Let us suppose, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers in an area which had been flooded, were able to seed only 20 per cent of the acreage that they had intended to sow. If this seeded acreage had averaged 25 bushels, the area

**March 24, 1955**

would not qualify for P.F.A.A. Yet the farmers had been able to sow only 20 per cent, or one-fifth, of their wheat crop. Taking into consideration the whole acreage intended to be seeded, the average yield would be not 25 bushels, but one-fifth of that or only 5 bushels, which would qualify the area for P.F.A.A. payments.

Figures on the basis of a farmer's intended wheat acreage where spring flooding has occurred is only fair. It would present no difficulties to P.F.A.A. officials. Farmers could declare in advance the acreage which they intended to sow with various grains, and these figures would be used in establishing the average yields. Of course, if other grains had been sown on the land intended for wheat, and had been harvested, that would be taken into account; but in north-eastern Saskatchewan, in 1954, many fields intended for wheat were first flooded and then, due to the excessive rainfall throughout the summer, never became dry enough to permit seeding of any grain. I understand, from conversations with other members of this House, that this condition was not confined to north-eastern Saskatchewan, but was common to the whole eastern part of the province.

P.F.A.A. was designed primarily to assist farmers who had suffered crop loss as a result of drought. At the present time it has been extended to take into account loss from almost every cause, except spring flooding. We feel it should be extended to cover this situation as well.

The third recommendation in the motion deals with the size of the area on which average yields are determined for the purposes of awarding benefits. There have been numerous amendments to the Act since 1939. Most of them had to do with changing the size of the area which could qualify for awards. Originally, the Act made the township the basis for determining crop failure. The township is still the basis; but amendments to the Act declare, in one part, that one-half the township where yield qualifications are met, is eligible for an award as though it were a complete township. Another part says one-sixth of a township is eligible for award as though it were a complete township.

This reducing of the size of the area that can qualify for benefits is a step in the right direction. The smaller we can get the qualifying area, the less likelihood there is of discrimination under the Act. Yet no single section of land should qualify for awards when the farms for miles around have good yields. It is only proper that crop failure should be general before awards to farmers are paid.

The smallest area under P.F.A.A. which can qualify as a complete unit, separated from other areas, is a half township or 18 sections, and this area must be a rectangular block of sections. Yet crop failure does not occur in a square or a rectangular pattern. Every farmer here knows of areas where rains have cut across townships with the result that crops receiving the benefits of the moisture would be good, while a mile away, on either side, crops would be suffering; and flooding, too, does not occur in a uniform rectangular pattern.

The smallest area that can qualify and then only when it is bordering an eligible township is six adjoining sections. It seems to me that

this should be modified. Crop failure does not respect township boundary lines. It is certainly discriminatory that a farmer living alongside the boundary of an eligible township, whose crop may be less than that of his neighbour across the road, should be refused assistance unless the crop failure outside the eligible township comprises an area of at least six adjoining sections. Why could not that eligible area be extended by single sections to the end of the crop failure area, whether that takes in one, 18 or any number of sections?

I must repeat what I said at the beginning, namely, that the principle behind P.F.A.A. has been accepted by farmers of western Canada. The Rt. Hon. J.G. Gardiner, replying to criticism of some features of the Bill when he was introducing it in the House of Commons, asked that the Bill have a period of trial, following which changes could be made as directed by experience. Some changes have been made, but these have not gone far enough. Farmers would welcome further changes removing the discriminatory features of the Act as regards size and shape of areas qualifying for awards under the Act, and certainly would appreciate a more realistic approach on the part of Ottawa to the problem of farm financing.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would move this resolution, seconded by the hon. member for Pelly (Mr. Feusi).

**Mr. Arnold Feusi (Pelly):** — Mr. Speaker, in speaking briefly to the motion as presented by the member for Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis) I have in mind a situation back in the Pelly Constituency that made me rather happy to second the resolution. We have had a situation of flooding, during the last two years, over an area that was much too small to come under the Act. The area was very irregular. The area is probably some of the best farming land that the province has, because the bottom lands of the valley are probably three to four feet in thickness or depth of black soil, and the yields throughout the years have been 50 to 60 bushels to the acre. But for two years now we have had crop failure over the river-bottom areas of the Assiniboine. I could give you an example here, Mr. Speaker, of the year 1953, when there were 3,350 acres completely flooded out, and another 500 that were not sown. In 1954, there were 4,666 acres flooded out and 1,700 not sown. These records come from the Department of Agriculture through the agricultural committee of several municipalities in the area. This gives the House an idea of the need of having the qualifying area brought down to a much smaller size.

Another problem that presents itself is that we know the farmers are more and more considering the Act as a type of insurance. It is a step in that direction, but more than a few of our farmers have received a jolt, this past fall. The farmers will never have a sincere insurance scheme in P.F.A.A. as long as the Liberal party uses the scheme for a political organization.

**Some Govt. Members;** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Fuesi:** — We have had . . .

**Mr. Cameron:** — Just stay on the track.

**March 24, 1955**

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Feusi:** — Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the farmers will not come first under such a situation.

**Mr. Cameron:** — You just can't keep away from it, can you?

**Mr. Feusi:** — I would like to give you an example down in our area where two businessmen were assessors. Now, surely, if this is a farm insurance scheme and, goodness knows, there were plenty of farmers who were qualified as assessors and had the need of a little bit of assistance, but they were unable to get in under the Act, or under the set-up, and do a chore for the farmers. I just point this out because this past fall, we have had this spectacle through our country, and it is evident in our papers, where the Federal Minister of Agriculture moved officials of P.F.A.A. like checkers in and out again; in fact, so much so that you cannot very well pin an official down from day to day.

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — They don't even know!

**Mr. Feusi:** — It reminds me of part of a little story, of years gone by: "In again, out again, home again, Finnegan". In fact, it has got now to the stage where I think the member for Rosthern (Mr. Carr) happens to be 'Finnegan'.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Have you got another one like that?

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — It fell pretty dead over there.

**Mr. Feusi:** — I would like to point out that it is not fair to the officials, and it is not fair to the people who expect benefits from this Act, the people who have contributed for many years. They like to see it run strictly on a business basis, and not on a political patronage basis.

**Mr. Kramer (The Battlefords):** — Pork barrel!

**Mr. Feusi:** — There is another point I would like to bring out, Mr. Speaker. The member for Melfort pointed out the benefits that the gold producers and others have received from the Federal Government over a similar period of time that the P.F.A.A. Act has been in existence, and I cannot help but call to mind the flurry with which the Federal Government, this past winter, brought about the increase in benefits to citizens who came under the Unemployment Insurance Act. Herein was an example where they could have extended similar benefits to our farming population who were just as stricken. There are many of our young folks on the farms today who are not on the unemployment records; they are marking time in the homes of their parents. The parents are stricken through crop failure, and I believe that an extension of these payments similar to what was done under the Unemployment Act would have been enjoyed or appreciated very much.

Up in the north-eastern part of the province, I have checked recently, and I have found areas that we figured were very hard hit, quarter-section areas, that, this year, they have not qualified, the yield was just

a little in excess of 8 bushels, township after township. Certainly there should have been some leeway given in a situation such as this. I know these folks are very hard hit, and, in closing, I would just state that the scheme as proposed many years ago has had to be modified, and it will have to be modified again; but we would like to see it done along strictly business lines that will bring to our people the needed benefits. They have contributed to this scheme loyally and without any comment or reneging on their responsibilities. Not once have we heard it from the north. They have contributed through all the years during which the benefits were given out to the south and south-west and, this year, they did look forward to assistance very much, and we regret that the assistance could not have been extended on a larger pattern than was done.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Mr. Speaker, might I ask the speaker a question? Am I to understand that this is the first year you have had a bonus in your constituency?

**Mr. Feusi:** — Yes, to my knowledge, it is.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Well, I would just like to say this. I was interested in your remarks, particularly with respect to the farmer on the quarter-section, that the blocks were too large, that the blocks should be small, that the rectangles should be cut out, and that you had been contributing for years.

**Mr. Speaker:** — You are now speaking to the motion.

**Mr. Cameron:** — . . . to the upkeep of the people of the southwest. I would like to put on the record that when the P.F.A.A. was first brought into force, the south-west received a bonus for 11 years out of the first 12 years. Eleven out of 12 years, and it was the farmers of the south-west who have pioneered in all the changes that have been made in the P.F.A. Act up to date. We did not face a situation such as mentioned in the resolution, where spring flooding has prevented the seeding of wheat. We have never had that condition, and I can see that the Act had not foreseen such conditions; but you mentioned that the boundary lines were drawn in the wrong places, the boundary lines should be extended.

I would point out that you did not show where a crop failure begins and where it ends. There would have to be a boundary line somewhere and crop failure areas just don't give 'Farmer Jones' 30 bushels and the next man five. It goes from five gradually up to eight to 10 to 12, and the difficulty there is where to draw the boundary line between a crop failure area and where you are coming out of the crop failure area. The experience up west has proved that to put it on a quarter-section basis would be impossible for operation, or even on the basis of a section. It would have to be on the basis of a block, but not necessarily on the basis of a rectangular block.

I thought it would be well just to point out some of these things — that 11 out of 12 years, we had bonuses; many of these changes were made, and it came to be quite the accepted thing there. We did not hear such

**March 24, 1955**

suggestions as have been mentioned here, and that is why I asked if this year is the first when you have had a bonus, because those things had been talked about up there and finally the conclusion was reached that some of them were most impractical, and for that reason there is no longer pressure for those changes being made. But the increase in the benefits — yes; and number (2), where you have been prevented from seeding any wheat as a result of flooding, then I think by all means it should be amended so that you could base your judgment of the yield of wheat on what you may have seeded if it had not been for the flooded conditions. There is no question that the size of the area in which the average yield is determined for payments should be reduced, but I just wanted to point out to the member the impossibility of attempting, first, to classify P.F.A.A. payments as crop insurance — it was not meant to be that; and secondly, the impracticability of attempting to put it on a quarter-section basis.

**Mr. Feusi:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a correction here. There was no implication from this side of the House that it be put on a quarter-section basis.

**Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords):** — Mr. Speaker, I have a few words to say regarding these proposed changes in the P.F.A.A. scheme. I do not entirely agree with some of the statements that have been made. While I agree with them generally, I think that, at the outset, when the P.F.A.A. was first introduced it was one of the most acceptable schemes for western farmers that the Federal Government had ever introduced, and I think the scheme in itself, at that time, was acceptable in its original form. You bring in a plan, and obviously, from time to time it requires changes, but I do not believe that western farmers ever anticipated that this plan would fall into the category it is now in.

I concur in some of the statements made by the hon. member for Pelly (Mr. Feusi) and his objections could have been more critical; and likewise those of the mover, the member for Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. C.G. Willis), but for the fact that they are not from an area where P.F.A.A. has been paid out for a number of years. We in the Battlefords have not been as unfortunate as the people in the area around Maple Creek, but I would say that up in the north-west, farmers have received, on an average, since the inception of P.F.A.A. crop failure bonus, very close to one year out of three or four.

In looking over the roster of these P.F.A.A. Inspectors, some of them are objecting to these people being used for political purposes. I am objecting to them being there at all. They are not necessary. The whole thing is ridiculous. They took months and months last fall.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Cameron:** — Order is right.

**Mr. Speaker:** — May I suggest to the hon. member that he is transgressing pretty much from the resolution.

**Mr. Kramer:** — I am speaking to the resolution, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Cameron:** — That is not in the resolution at all.

**Mr. Kramer:** — All right, I will move an amendment, then, to the resolution, Mr. Speaker, and speak to that. Is that permissible?

**Mr. Cameron:** — Move it, and we'll all debate it.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Yes, certainly, I will move it. I will move an amendment to this motion:

“That the Federal Government utilize existing agencies, namely, the information available through the permit book in the elevators and the municipal secretaries and their elected council . . . “

**Some Govt. Member:** — They would do that, all right.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Oh yes, they would do it — as little as they possibly can.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Load it all onto the secretary.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Put it onto the secretary, yes, the secretary in every municipality could handle this.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Let us get your amendment.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Keep those people quiet on the other side of the House, and I will finish my amendment.

**Mr. Speaker:** — No, you have to move your amendment now. If you are moving an amendment, we want it. It must be written.

**Mr. Kramer:** — I will move the adjournment of this debate, then, Mr. Speaker, and I will prepare an amendment.

(Debate adjourned)

The Assembly resumed, March 3rd, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Brown (Bengough):

“That this Assembly, recognizing that the decline in net farm income resulting from the failure to establish a national agricultural policy based on parity and orderly marketing, has adversely affected our whole Canadian economy, calls upon the Federal Government to convene a Federal-Provincial Agricultural Conference to draft a comprehensive agricultural policy, for submission to Parliament at the earliest possible date, and that will provide farmers of Canada with their fair share of the net national income; the said Conference to have particular reference to:

(a) the establishing of national marketing boards for livestock, dairy and poultry products as a means of ensuring price stability and orderly marketing;

(b) the effecting of long-term contracts for agricultural products as a further means of price stabilization; and

(c) the establishment of price supports to the producer, which shall be related to parity based on an acceptable formula.

“And further, That this Assembly recommends that the Government of Saskatchewan take all necessary steps, upon consummation of the policy herein referred to, to assure its proper and immediate implementation in this Province.”

**Mr. A. Loptson (Saltcoats):** — Mr. Speaker, I am rather disappointed that the hon. member who just sat down was not given time enough to write out his amendment, because we might have had a little livelier debate than you are going to get from me.

I might say that not long ago I had prepared a rather voluminous speech on this resolution, and I was a little disappointed that circumstances turned out so that I was not able to deliver it.

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — Get somebody to read it for you now.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Now that we have got kind of humoured down to more reasonable terms, I am not going to dwell on this resolution for any length of time. I think it is quite important to some extent, although I think that the resolution is very poorly worded. The resolution, in the first place, refers only to agriculture.

I am not going to argue that these things may not come about, but I am going to argue that a Federal-Provincial Agricultural conference is not going to bring them about, because the cause of the net earnings of the farmer is certainly not the fault of the policies of the Federal Government. I think it can fairly be established that the high earnings of the farmers have come about as a result of the policies of the Federal Government. I do not think anyone can argue and say that our wheat prices are not the highest in the world, today, except maybe for the United States. I do not think anyone can say that our dairy products are lower than any other place in the world, except maybe the United States.

**Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):** — What about the cost of production?

**Mr. Loptson:** — And I do not know where you would sell our wheat for any more than we are getting for it, today, and that is partly as a result of the agricultural policy of the Federal Government. But I can argue, truthfully, that the actual cost of production can be attributed to this Government here in Saskatchewan to a large extent, as a result of their policies.

And also I can say that this C.C.F. party is not entirely void of the responsibility for the increased price of agricultural implements and other goods that the farmer has to buy in order to produce his wheat. If my hon. friends want me to go into detail on those things, I think I can prove every point of this.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — Let's hear you do it.

**Mr. Lopton:** — Not only has this Government been responsible for the farmers not getting all the price that they might have got for their products, but they have also been responsible for increases in taxes and levies of all kinds that have gone into the cost of production. Many of those arguments already have been delivered in this House, and I do not know whether I should take up the time to repeat them. But when this C.C.F. Government here is shedding crocodile tears for the farmers, then I would say that they should check up on some of their own actions with respect to what they have done to increase the costs and reduce the revenue that the farmer has received since they came into power.

I venture to say that it did not help the farmer any when we had the railway strike in 1950, right in the midst of harvest; and when the Federal Government called in the Unions and the Railways and demanded that they settle it; and after they had settled it, they wanted to order them to go to work immediately, and brought a resolution into the House of Commons, and what did the C.C.F. representatives in Ottawa do at that time? Every one of them voted against them going back to work, except one member in the House of Commons — every one of them.

**Premier Douglas:** — They were already back to work.

**Mr. Lopston:** — They still wanted to stay out.

**Premier Douglas:** — They were back at work before Parliament even met.

**Mr. Lopston:** — They certainly were not. The resolution is right in Hansard. And I see that there was only one C.C.F. member in the House that did not vote against ordering the men back on the road.

Then I might say that it certainly did not help the selling of our 1950 frozen crop when the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) got up in a convention in Saskatoon, and said that the 80 cents initial payment on that wheat was all that they were going to get. Now, surely, Mr. Speaker, a Minister holding that responsible position should have known better than to make that statement, even if he thought it was right! It certainly was not going to help the sale of that frozen wheat to the United States or any other place, when the Minister of Agriculture of the province that produced most of that wheat, said that that was all it was worth, in other words. Well, then, I would say that the rehearsing of the Premier, himself, on that 'give-away' policy, has certainly not helped bring revenue to the farmers.

Another one they had here was a very interesting one and an important one, and that was the 'have-regard' clause of years ago, when the

**March 24, 1955**

hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. McIntosh), out of the blue, when the conference was pending for an increased price under the 'have-regard' clause, got up in this House and told the world that the British people had already paid about \$280 million more for this wheat than they needed to have done. Well, now, surely, any reasonable man will realize that there wasn't much chance of getting any further payment after that statement had been made.

I would like to say something about this last barrage that came forward here, the other day. We were talking about subsidies — subsidizing our dairy products. We all know that butter has been subsidized. There was a floor set at a price which, I think it is fair to say, is about as high as it is any place in the world, today — at 58 cents. That price is accumulating a stock which means that something has to be done to get rid of it, as all subsidized goods generally do accumulate. Then, when the Federal Government decided that they would ask the institutions throughout Canada to use butter in their institution, gaols and hospitals, in preference to margarine, I think it is fair to say that every province in Canada accepted that offer of buying butter at two-thirds of the cost to the Federal Government in preference to margarine.

**Premier Douglas:** — May I ask my hon. friend a question?

**Mr. Loptson:** — . . . Margarine, except Saskatchewan.

**Premier Douglas:** — Will he tell me which provinces have accepted it, and on what authority he is making his statement?

**Mr. Lopston:** — Well, I haven't heard of any one refusing to use it.

**Premier Douglas:** — Have you heard of any who have accepted it?

**Mr. Loptson:** — Yes.

**Premier Douglas:** — How many? Which ones?

**Mr. Loptson:** — Well, Ontario is one. Manitoba, I understand, is another.

**Premier Douglas:** — Can I find any authority for those statements?

**Mr. Loptson:** — Well, there are press reports. Can you say that anyone has refused to use it?

**Premier Douglas:** — Has the hon. member got the press reports?

**Mr. Loptson:** — Can you say that anyone has refused to accept it?

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I am not making the speech. The hon. gentleman has . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — You are now.

**Premier Douglas:** — Just a moment, I am up on a point of order. The hon. gentleman has just made a statement in which he said that every province except Saskatchewan has accepted the offer.

**Mr. Loptson:** — As far as I know, they have.

**Premier Douglas:** — Has the hon. gentleman any public statements by any Provincial Government to substantiate that remark?

**Mr. Loptson:** — Well, say who hasn't.

**Premier Douglas:** — You are making the statement, not me.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Sure, I made the statement, and so far as I know, they have.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! In any event, the hon. member is accepting the responsibility for his statement.

**Mr. Loptson:** — In any case, we have the statement of the hon. Minister of Health (Hon. Mr. Bentley) who said that margarine is as good as butter and there was no reason why they should pay any more for it. Well, that is what this Government has done. Instead of helping agriculture, I say they have done a lot of harm in respect to the amount that they might have received for their products.

I might also say that they are also indirectly responsible for the high cost of implements. I am not going to blame this Government for that, but I am going to blame it on to the C.C.F. party and their affiliated Labour Union leaders, particularly C.C.L. They are continuously advocating higher wages, in spite of the fact that the price of farm products is going down. Mr. Speaker, you may ask why should they be doing that. Well, there is a reason for the C.C.F. party wanting labour to get more wages than the manufacturers can afford to pay. There is a reason why they want agriculture to make less profits than they are entitled to make, because, if you look back into their history and into their platform, and check up on the statements of their leaders, they claim that a C.C.F. party cannot function or get any place unless there is a depression. I think that is true. And in order to obtain that end there are two things necessary . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — If I wanted a depression, I would vote Liberal! That would be the surest way to get one.

**Mr. Loptson:** — First of all, you have to depress the earnings of agriculture. Next, you have to raise the price of manufactured goods in order that they will pile up on the shelves and become unsaleable; and when you cannot sell your products then, of course, there is mass unemployment, and when there is mass unemployment there is no more sale for agricultural products.

No, Mr. Speaker, this conference is not a solution for our troubles, today. I suggest that every fair-minded person in Canada realizes that our prosperity depends entirely on our ability to sell our surplus on the world market. I think we will all agree on that is the important part as far as we are concerned. In order to sell our products on the world markets we have to be within the price range to compete with other competitors for that world trade; and in order to compete, naturally, we have to have a price range which is equitable to the producer as well as to the man who is going to buy it. The result is that every man and woman, no matter what political leanings

**March 24, 1955**

they have, is interested in that very fact, in order to establish a price level whereby we can dispose of these commodities and keep up our standard of living.

Then the question is, how are we going to do it? I would say, not through a political conference, that is not going to get you any place. The Premier of this province and the Minister of Agriculture going to Ottawa to raise ‘hell’ for high prices for our agricultural products — it has to be on a parity with the high-priced manufactured goods, which have already priced themselves out of the world market.

I suggest that we should forget all about that, and use a little common sense, and get all these factors and factions together, get labour together, who, in some instances I think, are getting more than their share; get agriculture in with them, which I think probably is not getting its share; get the manufacturers in to the conference; and get the governments in to the conference, because one says that the labour is too high, others say the taxes are too high, some say that agricultural products are too high and that is raising the cost of living. Well, let us get together and see who is wrong and who is right and I think, if that is done, it should be done in a non-political manner, and done from the standpoint of the best interests of the nation and in order to try to devise a way whereby we can preserve our standing in the world market, as we have had it in the last ten years since the last war. I understand that we have gone up as high as being the third largest exporting nation in the world, and surely, Mr. Speaker, let us lay down the gauntlets as far as politics are concerned, and partyism is concerned, and do some independent thinking and devise some scheme whereby we can preserve our position in the world market and make a little for ourselves in order to preserve the standard of living that we have been enjoying.

To that end, Mr. Speaker, I am going to move an amendment to the motion, seconded by Mr. Danielson (Arm River) — the dead end kid:

That all the words after “from” in the second line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

“the high cost of production, calls upon the Federal Government to set up an independent committee or commission to investigate the cause of this high cost of production with a view to establishing the true facts as to the relationship of price of commodities entering the production of food and manufactured goods and services and to make such recommendations as it sees fit to bring out price structure to a competitive basis and to maintain full employment.”

If you wish, I will repeat the resolution as it will be after it is amended.

**Premier Douglas:** — I think most people, Mr. Speaker, can follow that.

**Mr. Loptson:** — I won’t take up time by reading it, then. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to submit that if my hon. friends really are honest

about what they are asking and trying to promote, they certainly cannot vote against this amendment.

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

**Hon. T.C. Douglas (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, what I have to say will just take about three minutes. I do not know whether the amendment is in order, in view of the fact that it really is a substitute motion, and since it does not deal with the basic question of the resolution, which has to do with marketing. But leaving that out, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out three things which I think are wrong with the amendment.

The first is that it strikes out all of the heart of the motion, thereby completely failing to deal with the fundamental things which agriculture requires, namely, the establishment of national marketing boards, and long-term contracts for export trade and the agricultural prices support Act. All of that is struck out.

**Mr. Loptson:** — That could come from the recommendations.

**Premier Douglas:** — It is all struck out by this amendment. In other words, to vote for the amendment is to vote against the things listed hereunder — (1), (2), (3).

Secondly, this amendment asks for an investigation of the high cost of production by gentlemen whose party took off price controls and are, therefore, today responsible for the high cost of production. They do not need a Royal Commission to tell them why they have a high cost of production. They have a high cost of production because the party to which they belong took off price controls and left the people of Canada to the ravenous wolves — big profit and big business!

**Mr. Loptson:** — Great Britain took off price controls.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Premier Douglas:** — Great Britain kept on price controls for quite a long time and continued to implement anti-inflationary policies which our government has never implemented.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my hon. friend a question. Is there any free nation in the world today, that has price control?

**Premier Douglas:** — There are nations in the world, today, who are implementing anti-inflationary policies which our government has never done. We did not ask that price controls be kept on as a permanent measure. My hon. friend thinks he knows something about that. He has demonstrated that he knows nothing about it. I will try to give him a very elementary lesson in economics such as you would give to a Grade 1 child.

**Mr. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition):** — Where would you get it?

**Premier Douglas:** — What you had at the end of the war was people with a tremendous reservoir of purchasing power and an inadequate

**March 24, 1955**

amount of goods. To take off price controls at that time was bound to result in a terrific inflation, because there was more money than there were goods. What we asked for was that price controls be kept on until our manufacturing facilities had been turned over from wartime production to peacetime production, and that, when there were goods to match the money, then the price controls could gradually be removed — when there was a balance between the two. That is what was done in Britain. They were removed when there was a balance. We didn't do it in this country.

**Mr. Loptson:** — . . . should have given you the whole lot.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Premier Douglas:** — The third thing, Mr. Speaker — my hon. friend is trying to make up for the speech he didn't make a few minutes ago. I say that is the second thing that is wrong. There is no need to investigate why there is a high cost of production. The high cost of production was brought about because the Federal Government refused to implement anti-inflationary policies.

The third thing is a typical resolution of the Liberal party who believe that the only way that you can deal with the problems of the farmer is to reduce the standard of living of the worker. Now, Mr. Speaker, if that were right . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — What a silly argument!

**Premier Douglas:** — “If the worker didn't get such high wages, the farmer would be better off.” That is what he said.

**Mr. Danielson:** — He never said that. High wages . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Premier Douglas:** — If my friend will just keep quiet — you can make all the speeches you like afterwards. If you can't make any better speeches than you made, this afternoon, you would be better to go back home.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Cameron:** — Oh, yeah!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The hon. member for Arm River can have an opportunity to speak on both the amendment and the motion.

**Premier Douglas:** — He may speak, but he won't say anything. Anybody knows that before he gets started.

**Mr. McDonald:** — We're not hearing anything, now.

**Premier Douglas:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal party has always worked on the thesis that if you have low enough wages you will have agricultural prosperity.

**Mr. Cameron:** — That's not true.

**Premier Douglas:** — The whole proof of this country is to the contrary. If low wages would have made prosperity, this should have been a rich country in the 1930's. The fact of the matter is that the farmer could not sell, even in the domestic market, because the worker did not have the purchasing power. And the gentleman opposite tells us that if you took down the wages for the railwaymen, if you took down the wages for the farm implement manufacturer, if you took down the wages of the people in industry, the farmer would be well off. The farmer would be worse off!

**Mr. McDonald:** — He never said that.

**Premier Douglas:** — The hon. gentleman said it, and there is no use of my friends over there trying to patch it up.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The hon. member made his speech and it should be on the records, and as far as I can remember, he did make that statement.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, my hon. friend over there is making a speech for me that I never said.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. Premier is just replying to what the hon. member for Saltcoats said.

**Mr. Loptson:** — I never said it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — It is not necessary for anyone else to deny something which the hon. member, himself, is not getting up on a point of privilege to deny.

**Mr. McDonald:** — He just denied it.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Mr. Speaker, he said that I had suggested that labour should have lower wages and in that way it would make . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, the records will bear it out exactly.

**Mr. Loptson:** — I said just the opposite. I said if there are unemployed . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I just need to finish this sentence, I do not want to carry on the debate.

**Mr. Loptson:** — If you are going to be too long-winded you had better wait until after supper to make your speech.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Premier Douglas:** — I would have been finished in three minutes if the hon. member hadn't interrupted every two or three minutes. He has made

such a poor hatch of it already that he has to try and patch it up.

The implication of this gentleman's remarks, Mr. Speaker, is that the high cost of production is caused by high wages. He said nothing about high profits. The fact remains that the only way farmers are going to have decent income is for the people who buy their goods in the cities to have decent wages, and that is contrary to the whole Liberal policy. As far as I am concerned, I do not think we need to debate this amendment at all. I am prepared right now to vote against it. First of all, because it is a negation of an agricultural policy which the Liberal party does not believe in, and does not want to vote on; Secondly, because it asks for an investigation into high production costs, when we know why we have high production costs, because we have a Liberal Government in Ottawa, controlled by big business; and further because these gentlemen opposite think the way to reduce production costs is to have low wages for the workers, and that puts the Liberal party exactly where it belongs, and as far as I am concerned, I am prepared to vote this amendment down right now.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I am not going to put the question. It being six o'clock, the House will recess until 7.30.

7.30 o'clock p.m.

**Mr. A.H. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, when the Premier was speaking, just before we called it six o'clock, he made some statements in regard to what he thought the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) had said, and he referred to what the hon. member for Saltcoats had said as a 'silly argument'. I would like to say that his interpretation was certainly silly; that the argument was sound. If he had been listening to what my hon. friend from Saltcoats said, then he might have made a lot better effort than he did, a few moments before we called it six o'clock. His reference to labour and reference to high profits by some of the larger companies in Canada were not at all in comparison to what the hon. member for Saltcoats had said.

The hon. member for Saltcoats also mentioned the fact that it was possible that there were corporations and companies in this country who probably were making a large profit, and the amendment to the motion recommends that we ask the Federal Government to set up a commission to investigate this particular problem. What is the difference between that and the suggestion of this Government and the plans of this Government in setting up a Royal Commission to investigate the problems with regard to agriculture and rural life in the province of Saskatchewan?

**Mr. Danielson (Arm River):** — Not a thing.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Here we have a picture of a government in the province of Saskatchewan who are not prepared to deal with the obvious troubles that we find in this province in regard to agriculture and rural life, but they set up a Commission to investigate them — in other words, something to hide behind. Then, on the other hand, when we ask that a Commission should be set up by the Federal Government to investigate certain things in our economy, the Provincial Government of Saskatchewan claim to have all the answers. In my opinion, they haven't the answers to the problems here in Saskatchewan, so I think it would go without saying that they certainly haven't the answers to the problems for the entire Dominion of Canada.

The Premier also referred to the fact that the amendment had cut out the ‘heart’ of the motion itself. I can agree with that, but after all, if this Government, as I have pointed out, are not prepared to deal with the problems in rural Saskatchewan — they say they haven’t got the answers, and they would like the information from a Royal Commission, and I think they were justified in setting up that Commission — then I think they should be prepared to support the amendment to the motion that we have suggested, namely, that the Federal Government set up a Commission to investigate this very thing across Canada. I have no doubt that probably part of the main part of the motion could be contained in a report and recommendations from a Commission which we are suggesting might be set up.

I had no intentions of speaking to the motion or the amendment, but I am going to say that I am certainly going to support the amendment because I do believe that it is the proper approach to the problems we are facing. However, I cannot support the motion as it exists because of the attitude of this Government with regard to our own little problem here in Saskatchewan. Perhaps I shouldn’t say ‘little problem’, because it is a tremendous problem, and I want to commend this Government for the actions they have taken, and I think that we are only asking that the Federal Government of Canada take similar action with regard to the problems mentioned in the motion.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendment and if the amendment is turned down, which I hope it will not be, because just as the member for Saltcoats has said, we are asking people of every political faith and from every walk of life — labourers, farmers, management and everybody else, to get together and try and find a solution to this problem, and I do not think there is any reason why anyone in this Chamber, no matter of what political faith he may be, could not whole-heartedly support the suggestion as contained in the proposed amendment to the motion.

**Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural & Mineral Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, there are one or two remarks I would like to make in regard to the amendment. One cannot help but be amused at the difficulty some of the members on the other side of the House have in looking after the careless remarks made by the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson), and I think that when we get the transcript of the records we will find, then, that the hon. member did not refer to profits, but he referred to high wages of labour.

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — That’s what he meant, too.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I do not want to dwell on that point, but my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald), has introduced in the debate the Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life in the province of Saskatchewan, and he is suggesting that this amendment would be asking for the same thing in the Federal field. Mr. Speaker, this amendment concentrates on one point only — the cost of production . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — No it doesn’t. Read it.

**March 24, 1955**

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . and leaves out other points which have certainly been recognized for a long time as being very important to agriculture.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Read the amendment.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — There is certainly no comparison between this amendment and the request in it, and the setting up of a Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life in Saskatchewan with the widest terms of reference. My hon. friend talked about the obvious solutions. Some of his friends were here in this House for a great many years, but they didn't take any steps to put into effect any 'obvious' solutions.

**Mr. McDonald:** — You haven't suggested any here, either.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . and I would suggest . . .

**Mr. Cameron:** — Not one.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . that this amendment springs from a hope in the hearts of the hon. members opposite that they might escape from having to make a decision directly on the main motion.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Call the vote and you'll see.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Now I realize well what uncontrolled inflation has done to the cost of production. I think I realize it as well as anyone. I am not prepared to support the amendment because I think that question itself is taken care of in the resolution by its reference to parity. You cannot consider parity without taking into consideration the costs of production as well as the price you get for your products.

I will have to oppose the amendment.

The question being put on the amendment (Mr. Loptson), it was negatived by 24 votes against 8.

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

**Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer members to the last part of the motion:

“And further, That this Assembly recommends that the Government of Saskatchewan take all necessary steps, upon consummation of the policy herein referred to, to assure its proper and immediate implementation in this Province.”

If the policy so set out in this motion is carried forth in Ottawa, you will have national marketing boards for livestock, poultry and all products; you

will have all long-term contracts for everything that is to be sold; you will have the establishment of price support for everything that the farmer produces, which shall be related to parity based on acceptable formula.

**Some Govt. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Cameron:** — Then I would ask you this: what is there left for the province of Saskatchewan to do? That is tagged on at the end. Instead of taking any bold initiative in the province of Saskatchewan, you expect us to pass a resolution like this, and then to tag yourselves on by saying — “If and when Ottawa does all of this, we will, in the province of Saskatchewan, take the necessary steps to agree to it.” I never saw anyone hedging on an issue such as is done right here.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Do nothing!

**Mr. Cameron:** — Instead of standing up and facing the issue, you pass a resolution asking Ottawa to do all these things, to exempt us from having to do them, and then to say “if and when this is done, we, in Saskatchewan, will tag along with it.” And you expect us to vote for that!

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — Mr. Speaker, I am interested in the contribution of the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron). It is pretty obvious that the hon. member for Maple Creek, while he is seated here, his heart is in Ottawa. He is very concerned lest the government at Ottawa might be obligated to live up to its constitutional obligations.

**Mr. Cameron:** — I want something done in Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — As he was reading the motion I could not help asking myself, “who else can establish a national marketing board for livestock and dairy products and poultry products; who else can establish them?”

**Mr. McCarthy (Cannington):** — Such a wise owl!

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — I suggest that a national marketing board cannot be established by anyone else except the national government. My hon. friend from Maple Creek may wish that Ottawa would not be compelled to live up to its obligations; but the obligation is there, squarely upon their shoulders, and they can wiggle and squirm as they like and they cannot escape it.

Then he says, “here you are asking Ottawa to effect long-term contracts for agricultural products”, and he suggests that that is letting Saskatchewan off pretty lightly. I would like to ask him who else can effect long-term contracts for agricultural products? Who else can establish price supports to the producer, related to parity?

Mr. Speaker, it is high time that hon. members opposite realize that they are members of the Legislature of Saskatchewan, not apologists for the Liberal party at Ottawa.

**Mr. Cameron:** — what is the purpose . . .

**March 24, 1955**

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — We were led to believe, last fall, that this Party had had a rebirth. We have been led to believe that this Party was through defending the unpopular policies of the Liberal party at Ottawa. Why, the minions of my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, said “the Liberal party will never get anywhere in Saskatchewan as long as the C.C.F. can continue to hang around our necks the terrible record of the Government at Ottawa.” They said that all over this province, and it was on the strength of that very campaign that my hon. friend got to the seat where he now sits, and, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Cameron:** — It would take a lot of nerve to vote against that, don’t you think?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — . . . I suggest that if that was their policy out on the hustings of Saskatchewan in the fall of 1954, it should be their policy now in this Legislature. Let them cut themselves loose. Let them deny the great Minister of Agriculture at Ottawa. Let them say that they are in favour of these things because the people of Saskatchewan, yes, the people of Canada, need them and are prepared to support them. Let us say as members of the Legislature that we are prepared to support these things because the producers of Canada are asking for them.

**Mr. Cameron:** — We’ll probably . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — Let us say that we are prepared to support them, even though members of a Provincial Legislature, and let us not be trying all the time to protect the people at Ottawa who are doing nothing for the producers of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River):** — I couldn’t let a glorious opportunity like this pass without looking at my friend over there. You know, he is a great actor, or else he is terribly ignorant — one of the two.

This motion “calls upon the Federal Government to convene a Federal-Provincial agricultural conference to draft comprehensive agricultural policies for submission to Parliament at the earliest possible date, that will provide farmers of Canada with their fair share of the net national income; the said Conference to have particular reference to:” — and here is what they are asking, and there is nobody who spoke, this afternoon, who said a word about this thing:

“(a) the establishing of national marketing boards for livestock dairy and poultry products as a means of ensuring price stability and orderly marketing;”

I could not possibly vote for that, and I will tell you some of my reasons for it.

(b) the effecting of long-term contracts for agricultural products as a further means of price stabilization;”

Well, we had some experience with long-term contracts and they haven’t all been too happy, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Loptson:** — They cost us a lot of money.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Yes, they cost us a lot of money, and at the low price we did get the Minister of municipalities told us that they over-paid us \$282 million.

**Mr. Cameron:** — They only think in millions.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That was at the time that Mr. Gardiner and Mr. Wesson were on the boat going to Great Britain to try to get some settlement over there, and when they got there they were faced with the speech of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. McIntosh) in this House in which he said that they had overpaid the Canadian farmer in the amount of \$282 million.

**Hon. Mr. McIntosh:** — Don’t shoot, Hermie!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Wasn’t that doing something for the farmer, Mr. Speaker? What a great service he rendered to the farmers of Saskatchewan and western Canada at that time! That was a smart trick, wasn’t it?

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — You’re arguing . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Gardiner and Mr. Wesson went over there and offered that the Government of Canada would convert the balance of \$65 million which was still outstanding on the loan that Canada had made to Great Britain, that they would turn that over as final payment on the contract, but they were met with the same thing. We just cancelled the rest of that loan. That was the reception that Mr. Wesson and Mr. Gardiner got from this glorious Labour Government in Great Britain, the friends of these people sitting in this House, today. They have sat here for 10 years and done nothing.

Now, this other thing, the establishing of price supports to the producer which shall be related to parity based on an acceptable formula. Even the great leader of the Farmers’ Union, Mr. Phelps — and I will admit Phelps has a lot of brains; he has flashes of brilliance that isn’t shown in this House by any of you; he has brains; but even he has admitted that no one has ever found a suitable formula to base price supports on.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — Then what is ‘Jimmy’ Gardiner talking about?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — He might be dreaming, but I’m not.

**March 24, 1955**

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! Might I remind the members that only five people have spoken on this motion. If the member who is on his feet is saying something you think you should reply to, you will have the opportunity to do so, and I would ask you not to keep on this cross-fire across the floor of the House. That applies to both sides of the House, because we cannot conduct the business of this Legislature if that is allowed to continue, and I am not going to allow it to continue. The member will continue.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I will do my best to keep those fellows in order, Mr. Speaker.

Now then, what is the situation in regard to this matter? Everybody in this House, if he knows anything, knows that the Dominion Government has no power to legislate a marketing board for livestock in the province of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Kramer (The Battlefords):** — Phooey!

**Mr. Danielson:** — That right belongs to the provinces, and that is a Dominion legislation provision, and everybody in this House should know that. When the provinces act and put up their Boards, then the Dominion Government has legislation which will facilitate inter-provincial traffic in all these commodities and finally give them the power to go out into the export markets of the world. That is the position, and I am going to read you something here.

**Mr. Cameron:** — They know it, too.

**Mr. Danielson:** — No, they don't know it, because I don't think they know anything. Don't accuse them of knowing anything.

Mr. Speaker, here is a news report from the Alberta Legislature, and it is dated March 15, 1955:

“Legislation to enable establishment of commodity producer marketing boards was introduced, Monday, in the Alberta Legislature and given first reading.

“Approval of 51 per cent of persons engaged in the production of a certain commodity within a defined area would be necessary to set up a board under terms of the Bill.

“Once a board was set up, 10 per cent of producers in the board could petition for the board to be dissolved or the Government could order a plebiscite. A 51-per cent vote of the producers would be necessary to scrap the plan.

“The Government will hold a plebiscite when a plan for the control and regulating of marketing is submitted.

“Agriculture Minister Halmrast said the Bill was submitted to the House before it was discussed with the Alberta Federation of Agriculture and the Farmers' Union of Alberta, two groups which requested enabling legislation.

“Stock growers’ organizations in southern Alberta have opposed marketing legislation.”

Those are the facts. You have here the enabling legislation which was put on the statute books in 1944, Mr. Speaker, which the Premier said was going to be the cornerstone of the edifice they were going to build in the Province, when they put through The Natural Products Marketing Act. It is still there, and it includes everything that is grown in the province of Saskatchewan, everything except wheat. It includes coarse grains. Why don’t they use it? They have never used it for one solitary thing, except honey. Ontario has half a dozen marketing Acts and Boards set up for the purpose of marketing several of their products. British Columbia has it. Alberta, I think, has one, and they are introducing more now. Why then does this Government resist the temptation? — because I know the temptation is in this group to regulate and control everything. Haven’t they the courage of their convictions to go ahead? If they do, they can get the enabling legislation that is ready to be extended to them by the Dominion Government, not only for this province, but for every province of Canada; and it has been there for four years now. It is four years since it was put on the statute books of Canada. What are you talking about? You don’t know anything about what you are talking about. The real purpose of this resolution was never mentioned here, this afternoon. It wasn’t mentioned once, because it says “the establishing of national marketing boards for livestock, dairy and poultry products” etc., and “the establishment of price supports which shall be related to parity prices based on an acceptable formula.” “And further, That this Assembly recommends that the Government of Saskatchewan take all necessary steps, upon consummation of the policy herein referred to, to assure its proper and immediate implementation in this Province.”

But you are the fellows who have the power right here in this province, and together with the other provinces you can control and market everything that a farmer grows, from peanuts to horses, if they raise them and cattle and everything. Why don’t you get out the old legislation? It must be getting pretty musty and dirty by this time. That cornerstone of C.C.F. policy, of socialization of the province of Saskatchewan, with which you really intended to socialize agriculture, but you didn’t have the guts to do it.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Or the courage, Mr. Speaker, pardon me. This isn’t the first time they haven’t had the courage to do what they said they were going to do.

I would be remiss in my duties, I would be unworthy of the trust that the people of Arm River showed in me when they elected me to this House, if I voted for something like this.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Right.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I would be. And I can assure you I have been in touch with

**March 24, 1955**

people here in this city of Regina this last week. Two of them sat down, Monday morning, to have breakfast with me, and one of them said “if you ever support anything like this, you don’t need to come back to Arm River and ask for our vote any more.” So that is the situation. That is about all I have to say.

**Mr. E.H. Walker (Gravelbourg):** — Mr. Speaker, we have heard an awful lot from the hon. member over there in the last couple of minutes. I didn’t think that he had the courage to misrepresent his constituents to that extent. I thought he would go a long way, but I didn’t think he would ever go that far.

A few days ago, when the mover and the seconder introduced this motion they covered the subject pretty thoroughly insofar as the depression which exists in the agricultural industry is concerned, and they tried to show what this province is already doing to help the livestock industry in Saskatchewan. The hon. member talked about the cornerstone . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — On which to socialize agriculture.

**Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):** — As a matter of fact, it is cornerstone. The only thing we are waiting for is the rest of the foundation to come from the Federal Government . . .

**Mr. Cameron:** — That’s right.

**Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):** — We have waited a long, long time and it hasn’t come yet; there has been no indication of it yet. This province has not the legal power to do anything more until they can get some assistance or some co-operation from the Federal Government at Ottawa.

They pointed out some of the things which this Government has done. They mentioned the fact that the Provincial Government, through its agricultural policies, had attempted to raise the standard of living and to stabilize the agricultural industry in this province. They have done it in a good many ways — through their livestock policies in encouraging higher standards of livestock, through better seed, through their forage crops, through drainage and irrigation, tending to raise the amount of production from agricultural land; they have opened up new areas and have spent a substantial amount of money in clearing new land, valuable agricultural land, upon which our youth could settle and make a living. They have also encouraged co-operatives in order that the farmers of this country could deal through their own organization to try to save themselves some money, and in an endeavour to prevent any more large monopolies from draining away the lifeblood of the agricultural industry of the province, such as the farm machine and meat packing industries and a good many others have been doing over the past few years.

They also pointed out some of the reasons for the depression of the farmers of Saskatchewan. For instance, it is well known that, in 1943, the average capital investment per worker in agriculture in Canada, was \$3500; by 1951 that had risen to \$9500 — just a little less than three times as much. The record in Saskatchewan is even more glaring. In 1941, the average

investment per worker in agriculture was around \$4700; by 1951 this had gone up to over \$13,400 — more than three times. Then the hon. members opposite have the stupidity to laugh and snicker and say that the agricultural manufacturers haven't taken advantage of the monopoly which they have in this province.

The share of national income for the farm labourers in Saskatchewan, in 1951, even though we had very nearly 25 per cent of the total labour force in Canada, the share in Saskatchewan was only 7.8 per cent of the national income. By 1951, that had risen to a little over 13 per cent. By 1954, it had gone back down to less than it was in 1951 — 7.5 per cent of the national income going to 25 per cent of the agricultural labour force in Canada.

The hon. member, a few minutes ago, mentioned something to the effect that the Liberal Government in Ottawa had made no commitments, nor had they any intentions of doing anything to stabilize agriculture in this province. Well, again, I want to quote you a few lines from Prime Minister King's speech away back in 1943.

**Mr. Danielson:** — If you are referring to me saying that, it is absolutely untrue. I never made such a statement.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — It sounded like it.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I made no such statement. I never said that.

**Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):** — It is quite all right. You made your speech; now I will make mine.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I never said that there was no intention to stabilize agriculture.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The hon. member rose on a point of privilege. He says you are ascribing a statement to him which he did not make.

**Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):** — I won't argue, I will withdraw it. I am not going to argue with him; it is a waste of time.

**Mr. Danielson:** — If the truth slipped out of him, he doesn't know, but he did say it, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — And I insist that he doesn't know any more . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I heard him make the statement, but I do not know that he referred to it as a statement that you made.

**Mr. Danielson:** — He certainly did.

**Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member says he didn't say what I said he did, so I will take it back; I don't care

**March 24, 1955**

but he has intimated and the other 'dead-end kid' there beside him has intimated, that the Liberals in Ottawa aren't going to do anything to help agriculture in Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member said that he made the statement he ascribed to you and he will rescind it.

**Mr. Danielson:** — No, he has repeated it right now: that I had made the statement that the Federal Government had stated that they were not going to do anything to stabilize agriculture in the province of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Speaker:** — You have already made your speech. You rose on a . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — I know, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member rose on a point of privilege. The point of privilege is that the hon. member who is speaking has ascribed a statement to the member for Arm River which the member for Arm River said he did not make. And the hon. member who is on his feet has said if that is so then he withdraws the statement.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That is correct, Mr. Speaker, but he just repeated it again.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! He has withdrawn it, and that is all there is to it.

**Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):** — For his benefit, Mr. Speaker, I will repeat what I said a moment ago. I said that if I made a statement which the hon. member claims he did not make, then I will withdraw it; but I said the two members sitting on the other side of the House had intimated, in their speeches, that Ottawa has no responsibility insofar as protecting the agricultural industry in Saskatchewan is concerned.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Two members!

**Mr. Cameron:** — Name your members.

**Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):** — So Prime Minister King, away back in 1943, in a speech over the radio is quoted as saying:

“To help to win the war the farmers are asked to accept a ceiling on prices, we believe they are entitled to a floor under prices to ensure them against an agricultural depression after the war.”

And then he goes on to say:

“That in prescribing prices the Board shall endeavour to insure adequate and stable returns for agriculture and shall endeavour to secure a fair relationship between the returns from agriculture and those from other occupations.”

And the hon. members say they cannot support our motion which is asking them to do that.

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — He disagrees with that.

**Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):** — Now I want to give my endorsement to the portion of the resolution which asks for long-term markets . . .

**Mr. McCarthy (Cannington):** — Where are you going to get them?

**Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):** — I'll tell you in a few minutes; don't get in a hurry.

I think the hon. members opposite should realize, and I certainly know that the people of Saskatchewan realize, that the farmers of this country are exposed to foreign markets and they have absolutely no protection whatsoever; but we are required to buy our essential commodities and services on a protected market, protected by tariffs and protected by subsidies from the taxpayers of Canada.

In a letter on Canadian livestock products published, (believe it or not) by the Industrial Development Council of the Canadian Meat Packers — certainly not a Socialist organization, much as I would like to see it be . . .

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — Minty's clients.

**Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):** — And if I might quote a few paragraphs from this, I think it will bring out the points which I wish to make in support of this motion. The article is entitled, "What is ahead in 1955", and they are pointing out that the livestock and meat industry is expecting an unusually large amount of product to come on the market. They say:

"From all indications 1955 will be another year of relatively heavy meat output in North America, which is revealed by recent surveys."

They point out that during the four weeks of 1955 the hog slaughter exceeded last year's by nearly 30 per cent; Cattle slaughtering slightly exceeded last year's record post-war totals; calf slaughter held meat 1954 levels and right on down to sheep and lamb slaughter, which rose by nearly 17 per cent. The article goes on to point out that the number of cattle reported on feed in the U.S. and Canada is considerably higher than a year ago. The United States Department of Agriculture has placed the increase in that country at around 8 per cent. The nearest figures that are available in Canada indicate an increase of from 15 to 20 per cent in the cattle that are being prepared to go to market from three to six months hence. They go on to point out:

"Until larger supplies of fed cattle begin to reach market, the spread between higher and lower grades seems likely to remain wide. Cattle feeders should keep this possibility in mind, particularly if the demand for beef should happen to lag with the onset of warmer weather, just as if it is in good supply. Experienced cattle breeders know how essential it is to keep in close touch with the market and in view of the rather sensitive balance likely to prevail between demand and supply over the next few months, an orderly marketing programme for cattle as they attain the proper weight and degree of finish, would seem especially desirable."

Now we have the friends of the members opposite supporting us, but they haven't got around to it yet.

In another article in the same issue, they talk about storage, and I think probably this article is one of the biggest reasons why we need a national livestock marketing board. We hear arguments from uninformed people, such as the members opposite, that one of the reasons they do not want national marketing boards for livestock is because it is a perishable product. Well that, my friends, is one of the big reasons why I think we do need a national marketing livestock board, because it is a perishable product, and at the present time the livestock producers are at the mercy of the packers. In this article on storage, an important marketing service, the Council for Canadian Meat Packers, say this:

“Storage is generally an integral part of the marketing of any product. The products of farm origin, particularly those which fluctuate seasonally in supply and are perishable, storage operations help to equalize production and consumption and provide more orderly marketing and stable prices. Livestock and livestock products are in this category. It has been truly said that refrigeration has changed slaughtering and meat packing from a local trade to a national industry. Certainly without modern facilities to freeze and store meat and to ship under refrigeration, the whole livestock and meat industry could not have developed as it has on such a large and extensive scale.

“Today it is possible to process livestock close to the point of production and to preserve fresh meat for shipment to consuming centres thousands of miles away. The widespread application of the refrigerating principle in retail stores and homes now completes the process and permits the meat to be sold on a volume basis the year around.

“Pork requires the largest freezing operation because hog marketing rises to sharp peaks in the spring and fall, and without storage the surplus production at these periods would cause prices to be unduly depressed and the market demands could not normally be met during the summer months.”

I doubt very much if the storage facilities have been used to their fullest extent, because if they have I sometimes wonder what is the reason for the tremendous fluctuation in the prices, today. Certainly there is no call for it, except the fact that the packers want to make undue and excessive profits and our friends across the way there like to help them out in doing that, at the expense of the stock raisers of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. McCarthy (Cannington):** — That's a wise statement . . .

**Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):** — It is too bad you couldn't do so well.

**Mr. McDonald:** — What about the Co-ops?

**Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):** — We can go back and look over this wheat agreement which the hon. member was speaking about a few minutes ago, and I think these figures are something that he should take a look at. To go back to 1943, they give the price of domestic wheat, the price of Class 1 wheat and the price of Class 2 wheat, and from 1943 to the end of 1947, under the Anglo-Canadian Wheat Agreement of 77 cents a bushel, Class 1 wheat was selling for \$1.25, and class 2 wheat from \$1.42 to \$1.55 — a spread of approximately 48 cents for Class 1 wheat and 65 cents for Class 2 wheat, which the western Canadian wheat growers had to absorb — not the people of Canada as it was intended, but the western wheat growers were satisfied to absorb that loss in the price of wheat for the sake of long-term agreements and the promise of parity prices after the war was over.

Then, in 1947-48, the International Wheat Agreement came into effect, and we find that the spreads were even greater. The domestic price of wheat was around \$2.00 a bushel, in 1948-49-50, and then it started to drop down to \$1.81, \$1.82, to \$1.70 at the present time. Class 1 wheat and Class 2 wheat were selling for around \$1.55 and up, and the spread in those years was running around at least 60 cents a bushel, which again the Canadian wheat producers had to subsidize in the domestic market, and they had to subsidize the overseas market for the benefit of the manufacturing industry in this country.

This motion is calling for a Dominion-Provincial conference to discuss these things. I don't know why the members opposite are so afraid of having our two governments get together to see if they cannot work out some agreement. Surely they don't have to be so afraid of a Dominion-Provincial conference to discuss these topics. Have they no confidence in their Federal Government at Ottawa? Are they afraid that they can't stand up to public pressure once our Provincial Government makes their offer to them? I suspect they have good reasons to be afraid of the people of this province and of the people of Canada. We are calling for this Dominion-Provincial conference to discuss the establishment of national marketing boards; for long-term contracts and for an internal price structure based on parity.

The hon. members opposite have a great time trying to let on that this is something new in the world, that we are asking for something entirely new and something that hasn't been heard of before. I want to point out to them what some other countries are doing in this regard, and I want to assure you from the first that it is not provincial or state governments that are doing these things; they are national governments, representing the whole country. Australia has set up an Australian wheat stabilization scheme. I won't go into it in too much detail, but there are two or three points which I think are of considerable interest and could be of value if they could be adopted into the Canadian picture. For instance, in Australia, the growers will receive for wheat sold domestically, \$1.53, approximately the International Wheat Agreement price at the present time, or at least they are guaranteed the International Wheat Agreement price if the latter falls below \$1.53. They are guaranteed that price for the wheat they export. Then they are guaranteed the cost of production, the equivalent of \$1.40 per bushel. That will be in effect for all export wheat up to a maximum of 100 million

**March 24, 1955**

bushels shipped in any one year. The cost of production is to be estimated from season to season. The third point is their equalization scheme. A stabilization fund is created for the growers to which the growers will contribute a maximum of 16 cents per bushel, and where the export prices are above the cost of production, a total not to exceed \$44 million; and if the price of wheat goes down below the cost of production, then they will draw from the fund which is built up.

I see nothing wrong with our two governments getting together and discussing problems such as that. The Australian wheat stabilization scheme guarantees prices for all export wheat up to a certain maximum, based on the cost of production. The Australians have also gone a little further again than we have. They have given the livestock producers a pretty good deal. They have a marketing and stabilization scheme for all meat products. Australia has entered into 15-year meat contract agreements with the United Kingdom covering beef, veal, mutton and lamb. Although the contract calls for government selling, it also embodies provisions for the private trade. They point out that the contract provides that even on reversion to private trading, if the trade does not take all the Australia surplus the United Kingdom government is obliged to take the full amount. They are guaranteed a certain production of the meat which they may produce. If prices are higher in private trading than under the government provisions, then the producers get the benefit of such higher prices. If prices are lower, then the price formula contracts with the British government makes good the difference. There they have their 15-year meat contract under which they are guaranteed their cost of production.

The Australian plan not only guarantees to the United Kingdom their meat for the coming 15 years, but it guarantees the producer in Australia that he will get his cost of production. It stabilizes the agricultural industry and I am quite sure helps to stabilize the whole Australian economy. The United Kingdom agreement is stated "to develop further the production of meat in Australia, increase the export of meat to the United Kingdom, and provide a satisfactory market in the United Kingdom for the whole of the exportable surplus of meat from Australia during the term of the agreement."

In the short term, up to September 30, 1953, in the case of beef and veal, a detailed agreement applied. Under this a floor price is fixed, below which prices cannot fall before 1958, the floor price being the 1950-51 contract price. Prices are reviewed periodically and adjusted accordingly, and here they point out that in prices under the agreement for 1952-53, they were 20 per cent higher than those under the 1951-52 agreement. Those recently announced for 1953-54, show a 5½ per cent increase.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Would the hon. member permit a question? What is the price? You gave us the percentages; have you got the price per pound for any of that?

**Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):** — No, I don't see it here. I imagine it would be a little too detailed — yes, they do give it here in pounds.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Could you give it to me?

**Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):** — I will send it over to you and you can look at it.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — I think you will find it is away below our price.

**Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):** — I think, Mr. Speaker, that the agricultural industry here in Canada could well use some of these long-term agreements to stabilize the agricultural economy and to try to guarantee us our cost of production. I want to suggest further that, if the Canadian Government sits around much longer, we are going to miss the boat. Practically every country in South America has signed long-term agreements with the various European countries to handle practically all of their major products.

**Mr. McDonald:** — And gave it away.

**Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):** — And I want to suggest that if this Canadian Government is going to sit back and hope for the Winnipeg Grain Exchange or some of the private meat packing firms to turn around and sell out products after we have already paid the packers for it, then I think it is going to do the greatest damage possible to our whole agricultural economy and to all of Canada.

I want to call upon the members opposite to reconsider their decision and attempt to justify their position and support this resolution, because I do think it will help all the farm people of Saskatchewan.

**Hon. L.F. McIntosh (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** — Mr. Speaker, I am rather amused at the hon. member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) in his remarks this afternoon, and also the hon. member from Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson), that I was probably responsible for costing the farmers of the province of Saskatchewan many millions of dollars because of a statement I made on the floor of the Legislature approximately five years ago.

**Mr. Loptson:** — You cost them \$145 million, I think it was.

**Hon. Mr. McIntosh:** — Now they are putting a figure on what I actually cost the farmers of Saskatchewan. Might I just say to my hon. friend from Arm River that I came back into the Legislature in 1952 with a majority much in excess of 100, and there were, elected on this side of the House, many more members than there were prior to my having made this statement on the floor of the Legislature. However, I very much appreciate the compliment that he extended to me when he inferred, along with his seatmate, that what I said on the floor of the Legislature some five years ago, had a profound influence on the government of Great Britain. I might just mention, in passing, that the Hon. Mr. Howe, on the floor of the House of Commons, stated that Britain had filled its obligations in full under the U.K. wheat agreement.

**Mr. Danielson:** — When?

**Hon. Mr. McIntosh:** — He made that statement prior to any final settlement being arrived at by the Government of Canada.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Do you know when the final settlement was?

**March 24, 1955**

**Hon. McIntosh:** — I know when it was, yes.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Arm River laid a great deal of stress on clause (a) of this resolution: “the establishing of national marketing boards” and he stated that the Government of Canada did not have the power to establish national marketing boards. I recall, back in 1934 when there was a National Marketing Act placed upon the statute books of the Dominion of Canada by the then Bennett government, that following the 1935 election and the return of a Liberal government, the National Marketing Act was referred to the Privy Council, but the enabling legislation passed by the provinces was not referred to the Privy Council along with the Dominion legislation for an opinion as to where the jurisdiction or divided jurisdiction lay. Had the Dominion Government sent along with the National Marketing Act the enabling legislation passed by the provinces, the decision of the Privy Council might have been somewhat different than what it was when they were just considering the National Marketing Act.

What I wish to say is that we are a self-governing nation and somewhere within the Dominion of Canada lies the right for the people to govern themselves, and all that is being suggested in this motion is that a conference be called to give consideration to the whole question of marketing agricultural commodities. At such a conference surely the provinces and the Dominion, knowing that we are a self-governing nation, can arrive at where the jurisdiction and responsibility lie, having due regard to the fact that we are a self-governing nation and somewhere within the Dominion of Canada lies the right for the people to decide on their own course of action.

The hon. member from Arm River also made mention of The Natural Products Marketing Act of Saskatchewan, which was passed at the session of 1944-45, and then proceeded to say that there were a few pails of honey being marketed under and through this type of legislation. It is quite true that there is only one group of producers, up to the present time, that has taken advantage of the Provincial Act, but I would like to say to my hon. friend that this Act is a vehicle for the producers of various kinds of commodities to use; it is a vehicle for their use to market their products if they so wish, co-operatively and jointly.

This motion, as I interpret it, asks that there be a conference to discuss the possibilities of setting up national marketing boards that would assign to the producers the right, if they so wish, to market all kinds of agricultural commodities. I do not see anything very seriously wrong with finding out where the jurisdiction lies . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — We know where it lies.

**Hon. Mr. McIntosh:** — . . . and a Board set up by the Dominion Government, and then the producers in the various provinces of the Dominion of Canada setting up provincial boards under the jurisdiction of the provincial legislation that they have, and then the co-ordination of the operation of those boards in the national field of marketing. That is where I see the final clause of this resolution becomes important — if such legislation is made available and such boards are set up, that this province and its government do its utmost to see that there is nothing in the way, insofar as this province is concerned, of the producers carrying out the rights given to them from such a conference as mentioned in this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, having had some knowledge and experience in marketing and having had some knowledge of the 1934 National Marketing Act and the enabling legislation passed by this province, the province of Alberta and the province of Manitoba, at that time, and having had some knowledge of the purpose and intent of this type of legislation and the field of action that could be taken if there was a national marketing agency under Dominion legislation, I have no hesitation in supporting the motion as it is.

**Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena):** — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add a few words to this debate. I notice here, this evening, we have had a lot of words from the gentlemen opposite, others have done a lot of talking from their seats, but added little to the debate.

They are opposed to asking the Federal Government to call a conference in conjunction with the provinces and other bodies in regard to these problems. It is most amusing to me, Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, to notice members on the other side of the House getting up and objecting to a headline which appeared in the 'Leader-Post', a paper which is almost their Bible, objecting to a headline accusing them of supporting a Livestock Marketing Board. Now we even see them opposing the Federal Government for the establishing of a marketing board on a national basis.

**Mr. McDonald:** — It's your responsibility.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — The member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) said that we have in this province the necessary Act to set up these boards. As the Minister of Municipal Affairs has just pointed out, that is only a means of legislation under which a marketing board would have to set up their organization.

We definitely know in this province there is something wrong. During the latter years of the war, and after the war, we were operating under a price control system. According to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures for the years just following the war, from 1944-45 on to 1945-48, using the suggested figures of 1935-39 being 100, we note that in only 5 years have the wheat producers of western Canada received the cost of production. In those 5 years we received, on that basis, the cost of production. Since then we have been gradually declining year after year. Our costs of production have been falling behind until today, we are down to 80 cents on the dollar to what we had in 1935-39. We are receiving for our wheat in the west only a little better than 50 cents on the dollar in comparison to what we were getting 8 years ago, in 1945-46, just after the war when we had price controls.

If those things continue the trend they have been following the past few years, in another three or four years we will be down to 35 or 40 cents on the dollar compared to what we got at the end of the war. The price for stock tells about the same story. I won't weary the House with statistics but I have the Dominion Bureau of Statistics prices here for all types of grain and butter, eggs, milk, and dairy products, cheese and so on, hogs from 1943 up to the present time. I will just come to some of the rates for the more recent years. I note in 1951, the average price at Winnipeg for steers up to 1,000 pounds, was \$31.95 per cwt. In 1951 we had a good year.

**March 24, 1955**

But, now we find, in 1954, only three years later, the average price for the same type of steer is \$17.63 per cwt. So, on the return to the farmers for their good steers up to 1,000 pound in weight, we find today that they are only receiving slightly more than half of what they did three years ago.

When the members opposite try to say that it was statements made in this House which caused the price of the farmers' commodities to come down, the reverse is quite the truth. The reverse is quite true because, if it wasn't for the resolutions that this legislature has passed asking the Federal Government to try and do more for the west than they have done, we would have had poorer treatment than we have now. It is this Legislature which has given leadership and guidance to a number of the farmers of this province, making them aware of the life they have been living, because we are in a position to get at the Dominion Bureau of Statistics a little easier than the average farmer, and we can make those figures available for them. I cannot for the life of me see how any member opposite can fail to support a resolution asking that the whole question of agriculture, the returns from agriculture and the cost of production, be discussed by a Federal-Provincial Agricultural conference. Mr. Speaker, I shall support the motion.

**Hon. T.J. Bentley (Minister of Public Health):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two in this debate. Our friends opposite remind me very much of a little item that appears in the front page of the 'Leader-Post' every day, called "Today's Chuckle", and if they look at the bottom of the 'Leader-Post' they will see that Today's Chuckle says: "A man who loses his head is often the last one to miss it". I sometimes think they are the last ones to realize how much they have lost their heads in the last hour or so of debate.

I have in my hand here, Mr. Speaker, the agricultural policy adopted by the Saskatchewan Liberal party  
...

**Mr. Kramer (The Battlefords):** — Not again!

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — ... at their last convention, and I notice, under its agricultural policy, three little items that have a close relationship to the three items mentioned in the resolution proposed by the hon. member from Bengough (Mr. A.L.S. Brown). We see (a) in the hon. member's resolution — "the establishing of national marketing boards for livestock, dairy and poultry products ..." When the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) was speaking he said he was against all that kind of thing and was certainly going to be opposed to the establishment of a livestock marketing board, so I draw his attention to item No. 16 in the agricultural policy of the Liberal party, from its convention of last fall.

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — But they have been re-born since then!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Well, verily you must be born again, the Good Book says, and I suppose they will keep in trying until they finally get the right type of birth.

Item No. 16 reads as follows, in the Liberal policy, in their platform:

“Endorsement of the Canadian Wheat Board as the best method of marketing grain and extension of the powers of the Board to include full control over the marketing of all grains, with adequate representation of producers on this and other such Boards.”

**Mr. Danielson:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — What other such Boards are there for the marketing of agricultural products, except the kind of Boards that would market livestock, dairy products and poultry products? What do our friends mean? Where is the head that they do not miss yet? They should go back to last November and pick it up, because certainly that is what they say on this — meaning the Wheat Board, and other such Boards, and this is what this resolution calls for.

**Mr. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition):** — Provincial Boards.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Now we will go along. This is a sort of hydra-headed monster — one of the most fierce of all times. They lost all three of them, I guess, because now we go to the next one, marked (b) in the hon. member's resolution which is being debated now, and this one reads: “the effecting of long-term contracts for agricultural products as a means of further price stabilization.” Section 15 of the Liberal party's platform on agriculture says:

“Full co-operation with the Federal Government in securing for farm products the widest markets and the best possible prices.”

The member for Maple Creek, when he was speaking — and I think the Leader of the Opposition, if I remember correctly . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — Steady, now.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — . . . stated that — I think I remember correctly, but if not I will stand for correction. Anyway, someone from over there (and I am pretty sure it was both of the gentlemen I just mentioned) stated that this Government should do the job itself. Certainly, the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) said that this Government should do the job itself. Now if this Government should do the job itself, and our friends across the way ever do find any of the heads they have lost, and should be some day inflicted by some set of circumstances on this side, are they going to accept their own advice, because, here in their platform, they will co-operate with the Federal Government — the very thing that this resolution is suggesting, co-operation with the Federal Government.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Sure, that is just what I said.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Mr. Speaker, I love the member for Arm River. He is a source of never-ending joy to me, because whenever he is

**March 24, 1955**

caught, he says "that is what I said." I agree with him. And whenever he gets up to speak, he says something else. However, that is fine. I like him that way and I hope he continues to be that way until 1956, or thereabouts.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — He picked up a head, but it wasn't his own.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Now we come to the other item in the resolution, the part which they wanted to cut out, which the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loftson) tried to amend by cutting out completely — the third one, item (c): "the establishment of price supports to the producer, which shall be related to parity based on an acceptable formula." And now we turn to item No. 14 in the Liberal platform, the very last head under . . .

**Mr. Swallow (Yorkton):** — Going backwards, eh?

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Yes, This one says:

"A permanent policy of adequate floor prices for agricultural products and the utilization of the agricultural prices support Act to maintain floor prices."

**Mr. McDonald:** — Absolutely.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — What is the difference?

**Mr. McDonald:** — The difference?

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — And this "the establishment of price supports to the producer, which shall be related to parity based on an acceptable formula." The only difference, Mr. Speaker, is this . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — You are losing your head, boy.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — The only difference, Mr. Speaker, is that this, in the resolution, is a vast improvement over theirs. The Liberals say they want to have agricultural prices support in maintaining floor prices. Do they want the floor down the basement or in the sub-basement, or where? This one says we want the floor and parity on an acceptable formula. Our friends should try and pick their heads up and make use of them, if it is possible, because in every one of these things here they have stated similar objectives in their platform, and now they say that they are going to vote against this. Well, I hope they do. It will show exactly what sort of an attitude they have, and when they have to face the public we will see what attitude they take.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who doesn't support this motion tonight, can never, by any stretch of imagination, claim that he is a champion of the farmers in the province of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. A.L.S. Brown (Bengough)** (closing debate): — Mr. Speaker, in closing this debate which I started, I think it was on March 3rd, I presume that much has been said, much of which may be true, much of which may be new. The only unfortunate part about it is . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, but I wanted to speak before the member adjourns the debate.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I gave the warning. Proceed.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Oh no, Mr. Speaker. I stood up and when the member stood up I didn't know whether he was going to close the debate or just what he was going to do.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Oh, I gave you the warning.

**Mr. McDonald:** — That was before the Minister of Health spoke, Mr. Speaker, if you recall.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Are you prepared to let him speak?

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — Certainly.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Go ahead, then.

**Mr. A.H. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, my good friend, the Minister of Public Health (Hon. Mr. Bentley) has referred to the Liberal platform which was drawn up in convention on November 25 and 26, last, and surely to goodness he realizes that this is the Liberal provincial platform, and it points out the policies that a Liberal party would adopt when they sit on that side of the House. The things that he has referred to here, this evening, and the majority of the things that have been referred to by speakers on the other side of the House, are the responsibility of Provincial Governments and nobody else. The Federal Government has no constitutional responsibility, and they have no authority to do what you have been asking them to do here, this evening. The Federal Government has the responsibility, once the provinces have instigated legislation and started it on its way. Then the Federal Government will come into the picture and play their part in inter-provincial and export trade.

**Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):** — Hopeful, aren't you?

**Mr. McDonald:** — I wonder if we didn't have a Federal-Provincial conference not very long ago. I wonder if some of the people on that side of the House realize that the Minister of Agriculture for this province, and the officials of his department, were at a Dominion-Provincial Agricultural conference . . .

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — That was a Liberal caucus.

**Mr. McDonald:** — . . . not very long ago.

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — That was your caucus.

**March 24, 1955**

**Mr. McDonald:** — And I wonder how many people over there even know that December 6, 1954, as a matter of fact which is only some four months ago, there was a conference, as a matter of fact it was the 16th Federal-Provincial Agricultural conference, held in Ottawa, beginning December 6, 1954.

**Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):** — What were the topics under discussion?

**Mr. McDonald:** — At that time many of the things that have been discussed here, this evening, were discussed at that conference. It is too bad that the Provincial Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) isn't present here this evening, because he was present and took part at this conference, . . .

**Hon. J.T. Douglas (Minister of Highways):** — . . . “Jimmy” Gardiner . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — . . . and I think the Minister of Highways would be well advised to read the report of that conference then he would know what his colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, had to say at that particular conference, and he would know the answers that the different Ministers of Agriculture from across Canada gave to the Minister of Agriculture of the Province of Saskatchewan. I would recommend to all the members on the other side of the House that they look up the records of that conference. Then they will know where the constitutional responsibility lies for the things they are asking in this motion. It lies with this Government as far as the province of Saskatchewan is concerned; it lies with the Provincial Government of Manitoba as far as the province of Manitoba is concerned — and it lies with the Provincial Government of British Columbia, or Ontario, or Alberta, or any other province in Canada, as far as that particular province is concerned.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — That's what “Jimmy” Gardiner says.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Once those provinces have looked after their constitutional responsibility, then the legislation is already on the statute books of the Dominion of Canada for the Federal Government to take its part. You are the people who are asleep at the switch.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — That is Jimmy's speech.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Once those provinces have looked after their constitutional responsibility, then the legislation is already on the statute books of the Dominion of Canada for the Federal Government to take its part. You are the people who are asleep at the switch.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — That is Jimmy's speech.

**Mr. McDonald:** — You were the people who passed The Agricultural Produce Marketing Act, and now you haven't the courage to implement the authority that you took unto yourselves under that Act.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. McDonald:** — What happened at this last agricultural conference held in Ottawa, beginning December 6th? I want to read something that was said there by the Federal Minister of Agriculture for Canada, and he said this:

“I have been reading in the press and hearing on the radio, during the last few days, demands that we provide, under The Agricultural Prices Support Act, parity prices. We have not the authority in peacetime to set the prices for farm products. That authority rests with the provinces.”

Did the Minister of Saskatchewan deny that? Did he dispute it? No, he did not. But you have a lot of people here, tonight, who either know nothing or do not want to face up to their responsibilities, and endeavour to paint a different picture for the electorate, as the Minister of Public Health would like to create the idea. There is absolutely nothing wrong with the platform that was laid down by the Liberal party in convention. They realize that it is the responsibility of the Provincial Governments to do these things, and the Liberal party would be prepared to do the things that are in our provincial platform — not the Federal Government of Canada, because the Federal Government of Canada has not the authority, and you know it, and if you do not know it, you should not be a Minister in any province.

Now, what did the Minister of Agriculture for Canada say regarding that? He said:

“We, therefore, devised a plan under which the Federal Government, through the Department of Agriculture, could help to stabilize prices; it is embodied in the Agricultural Prices Support Act.”

And he went on to point out the amount of money that the Federal Government had spent under The Prices Support Act in stabilizing farm products in Canada.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — For the Packers.

**Mr. McDonald:** — For the Packers? That is the most ridiculous statement I think that was ever made, Mr. Speaker. If my hon. friend knows anything, he knows that the co-operative movement in this province are in the packing business; they are in the cream business, they are in the egg business. And if you knew anything about farming or farm products, you would know well the returns to a producer on products that he sells through a co-operative movement. How much of a dividend does he get from his co-operative? If the tremendous excess profits were there that you people claim are there, then there would be a big payment come back to the producer, wouldn't there? I know, because I happen to be a producer of butter and eggs and milk, and I know the amount of money I get back from my co-op. Certainly, we get some — and what about our chickens and turkeys? It is the same thing. What you people are trying to do is to kill the co-operative movement throughout Canada. You are wanting a Government Board to take control of products that the producer himself ought to control, and nobody can deny that statement. You are trying, with one hand, to be the great friend of the co-operative movement — and with the other hand, you are trying to cut their throat.

**Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):** — Did the Wheat Board kill the Wheat Pool?

**Mr. McDonald:** — How much money has been spent under the Agricultural Prices Support Act for Canada? Approximately \$300 million.

**March 24, 1955**

**Mr. Gibson (Morse):** — To the packers!

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker — to the packers!

**Mr. Gibson:** — You bet you.

**Mr. McDonald:** — I asked this Government, in Committee, to give consideration to helping our co-operatives go into the meat-packing industry. What was the answer? They haven't answered. I asked this Government, also, to help the co-operatives go into the manufacturing of farm machinery. What was the answer? They haven't answered. Well, goodness me! If this Government was doing the job that it ought to be doing, it would see that our co-operative movements, as far as finances were concerned, were put into a position where they could go into the meat-packing business if they found that it was financially possible, and they could go into the manufacturing of farm machinery. But no, you sit there and do nothing! You are always complaining about past Liberal governments in this province being 'do nothing' governments. If there ever was a government in this province that was doing nothing to face up to the situation that we have now here in this province, well, I would like to see a better group of 'do nothing' people than those who are facing me here tonight, and including those people who are not in the House.

**Some Hon. Member:** — Ask 'Uncle Louis' to do it for them.

**Mr. McDonald:** — What has happened? The only thing that you are prepared to do is go down to Ottawa, get Ottawa to help us; let Ottawa provide our education, let Ottawa build our highways, let Ottawa supply a national health scheme, which they claim Ottawa promised them some 30 years ago. Why, it is only 10 years ago, since you, the members of the C.C.F. party, promised free health services to every man, woman and child in this province, without cost. Did you do that? You promised every man, woman and child in this province that you would do that. That wasn't 36 years ago; it was 10 years ago.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — What are you quoting from?

**Mr. McDonald:** — What am I quoting from? I will read it to you.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Read Mackenzie King's speech of 1919.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. McDonald:** — I will read it to you, Mr. Minister of Public Health. I have it right here, and I will quote you two pages of it. I quoted one of them here, a few days ago . . .

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, are we discussing health insurance now?

**Mr. McDonald:** — The hon. Minister has asked me a question and I am going to answer it. You don't like it, I know, but you are going to take it.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — It is not worrying me any.

**Mr. McDonald:** — What am I quoting from? Well I am quoting from a broadcast, February 9, 1943 — that is just 12 years ago, that isn't 36 years ago; and the person who is now Premier of this province, said this:

“Just as we have made education available to all . . .

They thought they had already done that at that time; they hadn't included power yet; apparently they had made it available . . .

**Mr. Kramer:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — “. . . the time has come . . .”

**Mr. Kramer:** — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I was called to order once, this afternoon, for not speaking to the motion, and I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition is just as much, or more, out of order than I was.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, I am replying to a question from the Minister of Public Health. He said this:

“The time has come when we must make all the benefits of medical . . . science available to all without money and without charge.”

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — They can't take it.

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — Mr. Speaker, no member has a right to break the rules of this House on the pretext that some other member asked him a question, and I insist, as a member of this House, that the rules of this House be in force.

**Mr. Speaker:** — You have broken the rules of this House, many of you, and if I enforced them, many of you would be out of the House. If there were not so many interjections from both sides of the House we might be able to keep a little better order. When a question is asked, you simply provoke the answer. The member may continue.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Thank you very much for your fair ruling, Mr. Speaker. And then he said this:

“By supporting the C.C.F. you can make this right of health and happiness the lot of every man, woman and child in Saskatchewan.”

Then again, speaking in Biggar, on May 18, 1944, he said this:

“A C.C.F. government would proceed to set up medical, dental, hospital services, available to all, without counting the ability of the individual to pay.”

**March 24, 1955**

What has happened, Mr. Speaker! Without the individual's ability to pay? Today, if you do not pay your tax they fine you, and if you do not pay the fine they put you in gaol.

**Mr. Gibson:** — But you have to have the ability to pay, first.

**Mr. McDonald:** — That is the philosophy of this Socialist party.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I think the hon. member has answered the question now.

**Mr. McDonald:** — I think I have, too, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — You will proceed with the motion.

**Mr. McDonald:** — There is another debate coming up later on, and I will read the rest of the paper to my hon. friends then. If they didn't appear to be so uneasy I wouldn't bother.

I do want to refer to the amount of money that has been paid under this Agricultural prices Support Act to the different producers of agricultural products across Canada . . .

**Mr. Cameron:** — Packers, packers!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. McDonald:** — Under the agricultural prices set up in 1944, a revolving fund of \$200 million was provided. It was first applied to potatoes, in 1946, in 1948 and 1950, and the net cost was \$2,036,000. I presume my friends will say that the packers got that. For your information that support price was paid to the producers of potatoes in eastern Canada.

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — Hear! Hear! Remarkable!

**Mr. McDonald:** — And what about apples? It was applied to apples from 1947 to 1949, and again in 1954, at a net cost of \$6,806,000.

**Mr. Cameron:** — To the packers!

**Mr. McDonald:** — To the packers, I suppose.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Packers of apples.

**Mr. McDonald:** — It was applied to white beans, honey and skimmed milk from 1948 to 1953, at a net cost of \$667,000. It was applied to cheddar cheese from 1949 to 1953, at a net cost of \$155,348.

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — Peanuts!

**Mr. McDonald:** — It was applied to butter from 1949 to 1954, and it is expected to result in a net cost of at least \$2,606,000 . . .

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — To the producers? Or Packers?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. McDonald:** — While we are dealing with butter I want to point out the attitude of this Government. When the Federal Government was prepared to sell some of their surplus butter to the different institutions from across Canada, what was the attitude of the present administration, the farmers' friends in Saskatchewan? They said, "Oh, no, these people have to eat margarine; we can buy it cheaper." Well now, wasn't that a great thing for the farmers of this province who are engaged in the production of milk and milk products? You could buy that butter at one-third less than the Federal Government paid for it, and you said "No, you people will have to eat margarine, we can't afford to feed you butter." You were not prepared to put a nickel into the farmers' pockets to help those people who are living in the different institutions in this province — at one-third off the price. That is the attitude of the farmers' friends that sit over here. There isn't a friend of a farmer sitting over there, according to the actions of this Government.

What has happened in regard to eggs? Referring to this same Federal legislation, it has been applied to shell eggs from 1950 to 1953 and has only resulted in a net cost to date of \$65,408. It may cost \$700,000 in 1954, which would total \$765,408 for shell eggs.

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — What are you reading from?

**Mr. McDonald:** — The utilization of this fund to maintain prices on hogs and cattle, through foot-and-mouth disease, cost the Board \$70,144,000 and the total cost has been some \$300 million. That is the total cost.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — Could I ask what the member is quoting from?

**Mr. McDonald:** — Yes, I am quoting from the figures that were given at the Dominion-Provincial conference on December 6, 1954.

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — By whom?

**Mr. McDonald:** — This is the only thing that the Federal Government can do, because this is as far as they can go under the constitution of Canada.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Subsidize tariffs, eh?

**Mr. McDonald:** — But the responsibility lies with the provincial governments to work in co-operation with the Federal Government under this Act. Then, if the producers of western Canada want marketing Boards they can have them; but it is up to this Government in Saskatchewan and the other provincial governments across western Canada to pass the original legislation, and to nobody else.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are an awful lot of figures that one could refer to that were used at the last Dominion-Provincial conference, and, as I say, the Minister of Agriculture for this province was there. I met him in Ottawa. I was there, but not at the conference. I met members of his staff in the corridors of the House of Commons in Ottawa, during this conference.

**March 24, 1955**

And I am certain, according to the records of that conference, that many of the things that were said here, this evening, are certainly not the impressions that the Minister of Agriculture for the Province of Saskatchewan left with that conference. He talked sense at that conference, but this afternoon and this evening I never heard such ridiculous and unfounded statements in my life, to come from people who are supposed to be representing constituencies in this province.

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — He was talking to a better audience.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this motion under any consideration.

**Hon. Mr. McIntosh:** — Will the hon. member permit a question? Did this Government give any financial assistance to Canadian Co-operative Implements Limited, to the horse-processing plant, and did they offer assistance to any group of producers if they wished to go into the processing of livestock?

**Mr. McDonald:** — Well, certainly. And so did the government in Ottawa. If I wanted to go into the records and the figures that were used at that conference, the amount of money that Ottawa has spent in that direction to date, to help co-operatives across Canada, not only in Saskatchewan, it is a terrific figure; and with credit to the co-operatives, most of them have paid back that money to Ottawa. I am saying that if you have any respect at all, or any desire, or any wish to help the co-operatives in this province, then you ought to be talking about the co-operative movements in this province, and not be out with a rumor trying to cut their throats.

**Hon. Mr. McIntosh:** — Mr. Speaker, I am afraid the hon. gentleman did not get my question.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think he did. He said, "Certainly, they did."

**Mr. Wahl:** — Mr. Speaker, might I ask the hon. member a question. I would like to ask what is the difference between a national livestock marketing board and the Canadian Wheat Board?

**Mr. Cameron:** — Surely you don't expect us to answer that.

**Mr. McDonald:** — If I attempt to answer the question here, I am afraid that I would have to adjourn the debate at 10 o'clock. There is just about that much difference. I realize that my hon. friend doesn't know the difference or he would not ask the question. Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I shall warn members again, that the hon. member for Bengough is about to close the debate.

**Mr. A.L.S. Brown (Bengough):** — Mr. Speaker, there has been much said here which might require considerable time to answer, but I shall attempt to keep my remarks brief though not quite as brief as the remarks of the hon. member for Moosomin when he tried to answer the question of the member

for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. Wahl). I think the reason that he kept his remarks so brief was that the difference between the Canadian Wheat Board and any national marketing board is so slight that it requires no answer. In the method of operation and the National Marketing Board for livestock, for dairy products, for poultry products would operate in exactly the same manner and to the same effect as does the Canadian Wheat Board.

I was interested in the figures which the hon. member for Moosomin was quoting, and I asked him to designate his source. When he came to the figure of \$300 million as having been paid out under the Prices Support Act since its inception, I knew full well he was not quoting from the report of the Agricultural Prices Support Act, because in this Act they indicate that it has cost the Federal Treasury not \$300 million, but rather \$80 million. The \$300 million to which my friend referred . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. No, you have misinterpreted what I said. What I said was that the total net cost to the Federal Government has been \$83,563,000, and when I used the figure of \$300 million, that was the gross amount used in trying to stabilize prices of agricultural products in Canada — the gross amount was \$300 million.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — I tender my apologies to the hon. member. I didn't catch his figure of \$83 million, because that is in effect all that has been used out of the Agricultural Prices Support Fund for the purpose of supporting agricultural prices. The difference between the \$83 million and the \$300 million could be termed paid and returned into the Federal treasury after the sale of their products. So, in effect, it has been only the \$83 million that can be referred to as having been used for the purpose of supporting agricultural prices in the agricultural case.

When I was opening this debate I accused the Federal Government of deliberately and intentionally breaking the intent, if not the wording of the Act. I was interested in the figures which the hon. member for Moosomin was using. He was quoting the figures that had been paid, as he suggested, in support of apples, cheese, dairy products and others, and interjections were continually being made that it was being paid to the packers and not to the producers. I am going to suggest to him that there wasn't one single solitary penny of that money to which he referred paid directly to the producer. According to their own Act, they pay to the producers of an agricultural product direct.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Packers of potatoes, eh?

**Mr. Brown:** — And irrespective of whether the packer is an independent or private enterprise, or whether it is a co-operative, the Act states that it shall be paid directly, not through a packing organization, whether it be co-operative or otherwise. It is true that in those co-operative concerns which are in a position to take advantage of the Agricultural Prices Support Act, the producer does get the advantage, but in our society today, in our farm economy, there is much of the processing done by agencies that are yet not socially owned, and they are not socially owned largely because of the philosophy of people such as my friends opposite represent. They have definitely opposed the development, in the agricultural industry and in our economy generally, of socially-owned enterprises whether they are co-operatives, or whether they are nationally or provincially operated.

**March 24, 1955**

He suggested that we were trying to kill the co-operative movement out here. I am telling him that there is no way you can kill the co-operative movement faster than to do exactly what he was suggesting here, that we should force the co-operative movement into the meat-packing plants, or in the processing plants.

**Mr. McDonald:** — No one said that.

**Mr. Danielson:** — No, oh, no.

**Mr. Brown:** — That we support the co-operatives into the manufacturing of farm implements — that's exactly what you said.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, on another point of privilege. I will have to ask the hon. member to withdraw that. I did not suggest at all that co-ops should be forced. I said that this Government should make the money available to the co-operatives to go into any enterprises where they thought there was an opportunity to bring down the cost . . .

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — Mr. Speaker, I was at the Committee to which he referred. As a matter of fact, I was the Chairman of that Committee. The answer which was given to him at that time was that the money will be made available under our Cooperative Guarantee Act if the co-operatives come and ask this Government for the assistance. He was given the assurance by the Minister in charge of co-operatives that that assistance would be made available. If that is what he is suggesting, he is just about four or five years too late. We have already done that and, therefore, he has got no criticism of this Government in that respect. I humbly suggest that that is not what was in the back of his mind. By forcing them into something that they in themselves were not prepared to undertake with our assistance, then there would be nothing that would kill them faster than an action such as that.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to interrupt my friend but I don't want him to say that I said that this Government ought to force the co-operatives into anything, and I would request that the hon. gentleman withdraw his statement.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** - Well, if I misquoted my hon. friend I imagine I will have to retract it, and I do most humbly retract any suggestion of a misquotation. But it certainly left the impression in my mind. The thing we have already done that he has now asked us to do, if that isn't good enough, then there is an implication that might be there that we should force them into something that they were not prepared to do themselves.

He said we are continually asking the Federal Government to accept that which is our responsibility. He tried to suggest that these three items to which we suggest a Dominion-Provincial Conference should have particular reference were a Provincial responsibility. I might point out that, in my opening remarks, I indicated that these were not all the problems that surrounded the agricultural economy of this province, but that these were the three main things around which a conference could be built and could work. He says we are trying to evade our responsibility; that it is a provincial responsibility to implement all three of these. Yet, he has not suggested one mere instance of how we here

in this province could undertake to establish price support based upon any level. He realizes, or he must realize, that most of our agricultural products depend upon interprovincial trade or international trade, and he realizes, or must realize, that we as a province have no constitutional authority over interprovincial trade, that we cannot control a product either coming into this province or a product going out of this province. If my hon. friend believes in a federation, I am certain he will agree with the principle that we, as a province, should not have the right to bar a product coming into this province at a cheaper or lower level than we in the province are prepared to convey it on. The Federal Government has that constitutional authority. If he is suggesting that we have the authority to implement this, he is suggesting that we should create a Balkan state out here in western Canada in which we have got a state in Saskatchewan with constitutional authority to impose tariff barriers, tariff regulations, to impose excise duties, and regulate the inflow or outflow of products in our province. I suggest that that is not our responsibility, and the only one whose responsibility it can be is the Federal Government's, if we believe in a federation.

He suggested that we are asking for a Dominion-Provincial Conference but that we have already had such a conference just back in the month of December. I am going to suggest that the questions which we raise in this motion were not on the agenda and could not properly be discussed. That Dominion-Provincial Conference was a production conference which has been held annually for the last number of years. While not belittling a production conference — I think they are proper and should be undertaken — but they do not and cannot consider the problems we suggest here. The Minister of Agriculture at that conference asked that a conference should be called for the express purpose of devising a national agricultural policy, and it was because of the fact that he initiated it at that production conference that we are continuing that request through the medium of this Legislature.

Much has been referred to by the member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald), the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) and by the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron). With particular reference to the remarks made by the member for Maple Creek, when he comes to this last part and says the Federal Government is going to do all the first part and then you come down to the last part and what is left for the provincial government to do, I suggest that we on this side of the House have the welfare of the agricultural industry in mind and that we realize that we do have a responsibility in this respect. The reason that we have incorporated this as a clause in this motion is that every time that we have asked the Federal Government to implement any of these things, they say they haven't got the constitutional authority to do it. They might be right; maybe they haven't got the full constitutional power to do it; but let them point out to us what action we as a Legislature can take and we will take it. They have not.

My hon. friends will recall that when the Federal Government asked us to pass the complementary legislation allowing oats and barley to be taken under the Canadian Wheat Board because they said they did not have the constitutional authority, we were the first Legislature in western Canada to undertake such action, and as long as this group sits on this side of the House, I can assure you that we will be the first to undertake and implement our part of what might emerge from this type of a conference, after the Federal Government has told us what action we shall take, or must take, so that they can implement national marketing boards, long-term contracts and establish prices support on the basis of parity.

**March 24, 1955**

**Mr. McCarthy (Cannington):** — Why don't you ask them?

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — I might point out to my hon. friend from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) that his good friend sitting to the left of him there, the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) just about answered the question that he raised, because, he did point out that we have certain responsibilities; but it left the impression in my mind, at least, from the remarks made by the member for Arm River, the member for Maple Creek and the member for Moosomin, that the position they would like to see us get here in Saskatchewan, is that where marketing boards will fail, they would like to see set up the only type that we can set up, as a province, is on a producer marketing basis. That is the only basis upon which we can set it up. There is no greater assurance of failure for a producer marketing board than to have it operate without a national marketing board. The only way a producer marketing board can operate effectively, efficiently, and in the best interest of the agricultural industry is to operate within the frame work of a national marketing board. If there is anything that will defeat . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — Who told you that?

**Mr. Cameron:** — Who's back of that?

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — If there is anything that will defeat, that could defeat or might defeat that marketing board, if the producers ask for it, is the realization of the people of the province of Saskatchewan that they cannot depend upon the Federal Government to implement its part by which a producers' marketing board could operate.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Who's squirming now?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — The producers of this province do not forget what happened back in 1933 and 1934 (my memory fails me as to the year), the time when we took a vote on a national scale for the implementation of a national marketing scheme for our poultry products. And it was the Liberal organization of western Canada that went out deliberately and intentionally for the purpose of defeating it. The producers of this province, in respect to orderly marketing, have no more faith in the Liberal party or in the Liberal Government in Ottawa than they had in the Liberal party or Liberal organization back in those years.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Who's backtracking now?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — My hon. friend from Arm River made the statement that nobody knows what parity is. I might suggest to him, Mr. Speaker, that we had a delegation of 400 farmers from Saskatchewan who went down to Ottawa in 1942. They asked for parity prices. Four hundred farmers from Saskatchewan knew that parity price was a concept that could be accomplished. The good friend of my friend from Arm River, at Ottawa, the Hon. Jas. G. Gardiner, has admitted and conceded that there is a parity concept, and I quoted it to him

in my opening remarks in this debate, but for his benefit I will requote it to him.

**Mr. Cameron:** — What does Benson say?

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — I quote:

“Mr. Gardiner, speaking in the House of Commons on February 9, 1943, stated as follows:

“Parity price is the price of a commodity which will give a purchasing power with respect to articles a farmer buys equivalent to the purchasing power of such commodity in the basic period.”

Note, Mr. Speaker, he states parity price is the price — apparently in his opinion there is a parity price, and it is not too difficult to arrive at. Further, I would indicate to my friend that in my opening remarks I did not state that this might be the final conception of what a parity price is, but I said it was a basis upon which negotiations could be worked out as a concept until they could work out, if necessary, a parity formula and a parity structure which would be more successful.

My hon. friend from Saltcoats (Mr. Loftson) in his remarks, which were rather hard to follow and apparently did not bear a great deal of relationship to the motion, tried to leave the impression, first of all, that the decline in farm income was not the fault of the Federal Government. The Federal Government controls the economic and fiscal policies of this province, and if it allowed one section of its population to get out of relationship with another section of its population, then the Federal Government, because it does control fiscal, economic and national policy of this country, must accept that responsibility.

He stated, for instance, in his remarks that we have the highest price for beef anywhere in the world. Outside of possibly the United States, we have high prices for our dairy products, and he comes to the point where he reaches wheat and he says that we have got a price for wheat that cannot be sold at a higher price. I would point out to him that we here in Canada, producers of the best wheat in the world, have the lowest floor price for our wheat of any export country in the world. We are lower than any country to which my friend might wish to refer. We here in Canada . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — It backfired.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — . . . have only a floor price under our wheat, at the moment, of \$1.40. I might point to my friend also . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — What is Australia?

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — Australia at the moment to the producers is the cost of production. Exactly what we are asking for in this motion.

**Mr. Danielson:** — The floor price.

**March 24, 1955**

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — The floor price, as far as wheat is concerned, to the producer is the cost of production, and that is what we are asking.

**Mr. Danielson:** — It's 90 cents.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — The floor price for domestic wheat in Australia today is \$1.55. I would point out, as my hon. friends must realize, that the cost of production in Australia is much lower per bushel of wheat than it is here, and in the final analysis that determines what the value of your wheat is, and is the purchasing power of that bushel of wheat. But, even in terms of dollars and cents . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — That's only for domestic use.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — . . . in Australia guaranteed cost of production \$1.55 to the producer; here, we in Canada are guaranteed \$1.40 basis Fort William, and approximately \$1.20 to the producer. Even though their crop production is lower than ours, their guaranteed price is higher.

I would further point out that Australia is one of the lowest, and it is still some 35 cents above ours. The United States, which also has a lower cost of production than we have, have a guaranteed price of \$2.24. If you take Turkey, for instance, it has a guaranteed price from \$2.28 up to \$3.00 a bushel. We can go to Argentina, another exporter of wheat, with a guaranteed price of \$2.72, and you can continue along the list and you will find that, in every instance, theirs is higher than we have here. As I was trying to point out to my friends a few moments ago . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — No, no!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — . . . we had a floor price back in 1949-50 crop year of \$1.70. They cut the floor price under wheat in the last four years from \$1.70 to \$1.40. I would also remind hon. friends that when we introduced the motion in this House back in the Session of 1951, asking that the initial floor price under wheat be raised back from \$1.40 to \$1.70 my hon. friends did a mighty lot of hedging before they voted for it.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Who is talking against the marketing board now?

**Mr. Danielson:** — Make a circle and come back.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — I'll make the circle the same as he does, and will come back to it in a moment. But they did a mighty lot of hedging at that time, because we asked that it be done immediately. They wanted to strike it out, and asked that it be struck out; moved an amendment striking the word 'immediately' out and putting in 'as soon as possible'. I guess we might as well have put in 'as soon as possible', Mr. Speaker, they never took any action on it at Ottawa to bring it back to the level it was at that time.

But we here in Canada have the lowest floor price under our wheat, and when my friend from Saltcoats suggests that we as producers are getting as

much for our wheat as we have a right to expect, I am going to suggest that if these other countries can do it under much more difficult circumstances possibly then we would have to do it here in Canada, that we can certainly do as well.

My hon. friend from Saltcoats also referred to the fact that it probably wasn't so much the price we were getting for our product as it was the fact of high-cost production which was involved, and I will agree with him that that is basically true. But, he tried to leave the impression that one of the causes of that high cost of production was due to the high cost of labour; that we in the C.C.F. organization, our political organization, have advocated and had caused the skyrocketing of labour prices. He mentioned as one of the reasons there was a high cost of farm implements today, the high cost of labour on farm implements. I am going to suggest to him that he read the report which he approved of back in 1952 in this Legislature, and which indicates that, taking 1945 as a base year, 100 per cent, salaries and wages had increased on farm implements from 100 up to 157. The cost of living during that same period went up from 100 to 150. In other words, the labour cost on farm implements did no more than keep pace with the increased cost of living, and labour in the farm implement industry had a right to expect that its wages and income should go up with our cost of living and our cost of production.

I might point out to him — and once again this is in this report and I confess it is back in 1952, but the trend is exactly the same — that the profits increased from 12 per cent in 1946 to 33 per cent in 1951. There is the explanation of the increased cost of farm machinery. I could take another quotation, if my friend would like it, of the cost of wages that go into a farm implement today. Back in 1945, 42 cents out of your dollar for a farm implement went to pay for labour; back in 1950, 28 cents out of your dollar for a farm implement went to pay the costs of labour. That is not what would cause the increase in respect to our farm implements, but rather it has been the allowing of those people who in the past have controlled our economy, who control the final price of these products, which we have to pay, who are to blame for this increased cost of production. They have been allowed to have this increased cost of production due to the failure of the Federal Government to implement the commitments which it made to the people, and the commitment which was made in particular to the farmers back previous to 1946.

There is much more that could be said, but I think, Mr. Speaker, in concluding these remarks, I should properly repeat one statement which I made at the opening of my remarks, because I think those remarks that I made at that time were missed by my hon. friends opposite. I stated at that time that we could not have a prosperous, secure agricultural industry in this country of ours unless it was based and built within the framework of a national economy based upon a high level of employment, full purchasing power and an ever-expanding production. That is the essential thing that we must obtain, and I am going to suggest that it is through this medium that agriculture can play its proper and fair share in the building not only of the Canadian national economy, but to make its contribution to international welfare, and through this medium bring about a day when we shall have peace and security in this world of ours as well as in Canada.

The question being put on the motion (Mr. Brown (Bengough)), it was agreed to by 26 votes against 8.

The Assembly then adjourned at 10 o'clock p.m.