

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session - Twelfth Legislature
29th Day

Tuesday, March 20, 1956

The House met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day

Cash Advances on Farm-Stored Grain

The Assembly resumed, from Tuesday, March 6, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):

“That this Assembly, recognizing that the Federal Government guaranteed bank loan scheme is inadequate to meet the serious financial crisis now confronting the western grain farmer and the entire prairie economy, deplors the failure of the Federal Government to provide a prepayment on the initial price of grain in the form of a cash advance on farm-stored grain.”

Mr. G. H. Danielson (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate on this resolution, which has been on the Order Paper now for about six weeks or more, many things that had not happened at the time this resolution was introduced have happened since, and it seems rather a peculiar thing to discuss matters at the present time which have been decided in which have been in operation for five months.

The essence of this resolution is the advancing to the wheat farmers in the prairie provinces of cash by certain agencies. These advances to the farmers, Mr. Speaker, have been in effect since the 15th of October and they have been made use of in varying degrees by the producers of these prairie provinces.

It might be well to go back and see what really took place and what was done by the organized farmers of the prairie provinces - the various farm organizations, I should say, because there is more than one organization in the prairie provinces. There are several of them, and sometimes their views do not always coincide as to what is best for the farmers. There are differences of opinion which are not always universal even among farm unions or farm organizations.

I was at an meeting called in the city of Saskatoon for two days; I think September 28th (if my memory is correct) was the first day of the meeting. I happened to be in Saskatoon that day and I made it my business to sit in on that meeting from about 2:00 o'clock in the afternoon until about 5.00 o'clock. I think, if I gauged it correctly judging by the press reports and various other information that emanated from that particular meeting, that was the most important part of the two-day meeting, because at that time the question that this resolution raises was the topic of discussion. I think the organization responsible for calling this

March 20, 1956

meeting, Mr. Speaker, was the Federation of Agriculture in the three western provinces. I was very interested in the discussion and in the opinions expressed in regard to the topic that this resolution deals with, namely, advances to the wheat growers on their grain.

There were only two voices in that whole meeting that were raised, or expressed the conviction or made the plea that the proper way to deal with this problem was to have the Wheat Board get up an agency to distribute these advances, and they were the Farmers Union of the province of Saskatchewan and the Saskatchewan Government as represented by the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I might say that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. McIntosh) did not express any opinion on that particular topic while I was there, but his colleague, the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) was very vocal along that line.

But when we came down to some of the other fellows who were at that meeting - men whom I think represent agriculture in the province of Saskatchewan more than any others and far more than the Saskatchewan Government does, and far, far more, also, when it comes down to the business activities of farm communities of the province, than even the Farmers Union does; and I am referring to organizations such as the Wheat Board and the various other organizations. The Trustees Association was represented there, if I remember correctly. There was a representative at that meeting from the Rural Municipal Association. There was a representative also from the Board of Trade of the various urban municipalities in the province, and if I am correct (and I think I am) there was one delegation that represented the Board of Trade of the city of Edmonton, Alberta. When this thing came up for discussion, there were very frank expressions made by all these men who took the different attitudes and took different views in regard to the proper method to be followed.

I could not help but notice someone there who is very well known to myself, one of the first men I met when I came inside the door of that meeting place, which was in the Bessborough Hotel in Saskatoon, namely, a man who used to sit in this House for four years as a member for the constituency of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley, and he has since taken a very active part in farm organizations; he has been a Director of the Wheat Pool and he is still in the co-operative movement in the province of Saskatchewan. I have always considered Mr. Warden Burgess to be one of the very intelligent and outstanding members of this House. We didn't always agree - in many things we disagreed; but he didn't mince anything about such matters. He gave the reason why his opinion was along the lines that this loan, or advance (as you wish), there is no difference between the two, Mr. Speaker. In one way, if you use the Wheat Board you will get an advance on your grain; if you go to the bank you also get an advance against your grain, because that is the security for your loan, and the quota book or the permit book (whichever you like to call it) is the instrument used in both cases to recompense the party that has advanced the money to the farmer. You can split hairs all you like, but it is the same thing, exactly. Mr. Burgess was very clear on this matter, and he said that in his opinion, first of all there must be interest on this thing, because this loan should only be for the individual who needed it. He said it is not a thing that should be distributed to someone who doesn't need the advance, it is only for the individuals who need it. He said, if there is no interest on this advance, everybody could go in and get this money. And he drew an illustration in that respect, and

it was very sensible - what would prevent someone like myself, or someone else, from going in and getting \$1,500 and turning around and buying savings bonds at about 3½ per cent interest. "I could do that," he said, "because I could get the money without interest. Why shouldn't I recoup myself if I could use that money without interest and get the benefit that I could very well get from a transaction of that kind?"

That was one thing he said, and he also said this: I want to read exactly the words he used when he spoke of this topic - I will get it a little later.

Mr. Wesson, President of the Wheat Pool, also was very frank and outspoken in this regard, and, he pointed out, also, in full agreement with Mr. Burgess, and Mr. Brownlee, the President of the United Grain Growers (and this might surprise some of the members on the other side of the House) but even with Mr. Jake Schultz, from Manitoba. There was just one difference of opinion between Jake Schultz and Mr. Wesson, Mr. Brownlee and the other person whom I mentioned, and that was that Mr. Schultz insisted that there should be no interest on that money. Otherwise, as far as the money being handled by the bank, or the advances being handled by the bank, he was of the same opinion at that meeting as the other gentlemen whom I have mentioned.

That was one of the things I wanted to say at this time, because there is no one in this House who has spoken on this. When my seatmate, the hon. member from Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) spoke, he didn't get far enough into the matter to say anything about this thing, because there has been an attempt made (it has even been made, today, by the party opposite) to leave the impression in the country and in the minds of the people that it was the Dominion Government who blankly refused to do what you are asking them to do now.

A few days after this, a meeting was held in Saskatoon. This was an inter-provincial meeting held to pick the delegation that went to Ottawa, and we know what happened when they got to Ottawa. Even Jake Schultz said this, about the result of the Ottawa meeting;

"Jake Schultz of the Inter-provincial Farm Union Council said in Winnipeg the Federal Government's policy was the result of the inaction of the Federation of Agriculture, the prairie Wheat Pools and the United Grain Growers. He said that bank loans were what the organization had asked for."

Yes, that is what Mr. Schultz said, and he was in the delegation that waited on the Government at Ottawa, and he was one of the key men who was taking part in the meeting at Saskatoon. He was also representing his province in the inter-provincial meeting, where the delegates were selected to go to Ottawa.

That was what they decided on among themselves, and Mr. Parker of Manitoba said they regretted Ottawa had not seen fit to make loans available at the rate which would apply if the Wheat Board had borrowed the money - this would amount to about 3¾ per cent. That was all the complaint that

March 20, 1956

Mr. Parker had. He did not ask for advances for the Wheat Board. The only thing he complained of was the difference between 3¾ per cent interest in the 5 per cent which has been charged on these loans today.

So we have to here the western farm organizations - and, by the way, maybe some of my friends opposite can come forward and show me where the Farmers Union, represented by Mr. Hansen, and the Saskatchewan Government represented, I think, by the Minister of Agriculture, stood out in that delegation at Ottawa and made any definite demand that this advance should be made through the Wheat Board. I haven't seen anything to that effect, Mr. Speaker, but it may have happened; and if it did I will be glad to have them show me where that was done. I haven't anything in my collection here, which I have been trying to pick up during the last few weeks and the last two or three months, in order to have something to help me make up my mind in regard to the result of this particular request to Ottawa.

If this is true, finally, can anyone truthfully say that the Government of Canada acted contrary to the wishes of the western farmer? They did no such thing. There was something else crept in here, and it creeps into everything that we, as farmers, try to do, and that is the political aspect by a party in this province which is trying on this score to arouse dissatisfaction, which is trying to use every possible clue and every possible difficulty that comes up in our economic life in this province for one thing, namely, for political purposes.

Mr. Marler, from Alberta, put the thing very nicely, Mr. Speaker, when he said that this wheat problem had been "dramatized" for political purposes.

I want to draw your attention to another thing that happened a few days ago, when the Rural Municipal Association of the province of Saskatchewan came before your House Committee here sitting in Room 267, on the very front page there is a clear-cut statement from that organization that the wheat problem and the marketing problem in this province had been used as a "political football."

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg): — What did their convention say?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Danielson: — I don't think you know what their convention said. I asked somebody who was at the convention, and they weren't very clear themselves.

Now that is the situation. And what is the reason? Well, this political party in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, find themselves without an issue for the coming election. They find themselves without a smoke-screen. . .

Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek): — That's right.

Mr. Danielson: — . . . that they can use as a fog to hide some of the records of this administration. For that reason they have searched heaven and earth to try to get something which they could magnify and

dramatize for the purpose of trying to divert the attention of the people of the province from their own record.

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg): — Set fire to that. . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Danielson: — And anything that hinders or makes life more difficult for the producers of this province is grist for their mill, because they just blame everything on the Federal Government; and, of course, if they can discredit and put a lot of blame on the Federal Government, they have hopes that some of that might react on the Liberal party in the province of Saskatchewan. That is their hope. They have done that, and they are still trying.

This resolution is just for one purpose, and it is to try to justify the action of the Saskatchewan C.C.F. members in the House of Commons during this last session. Here we have a resolution which is negative, absolutely negative. There isn't a thing in that resolution, today, that is substantive - not one.

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg): — Are you going to vote for it?

Mr. Danielson: — They come out with this five months after this plan has been in operation - it has been in actual operation since the 15th of October; and here they are passing a resolution in this House for the purpose of trying to whitewash or justify the action of their Federal compatriots in the House of Commons during this last session. They set up a filibuster in Ottawa which lasted about 14 days. There were seven votes taken, and at the end of this battle, while they had some support from the Social Credit and the Conservatives, when the vote was taken, all these latter voted for the Bill which meant extension of credit to the farmers of western Canada, but the 18 C.C.F. members all voted against it, every one of them. As it stands now, they have the great distinction of being the only group in public life in the Dominion of Canada who have come up and stood up and said, "We don't want the farmers to get any money from the banks." That is what they said. Well you know, sometimes it takes the farmers a little time for something to sink in; but it has sunk in now. I know a little bit about rural life. I am a farmer myself, and I know that while there is not a tremendous number of farmers who have to go to the bank and take a advantage of this Dominion legislation, many farmers have been able to get money from the banks. There are thousands and thousands of farmers who went to the banks to get a loan long before the Dominion legislation took effect, or even before the 15th of October. I know that. I asked the bank manager in my town how it was going, and he said: "You would be surprised if you knew the amount of loans that I have been extending here in the last two or three months, ever since harvest time." And there is nobody here that has any record whatever of those in their community or district who have been compelled to go without the necessary financing, and they do not need to.

Now let's argue the point. The banks in this country know there are certain cases (even the Government has found that out, no matter what the government is) where they have to draw the line and be a little

March 20, 1956

more cautious and see that the interests even of the Government and the banks are taken into consideration. That is one of the reasons why this motion has come before this House - not for the intention of doing anything, Mr. Speaker, which would be of any benefit to the people of the province, or to the wheat producers of the province; but simply to try to justify this stand which has proved unpardonable, from the public point of view and from the welfare of the people of the province, which has been taken by the C.C.F. party not only in this province, but in the House of Commons at Ottawa.

Let me read you the resolution;

"That this Assembly, recognizing that the Federal Government guaranteed bank loan scheme is inadequate to meet the serious financial crisis now confronting the western grain farmer and the entire prairie economy, deploras the failure of the Federal Government to provide a prepayment on the initial price of grain in the form of a cash advance on farm-stored grain."

It doesn't say anything about the Wheat Board. We passed a resolution something similar to this, last year - not exactly, but something along the same lines. There wasn't anything said about the Wheat Board there. I have checked back on the records of this House and at no time has there been a special request to the Wheat Board, so far as that is concerned.

I was very interested in the Premier's attitude on this matter and I have here, from Swift Current, October 31, 1955, where he said, speaking in regard to this:

"The Wheat Board should be empowered so that at any time it cannot take delivery of grain through its agents, it can go to a farm and measure the wheat in the granaries, seal the granary and give the farmer and interim certificate for about 75 per cent of initial payment, then bring the wheat in and collect the other 25 per cent; even on an 8-bushel quota this would help."

I have no complaint about the last statement, but I just wonder if any person who knows anything about business - how would you, Mr. Speaker, if you had all the resources of the Dominion of Canada, and were responsible for them, if you are a bank manager; how would you like to turn loose 2,000 men in the province of Saskatchewan alone with a cheque book among these farmers? How would you like to do that? Send them out looking at grain on the road, looking at grain in the fence corner, looking at grain out in the field where there is no roof on the bins at all, and some of it probably mixed up with old wheat which has been laying there for several years? There is wheat in my district which has been there since 1953, mixed in with the 1955 wheat - not with the 1954 wheat because that was rusted and it was not mixed with good grain; but that is the situation. How would you like to turn loose 2,000 elevator agents - and there are at least that many in the province of Saskatchewan? I forget really how many elevators we have, but there are 1,100 shipping points - 1,107 I believe is the correct figure. In my town there are seven elevators and there are very few towns that I see without at least two elevators - from there up to seven, and sometimes eight -

Mr. Kramer (The Battlefords): — How many windmills?

Mr. Danielson: — At Cabri I think there are eight or nine elevators. That is what this thing means - allow the elevator agents to go out to the farms.

There is another aspect to this thing, and I mentioned it one day when I was speaking to one of the Pool officials. I said to him, "There is one thing about this you might explain to me, if you can. You have been complaining year after year, and with some reason, that you had not been able to get the number of bushels of wheat into your elevator which the membership you have says should go to that elevator, or which should be put into Pool elevators." Now that is one complaint that the Pool has consistently had. I think it is correct. Only when you get every elevator full of wheat, Mr. Speaker, that is a rule that cannot be enforced, and we admit that. But how would you like to turn around now to the Pool, who have about 1,100 elevators in the province of Saskatchewan, and against all the other elevator companies, turn loose 2,000 agents with a cheque book, let them go out and give the farmers a cheque - and there is where the farmer has to take his wheat, because he has to have that permit book, or quota book, whichever you like.

That is one aspect of the thing which I think might be very embarrassing to the farmers' organization which is one of the biggest grain-handling organizations we have in Canada, or I suppose in any country for that matter.

I am not going to take the time of the House speaking about this thing for very much longer, I want to point out to you that these men in Ottawa who have consistently tried to justify themselves and who, of course, have been trying to come to the aid of their distressed colleagues in Saskatchewan so far as the political picture is concerned, have not been able to accomplish anything that has been worth one iota to anybody by their actions, but they have been able to hold back, retard and advertise the situation in the province of Saskatchewan and all over western Canada in regard to this shortage of marketing facilities. That is one thing we should not forget, because, after all, it doesn't make any difference; it is only human nature. When you advertise your troubles to the world, particularly when you have a commodity to sell, that is not going to enhance your price, and it is not pointed to be conducive to any hasty action on the part of our purchasers or customers to rush in and buy wheat.

There was a question asked in the Committee here, a few days ago, directed to Mr. Phelps, who has a wide experience in farm organizations and has been a farmer himself, and has had the honour of being a Minister of this Government. The question was asked of him: when anybody got up and advocated a give-away programme, and ship it out and give the wheat away, and all that sort of thing, if, in his opinion, that was conducive insofar as the price of wheat was concerned to harming our situation. Mr. Phelps did not hesitate one minute; he said, "most certainly; that goes over the wires to the Old Country almost before it is known here." And that is the situation, in spite of anything that has been said to the contrary by those who have practiced that kind of advertising.

March 20, 1956

Mr. Speaker, I said that this resolution is negative. It is negative. There isn't a solitary thing in that resolution of any constructive nature. It is only condemnation of another government. It is condemnation for doing something which has been in operation for five months. The legislation has been on the statute books now for, I think, about three weeks; that is very immaterial, but it has been there for some time now.

It has been said, I think by the mover of the resolution (and I agree with him) that there are places in the province of Saskatchewan where there is a shortage of facilities to which the farmers can go. That means that the banks are far away from their community or from the district where they do their business, and there should be other provisions made where they could have better access, or more convenient access, to these facilities so they could conduct their business in regard to financing, which I think they are fully entitled to.

I am going to move an amendment to this resolution, and my amendment is this, Mr. Speaker, seconded by Mr. Loftson:

"That all the words after the word 'the' in the second line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"immediate financial needs of prairie farmers, urges that credit unions, and where credit unions and banks are not conveniently located, that elevator companies be allowed to make loans or advances to farmers on the security of farm-stored grain on the same terms and under the same guarantees against loss as are provided for the banks."

Mr. Speaker: — The Clerk has just pointed out to me that the second are, Mr. Loftson, is out of order because he has already moved an amendment before, so in the first place we will have to have a different seconder.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, it is seconded by Mr. McCarthy.

Mr. Speaker: — I will allow the amendment, moved by Mr. Danielson, seconded by Mr. McCarthy. The debate is now on the proposed amendment.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I have a very bad cold and will, therefore, not impose any undue suffering on the House for any great length of time. I would like to say just a few words about the speech to which the House has just listened, and to the amendment which has been moved.

The member for Arm River, in dealing with this Resolution, has followed the very old practice of attacking your opponents when you are not able to answer the arguments of your opponents. He suggested that the sole purpose of this Resolution, moved by the member for Gravelbourg (Mr. E. H. Walker) is to justify the actions of the C.C.F. members in Ottawa since Parliament met. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, this Resolution

does not just deal with the stand which some of the members of Parliament have taken in the few weeks that have elapsed since the Parliament of Canada convened. This is a position which the members on this side of the House and the C.C.F. members of Parliament have been taking for over 12 years. It is a consistent policy we have advocated in season and out of season irrespective of the fact that my hon. friend argues that bank loans have been operated since the 15th of October, and, therefore, it is a fait accompli, and we might just as well accept it.

When we take this position we are not merely thinking of the situation as it obtained last fall. We are thinking of the situation as it will obtain next fall as well, and as it may obtain again and again in the years that lie ahead. We have always taken the position that the Wheat Board should have this power in any given year when they can see that they are not going to be able to take delivery of the farmers' grain. Remember that, after all, this is the sole agency with power to purchase wheat and certain grains. In any year when they cannot accept grain they should have the authority, through their agents or through some other agency if they want to set it up, to pay the farmer a cash advance on the wheat stored on his farm. This is not to justify something that has happened in the last two months. It is a consistent position we have taken through the years, and as a matter of fact, in this Legislature. I think some of the members opposite have voted in favour of a resolution along these lines.

It is a favourite trick whenever you cannot answer an argument to make an attack on the proponents of that argument. Mr. Howe tried that. Speaking in the House of Commons, he said:

"Many honourable members may think that the inspiration for that suggestion (cash advances) came from the farmers. I can assure you there has been nothing of the kind. It came from the cities.

"Who are the supporters of cash advances? The supporters are the enemies of marketing through the Wheat Board."

Mr. Speaker, just how ridiculous can anyone get! Mr. Howe was still supporting the Winnipeg Grain Exchange when he was a member of the Government. He allowed the Winnipeg Grain Exchange to operate. An Order in Council set aside the Wheat Board where it remained inoperative for several years. Members of our group were fighting for a Wheat Board. And Mr. Howe suggests that those who advocate cash advances are the enemies of marketing through the Wheat Board! Let me just review who have asked for cash advances handled through the Wheat Board. Well, they were the Manitoba Pool in convention assembled, the Saskatchewan Pool in convention assembled, the Alberta Pool in convention assembled, the Manitoba Farmers Union, Saskatchewan Farmers Union, and the Alberta Farmers Union. My friend ought to quote Mr. Schultz. Instead, he tries to pick out an odd individual. We have been very careful to avoid the resolutions passed by these people. Mr. Schultz is closely associated with the Manitoba Farmers Union. This was their Resolution, passed at their meeting in Winnipeg on the 5th, 6th and 7th of December:

March 20, 1956

"Be it resolved that this fifth annual convention of the Manitoba Farmers Union disapproves of the present system of bank loans to farmers on farm-stored grain."

Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats): — After the. . .

Premier Douglas: — The resolution continues:

"Be it further resolved that we request the Federal Government to make immediate provision for cash advances to farmers on farm-stored grain on the following basis:

- (a) that these advances shall be for the full initial payment;
- (b) that these advances shall be paid on behalf of one-half of the deliverable grain;
- (c) that all administration and interest charges are to be borne by the Federal Government;
- (d) that these advances shall be repayable on the basis of one-half of the value of each delivery made by the farmer; and
- (e) that these advances be made through the facilities of the Canadian Wheat Board."

You could hardly classify the Farmers Unions and the Wheat Pools and the three provincial governments as enemies of marketing through the Wheat Board.

Here is the 'Leader-Post' of March 15th. A Canadian press report from Winnipeg states:

"The Manitoba Government, Tuesday, went on record as favouring cash advances on farm-stored grain through the Canadian Wheat Board, at the same interest rates the Board now pays on borrowing."

I have the Manitoba Votes and Proceedings containing the amendments which Mr. Robertson (who, I believe, is the Minister of Agriculture) moved to the motion of Mr. Roblin (who is the Leader of the Opposition). Mr. Robertson places the Manitoba Government in this Resolution, just as he did in a Provincial Affairs broadcast last fall, squarely on the side of cash advances handled through the Wheat Board.

My hon. friend made mention of the delegation which went to Ottawa on which the other two prairie Governments, the three Wheat Pools, the three Farmers Unions, the Federation of Agriculture, the United Grain Growers were represented. Page 5 of their presentation stated:

"While the long-term agricultural problem also received consideration (they are talking of the Saskatoon meeting), the immediate problem of cash shortage

held the spotlight of the Conference and resulted in the following Resolution being passed:

" 'Be it resolved that the organizations participating in the Conference urge the Government of Canada to make immediate provision for advances to farmers on grain in store on the farms; and further

"that these advances should be up to one-half the value of the normal delivery expected, and should be repayable on the basis of one-half of the value of each delivery made by the farmer'."

That was the stand of the three prairie Governments, the Wheat Pools, three Farmers Unions. I would say that that group represents the public point of view of Canada from the Head of the Lakes to the Rocky Mountains. In the face of that almost unanimous expression of opinion in support of cash advances, Mr. Howe says:

"The supporters of cash advances are the enemies of marketing through the Wheat Board."

The Government of Saskatchewan is in very good company with the other two prairie Governments, with the Pools and with the Farmers Unions.

When my friend, the member for Arm River, seeks to make out that there is some ulterior motive, or that we are introducing and supporting this Resolution because of some action in Ottawa, I say to him that this has been the consistent policy we have followed over a period of more than 12 years. It will continue to be our policy until we can get some Federal government to recognize that the farmer is entitled to some return for his labour, until such time as the Wheat Board is able to accept delivery of his wheat.

The member for Arm River said: "Can you imagine turning 2,000 elevator agents loose with cheque books. . ." "What a chaotic situation it would be to have 2,000 elevator agents turned loose with cheque books." In the first place we have pointed out in these resolutions, all along, that these cash advances should be on properly stored grain in a bin. Therefore, all this talk about it lying under the snow or in the corner of a field is entirely irrelevant. We have always said cash advances should be made on properly stored grain. And who is in a better position to make these cash advances than the elevator agents? They are in a far better position to know whether it is well stored, and they are in a position to know what grade it is. The Government of the United States has been following a policy like this for over 20 years. When the gentleman across the way tried to portray this as being a chaotic plan that would have elevator agents running around the country with cheque books, I want to point out that in the United States since 1934. . .

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — Tell them the whole story.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

March 20, 1956

Premier Douglas: — . . . the Commodity Credit Corporation has been making cash advances to those who want them. It has also bought grain outright on the farms, and sealed the bins, and told the farmer later when they wanted delivery.

Mr. Loptson: — See what a mess they have now.

Premier Douglas: — The member for Arm River wondered what the effect would be on the Saskatchewan Pool, if there were cash advances. I want to say that there is no elevator company on the prairies that would benefit more from cash advances than the Pool. Here is a typical example of the situation as it obtained last fall, and could quite easily obtain next fall. A farmer who is a member of the Pool and has grain on his farm, finds that his elevator is plugged. He can take his grain if he wants to, to one of the line elevators that have some room. But he doesn't want to, because he has always taken it to the Pool. So he puts off the delivering of his grain just as long as he can. Finally when he gets to the place where he has either to see his family in want or surrender his principles about passing by the Pool elevator and take his grain to a line elevator, you know what is likely to happen. He finally takes his grain down to the line elevator, because they have got room and the Pool elevator hasn't.

See the other side of the picture. If this farmer finds that there isn't room in the Pool elevator, he can say to the agent, "I have got so many thousands of bushels of grain on my farm. Will you come out and measure it and test it and see if it is properly stored, and give me a cash certificate up to 75 per cent (or whatever it is point to be) up to a certain quota?" Then he gets his cash certificate. He has the money with which to look after his family and pay his operating expenses. Later on, when there is room in the Pool elevator, he will be able to deliver his grain. It will be entered in his Permit Book that he has already received a cash advance from the Wheat Board pay through the Pool. Therefore, he will be able to deliver his grain to the Pool when the Pool has room.

What is being done at the present time is that we are forcing many Pool members to deliver their grain to line elevator companies, because they just can't stand the economic pressure of not having sufficient money to see their way through this period of surplus.

The member for Arm River has never been slow to impute motives. He suggested that the sole reason for raising this question was because we wanted to make it an election issue.

Mr. Loptson: — Sure thing.

Mr. Cameron: — Like the foot-and-mouth disease.

Premier Douglas: — Well, we have wasted an awful lot of years when there wasn't any election in the offing. I want to tell my hon. friends, and I know it will make them very happy, that Mr. Gardiner has now invited us to make it an election issue. This is Hansard, Thursday, February 23, page 1480. On the page before, Mr. Gardiner with chiding the member for Melfort-Humboldt because he was down in Ottawa making speeches when he should have been at the On-to-the-Bay dinner. He said:

"The hon. member refused to come home to discuss the On-to-the-Bay movement, and was wasting his time down in Parliament making speeches on cash advances."

I thought that was what he was elected to do. But, anyway this is what he goes on to say. I picked it up so my friend would not think I was taking it out of context.

Mr. Danielson: — Is that the issue for next election?

Premier Douglas: — My hon. friend will get the issue, and I will see that he gets the issue! I will make a personal job of seeing that the issue is put before his people.

Mr. Cameron: — You have been saying that for 12 years.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Premier Douglas: — Speaking again to the member for Melfort-Humboldt, Mr. Gardiner said:

"I am going to say this to him, however, that if they will run the election on this issue" (of cash advances) "and no other, we will lick the pants off them."

That is Mr. Gardiner's invitation. If we will fight the election on this issue and no other, they will "lick the pants off us." Of course, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald) will have some difficulty, because he has got one foot in the pants on cash advances and the other one on bank loans, so he is going to have some difficulty in this contest.

Mr. McDonald: — We'll win on either one and you know it.

Premier Douglas: — There is the person who is making an election issue.

Mr. Cameron: — He is speaking for the Dominion. . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Gardiner? Oh, no, no, no! If my friend wants to go back, I will read that to him. He said:

"That reminds me of the fact that he threw out a challenge a while ago."

Mr. Gardiner is speaking, on page 1480. He said:

"There is going to be an election in Saskatchewan in June." (Mr. Gardiner apparently knows about that). "I have always found it a very good bit of advice to say you had better wait until the election is over and you can probably prophecy more accurately at that time. I am going to say this to him, however, that if they will run the election on this issue and on no other we will lick the pants off them."

March 20, 1956

So Mr. Gardiner has chosen the battleground, and my hon. friends can now get their ammunition ready to support the fight on the grounds which Mr. Gardiner has selected.

Mr. Cameron: — We knew that long before you did.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Premier Douglas: — Now, Mr. Speaker, may I say a word about this amendment. This amendment proposes to strike out the words after the word "the" in the second line, and to substitute therefor:

"immediate financial needs of prairie farmers, urges that credit unions, and where credit unions and banks are not conveniently located, that elevator companies be allowed to make loans or advances to farmers on the security of farm-stored grain on the same terms and under the same guarantees against loss as are provided for the banks."

Mr. Speaker, if ever I saw proposal that was designed to create chaos and confusion this is it. Some of the people are going to go to the banks, some are going to go to the elevator companies. If it is all right for a third of the farmers to go to the elevator companies instead of the banks, why isn't it all right for all of the farmers to go to the elevator companies?

Mr. Lopton: — They can't, the C.C.F. roads won't allow them to.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Premier Douglas: — I want to tell the member for Saltcoats that he has never in his life listened himself into trouble. Right now he is talking himself into it, that is if he realizes it.

Mr. Lopton: — I have never got into trouble. . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Premier Douglas: — If the hon. gentlemen will get some of their manners restored, Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to go on.

Mr. Danielson: — Look who is talking about manners!

Premier Douglas: — I point out, Mr. Speaker, the complete inconsistency of on the one hand, saying it would be harmful and it would be administratively impossible to use elevator agents all over the province to handle cash advances through the Wheat Board, while on the other hand, move an amendment saying that where a farmer cannot get to the bank, the elevator agents should handle cash advances.

Let us examine the difference. In a town where there is a bank the farmers are going to have to go to the bank. But the bank managers have no facilities for going out in the country and checking grain. Unless this man has some fairly good security there is a good chance that he is going to be turned down, as hundreds have been turned down. But 50 miles

away where there isn't a bank, a farmer will go to a grain elevator agent. He will get a cash advance on the grain stored on his farm, not on the basis of this economic security or his bank standing at all but as a right, because he has got grain on the farm. Why this distinction? Why this difference? If we are going to treat the second man on the basis of cash advances given to him through the elevator agent, why not treat the first man the same way?

My friends here have endeavoured to wiggle out of a very awkward situation by suggesting neither bank loans on the one hand nor cash advances on the other, but rather a sort of 'dog's breakfast' which will get some of the loans handled by the banks and some advances handled by the Wheat Board. At least my friends have come half way. I am glad of that. They were all for bank loans a little while ago. Now they are going to allow some of the farmers to have cash advances through the elevator agents. I asked them now to come the other half of the way and vote for the Motion.

The question being put on the proposed amendment (Mr. Danielson), it was negative on recorded division by 36 votes against 10.

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

Mr. A. C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, may I say a word or two on the main motion. I find this a rather ridiculous situation that we are in here in this particular matter. I will tell you why. It is because this resolution as I recall was placed on the Order Paper within two or three days after the House assembled. This resolution was on the Order Paper deploring the action of Ottawa in not doing a particular thing, and yet we set up an Agricultural Committee to investigate the whole field of markets and the marketing of farm grain, and the crisis we are facing, and to make recommendations as to what we can do in the interest of the farmers, and yet at the same time we had a resolution introduced in the House, knowing that this Committee was going to be set up, condemning the action taken by Ottawa, putting ourselves on record.

I suggest the action that was taken prejudged the case before the Agricultural Committee even sat on it. This is the situation that we find ourselves in, and I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what in the world is the purpose of the Agricultural Committee and their sittings, that is supposed to report to the Legislature and bring in its findings and its recommendations in regard to the financial crisis the farmers are facing in the province of Saskatchewan today, when we have a resolution now that will prejudice the decision of this Committee and say we deplore the action of Ottawa, because they didn't give us cash advances, before the Committee has brought in its recommendations as to whether or not it favours cash advances, or whether or not they think that cash advances are in the best interest, rather than some other method you might propose to alleviate the situation.

I say this resolution, in my opinion, was brought in prior to the meeting of this Committee, and its one purpose was to put themselves on record. And the Premier made the statement:

March 20, 1956

"We have been propounding this for 12 years. We have not changed our position";

and yet here is a Resolution that says:

"that this Assembly recognizing the Federal Government guaranteed bank loan scheme is inadequate to meet the serious financial crisis now confronting the western grain farmer and the entire prairie economy, deploras the failure of the Federal Government. . ."

I think this is the crux of the situation: "deploras the failure of the Federal Government." That is what they have been doing for 12 years, because there has been no mention of bank loans for the past 12 years; there has been no financial crisis regarding the marketing of wheat for the past 12 years, so how can he justify that he is in support of a programme that they initiated 12 years ago (and I agree that he is) in that that programme has been deploring everything that Ottawa has done and that is increasing with the philosophy of the C.C.F. in this province. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this Resolution was introduced into the House knowing that we were going to have an Agriculture Committee meeting on these things, to prejudge the decision which the Agriculture Committee would make, and I think that we are wrong in passing this Resolution, or in taking a vote on it until such time as the findings of the Agriculture Committee have been brought into the House and discussed. Then we should be guided by the suggestions and the recommendations made by this Committee of the House, which was set up for that purpose; and then pass what we might think is a resolution, urging Ottawa, or placing the position of the province behind the recommendations of the Agriculture Committee in what they in their considered opinion, after reviewing all of the Briefs that have been submitted by the various organizations, after taking into consideration the suggestions made and offered by the Royal Commission which has been sitting for four years, then bring in a recommendation or resolution into the House. The people of Saskatchewan are becoming sick and tired of every day listening to nothing but "cash advances" and "cash advances." I didn't know this was coming up, or I would have brought a letter to read. I had a letter from a lady just the other day, from the northern part of the province, who I thought put it very well, when she said:

"I am sick and tired of hearing of cash advances and bank loans."

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Did I understand the hon. member to say he didn't know it was coming up?

Mr. Cameron: — No, just today.

Mr. Speaker: — It has been on the Order Paper. You're a little late.

Mr. Cameron: — I didn't know it was coming up at this particular time of day. She said this - I haven't got the letter, but I am going to tell you what she said:

"We haven't got any wheat in our area of the province because we were rusted out, we have been flooded out, we haven't got any wheat."

She goes on to say:

"They talk about cash advances. I will tell you something else. Last year my husband and I could not pay our hospitalization, but it wasn't very long before we were notified that we must - or else.

"Our roads are blocked in this particular area, and those people who have a few bushels of wheat in their granaries and there is room in the elevators cannot get them out."

So I say that the people are becoming sick and tired of this talk deploring something because we know this Legislature hasn't any authority to correct it if we do think it is wrong. It is something which has been passed, something which is operating, something which the farmers have taken advantage of; and to keep on harping on something that is passed and agreed to and is being carried on, I think is just reaching the stage of utter ridiculousness. I think we are wrong, as I said at the beginning, to introduce such a resolution when we have set up an Agricultural Committee to investigate it, and to try to take a vote on this amendment today, when we are expecting the report of the Agricultural Committee a few days from now.

It shows how ridiculous we can be, and there is only one conclusion. It was introduced for political propaganda for an election issue.

Mr. W. J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, I think that a member of the Legislature, whether he is on this side of the House or on the other side of the House, has some responsibility to the people in his district and the province of Saskatchewan.

When the hon. members opposite suggest that we cannot do anything about this shortage of cash which farmers must have, I cannot agree. If we look at the situation of the farmers today, compared to the farmers of 30 or 40 years ago, we must recognize that there is a vast difference in farming operations, a vast difference in the way of life. In the early days when we first settled on the farms and the homesteads, we were more than self sufficient. Cash did not mean too much to us. We had our garden produce, a few animals around the place; we picked wild fruits, and in many cases people made their own clothing from the wool they produced and so forth. Today the situation is entirely different, Mr. Speaker. Today, the farmer depends upon cash to get those things that he requires to make a living, for clothing and for food. Today he does not produce as much of these things on the farm, but buys most of it, and he cannot buy it unless he has cash.

In this Resolution we say that we recognize that bank loans have not been adequate, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is so in the province of Saskatchewan and in the west today. Loans have not been adequate because, in the first place, they are not sufficient to pay the expenses that must be paid to operate a farm, let alone to provide a living. So I think it is the duty of the members of this House to speak up and tell the Federal Government what the situation is. It is not sufficient that

March 20, 1956

only farm organizations and other organizations in our province speak up. We must speak with one voice here, and that is the purpose of this Resolution.

I pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that there is a need for cash. I know that is so in the area up north. Notwithstanding what a certain correspondent may write to an hon. member opposite, the facts are that farmers not only have wheat, but many of them have coarse grains, and they cannot sell either, and as they cannot get any cash for the grains, a cash advance is actually the only answer. There are, of course, other questions involved - the price that should be paid, which is not contained in this Resolution. That is another question which the Governments must deal with.

The second part of the Resolution says: "that the cash advances should be made for grain on the farm"; and, as the Premier mentioned a while ago, no one is asking for cash advances on grain that is not stored properly, whether it is wheat, barley, or whatever it may be; but cash advances only on grain that has been properly stored.

I would like to make a few comparisons. I think the time has come in our age and civilization that we must take a different approach to these problems of farmers. I think that the same approach must be taken by the senior government that has been taken towards various corporations and companies. They are not allowed to suffer as farmers suffer. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, a mine, say up in northern Saskatchewan, producing copper, or zinc, or uranium, and stockpiling its ore and not paying their men the wages they are entitled to? Is the farmer the only one who is supposed to produce and stockpile and wait until there is a market? There is the whole crux of the situation. A farmer is not only a producer, he is also working man, and he must be paid his wages, otherwise he cannot survive. He must be paid his wages the same as a miner who works for a mining company is paid wages, and I would like to point out that when these mining companies have any difficulties the Federal Government is the only Government which can save these companies from bankruptcy and come to their rescue so that they may pay their labouring men for producing goods and services. That is all that the farmers ask for - cash, so that they can continue to work and produce and make a living. When the members opposite say that this is outside of their jurisdiction, and when they suggest that other organizations must speak and not us, I cannot agree with such arguments because in my opinion it is the responsibility of members of this House, notwithstanding what their political affiliations may be, to tell those who are responsible what the situation is, and to suggest to such authorities what should be done, and so I shall support the Motion.

Mr. R. Walker (Hanley): — I do not want to lengthen this debate, but there are a few remarks I feel I ought to make by reason of something which was said by my hon. friend from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron). The hon. member tries to leave the impression that this House is concerned only with party politics and not with the plight of the farmers.

Mr. Loptson: — He never spoke a truer word.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Let me say that the members of this House are confronted with the task of spending for an \$87 million programme. They are confronted with the task of raising that sum of Supply, and it certainly concerns, in my opinion, all members of this House to see to it that the tax base of this province is stable and solvent. Certainly, when we are confronted with shrinking revenues from the education and hospital tax and other sources, we must be concerned with the basis for our taxation.

The hon. members of the Opposition have drawn to the attention of this House repeatedly the fact that some school districts and municipalities are having increasing difficulty in collecting their tax revenue, and I have no doubt that that is true. The figures substantiate that argument, and I have taken the trouble, Mr. Speaker, to inquire of municipal men as to the reason for that situation, and without exception, from Liberals and Conservatives and C.C.F. municipal men together, they all agree the reason for the difficulty is because of the unusual cash shortage on the farms in Saskatchewan, last fall. There isn't any doubt about it, that is the reason for the difficulty. That problem cannot fail to concern this Legislature. If it is concerned about its legal responsibilities, this Legislature has to be concerned with that problem. I am sure that we would be remiss in our duties to our constituents, to the people whom we represent, if we did not take a sincere and honest interest in that most vital problem concerning them.

The matter has been raised, of course, in the House of Commons. I think it is within the knowledge of all hon. members, that opposition parties in the House of Commons have raised considerable debate on the matter, and I think probably it is within the knowledge of all members of the Liberal party and the Liberal members without exception opposed this proposal for cash advances through the Wheat Board and through the elevator companies. As a matter of fact, most hon. members know that Liberal members of the House of Commons who come from Saskatchewan, particularly the one who represents my area in the House of Commons (Mr. Tucker), after going on record in Saskatchewan as being in favour of cash advances, went down to Ottawa and voted against that proposal. He gave as his explanation that it was a party matter, that as a Liberal he had to oppose this proposal because it came from the C.C.F.

Mr. Cameron: — That is your interpretation.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — As a matter of fact, he sought to explain the thing on the basis of politics. Now, Mr. Speaker, if this proposal cannot be made in the House of Commons without the mover being accused of being tainted with politics, and if it cannot be made here without it being alleged that it is based on politics, where on earth can it be proposed! I suppose in the Senate. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to be deterred by these people who try to cow us and frighten us out of our proper responsibilities and duties. Members of the C.C.F. at Ottawa were confronted with the very same kind of diatribe as we got this afternoon from the member from Maple Creek.

Mr. McDonald: — We have lots of it now.

March 20, 1956

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — I suggest that the fact that this Legislature takes up this problem, recognises that this is a serious problem, ought to make it abundantly plain to the Federal Government that this is not just a proposal of C.C.F. members of Parliament at Ottawa. This is a matter which concerns the people of Saskatchewan. The fact that it comes from a Provincial Legislature, I submit, will carry even more weight in the eyes of the Government of Canada than the fact that it comes from a political party in the House of Commons, and, of course, in order to make it carry the maximum weight, it ought to be concurred in unanimously in this House. Certainly the argument Mr. Tucker that it was a vote of confidence against the Federal Government cannot be employed here. Surely the hon. members opposite can vote for this Resolution without defeating the Government at Ottawa. Mr. Tucker always said that he mustn't vote for it because it would defeat the Government, and he prefers Liberalism to this particular measure; but surely that argument isn't available to hon. members opposite. They can vote for it and it can pass here unanimously without defeating the Government of Canada. It will not defeat the Government of Canada, but it will draw to their attention this matter of grave and pressing importance to the people of Saskatchewan.

It is certainly not open, either, to members of the Liberal party to say that this is a Federal matter about which we should have no concern. As a matter of fact, at the time the thing was raised in Saskatchewan last fall, it was raised by my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, who took a flight to Ottawa with a "secret" formula. He was concerned about it because of the pressure that was brought to bear upon him by his own followers who do not really believe that it was none of his business. They sent him to Ottawa to make it his business, and he cannot get up in this House, or none of his cohorts can get up in this House, and now say that this is not a matter of concern to provincial political parties. He made it his business. He made it an issue. As a matter of fact, he went out in this province and said that this proposal would be no more effective than a "stirrup pump in a forest fire." I suggest that he was making this a political issue for provincial political parties, and if it is fair game for the Liberal party to represent this bona fide demand of people in Saskatchewan, then certainly it is fair and proper that we on this side of the House ought to be concerned with it, too, and ought not to be accused of making it a political issue. They made it an issue. They accepted it as making up a political issue. Now in order to try to squeeze themselves out of some responsibility when the vote comes before this House, they try to draw out that same old red herring that they have been dragging around for years, by saying that this is not a provincial issue. It is a provincial issue. It was admitted by them to be a provincial issue, when the Liberal Leader spoke on it and went out of his way to make representations upon it.

It is a provincial issue because it concerns the solvency of the Provincial Treasury. It is a provincial issue because the people we represent are vitally concerned with this problem. Since they are concerned with this problem, I am also concerned with it because I am concerned that this provincial economy should be prosperous. Not person in Saskatchewan can afford to be independent of this problem. No person in Saskatchewan can afford to turn his back on this problem. It concerns not just the C.C.F. and Liberal parties, it concerns the farmers, it concerns business people, professional people, people in all walks of life. As a representative of those people and, I hope, a good representative, I am going to speak and vote on their behalf on this motion this afternoon.

Mr. J. W. Horsman (Wilkie): — I had no intention of speaking on this Resolution, that is if you can call it a Resolution. I see nothing in it that asks anyone for anything. That is my thought on it.

I think if you will read it over carefully you will find that the first part of the Resolution dealing with bank loans states that "bank loans on farm-stored grain are inadequate," and then it goes on to deplore the failure of the Federal Government for not instituting a prepayment on the initial price of wheat in the form of cash advances; but nowhere in this Resolution does it ask the Federal Government to give cash advances on farm-stored grain. The only thing it does is "deplore the failure of the Federal Government" for not doing that. I see nothing in this Resolution that I cannot vote against. If it came right out and asked for cash advances, or ask the Legislature here to use their influence with the Federal Government to get cash advances for the farmers of the west, I could vote for it; I cannot vote for a Resolution that does nothing but deplore the fact that the Federal Government has not done certain things.

Mr. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I can agree with much of the argument that was presented by my seatmate, the hon. member of the Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron), in the fact that we do have a Committee sitting, or which has been sitting during this Session of the Legislature, to deal with agricultural prices and marketing, and I think that we would be very foolish to consider either this motion we have in front of us at the moment, or Motion No. 2 to be moved by Mr. Dewhurst at this time.

The report of our Agricultural Committee has been presented to our members, and I understand that tomorrow we will be meeting to discuss this report. Once the report has passed the Committee then it will be discussed in this House, and I for one would like the opportunity of studying the report, getting the feeling of all the members on the Committee and the feeling of the Legislature after the report is brought into the Legislative Assembly itself, and for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask permission to adjourn this debate.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I do not think we on this side of the House want to agree to an adjournment. This has been on the Order Paper since almost the first week that the House met. We have already been criticised today for leaving the matter until after it was dealt with in Ottawa. We had no choice because there were special orders that always took precedence on private members' day. I would agree to my hon. friend's proposal of leaving it until after the Committee reported if they had not on two occasions moved amendments to emasculate this Resolution, and at that time there was no suggestion of postponing it.

It seems to us that, having failed to emasculate the Resolution by two amendments, they now want to delay the matter coming before the consideration of the House, and I do not think we want to agree to an adjournment. I leave it entirely, of course, to the members on our side.

March 20, 1956

Mr. Speaker: — That is a matter for the House to decide. I might draw to your attention there are 11 members who have already spoken on this, and as the Premier says there has been two adjournments. I will then ask for your consent to adjourn.

(Leave to adjourn refused)

I am afraid the debate will have to go on.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, there are several things that I want to say in regard to this Motion, but before I say anything, I want to refer to a few letters that I have received from different parts of the province of Saskatchewan concerning the condition of farmers throughout our province. The first letter I want to read to you is from a young farmer, and I think with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will read the complete letter:

"I think you should, as the C.C.F. have been, take a definite stand regarding cash advances on farm-stored grain, and put yourself and the Provincial Liberal party against such a policy.

"An analysis of the Saskatchewan farmer's problem would make apparent that the slow up in grain marketing was not wholly responsible for the present financial condition, but rather the low farm production prices, plus rising farm costs. I have discussed this with several friends and all agree that Wheat Board advances with the consequent financing costs and losses, would further reduce our income, and even destroy the Board."

And it goes on. He gives several reasons for making this statement in his letter.

I want to read from another letter. I have many of them here, but I am only going to read from the two this afternoon. This letter begins:

"It is very nice of you to think of the people around here. You were wondering about the conditions around this part. Well, they are pretty grim. There was very little crop threshed around here on account of the flood. For instance, I had 150 acres in crop, and most of it being under water, I only threshed 1,000 bushels, and I farm 3-quarter sections of land, and I got some people in my division who never threshed a bushel on account of the flood, and this far is the situation looks this spring it will be worse than ever, as there are three or four feet of snow over this entire community."

And he goes on to say that:

"It isn't cash advances that are needed in this particular area of the province, but what these people

need is some help for those farmers who are in dire circumstances because they have no grain on their farms."

I only brought those two letters to your attention because there was some mention of what the feeling was of people in different parts of the province.

When, the member for Gravelbourg (Mr. E. Walker) was introducing this motion into the Legislature, he referred to a trip that I made to Ottawa, last fall, and the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) referred to that trip again this afternoon, and, as a matter of fact, he said that I was set to Ottawa.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have never been sent to Ottawa. When I decide to go to Ottawa I will go on my own goodwill and my own free time. But the reason I went to Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, was not with any secret plan in mind. I went to Ottawa as an individual and a farmer realising the situation of the farmers in the province of Saskatchewan last October and November, and I realised that there was a definite shortage of cash as far as farmers were concerned. I was not too concerned what method the Canadian Wheat Board or the Federal Government adopted in making money available to the farmers of western Canada, but I was very concerned that they should do something, and do it as quickly as possible, to get money into the hands of our farmers.

I have been criticized because it was supposed to be some sort of secret plan. It was not my intention to go to Ottawa to get a lot of publicity. My intention was to go down there to do whatever I could as an individual to bring relief to the farmers of western Canada.

I have mentioned on several occasions that I do not believe that bank loans or cash advances are the answer to our problem, and I repeat that here this afternoon. This problem is far greater than the one act of either paying cash advances or bank loans can rectify. I have said that bank loans or cash advances are about as good as a stirrup pump at a forest fire, and I repeat it here this afternoon, and I speak as a practical farmer in this province. I have always advocated that we ought to have more public storage here in western Canada, and I advocate that again this afternoon.

Some people speaking earlier in this debate have said, and I want to quote. It was the hon. member for Pelly (Mr. Feusi), when he said that:

"No one would object if we held all our wheat, if we had cash advances, if we held all our wheat on the farms."

Mr. Speaker, I have never heard such a ridiculous statement. You and I both know and realise as practical farmers that when you. . .

Mr. Feusi:-Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I would like to ask the hon. member to return that statement to his own mind, because I did not make such a statement as that.

March 20, 1956

Mr. McDonald: — Well, I may have the wrong member, Mr. Speaker, but it was made by one of the members on the Government side of the House. I think I know the member now, but I am not going to name him in case I'm wrong. But, at least, some member on the Government side of the House, speaking earlier this debate, made that statement, and I want to repeat again that any practical farmer knows that that is not the answer to our problem. We know that when we produce grain we produce it to sell, and if we are going to continue to store grain on our farms from one year to another, pretty soon, rather than having our grain properly stored as the Premier has said, we are going to have it all out in the open. The farmers of this province produce a crop and have most of it in their farm storage bins by about the first of November. Farmers across this province want the opportunity to have those bins emptied by the following July 31, and no system of cash advances will make that possible - that is, cash advances by themselves.

If we are going to implement a programme of cash advances, then, in my humble opinion, we must have a programme to increase good farm storage. I doubt very much if that is the proper answer to this problem. My personal opinion is that we should see that the grain-handling companies construct more public storage here on the prairies.

During this last fall we found that for some time there was space available in our terminal elevators, but we were unable to get the grain from western Canada into the terminal elevators. Now we find that we have a good deal of space available here in the province of Saskatchewan in our country elevator system. As a matter of fact, about 45,000,000 bushels of space. Our farmers are unable at this time to take advantage of that space due to the fact that the roads in the province are blocked at the moment on account of snow, and I believe that we are going to have more trouble in regard to filling this 45,000,000 bushels of space, because no sooner will the roads become unblocked as far as snow is concerned, but they will be blocked with mud.

I want to refer to some of the things said so far in this debate. When the mover introduced the motion in the House, he referred to a statement that I am reported to have made back on November 9, 1955, when he said that I had made the statement that - just a minute, I want to read part of it to you; that I had made the statement that:

"Delegates to the Wheat Pool convention were opposed to cash advances."

And there was an article in the Regina 'Leader-Post' of November 9, 1955, headed, "Pool Takes Issue With McDonald"; and I note about the second paragraph they state:

"It is obvious that Mr. McDonald was either misquoted or misinformed."

Now, I am not one of these people who run to the press every second day and say that I have been misquoted, but I think it is obvious from the attitude of the delegates at the Wheat Pool convention that they were in favour of cash advances. What I said at that time, and what I want

to repeat here today is that "the officials of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool were not in favour of cash advances." And I want to substantiate that statement.

Why did the officials of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool not seem fit to put this matter on the agenda to be discussed at the annual Wheat Pool convention? I think it is fairly obvious, because the officials of the Wheat Pool were opposed to cash advances.

Premier Douglas: — They did put on the agenda.

Mr. McDonald: — It was put on the agenda, yes, after the delegates met in convention, and it was at the request of the delegates that it was placed on the agenda at that meeting.

I want to refer now to what the President of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool had to say about cash advances - and I have so many of them is here that it will take some time to read them into the record; but first of all I want to refer to what Mr. Wesson had to say on September 28, 1955, and I quote:

"Bank loans up to \$1,000 based on grain to be delivered to elevators and guaranteed against loss by the Federal Government was suggested by President J. H. Wesson of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, as a means to alleviate the emergency financial problem of western farmers."

Now that was prior to the Wheat Pool meeting, and I suggest to you this is the reason that this cash advances matter was not on the agenda when the Wheat Pool first met. Mr. Wesson went on to say:

"The Federal Government should be asked to pass an Act similar to the one of 1951, which provided emergency financial assistance to farmers in difficulties. That year the crop was snowed under and farmers could not harvest. The farmers are in the same difficulty this year for another reason. They could not deliver grain, and faced the immediate problem of obtaining cash to carry on."

Mr. Wesson said:

"The Wheat Pool did not agree with the suggestion of interest-free loans to farmers, but it should not be exorbitant. The banks would grant some loans now, but were choosy of their creditors, and the 5 per cent interest was too high.

"The Government should pass legislation, and there should be an agreement between the Bank of Canada and the Chartered Banks whereby the loans to farmers be on a 2 per cent or 2½ per cent interest basis."

Mr. Walker (Hanley) - Where did we hear that before?

March 20, 1956

Mr. McDonald: Mr. Wesson's statement continued:

"The loans would only be made on the basis of the grain the farmer would probably deliver and entered in his quote book. The Federal Government should take the loss, if any. The 1951 Act provided for an expenditure of up to \$20 million for this purpose, but only \$660,000 was loaned."

Mr. Wesson pointed out that:

"The risk of loss would be much less today where the current crop was well housed; the 1951 grain was under the snow when the loans were made."

So you can see from that, Mr. Speaker, that the President of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool was opposed to cash advances, and definitely recommended bank loans.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — He is now.

Mr. Loptson: — After the C.C.F. got among the delegates.

Mr. McDonald: — Then again on September 29th, the day following the quotation that I just read to you, Mr. Wesson had this to say, as reported in the Regina 'Leader-Post':

"J. H. Wesson, President of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, warned that any request of the Federal Government would have to be reasonable to gain approval from eastern members who were not too concerned with wheat problems. In effect, this resolution asked for subsidization, and with Canada exporting 80 per cent of her wheat products, such a programme could cost the Treasury from \$150 million to \$200 million annually."

I want to go on to something that he said a little later in his remarks on the same day:

"In another effort to give the farmer a large return for his labour, the Canadian Government was urged to assume the carrying charges on all grain in store at the end of the crop year. It was pointed out that the western farmers were fulfilling one of the objectives of the United Nations maintaining a food bank for the people of the world, but the cost of maintaining it should be borne by all Canadians and not solely by prairie farmers.

"A five-pronged resolution was passed and was aimed at a more positive programme for disposing of Canadian grain without price cutting:

“(1) that Canada was urged to extend credit were necessary to facilitate grain sales and reliable foreign currencies be also taken in payment when necessary;

“(2) that barter trade be used when necessary, providing the barter goods or raw materials did not lower living standards of Canadian workers through unfair competition;

“(3) that Canadians participate in famine relief programmes where needed;

“(4) that Wheat Board sales personnel be increased an aggressive sales promotion programme be carried on;

“(5) that an intensified programme of scientific research be carried on to find other possible uses for Canadian wheat.”

Speaking earlier in the debate, the hon. member for Elrose (Mr. M. J. Willis) said that "just as soon as the Federal Government are prepared to stand aside and let the province take over, we will do a better job."

Well now, Mr. Speaker, I ask: do the farmers of the province of Saskatchewan want to maintain the Canadian Wheat Board, or do they want a Board of this Government set up to handle wheat as far as the province of Saskatchewan is concerned? According to the hon. member for Elrose that is what he wants. According to his own statement, he doesn't believe in the Canadian Wheat Board. He says that we should have a provincial board to market wheat for the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Willis (Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, a point of privilege. I did not say that in this House. I said, "when the Federal Government wants to stand aside and the people elected a C.C.F. government at Ottawa, we would make a better job of it down there."

Mr. McDonald: — That is not what the hon. member said. What the hon. members said was this, and I repeat: "Just as soon as the Federal Government are prepared to stand aside and let the province take over, we will do a much better job."

Premier Douglas: — May I ask my hon. friend what he is quoting from?

Mr. McDonald: — It is taken off the record of the Legislature, in my own handwriting.

Premier Douglas: — I think my hon. friend should check the Hansard again, it isn't my recollection that he said that.

Mr. McDonald:- Now, I just wonder what that would mean to the people of the province of Saskatchewan. I think we can all think back a few years, and we will remember when the Federal Government paid considerable

March 20, 1956

sums of money into the Canadian Wheat Board and made it possible for payments to be made here in western Canada.

The new programme of paying interest and storage charges on everything over 178 million bushels this year will mean an expenditure of \$32 million. A good portion of that will come to the farmers of the province of Saskatchewan. I wonder how many farmers or how many members of the Government sitting opposite realize what that programme will mean to the farmers of the province of Saskatchewan!

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — They pay plenty too.

Mr. McDonald: — That \$32 million means that every family in the Dominion of Canada will pay into this plan approximately \$2.00; that every farmer in the province of Saskatchewan will receive approximately \$125 a year under that programme, . . .

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg): — That is just this year. . .

Mr. McDonald: — . . . if our surpluses continue to stay where they are at the present moment.

I want also to refer to what other farm leaders have said in regard to cash advances. I want to refer again to an article out of the 'Leader-Post' of September 29, 1955, and here we have, speaking of Mr. Ben Plumer, Mr. Warden Burgess, Mr. Brownlee and again Mr. Wesson. This is taken from the 'Leader-Post'" and I quote:

"One delegate said it would be getting an advance for grain not delivered in the same way that the initial payments was an advance without interest on grain delivered, and held by the Canadian Wheat Board until sold.

"However, Ben Plumer of the Alberta Wheat Pool said farmers did pay interest on initial payments for grain, since the Wheat Board had to borrow money from the banks at interest which was repaid when the grain was sold. These interest payments were charged against the farmers by the Wheat Board.

"Warden Burgess, Saskatchewan Wheat Pool director said interest paid on loans would give some big farmers a chance to make easy money. Under the system proposed by Mr. Shultz he said a farmer now in difficulty could apply for interest-free loans and then put the money advanced into government bonds which pay 3½ per cent interest. Many farmers would seize such an opportunity to make money.

"For this reason, J. E. Brownlee, President of the United Growers, said there would be a fixed maximum for these loans or advances. Only those in need of emergency assistance should get it.

"J. H. Wesson, President of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool made this suggestion, Tuesday, when he proposed re-enactment of the 1951 legislation - in other words advocating bank loans."

Now that was their attitude on paying storage on farm-stored grain? The conference rejected a motion calling for farm storage payments; instead it voted that the resolution be referred back to the various organizations concerned for the consideration. What was Mr. Wesson's thinking on this suggestion?

"Mr. Wesson also opposed the move on grounds that such a plan would make the large farmers the beneficiaries."

In the province of Saskatchewan we have been told just recently that we still have approximately 34,000 farms in this province that are uneconomic units. If this programme were adopted, we are doing the very thing that we ought not to be doing, because we are making those farms more uneconomical than ever, and we ought to be adopting a programme that will help the small farmer in this province. There are literally thousands of farmers in this province who have no wheat to take a cash advance on. Now we are asking these people to underwrite or to subsidize the wheat miner in the province of Saskatchewan. There are farmers in this province who have from 90,000 to 250,000 bushels of wheat in store on their farms, some of it is in good storage and some of it is in open bins. As far as I am concerned, I do not want to have to pay part of the interest charges for the money that any big farmer can borrow on that wheat, and I do not want the farmers who reside in my constituency to have to pay part of the interest charged on the wheat miners in the province of Saskatchewan.

The people whom we ought to be taking care of, Mr. Speaker, are those people who are in financial difficulty because they have no grain. Who is doing anything about it? This so-called friends-of-the-farmer Government in this province ought to be doing something about it, rather than sitting in this Legislature and other Government places howling about cash advances. Certainly those farmers who have grain ought to have some relief and some way of receiving money for the grain they have in storage; but I do not believe that cash advances is the answer to that problem. In my personal opinion the answer to the problem is this: to increase public storage here on the prairies so that the farmer can have the opportunity of delivering that grain during the crop year in which it was grown.

I know as a practical farmer - and sometimes I wonder if there are any over there when you hear them talk; but when a farmer puts the grain in his granaries by November (as a rule we have all our grain stored by the 1st of November) we like to be able to deliver part of that grain over the complete season; in other words, from the 1st of November to July 31st; but by July 31st we would like to be rid of all of that grain and receive our advance payment or initial payment. If we had a programme like that instituted here in the province of Saskatchewan and in western Canada, we would not need cash advances, we would not have grain

March 20, 1956

lying all over the prairies here in western Canada, and a lot of it is lying out in the snow and the water.

Some people are trying to tell us that there is no need for increase in the public storage of western Canada. I believe that there is a need, and I say that if those people who have been in the grain handling business for years in western Canada fail to provide the necessary storage, and if Ottawa failed to provide it, then it is up to us as a Provincial Legislature to provide it.

Mr. Speaker, if we have \$5,500,000 to put into a cement industry here in the city of Regina, surely to goodness we have got another \$5,500,000 to put into public storage for agricultural products here in the province of Saskatchewan!

Premier Douglas: — Who are you kidding?

Mr. McDonald: — Now, as far as the bank loans are concerned, I am in complete agreement with all those who said that 5 per cent interest is too high. I think it is too high. When Mr. Wesson, speaking on cash advances, suggested that it should not be over 3 per cent, I agree with him. If the Canadian Wheat Board are able to borrow money from the Bank of Canada at around 3 per cent when they buy our grain, then why are they not able to supply money for bank loans are cash advances or whatever way you want to distribute it, at an equal percentage rate? I think we ought to be able to get this money at around 3 per cent interest, and I note here also that the different farm organizations of western Canada have asked for bank loans at 3 per cent.

I would like to quote a great deal from the question in regard to bank loans and cash advances policies that have been adopted by other agricultural nations, but I do not think that is necessary at this time. But, Mr. Speaker, there is just one other thing that I want to bring to your attention. The Canadian Wheat Board annual report for 1954-55 gives us the names of the advisory committee of the Canadian Wheat Board. Now the Premier has just told us that all the farm organizations were clamoring for cash advances. . .

Premier Douglas: — Isn't that true?

Mr. McDonald: — Just let me finish. Now we have the heads of our farm organizations who are the advisory board of the Canadian Wheat Board. Who are they? We have Mr. J. H. Brownlee from Winnipeg, Manitoba. We have Mr. C. P. Hansen from Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, who is the President of the Saskatchewan Farmers Union. We have Mr. R. C. Marler from Edmonton, Alberta. We have W. J. Parker of the Wheat Pool from Winnipeg, Manitoba. We have Ben Plumer from the Calgary Wheat Pool of Alberta, and J. H. Wesson, President of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. That is the advisory committee to the Canadian Wheat Board. Have they ever asked for cash advances? Have they?

Some Govt. Member: — Don't be silly.

Mr. McDonald: — Isn't it the duty of an advisory committee to tell the Canadian Wheat Board what they want?

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Within the law.

Mr. McDonald: — Isn't it? Have they? I am asking you.

Premier Douglas: — My hon. friend knows their material purpose; we have no way of knowing, neither have you.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — They can advise them within the powers set out in the Act.

Mr. McDonald: — Because of the fact that the advisory committee to the Canadian Wheat Board is made up in its entirety by the leaders of western farm organizations, I want to move an amendment to this resolution that we have before us. I would like to move, seconded by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Carr):

"That all the words after the word 'Assembly' be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"approves the policy of marketing grain through the Canadian Wheat Board, and goes on record as supporting cash advances on farm-stored grain if and when this policy change is requested by the Canadian Wheat Board."

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — They are an administrative body. How silly can you get!

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

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I will only detain the House a few moments to comment on this amendment. I think it is the most amazing amendment that I have ever heard in twenty years of listening to motions and amendments being proposed in public places. Let us read it:

"That all the words after the word 'Assembly' be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"approves the policy of marketing grain through the Canadian Wheat Board," (We have no quarrel with that.) "and goes on record as supporting cash advances on farm-stored grain," (There certainly could be no objection to that. If my hon. friend had stopped there one could probably have voted for it, especially if he had said "through the Wheat Board." But he said:)

"if and when this policy change is requested by the Canadian Wheat Board."

March 20, 1956

Mr. Speaker, that is the most preposterous proposal I have ever heard. Here is a public man who favours something that is good for the farmers. He is in favour of cash advances. But the farmers cannot have it, even if the Government wants it or even if Parliament wants it. They cannot have it unless it is requested by the Canadian Wheat Board!

Mr. McDonald: — Nobody said any such thing.

Premier Douglas: — Well, my hon. friend can surely read English language. Whoever drafted it for him should have explained it to him. It says: "If and when" - that is simple enough - "if and when this policy change is requested by the Canadian Wheat Board." In other words, we can get cash advances on farm-stored grain "if and when this policy change is requested"; and "when this policy change is requested by the Canadian Wheat Board."

Where is the supremacy of Parliament about which Mr. Mackenzie King used to speak? Where is the power of the elected representatives of the people? The representatives of the people may say they want cash advances on farm-stored grain, but until a group of people appointed by the Federal Government - virtually civil servants - employees of the state, give their approval you cannot have cash advances on farm-stored grain, even though Parliament wants it, the Legislatures want it, the farmers want it, and farm organizations want it.

Mr. Watson (Saltcoats): — What about the Producers' Committee?

Premier Douglas: — My friend talks about the Committee. That is the biggest joke in this country. The Producers' Committee is an advisory committee only given power to make recommendations to the Wheat Board within the limitations of the statutes. They have no power to make recommendations on policy matters. Not only that. The Wheat Board doesn't need to do any more than snap its fingers at them when they do make recommendations.

Mr. Loptson: — Would you like to. . .

Premier Douglas: — My friend can just keep quiet. If he wants to make a speech, let him get on his feet, instead of sitting there interrupting everybody, when he has nothing to contribute to the debate except to sit and burp.

Mr. McDonald: — Now he's mad!

Premier Douglas: — I will tell my hon. friend now why he has moved this amendment, Mr. Speaker. It looks queer and preposterous at first, but there is a very good reason why this amendment has been moved. Remember, he is saying that we are to get cash advances on farm-stored grain only if and when this policy is requested by the Canadian Wheat Board. Where did Mr. Howe say in the House of Commons? My hon. friend knows what the Wheat Board would recommend! Mr. Howe said, at page 127 of Hansard:

"I can tell the House that if the Government instructed the Wheat Board to lend money on farm-stored grain

and assume the responsibility for the lending of that money and its subsequent collection, the four members of the Wheat Board would be out of office within a matter of days."

This was the boss! Mr. Howe said in effect: "I cannot give you cash advances. The members may want it, the farm organizations may want it, but three provincial governments and three provincial legislatures may ask for it, but I cannot give it to you. Because, if I did, the four members of the Wheat Board would be out of office within a matter of days." Then the Leader of the Opposition comes in here, knowing that Mr. Howe has put the Wheat Board on record as being against cash advances and he says, in effect: "I will agree to cash advances providing the Wheat Board agrees, because I know already they are not going to agree."

If ever there was an attempt on one hand to be in favour of cash advances but on the other hand to attach a proviso that it be recommended by a body who are already on record as being against it, here it is! Why don't my friends come out honestly and say they are in favour of cash advances on farm-stored grain as they do in the first part of the resolution? Never mind saying, "if the Wheat Board approves"; or if somebody else approves. If the supreme Parliament approves, that is all that should be necessary. If the members of this Legislature are supporting it, and the members of the other Legislatures support it, that should be enough.

Mr. Watson: — Don't pound the desk too hard!

Premier Douglas: — If we came into this House and told this House that we were prepared to do something providing a group of civil servants on a Board approved, my friends would laugh us out of court. And we would deserve to be laughed out of court. These gentlemen come in here and tell us that the farmers want cash advances and that they are in favour of cash advances on farm-stored grain. But they want to 'gimmick' it. And the gimmick is, "provided the Wheat Board will approve." They know perfectly well, of course, that the Wheat Board is not going to approve and that they have already threatened Mr. Howe with their resignations.

I want to say that this supine attitude of allowing a group of civil servants or government appointees to tell a government what it shall do is the very negation of parliamentary government and of democracy. Any government with any sense of dignity, or any sense of responsibility, would let this decision be made by the supreme court of Parliament and not allow it to be made by a group of people whom they have hired to do what they are told and not to tell the Government what they should do.

I cannot speak for my colleagues, but I, for one, shall vote against this amendment, as I do not propose to have any policies advanced by any legislature or any parliament subject to a veto by a group of hired officials.

March 20, 1956

Mr. Cameron: — I want to point out to the House in regard to this amendment, the effort that we in the Opposition have been putting forward to make something constructive out of this destructive resolution.

It says that we "deplore the Federal Government." That is the sum total and substance of that resolution, and nothing else. Then in an attempt to make it into constructive resolution, something that the House may come to some agreement on, we introduced an amendment that was ruled out of order. I want to review that amendment.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Well, you can't.

Mr. Cameron: — That amendment was ruled out of order - that was the first step.

Mr. Speaker: — Which one? There was no amendment ruled out of order.

Mr. Cameron: — Yes, the first one was ruled out of order, when we brought in an amendment to the effect that the credit unions, where it was not convenient to get to the banks, could be utilized and that elevator companies be allowed to make loans or advances to farmers on farm-stored grain; to include the three organizations to bring a wider range to the farmers. That was ruled out of order.

Then, from that, we proceeded to the amendment, this afternoon. . .

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. This House is far too busy to discuss or argue about resolutions which have already been voted upon or ruled out of order.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! No, that wasn't the grounds at all, and anyway I think that has already been decided upon.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — He can't read them now.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! You had better confine yourself to the amendment.

Mr. Cameron: — Then I would say this - the second amendment which we just voted on. . .

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Order!

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Cameron: — Now this amendment which we have here, which we are speaking on now, is the third attempt by the Opposition to bring in some basis of an amendment where we could have some constructive resolution on this matter. Three attempts have been made to bring it into something which would give us a basis of discussion and get a resolution on. . .

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg): — Who do you think is going to believe that?

Mr. Cameron:- . . .and three attempts have been turned down. We have one resolution that says "we deplore the Federal Government"; and nothing, no matter what could be suggested, will change the thinking or the motive behind the resolution to condemn the Federal Government. No matter what amendments are brought in, there is no basis of mutual understanding or discussion - "this is what we want, and this is what we are determined we are going to have in this House." That is the purpose of it. No matter what effort has been made to get something into this, to turn it into a constructive resolution, we have been defeated on three attempts, and the people of the province will know the purpose behind it, the effort that we have put forth to bring into this resolution something that would be constructive.

We have, at the request of the western provinces, people on the Advisory Board to the Canadian Wheat Board, who are farmers, representing farm organizations. We fought for that in the west for years. We thought we didn't have representation enough in the Advisory Committee to the Canadian Wheat Board. We have that, today; and surely we could go so far that if these leaders of three western farm organizations should feel, or see fit, to recommend those cash advances, surely if they are on the Advisory Committee to the Canadian Wheat Board, if they are convinced in their minds that cash advances is the right and only and proper solution to the situation. . .

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Parliament are the only. . .

Mr. Cameron: — . . .then surely they are within their rights in recommending that such action be taken.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Parliament is the only one. . .

Mr. Cameron: — And I think that if they should recommend such a consideration we would be within our rights in considering it. So we have come all the way down the line to try to get something constructive into this resolution; but the purpose is merely "we stand square for to condemn Ottawa and nothing else; and no matter what you submit we will not consider." That is the purpose behind the resolution; that is the purpose of defeating all the amendments.

I want to say here that if the Premier objects to using the Canadian Wheat Board, which he calls a staff of civil servants, then let us put it - perhaps it was mis-worded; let us change the resolution then to read "the Advisory Committee to the Canadian Wheat Board." They are not civil servants; they are an Advisory Committee. If the Advisory Committee to the Canadian Wheat Board recommends cash advances, then that should have a tremendous weight with every member in this Legislature, because they know the thinking of the farm people; they are at the head of these farm organizations, and I would like to amend that to add the words:

"the Advisory Committee to the Canadian Wheat Board"

I think that was the intention of the Leader of the Opposition. I can see the implications of the Canadian Wheat Board; I think the Premier was within his rights in pointing out that this is a constituted Board set up by Ottawa.

March 20, 1956

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! You can't amend a resolution like that, by just saying you want to use some other words.

Premier Douglas: — He can move a sub-amendment.

Mr. Cameron: — We are moving a sub-amendment.

Mr. Speaker: — You didn't say that you were moving a sub-amendment.

Mr. Cameron: — I am pointing out, Mr. Speaker, that I think we should move an amendment to this, putting in the Advisory Committee to the Wheat Board, and I was about to say that I think that was the thinking of the Leader of the Opposition, because he had mentioned the prominent key men in farm organizations and that if they, as the Advisory Committee, with full knowledge of the situation, of the farm problem and farm desires should see fit to recommend that cash advances be paid, then I think, with all due consideration, that would have a tremendous weight with the people and we would be prepared to go along with that.

I think in fairness to the amendment, what we are attempting to do is get a basis of discussion, something that we could go with, something that would be in the interests of the farmers, something of a constructive nature, to make some constructive recommendation.

I would therefore move this amendment to the amendment, seconded by the member for Wilkie (Mr. Horsman):

"That the words 'Advisory Committee to the' be inserted before the words 'Canadian Wheat Board' where they last occur."

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

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words about the sub-amendment. This illustrates, I think, to what lengths the Liberal party is prepared to go in order to escape responsibility for what it does.

The objection was taken that the Canadian Wheat Board is simply a group of employees of the Federal Government, and it was argued, quite rightly and properly, that one should not expect them to come and recommend policy to the Parliament of Canada. Now it is suggested that the recommendation has got to come from a place twice removed - from the Advisory Committee, and I suppose the member for Maple Creek visualises the Advisory Committee making a recommendation to the Canadian Wheat Board, and then he visualises the Canadian Wheat Board passing on this recommendation, which they would not make themselves. The reason he has proposed the amendment to the amendment is that he knows they wouldn't make themselves. As a matter of fact, if they couldn't make it themselves, how can they be expected to pass it on from the Advisory Committee? The truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that there is only one place that this recommendation needs to be made to - and that is to the Government and Parliament of Canada, and to expect a group of advisers to the Wheat Board to make a recommendation to the Parliament of Canada is just utterly silly.

As a matter of fact, if the hon. member would take the trouble to read the Wheat Board Act and see what powers this Advisory Committee really have, he will find that they have the power to advise (informally, without any binding effect) the Wheat Board in matters of policy. But this does not come within the field of policy of the Canadian Wheat Board. This requires an amendment to the Wheat Board Act, which can only be passed by the Parliament of Canada. Therefore, the Advisory Committee has no jurisdiction whatever to entertain or recommend or discuss changes in that legislation.

Mr. Cameron: — They sure will be pleased to know that.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Well, as a matter of fact, if my hon. friend doesn't know that, he certainly isn't aware of any of the fundamental principles of law or of the constitution.

That would be like suggesting to some group of civil servants that they recommend an amendment to the Act which gives them their existence. Certainly no group of civil servants can be expected to make recommendations on that. To ask the Advisory Committee to the Wheat Board to make this recommendation you must have in mind who they are to make it to.

Now, who are they to make it to? They cannot make it to the Wheat Board, because they have no legal right to take this matter into consideration. Who must they make it to? This Committee must get off in a hotel room somewhere by itself, unknown to the Wheat Board because the Wheat Board is opposed to this proposal, and make arrangements privately to meet with some members of Parliament to try to get the Act amended. Now that, to my notion, is the height of absurdity. If the Parliament of Canada wants to make this amendment, they will make it. If we have any recommendation to make we should make it to the Parliament of Canada. The people of Canada are the people who ought to have the rights and privilege of making that recommendation, and nobody else.

Hon. J. T. Douglas (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether this is an attempt to confuse the people of this province in regard to the issue before this House, today, or whether it is just another exhibition of the confused state of the minds of the members opposite.

Certainly, when one looks at this whole matter and the way the situation has been handled throughout the entire year, there has been nothing but confusion reigning throughout the entire season; and this, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, simply confuses the issue a great deal more than it has been confused.

I would like to point out some of the actions that have been taken place that lead me to believe that some of the action taken by the Federal Government and the people opposite is a deliberate attempt to confuse. I remember quite well, last August, when we were getting ready to harvest our crop, we were told that there would be ample wheat moved to take care of the wishes of the farmers of western Canada; and then after we had commenced to harvest our crop and we were ready to move some of this wheat to market, we

March 20, 1956

were told that there was no space available.

Mr. Speaker: — I am afraid the hon. member is out of order.

Mr. Cameron: — Yes, we are debating the amendment to the amendment.

Hon. Mr. J. T. Douglas: — All right then, I would just say that anything that has been offered in this amendment to the amendment is simply another attempt to confuse the issue and to allow the people opposite to get out of a very embarrassing situation.

Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats): — I understand the House is to adjourn at 5:15, and in that case I would like to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

The Assembly then adjourned at 5:15 o'clock p.m.