

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

Thursday, March 22, 1956

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

On the Orders of the Day

**Re Press Statement**

**Hon. C. M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer):** — Before the Orders of the Day, I wish to refer to an article in this morning's paper entitled, 'McDonald Says Facts Distorted', and I quote:

"Recent actions of two Cabinet Ministers in the Saskatchewan Legislature indicate the lengths to which the C.C.F. Government is prepared to go in distorting the true situation, A. H. McDonald, Saskatchewan Liberal leader charged Wednesday night."

"His references were Provincial Treasurer Fines and Education Minister. W. A. Lloyd."

"Mr. McDonald recalled that in the budget debate last Thursday he referred to Mr. Fines' statement published in 'The Regina Leader-Post' April, 1954. He quoted Mr. Fines as saying: We were able to borrow \$10 million at a lower rate of interest than any other province or even the Dominion has done since 1950.

"The next day, Friday, Mr. Fines spoke and closed the debate, which was his privilege, Mr. McDonald said.

"No person could speak after him. No person has any opportunity to refute in the House anything which he said until the 1957 session of the Legislature, McDonald explained.

"Taking advantage of that situation, Mr. Fines said it was 'deliberate misrepresentation or stupidity' which led me to challenge his statement that 3¼ per cent was the lowest rate obtained on a loan by any government in Canada since 1950.

"Mr. McDonald said he just mentioned three or four government loans made since 1950 at a lower rate of interest. But he said he found that in the period to which Mr. Fines referred the federal government sold two bond issues with an interest rate of 2½ per cent, and other provincial governments

**March 22, 1956**

sold seven issues with interest rates of less than 3¼ per cent, and three issues with 3¼ per cent rate.

"Yet, Mr. McDonald commented, "Mr. Fines said I was guilty of a deliberate misrepresentation."

Now, Mr. Speaker, all I want to say about it is in the first place, an official statement was given to the press on the 1st of April. I have here a copy of the 'The Leader-Post' dated April 2, 1954. 'The Leader-Post' says:

"Mr. Fines said the excellent prices obtained would result in Saskatchewan borrowing on the Canadian market at a lower price than any other federal or provincial government since 1950."

Now, in speaking the other day, the hon. member gave two instances of Dominion loans in 1950. I want to reiterate that I said nothing about loans made in 1950, because we ourselves borrowed a lower rate in 1950. Then he dealt with two other cases, New Brunswick and Ontario, where they sold bonds at 3¼ per cent in 1951. I pointed out the other day that those bonds were for shorter terms and could not be construed as ordinary borrowing for capital purposes, and Quebec had a rate of 2 7/8 per cent. I also pointed out to the hon. member that the issue he referred to in Quebec was borrowed in the United States. "Again in 1952", he stated, "Nova Scotia were able to complete a deal for 2¼ per cent interest" but that also was a two-year issue; that was not borrowing in the ordinary sense, for a long-term purpose.

Then he referred to the province of Quebec, and of course, that was two weeks after, so I just want to say again that I think that it is not proper for the hon. member, after it has been brought to his attention, to continue to repeat these statements. I was willing to give him the benefit of the doubt that he did not know any better, but after he goes on and repeats it after it has been brought to his attention, when he can look it up in any of the books, and find out that his statement is not correct. . .

**Mr. A. H. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that the statement is correct, and if the Provincial Treasurer will look through the book that he just held in his hand, he will find the statement which I referred to in my radio address last night.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Well, give me some of them. Let's have some of them.

**Mr. McDonald:** — In that book, and in the Dominion Bureau of Statistics; they are listed in there.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Mr. Speaker, may I say again that there is no bond issue that the hon. gentleman can point to, except for these short-term periods, two or three years. . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — Is this Montréal's?

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — No, this is the Investment Dealers' Handbook, which just came out this week, but they are all in it. Every issue is there. I'll be glad, Mr. Speaker, to get up and apologize to the members of this House if my statement is not correct, but I know the situation so well, that I know that what I have said is correct.

### **Boxcar Distribution and Allocation**

The Assembly resumed from Tuesday, March 6th, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Dewhurst:

That this Assembly requests the Government of Canada:

- (1) to make a sufficient number of boxcars available for the movement of grain, so that all times grains may be moved into available terminal storage space; and
- (2) so to amend the Canada Grain Act that allocation of boxcars among the various elevator companies may be on the basis of the preference indicated by the application in each producer's permit book; and
- (3) to instruct the Transport Controller to make a more equitable distribution of boxcars as between shipping points, the allocation to be on the basis of need.

**Mr. A. H. McDonald (Leader of Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, I understood when I adjourned the debate sometime ago that you were going to divide the motion into three parts, and I would like to know what your ruling is there before I speak on the motion.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I take it that you want a ruling on whether this is permissible at this time, or will it be held over until the report of the. . .

**Mr. MacDonald:** — No, Mr. Speaker, I want to know whether you are going to have us make your ruling so that we can vote on the complete motion as it exists, or whether you are prepared to divide it into three parts.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Oh yes, yes. I think I did say I would split this into three parts, so we will take it as three separate motions, if that is agreeable.

- Agreed -

**Mr. F. A. Dewhurst (Wadena):** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I cannot see the necessity of it, but if it is your wish, I won't object.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well, then we'll take them as three separate motions.

**March 22, 1956**

**Mr. McDonald:** — No. (1) of the motion before us, Mr. Speaker, reads as follows:

"to make a sufficient number of boxcars available for the movement of grain, so that at all times grain may be moved into available terminal storage space."

I think all the members of the Legislature are in agreement with that part of the motion. Now, I think that from some information which we have received through the daily press in this province, we have found on some occasions that those people in charge of boxcars have found that it might be of advantage to us not to fill space in terminal elevators immediately that it becomes available, and I think that all members in the Legislature realize why that policy has been adopted, because there are many instances when perhaps the delivery in the 12-month period would be greater if we were not to cram our terminal elevators immediately that any space became available in it.

My personal view is that those people in charge of boxcars are attempting to do the very best they can, but I believe that all members in this Legislature are prepared to ask those people in charge to do even better in the future than they have in the past, and as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, that is all I have to say on part (1) of the motion, and I will support it.

The question being put on Part (1), it was agreed to unanimously.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, Part (2) reads as follows:

"so to amend the Canada Grain Act that allocation of boxcars among the various elevator companies may be on the basis of the preference indicated by the application in each producer's permit book."

I believe there is a lot of request in Saskatchewan for this type of legislation, but I do not believe the resolution goes far enough. For instance, if a farmer were to request in his permit book that he wanted all the cars, as far as his name is concerned, to go to one particular elevator, and then he finds that that elevator is unable to handle a certain type of grain which he had produced, it could be that he would find himself in the position where he was not able to deliver to another elevator. For that reason, I would like to see the motion go a little further, because I do not believe that any individual should be penalized because of the fact that he is unable to deliver a certain type of grain to the elevator which he has selected as the elevator of his choice, in his permit book.

If it were not for that, I would be prepared to support Part (2) of the motion, but I wish that the motion had gone a little further, and been a little more explanatory. As it is, it leaves it in the air, and for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I believe that each member should be left to vote as he sees fit on this particular part of the motion.

If it is the intention of the mover to implement some guarantee whereby a farmer could deliver his grain to an elevator other than the elevator he had listed as his choice, then I believe we could support this part of the motion as well. But as this has not been done, in all sincerity I do not feel I could support this part of the motion.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Might I point out that we will treat this as a separate motion, so the mover and the second will have an opportunity to speak on this.

**Hon. C. M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer):** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say one thing, and that is that all members are perfectly free to vote as they see fit. There is no whip held over any of the members; these are private members' resolutions, and everyone is perfectly free to vote as he sees fit.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for a little clarification before I say anything. If I speak now, would that indicate that I had lost my right to close the debate on this motion?

**Mr. Speaker:** — No. This is being treated as a separate motion.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — So I would still have a right to close the debate a little later on, if I wish?

**Hon. T. J. Bentley (Minister of Public Health):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order I would like to be sure where we stand on the right to speak, too. If this is being treated as a separate motion, the Leader of the Opposition has already spoken on it. Has he exhausted his right, or may he speak again on it?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Yes, he has exhausted his right, having spoken before the mover.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — But the mover may now speak, and then close the debate?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Yes.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Maybe I was a little hasty.

**Mr. G. H. Danielson (Arm River):** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words. Under present conditions, I think you are asking the farmer something that isn't really fair. When he takes his permit book out in the fall of the year, and that is generally before the commencement of the crop year - before August 1st; the crop has not always been cut. Sometimes - take last year, on July 1st last year nobody thought they were going to have a crop. Are you not asking too much when you ask a farmer, under present crop conditions and under present storage facilities that we have at our disposal - when you ask him to sign the book, indicating the particular elevator he wants to handle his grain for the next ensuing 12 months? I imagine that would be on a crop-year basis, Mr. Speaker, because you get a new quota book for every year.

**March 22, 1956**

Now, it may look all right, but just imagine that in the middle of the delivery season, probably September or October in the fall, we find that instead of having a 10-bushel crop, we might have a 20-bushel crop. That has happened many times in the last few months of the new crop year, and in fact the last two or three weeks, even, improvement in crop conditions is remarkable in some years. Then he finds that the elevator which he has designated as the place where he wants to haul his grain is plugged to the doors. There is no prospect of getting any cars; there are two or three other elevators in town, or maybe one only, which is still taking in grain. The farmer needs money, and here he is, tied to a particular elevator. We talk about restrictions and regulations sometimes hindering progress, and the opportunity for the farmer to get any cash out of his crop, and that is true, but I think we are kind of asking for another; one more which we don't have to ask for. I think as the thing is at the present time, you have the car order book – it's a Dominion Statute Law; nobody is taking it away and nobody has changed it. If two or more farmers, or one farmer even can go into the stations and demand that he be permitted the car order book, and in any place where there are a few farmers, in any town, they can demand it. If there are sufficient farmers who think and feel that that is the proper way to do it under the present conditions, then they have all the opportunity in the world of making use of that provision. It is now on the Statute Books for them.

I am not really opposed to this. I wish that the provision that is in the car order book today could be operated under present conditions, as the gentleman who represented the Transport Controller, or his Department before the Agricultural Committee, pointed out himself. I asked the representative of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool just how he was going to operate, and he said this, "Why, under present conditions when you have a blockade, and you have a stoppage of deliveries in every place, it isn't possible to operate this way." Well, if it is impossible to operate your car order book, then it is just as impossible to operate under this particular clause or principle which this resolution asks for.

**Hon. J. H. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, I think this is a good motion that we have before us now, because I have always felt a bit aggrieved when I owned shares in our own Pool elevator and I was not able to deliver my grain to that Pool elevator because it was full; and some of the others who didn't have so many customers had lots of room and I had to go there and use facilities other than my own.

I think this resolution will do a great deal to cure that. For example, we have in a town perhaps one Pool elevator and a couple of others, and it may very well be that if there was free choice among the farmers of that community, the Pool elevator would handle half the grain in the community. But the will and desire of the farmer to deliver the grain is completely frustrated by the fact that cars may be divided on the basis of per elevator, or permanent storage space. I think it is very fundamental that we have the right to choose.

The hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) said the farmer finds, in showing his preference, that because there are no cars and that particular elevator is plugged, he has tied himself up. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the situation as it is today, and what we want to get away from. We want to have these cars allocated in the proportion of the grain going to these elevators, so that there will be free and open competition between these elevators and the free choice for the farmers who are delivering their grain. The car order book, the hon. member said, just doesn't work today, and I think he is correct, for the simple reason that few farmers actually ship their grain today. It nearly all goes into the warehouse and loses its identity, so the important point insofar as allocation of boxcars is concerned is not the car order of the individual farmer, but the farmers collectively who are patrons of one elevator, and it is, of course, the Pool elevator organization that is getting the short end of the stick.

I would point out, too, that the motion does not suggest that when a farmer signs an application indicating his preference that he is bound to deliver grain to any one elevator. Mr. Speaker, the motion reads:

"So to amend the Canada Grain Act that allocation of boxcars among the various elevator companies may be on the basis of the preference indicated by the application in each producer's permit book."

Now, if it was meant that the farmer would be bound by that preference the motion should go on and say so, but that is not the case. I want to deliver my grain to the Pool elevator, but if for some reason I have the kind of grain, or something like that, that the Pool cannot handle, I know that I'm going to have to go to another elevator, and I'm going to be free to do it. This will not prevent me from doing it. It is no curtailment of freedom.

I would ask the hon. members opposite - I know many of them are Pool members, and many of them know the history and struggle of the farmers in the marketing of grain - to support this motion, because the present space and allocation of boxcars is against the farmer developing his own marketing organization, and I hope they will support this motion.

**Mr. John Wellbelove (Kerrobot-Kindersley):** — Mr. Speaker, I will support this resolution on the basis suggested by the last speaker. This does not ask at all for any interference with the Canada Grain Act, insofar as the licensing of an elevator is concerned. All this asks for is that a grower of grain may be enabled to state his preference as to the elevator of his choice, to which he desires to deliver his grain providing there is space available under The Canada Grain Act, which says:

"Any elevator that is licensed by the Board of Grain Commissioners has to accept grain from any person, provided there is space for the particular grain in that elevator or grade of grain, which he desires to deliver."

This resolution does not interfere with that at all.

**March 22, 1956**

**Mr. R. A. McCarthy (Cannington):** — Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few remarks here. The reason I personally object to this is because I realize that it is not going to make as good use of our storage as we could otherwise; it is going to restrict the use of storage, not add to storage. If you have grain as we have down there, and I think in most of our little towns there is a small portion of one grain, let us say there is a fair portion of a certain grade of barley. One elevator takes that and another elevator takes something else. If each one of those elevators had to keep a bin for that, you would have three bins tied up with that particular kind of grain.

So, after all what we are trying to do here, if it wasn't for the shortage of storage space and cars, we would not need at all, because everybody would want to drive to the Pool elevator, and it would be perfectly in order for them to do so, and this is just an emergency situation. If you go back over the years, there is only just an odd time that there is a shortage of this kind. This time it has lasted two or three years on account of a large crop, but I think what we are trying to do here is put something on the books to cover an emergency that might prove to be a disadvantage to us. After all, we in this House (and I am a member of the Pool) should look at the overall situation.

We are complaining about our shortage of storage space, and it is short. But I think this would add to the difficulty; not make it better. And, as the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Brockelbank) said a moment ago, (when he said that if he signed his permit book to the Pool it would not prevent him from delivering his grain to another elevator), periodically that is true, but in practice, if I say I am going to deliver all my grain to the Pool elevator, and have a few loads of another grade left, it is going to be very difficult for me to get those few loads into another elevator, because I would have to use space that had been made available in that other elevator by someone else's permit book.

So I think we should look at this whole picture, and try to make good use of all our storage, and I think it can be better done without this. As I said before, probably in two years' time (I wouldn't be surprised if it were in less time), because if you take the history of this country - we have had more deficient crops than we have had surplus crops; and in that case, it would not make any difference. You could drive into your Pool elevator, the same as we have done for past years, and unloaded there. So I think you are putting a restriction on the storage, instead of helping the situation, and that is my objection to it.

**Mr. R. Walker (Hanley):** — Mr. Speaker, I think that there is a misconception as to the effects of this resolution. I think that some people think, or say they think, that when a farmer has indicated which is his elevator of preference, that he is bound to deliver all his grain to that elevator. Now, the truth of the matter is, of course, that this is not envisaged in the resolution at all. All the resolution purports to do is to allocate the cars according to the percentage of farmers who indicated their preference for that particular elevator, and it would still be free and open for a farmer to deliver to another elevator if there was space, or if there was some kind of agreement between the elevator agents that one would handle only a certain class of grain, and the other would handle another class of grain. There was no suggestion that



the farmer should thereafter be compelled to deliver to the elevator which he indicated was his choice.

As a matter of fact, as the member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Wellbelove) pointed out, the Canada Grain Act would still guarantee to the farmer the right to deliver to any elevator that had space, but the effect of the resolution would be that the space, the unfilled space, would be apportioned between the elevators, according to the preference of the farmer, rather than as it is now, according to the preference of the Transport Controller, or according to the preference of the Grain Company.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I think we must look at this thing in a practical context. The truth of the matter is that if you go around the country and hear these complaints - you hear complaint after complaint from farmers who want to deliver to the Pool and are compelled to deliver to line elevator companies. I have never heard one single complaint of the farmer who wanted to deliver to the line elevator company, and was forced to deliver to the Pool, by reason of the allocation of boxcars, - not one single word of complaint. In my opinion, anybody who opposes this proposal is trying to continue the present situation of compelling Pool members to deliver to line elevator companies. Because that is the effect; that is the only result that would flow from a failure to institute this policy.

If we continue the present system, we just continue to compel Pool members to deliver to line companies. That is the only result. Not a single farmer that I ever heard of who wanted to deliver to a line elevator company has ever complained to me that he has had to deliver to the Pool, because they were the only people who had space - not one. So if, instead of allocating these boxcars according to a secret formula, if they were allocated according to a formula based upon the indicated preference of the farmer, there would be nothing to prevent a farmer from delivering to some other elevator, if space was available, and he so wished.

All this purports to do is to divide the boxcars in any particular delivery point according to the preference of the farmers in that particular delivery point. Now, of course, there are delivery points where the Pool members produce about 25 per cent of the deliverable grain, and they still get cars according to that secret formula. There are other points where the Pool members produce about 75 per cent of the total deliverable grain, but they still get cars according to that secret formula, and that is, in my opinion, kind of a Procrustean bid, cutting the farmer off to suit this secret formula.

Far better it be that a separate formula be devised for each delivery point, based upon the indicated preference of the farmers, and I for one cannot possibly see how anybody can argue that the farmers do not want to deliver the grain according to their preference; according to the elevator of their choice. Anybody who says that, of course, is quoting a pure paradox of inconsistency. The farmer always wants to deliver grain to the elevator of his choice, and this measure, if implemented bona fide by the Federal Government, would ensure that result.

Therefore, I will vote for it.

**March 22, 1956**

**Mr. A. H. McDonald (Leader of Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question. I agree with him that under the Canada Grain Act, if you take a load of grain to an elevator, and there is space in that elevator, according to the Act, the agent has to receive that grain. But I wonder if the hon. member realizes what is going on every day in this province - people are delivering grain to an elevator and being refused, and any farmer, when an elevator agent refuses to accept his grain, I am sure is not going to oppose on him. But I just wanted to ask him if he realizes that is the case?

**Mr. R. Walker:** — Well, of course, Mr. Speaker, in answer to that question I would say that is undoubtedly true that farmers are wanting to deliver grain to elevators, but aren't able to do so, because for some reason the elevator has bins for only certain grades of grain, and the grain offered might be a different grade. But I say if there is any reason why a farmer cannot deliver to the elevator of his choice, if this policy is adopted it will not be for the reason that that elevator has not got adequate boxcars. That one reason will be removed; that is the most effective reason now why the farmer is being compelled to deliver to other than the elevator of his choice.

**Mr. A. Lopton (Saltcoats):** — Mr. Speaker, I do not know why my hon. friend from Hanley. (Mr. R. Walker) is talking like that. I think he must be talking through his hat. As far as my experience is concerned we had four elevators in my town where I used to deliver grain, and my choice of elevators was when I brought that load in and I delivered approximately the same to each of the four elevators, the Grain Growers, the Pool, the Federal and the National. But when I was delivering where there was only one elevator, which happened to be the case south of town where I had a farm, I found the situation entirely different from what it was when there were four elevators. Am I going to be tied up for the whole season, as a result of making my choice in the permit book for that season? That's what this resolution does.

**Mr. R. Walker:** — It doesn't do that.

**Mr. Lopton:** — Now, apart from that, I have no objection if a man wants to tie himself up to an elevator. Let him do so. That is his business. But, under the present car shortage conditions, I think it is absolutely absurd, and I will quote the Vice-President of the Pool, in his evidence to the committee on agricultural prices, when he stated that this policy was impossible at the present time. So I am going to move an amendment to this motion, seconded by the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson), that the following words be added to the motion:

"that this regulation come into force only after boxcars become plentiful."

**Some Govt Member:** — Surely you don't mean it that way!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Lopton:** — Well, let's be sensible about it. I've got some backing, I've got the full management behind it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Moved by Mr. Loptson, seconded by Mr. Danielson, the following amendment to the motion number (2) on the Order Paper, that the following words be added:

"That this regulation come into force only after boxcars become plentiful."

**Hon. J. H. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. On this motion which stands as number (2) under Number 1, the hon. member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) spoke just before I did. He exhausted his right to speak on motion. When an amendment is to be moved, both the mover and the seconder. . . (will the hon. member from Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) please keep quiet). . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — When an amendment is to be moved, both the mover and the seconder of the amendment must have their full and unabridged right to speak on that motion. Otherwise it is not in order, and I suggest that the seconder is out of order. There is no amendment before the House.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. Member is quite right. The hon. member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) has already exhausted his right to speak to the motion. The point of order is well taken. The debate is still on the main motion. I wish to inform the Assembly that the mover of the motion is about to exercise his privilege of closing the debate.

**Mr. Loptson:** — No, Mr. Speaker, I will make that amendment, seconded by the member for Wilkie (Mr. Horsman).

**Mr. Speaker:** — Moved by Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats), seconded by Mr. Horsman (Wilkie) that the following words be added:

"That this regulation come into force only after boxcars become plentiful."

**Mr. R. Walker:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I suggest that the mover, having already risen in his place and moving a motion, has already exhausted his right to speak, and cannot get up and move a second amendment. But, I also suggest that the amendment is out of order on the second count; that it is frivolous, vexatious and completely nonsensical, and if passed, makes simply a joke — a parody out of the motion.

**Mr. Speaker:** — No, no. I rule the motion is in order. Are you ready for the question?

**Mr. G. H. Danielson (Arm River):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I have a right to speak on the amendment.

**Mr. Speaker:** — That is true.

**March 22, 1956**

**Mr. G. H. Danielson (Arm River):** — There is one thing, Mr. Speaker, that all these gentlemen across the way absolutely ignore and shut their eyes to, and that is the present situation. There is not one of them who will admit that today there is a blockade; there is an absolute stoppage of deliveries to elevators in this province of Saskatchewan. I would say this, immediately that this is removed, and grain commences to move, there is no need for any of these regulations. I asked that question from the Pool representative before the committee here, and I said, 'Now, how can you operate under present conditions. . .'

**Mr. Dewhurst (Wadena):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, is he referring to the committee that is sitting? I was ruled out of order when I referred to some of the proceedings of that committee, when I originally moved this motion.

**Mr. Danielson:** — All right, Mr. Speaker, it is through now! Mr. Speaker, a practical, experienced official of one of the big grain companies in the province of Saskatchewan says this:

"Under present conditions, this rule is not practical and cannot be applied."

**Mr. E. Walker:** — Who said that?

**Mr. Danielson:** — It was the second Vice-President of the Wheat Pool, in answer to my question to the committee. . . Now, if I have violated the rules, the member from Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst). . . he can blame his friend, the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) because he didn't know, and I had to tell him. . .

**Mr. R. Walker:** — That's not true.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Now, after all, that is the situation. Now, as I have said before, in my town today and in towns all over the province of Saskatchewan - in all three western provinces, I think, probably a similar situation exists, where you find more Pool members bringing grain into line elevators than they bring to the Pool elevators.

**Mr. R. Walker:** — That's right.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Because, last fall when the elevators were filled up, after they had taken out a big part of the old grain that was in there, all the elevators were filled. The fellows that started early enough were lucky to get their wheat into the Pool elevators; it only took two or three days with all these combines to fill the two Pool elevators in my town. Where else would they go? There's another five elevators in that town, and I wonder today if they made a check of the ownership of the grain that is in all of the seven elevators, you would find more Pool elevator members (I'm sure of this) have their wheat in the line elevator companies than what they have in the Pool elevators. That is the condition all over this province, isn't it? This is what we are faced with, but this is the point which all members opposite seek to dismiss and absolutely ignore. They do not want to face of that reality.

But surely to goodness, there isn't a man in this House who desires any more than I do that the Pool elevators should get every bushel of wheat that their membership delivers. I don't think there is any difference of opinion on that matter. But, according to this resolution here, Mr. Speaker, if I sign my delivery book and indicate that I want to draw my wheat to the Pool elevators, what does it mean? According to the members on the other side of the House, it doesn't mean a thing.

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — They'll get the cars.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I am free, anyhow, to go anywhere I like to put that wheat. According to The Canada Grain Act, Mr. Speaker, I am free. But what is this? This indicates that I have made a promise that I desire, and that I am telling the railroad companies, or the elevator companies — 'I just found out a few days ago that they are really the ones that distribute the boxcars to the particular elevators; and I want to get that car to the Pool elevator.' But what will happen now, if I have some of my 1955 wheat next summer in the National elevator? There is none there today, but it could be that I could have some in the National elevator in my town. The thing is so confusing, and so impractical that it cannot be applied, that is all, and I am sure the member from Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) was correct when he stated that instead of minimizing the present difficulty, it is going to aggravate the situation, until such time as we have the channels open and we can move our wheat freely to wherever elevators we see fit.

Therefore, I think that while you had a good laugh at the amendment, after all, Mr. Speaker, it is a practical way out. We don't want to vote against this, because we have no objection to it, and it certainly is not applicable at the present time. We just would like to clarify to this extent - that, at the present time, this rule is inapplicable and impossible to enforce, and that it should not come into operation until such time as the transportation system is functioning properly, so that we can ship our wheat wherever we wish.

**Mr. R. H. Wooff (Turtleford):** — Mr. Speaker, the position of the gentlemen opposite have taken certainly both surprises me and amuses me. That the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) should suggest that we are going to aggravate the storage situation by passing this motion, is beyond me.

So long as the limited number of boxcars we have are rolling all the time, they are carrying all the grain, and making available all the storage that so many boxcars possibly can.

I have on my desk the debate from last year on almost identical resolution, and believe it or not, Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen opposite voted in favour of it. Now just exactly why they have changed their minds, or are putting up such ridiculous and fallacious arguments at the present time, is beyond me.

I, for one, Mr. Speaker, will support the motion.

**March 22, 1956**

**Mr. J. W. Horseman (Wilkie):** — Mr. Speaker, I think everybody should realize that the way the wheat has been handled in the last few years - shortage of boxcars, shortage of elevator space, shortage of all kinds, we should realize, I think, that if, suppose 50 per percent of the farmers would tie themselves up to the Pool and try to deliver their wheat there, we know that one elevator cannot handle that wheat unless they have sufficient cars to keep it rolling right through the elevator steadily. In my town, we have seven elevators on two railroads. In Unity we have five elevators; one Pool, and four line. In the fall, when harvesting is in full swing, those elevators are all busy, all the time as long as they have storage. One elevator couldn't begin to handle half that grain, and the only effect this would have, if you tie yourself up to the one elevator - it doesn't matter which one, you would only have to wait that much longer for a car. You could not do anything else.

I was one of the first men to ever join the Wheat Pool. I joined the First Wheat Pool that was ever formed - the compulsory pool, and in common with other Pool members, certainly I would like to deliver my grain to the Pool elevators, but I am not going to stand around and wait to deliver to the Pool elevator, or make a promise to the Pool agent that I am going to deliver my grain to him, if I know well enough before I sign that application that he cannot take the grain. I know that. So I think, for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I don't think it makes a great deal of difference in a crisis like this where we have a surplus of grain, and no place to store it - the main thing is to get the grain off the farm and store it some place, whether it is in the elevator of your choice or not. The elevator of my choice, things being as they are now, would be any elevator where I could put some grain, but my preference would be for the Pool, because I am a member of the Pool. Still, I wouldn't let that stand in the way of delivering my wheat.

**W. J. Berezowsky (Cumberland):** — Mr. Speaker, it has been clearly indicated just where the Opposition stands. I think that every member in this House knows that any elevator, and of course a full elevator can handle ten times as much grain as they are handling right now, but if the Opposition suggests for a minute that the Pool elevator say in my community, or any community could not handle the grain because the farmers would be bringing it in, we must remember this fact, that as the cars come in, and as the farmers desire to ship through the Pool, the Pool would be emptying its bins just as fast as it would be getting the grain into the elevators.

Such arguments only indicate that the members opposite are interested to see that the private elevators are able to keep their bins full; keep the grain moving, and make profits.

**Mr. McCarthy (Cannington):** — Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is applying that to me, I say it is absolutely untrue.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I'm very happy that at least one member on the other side stood up and said that he does not favour or agree with what apparently pertains to all the rest of them.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Mr. Speaker, again on a point of privilege, I didn't say that.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, the amendment is suggesting a solution that we must wait until the boxcars are available before the proposal can come into affect. Now, where are the boxcars going to come from, Mr. Speaker? Boxcars, I submit, are available, and I submit that the boxcars should be on the prairies to take delivery of the grain, but the boxcars today are used for the same kind of people as has been suggested on the other side a few minutes ago - in moving ore, or pulp, and things like that, while the poor farmer has to suffer.

**Mr. A. Loptson (Saltcoats):** — That's a lot of bunk – that's all been cleared up.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — That is quite true, and there is nothing we can do, either by an amendment, or by resolution, to solve the problem of the number of boxcars. The boxcars are available, and they should be here, and making the suggestion in the amendment that we are asked to vote on, that we must wait until boxcars are available, well, I say it is ridiculous.

**Mr. A. H. McDonald (Leader of Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, I cannot let go what the hon. member for Cumberland has just said. I sometimes wonder if some people who speak on the opposite side of the House have ever delivered any grain, or had any personal experience with the delivery of grain in Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Howe (Kelvington):** — Oh come, come, Hammy!

**Mr. McDonald:** — I wonder if the hon. member opposite realizes that once you load a boxcar, you have to have someplace to unload it, and the difficulty today is not in getting the boxcars to load; its finding someplace to unload, and it is only. . .

**Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):** — What nonsense you are talking now!

**Mr. McDonald:** — Well, there isn't any place in the Dominion of Canada today were boxcars can be unloaded, other than directly into a ship, and anybody that doesn't know that, doesn't know anything. Now, I want to say a word or two about delivering to the elevator of your choice. Ever since I started farming, I have delivered all the grain to the Pool elevator that I could get into it, but I feel like the member for Wilkie (Mr. Horsman), that if I have grain which is poorly stored, or if I am short of money, and there is room in any elevator - I don't care who it belongs to – I'm going to take a load or two there to get some ready cash, or to take it out of poor storage. If the elevator of my choice is full, naturally I will take it to a line elevator, but in my experience I have, on many occasions, taken grain to elevators other than to my local town, because I was unable to deliver to an elevator in my town because the elevators were blocked.

I can remember in one instance, drawing flags into the province of Manitoba, so that I could deliver. I can remember on another occasion, drawing rye 30 miles south of my farm because there wasn't an elevator in my

**March 22, 1956**

particular town which would accept rye at that particular time. I can remember also of taking a load of oats to an elevator in my town which I normally patronize, when I arrived there with a load of oats, I was told he was saving the room for his customers. Now, Mr. Speaker, he had room in that elevator, and under the Canada Grain Act I could have insisted that he buy that load of oats. Do think I was going to sell it to him after he told me that he was saving that room for his customers? Not very likely. I took it back to my farm, and delivered it to the Pool sometime later when there was room.

This resolution, if we read it, looks to be workable, but in actual practice, Mr. Speaker, it will not work, and I know that from personal experience. There isn't anyone who wants to deliver their grain to the Wheat Pool any more than I do.

**Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):** — You and Howe and 'Jimmy' Gardiner!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. McDonald:** — I do not want to be in the position of not being able to deliver grain anywhere else other than to the elevator of my choice, whether that is the Wheat Pool or the line elevators.

I suppose there are some people in Saskatchewan who like to deliver grain to other companies besides the Pool. There must be, or there would not be any other elevators. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I think that each and every one of us should realize that if the policy which we are asking for were adopted, that it is not practical, and will not work. We would curtail the movement of grain far more than it is curtailed at the moment.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I personally am going to vote against it, and I don't care who knows it.

**Hon. T. J. Bentley (Minister of Public Health):** — Mr. Speaker, may I say a word or two on this? I had not intended to. I thought we would probably all be so anxious to do what we could to support the farm organizations, and the farmers that we would not want to have any political acrimony, and I am going to try and avoid that myself, because I think it is something beyond partisan politics, and really should be something that should be thought of, and decided on the basis of its merits and its workability.

Now, I will agree with any speaker who has spoken and who says the reason for the resolution presently before us, is because there is a blockade. I think it was the member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) - one of the members over there anyway, who stated that some of us over here do not recognize there is a blockade. That, of course, is not a valid statement, because everybody knows there is difficulty in delivering grain, and there has been for a good many years. If there wasn't any, and if the situation was as envisaged in the amendment offered by the member from Saltcoats (Mr. Loftson), there would be no occasion for a resolution like this, or any interest displayed in the movement of grain, insofar as country delivery is concerned, in this Legislature.



It has been mentioned, I believe, by one or two over there during the course of the debate, that if (and I assume you will permit me the privilege of speaking, not only to the amendment, but also on the resolution, as others have done).

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! But the point of your discussion seems to be quite far removed from the amendment or the resolution.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — True, true, but one has to advance the arguments he believes in, to support his case, and if I were going to speak on only the amendment offered by the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson), I would simply say that that is nonsensical, irrelevant, frivolous, or any other word you want to give it - it has no meaning, and I would vote against it. But the reason he offered it, I assume, is to soften down the intent of the main resolution, which is contained in what we are discussing at the present time.

It has been said that it would not work to carry out the terms as are mentioned here. I think it was the hon. member from Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) who made a comment the other day, when this was under debate before, that this would take away the choice of a farmer altogether. I think that is what he argued the last time he spoke, a few days ago, that, by introducing this measure, and expecting a farmer to state his preference in his permit book, would deny him of a choice of another elevator and later on.

**Mr. R. A. McCarthy (Cannington):** — To deliver to another elevator.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — To deliver to another elevator, yes. Even if that were so, I would still say that this is better than the situation that presently is in effect, for in effect now, the farmer has no opportunity to state any choice whatsoever. If he wishes to deliver grain, if there is any place for it to go, that is where it must go. If there is a vacancy at all in any elevator, he must take his grain to that elevator. So even while he may, to some extent, appear to be curtailing his opportunity for a choice of delivery place later on, he would be better to state his choice under this, than to be as he is at the present time.

Of course, this is a matter of opinion, and I am stating mine. I am stating it from the experience of having delivered grain, and of having handled a great many bushels of grain. Now, this is a position which I cannot understand anyone taking, as they do over there: they claim that by having a provision like this in the Canada Grain Act, that it would slow down the movement of grain. I cannot understand that position, because I know how grain moves. In the first place, we will take a hypothetical point, where there were five elevators. And we'll say these elevators are completely full today, and there is no room to move any grain out of them anywhere in the country. Therefore, no boxers will be delivered, because there is no chance of them being unloaded. But, now there comes an opportunity to move grain out of there, and the type of grain that is at that shipping point is now required, so 10 cars are ordered to that point. One of those is farmer-owned elevator, we'll say. There may be two, but we'll take the hypothetical place where one of them may be a farmer-owned elevator; and the others are privately owned. Half the farmers in that area who deliver to that point are anxious to deliver, and have an

**March 22, 1956**

ownership in that farmer-owned elevator. The other half of the farmers prefer to choose one of the remaining four. Now, if 10 cars are going to be delivered, there is no reason why 50 per cent of them cannot be delivered to the place where the farmers have their choice, because they own the elevator. Just as much grain will be moved out of that point as though there were two cars placed at each elevator. Just as much grain will move, so nothing will be slowed down. I cannot understand the reasoning of people who talk any other way.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — That's only one instance.

**Mr. McDonald (Leader of Opposition):** — That's only part of the story.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — No, Mr. Speaker, that is the whole story. You can apply that anywhere at all.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question?

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** - Yes, surely.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Do you know that the Pool is getting 50 per cent of the cars today?

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — No, I know nothing of the kind, Mr. Speaker. They are getting slightly over 40 per cent. I do know, however, over a great period of years that 49 to 53 per cent has been the average handling by Pool elevators in this province; therefore indicating that at least 49 to 53 per cent, varying slightly from year to year, under varying conditions, the farmers in this country prefer to deliver to that elevator. I say that no amount of blockading should prevent these people from using that elevator.

Now, we come to the point of the actual job of doing it - the technical handling of grain. Any elevator in this country, even your old 35,000-bushel elevators can handle a million bushels of grain, given the time to do so. So it isn't a question of time. If you were to place the cars at the elevator where the farmers want it, that elevator, unless it breaks down, can handle enough grain to fill those cars as fast as they come in - they will never come in too fast. So it isn't a question of the practical handling of grain. It can be done. I say the person who wants to deliver to any particular elevator should have the right to do so, and I do not see anything wrong with this at all. Certainly I could not support such an amendment as the hon. member from Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) has introduced here, because it does not mean anything. Because, when we get to the point where there are plenty of boxers, there is no problem, so therefore you do not need any kind of a resolution at all. So this amendment does not mean anything except to kill the whole motion.

I would like to say to the members opposite that there is nothing impractical in what is offered here. It offers at least a wider choice for the farmer to decide which elevator he wants to take his grain to, and therefore, it should be supported by every member in this House.

**Mr. W. H. Wahl (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley):** — Mr. Speaker, I should say a few words about this allocation of boxcars. This is not an emergency situation. According to leading Western economists, surpluses are here to stay. Improved methods of farming cause us to produce more grain, and consequently we are going to continue to have these surpluses. But this allocation of boxcars is in involved question; it has to do with several subjects, and one I would say is cash advances on farm-stored grain. These questions are involved, but the members on this side of the House cannot understand the attitude of the members on the other side of the House. Well, I think I can understand it, because this questions involved with politics, and business.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think it would be just as well if you would confine your remarks to the amendment.

**Mr. Wahl:** — Well, the remarks of politics and business, I would have to go into it, in order to explain how it fits in with the boxcar allocation. But the Federal Minister of Agriculture has just had a biography published. . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Does this apply to the amendment?

**Mr. Wahl:** — This has to do with the allocation of boxcars, and a reporter commenting on the Hon. Minister's long stay in politics said that the reason he had been able to be Minister of Agriculture and stay in politics for so long was that he had been able to retain the sympathetic understanding of the leaders of all of our farm movements, expecting a few of the more recent members, and to prove that point, I am going to read from the book here.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! I can't allow any extraneous matter to be introduced.

**Mr. Wahl:** — This is distribution of boxcars, Mr. Speaker, for shipment of grain from country elevators.

**Some Govt Member:** — You can't muffle him, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Go ahead, Harry. Don't let him talk you down!

**Mr. Speaker:** — It is not a biography?

**Mr. Wahl:** — No, this is not a biography. "Distribution of boxcars for shipment of grain from country elevators", and it is by J. Brownlee, who is known for many things, but I am going to speak of him as President of the United Grain Growers. This is what he says:

"Now as against such a plan (and this is a summary of his book and it is just a paragraph) we repeat the simple suggestion we have already made - leave it to the Canadian Wheat Board to allocate its shipping orders on an equitable basis between the elevator companies, as long as elevator congestion continues, and as long as it has special needs for certain kind of grades of grain. In our opinion, that leaves

**March 22, 1956**

the ultimate control of car distribution with the body responsible for moving grain into sales position and with that body now closed, with all the authority which Parliament can confer it leaves the control with a body which can change its policy at any time to meet marketing needs, as against formula which of necessity must be rigid and inflexible. In other words, let the Board which did the job in wartime finish the job which has arisen in peacetime."

Now that sounds very nice, but he is concerned with the business of people other than the farmer. He is not considering the farmer and his business, which is trying to get some money for the grain that he has grown, and he has an entirely different view from his predecessor, who originally founded the United Grain Growers, and he thought that he had solved that old injustice, the allocation of boxcars, and that was away back about 1905, but this man completely reverses the decision and says that you are to allow the railway companies and the elevator companies to allocate these boxcars according to their business needs.

Now I contend that the man to be concerned with is the farmer, and that is what these gentlemen across the way have forgotten. They have forgotten the interests of the farmer. He is the man that grew the grain. It is his grain that is in the elevators now. The Wheat Board has merely given him a payment on that grain, and I am going to bring to your attention another thing that has to do with the allocation of boxcars, and this is an article in 'The Leader-Post', Tuesday, March 19, and this is by Walter Tucker, Liberal M.P., and it is headed: "Liberal Airs Cost of Storage", and he goes on to commend the Government for guaranteeing the storage charges of grain in the elevators, or otherwise guaranteeing the elevator companies, the people who store the farmers grain, a permanent income, and a good income at that, and I am going to explain what this has to do with the allocation of boxcars.

If the elevator companies and the terminals didn't have guaranteed income, they might be more anxious to see that boxcars are allocated and the farmers' grain be moved into the markets of the world. So, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to support the amendment if that is what I am speaking on, because I think on this side of the House we should be justly concerned with the business of the farmer, and that is seeing that he gets some money for his grain.

**Mr. F. A. Dewhurst (Wadena):** — Mr. Speaker, I don't think I need to repeat at this time what I said when I moved the Motion as a whole before.

**Mr. Speaker:** — You are speaking on the amendment.

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — Well, speaking on both. If I speak on this, I don't need to speak on the other as a Motion, because it is pretty hard to speak on something negative and the amendment as a negative thing. It doesn't do anything to solve the farmers' problems.

Now reference was made to the Car Order Book. How can the Car Order Book be practical or function on the unit quota, where a number of farmers use the unit quota. It is pretty near impossible for the farmers to be able to say, "Well, we want to order a car", and put their grain through the elevator of their choice by the Car Order Book method, when they are delivering on unit quotas. Even under the one or two bushel quotas, the majority of the farmers of this province do not farm on a large enough scale to be able to load a car at once. Now this Resolution does not say - I want to make it quite clear - it does not say that a farmer must assign all his grain to any one given elevator. It does say that he shall deliver to the elevator of his choice. If the necessary amendments are made to the Canada Grain Act, whereby when a farmer applies for his Permit Book, if he has to say 'I want to deliver 50 per cent of my grain to the Pool elevator, 25 per cent to the Searle and another 25 per cent to the Grain Growers', then it would be tabulated on a percentage basis and boxcars would be allocated accordingly. There is no suggestion that he must deliver all or none to any one given elevator. It is the elevator of his choice. He can take any portion of it to whichever elevator he likes.

When I drafted this Resolution, I did not intend to try and solve the details of what should be done, and when the farmer gets his Permit Book, he doesn't have to leave that Permit Book at an elevator. The Permit Book is his and he takes it with him. If he has signed all of his grain to one elevator, naturally that is where he will want to take it, but if he has proportioned his grain to the various elevators, he would take in that portion, and he has the right to do so, and he has the book to cover it.

Here a couple of years ago, farmers from Naicam, because the elevators there were plugged, were hauling their grain out to Humboldt, and west of Humboldt. After the farmers had hauled their grain out west of Humboldt, boxcars were made available at Naicam and Spalding, and then the farmers started to haul their grain up to Naicam and Spalding from Leroy, if that makes sense, I fail to see it.

The statements of the members opposite remind me very much, Mr. Speaker, and Edgar Bergen programme when he was asking Mortimer Snerd one time. He says, "Mortimer, how can you be so stupid?" And Mortimer Snerd said: "It is not hard, I don't even have to try." And that is about the way their statements strike me; they don't even try to think their problems out.

Now, I have a letter here from a farmer in my constituency, and he points out that he has never delivered his grain, if at all possible, to any other elevator than the Pool, and he said here that believe it or not, he hauled a load of grain to the Pool elevator at his delivery point on December 22nd, 1954, and because he wasn't prepared to haul to the line elevator company, there were no cars put into the Pool as long as there was any available space at the other elevators. He wasn't able to deliver one bushel to his Pool elevator in 1955, and it wasn't until January 11, 1956 that he was able to deliver the first grain to the Pool elevator in his town. That is from December 22, 1954 to January 11, 1956. Those are the inequities that we are trying to stop by this Motion, and I see no reason why any member of this House cannot support it to give the farmers the freedom to try and deliver their grain to the elevators they think it should be delivered to.

**March 22, 1956**

The question being put on the proposed amendment by Mr. Loptson, it was negatived by 31 to 7.

The question being put on Part (2) of the motion, it was agreed to by 31 to 8.

The debate continuing on Part (3) of the motion;

"(3) to instruct the Transport Controller to make a more equitable distribution of boxcars as between shipping points, the allocation to be on the basis of need."

**Mr. McDonald (Leader of Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, there is just one thing I want to say on this part of the Motion, and that is this, that I hope all members realize that sometime it may appear very unfair to us when quotas are opened in some particular part of the province, or some parts of Western Canada, and those quotas are much higher than the quotas that are in effect in another part of our province, or in western Canada but I believe that right at the moment the Canadian Wheat Board are moving a considerable quantity of No. 5 and No. 6 wheat into a marketing position, because they have a market for that wheat. The wheat will be taken out of the terminal elevators almost as quickly as we can move it to the terminals. Therefore, you can see the quotas are being increased in those stations that have No. 5 and No. 6 Northern Wheat in-store. On the other hand, there may be stations in Saskatchewan with a very small quota that have an abundance of No. 1, No. 2 or No. 3 Northern Wheat that are not getting large quotas in comparison to those that have the lower grades of wheat; I think, just keeping that in mind, I am going to support this part of the motion, but I just wanted to bring to the attention of the House that that is the reason why on many occasions we have large quotas in some areas, and small in others. It seems to me it is because of the demand for certain grades of wheat in the export markets of the world. But as I said a moment ago, I am going to support the third part of the motion.

The question being put on Part (3) of the motion, it was agreed to unanimously.

### **Bank Loan Scheme**

The Assembly resumed, from Tuesday, March 20, 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, deplores 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."

And the proposed amendment thereto, moved by Mr. McDonald:

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

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

And the proposed amendment to the amendment, moved by Mr. Cameron:

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

**Mr. A. Loptson (Saltcoats):** — Mr. Speaker, I suppose I'll have to confine myself to the amendment to the amendment. As a result of that my remarks have to be short. I will probably have to confine myself to why we have suggested that the recommendations should come from the Advisory Committee of the Wheat Board.

Now I think there is a logical reason for that. I think I might state here and now that had I been asked what I would do in the case that came up last fall with respect to non-delivery of grain, I would have immediately said that the proper thing to do is to let the elevator company make advances. I think that that would have been my first consideration. But when I saw men who had been in the grain business and trusted by the farmers to market their grain, and some of them have handled it for the last quarter of a century, take a different stand, I thought to myself who am I, a farmer out in the country, who has never had anything to do with the marketing of wheat, to take a different course than these men were taking who had been there in the service of the farmer for a quarter of a century.

Consequently, I felt it was only logical that I should take their advice. Now it seems peculiar that none of these men, as an Advisory Committee to the Wheat Board, have advocated cash advances right from the start, and I want to just enumerated the personnel of this Committee.

First of all, I will take one of the officers of the co-operative movement, and that is Mr. Brownlee, who is President and General Manager of the United Grain Growers. He was for several years general counsel for the United Grain Growers Ltd., and for the United Farmers of Alberta. He was Premier of Alberta as head of the U.F.A., a farmer's government.

Now, I submit that there are a few men in the grain business who are sounder than Mr. Brownlee, and I think most of the other men will agree, even Mr. Wesson, who is President of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. Another member is William James Parker, President of the Manitoba Pool Elevators, a farmer at Sanford and Union Point. He is Vice-President of the Canadian Co-operative Wheat Producers Limited, Vice-President of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, and he takes part in many other activities besides those mentioned. The third member is Ben S. Plumer, Chairman of the Alberta Wheat Pool for many years, and Director for many years prior to that. He was a member of the original

**March 22, 1956**

Board in 1923, and is on the Board of the Canadian Co-operative Wheat Producers Limited, and a farmer at Bassano, Alberta. Another Board member is Roy C. Maller, President of the Alberta Federation of Agriculture, re-elected for his 10th term in January, 1956 and he is a farmer at Bremner, Alberta. Another member is John Henry Wesson, President of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, First President of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture from 1936 to 1940, and he is now on the Executive Board and has been since 1948; Director of District No. 16 of the Wheat Pool since its origination in 1924, only member of the original Board since in office. He was first elected President in 1937, and he is, a farmer in partnership with his brother at Maidstone. The sixth member of the Board is a young member, Chris Hansen, the President of the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union, and former Junior President of the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union, elected First Vice-President, December, 1954 and became President in March, 1955 and was re-elected at the convention in 1955.

Now I submit, Mr. Speaker, that these are men who have the interest of the farmer at heart, and the reason why they took this stand is because they knew the implication in cash advances.

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — What stand?

**Mr. Loptson:** — . . . that applied to the other formula. They knew better than anybody else knew. . .

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd (Minister of Education):** — Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member permit a question? He said the reason they took this stand, - what stand?

**Mr. Loptson:** — . . ., because they knew the difficulties involved.

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd:** — What stand did they take?

**Mr. Loptson:** — I am telling you what they knew! They knew the implications and the difficulties of bringing this other formula into effect. My hon. friend here, what does he know about it?

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd:** — Does the hon. member wish to answer a question?

**Mr. Loptson:** — No! I am telling you the reason why these men endorsed the present system is simply because they knew the implication involved in the other.

**Mr. R. Walker (Hanley):** — What present system did they endorse?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Loptson:** — Now then having done that and the government having adopted their recommendations, some of these men have reversed their position on the advice of who? The pressure of the C.C.F. party.

Now Mr. Wesson personally is in favour of the present system, in spite of the fact that I may not be in favour of it.

**Mr. R. Walker (Hanley):** — Trying to get him fired.



**Mr. Loptson:** — Mr. Giddings has told us that we are entirely in the hands of our delegates. When the delegates assembled after the decision had been made, the majority, I don't know how big the majority was. . .

**Mr. Watson (Hanley):** — Two-thirds majority.

**Mr. Loptson:** — They went and suggested the other system of cash advances. Still, I am happy to say that Mr. Wesson knows that it is not the best thing for the farmers.

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — . . . something like Walter Tucker. . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — Mr. Giddings has already intimated that his personal opinion does not prevail if the delegate say otherwise. Now I submit that some of the delegates of the Wheat Pool are not concerned with the farmers' welfare; they are concerned with the C.C.F. welfare, and I will name the delegate in my area. What would he know about the method of dealing with the grain situation in Saskatchewan?

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

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

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

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — I submit that it is inconsistent with the dignity of this House for any member to get up and say that the delegates of the Wheat Pool are not primarily interested in the Wheat Pool, but are interested in politics. . .

**Some Hon. Member:** — Two-thirds majority.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Mr. Speaker, I can point out to you the delegate in my constituency doesn't know anything about what is best for the farmers. All he knows about is what is best with the C.C.F. party.

**Mr. R. Walker (Hanley):** — Who is it? Tell us who it is?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Loptson:** — Maybe this is new to you gentlemen on the other side of the House, that even the Premier of this province of Saskatchewan when speaking in the by-election at Rosthern in 1923, stated this. . .

**Hon. C. M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer):** — In 1923? The Premier was still a very young boy at that time, and he wasn't even in politics.

**Mr. Loptson:** — In 1953. Wasn't he responsible for what he said?

**Hon. Mr. Fines:**— You said 1923.

**March 22, 1956**

**Mr. Loptson:** — He suggested that loans on farm-stored grain should be made available at a low rate of interest. Now he must have reversed his position. Why? Because he thought he could make more votes by doing so, but not because he thought it was better for the farmers.

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — Because he believes in democracy.

**Mr. Loptson:** — . . . Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — Is an hon. member of this House entitled to impute motives.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Loptson:** — I submit, Mr. Speaker, that. . .

**Mr. E Walker (Gravelbourg):** — What are the rules?

**Mr. Loptson:** — . . . the ability of the class of men who supported the present system, and probably will advise on the future system, and when they advise so I am going to support it. If they reverse their system, I am prepared to accept their advice.

**Mr. E Walker (Gravelbourg):** — . . . rubber stamp, aren't you?

**Mr. Loptson:** — I am not prepared to take the advice of Mr. Argue who has been going around the country string of discontent. I am not going to a farmer who doesn't know anything about the business. G. H. Castleden - what does he know about the welfare of the farmers? He has been going around the country stirring up discontent. Mr. Nicholson, an ex-preacher, or maybe he is still a preacher, I don't know whether he is or not, he goes around the country telling the people how they should get free loans at the expense of the small farmer.

Now I want to say this, isn't it possible that these men who are in the know, know that these cash advances are of no benefit to the small farmer, and that it would act against him to the advantage of the big farmer? The Premier at one time, or in many instances, suggests that 75 per cent of the initial price of wheat should be advanced immediately, without interest, to the farmer. Who would get that advance? I showed you a record of one farmer in Alberta who had 150,000 bushels on his farm. He would be getting \$90,000 of interest-free money. Wouldn't that be a nice thing for him, and who would be paying for it? The small farmers, not one-tenth of whom would get any benefit, either by bank loan or a cash advance.

So, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is absurd if the farmers should take the advice of the C.C.F. agitators and politicians in preference to the advice of the Committee of the Wheat Board.

That is all I have to say, Mr. Speaker, and I am certainly in favour of the amendment.

**Hon. I. C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, I regret that I wasn't able to participate in this debate a day or so ago, but I do want. . .

**Hon. C. M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer):** — Mr. Speaker, may I suggest we confine the debate to the amendment to the amendment.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think that would expedite that point. . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — I have lots to say.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Yes, the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) drifted quite a distance away from the amendment, but in regard to it, and what the hon. member has said in support of the amendment, it occurred to me that perhaps he has forgotten that this Legislature, I think on either two or three successive occasions, has asked the Federal Government to make provision under which the Wheat Board could make advance payments on farm-stored grain a permanent feature of Wheat Board marketing. It isn't a matter at all, Mr. Speaker, of whether or not this particular principle of advance payments on farm-stored grain was suggested by the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union, the Wheat Pool, or, as the hon. member for Saltcoats said, 'by C.C.F. politicians'. The fact that we are dealing with it, Mr. Speaker, is that this Legislature is on record asking the Federal Government to do that. The Federal Government, at a time of grave crisis and emergency, failed to do that and this Legislature is now deploring the fact that the Federal Government didn't take action that was asked by this Legislature. That is the point.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The point is that we are discussing an amendment to the amendment. There will be an opportunity to speak on the main motion. Some of you have spoken, but the hon. member who is now speaking has not spoken, but the amendment to the amendment reads as follows:

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

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — That is exactly the point I want to make. I have never seen a group of people make a more clumsy effort to get the Federal Government out of its responsibility than as attempted in this amendment, Mr. Speaker.

After this Legislature had asked the Federal Government to do this, now they come around and suggest that not the Canadian Wheat Board, but the Advisory Committee to the Board, in the case of another crisis, make the suggestion to the Federal Government that this Legislature has already made. That just about wins the handsome 'putty auto-jack' for political manoeuvring, Mr. Speaker, not only because of the inadequacy of the amendment itself, but because of the completely ridiculous attempt to remove the onus of responsibility from where it naturally belongs.

Mr. Speaker, I will certain oppose the amendment.

**March 22, 1956**

The question being put on the proposed amendment to the amendment, moved by Mr. Cameron, it was negatived by 26 to 8.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Now are you ready for the vote on the amendment?

**Mr. A. H. McDonald (Leader of Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, when I dictated the amendment to my secretary, I intended to include those words, "Advisory Committee to the" which we moved in the amendment to the amendment, and I either omitted to dictate them to her, or she omitted to type them, but I will take the blame for it, Mr. Speaker, and in view of that fact I would like to withdraw the amendment that is under my name.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Has the hon. member leave to withdraw this amendment?

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Mr. Speaker, we would have no objection except that we would like to have an opportunity of voting on it; we have only voted on the amendment to the amendment; and if it is withdrawn, then, of course, the will of the Assembly cannot be determined. I would think we should have to vote on it at this time.

**Mr. McDonald:** — I'll vote against it then.

The question being put on the proposed amendment of Mr. McDonald, it was negatived by unanimous agreement.

The question being put on the main motion of Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg), it was agreed to by 28 to 8.

The Assembly then adjourned at 5:35 o'clock p.m.