

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session – Twelfth Legislature
39th Day

Wednesday, April 4, 1956

The House met at 10.30 o'clock a.m.

On the Orders of the Day.

TRIBUTE TO FORMER MEMBER

Hon. T.C. Douglas (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity on the Orders of the Day to tell the hon. members that news has just been received that Mr. Ben Putnam has passed away.

Mr. Putnam represented the Constituency of Humboldt in the Tenth Legislature, from 1944 to 1948. Many of the members who are sitting in the House now probably sat in the House with Mr. Putnam and knew him very well and enjoyed working with him, and I am sure that all of them will feel his passing very keenly and will want, in this formal manner, to express our regrets and to extend to his family our condolences in their time of bereavement. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to put on the record of the House a very brief statement:

Mr. Putnam was born in Laurel, Iowa, on January 15, 1886. He received his education at Iowa State College of Agriculture, and, in 1911, the year of his marriage, he came to Saskatchewan to take up farming in the Watson district. A splendid type of citizen, Mr. Putnam took a keen interest in community and church affairs and was active throughout his residence in the province, in the farm movements. When he entered this Legislature in 1944 as the member for Humboldt he brought with him the same sterling traits of character, the same qualities of heart and mind which had earned him the enduring respect of a multitude of friends. These traits and qualities made him an admirable member of this Assembly, respected by all his colleagues in the House.

Two of his sons served in the last World War – one, Max, being killed in action overseas. Mr. Putnam is survived by his widow, two sons and three daughters.

Mr. Speaker, I would therefore like to move, seconded by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald):

“That this Assembly learns with profound regret of the death at noon, today, of Mr. Ben Putnam, who represented the Constituency of Humboldt in the Tenth Legislature, from 1944 to 1948, and extends its sincerest sympathies to members of the bereaved family.”

April 4, 1956

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I did not have the privilege or the honour to know Mr. Putnam, so I think I should leave remarks to be made to those members who sat in the Legislature with him and knew him personally.

I do want to concur in what the Premier has said, and I know that the members who knew him personally will have more to say at this time.

Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps I am the only member on this side who had the privilege of sitting in this House with Mr. Putnam, who was sitting on the Government side of the House. I knew him fairly well. He was a farmer, like most of the members of this House have been, and are, perhaps, today. I could not help but be impressed with Mr. Putnam's fairness, with his honesty and his direct approach to some of the problems that have faced us in Saskatchewan; that were facing us more at that time than today. With these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself in expressing regret at the sudden death of Mr. Putnam.

Hon. J.W. Burton (Provincial Secretary): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with the Hon. Premier and the Leader of the Opposition and other members who have spoken in expressing my sympathy to Mrs. Putnam and the family in their bereavement.

I might say that it was with shock and a deep sense of personal loss that I was advised by long distance, shortly after the lunch hour, today, that my friend, Ben Putnam, had passed away. I have known him for many years. I knew him to be a conscientious, sincere hard worker in everything that he undertook and everything that he believed in. He was very active in farmer organizations; in fact, in anything that would tend to improve the community in which he lived. He was, as has been pointed out, a very able member of this Legislature. He will be missed not only in his own immediate community, but throughout a great part of this province. As I said, many people like myself will miss Ben Putnam, because we had, in Ben, a true and reliable friend.

Mr. Speaker: — I should like to say a few words, myself. I knew Mr. Putnam very well and I think the remarks that have been passed by other members pretty well describe him. He was down-to-earth man, and I think his whole heart and soul was in working not only for his immediate family, but for all the people of the province.

I think we would all wish to rise for a moment in respect to his memory.

**SELECT SPECIAL COMMITTEE
ON MARKETING AND FARM INCOME**

The Assembly resumed, from Thursday, March 29th, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Brown (Bengough):

“That the Final Report of the Select Special Committee on Marketing and Farm Income be now concurred in.”

And the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Dunfield:

“That all the words after the word ‘That’ be deleted, and the following substituted therefor:

“the Select Special Committee on Marketing and Farm Income be revived, and that its Final Report be not now concurred in; but that it be referred back to the said Committee with instructions that the Committee have power to amend the Report as set forth in Sessional Paper No. 129.”

Mr. A. Loptson (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned this debate I did not have very much left to say, but circumstances indicated that I was going to have to say a little more than was necessary. Now that the desks are cleared and I have a little reinforcement here, I do not think I will make my remarks as short as I had intended.

There were some items in our amendment that the Premier wanted clarification on. He wanted some substantial reasons why the amendment was made. I believe a clause on page 147, section (d), having to do – “That the word ‘not’ in clause (b) of Section III be deleted.”

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — What page?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Page 149, I think.

Mr. Loptson: — You all have a copy of the amendment now.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Is that on page 149?

Mr. Loptson: — On page 147, I think. No, it is on page 149. That is right.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I’ll come over there and help you make your speech in a minute.

Mr. Loptson: — It says: “(b) The present municipal tax levy is not a significant factor in the cost-price squeeze.” The amendment suggests that we delete the word “not” – that we take that out, and say: “The present municipal tax levy is a significant factor in the cost-price squeeze.”

The reason we want that changed is that taxes have gone up

April 4, 1956

tremendously in recent years, not only since 1944, but particularly since 1939. I will give you an instance of municipal levy in the municipality that I reside in – rural municipality No. 183. The municipal taxes, including school taxes, in 1945, on a three-quarter section, were \$96.13. In 1955, they were \$242.20, or \$46.19 less than three times what they were in 1945.

On another parcel of land in R.M. No. 211, the total taxes, in 1944, were \$273.22; in 1955, they were \$747.45, or \$72.21 less than three times what they were in 1944.

Then we can look at the Larger School Unit, which was organized in 1952. In 1953, the total assessment, or tax levy, for that Larger School Unit was \$173,700; in 1955, it had risen to \$339,500.

In the North Melville Larger School Unit, organized in 1945, the tax levy of that School Unit was \$89,000; in 1955, it was \$223,000. So I submit that when you say that municipal taxes have nothing to do with the cost-price squeeze, it is not a fact.

Then we will take it on a larger scale. We will take, for instance, the rural municipal taxes per capita, taken from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. In 1939, they were \$20 per capita; in 1953, they had risen to \$82 per capita; and I would judge, taking for instance since 1923, the total cost went up 126 per cent in the farm costs, and the municipal taxes went up 300 per cent. That is more than twice as much as the average farm costs, or the costs of commodities that you have to buy. That is the justification for that amendment.

I think another one was the question of censoring the Transport Controller. Some exception was taken . . .

Premier Douglas: — The boxcar shortage first, and then the Transport Controller.

Mr. Lopton: — Well, I submit that it was not in accordance with the evidence produced before the Committee, and I will read you a clause from his evidence. He says:

“My duty with respect to grain handling is two-fold . . .”

I am just reading the paragraph that refers particularly to that:

“ . . . First, to ensure that, when grain is sold by the Canadian Wheat Board or any other exporter, the grain will be at the seaport when the vessels are sent for their load. Secondly, to see that transportation does not limit in any way the export sales of grain from Canada. I have carried out these duties. In the period from my appointment, or shortly thereafter, no demurrage has been paid on grain shipments from Canadian ports due to transportation. There has been some demurrage paid, but not due to transportation, and there has been shipped from Canada, since my appointment, 1,400,000,000 bushels of grain without delay.”

“In the Federal House, recently, the question was asked as to whether transportation had interfered with the sale of Canadian grain, and if so, to what extent. The answer was that transportation had not interfered with the sale of Canadian grain, and I can assure you that that is the case.”

Then he goes on:

“It has never been part of my duty to allocate boxcars to individual stations, nor to allocate cars to elevator companies at individual stations. As a matter of fact, I have not the power to do so.”

Now this is his evidence:

“The movement of grain in western Canada is under the sole control of the Canadian Wheat Board. They can order and discontinue the shipment of any kind of grain or any grade; or they can specifically order the kind of grain or quantity of grain to be shipped, and name the designation of the shipment. And this is as it must be in order that the Wheat Board can order the right quantity and grade to complete sales by exporters or sales by the Board.

“In actual practice the Canadian Wheat Board orders shipments of grain from grain companies on a percentage basis. The grain company decides from which points it wishes to ship and submits a list of the points to the Wheat Board. The company, after the list has been approved by the Wheat Board, then orders the cars from the railway agents at the various points throughout the west.

“Let us examine the transportation situation that has existed in this present crop year, that is, from August 1, 1955, until the present time. You and I have been seeing the phrase ‘boxcar shortage’ in every newspaper across Canada, and have heard it on public platforms and over the radio scores of times. This phrase ‘boxcar shortage’ has been the ready excuse for every ill in western Canada . . .”

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Howe says it.

Mr. Loptson: —

“ . . . We have four main outlets for export grain from Canada and I will deal with each of these outlets separately. The Pacific Coast ports of Vancouver, New Westminster and Prince Rupert are open all year, and Churchill for a period of about 2 1/2 months. The St. Lawrence ports are open for about eight months, and the Atlantic ports of Halifax, West St. Johns and East St. Johns, while open for navigation all year, are used for the export of grain from the month

April 4, 1956

of December to April, inclusive, when the St. Lawrence ports are closed.

“Now the first one I mentioned as a Pacific ocean port. The Pacific coast port, in the months of August September, October and November, had a large surplus of wheat over and above export commitments or requirements. Since November sales have been very good and all export commitments have been met. The stocks of grain have increased from 4,400,000 bushels of wheat on November 30th to stocks, on February 29th, of over 10,000,000 bushels of wheat, and almost 3,000,000 bushels of coarse grain. I think you will see in the rated capacity of the terminals out there that they are somewhere in the neighbourhood of 15,000,000, and there are 13,000,000 bushels in storage.”

Now I think, Mr. Speaker, that is sufficient proof that the clause in this submission is not in accordance to the evidence that was produced at the Committee hearings.

Premier Douglas: — It is in accordance with what Mr. Howe said.

Mr. Loptson: — Well, we are going by the evidence that came before the Committee.

I have dealt with the other clauses extensively, and I do not think it is necessary for me to go into them any further. There were two or three left that I had not mentioned. I think one of them is on page 158, and our amendment reads:

“That clauses (b) and (c) of paragraph 6 of Section I be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

“(b) bilateral and multilateral trade arrangements.”

Our submission is that in this recommendation it suggests that sales against import currency and barter deals be established. Now I think there is a clause where we have suggested that the Board should hold the wheat at a rigid price to our best customers. Well, how are you going to hold wheat at a rigid price to our best customers, when you propose to give it away to some other customers? It just doesn't gibe. It just doesn't work; and the more you talk about giving wheat away for worthless currency, then the importers from other countries who are paying in good currency are going to discontinue their purchases – and that is what has happened in the last 18 months, and that is one of the reasons why we didn't have sales at the beginning of this crop that we should have had, the simple reason being that there has been too much talk about giving wheat away.

Premier Douglas: — Might I ask my hon. friend if he would consider sterling as being worthless currency?

Mr. Loptson: — Sterling is not available for wheat, not from the United Kingdom.

Mr. Erb (Milestone): — Oh yes, it is.

Mr. Loptson: — They have said time and again, and my hon. friend the Premier of this province knows very well that even when the Labour Government was in power in the United Kingdom they refused to buy wheat for sterling.

Premier Douglas: — That is not true, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Loptson: — Gaitskill said so himself.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, that is not true, Mr. Strachey, the Minister of Food, himself, told me that they were prepared to buy with sterling.

Mr. Loptson: — He openly – and if you want me to look it up, I will.

Premier Douglas: — I wish you would.

Mr. Loptson: — It will take me a little time, but I have it here.

Premier Douglas: — I wish you would find it.

Mr. Loptson: — It was only this fall . . .

Premier Douglas: — No, but you said the Labour Government. I am not talking about the Tory Government, but the Labour Government.

Mr. Loptson: — Yes, we have that.

Premier Douglas: — All right, let's see where the Labour Government said they wouldn't buy with sterling.

Mr. Loptson: — Well I can look it up; I have it here; and it is only as late as this fall when the U.K. Commissioner was here and told a meeting at Saskatoon that they would not buy one more bushel for sterling.

Premier Douglas: — But not the Labour Government.

Mr. Loptson: — Anyway that is our reason for having that deleted. And then on page 159, we say:

That paragraph 10 of section I be amended by adding the words 'continue to' after the word 'should'."

That particular paragraph reads as follows:

"10. **Relief and Emergency Aid Programme.** That the Canadian Government together with other nations should participate in free disposals of food surpluses to areas in need of famine relief."

We suggest that the words "continue to" after the word "should" should be put in there because they are already doing it.

April 4, 1956

Premier Douglas: — To whom?

Mr. Loptson: — Under the Colombo plan; and they are always ready to give where famine is prevalent, and it has never been refused by either the Canadian Government or the United States Government, to help any needy nations.

Premier Douglas: — Only the United States Government, not the Canadian Government.

Mr. Loptson: — Well, anyway, it is our opinion that those words should go in there; that they should “continue to” participate in free disposals of food surpluses to areas in need of famine relief.

Then we say, in paragraph 9 of the amendment:

“That all the words after ‘returns’ where it first occurs in paragraph 11 of Section I be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

“To each grain producer by providing:

(a) a payment of \$2.00 per bushel (Basis No. 1 Northern at the Lakehead) for the first 1,000 bushels of wheat delivered in each crop year by each producer with comparable arrangements for coarse grains.”

We submit that that would take care of the small farmer’s immediate needs, and we have at the present time, according to the records, about 70 per cent (or 69 per cent to be exact) in the small farmer class, people who produce probably not much more than 1,000 or perhaps 2,000 bushels of wheat. And 69 per cent are in this class and if we are going to promote assistance to the small farmer, I do not know of anything better than to give him a guarantee for the first 1,000 bushels of wheat or comparably the same amount for coarse grains that he produces.

Premier Douglas: — Would my hon. friend explain something? I have been trying to understand it from reading the amendment, but I am not clear about it. If you give \$2.00 a bushel for the first 1,000 bushels to the producer, and that wheat brings less on the market, is my friend proposing that the Government should make it up out of the consolidation revenue fund, and take it out of the rest of the producers?

Mr. Loptson: — I am proposing that the big fellow will make it up out of the pool, if the rest of the wheat goes below \$2.00. I haven’t finished this clause; it goes on a little further:

“(b) best market prices for the balance of each crop year’s delivery.”

That means that the rest of the wheat that this man sells – he gets \$2.00 a bushel for his first 1,000 bushels, no matter whether he has 100,000 bushels, or 1,000 bushels; and then if the rest of the wheat sells for a

lesser price, then you know these poor fellows that have 100,000 bushels can make up for the poor little fellow. I don't think they would object to it if they had a chance to sell their wheat.

Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. gentleman would permit a question. I am rather intrigued by this amendment here.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — And I am amazed!

Mr. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale): — I notice in (a) it is suggested that a payment of \$2.00 per bushel for certain quantities of the first deliveries be made; and then in (b) it says the "best market price for the balance." I am wondering if there isn't going to be a difference between the \$2.00 for the first deliveries and the best market price for the balance; and if there is a difference, out of what fund would the difference come? I am just wondering that.

Mr. Loptson: — Out of the pool.

Mr. Wahl (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — What pool – the Wheat Pool?

Premier Douglas: — No, no!

Mr. Loptson: — No, out of the pool. After you have sold all the grain you divide the difference up equally on the balance. Now, then the next one is:

"That paragraph 12 (a) of Section I and the heading 'Domestic Parity for Wheat' be deleted and clause (b) of paragraph 12 become clause (c) of paragraph 11."

The next one is on page 162.

Premier Douglas: — Are you leaving the domestic parity?

Mr. Loptson: — That is deleted, and clause (b) of paragraph 12 becomes clause (c) of paragraph 11. It is taken care of in that \$2.00 a bushel. And on page 162:

"That the words 'continue to' be added after the word 'should' in clause (a) of paragraph 16 of section III."

That is at the top of the page. It now reads:

"(a) It should apply to all commercial marketings of all agricultural commodities at all times."

And we propose to add the words should "continue to" apply to all commercial marketings of all agricultural commodities at all times. and again:

"That clause (f) of paragraph 16 of Section III be deleted."

April 4, 1956

Premier Douglas: — Why?

Mr. Loptson: — It reads now:

“The programme should ideally aim at providing equity not only for the agricultural industry as such, but also should provide decent standards of living and levels of income security for all farm families within the industry.”

Mr. R. Walker (Hanley): — That’s bad, is it?

Mr. Loptson: — There just isn’t any sense to that statement. That is all the credit you are giving there – that says, in effect, whether you produce anything or not. So we propose that that be deleted.

Mr. E.H. Walker (Gravelbourg): — May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Loptson: — Oh yes, all the questions you like.

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg): — If we deleted the word ‘decent’ would that fit into your amendment satisfactorily?

Mr. Loptson: — I figure that a man should earn his living; he should work for what he gets, the same as the rest of us do. Now the next one is on page 164, and there we propose to change it as follows:

“That paragraph 18 in Section IV be deleted, and the following substituted therefor:

“18. **Additional Storage Facilities.** That Federal and Provincial Governments together with Elevator Companies take appropriate action to provide additional temporary or permanent grain storage facilities so that farmers’ delivery quotas may be substantially increased.”

We propose that as a substitute for the present section.

Then we go to the next one which now reads:

“19. **Coarse Grains and Flax.** That, since a storage programme for feed grains would be an important stabilizing factor in the livestock industry, an ever-normal granary system for the major feed grains be created. As in the case of wheat, a national stockpile of feed grains would be kept on hand to level out fluctuations in short-term supply.”

Well, we were trying to do that provincially and it did not work out very good, according to the information we got this afternoon from the Minister of Agriculture. We propose to delete that section. Then we say:

“That clause (a) of the present paragraph 20 of Section IV be deleted and the following be substituted therefor: . . .”

That is the section that recommends a national livestock board. I will read it:

“(a) National Livestock Board. That a federally constituted national livestock marketing board be established as a necessary feature of any long-term comprehensive farm policy.”

We propose to replace that with this clause:

“(a) Livestock Boards. That such provincial or national livestock boards as are requested and approved by votes of the producers concerned be established.”

The next one is:

“That all the words following ‘products’ in the present paragraph 22 of Section IV be deleted.”

You will know that Section 22 reads as follows in this report:

“That export boards be established under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government to enter into foreign trade as bulk-selling agencies for farm products. Similarly, import boards might serve an important function as bulk-buying agencies. Such agencies would be particularly important in connection with any barter arrangements.”

We propose to delete all the words following ‘products’ in the third line of the present paragraph 22 of Section IV. Then we say:

“That the following new paragraph 26 of Section VI be inserted:” (page 169 of the report)

You will note that on page 169, we propose that the following new paragraph 26 of Section VI be inserted:

“26. Prairie Farm Assistance. That the Federal Government increase the payments and the levy under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act and that the Government of Saskatchewan enact legislation to provide assistance to farmers suffering crop losses and who are not provided for under the Federal Prairie Farm Assistance Act.”

I think those are about all the amendments we propose to this report, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — No, you have another one on page 6 of your amendment.

Mr. Loptson: — Yes this one:

April 4, 1956

“That the word ‘Provincial’ be inserted after the word ‘That’ where it first occurs in the present paragraph 26 of Section VI.”

Yes, that is the paragraph titled “Guaranteed Bank Loans” —:

“That Provincial Government guaranteed bank loans (apart from Farm Improvement Loans and Provincial Government guarantees) be used in emergency situations where farmers suffer crop failure and have no collateral to offer as security. Further, that the guarantees be extended to cover credit union loans for these purposes.”

Well, we haven’t proposed any particular amendment to this section, except that the Provincial Government should step in where other guarantees have failed, something similar to what we did when the Provincial Government guaranteed bank loans to provide seed.

Now this is the explanation of this amendment, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if we want to deal with this thing impartially, what we have suggested as changes in this report are entirely practical and in the interest of our farming community, and I shall leave it to the Government and other members of the House to deal with as they see fit.

Mr. R. Walker (Hanley): — Have you any argument in favour of it?

Mr. A.L.S. Brown (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, the motion which has been moved by the member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Dunfield) was one that would refer this report back to the Committee; first of all to revive the Committee, and then to refer this report back and have it amended in the manner suggested in their Sessional Paper filed along with their amendment.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that that will have to be dealt with in two phases. The first phase is in respect to referring this report back, and to the reviving of the Committee in itself. I would like to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that anyone who accepted responsibility in that Committee could have brought forward these suggestions which are being brought forward at this time. There was ample opportunity for any member of the Committee to place his views and his opinions before that Committee, and they had the utmost opportunities to do so. The suggestion was made by the Leader of the Opposition that they were not receiving the co-operation, that their group (I presume he is referring to their group) was not receiving the co-operation . . .

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. My hon. friend knows very well that these amendments were submitted . . .

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — They were not.

Mr. Loptson: — Many of these amendments were submitted and turned down.

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, if any of the amendments which were

submitted here were turned down, they were turned down by a majority of the Committee, and no member of the Committee can take objection to a majority rule. Not even the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) or the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) can take objection to that, because they sit in this House only by virtue of the fact that they were able to obtain a majority; so they should believe in the majority rule.

However, there was the utmost opportunity given for anyone to place his views and his opinion before that Committee, and when they suggest that co-operation was not provided, that there was any hindrance put forth to prevent them from making their submissions, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that that is indeed a reflection not only on the Committee, but it is certainly a reflection on the Chairman. Inasmuch as I was Chairman of that Committee, I think I have the endorsement of the Committee when I report back to you, Mr. Speaker, and say that no one was denied the opportunity at any time to place his opinions before that Committee, and that I did attempt, in my capacity as Chairman, to make it possible for any member, whether he was from the Opposition as such, or whether he was from this side of the House, to place his views before that Committee and to have them considered in the Manner in which they were presented.

I did not report this, Mr. Speaker, when I presented this report to the Legislature; but insofar as the Leader of the Opposition has raised the question, it now becomes public knowledge. I thought that of all people, the Opposition would be the ones who would want to forget what happened in one of the in camera sittings of that Committee, when they in body all walked out of that Committee. I make reference to this, as I suggest, Mr. Speaker, simply because the Leader of the Opposition raises it. I think at this time we saw the complete disintegration of the Liberal party as such. If there ever was a time when the Liberal party was great in this province, it has indeed sunk to a low level when those who propose to represent a party such as that, use as a means of trying to present their views that of walking out of a Committee to which they were elected by this Legislature, and in which a certain responsibility was delegated to them.

Mr. Loptson: — You wouldn't admit that the meeting was out of your hands.

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, if the meeting was out of my hands, it was out of my hands simply because of the actions of the member for Saltcoats.

Mr. Loptson: — It was out of your hands.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — At the time at which the walkout occurred, it is true it occurred on a point of order which could not be heard by the Chairman, simply because the member for Saltcoats refused to obey the order of the Chairman to take his seat until such time . . .

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, that is absolutely untrue. It certainly is! I moved that a certain clause be deleted and I couldn't get a word in because it was just a hoodlum

April 4, 1956

meeting and I said “if that is the way it is going to be run, I’m through!”

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural Resources): — It wasn’t a walkout, it was a strike.

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — The word ‘strike’ is better; but I am certain that my hon. friend’s memory is certainly not that short. I think that he will recall that he did move that a certain clause be deleted, a motion which was absolutely in order, and which I accepted; but it was following that, and speaking to his motion, that he began to refer back to proceedings which had already taken place. It was at that point that the member for Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. C.G. Willis) raised a point of order, a point of order which in my opinion was justifiable, and the member for Saltcoats should have accepted . . .

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege again. He is absolutely wrong, I didn’t even speak to the clause. I said that I move that that clause be deleted, and I want to say this to the Chairman, that it was no fault of the Chairman, and I am going to give him credit for conducting the inquiry well, and he conducted the meeting well, but it was not so with the Government members of the Committee. I just want to state that the meeting broke up because half-a-dozen men talking all at once . . .

Mr. R. Walker (Hanley): — It’s a lie.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! Of course I, as Speaker of the Legislature, had no knowledge of that. As a matter of fact, I think if the proper procedure had been followed we wouldn’t have had this discussion, because that will lead nowhere. It is simply one person’s word against the others. It may be supported or otherwise. I think that the Chairman erred, it should have been reported to the Legislature. He should have reported to the Legislature that you had absented yourself deliberately from a Committee to which you had been appointed, which in fact does constitute a violation and should have been dealt with on the floor of this Legislature. If you will look up the authorities you will find that you are supposed to attend meetings of those Committees that you were appointed to, and if you do not and if you deliberately break up those meetings, it is contempt.

Mr. Loptson: — There was no breakup.

Mr. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what authorities you are quoting from now.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, you can look them up for yourself.

Mr. McDonald: — Well, I have looked them up, and there is no contempt in walking out of a Committee meeting.

Premier Douglas: — As a matter of fact, I believe the Leader of the Opposition looked them up before they walked out. As a matter of fact, my understanding is that they were looking all evening for some excuse to walk out.

Mr. McDonald: — I sure did look them up.

Mr. Speaker: — My point of order is this. There is no use arguing across the floor of the House between the Chairman of the Committee and those who absented themselves. I have no motion on it, and those who were not in the Committee have no motion of it.

Mr. R. Walker (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member for Saltcoats will surely admit that the motion which he made had to do with deleting 6(b) in reference to Sales Against Importers' Currencies. He made that motion and then proceeded to speak on the motion, and in the course of his remarks he went away back to work that had been decided the previous day by the Committee, and he started talking about taxes not being a factor in the cost-price squeeze . . .

Mr. Loptson: — That's right.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — . . . and it was at that point where the hon. member for Melfort rose on a point of order, on the grounds that the matter had been dealt with at a previous sitting of the Committee and that the hon. member was out of order in discussing that matter. The hon. member said this is all trash that has been decided by the . . .

Mr. Loptson: — My hon. friend was the leader of the hoodlums in that meeting.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I insist that the hon. member withdraw that word. I insist that that word be withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member must withdraw that. He cannot accuse anyone of being a hoodlum.

Mr. Loptson: — Might I say that he was the leader of the group?

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, I accept the compliment which the member for Saltcoats has given to me, but that still does not alter the position which I must take in reporting back the facts as they were, and the facts as I saw them. But I do want to assure this House, Mr. Speaker, that what they are attempting to do at this time could have been done in the Committee. There was ample time provided for them. When I suggested to the Committee in the first instance that I would undertake to prepare a draft report to present to the Committee, I told the Committee at that time that any member of the Committee was free to undertake a similar job on a similar task, and that any suggested report that they would place before that Committee would as far as I was concerned receive the same consideration as the one which I was presenting. After the members of the Committee had my suggested draft report in their hands there was still ample time in which they could have prepared a minority report if they had so wished, or a minority report prepared by any one individual, and could have submitted it to that Committee, and unquestionably, knowing the co-operation that I had received from that Committee up to that date, it would have received consideration and no doubt would have been incorporated as a minority report. If my friends had wished to take that opportunity

April 4, 1956

of presenting their views (if they had some minority views) to the people of this province and this Legislature in that Committee as it was constituted at that time, they did have the opportunity to so do.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that on that basis alone there is justification for defeat of this amendment; but I do feel that I should take a moment or two to go over these amendments and suggest why, in my opinion, they are not applicable and why there would be no justification for reviving the Committee and sending back these particular amendments. In so doing I would like to take this opportunity, for any of the findings or the recommendations brought in question by this amendment, to refer back to the report to justify that which we originally incorporated in our findings and our recommendations.

As I pointed out when I moved this report, Mr. Speaker, we had undertaken, as far as it was humanly possible, to document every bit of information that was placed before the Committee. There was nothing taken out of the air. Everything in this report was based upon evidence submitted before that Committee, and anyone who will take the trouble to read it and to read the footnotes as well, will realize that that job was done to the point that there is no place in this report where a finger can be pointed, and there is not an item that is not substantiated by evidence which was before the Committee, and evidence that was available to any individual member of that Committee.

The first one on which they suggest an amendment should be made is on page 147, in which they suggest that our findings on the export of agricultural commodities other than grain have declined from a very high level in 1945 to almost insignificant amounts in the last few years. They suggest that that statement is not based on facts. I would refer them back to the report in which we state that exports of beef, bacon and ham, and cheese have declined by 90 per cent or more since 1945. Taking them on the basis of the individual commodities, we could take for instance beef. In 1945, Canada exported 190 million pounds of beef, and only 19 million pounds in 1954. Surely that is a "significant decline." The same thing is true in respect to ham . . .

Mr. Lopton: — Where would you find this beef to export in Canada?

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — If you get the market, you will soon produce the beef. We proved that was possible during the war years, when we did have a market and we did produce not only beef but ham and poultry products and dairy products as well. The same thing is true as far as bacon and ham is concerned; from a high in 1945 of 450 million pounds, to approximately 8 million pounds of bacon and ham for export at the present time.

The same thing is true in respect to cheese and other dairy products. We say that exports have declined to almost an insignificant amount in the past few years, and I think it is certainly substantiated by the figures which I have given, which were taken from the Bank of Canada Statistical Summary, a bit of evidence which was placed before the Committee and which was available to the hon. member for Saltcoats, if he had wished to used it.

The next one deals with clause (b) on page 149, in which we state as a matter of finding that “the present municipal tax levy is not a significant factor in the cost-price squeeze.” I realize that we were dealing primarily with the price part or the price end of the cost-price squeeze, but here was the evidence which was submitted to that Committee, which I did not feel that the Committee could in any way ignore. It was certainly substantiated by evidence which was presented by the School Trustees’ Association, by the Association of Rural Municipalities, and by one or two others, but it was mainly substantiated by the evidence submitted by the Royal Commission when they placed before that Committee a chart in which they indicated that since 1941 up to 1953, the ratio of municipal taxes to total farm costs had decreased. In 1941 they were approximately 8 per cent of the total farm costs, and in 1953 they had declined to the point where they were only 6 per cent of the overall farm costs. In the report which was placed before the Committee on local government and rural roads, they make this observation:

“Land taxes have not competed successfully with other farm costs. All farm costs have been rising, and land taxes have shown the least tendency to increase relative to other costs. This means that the improvement to municipal school and health services have been sacrificed to meet the rising cost of farming.”

So we make that finding based on the evidence which was placed before the Committee, that the municipal tax level at present is not a significant factor. So I think we were stating a finding that was justified on the evidence.

The next one deals with the question of “boxcar shortage”; and as I intimated in my opening remarks, dealing with that particular section, I did feel that we were indeed in good company when we suggested that there was a boxcar shortage existing, and the Committee had ample evidence before it to substantiate that there was indeed a boxcar shortage during not only the early part but also the latter part of the 1955 calendar year. We did accept the fact that there were certain extenuating circumstances which could to some extent justify some lowering of the number of boxcars that could be made available. We attempted to be fair in this respect, and we did say that there was a slow movement of grain in the 1955-56 crop year, and the railway companies allocated boxcars to other industries. There was a great demand from the United States for British Columbia lumber and boxcars were made available for this purpose. As of December 31, 1955, the number of Canadian boxcars in the United States exceeded the number of United States boxcars in Canada by 9,548. The railways evidently had not anticipated the booming Canadian economy which was piling up demands for available rolling stock, and, as well, a shortage of steel retarded replacement of obsolete boxcars; adverse weather conditions made it particularly difficult for railways in the matter of snow removal, and reduced efficiency of steam locomotives. The Transport Controller in his evidence before the Committee stressed the fact that the slow rate of export of grain in the early months of the 1955-56 crop years accounted for the reduced volume of shipments from country elevators, and that there was in fact no real scarcity or shortage of boxcars.

April 4, 1956

That is a summary of the evidence that was before the Committee, and we accept the fact that there were extenuating circumstances which to some extent would justify some of the actions taken; but we did not and could not subscribe to the view that there was in fact no real shortage of boxcars during that particular period. While it was true that exports of grain have fallen off substantially compared with a year ago, this does not provide the whole explanation. The fact that the Canadian Wheat Board was not making the sales that it had made in the previous crop years does not explain the whole situation, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Milner's evidence was based strictly on the assumption that the Canadian Wheat Board was not making the export sales that it had made the previous year. In the period from August 1 to December 28, 1955, exports of Canadian grain were 42 million bushels less than the clearance for the corresponding period of 1954. However, in this same period shipments of grain from country points in the prairies declined by some 280 million bushels compared with the previous year. It was a drop of 42 million bushels in export clearance, and a crop of some 82 million bushels moved from the prairies to the terminals.

Mr. Loftson: — Due to the C.C.F. give-away policy . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — It certainly had nothing to do with the C.C.F. give-away policy. Then too, by the beginning of January, 1955, western terminals had 76 million bushels of grain in store. A similar figure was not obtained in 1956 until the end of February. In other words, it took them two months longer in 1956 to get the terminals in the same position as they were in January of 1955, in the 1954-55 crop year. So there was, unquestionably, a shortage of boxcars. On the face of it, we could arrive at no other conclusion other than that there was in effect and in fact, a boxcar shortage and that this boxcar shortage did contribute to the cash shortage which existed among the farmers of western Canada and the farmers of Saskatchewan in particular.

Now we come to the one on the Transport Controller in which he suggests that we should delete that paragraph dealing with the powers of the Transport Controller. I might point out (and I think I am justified in reporting this to the House and no one I think will take exception to it) that when this particular clause was before the Committee, there was no endeavour on the part of any of the members of the Committee to have it deleted. Somebody somewhere along the line since they walked out of the Committee at that time had this pipe-dream that this particular paragraph should be struck from the records.

We made this finding strictly on the evidence presented by Mr. Milner himself, and the members who were on that Committee will recollect hearing Mr. Milner give us the evidence at that time. I think that we, as members of the Committee, appreciated the fact that Mr. Milner took the opportunity to appear before us, and that he did graciously accept the invitation which we extended to him. But nevertheless, I do not think that in itself is any justification for the Committee deviating from what was obvious to them, and certainly obvious to myself as Chairman. We were alarmed to note a situation developing in which the Transport Controller

apparently is not utilizing the formal regulations provided him for the control of transportation facilities in the manner specified and the regulations were filed under which the Transport Controller was established and the basis under which he operates. One section of the regulations under the Department of Transport Act empowers the Transport Controller "to order any person dealing with transport facilities to extend, furnish or supply, or make use of any bulk transport facilities, or equipment for transport, at such time and places and in such manner as he desires." But despite these widespread powers, evidence presented to the Committee by the Transport Controller himself indicates that no directive or mandatory order had been issued to either the railways or shipowners since 1952, and certainly none were issued in the 1955-56 crop year.

The Committee recognized that there may be times when it is permissible or even desirable to use powers of persuasion rather than to issue decrees, but the Committee submits that at the very minimum a formal directive could have, and in my opinion should have, been issued to the railways incorporating whatever prior arrangements or commitments may have been needed. I should think that any industry, and agriculture in particular, is certainly entitled to that type of protection to assure that any verbal agreement which may be entered into is carried out to the letter, and carried out extensively, where there is no discrimination as between industries.

Now coming down to No. 5 under "Price Support" Section IV, on page 153, in which he suggests that we should strike out of the findings on price support that the effect of incentives of the United States price support programme in causing the buildup of surplus stocks has been greatly exaggerated. He wishes that to be struck out, and have a substitution put in there which would read as follows:

"which may necessitate the implementation of controls over production."

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that price supports as they have been applied in the United States have not, of themselves, been responsible for building up any of the surpluses which may have occurred in the United States. I suggest that, on the whole, it was not so much the incentive of production that created the surplus, but rather it was the under-consumption in the United States and the fact that she has had not, as of then, adopted some of the policies which she apparently is adopting at the present time, which will move this food and so-called surplus to the markets of the world. I suggest that, in Canada, application of the same principles under price support would in itself not create any surplus. We here in Canada cannot possibly undertake to produce too much foodstuffs in view of the need, not only in Canada, but in the markets of the world. They further go on to suggest that the implementation of this type of a programme in Canada would indeed place an undue heavy burden upon the taxpayers of this country.

Now it is true that under our present economy, an adequate price support under all our agricultural products might be quite a burden upon our Federal Treasury, but we do suggest, and I think it is amply proven in the United States, that the placing of a price support on agriculture has beneficial effects upon the whole economy; that by virtue of

April 4, 1956

paying to the producer an adequate price for his product, you do in that way distribute wealth not only to the producer, but he in turn distributes it to the other segments of the economy. And that, in no sense and in no way, should we place upon the price support policy that the total amount spent under any price support programme should of necessity be charged against agriculture as such, but rather that it should be charged against the whole economy. In that manner the application of a price support programme would not of necessity be anywhere near the sum which might be suggested by their proposed amendment. I further suggest (and I think the Committee concurred on that) that in spite of any cost it might have upon the Federal Treasury, a cost which would only be created by the failure to adopt proper marketing schemes and failure to obtain markets, the Federal Treasurer should be prepared to undertake that expenditure not only in the interest of agriculture, but in the interest of our economy as a whole.

Coming down to what is possibly the most ridiculous one – and that is the one dealing with “Snow Removal” on page 157. In the terms of reference of this Committee nowhere did I ever see the word ‘snow’ mentioned, nor was the question of the removing of snow from the highways or the market roads in any way referred to this Committee. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that amendment in itself is too ridiculous to be worthy even of comment. I think the significant thing in this particular amendment is not what they propose to substitute; it is what they strike out, and that is on “Farm Storage Payments”; and there was ample evidence before that Committee, and certainly the Committee concurred in it, that farm storage payments under the present situation are justified.

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I don’t think farm storage was ever mentioned in the evidence that was brought before the Committee.

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — The main thing is that you are against it. I think that is the main thing. The secondary thing is the fact that it was before that Committee and mentioned by more than one farm organization.

Mr. Loptson: — Can you name one?

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — The S.F.U. for one. The Wheat Pool, and further Mr. Howe himself, in the Hansard that was filed before the Committee, indicated that in his opinion there was justification for payment of storage on farm-stored grain.

Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, might I ask one point here. I recall the Committee asking you, Sir, what evidence I could turn to to support this farm-stored grain, and you were unable to give me any at the time. Your answer was (if I recall correctly – not the exact words, but the sense of it) that it was so self-evident it wasn’t felt necessary to put it in the Brief.

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — Those are partly my words, but they were not expressed in that manner. I think the question was raised, possibly by the member for Maple Creek, if this was such an important recommendation of ours, why did all the farm organizations not make such a proposal to the Committee? It was at that point that I did say that

possibly in their opinion, justification of such action was so self-evident that they felt that it was no longer necessary to include it in their presentation. But it does not alter the fact that practically every farm organization in Saskatchewan, over the past period of years, has advocated that payments be made on grain stored on the farms, and I suggest further that this is not something new. It has been in operation here in the past. It was operated back in 1941 when a similar situation had existed, and the Minister of Transport has stated since that time, on April 29, 1952, that he was able to see occasion for the payment on storage on the farms in those years when the markets were sluggish, and, in addition, when deliveries of grain would only clog up the marketing machine instead of facilitating the sales of grain. According to the policy of the Federal Government this year, that was certainly the situation. So there was certainly justification for making that finding, and for us incorporating that as a recommendation. In this particular instance I do not think they agree with Mr. Howe.

Coming now to No 7, on page 158 – and this is the straw that broke the camel's back. It was under this particular section that my hon. friends did walk out of the Committee, and it was at this point that the member for Saltcoats raised the question that we were getting so ridiculous that he could no longer stay with us. and he walked out, followed by the rest of his colleagues. It was the sale against importers' currency, and the barter deal. I would point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that they took violent objection to that in the Committee, and apparently the hon. member at the present time is taking equally violent objection to it when he mentioned it in his amendment; and he still suggests that we should not undertake sales against importers' currency, and that we should not accept barter deals. But their amendment does suggest that we should have instead of that "bilateral and multilateral trade arrangements."

Now I am going to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that any bilateral or multilateral trade which could be in any way effective in disposing of any of our agricultural, or any amount of our agricultural products, would have to be on the basis of sales as against importers' currency and on the basis of barter deals. There is absolutely no other way in which it could be accomplished, We did point out in our report that barter does not necessarily involve simultaneously an exchange of goods; it may take the form of a reciprocal sales contract, involving mutual agreements, to take certain quantities of goods at stated prices over an agreed period of time. There is an application of what we mean, and we intend it to mean, by the term 'barter deals', and I suggest that by incorporating his proposed amendment, it would do nothing more than what we suggest would have to be done on the basis of sales and on the basis of barter deals; and rather than add to the report, their suggestion would certainly detract from an overall useful means of disposing of our agricultural products on the markets of the world.

Then, on page 159, they undertake to add the words "continue to" – that the Canadian Government, together with other nations should "continue to" participate in the free disposal of food surpluses in areas in need of famine relief. I am going to suggest that they can point to no incident in which there has been any undertaking by the Canadian Government, as such, to participate in free disposal of food surpluses in areas

April 4, 1956

in need of famine relief. If they can point to any one incident in which this has occurred, I would be prepared to accept the fact that there might be justification for inserting the words "continue to"; but they have not as yet suggested any place in which it can be done. On the contrary, incidents can be pointed to in which the action of the Federal Government would prevent the disposal of surplus foods in areas in need of famine relief. Hon. members will recall a time when there was a desire on the part of the farmers of this province to supply wheat to Pakistan, and it was the action of the Federal Government which, through the Canadian Wheat Board, made it impractical for the farmers to make that disposal. So I think we are justified in saying that it should commence, and we might even go further and say that it should not in any way hinder the movement of the surplus foods to areas in need of famine relief.

We come down a little further under "price policies," in which we suggest as an immediate solution something which could be done immediately as a stop-gap on further deterioration of the price of our wheat, and in this particular price policy we are dealing only with wheat. This is something which could be done immediately to prevent any further deterioration. We do not suggest that this in itself would alleviate the situation to any great extent; but it would be in effect placing a floor where it is now, and prevent it from going any further. They want to delete the suggestion which we are making that:

"the initial price for the coming crop year be announced and that it be retained at its present level,

"and further that the final returns for the present crop year, (that is 1955-56) be not less than \$1.56, which is what we received for our 1953-54 crop, and is the minimum under the International Wheat Agreement."

In making that suggestion, I think we are in line with practically every farm organization that appeared before us.

To go on further, I will have to deal with the amendment to this in co-relation with the other one they wish to strike out, and that is "domestic parity for wheat." They suggest that our recommendation in clause (a) that the wheat sold in Canada for domestic consumption should be on the basis of parity, or on the basis of a maximum under the International Wheat Agreement should be deleted. It so happens at the moment that the two figures coincide, so you can use whichever illustration you wish, either the maximum under the International Wheat Agreement, or the parity price for wheat, that all wheat sold in Canada be sold at that price, and in making this recommendation we are certainly in line with the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. Their presentation before us made it abundantly clear that they believed in the two-price system for wheat, and that the domestic price for wheat should be on the basis of parity. The Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture made similar representation; so the adoption of that principle would be in line with the request of all farm organizations.

In clause (b) of that same section we incorporate the very principle which the amendment would purport to incorporate in the report.

We say that this should be worked in conjunction with the present delivery quota system, so that the initial wheat deliveries would only command the higher price. So that, if the principle was adopted, it would be on the initial deliveries that the producer would receive the \$2.05. But, we go one step further than the amendment would suggest. We suggest that, on the overall average it be not less than \$1.56 per bushel; that the final realized payment should not be less than that. They say that the "best market prices for the balance of each crop year's delivery." We are suggesting that, if necessary, the Federal Government subsidize wheat to the point where it will not be allowed to go below where it is at the present time. My friends apparently are opposed to that principle.

Referring to clause 12 of the amendment – on page 162 of the report where, dealing with our ultimate objectives as far as the price support for agriculture is concerned, we make this categorical statement, that it should apply to all commercial marketings of all agricultural marketings. They want to suggest that we should add the words "continue" to apply to all commercial marketings. They are implying that it does at the present time. It certainly does not apply to agricultural commodities. You can name them by the dozen to which this Agricultural Price Support Act at the present time does not apply, and to create the interest that it does, I think it unjustifiable and unwarranted. I think that we are perfectly justified in making that categorical statement that it should apply to all commercial marketings and to all commodities.

The one that really floored me was when they came down to clause (f) of that same section in which we suggested that any price support programme put in operation should ideally aim at not only providing agriculture, as such, its fair share of the national wealth, but that it be created in such a way that it will create equity within the industry; that application of a parity price programme for agriculture that you do not of necessity create a condition in which you have got one operator at a high level and possibly another operator at a low level. Application of a price support programme based on parity might do that, but we say one that we should ideally aim at is one that will create equity within the industry.

Mr. Loftson: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member if he would just explain how we would apply that?

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — There are many ways in which you could create equity within an industry. One of the means I could use as an illustration is a comprehensive crop insurance scheme. When we reach the point where we have a parity structure under our agricultural products, then it would be possible have a comprehensive crop insurance scheme which would be one of the means by which you would create equity among individuals within the industry. There are other social security measures which could be applied to the agricultural industry, which presently are being applied to other industries. Our ultimate objective, I think, we should keep that in mind as a basis of social justice, that not only do we want economic justice for the industry, but we want social justice for the people within the industry as well. I think that we are within our right, and certainly justified, in incorporating that as an ultimate objective for any price support programme or any agricultural programme to aim at and to work towards.

April 4, 1956

Now, coming down to “additional storage facilities,” on page 164. Once again, in this particular incident, it is not so much the amendment itself that is important, but once again it is the important part that they are striking out. There might be some arguments that could be advanced for the proposed amendment that my hon. friend has moved. There might be some arguments for it. If there were, he certainly never gave them here this evening, and if there were arguments, he certainly never gave them in the Committee when he had an opportunity to do so. But what they are striking out here is a “public storage agency,” and “a financing agency.” We suggest and make recommendations that these agencies should be established in the interest of a stabilized industry; that the Federal Government would carry at the national expense a wheat stockpile sufficient to meet one year’s domestic and export requirements. We did in our findings commend the Federal Government for the steps which they have taken in that direction at the present time, but we suggest that they can go even further and take care of a wheat stockpile sufficient to meet one year’s domestic and export requirements: in effect, what, under the present International Wheat Agreement, they are supposed to be doing.

Then we further suggest (what they want to strike out) the desirability of a financing agency to meet credit needs in connection with grain deliveries and to provide the necessary administrative machinery, either through the Canadian Wheat Board or a separate agency created by the Federal Government. I think that in the interest of an overall comprehensive marketing system, that both of these things, as far as wheat is concerned in particular, are absolutely necessary, and that the financing agency could be used for commodities other than wheat, and for the storing of either perishable or non-perishable goods.

On the same page where we make the recommendation that the principle of an ever-normal granary be applied to coarse grains as well as to wheat in the interest of stabilized production of livestock, they suggest that that should be struck out. I suggest that that is a sound basis, and if you are going to have livestock production on an even keel and over a sustained period of time, it is necessary that we (maybe not so much here in western Canada, but certainly in Canada as a whole) make certain that we have the feed reserves necessary to take care of this livestock production.

Coming down to the “livestock boards” on page 165, the interesting thing about their proposed amendment is what they want to strike out, and that is the recommendation which this Committee is making to this Legislature that livestock marketing boards be established. Every witness practically who appeared before the Committee from the farm organizations, expressed the opinion that, in the interest of a stabilized marketing scheme, we should have a national livestock marketing board, and it is noteworthy that two-thirds of the briefs from communities that the Royal Commission had presented to them recommended that a federally-constituted marketing board be established for all livestock and livestock products. I cannot conceive how it is possible to have a marketing scheme in which so much of our potential production of livestock needs will be going out to the world markets, and as such, can only properly be done through the medium of a national livestock board created on a governmental

basis. We do suggest that there is a place for producer marketing boards, and we suggest that, in the case of poultry and eggs, commodities which are marketed primarily within their own boundaries, such a marketing agency might have merit, and certainly is worthy of consideration and study.

Coming to their amendment No. 18, referring to page 165, in which they would strike out our recommendation that import boards be established on a similar basis as our present export boards. Now I suggest that, if we are going to have a continuation of a fair trade relationship between countries, it is necessary that we have boards such as the Canadian Wheat Board, the National Livestock Marketing Board, to place our products on the markets of the world in an orderly manner. But to make them completely effective it will be necessary to have import boards which will take the goods necessary to pay for those goods which we are selling. It would be particularly of benefit if we ever reach the point we suggest can be reached if we enter into barter deals and barter arrangements with other countries, and it would be of utmost importance that we have not only the export boards but import boards as well.

Coming to No. 19, the one dealing with the "P.F.A.A."; I might point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that in the terms of reference under which this Committee was set up, this particular question of crop failures was not mentioned, and it is that question with which P.F.A.A. is concerned. No doubt there is justification for considering a thing of this nature, but insofar as we were dealing with markets, marketing and farm income exclusively there was no evidence and no suggestion made before the Committee that any consideration be given to the question of improving the P.F.A.A. However, in our report we do point out where the Royal Commission has suggested that in any comprehensive overall agricultural policy, it would be necessary to incorporate a comprehensive crop insurance scheme; so we have, we felt, dealt with the principle here; and I do feel that, if and when this Conference we are asking for is held, unquestionably the question of a crop insurance scheme will be placed on the agenda; but in this report we are not making any specific recommendations in that regard.

The final suggested amendment, Mr. Speaker, is to insert the word "Provincial" before "Government Guaranteed Bank Loans." Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the government guaranteed bank loans, as we visualize them in this report, are complementary and supplementary to the P.F.A.A., and as the P.F.A.A. is presently under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government and must remain so, then I suggest that the type of guaranteed bank loans to which we are referring here could only be, in general terms at least, applicable to and by the Federal Government. It is possibly true that there are incidents here in the province in which the Provincial Government could undertake to make government guaranteed bank loans, not available to individuals, but as they are doing presently under The Co-operative Guarantee Act and through The Seed and Seed Supply Act, to organizations composed of farmers, and it may be necessary to extend that principle. But in this particular instance, we are referring to government guaranteed bank loans, which would be, as I say, supplementary and complementary to the P.F.A.A., and as such could only be done under Federal jurisdiction.

April 4, 1956

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have taken a considerable length of time in an endeavour to deal with the amendments which have been suggested by the motion moved by the member for Meadow Lake, and in closing, may I restate that, in my opinion, there is absolutely no justification for reviving the Committee; that any work that could be done by that Committee, if it were revived, could have been done when it was sitting at that time. This House has absolutely no assurance that the situation that the hon. members opposite created would not be created again, and that they would attempt to create the same impasse which they attempted to create at that particular time. We have no assurance that that will not recur, and if the Committee was revived I can see that by the Committee incorporating in their report these suggested amendments, it would certainly add nothing to the report but, in my opinion, it would emasculate it. It would make the report an abortive report rather than one which, as I suggested when I tabled it, is a constructive report.

I am going to make this final plea to the members of the Opposition that they vote against their own amendment. They have set that precedent already in this House, so they can continue. In the interest of agriculture as a whole, they should vote against their own amendment, and they should support this report which is presently before the House, because, as I suggested in my opening remarks, I feel that it is not only in the best interests of the agricultural industry, but it is in the interest of Saskatchewan economy that we present a united front on this question of marketing and of farm income; a united front not only as far as this Legislature is concerned, but a united front as far as we and the farm organizations in this province are concerned. By voting for the amendment they will certainly do nothing to further the cause of agriculture, and will run the great risk of endangering any progress that might be made at such a Conference when it is called.

Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I am going to start my talk, this evening, by going back to the statement which my seatmate mentioned in regard to selling wheat for sterling. I was looking through this and my eyes fell on an item here. On December 14, 1955, Mr. Gordon Baldwin told the convention of the Saskatchewan Farmers Union “That Britain would not buy a bushel more wheat if Canada accepted payment in sterling.” Mr. Baldwin is the United Kingdom senior Trade Commissioner in Canada, and if anyone ought to know the official British policy in this matter it is he.

I have in my files, Mr. Speaker, and I can say without any fear of contradiction because, given time, I can produce every word of it, that during the Labour Government’s term of office there were at least two Ministers who expressed the same view.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, one British Labour Minister, right in this city, said that they were prepared to accept sterling.

Mr. Danielson: — Who was he?

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Harold Wilson, then President of the Board of Trade.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, others said they wouldn't, so that ends that. You say one thing and I say the other.

Premier Douglas: — It isn't important what you or I say. It is important what Mr. Wilson said, He was the man in charge at the time.

Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Was he speaking for the Government?

Premier Douglas: — Certainly, he was speaking for the Government. He was President of the Board of Trade, which is what they call their Minister of Trade and Commerce — the Rt. Hon. Harold Wilson.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, you bring that quotation in here and then we can decide.

Premier Douglas: — You haven't got a quotation; you are just using your imagination.

Mr. Danielson: — Unless you do that, Mr. Minister, I am not going to accept your statement.

Premier Douglas: — You just have an imagination, and that is badly discoloured.

Mr. Danielson: — I want to say to you, now, until you bring your statement in here and quote it to me like I have done, I am not going to accept your statement.

Premier Douglas: — You haven't got any statement. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has not brought in any statement quoting the British Labour Government. He brought in a statement quoting the British Trade Commissioner. I heard him make the speech in Saskatoon, but he was not speaking for the British Labour Government. The British Labour Government was not in office when he made that speech.

Mr. McDonald: — There is no such thing as a British Labour Government.

Premier Douglas: — There was.

Mr. Danielson: — He did admit . . .

Mr. Cameron: — You are going to sell wheat to a Conservative Government, not a Labour Government.

Mr. Danielson: — You do admit that Mr. Baldwin was acting for the British Government?

Premier Douglas: — Of course.

Mr. Danielson: — That is all right, then, that is all I wanted to find out. I could not help but notice, Mr. Speaker, the look of the crowd on the other side of the House when something was said here in regard to the fact that we asked, in this amendment, that the first 1,000 bushels

April 4, 1956

that a farmer produces should be priced at \$2.00 a bushel. There is nothing that could be done that would benefit the small farmers, today, and give them an opportunity to operate and carry on and take care of his family, more than that. My giggling friends over there can laugh all they like – that is their mentality, anyhow.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Yeah! Look at the record!

Mr. Danielson: — And I am going to tell this to the supporters of the C.C.F. “farmers’ friend” Government over there, and that is that this same crowd over here have proved that they are advocating, today, that these small farmers, hanging on on a quarter or half-section farm – (and there are 69 per cent of them in that category in this province); they are advocating that these small farmers should pay storage for the big producers on their wheat; that that should be taken out of the small farmers’ earning so that these fellows with 50,000, 70,000 or 100,000 bushels in their bins do not have to pay it alone. That is your policy, and you are the farmers’ friends, of course. You are the fellows who profess to help the poor man . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — They got rich all of a sudden.

Mr. Danielson: — When I hear the gleeful and joking expressions that have come forth on the floor of this House, I cannot help but think, Mr. Speaker, that I have not heard a small farmer yet who would not be well satisfied if he got \$2.00 a bushel for the first 1,000 bushels he produces. I talked to a man, a few days ago, who knows something about the grain business, who says there is no scheme that could be handled in a simpler way, with less expense, because everybody, even the fellow with 100,000 bushels would get \$2.00 for the first 1,000 bushels he brought in.

I just want to say a few words in regard to these things because, after all, there is another side to anything, Mr. Speaker. If there has ever been a group of men who were in distress and are trying to get something to dramatize and cover up and take attention away from their own failings, during this last four months of the farmers’ difficulties in the province of Saskatchewan, it is the group opposite us; and that is why this Committee was appointed, Mr. Speaker – merely to dramatize and cover up for their own inaction, and to justify their friends in Ottawa, because that was a boomerang right back in their faces. This is purely political distress, and the Committee was set up to save the life of this political aggregation in the province of Saskatchewan.

Premier Douglas: — This is the third time you’ve made that speech.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Danielson: — That is all it is. You can go out to the farmers, today, and they will say the same thing, and I will tell you why. There are very few farmers in Saskatchewan who have not, weeks ago, gone to the banks to ask for a guaranteed government loan. There are so few that it doesn’t amount to anything.

Mr. E.H. Walker (Gravelbourg): — Too prosperous?

Mr. Danielson: — Oh, I know something about it. I have the statistics for 55 years.

Hon. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — What about that poor little farmer you were talking about?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Danielson: — If this group over there could keep quiet, I might be able to tell them a few things.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! All hon. gentlemen will have an opportunity to reply to anything the hon. member says.

Mr. Danielson: — That is just the way they acted in Committee.

Mr. McDonald: — Only worse.

Mr. Danielson: — We couldn't get a word in. Some of them stood up and howled when we walked out. They did, and that doesn't mean maybe; it was true.

There was Marler. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, in the Committee I pointed out to the Chairman – and I have no quarrel with the Chairman. He did a good job handling that Committee, but the last few nights the radicals, the extreme left-wingers in that group, got out of his control completely, and even the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) came in to that Committee the second night – and I admired him because he got up and said he thought it was worthwhile looking at some of these things we proposed. But there was the group sitting back of him who had made up their minds there wasn't any use listening to anything we had to say at all, and so the whole thing was taken out of the hands of the Minister and the Chairman, and a few extreme radicals – they are all radicals – but these were extreme . . .

Premier Douglas: — There isn't much . . .

Mr. Danielson: — You weren't there; you wouldn't be in with the extreme force, anyway.

Premier Douglas: — You would make a Tory look like a leftist.

Mr. Danielson: — That's right. There are a lot of good Tories in this province, and more of them than C.C.F., and they have nothing to be ashamed of either.

Premier Douglas: — Nobody said they had.

Mr. Danielson: — They have nothing to be ashamed of.

Mr. Kramer (The Battlefords): — But you don't belong to them!

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

April 4, 1956

Mr. Danielson: — They came here and built this country up with many of us fellows, and we did not know what a C.C.F.'er was at that time. If they had come here 55 years ago we would not have any province for the simple reason that these fellows cannot live without calling on the Federal Government, calling on them for everything in the world that they need. We didn't know what a Government was; we didn't have . . .

Premier Douglas: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Premier Douglas: — He hit the jackpot that time!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Will the hon. member kindly confine himself to the amendment.

Mr. Danielson: — My friend over here, the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. J.T. Douglas), I am surprised at him. I came here in 1904 and there was no such thing as Saskatchewan when I came; it was the North-West Territories; we were only part of the North-West Territories, and you, Mr. Speaker, probably were one of the early pioneers of this province, too, and you will know what I said just now that occasioned such hilarity over there is only the bare truth. We lived through this thing, and when the settlers that settled your district, Mr. Speaker, came anywhere from 40 to 60 miles north of Long Lake and then east of the lake about 200 miles to get to their homestead, I wonder how many of these fellows who are always calling on the government for everything could ever have done that.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask what this has to do with the amendment?

Mr. Speaker: — Might I ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the amendment.

Mr. Danielson: — I have done it myself. When you listen to the talk that has gone on here all afternoon and tonight, too, I am not the only one who gets off the topic that we are supposed to be discussing.

Premier Douglas: — We have only had one speaker, and he confined himself to the amendment.

Mr. Danielson: — When I pointed out to the Chairman of the Committee that there was evidence produced before the Committee by witnesses who came here to give us their assistance, and that the report, as set out here, absolutely contradicts that evidence; it doesn't take any notice of the evidence, and absolutely contradicts some of the evidence that was given by very prominent witnesses.

Mr. E.H. Walker (Gravelbourg): — Unreliable ones.

Mr. Danielson: — The answer of the Chairman to myself, the first night in camera was this. He said, "We don't have to take any cognizance of it if we don't want to."

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I made no such statement.

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, you did.

Premier Douglas: — Your imagination is running away with you again.

Mr. Danielson: — Oh, no.

Mr. McDonald: — You weren't there, Mr. Premier.

Mr. Danielson: — Oh, no, my imagination is a little bit too much for you.

Premier Douglas: — I'll tell the world it is; it's too much for all of us.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Danielson: — After all, Mr. Speaker, I am going to read you what Mr. Milner said, and if this isn't a clear-cut statement of fact, setting out very clearly conditions as they exist that no person or no government or no Wheat Board could be responsible for, I don't know what facts are. He said this:

"I have stated that the eastern movement originates at the Lakehead. I would like to examine with you the space situation at the terminals at the Lakehead throughout the summer months, and until the close of navigation. There were in storage from 60 to 64 million bushels of grain right up until November 7, and from November 7th to November 24th, an average of a little better than 56 million bushels in storage throughout that period. It would have been foolish, and a deterrent to export business, to have put any more grain in storage during that period. There were sales for malting and feed grades of barley, for Durum wheat and for flax, and space had to be kept to handle these grains for export.

"On November 7th there were on track awaiting unloading, 3,737 cars of grain. On November 24th there were still 2,419 cars of grain on track awaiting unloading, and in that period, November 7th to November 24th, we shipped out of the Lakehead 22 million bushels of grain. Between November 24th and the close of navigation on December 15th, there were shipped from the Lakehead 34 million bushels, and stocks were down to a low of 33,300,000 bushels. It is both desirable and necessary to have the stocks at the Lakehead low at the close of navigation. It is necessary because the Canada Grain Act requires that terminal elevators be weight over. It is desirable because it provides an opportunity for the Canadian Wheat Board to move into forward positions those grades and grains which they think will be in demand for export, and to reorganize their shipping programme accordingly.

April 4, 1956

“At the close of navigation, all elevator space east of Fort William and Port Arthur was full, with the exception of a small lot in one transfer house that was less than one-half million bushels, and that was just bad guessing on the part of the operator. The situation east of the Lakehead to close of navigation was that we had taken advantage of everything – of every possible place to put grain that could possibly be put. The terminals were full and lake vessels were full, so nothing more could have been shipped.

“The terminal stocks have gradually increased at the Lakehead, and this spring more than 67 million bushels of grain is in store at the Lakehead.

“Now, gentlemen, I have said, and I think some of you will probably ask some questions about it; I have told you that it is not good business, and it would be deterrent to export, had we had more grain in the terminal elevators in the month of November, and I cannot stress that point too strongly. We had cars on track that we simply could not get unloaded. We had to mobilize transportation to a great extent, and we had to go around the cars that were on track at the Lakehead, with new arrivals, because the new arrivals carried the type and quantity and quality of grain that was required to meet export commitments of the Wheat Board and other exporters. So, when you get to the point where in your elevator operations, it is simply folly and would be a deterrent to export, either in new business, or the completion of old business, to have any more grain in the terminal.”

I could go on and read the statements of this man, who, I think, has a high reputation. He has been a grain man and has operated elevators in the early days, and he certainly isn't out trying to get any glorification or make anything else out of himself except to be of service to the people and look after the interests of the producers; and that interest, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you, is the best interest of the farmers of western Canada.

Hon. J.T. Douglas (Minister of Highways): — He admired Mr. Howe, didn't he?

Mr. Danielson: — Yes.

Mr. R. Walker (Hanley): — A political appointee!

Mr. Danielson: — I said, a few moments ago, that this Committee was appointed for political purposes, and nothing else than political purposes.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Find that in the evidence.

Mr. Danielson: — You had a Commission set up by this Government, and I think they were a good group of men, at least they were local, mostly, and the people who worked on that Royal Commission on Rural Life were people who had lived in the province and were interested in the various organizations and should know the economic problems that face the people of this province. I have no complaint about any of them. They went out among the farmers. I sat up in the library in the city of Regina here for a whole day, and I sat at four tables, at least, among the small groups that were having discussions there, and I met some Government employees there, among other people, and I think the experience and the attempt was worthwhile. Many practical things were brought out in those discussions; and there were many ideas put forth that proved valuable to the Commission. But, after all, you spent between \$300,000 and \$400,000 on that Commission. They have done good work; they have put down their findings in their reports which have been presented to the people of the province. I think there are some more to come, and if these men, with the training and experience, and with information obtained from witnesses they could call on, have not been able to find out and give us a clear-cut and sound unbiased opinion of the agricultural problems facing the people of the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, then how do you expect that you can get it out of a partisan political committee like we had in this House?

I am not going to put that all on one side. You have been in public life, Mr. Speaker, long enough to know that you are not going to sit down and take the guff and ridicule of any political group. You have too much pride in yourself; you would stand up and fight — and so did we, and we make no apologies to anyone for it. I say that any man who had any respect for himself and the party he represents in this House would not have taken any more than we took from this group over here.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — What did you walk out for, then?

Mr. Danielson: — And those are the facts, Mr. Speaker. We walked out on them, and I think that was the proper thing to do. We might have sat in there for another night or two and the results would have been exactly the same. That report could have been written before this Committee ever sat, for all that is in it. Every word of it could have been put down, because it is nothing more than a political document to back up the attitude and agitation that has been carried on by the C.C.F. party in this province since early summer.

I have something here which indicates that a long time before this Committee was set up or started to work, they knew what the result would be. And I quote:

“Government sources indicated Thursday that Agriculture Minister I.C. Nollet is strongly advocating such a committee as a means of providing the cabinet with ammunition in case Prime Minister St. Laurent agrees to a reopening of talks on the proposed Federal-Provincial tax rental agreements.

“Mr. Nollet is known to be incensed by recent comments by Roy Marler, Edmonton, President of the Alberta

April 4, 1956

Federation of Agriculture. Mr. Marler has said on numerous occasions that the financial position of the western farmers actually isn't too bad at all.

“Mr. Nollet is believed supporting the principle of a Select Committee so that material can be obtained to counter the effect of statements such a those made by Mr. Marler.”

This wasn't any news to us when this thing came up on the floor of the House, when the necessary steps were taken to set up this Committee. We knew what we were up against, and what it was for; and I am saying to you, right now, that was the sole reason for appointing this Committee. There is some good in that report, and I say this – maybe from the point of view of getting proper information to members of the House and people of the province, the matter of getting this evidence was well worthwhile. Listening to these men and asking them a few simple questions certainly benefited me, and I think the same can be said of every member in this House. So the time was not altogether wasted, since it was of benefit in that way. But I am not going to support a report, Mr. Speaker, that so widely varies with the submission of evidence given before that Committee. People who were not biased (I don't know what their political leanings were) came and answered the questions that were asked of them. As a matter of fact, the Saskatchewan Rural Municipal Association said right on the front page of their Brief, that this wheat question and the question of cash advances were nothing more than a political football. It has been brought about by the distress in the ranks of the C.C.F., and it all shows up in this report. Well, I did not come down to this Session for the purpose of helping the C.C.F. out, and I am sure I am not going to help them out. We have suggested certain changes – maybe not what everybody thinks they should be; but they are things, perhaps, for the better. But I am not going to support a report that is absolutely negative of the evidence that was given before that Committee.

Let me tell you another thing, Mr. Speaker. Many of the witnesses who appeared before the Committee, and submitted their Briefs – the counsel made a wonderful job of handling them and bringing out the points which were not too clear in their Briefs; but, after that, the witnesses were at the disposal of the Committee and we all asked questions, and invariably, the first time we heard anything about cash advances or farm storage was from some of the members across the way asking questions about it. I remember one fellow who didn't want to answer any questions directly, saying, “of course the farmer is lots happier if he has money in his pocket.” That is the way he put it. But as far as the Briefs were concerned – maybe not all of them, but at least 80 per cent of them were at variance with the findings of this Committee.

I do not want to take up all the time of this House, but we come to parity prices, Mr. Speaker. The Chairman of the Committee, when he made his contribution to the debate here this evening – and it is surprising to me that we shut our eyes to, and refused to see or learn anything from, what happened in countries where they have tried this system out, where they have tried it out for many years. We can go back in history and find that this system was tried even a hundred years ago.

Mr. Loptson: — In 1777.

Mr. Danielson: — That is right. We have information on that here. But there is one thing I want to point out, Mr. Speaker. It has been tried and was tried on a most extensive scale in one country in the world where they have a population of 170 million people, I think, today, one of the wealthiest countries in the world where they consume, insofar as grain is concerned, about 80 per cent or more of all the grain they produce in that country. They have engaged in the luxury of experimenting with or operating this sort of a system, and the result is not so very happy after all. In the last issue of “The Reader’s Digest’ there is an article I want to quote from. The article is written by John Strohm, and is headed: “THE FANTASTIC U.S. FARM MESS” –

“In a costly but futile attempt to support farm prices near the levels guaranteed to farmers during World War II, the United States Government has succeeded only in amassing an eight-billion-dollar hoard of food and fibre which can’t be eaten, used, sold, or given away. And as surpluses have skyrocketed, farm prices have tobogganed. It’s a grim example of what government can do to people while trying to do something for them.

“This vast hoard of wheat, corn, beans, tobacco, peanuts, butter and some two dozen other products comes to one million dollars of taxpayers’ money per day.”

I am not going to read it all, but here is a paragraph that I think is very significant:

“There are many false ideas about the farm programme-slogans repeated so often that they are accepted as economic truths, as well as political gospel . . .”

And I want to say to some of the members across the floor of the House that that could well apply to them, because slogans are a cheap thing, Mr. Speaker, and if you repeat them often enough sometimes some people will accept them as being facts and economic truths.

“ . . . Here are some which have helped spawn much of this unwise farm legislation:

“Farm price laws rescued American farmers from the depression. False! Farm prices did not start moving up until 1940, when war and inflation caused all prices to go up. Farm prices averaged only 78 per cent of parity in 1939, six years after law-makers had thrown every law and panacea in the book at the farm problem.

“The farm problem can be cured by a simple farm law. False! What does a New York dairyman

April 4, 1956

have in common with a Florida citrus-grower?

“Farm legislation . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. member what he is quoting from?

Mr. Danielson: — I gave you that. It is ‘The Reader’s Digest’ of April, 1956. Mr. Speaker, there isn’t a word in this article that has not been taken from the records of the United States Government.

Mr. E.H. Walker (Gravelbourg): — It’s sure twisted around, though.

Mr. Danielson: — I will continue quoting from this article:

“Farm legislation has been geared to the past. Eating habits have changed. Far fewer starchy foods, far more meat, eggs, dairy products, fruits and vegetables are eaten today. For example, wheat consumption per capita has dropped from 310 pounds per year to 173 pounds, in the last 45 years. Yet the farm programme encourages raising wheat – to sell to the government.

“Control threatens loss of traditional freedoms. Here is an actual timetable of how controls breed controls. In 1953 the government said, ‘We’ll pay you \$2.21 per bushel for wheat.’ The farmer responded by planting more wheat.

“In 1954, the government had so much wheat it was forced to say: ‘We’ll continue to pay you 90 per cent of parity, which by now came to \$2.24, but we must cut your acreage.’ So the farmer fertilized heavily and grew as much wheat on, say 60 acres as he had on 80.

“The government wheat-pile grew and grew. So the government was forced to level its sights on all farmers who had been exceeding their acreage allotments: “We’ll have to fine you \$1.12 a bushel on all wheat produced on acres above your quota.’

“In 1955, the government cut the price from \$2.24 to \$2.08, and this year it proposed to go even further – to cut the price to \$1.81, and to pay the farmer so much per acre for not growing wheat.

“In the meantime, the government has been forced to arrest or sue more than 1,500 farmers who grew wheat on their own farms in excess of their quotas, even though they fed it to their livestock.

“Big government has gotten bigger. Six years ago, I went into rich De Kalb County, Illinois, and

counted 180 full- or part-time government employees getting federal tax money to do some job for the farmers. That was just one of the 3,000 counties in the United States.

“Today, far more bureaucratic manpower is needed. There is more land to measure; there are more loans to process, more bins to inspect, more records to keep, more violators to prosecute.

“There is inevitable graft, waste, corruption and inefficiency. Five men rented 100 surplus army buildings from the government at Camp Crowder, Mo., for \$1,000 a month. They then rented the space to the government for \$19,000 a month – to store government-owned grain.”

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — That sounds like the Alberta government.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Danielson: — Some of the experience in Saskatchewan . . .

Mr. Loptson: — That is the system you want here.

Mr. Danielson: — The article continues:

“There is inevitable spoilage; weevils in the grain, cheese that’s going stale, rats in the granaries.

“The government’s attempts to support potato prices resulted in 470 million dollars of taxpayers’ money going down the drain, and deliberate destruction of millions of bushels of potatoes.

“No wonder Vice-President Nixon has soberly warned: ‘For the administration or for Congress to support continuance of a programme which will pile up surpluses and result inevitably in the destruction of millions of dollars’ worth of foods would be the height of irresponsibility.’”

“If the farm programme was that bad, who was it for?”

Mr. Speaker, I could go ahead and read more of this, but I am just showing you. And again I want to repeat that every word of this is recorded history in the United States government.

Mr. Wahl (Qu’Appelle-Wolseley): — There is another interesting article on page two.

Mr. Danielson: — Now then, Mr. Speaker, how in the world do we expect Canada, with a population of between 16 and 17 million

April 4, 1956

people . . .

Mr. Wahl: — What about Australia?

Mr. Danielson: — Well, if you go as far as Australia goes, you would have to back up. You would have to back up and not go forward.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, we eat 20 per cent of our wheat and we export 80 per cent of it. I can see no possible prospect of the people of Canada, even if they wanted to, supporting a price and that 200,000 wheat growers in western Canada would be able to produce all they wanted to produce, and get that fixed price. The result would be chaos, and there is no doubt but what that would be the result. But the first result would be this – and I mentioned it in the Committee. I think the witness before the Committee was Brown, and I suggested if that could happen here, and I asked, “Don’t you think that if a subsidy was paid by the Government for wheat production that they would have to control acreage and control production?” He said “definitely, because they had to do it in France.” And he mentioned another country, and I think Great Britain as well. Well, none of us want that. If I mention that to my friends on the other side they think I am just talking, that I should be shot or something, because they don’t want to listen to that, and neither do I. I think the farmer is resourceful enough in his occupation; there are many things you can do on the farm besides raising wheat, and I have never seen a farmer yet who wouldn’t, if he had the opportunity to dispose of or sell his produce on the markets of the world. He may run into a tight squeeze for a year or a year and a half; he may have a hard time when rain comes too often, or when we don’t get any rain at all, as happened for seven or eight years during the ‘thirties, and even then the farmer pretty well stood on his own feet. But to subsidize the farmers to produce articles that are not needed, I think that is the height of ridiculousness, because it is disastrous, and the person who would suffer most would be the farmer himself. The one who is going to suffer the most would be the producer himself in a policy of that kind.

Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the amendment, and I am not going to support the report.

Mr. Peter A. Howe (Kelvington): — Mr. Speaker, before we leave it go too long after the member for Arm River has spoken, I want to say a few words. When he started to speak, he spoke in glowing terms of, and sympathy for, the small farmer in support of their amendment on page 159 . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, he is not going to misquote me. I pointed out that they were the men who were talking about helping the small farmer – the “farmers’ friends.”

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Danielson: — I am one of the small ones myself.

Mr. Howe: — I think I can bear it out by the amendment itself.

Mr. Danielson: — That's all right.

Mr. Howe: — You are referring to the amendment that was made providing for a payment of \$2.00 a bushel for the first thousand bushels, and he spoke in glowing terms of their sympathy for the small farmer. I think I am correct in that. Well, it reminded me, Mr. Speaker, of the stand that the hon. member for Arm River took a few years ago on a similar issue, and we have him on record here — referring back to the journals of 1941. The Premier at that time asked to adjourn the House for the purpose of discussing a subject of very important matter to the people of Saskatchewan, and the matter was one dealing with the question of the price of wheat. The Government introduced a resolution that is divided up into six parts. The first one deals with an initial payment of 85 cents a bushel for wheat. The next one deals with 50 cents to be levied on each bushel for processing (that is to be paid to the farmer), and so on down the line. However, we were on the Opposition at that time, and Mr. Brockelbank moved an amendment that the words “not less than” be inserted after the word “at” where it appears in clause (1), and that the words “provided that the first one-thousand bushels marketed by each farmer be paid for at a price of \$1.25 a bushel, basis No. 1 Fort William,” be added at the end of clause (1). The debate continued and finally there was a vote taken. I notice here Mr. Brockelbank voted for the amendment, and myself and you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, I think I should be entitled to ask . . .

Mr. Howe: — Now, we were trying, Mr. Speaker, to . . .

Mr. Danielson: — . . . what year that was.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The year was 1941.

Mr. Speaker: — What is your point of order?

Mr. Danielson: — My point is that every time I say anything I have to prove where I get it from. Now, I want him to tell us what year that was.

Mr. Howe: — The year 1941.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! The hon. member evidently did not hear, would you quote it again?

Mr. Howe: — That was negatived, Mr. Speaker . . .

Premier Douglas: — “Oh! Memories that bless and burn.”

Mr. Howe: — . . . and the only member on the Opposition side now that I can find that remains is the member for Arm River, and he very prominently voted against it.

Then we go on further and made another amendment that the following words be added to clause (2): “on the first 1,000 bushels he

April 4, 1956

markets (at least we go that far) in giving the small farmer 85 cents a bushel on the first 1,000 bushels," but no, they voted against that too, Mr. Speaker. And I find again Mr. Danielson's name on the list. Well, now, the amendment that has been proposed wouldn't have been too bad to suggest that we give the farmers \$2.00 a bushel for the first 1,000 bushels, but then they spoiled it afterwards by suggesting that the balance of the wheat be sold at the market price, and that whatever accumulates into that pool be turned over then to these farmers who delivered the first 1,000 bushels to make it up to \$2.00, and he is subsidizing himself.

Mr. Danielson: — That is what we are getting now!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I just want to make an announcement here. I warned, when this amendment was first brought in, Mr. Nollet, Mr. McDonald and Mr. Brockelbank, who more or less engaged in a cross-fire, I am going to consider that as having exhausted their right to speak on this motion, because I don't know whether you are speaking on the motion or you are just having a conversation among yourselves. So those who have spoken on the motion at the present time are Messrs. Loptson, A. Brown, Danielson, and Carr . . .

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, I just spoke on the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: — I am talking about the amendment.

Mr. J.W. Horsman (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, I was a little surprised when this Committee was appointed in the first place. The reason was that we just had a Commission that had worked along practically the same line, travelled all over Saskatchewan, headed by a very eminent gentleman, and I may say, composed of a group of very eminent people who certainly should have known how to conduct the inquiry that they went out to do. That, of course, was the Baker Commission; and in their report they had one edition – one whole book, in fact – on marketing and farm income, and now it has been found necessary to appoint this other Committee. Apparently the Baker Commission, according to the Government of Saskatchewan, did not do a very thorough job, and it was found necessary to appoint a parliamentary committee composed of members of this House to go further into the matter.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I cannot allow any reflection to go out on the Royal Commission. I explained, when the debate on the Speech from the Throne took place, why we were appointing the Select Committee, and I made it abundantly clear that we had the highest regard for the so-called "Baker Commission," and I think it is unfair of my friend to suggest there is any reflection cast upon that Commission.

Mr. Horsman: — The fact remains this other Committee was appointed to cover practically the same ground.

Premier Douglas: — And I explained to the House why it was appointed. If my hon. friend wasn't here, or didn't understand . . .

Mr. Horsman: — I just understood you to say the Committee was appointed.

Premier Douglas: — Yes, and I explained why.

Mr. Horsman: — I don't have to explain why . . .

Premier Douglas: — I said I explained why.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Horsman: — Anyway, such was the case. I do not say that there wasn't any good came out of the parliamentary Committee that we had. I think that some of the recommendations were good. I think we got a lot of information. Included in the information, of course, Mr. Baker appeared before the Committee himself. But while there are many good things in this report, there are some things that I do not agree with, and the members on this side do not agree with them all either, and that is the reason that we moved this amendment.

They talk about agricultural prices on farm products other than grain being very low. I believe that all the farm prices are too low. I am a farmer myself, and I have never done anything else all my life except farm, and I believe to some extent that is true; but still when you take the price of beef, for instance, we say it's a thing here every day that we have lost all our export markets for beef. Argentine beef, dressed beef, on the market of Britain a year or two ago was selling for less money than it was here in Canada. Our prices for meat here have been higher for the last year or two, almost all the time, than they were in the United States. I think right now that the United States price is a cent or two above ours, but there is very little difference, and it is the highest price of any market that I know of, right here in Canada. For that reason, I think that that report has over-exaggerated some of these things that we are talking about.

Another thing that was said in that report was that municipal taxes, and I know there is going to be some repetition if we go on in this debate, because there are just certain important factors that you will hear mentioned; municipal taxes are not a factor in the price-squeeze. When municipal taxes increased two or three times – at least they are three times higher than they used to be – I think they do become a factor. They are maybe not a great factor in themselves, but you will find that farm expenses, if you are a farmer, are a combination of small things – not the big things, but the small things – and municipal taxes certainly are a factor in the cost of running a farm today.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the report did not say that the taxes were not a factor, it said “not a significant factor,” which means . . .

Mr. Horsman: — If they were not a factor, why would arrears be piling up? Some of them say that that is because we are not selling our wheat. Sure 1954 was a poor crop; but taxes have been piling up before that. In the last three or four or five years, the arrears of taxes have been increasing daily in the municipalities. And if you want them to pay taxes, the easiest way to have it done is to make the taxes just as easy to pay as you can.

April 4, 1956

I think you will find that this thing of wheat delivery is a thing that is going to fix itself up. I think it has right now. We have now in the elevators in Saskatchewan room for about 40 or 50 million bushels of wheat; that is at the present time. I think that is correct. I think you will find that, as the roads clear up, you won't hear very much more about wheat deliveries, because everyone will be able to deliver pretty near all the wheat they want.

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — Is that a promise?

Mr. Horsman: — It is also stated in that report that the effect of the U.S. crop support has been greatly exaggerated, their effect on our farm prices and our marketing. I think that it has had a great effect on our prices. If wheat is sold, or is given away, on the terms that the Americans were doing, it is bound to affect the price any other exporting countries. A country like Canada cannot afford to do those things, as has been pointed out here tonight by the hon. member for Arm River very plainly, so that anybody should be able to understand that you cannot expect a country of 16 million people to do the things a country of 160 or 170 million people can do. That should be quite evident. They consume about 80 per cent of their wheat, and export about 20 per cent. That is a terrific difference. Another thing – and the Americans are finding it out, and it has been pointed out here tonight, too, if you are going to set up price supports under agricultural products at a fairly high level, you will find that in a year or two you must control production. There is no other way out of it. Farmers would grow every bushel of wheat they can grow, if they are sure they would get a good price for it, and you will find that something will have to be done.

A good deal has been said about farm storage, payments for grain stored on the farms. No one would like to see that done very much more than I would. I would like to sit down and get \$300 a month for grain stored on my farm. It would be very handy to get a cent a bushel a month for the grain we have out there. I have a neighbour who lives not very far from me, who, if that had been enforced this winter, would have been pulling down \$1,000 every month on farm-stored grain.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Nobody suggested that.

Mr. Horsman: — It would have been a nice income. But what about the farmers who have no grain, or have very little? I am not concerned too much about the farmers who have a lot of good grain on their farms, because I see the situation clearing itself up now. We are getting orders every day from overseas countries to whom we have never sold wheat before, and I think that, by the time the roads dry up, the situation will have eased off, and we will hear no more about wheat. But for the farmers who have no grain, price support or cash advances or anything else will have been of no good at all, no good whatever.

There is another question of domestic parity for wheat. That has been mentioned, too, but I would like to mention it again, as it is one of the things that we struck out in our amendment. I often thought that domestic parity would be all right and pretty fair too; but when you come to consider this, it works out just the same as the farm storage

does. You get \$2.05 a bushel for the grain that is consumed in Canada, and that is divided up 120,000 ways among 120,000 farmers according to the bushels of wheat that they have, and the farmer with 100,000 bushels of wheat could hold this increase in the price by 5 cents a bushel. He would get 5 cents a bushel on 100,000 bushels or 20,000 bushels, or whatever he may have . . .

Premier Douglas: — That is not what the report recommends.

Mr. Horsman: — That is what the report states.

Premier Douglas: — No, it doesn't. That is exactly what it doesn't recommend. It recommends that it be given on the quota in the first delivery.

Mr. Horsman: — But suppose you have nothing to deliver on the first quota!

Premier Douglas: — Then you can't get anything if you have nothing to deliver, of course. If you will look at the top of page 60 you will see that.

Mr. Horsman: — But I think that if we pay the farmers \$2.00 for the first 1,000 bushels of wheat delivered, that would help everyone. That would help the man with only a small amount of wheat.

Mr. Wahl (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Why don't they do it?

Mr. Horsman: — If he could get \$2,000 for 1,000 bushels of wheat, he could carry on for a year, and it would just help the big farmers on their first 1,000 bushels. He would have to take his chances on the rest and take the best price he could get.

Mr. Speaker: — Might I point out to the hon. member that it is getting quite close to adjournment time. If he could reach some point at which he would like to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Horsman: — Mr. Speaker, I will only speak about another minute, and then I will let you go.

I think, too, that there are occasions when emergencies arise in a province like Saskatchewan where the Provincial Government could do more to help. I think they could guarantee loans, too, that might in some way help the farmers; but all they want to do is put everything on the Federal Government. The Federal Government do this, the Federal Government do that, while they sit down and all they do is holler about the conditions. I think that this adversity is pretty well cleared up now, as far as wheat is concerned.

Another thing that we recommend is that payments under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act should be substantially increased, and that also would help the people who have a poor crop, or who have little or no wheat. When you talk about parity for farmers, the variation in the crop is what makes the most difference to the farmer. Last year, we had No. 1 Northern wheat that turned out at 40 bushels to the acre. We can grow wheat pretty cheaply when we can get 40 bushels to the acre; but you go

April 4, 1956

into some other district, where for years and years the farmers have got five or six or ten bushels to the acre, then you need about three times the price in order to make any money.

There are so many angles to this thing, Mr. Speaker, that it is something that has to be very carefully considered from every angle. If you are going to set all the farmers up so that they are all going to be independent, there will have to be some good substantial system of crop insurance, or something to back up prices.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, I assume that we are not going to deal with the entire part of it tonight, I don't want to go on with the debate, but if the discussion is going to go on for another day I would certainly appreciate the opportunity of speaking to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: — You have the opportunity of adjourning the debate.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Cameron: — Just a moment, Mr. Speaker, might I ask that we have the question put to have a vote on the amendment, not the main motion; the main motion can be left open if the Minister wishes to speak on it.

Mr. Speaker: — It is past adjournment time, if the hon. member wishes to adjourn the debate, it is up to the House to decide. Has the hon. member leave to adjourn the debate?

Premier Douglas: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I think we should get some understanding on what the position is. We were told that the Opposition had three speakers and that, therefore, they wanted to continue the debate, and we were, therefore, going to have to adjourn. If there are no more speakers from the Opposition and there are no members here who are particularly anxious to speak, we can take the vote now on both of them. I think the Minister of Agriculture has taken the position that was based on the continuation of the main motion, then he will speak on the amendment. If they would express their opinions as to what the Opposition want to do on the matter . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Mr. Premier, as far as continuing the debate, that is within the hands of the Chamber itself. I do not know of any arrangement.

Mr. McDonald: — If it is the feeling of the House that they would like to vote on both the amendment and the main motion tonight, I don't think there would be any objection to that.

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

(Debate adjourned)

The Assembly adjourned at 10.00 o'clock p.m.