

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session – Twelfth Legislature
40th Day

Thursday, April 5, 1956.

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

On the Orders of the Day.

REPORT ON RETURNS ORDERED

Hon. Mr. Burton (Provincial Secretary): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to report on the Returns ordered, this Session. To date 73 Motions for Return have been passed. This is considerably higher than the average for any one session, and exceeds by 16 the Returns requested in the session of 1952.

Of the 73 Returns ordered this session, 55 have been tabled; and half of those not answered were ordered since March 20th. May I take the liberty of pointing out that some of the Returns requested necessitated the searching of records in various departments from 1932 to 1955, and many of them required similar information from records for the past 10 or 12 years. May I also remind the hon. members that many of their requests for information are similar in nature, but worded in such a way as to cause a duplication of the search. I want to assure all hon. members that every effort has been made to supply them with all possible information which could be obtained in such a short period of time as is at our disposal; and I wish publicly to express my appreciation to the officials of my staff and all other departments for their co-operation in this work.

Mr. Lopton (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to draw to the attention of the House that, yesterday, I remarked that I had four or five Motions for Return for which I had not got the Returns. I have checked up these Motions and there are six in all, and the four or five that I mentioned did not include the one which the Premier made such a fuss about. I realize that that Return cannot be obtained in a hurry, but I submit that all the others could have been delivered here.

I will give you the information: On February 28th, Insurance Premium – on page 4; then, another one concerning the Guarantee and Fidelity Company, on page 4, March 15th. Blacktopping reconditions, brought in on March 20th. There was nothing to that to speak of, and if they had wanted to go after it they could have got that information. Then I asked for the cost of the University hospital at Saskatoon; that could have been answered very simply.

Highway Expenditure – on March 28. Now you may think that that was an intricate question, but I could have divided that question into six different questions and they could all have been answered within 48 hours. They were not political questions. I wanted the information to show my people that the Minister of Highways was dealing fairly with us in our constituency in respect to maintenance and repairs, in 1955. I did not want

April 5, 1956

that information in order to criticize him. If he doesn't want to give me that information it is quite all right with me; but I am satisfied that he did a good job, last year, as far as maintaining our highways is concerned, and I wanted that information in order to show that we were getting our fair share in the Saltcoats constituency.

Now that is the explanation of these Returns, and with the exception of the last one there is absolutely no reason why they could not have been answered, as a question, in this House. I may add, Mr. Speaker, that in the session of 1952, if you take a list of the number of Returns that died on the Order Paper it would indicate very well what I put on the Order Paper as early as the first week of the session. I have the pages here showing when they were asked. Some of them were asked on February 9th and they were all very simple questions converted into Returns for no other reason than that the Government did not want to provide the information.

Mr. Speaker: — Might I point out to the hon. member that you have made rather a serious charge against the members of this Government. I think you should withdraw that remark.

Mr. Loptson: — I didn't hear you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — I say I think you have made rather a serious charge against the Government. You have made what is equivalent to a direct charge that they were deliberately withholding information.

Mr. Loptson: — In 1952, there was no question about it, because some of the Returns asked for were very simple.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member has heard the explanation. He may not be satisfied with it; but I do think it is out of order entirely that you should be allowed to make a deliberate charge of deliberate withholding of information, and that is what you have done. I would ask that you withdraw it.

Mr. Loptson: — There was every indication of that, Mr. Speaker, in 1952.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to submit that the hon. member is not competent to say whether or not it would take a considerable amount of time to collect this information. For him merely to get up and say that this doesn't take any time at all doesn't mean anything, because I do not think he has any understanding or any experience upon which he could base such an assertion.

Now he asked about the question of February 28th, and that is a question which asks for "the amount of money spent on the following highways since April 1, 1955, to date." If it had said till December 31st, but to bring this right up to date would take a lot of time.

And then it goes on and asks, "No. 8 Highways from the Qu'Appelle river to Highway No. 44, (a) current; (b) capital." And all of them brought up to date.

The same thing applies to the question on insurance, which involves, I think, every Department of Government. It is rather significant to see that the hon. member said he wants this information, but of the of the Returns he has asked for, five out of six of them have been asked since the 15th of March, and after he had been here five weeks. If he was particularly anxious to get this information, knowing the amount of work that was involved, he should have asked for it in the first five weeks that he was here. My hon. friend likes to make wild assertions and impute motives. If that is to be permitted then I will make an assertion and impute motives, and say that my hon. friend didn't want this information at all; that he asked for it in the dying days of the session so that he could get up and make the kind of speech which he has just made, charging the Government with withholding information.

Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Was February 28th the dying days of the session?

Premier Douglas: — Only one was on February 28th. The other five, as I pointed out, have been since March 15th. Five weeks after he had been here. The hon. member doesn't want the information as much as he wants to get up and develop a persecution complex that the Opposition have been trying to work up for weeks.

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, I submit that the Premier doesn't know what he is talking about when he is talking about the highway question, because I have been getting regularly, in 48 hours, the very same thing I have asked for here, only I have asked before for individual projects; but here, in order to save time, for the staff in the office, I put them all in one question. I have been getting regularly through this session, on 48 hour notice, answers to the same questions that I asked in this list; only I asked about individual projects. Not that I care; but I am satisfied with the extension. I think they did a good job, last year.

Later —

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, with further reference to the question which has been raised by the member for Saltcoats, I have pointed out that out of six questions he asked, five of them have been asked since the 15th of March. The one he just referred to, about highways, was asked on March 28th. which is just one week ago yesterday.

Mr. Loptson: — It could have been answered before this.

Premier Douglas: — Well, my friend says it could have been answered, but the fact is, as I just read the question, it is asking for both current and capital expenditures to date from the 1st of April, 1955, and it is a very lengthy question. The only question which he asked before the 15th of March, five weeks after he had been here, is this one with reference to insurance, and I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that sometimes the members themselves are at fault, not only for giving us a great deal of work, but for delaying the answer by the way in which they word their question. Here is this question:

“(1) The amount paid in premiums by all Government Departments and Crown Corporations, including Liquor Board,

April 5, 1956

to the Government Insurance Office since it started business.

(2) The amount of this insurance placed through local Government Agents.”

Now, if my friend had worded this to say “the amount received by the Government Insurance Office from all Government Departments and Crown Corporations, including Liquor Board, since the Government Insurance Office started business” – all the information could have been procured from the Government Insurance Office. But when he worded it to say “The amount paid in premiums by all Government Departments and Crown Corporations, including Liquor Board”, then the Provincial Secretary has to send out to each Department, each Crown Corporation and to the Liquor Board, and correlate all the answers and bring it down properly as a Return. If my friend had been a little more careful about his question and asked what money had been received by the Government Insurance Office, then the Government Insurance Office could have taken it straight off their ledger; but in order to comply with the exact terms of the Motion then it was necessary to contact all these agencies, as I have pointed out. I think my friend has no complaint, when you consider that most of his questions have been asked since the 15th of March and that the one he is complaining most about was only asked a week ago yesterday.

Hon. Mr. Douglas (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, might I also point out that, in this question, he asked for the amount spent on highways from April 1, 1955, to date. That means not only construction but maintenance, and to get it up to date we would have to send out to the eight different warehouses in the province, and it is just impossible to get that information from last Wednesday to the present time. It is just another case of giving no thought whatever to the question.

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, the warehouses pay out for these expenses, do they not, and account for them?

Premier Douglas: — On maintenance: this is current account.

Mr. Loptson: — Who issues the cheques for the payment? You can only give me what you have paid.

Premier Douglas: — That isn't what you asked for.

Mr. Loptson: — And you can get it right in the Department of Highways.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — That isn't what you asked for.

Mr. Speaker: — I think the hon. member has received sufficient explanation.

On the Orders of the Day:

DEATH OF RAILWAY WORKER

Hon. Mr. Williams (Minister of Labour): — Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, Mr. speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the

House to a news article that appeared on page three of the 'Leader-Post' last night:

“Victor Sokoloski, 31, Wynyard, died Wednesday morning in a Regina hospital from injuries received in an accident at the Northwest mine near Bienfait last Thursday.

“A C.P.R. brakeman, Mr. Sokoloski had been working on the Bienfait switcher when he was crushed between a freight car and mine platform.”

As you know Mr. Speaker, last week we passed an amendment to The Compensation Act which provides a widow with \$250 cash payment immediately upon the death of her husband; that was an increase from \$100 to \$250. I feel it is most unfortunate that we didn't prorogue last night, as we might have done; but as it is now the widow of Mr. Sokoloski will be out \$150 and the Bureau will be ahead by that amount.

On the Orders of the Day:

RE NAME OF VETERAN LESSEE

Hon. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I wish to mention that I haven't received from the hon. Leader of the Opposition the name of the veteran lessee he referred to. I assume that he hasn't got the name available. However, I did some checking with regard to a lessee we had with frozen oat sheaves, and, without mentioning the name, I want to bring to the attention of the House the exchange of correspondence between the Department and that veteran.

On April 6th, he was written to, as follows:

“We note that your 1954 crop statement shows that nine acres of oats were cut for feed. Would you please advise the number of sheaves obtained from those nine acres?”

The purpose of that letter was to get an idea as to what the crop outturn was, in order that we could determine whether or not it was a crop failure. On May 20th, he was written to:

“We wish to thank you for your letter of May 2nd in reply to our letter of April 6th, and note that you got approximately 2,000 sheaves from the nine acres of oats sown in 1954. It is also noted that these sheaves were frozen and were, therefore, of little value as feed. The Department considers this to be a failure within the meaning of The Farm Security Act, and no share will be expected from you.”

Later:

Mr. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if the name that I sent across to him

April 5, 1956

corresponds with the name of the correspondent whom he mentioned a moment ago.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — No.

Mr. McDonald: — Well then, I want to ask, Mr. Speaker, if it would be possible for me to obtain an answer to a question which I asked on February 23rd, which was converted to an Order for Return dated February 28th — on page 3 of Votes and Proceedings of February 28th, regarding storage space for cereal grains.

Premier Douglas: — I was discussing that with the Provincial Secretary this morning. All of the Departments are not in yet. Each of the Departments are going through their records; and again I want to point out the question is:

“Whether or not there have been any discussions or correspondence during the last twelve months regarding increasing storage space for cereal grains, between the Government of Saskatchewan and (a) the Government of Manitoba; (b) Line elevator companies; (c) the Government of Canada; (d) the Government of Alberta, and (e) Saskatchewan Wheat Pool.”

Now that means checking the files of every Department and of every Minister, and some of these Departments, whose files are smaller than others, have completed their search and brought their answers in to the Provincial Secretary, but they are not all in yet.

Hon. Mr. Burton: — And I may add, Mr. Speaker, that in some cases there might be the possibility of having to obtain the permission of some of the other people before we can table the correspondence.

Mr. McDonald: — Could I ask this question? Have you any correspondence, so far? Have you received any correspondence from any of them?

Hon. Mr. Burton: — Yes.

Later:

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The name of the veteran lessee mentioned by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald), whom I thought I had identified, turned out to be the wrong person. Since then the hon. Leader of the Opposition has sent me the name of the veteran lessee referred to, and I made further inquiries and I find that, in 1953, this veteran had seeded several acres of land which yielded 100 bushels of oats. He was sent the usual form to fill out in order that we would know how much crop he had. He did not reply to that, but he sent a letter to the Department saying the crop was a failure, and although he did not complete the form sent to him, his letter was taken as the basis of writing off the crop as a crop failure and he was never asked, by any correspondence, to deliver any share to the Department at all.

LETTER FROM ANGLO-CANADIAN COMPANY

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, the members will recall the Return that was tabled on the motion of the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) in regard to the Anglo-Canadian Company.

There was one letter in that return which was an important letter and would be of interest to the members, and that was the letter dated December 23rd, from Mr. E.M. Little, President of Anglo-Canadian Pulp and Paper Mills Limited. I have had copies of that letter made and will have them distributed to members of the Legislature.

REPORT ON MARKETING and FARM INCOME

The Assembly resumed from Wednesday, April 4th, 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.”

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, in the event that the House would have completed the work before the House last night, there was some doubt expressed by the Premier as to whether the Lieutenant-Governor could be brought to the Legislature last night, and it was for that reason that I adjourned the debate, in the expectation that, if the House sat today, I did want to have the opportunity of speaking to the amendment, and I wanted to add if, Mr. Speaker, I am in the dog-house because of that action, it probably spurred from the fact of my keen interest in agriculture.

Premier Douglas: — We'll get you out . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I want to say at once to the House that I have only one reason for having become interested in public life and that was to advance the interests of our farm people; and I rather wanted to make reply to some of the statements made by the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson). He seemed to attribute to me by some means that I promoted the idea of a Select Special Committee to inquire into matters of farm income, because as he put it, for the sole purpose of obtaining political kudos.

I wish immediately to inform the House, Mr. Speaker, that insofar as I am concerned, I welcomed the setting up of the Select Committee of this Legislature to inquire into farm marketing and farm income with the full and complete intention that the recommendations that would be submitted by that Committee to this Legislature would be of infinite value to the Government in presenting the viewpoints not only of the Select Committee, but the viewpoints of many farm organizations to any Conference that might

April 5, 1956

be held in the future, and in the hope, too, that we would have behind this report the unanimous support of the Legislature. I received a telephone call this morning from the Minister of Agriculture in Manitoba, in which he asked whether or not it might not be a good idea if we now made representations to the Federal Minister of Agriculture that the Conference to be held on April 19th, should not be bothered to have in attendance there the Rt. Hon. C.D. Howe, Mr. Harris, and Mr. Carson. I mentioned to the House before that all Provincial Ministers of Agriculture were seriously concerned about a developing agricultural situation to which we must pay some attention. And in the hope that agricultural problems could be effectively dealt with, we have often discussed and agreed that a Federal-Provincial Conference in regard to agricultural marketing and farm income is becoming more urgent with each passing day. He also mentioned to me that we ought to make joint representation to have the farm organizations present at such a Conference.

I just mention this, Mr. Speaker, to indicate that the interest and concern regarding a rapidly deteriorating agricultural situation is shared by many other Ministers of Agriculture. In fact all of them have expressed concern, and also that the need for a Conference is urgent, and that the formation of a Select Special Committee of this Legislature was opportune and timely. I want again to reiterate that the Government was seriously concerned about the situation, and did not conceive the idea of a Select Committee for any political kudos. As a matter of fact, the hon. members opposite could have covered themselves with glory had they supported the recommendations and the report submitted by this Select Committee.

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — Absolutely.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the group on this side of the House doesn't have to appoint a Select Committee of this Legislature to gain political kudos. The fact that this group has supported and fought the battles of the farmers and the farm organizations over the years is proof enough in itself as to the sincerity of our intentions in the direction of improving the economic situation of the farmers.

The hon. member for Arm River also mentioned that the reason that they walked out of the Committee was because they were being obstructed, as he termed it, "by a group of extreme radicalists." He also mentioned that when I came into the Committee (I missed one sitting of the Committee due to illness) that I tried to placate the members. I did exactly that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Danielson: — You did.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I was hoping that we would approach this problem in an unbiased manner, and that we would have unanimous support for the recommendations of the Select Committee, in order that we could go to a Conference saying that we had the full and unanimous support of the Legislature behind the proposals submitted.

I quite agree, Mr. Speaker, that the Report of the Committee does not outline a concise and comprehensive plan to cover every aspect, but it does represent the viewpoints and considered opinions of various farm organizations, and it is an excellent document, as the hon. member from Wilkie (Mr. Horsman) has stated. It is the type of document which you could take to a conference and say, "These are the representative opinions of various farm organizations, and these opinions as such have been unanimously supported by the Legislature and we commend this Report for the consideration of this marketing conference." It is up to the marketing conference then to select from the various proposals submitted to it, to select a type of marketing plan that such a Conference would feel is best suited to meet the agricultural situation.

It is not a cut-and-dried report. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I could take exception to some of the things in it or not agree with some of the recommendations made, but they are certainly representative of the opinions expressed to the Committee and are reasonable in every aspect. I see no reason for the proposed amendment; no justifiable reasons have been given to support the amendment that we should now go back into Committee to consider the various proposals appended to the motion, by the material amendment to the motion.

I would like to deal with some of the suggestions made, the first one of which is that clause (d) of paragraph 1 of Section 1 be deleted. This is the clause that has reference to, or makes the statement that "export markets for products other than grain have been declining drastically since the post-war period." That is an absolutely correct statement. I would not want to go back into Committee again to reconsider that statement, because it is a fact, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Lopton) endeavours to support his contention that it is not backed by the statement, that the domestic market has consumed all agricultural products other than grain, and therefore, that there were no exportable surpluses, and, therefore, there was no need to worry at all about export markets. I would like to tell the hon. member for Saltcoats just why we have been able to consume domestically up to the present most all of our pork products and our beef products and our dairy products. I have been going over the statistics of my Statistical Division, and some of the information contained in there is revealing indeed, and I think certainly answers the contentions of the hon. member from Saltcoats. For example, in 1943 and 1944, when we had export markets for bacon and pork products, at a time when we were shipping as high as 730,000,000 pounds of pork products to Great Britain, we had in Saskatchewan a hog population of 1,500,000. In the post-war period, because of deliberate policies brought out by the Government at Ottawa, the number of hogs fell to 386,000 in 1949 and to 469,000 in 1953, and, for the last year for which we have record, just about 500,000 hogs. In other words, our hog population went down by one million hogs. This is the reason that we could eat it all in Canada, because there were no markets and there wasn't any incentive for our people to continue to produce hogs in quantity.

The same story holds for cattle. We had nearly 2,000,000 cattle in Saskatchewan in 1945, and our cattle population dropped to as low as 1,214,000, and in 1954 it was 1,387,000. A drop, Mr. Speaker, of one-half million in numbers of cattle. The same holds for sheep. We had 530,000 sheep in Saskatchewan in 1943, and in 1954 we had 156,000 less.

That is the reason why we can eat it all in Canada. And I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that this Province and Canada as a whole has a tremendous

April 5, 1956

potential capacity for producing agricultural commodities. I reiterate again that it is just as important and beneficial to the economy of Canada to export agricultural commodities and foodstuffs particularly to the needy areas of the world as it is to export and ship Coco-Cola to India and to Egypt in the expectation it is going to do those people some good.

I wish to deal with another matter, and that is the boxcar shortage. Again, Mr. Speaker, I see no justification for going back into Committee and dealing with this matter. The hon. members opposite endeavour to build up a case for white-washing the Transport Controller, and I assume, in the process white-washing, the Federal Government. They didn't need to do that at all. Perhaps Mr. Milner has not made use of the powers that he should have. The Committee was very mild in their observations in that regard. The Committee merely said he should have issued some directives, and all of the evidence supports the contention that he should have issued some directives, and not relied too much on the willing co-operation of the railways to do the things that they were expected to do, but, here, they want this entire section struck out, Mr. Speaker. They want to leave the impression with the people of this Province that there was no boxcar shortage.

Premier Douglas: — And to make a liar out of Mr. Howe.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Not only that, Mr. Speaker. They maintain that the Committee has not paid sufficient attention to the presentations made to it. Why did they constantly quote from Mr. Milner? Why did they not quote from the presentations made by the Wheat Pool when the Wheat Pool said, in regard to the boxcar shortage, that the farm income situation in Saskatchewan during the latter part of 1955 and the early part of 1956 has been aggravated by the slow pace at which the railway has moved grain from country elevators to the terminals, and then the following table summarises the movement of grain since the beginning of October. They went to the trouble of setting it out in table form, and then at the end they say the decline in grain marketing in Saskatchewan during the present crop year amounts to more than 30 million bushels compared to last year. This decline in marketing represents a serious curtailment of farm income, and they go on the record of visible grain in storage at lakehead and at Pacific terminals shows that there has been a large amount of space available since navigation closed early in December. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the figure mentioned by others (and I think by the Pool people too) is that we were short 36,000 boxcars in that period of time, compared to the year previous. Still the hon. members say there was no boxcar shortage, and they expect us to go back into Committee and come out, in the face of all this evidence, and make a re-analysis of this, and I assume if we don't agree with them, they will walk out again.

To go on, Mr. Speaker, in regard to this boxcar shortage. I am going to stand behind, and quote, a few more authorities in an endeavour to convince the hon. members of the errors of their ways, and if possible to convince them, too, that they ought to unanimously support the Report of the Select Committee. I have a clipping here dated January 20th, from the 'Leader-Post':

“Trade Minister Howe indicated today that a boxcar shortage is partly responsible, at least, for the ships lying idle in Vancouver harbor, because they can't get the grain ordered as their cargoes. He also blamed the weather.”

And going on again, another editorial of January 18th, again in the 'Leader-Post', and this is an authoritative publication for the hon. members opposite, and they should pay more attention to it. It says:

"Mr. Howe's assurance that railway boxcars now are being speeded west to clear local space through the movement of grain to empty bins in the terminals also is cheery news."

The 'Leader-Post' says:

"The tight boxcar supply has been delaying deliveries for months. Utilization of unfilled terminal space offers a certain way of getting approximately \$60 million of cash into the farmers hands in the initial payments on their delivered grain."

They go on again, the 'Leader-Post' states . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Milner's evidence makes it very clear.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: —

"Does Mr. Howe's assurance mean that sufficient cars are to be made available to catch up with this crop year's deficit of 36,000 carload shipments from July 31st?"

Even the 'Leader-Post' recognizes the real shortage, and Mr. Howe was chided for making the statement that by (I think he said April 1st) they should have as much grain shipped out or delivered as they did in the 1954 crop year. That commitment has not yet been fulfilled to my knowledge. But to get closer up to date, Mr. Speaker, I have here in my hand, a publication put out by the Alberta Wheat Pool on the boxcar situation, and they endeavour to make an analysis in that respect, when they say:

"The boxcar situation is a baffling one to the prairie grain producer."

The hon. members opposite are trying to make it more baffling. So many conflicting statements have been made that it is difficult to get a true picture. Recently both the Transport Controller and the head of the Canadian National Railways have issued statements to the effect that there is no boxcar shortage at the present time, nor has one existed during the current season. Earlier in the winter, Rt. Hon. C.D. Howe declared that one of the reasons so much space had accumulated in the terminals at the Lakehead and the Pacific was the shortage of boxcars. Later in the winter, the boxcar shortage was credited to the excessive number of Canadian cars in the U.S. I think the report stated then that there were about 11,000 boxcars more in the United States than U.S. boxcars in Canada. It was also revealed that during the late fall and early winter months, no directives had been issued to the railways instructing them to place more boxcars in the grain movement. That is the fundamental fact, Mr. Speaker. No directives were issued, and the Committee merely said that they thought that directive instructions should have been issued. What is wrong with that? It is completely in conformity with the facts. Still the hon. members opposite think we ought to go back into Committee again.

Mr. Lopton: — The terminal yards were full of boxcars.

April 5, 1956

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — And it goes on:

“Up to March 14th,” (this publication is dated March 30th, so its up to date) “grain shipments out of prairie elevators were down by nearly 20,000 cars, or about 12 per cent from the same period a year ago. Daily car loadings this year have averaged 753 or nearly 100 below those of last year. However, it is only fair to point out that in recent weeks loadings are above those of last year, and terminal space is filling up.”

But the fact remains, that there was a boxcar shortage, Mr. Speaker, and no one denies that, and I am afraid that the hon. members opposite are going to have an awful hard time to convince anyone, let alone members on this side of the House, that there wasn't any boxcar shortage.

One more quotation, again from the 'Leader-Post', up to date, March 27th, when they say:

“Up to the middle of March, the number of cars unloaded at terminals from the beginning of the crop year was 20,000 less than the year before. These statistics indicate that eastward movement will have to be stepped up to around 1,500 a week in the period immediately ahead if the Wheat Board is to have the wheat in position to fill export orders. In effect, what is happening is that the normal fall movement of wheat has been delayed until spring.”

Which is a genuine admission that there was shortage in the transportation field. In effect, what is happening is that the normal fall movement of wheat has been delayed until spring. Here is the advice: “The west should apply the greatest possible amount of pressure to the movement of boxcars westward accelerated.” That is enough, I think, on the question of boxcars.

I wish to move now to another contention made by the hon. members opposite in support of their amendment, and this is in connection with the deletion in Section IV of the Report dealing with United States price supports. They wish to have the words deleted “that has been greatly exaggerated.” The Report, as I recall it, stated that too much emphasis has been placed on price supports in the U.S. for the surpluses of agricultural commodities in that country, and the hon. members opposite seem to take the viewpoint, I take it, that the farmers should not have any price incentives because they might produce too much. They are obsessed with a fear of surpluses, Mr. Speaker. But I want to point out to the hon. members that the statement made in the Select Committee Report is solid from every angle, and it is my opinion, and the opinion of the agriculturalists in many senior positions, that price incentive is not the factor. It may be one of the factors, but I would say that it is not the major factor. I would say that in the case of the United States, and here, too, we followed policies of encouraging wheat production in order to meet the needs of Europe immediately after the war. That happened in the United States. It is not wheat they have surpluses of in the United States at the moment; it is many other commodities, and it can be attributed not to price, because in some instances their prices have been below ours and their general costs of service are higher than ours.

There is, therefore, in addition, an economic pressure on farms to produce. How can you stop them from producing? If you stop them from producing one thing, they are going to produce another thing.

This contention also overlooks the fact, Mr. Speaker, that science had made it possible in the United States, for instance, to nearly double the corn production by the introduction of hybrid corn, and many other scientific means have enabled farmers both here and in the United States to produce more. As a matter of fact, science, departments of agriculture, commercial firms are all providing the farmer with aids that will increase his production. I would suggest to the hon. members, if they are afraid of surpluses, that we immediately cease any more scientific progress in the direction of improving and increasing the productive capacity of our land.

These are the factors, Mr. Speaker, that have contributed most to any so-called surpluses that are being constantly referred to. I want to say in connection with surpluses that, as far as the world is concerned it can be recognized that there is a shortage of food, that there are millions of people throughout the world who are hungry and who go to bed hungry every night – to use a phrase that has been used over and over – until you would think that the hon. members opposite would have at least accepted the fact that there are millions of hungry people in the world, and that the fear of agriculturists and humanitarians is that we might not be able to feed these millions at a proper nutritional level. And statistics indicate that if we did that, if we did bring people up everywhere to a proper nutritional level, we would have to double the total food production throughout the world.

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member if there are so many hungry people in the world, why is it that the United States can't give these people hundreds of thousands of bushels for nothing? They refused to accept . . .

Premier Douglas: — Who refused?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Loptson: — India. They refused 3,500,000 bushels absolutely as a gift, and the Indian Government refused to let it in.

Premier Douglas: — That's a pipe dream.

Mr. Loptson: — It's not a pipe dream.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Loptson: — It was announced right in the 'Free Press'.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, I don't propose to speak about the United States government or their policies; but it is a well-known fact that they have had give-away programmes. If you have any doubt about that, just ask the Rt Hon. J.G. Gardiner; it seems to be of great concern and worry to him. It seems to be of great concern and worry to him, because he has not conceived the idea yet of trying to help out by furnishing food to areas where it is greatly needed. Our Government has not taken the concrete steps necessary

April 5, 1956

to develop trade relations or to think in terms of, or to support, the representation and recommendations made by FAO to the United Nations that we ought to have an International Clearing House Exchange, that we ought to finance some of the backward countries, and help them to get onto their feet in order that they can buy our foodstuffs. It is something that is well recognized, and I quite agree that dumping by one individual nation is not going to solve the problem. Any action that is to be taken must be concerted action between many nations, but I do regret that Canada has not been in the forefront in making representations of this kind to the United Nations, nor did they support the proposals made by FAO in that direction.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the other contention has been that, of course, they say the United States can do these things, they can subsidize their agricultural producers, but we can't do that in Canada because we have so little population in comparison to the population of the United States. They say the per capita cost would be higher, and I assumed this is another reason they would like to have us go back into Committee again. All I have to say in connection with this, Mr. Speaker, is that if in this country the ratio is about 80 to 20, population to production, that the agricultural industry in Canada is at least 60 per cent more important to the economy of Canada than the agricultural industry is in the United States, and the question of per capita contribution doesn't enter into the picture at all. It is just simply putting forward the principle of governments recognizing that purchasing power must be redistributed equitably between all segments of our economy, and all people that make up our economy, and we have been most deficient in regard to our agricultural industry in that regard.

That is one of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I wanted to speak on this motion, even if I did get myself in the dog-house for prolonging this debate. There is no cause that I would rather go in the dog-house for than sponsoring and championing this downtrodden industry that presents so many problems that something has to be done about. I hear this lip service from across the way, this talking about reducing taxes for example; that somehow or other the province can assume greater obligations in the direction of reducing taxes by way of grants or taking over more services. Do the hon. members not realize that provincial revenues are just as dependent as municipal revenues on our agricultural income? Do they not realize that in the final analysis final taxes will not be reduced, that costs are high today, better and more modern services are required? There is little prospect of looking in that direction for a solution to the tax problem. I want to point to the proper direction, Mr. Speaker, and I say if you give this basic industry its fair direction, Mr. Speaker, and I say if you give this industry its fair share of the national income we will not need to worry about taxes. And furthermore, if we can keep these profit-hungry – as Mr. Sherman would say perhaps, when he refers to the Power Corporation as “profit greedy” and forgets about the implement companies, forgets about the fertilizer companies; if we could keep those people off the backs of the farmers and their hands out of his pockets when he does get a little income or a price for his products, perhaps he would be in a position to pay his taxes.

I want to offer one more suggestion in regard to this high per capita in the event that our national government should find it necessary to subsidize agriculture, and it is that they forgot about the tariffs. They forgot entirely that ever since the dawn of agriculture in Canada we have

been paying through the nose because of tariffs on these implements that we need in the production of agricultural products. At least, Mr. Speaker, down in the United States they have recognized that where protective tariffs exist and where agriculture must, therefore, pay more in production costs as a result, they have earmarked tariff money to subsidize agriculture. Perhaps we ought to do the same in Canada.

Mr. Loftson: — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the hon. member must . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Nollet: — I know its hard for the hon. member to take, Mr. Speaker but . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — There is another point I want to make. In a country as great as Canada with our abounding resources, our small population by comparison is an asset when we talk in terms of being able to give our agricultural industry its fair share of the national income. Did they not forget that this same national government intends to subsidize a pipeline, and that they have subsidized other industries by various means and various devices? I think it is about time that this industry of agriculture stands up and demands its fair share, and this Committee Report hasn't even gone that far. It has been very modest, and it is in that direction that I think it has any deficiency, if you can find it. It has not gone far enough, and where it has gone far enough these hon. members have suggested that particular clauses should be deleted; one in particular where it suggests that after you give agriculture its fair share of the national income there ought to be an equitable redistribution of that income made within the industry by means of deducting a certain amount from the receipts that each farmer receives for the products that he sells to contribute towards a proper co-op insurance plan, not PFAA. They suggest here that the Federal Government should deduct more for PFAA. What from? After they suggest that we should only have \$2.05 a bushel for the first 1,000 bushels and sell the rest at random, they are suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that this basic industry, this downtrodden industry, has now reached the point where it could subsidize itself, where the big farmer could subsidize the little farmer. Can you imagine anything more far-fetched than that, Mr. Speaker? To suggest a thing like that, and then come out on top of this, after this industry has tried to support itself, and say there should be . . .

Mr. Loftson: — That's what we suggested.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . A redistribution of poverty within the industry, with prices going down to zero. Then after they had done all that, they said, "Well, we think that the Government would, and we would recommend that the Federal Government increase the contributions for PFAA payments. Mr. Speaker, there is only one way in which you can have a proper crop insurance plan, or any kind of security for our people and agriculture that is Now enjoyed by other segments of the economy, and that is to give the farmers enough. I don't care where they put the price. I hear a lot of talk about parity and that it is economic nonsense and that sort of thing. I know that you can't get a price that is equitable and fair to all farmers, because farm units vary in size. The

April 5, 1956

big farmer has lower production costs; but we must recognize the fact that that is the situation. Well, what can you do in this type of situation? The Committee has recommended this. They did recommend parity prices, particularly for foodstuffs consumed on the domestic market, and then they went on to say that this equitable distribution should be made, and I suggested that the hon. members know, in the Committee itself, that the big farmers all of them in fact, should contribute to a proper scheme of crop insurance, workmen's compensation, accident insurance. I would even go a step further, Mr. Speaker, and say there should be some superannuation plan for the small farmer who has insufficient financial means to maintain himself in decency when he can't farm any more. I know thousands of farmers, who have, because of age, because of infirmity, become unable to farm any more, and they sit in a little town in Saskatchewan trying to live on the old-age pension. But first of all, Mr. Speaker, you have got to have enough income and enough in price to make these deductions for all of these worthwhile security measures. The hon. members opposite have ignored that entirely and they suggested that that section should be struck out.

I don't want to go back into Committee to reconsider that, Mr. Speaker, because my position would be just the same; and again, if I didn't agree with them, I suppose they would walk out in a huff and then try to tell the people of this province that they got such rough treatment in this Committee that they just couldn't go on. But they had a responsibility as an Opposition to this Legislature to stay right in that Committee whether they agreed or not, and fight their way through. They ought to recognize that in a democracy the majority rules, and that the Government, if it wanted to, could have its will; but it is the duty of an Opposition to remain at the front, to remain in the front line and keep battling and not run away.

Mr. Speaker, the suggestion has been made that it was because of some of the extreme radicals. The hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) was an extra good boy that evening. We were getting along just fine, and had made wonderful progress, and I was sincerely hopeful that we would have unanimous support for the Report of the Select Committee. It was the hon. member for Saltcoats who wanted to revert back to sections that had already been dealt with, and he referred to them as being "crazy" and "silly" and everything else; and when he was called to order, he wouldn't come to order, and that is when the rumpus started.

The hon. members opposite can go out and tell their story, but I wanted the opportunity of telling the other side of it in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker. They are not going to fool the people of this province by putting themselves up as self-martyrs, especially the hon. member from Saltcoats. I have never seen anyone that could be martyred with such a sphinx-like grin on his face.

Premier Douglas: — It doesn't become you.

Mr. Danielson: — He took the grin off of your's.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, I think I have covered the point pretty well in this Legislature. The Chairman of the Committee, the hon. member for Bengough (Mr. Brown) made an excellent, I thought a very excellent, analysis of the Report and dealt very adequately point by point with the proposals submitted

by the members opposite in support of their motion that we should go back into Committee.

I see no justification for it whatever, and again I want to make a plea to the hon. members opposite. In a short while, Mr. Speaker, I will be going down to another Conference, not the kind of Conference we would like to see, to be sure, but a Conference at which I could at least ask that a Federal-Provincial Conference be called at an early date. I don't want to rush the Federal Government, as I told the Hon. Minister of Agriculture for Manitoba over the phone, this morning. I think we should plan this Conference for some time in the future, and gather the material in order that the question of agricultural marketing and farm income can be thoroughly dealt with, because I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of grave concern to me not only in the interest of a better deal for our farm people as such, but in the interest of stabilizing the economy of this province. Every business organization and it is true, municipal services and all of the services that we have in this province, depend on a high level of agricultural income. We cannot anticipate that we will return to more costs or more prices. We must look forward to an improvement in prices and an improvement in farm income, and I hope, too, that as a result of the work of this Committee, well supported by the Report of the Royal Commission on Agricultural and Rural Life, the people of Canada and the people of this Province will finally accept the principle that this basic industry should have its fair share of the national income, and that the people within that industry ought to enjoy the same security as people do in other segments of the economy.

For these reasons and because of my sincere interest in this matter, I again appeal to the hon. members opposite to support the Report of the Select Committee. As far as they are concerned, I will offer good political advice now, Mr. Speaker. My political advice to them is to support this Report and if there are any parts of it that they do not agree with, they can go on the public platform and say that they did not agree with certain parts of it. But for Heaven's sake, give me some encouragement to place me in a position where I can say "Here are the proposals that we wish to submit to a Conference, and these proposals represent the expressed opinions of farm organizations in the Province of Saskatchewan, and they have received the unanimous support of the Saskatchewan Legislature.

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, there are one or two observations I think we should make in answer to the Minister of Agriculture's remarks, this morning. He said here was an opportunity for the Opposition to cover themselves with glory and support this report.

Mr. Lopton: — A C.C.F. report! I want to deal a bit with what type of glory we think we would be covering ourselves with in this report. Someone said – I believe it was the member from Wilkie (Mr. Horsman) – that there were many things in this report that are practical; things that are in the interests of the agricultural industry; but there are some things that are highly impracticable, and in order to get what is practicable you are asking us to subscribe to what is highly impracticable, to underwrite some of the policies of the C.C.F. advocated both in Saskatchewan and in the House at Ottawa.

April 5, 1956

Before we go into that I think one impression should be corrected. I don't know whether the Minister intended to leave that impression or not, but the impression was left that there were tariffs on farm implements. There are no tariffs on farm implements entering Canada. Is there any tariff now on farm repairs?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain to the hon. member if he will permit me to do so. I did not specifically refer to tariffs on farm implements; but I do want to advise the hon. member that there were tariffs on farm implement products, and certain farm implement companies until very recently, have made representation to Ottawa to have them removed, that that has been done.

Mr. Danielson: — You didn't leave that impression.

Mr. Cameron: — Now that we have the record correct, there is no tariff on farm implements, and there is no tariff on farm repairs. Speaking of tariffs, one is rather amazed at the lack of any mention of tariffs in the report as such, because at one time they were fighting as the champions of the farmers for low tariffs and free trade, crossing the boundaries, bringing in goods from other countries. It was shameful that we had anti-dumping duties; that we had tariffs to forbid these products to come in from other countries for if we did that the agricultural industry would be able to take advantage of these cheaper goods on our markets. I am rather surprised that nothing was said about that, as such in the report, and I want to show some of the things we think the report has attempted to do.

I think that it has attempted to create a feeling of all things for all of the people. You come out both in favour of cash advances and in favour of bank loans. They are both included in the report. Cash advances and bank loans.

Mr. A.L.S. Brown (Bengough): — Do you not agree?

Mr. Cameron: — And you differ from the Royal Commission in this regard, in that you still persist that cash advances should become a permanent feature of the marketing system. There you differ from your Royal Commission, and you put advances on a permanent basis — they have put it on a temporary basis; and you thought it would be well to support bank loans as well. I cannot help but recall the Minister of Agriculture, a while back, talking about cash advances when he said it is so simple it is incomprehensible that it has not been done. I could not help but think of the study of the Royal Commission when they say cash advances is not the solution on a long-term permanent basis, and they recommended a system of stricter credit to assist those in need.

Then they come out both for parity prices and forward prices. Now, if you ever saw anyone riding two horses at once, you have it here. They come out for parity price and forward prices.

Mr. E. Walker (Gravelbourg): — You are now riding a jackass!

Mr. Cameron: — Two separate things entirely; two separate concepts behind them.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Not inconsistently.

Mr. Cameron: — The Royal Commission supports forward prices rather than parity prices.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. gentleman in what way they are inconsistent?

Mr. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale): — He doesn't know.

Mr. Cameron: — They say forward prices and parity prices, and the Chairman said that the floor price and the ceiling price and the parity price should be synonymous.

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — The market price, I said.

Mr. Cameron: — It should be one and the same thing; established, set parity prices.

Mr. Gibson: — No, he didn't

Mr. Cameron: — Then they go on to say, "We recognize the merits of forward prices; that we are willing to choose forward pricing just through the interim period until we can establish a planned economy in which we have a one-parity price for agriculture."

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cameron: — "In the meantime, we are prepared to go along with forward pricing, and with a floor price."

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — What's inconsistent about that?

Mr. Cameron: — Just a moment. That is as far as they will go with forward prices. They differ from the Royal Commission in this regard. The Royal Commission says that the law of supply and demand still governs marketing of agricultural products, and that you must take your products to the markets of the world, and they must compete in the markets of the world, and that your forward price would be set on the anticipated returns from those markets for a year in advance, to take out the fluctuation in the prices during that time, so that the producer knows a year in advance what he is going to receive for his produce. Then to have a floor price low enough, and yet high enough that would guarantee the farmer his cost of production so that the industry at no time would be operating at a loss, in order to keep from going bankrupt.

Then you must meet the supply and demand, and place your goods on the market in such a manner as to compete in the world market. And, if those markets should bring you a return less than your forward price, then the difference would be made up by the Dominion Treasury for the loss sustained during that year. That is the principle of forward pricing. That is not the principle of parity. Parity is to set your price for agricultural products on what you think is a parity with the cost of production, and on other agricultural industry at guaranteed returns.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — The forward price could be at parity.

Mr. Cameron: — Now I want to show you, in regard to parity, some of the thoughts

April 5, 1956

of others in a far more responsible position in this regard, perhaps, than we are. Parity, of course, is instituted with the thought that you could bring the farmer his fair share of the national income. Now the C.C.F. group is not the only group interested in bringing the farmer his fair share of the national income; not a bit. You say it is economic justice; it is a social justice, and it should be done in justice to the agricultural industry.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — And you say it shouldn't?

Mr. Cameron: — Justice to the agricultural industry will not, in itself, be sufficient to institute parity prices unless parity prices in themselves can bring about the desire we are hoping to obtain. There are many people with a broader experience than we have, who have come to the conclusion that parity prices are not the answer; that they will defeat the very purpose that you set out to do by instituting parity prices.

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg): — Who are they?

Mr. Cameron: — The United States has had the idea of parity prices for the past twenty years. Yet have the American farmers secured their fair share of the national income in the United States?

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg): — They have done better than we have.

Mr. Cameron: — The farmers have not secured their fair share of the national income.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — What's the comparison?

Mr. Cameron: — Just a minute. Personal income for the average farm family in the United States is only 58% as much as the personal income of the average non-farm family. Has that brought the farmer his fair share of the national income? Thirteen per cent of United States' families live on farms, yet they receive only seven per cent of the personal income of all families. Has that proved that parity has brought the American farmers a fair share of the national income in the United States?

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Give the Canadian figures now.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — You're dealing with the situation in the South.

Mr. Cameron: — This indicates that you have accomplished it, and if you look at the rigid price supports for parity as set up there, \$1 billion of wheat in storage, \$7 1/2 billions of surplus of commodities; \$1 million per day in interest to store these agricultural products . . .

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Who pays for the storage?

Mr. Cameron: — What do they pay? What did Mr. Benson have to say in regard to setting the price of parity at full 100 % of parity for rigid price supports?

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Who is Mr. Benson — a Republican?

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Benson? He is the United States Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. Danielson: — He never heard of him.

Mr. Cameron: — Is that clear? Now, he says this: “rigid price supports do not promote prosperity. Our Government,” Mr. Benson declared, “has an investment of over \$7 billion in price support operations, yet farmers are not sharing as they should the national prosperity. Experience proves,” Mr. Benson continued, “that rigid supports do not foster efficiency unless it is considered efficient to price commodities out of their markets, or unless it is considered efficient to maintain artificial demands for crops that drain fertility from our soil; or unless it is efficient to destroy the natural relationship between feed and livestock prices; or unless it is efficient to force upon agriculture the 31 millions of acres caught in wheat. Rigid supports provide the wrong kind of abundance.” So says the Minister of Agriculture for the United States.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — He doesn't believe in abundance.

Mr. Cameron: — “Experience proves that rigid supports do not provide this kind of abundance the U.S. needs for peacetime economy. We do not need abundance in storehouses.” He stated further: “Rigid supports do not guarantee farm earnings. The declines in U.S. farm prices and farm income have taken place not under an adjusted price support, but under the old outmoded rigid 90 per cent parity price supports. Adjusted or flexible price supports are not yet in effect,” he says. Then he says “The completely planned and subsidized economy” (and that is what the C.C.F. is aiming for) “is the surest way . . .”

Premier Douglas: — Did he say that that was what the C.C.F. was aiming at?

Mr. Cameron: — No, I said that – and that is evident from all your speeches, is it not? Are you going to say now that you were not working towards a planned economy?

Premier Douglas: — It is also now evident that Liberals have adopted the Republican policy from the United States.

Mr. Cameron: — You are back now on the Manifesto, and I think we are safe in saying that you still have your prospects of a planned overall economy; “a completely planned and subsidized economy,” said Mr. Benson, “is the surest way to weaken our people and destroy their character.”

Premier Douglas: — Make them hungry and it will make them virtuous!

Mr. Cameron: — Now we come to our own country in regard to parity. We come to the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, quite a farm body, which speaks with a commanding voice in the farm industry. What does it say about parity?

It says, first, when its Convention assembled: The support prices which you talk of as the floor and parity being one and the same, should not be incepted first. Major farm production products should not be supported higher than 85 per cent of parity nor lower than 65 per cent of parity.”

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I wish we got that much!

Mr. Cameron: — “This 20 per cent lends flexibility. Flexibility is necessary

April 5, 1956

to permit the law of supply and demand to operate.” They will permit the forward pricing and the floor price, and the flexibility, until such times as the Minister of Agriculture, together with his other assistants, can suspend the law of supply and demand.

Premier Douglas: — That sounds like Stanley Jones, himself!

Mr. Cameron: — The price to be such that producers would be encouraged to keep on producing, and they came up with a formula – what they consider should be a fair and reasonable basis for prices for farm commodities; and they set up a system of basic prices. The Minister of Agriculture is familiar with the formula, and I do not have to take up time in outlining it in detail . . .

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — Do you understand it?

Mr. Cameron: — . . . to be used in establishing support prices. They took the average price of No. 1 wheat from Fort William from 1943 to 1953, and they took the wholesale index, or rather the index of the wholesale prices of all farm products for the same ten-year period, 1943 to 1953. Then they took the cost of commodities and services, including the living cost for 1953. Then, taking the basic period 1925 to 1929 as 100 per cent, they estimated that today it would have to be approximately 150 per cent, if 1929 was 100 per cent. Then they took a look at the present prices of farm products on the markets in Canada to see whether or not they were within the range of that recommended as a flexible programme of a flexibility of 20 per cent between 65 and 85 per cent of parity.

Wheat would have to be, on the basic theory, either parity or basic price, \$2.05. Thousand pound steers at Toronto, under their formula, would have to bring \$23.06 per hundred pounds. Then they suggested that your peak or top or base of parity, then to operate, they should bring from 65 to 85 per cent of that.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Are we getting that now?

Mr. Cameron: — The Minister asks me, “Are we getting that now?” Then we come to the price . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Well, are we?

Mr. Cameron: — Just a moment. Let’s stick to references. You had your time. Under the C.F.A. . . .

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg): — You’ve had yours, too, but you don’t know it.

Mr. Cameron: — Under the C.F.A. formula, the initial price of No. 1 Northern wheat is approximately (to their figuring) 80 per cent of parity. Your initial price is 80 per cent of parity.

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg): — Oh, don’t be ridiculous.

Mr. Cameron: — Ridiculous, he says. Steers on the Toronto market, according to the formula worked out by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture – the present price is 75 per cent of parity; hogs, 70 to 75 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — 75 per cent on what?

Mr. Cameron: — Of their basic price set at \$2.05 for wheat.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Of their proposed parity, which is 65 per cent.

Mr. Cameron: — No, no! If you want to ask a question, I'll answer it, but if you want to make a speech . . . I set it up as carefully as I could. They set the parity price on the formula, but they represent parity as it should be today, taking 1925 to 1929 as the basic parity price period. Then they figure that if you are going to have wheat parity, wheat should be \$2.05 a bushel; that would be parity. Steers should be \$23.06 per hundred; we get 1,000 pound steers at Toronto. But then they say the price should operate between 65 and 85 per cent of that paid price, and if you take the prices today of farm agricultural products, wheat is approximately 80 per cent of their basic price of parity on your initial payment.

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — How do you figure that out?

Mr. Cameron: — Here, figure it out with a bit of arithmetic.

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — 80 per cent of \$2.00 is what?

Mr. Cameron: — Steers on the Toronto market, 75 per cent of parity; hogs, 70 to 75 per cent of parity; butter, 82 to 83 per cent. Their conclusions of their studies was this, and it was at such variance with the conclusions as brought down in this report, and so at variance, as yours were, with the conclusions brought down by the Royal Commission on Agriculture. Then the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, after their studies, came out and said "Parity in itself cannot solve the problem of the low income farm group."

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Agreed, agreed!

Mr. Cameron: — Do you expect us to support the system as the sole answer to the agricultural industry of Saskatchewan and of Canada?

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg): — Nonsense.

Mr. Cameron: — That is the great thing in your report that you ask for unanimous support on in this House.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the report does not say that parity is the sole answer. There are all kinds of qualifications . . .

Premier Douglas: — What paragraph says that?

Some Govt. Member: — He doesn't know.

Mr. Cameron: — They sent a committee down to Washington to study it.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — What part of the report?

Mr. Cameron: — The programme brings it right out as parity; as an economic social justice . . .

April 5, 1956

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am not arguing now as to whether the C.C.F. believe in parity. We certainly do. But we happen to be talking now about the report. What paragraph in this report says that parity is the sole answer?

Mr. Cameron: — I didn't say it was a particular paragraph in the report. I said all through the report the theme is prevalent that parity is your economic solution to the farm problem, and that is in there. Then they came out both for free trade and tariff protection; they want both.

Mr. Danielson: — They want the Liberal vote, and they want . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Free trade for the farmer and tariff protection for the labourer.

Mr. Gibson (Morse): — What part of the report is that in?

Mr. Cameron: — Import and export boards would accomplish exactly the same thing without having to state so. You could bring in your goods, regardless of the tariff. You'll have loans and credits, foreign currency and barter and give-aways.

Premier Douglas: — You are against them?

Mr. Cameron: — I remember, last fall, up in my constituency and all over the province, Mr. Coldwell was in there, and Mr. Johnston was the M.P. up there; the Premier was there too, and I think the Premier advocated — someone told me, (he can correct me if I am wrong on this) he said, "Why, take one-quarter of the money you are spending on defence and buy the farmers' grain. Nothing could happen. The solution is as simple as that." Just take one-quarter of the money we are spending on defence and buy the farmers' grain.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend does not need to say somebody told him. I said it in this House. He should have been here.

Mr. Cameron: — You still persist that that is the solution?

Premier Douglas: — Nothing is the complete solution, but it certainly would be a very good start if we took 25 per cent of what we are spending on defence at the present time to buy some of the surplus products of the farmer.

Some Govt. Member: — Here, here!

Premier Douglas: — All my hon. friend has to do is vote for the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: — May I suggest to the hon. members that we confine ourselves to the report?

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — Or to the amendment?

Mr. Cameron: — Then they come out with a two-price system in the report, contrary to the recommendations of the Royal Commission, who have made a four-year study

of agricultural conditions in Saskatchewan. By the time you have taken up all the costs of administering such a commission, what is to be gained by it is hardly worth the effort, and you would be asking the consumer to pay the price on the markets here, as on the world market. The whole theme of the Royal Commission, as they recommended, is that they think the three points is not in itself giving agriculture its fair share of the national income, but equally as great a problem, and possibly a greater problem, is the distribution of that income among the farm groups themselves, and that you must take into consideration that 69 to 70 per cent of the farmers of Saskatchewan are three-quarter section farmers, and that their cost production per bushel which they produce is much in excess of the cost of production of large farmers in many areas of this province. Therefore, by setting a set price for all farms, you are leading them right along on your high prices, and produce more at cheaper costs, and increasing their position or their advantage far greater than you are assisting the advantage of the smaller farmer. There is exactly an inequality in your parity prices.

And if you are to stabilize agriculture (you talked about bringing a fair share of the national income among the group of farmers), then you must consider the farmers in a position as producers. Then you have your floor price which guarantees them the cost of production. Then the amendment which we suggested of \$2.00 per bushel on the first 1,000 bushels would give the smaller farmer a higher price for a bigger portion of his total production than that which the larger farmer receives.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — That's wrong.

Mr. Cameron: — And there is no large farmer who would agree that that is a fair and reasonable solution, because they would gain the same advantage for the same number of bushels of wheat.

Then we come to the boxcar situation and Mr. Milner. I happen not to have been in on too many committee meetings, yet I was in on the farm machinery investigation. We have been in on investigations here in the Legislature, and have been on other committees . . .

Mr. Kramer (The Battlefords): — Were you on the McCarthy investigations, too?

Mr. Cameron: — I want to say that I do not think I have ever seen a witness come before a committee to give such whole-hearted support, and to state his facts without reservation as to what he was attempting to do; how he was doing it, and whether or not you could judge it was in the interests of agriculture. I came out of that committee, and I heard numerous members from your side of the House (I could name them, but I won't), who said that in their opinion Mr. Milner appeared to be a most outstanding man, and he appeared to have accomplished tremendous things in the face of all those insurmountable obstacles.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — That is ridiculous.

Mr. Cameron: — And that he was doing a good job. Then I noticed that the report comes out and says, "We have found an alarming situation." Do you know what the alarming situation was? That the boxcar controller, in dealing with the men to whom he must go and issue directives and suggestions and order,

April 5, 1956

called them into conference and he negotiated with them and, as he said, many of the conferences were heated, but when a decision was arrived at, those decisions were followed out. He said he found no need for exercising his authority to be a strict, intolerant boss issuing formal orders and saying "Follow it out – or else!" And he accomplished the same thing by getting the co-operation of all those who were interested in the moving of cars.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — About 36,000 boxcars short?

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg): — He accomplished nothing.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Cameron: — Then you say, not that he didn't do it – not that he neglected to accomplish something because he neglected to issue a formal order, but an "alarming situation" is developing in that the Controller (Mr. Milner) is not issuing a formal order.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Not getting results, either.

Mr. Cameron: — That's all.

Mr. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale): — Even the 'Leader-Post' says that.

Mr. Cameron: — That was the total sum of criticism.

Mr. Kramer: — By your fruits you shall know them!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Cameron: — I want to say also, that you had hoped of having a marketing conference at Ottawa. To my knowledge the conference has not been set; to my knowledge there has been no arrangement as yet made for such a conference; to my knowledge it has never been announced in the press in Manitoba or Alberta. It is just that you hope you may be able to have a conference. You want to go with a united voice.

Mr. Wahl (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Do you?

Mr. Cameron: — Well, then, I would have suggested this. If you had to have a united voice, you should have attempted likewise to get a united voice in the west, from Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan, the three major wheat producing provinces, with some answers to some of these perplexing problems. But, the difficulty is that your perplexing problems are changing from day to day, week to week, and month to month. What was the perplexing problem, last fall?

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg): — You simply can't keep up with them, can you?

Mr. Cameron: — It is not to the same degree by far, such a problem this spring.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — We still have more butter than ever.

Mr. Cameron: — When we were talking about boxcars, cash advances over bank loans, inability of farmers to move grain. That was a serious crisis for the farmers.

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg): — It is still present.

Mr. Cameron: — And you didn't lose an opportunity to go out and capitalize on it in every seat in this constituency?

Mr. Gibson: — How many seats have you got?

Mr. Cameron: — How it would solve the problem. Let me read what appeared just the other day in the paper. The heading, "East Ports Grain Rush is Looming."

"All terminal elevators in eastern Canada are empty or so heavily committed that shipments of grain from the prairies to the east are expected to reach record proportions as soon as navigation opens this spring," Government sources said.

"Orders for Canadian grain for Europe and Iron Curtain countries have reached such proportions in recent weeks that available stocks in the eastern elevator systems are practically completed.

"Shipping on the Great Lakes is about over."

Mr. A. Feusi (Pelly): — It is over now.

Mr. Cameron: — It is over now, is it? 40 to 50 million bushels of space in the elevator; demands for wheat already far in excess of what they were at this time last year; demands for wheat which would already indicate that we are in the happy position of practically assuring ourselves that we will sell 7 to 8 bushels per acre on the farms.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — That's a nice promise.

Mr. Cameron: — That's the situation as outlined today with firm commitments for wheat, and the only problem right now is that if the boxcar controller and the transportation companies neglect to get those cars to move that wheat when it is available into the terminal elevators, to get it across to market, and at the rate at which the wheat is being bought, and if we are going to succeed in getting that amount of wheat shipped, it is going to take a great amount of determination and ingenuity on the part of government and rail officials to get that wheat to the port in order to fill the commitments during the coming year. That is a very hopeful and encouraging position in regard to wheat now; so different from what it was last fall.

So if you go to this conference, what are you going to advocate? Boxcar shortage? We should definitely keep our eyes on it, and see, because that could be a problem no doubt to move this amount of grain. Cash advances? Give-away policy? I think, Mr. Speaker, if it has proven anything it has proven that the problem that the farmers were facing was a problem of marketing. Once the markets of the world have been emptied, and agreements made for wheat, and

April 5, 1956

that wheat begins to move, then it is of itself correcting the situation we faced last fall.

Mr. Gibson: — It should have moved last fall.

Mr. Cameron: — And if the roads open up. The only deterrent to farm cash, the greatest deterrent, I should say, at the present time and will be for some months, will be the condition of the rural market roads. The farmer will be unable to get his grain into the elevator. That will be the greatest obstacle at the present time.

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg): — That's the crisis, is it?

Mr. Kramer: — That's also the biggest laugh!

Mr. Cameron: — So because of that we say this. We found in committee that the Government, with its overwhelming majority on this committee, was determined to push forth its proposals, to come out with a report that would substantiate and underwrite those policies which have been advocated in Ottawa by Mr. Argue, Mr. Coldwell, and the rest of them in regard to parity prices, the cost-price squeeze, economic justice to the farmer; to underwrite the C.C.F. platform, and to take away some of the down-to-earth, practical though perhaps politically embarrassing, suggestions and recommendations made by the Royal Commission.

We said this, "You are determined to carry it through the committee. Every time we rose to offer a suggestion, you put up such a barrage that you could not even get up to speak most of the time." And you cannot deny what went on in the committee when we rose to offer a suggestion. It became such, and it was not that the member asked to revert back to a status quo — he wanted this particular section removed; but they wouldn't consent to the removal of that. Then a member rose and said, "Now look" (these are not his exact words) . . .

Mr. Gibson: — Suppose we get his exact words.

Mr. Cameron: — In substance he said, "Every suggestion we make, even for the removal of a single word, has been refused us."

Mr. Kramer: — That's not true.

Mr. Cameron: — He attempted to go back to review places which he knew of which, when that was under consideration, he had moved an amendment and we were voted down; other places where we had moved the change of a word, or the addition of the word to say, 'we continue' — that was voted down, and he was stopped as being out of order, because the Chairman ruled that you cannot go back and re-discuss sections of the report which have already been passed.

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — Oh no. Mr. Speaker, that is not true. That's a lie.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think the hon. member will have an opportunity to reply.

Mr. Cameron: — Pleading for unanimous support, the Minister of Agriculture said: 'For a unanimous voice to go down to Ottawa and accomplish something for the western farmers' . . . "This downtrodden industry . . . We want a united voice," says the Minister. United with whom? United in every little thing you fellows wanted . . .

Premier Douglas: — With the farm organizations.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — You just put yourself on record.

Mr. Cameron: — . . . without one minor concession, and then you want our support to go to Ottawa and say, “This is a united voice; this is what we want; — this is what we got.” But you are not going to get a united voice in everything you ask just the same as this . . . the same as the chairman says, “The report was passed without a dissenting voice.”

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — That’s correct.

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — Hear, hear! That’s right.

Mr. Cameron: — Correct — in words, but not in meaning! It would convey the impression that all was harmonious, and everyone was in agreement with everything — without a dissenting voice.

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — Is that not true?

Mr. Cameron: — I’m not going to vote for the main motion. You carried it through the committee; you carried it through here. You can go down to Ottawa and try to justify some of those things which you have put in there. That’s your responsibility. We say there are things in there, naturally, that we can support, but we cannot support, in view of the studies of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, of the Royal Commission, of the statements of farm officials in the United States, and it has proven conclusively that this fixing of rigid parity prices and cost support is not a sound solution to farm problems.

I am not going to underwrite Mr. Argue and the others in their policy on parity prices.

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — You’re ‘agin’ it.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — You’re not going to support agriculture, period.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Well, what do you propose to do? You haven’t given us one . . .

Mr. Loftson: — Straighten everything out, that’s what we’d do.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Cameron: — You have just finished spending over an hour, Mr. Minister, reviewing our proposals, and now you ask, what are we going to propose to do?

Mr. Erb (Milestone): — Yes, but he said something!

Mr. Cameron: — That would certainly indicate that you didn’t know what you were talking about, when you were talking about our proposals. That’s typical of you.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — All you did was . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

April 5, 1956

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, parity prices as recommended here, which will become the platform of the C.C.F., is not the answer to the farm problems. But there are many problems, many complex things, which must be considered in connection with the whole agricultural economy. There are, for example, your P.F.A.A., P.F.R.A., your Crop Insurance, your Family Allowances. All of these social aids, these other things that guarantee, in case of catastrophe, to put the agricultural industry on a firmer ground. You must protect it from these disasters – from the bottom up, as well as from the top down. The overall picture would take in measures which would assist in stabilizing and increasing this revenue from the bottom up, as well as trying to force it out through the top down, and setting prices which won't demand the prices on the market. Because, after all is said and done, in spite of all that the Minister of Agriculture might say, there is still a law of supply and demand.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Do you believe in it?

Mr. Cameron: — I believe in it; you bet I believe in it. That governs the market places of the world.

Mr. Loptson: — The Baker Commission believes in it, too.

Mr. Cameron: — We must place those market prices on the world markets, if we are to compete in those world markets and sell our produce in them. You set yourself a high enough parity price. You priced yourself out of the markets of the world. You talk about export prices for agricultural products as dwindling to insignificant. We have the highest beef prices anywhere.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Too high.

Mr. Cameron: — Too high? You talk about boards – import boards, export boards, boards to control this. I am glad you have receded at least to the extent that you have now recommended a National Livestock Marketing Board. I can assume from that, then, that the livestock men of the province will not be under such terrific pressure as they have been, during the past years, to prevent this Government from instituting the marketing board on their livestock, on their cattle, which they did not want, and had to go out and bitterly oppose in order not to have one placed upon the marketing of their cattle.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question? Is he saying that the Government put pressure on the livestock men of the province to accept the Marketing Board?

Mr. Speaker: — That's what he said.

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg): — He'd say a lot of things, if you'd let him.

Mr. Cameron: — Are you asking a question, or are five or six of you making speeches? I don't know which.

Some Gov't Member: — We're waiting on the answer to a question.

Mr. Speaker: — I understand the Premier rose to ask you a question. If you do not wish to answer it, you don't have to; but if you do, then do so.

Mr. Cameron: — No, Mr. Premier, I think it was to the municipal conference – not your municipal conference (correct me if I am wrong); but you shortly afterwards said, “A livestock board is inevitable. It is a matter of education, and you will have to proceed with much more education before the livestock men are ready to accept such a board.” He has put himself on record as stating this livestock board is inevitable.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. Since the hon. member has undertaken to quote (I don’t know from what), I’ll tell him what I have always said:

(a) That I think we must have, inevitably, a national livestock marketing board; (b) In my opinion, a provincial marketing boards has very little hope of success, and I have never been a keen advocate of it; but if the producers want it, the legislation is there, we are prepared to support it, and give it a chance to work.

I have repeatedly expressed that, and I am very glad the Committee has come out for a national livestock marketing board.

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, those are all the remarks I have to make at this time.

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a few words; I shall not be very long. I would like, however, to compliment the member from Bengough (Mr. A.L.S. Brown) on the able, capable way in which he chaired the Committee; also on the very capable way in which he presented the report to this House, and then summarized it before the amendment was introduced.

I would like to say that, as far as the members opposite saying that this is just a C.C.F. platform and that we should count on them for that, on the contrary, the reverse is true. We had in that Committee over 33 (I am sure it was over 33) different delegations which met before that Committee. Some 60-odd different people gave evidence there. The report is a true summary of the Committee’s findings, and for that number of organizations to come out and back up what they say is a C.C.F. platform shows, Mr. Speaker, that through the years the C.C.F. has been on the track, and are speaking for agriculture of this province.

I hope the member from Maple Creek won’t run away for I have something I wish to say to him.

Some Gov’t Member: — He will.

Mr. Dewhurst: — He can’t take it, Mr. Speaker. The member from Maple Creek has made a lot of very irresponsible statements in this House. I never at any time in my experience here saw so many irresponsible statements made by a man who knew so little about what he is talking. He says he has not sat on many committees but he did sit on the Implement committee; he sat on a special committee that was in this House, and he sat on this agricultural committee. What he should have said, Mr. Speaker, was that he had never attended many committee meetings. He would have known then what happened the night the members of the Opposition

April 5, 1956

walked out; what he was dealing with, what clause, and what was said. I wonder how he knows, Mr. Speaker.

I have taken the opportunity of checking the official record of registration of the Committee. The member from Maple Creek was not in the Committee that night the members of the Opposition walked out. He was not there. He was among the missing, as usual. Then he tries to tell this House just what the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) was saying; just what the member for Melfort (Mr. C.G. Willis) had said, when they became so confused and frustrated that they had to walk out. I think it is an insult to this House for him to try and bring that information here when he knows not of what he speaks.

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, I can tell my hon. friend that he reported it absolutely right.

Mr. Dewhurst: — Mr. Speaker, regardless of what the member from Saltcoats may try to say here, what he has said and what he may say in the future, we know what happened in that Committee. We know that the member from Saltcoats wanted to revert, when the member from Melfort rose on a point of order and asked if it was in order to revert. The member from Saltcoats would not even give the Chairman a chance to make a ruling. He just kept right on talking, and then slammed down his book and said, “If that’s the way we’re going to be treated, we might as well walk out of this Committee.” – a definite breach of all public responsibility for any member of this Legislature.

I have here the official attendance of that Committee, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to place it on the records of this House – that is the official attendance of Opposition members. You will recall that when this Committee was set up, some great to-do was played up in the paper as to how the Government had selected this Committee and had left the lone Progressive-Conservative off this Committee; and it was the Opposition who asked that he be included on this Committee. If the member had wanted to be on the Committee, having shortly before that received a Liberal nomination, naturally, Mr. Speaker, we assumed that it was up to them to ask him to be on the Committee, representing their side.

This Committee held 23 meetings. Out of those 23 meetings, the member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. Kohaly) attended 8. The member from Rosthern (Mr. Carr) was also added to that Committee and attended 15. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald) attended 19. Mr. McCarthy (Cannington) and Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats) attended 21 out of the 23. Mr. Horsman (Wilkie) attended 14; Mr. Danielson (Arm River) 17, but the member that just took his seat had the audacity to try and tell this Legislature what went on in that Committee and his record of attendance was the poorest of all – six out of 23 meetings, Mr. Speaker, and he was not even in Committee that night. Those are the kinds of thing this Legislature have to be listening to, and he was going to try and put it over the air of this province, and to the public of this province.

Mr. Speaker, if we had a truly free press in this province, he would go down with such condemnation he could never dare go back to his own home. So his actions should be condemned by the press of this province, when any member will abuse a privilege of his right in a Committee, and abuse

the House as he has done. He hasn't the decency, and he did not have the decency, to stay in the House to listen to what I had to say about it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I just came in. I was called out on a telephone message from the House.

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg): — Important business.

Mr. Dewhurst: — Mr. Speaker, for his benefit I will repeat it again. During the attendance of that Committee, he must have had a lot of important phone calls to attend to when he only attended six meetings out of 23, and was not even in Committee the night the Opposition walked out, and now he has tried to tell us all about it.

Mr. Cameron: — On another point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I was in the Committee at the time, and I walked out with the Opposition. I was there.

Mr. Dewhurst: — I have checked the record, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Cameron: — Well then, your record is wrong, because I was in that Committee, and I walked out behind the member from Arm River. I don't care if your record says I wasn't there; then your record is not correct, because I was there.

Mr. Danielson: — That record is just as true as some of the other records you make.

Some Gov't Member: — How long were you in the Committee?

Mr. Lopton: — That's just about as true as some of the other statements you make!

Mr. Dewhurst: — Well, I must accept his correction, Mr. Speaker. He said he was there. I don't recall him being there; but I do know the record shows that he attended only six times out of 23, so no wonder he doesn't know what the report is all about, that he doesn't know how to criticize it and doesn't know how to analyze it. That explains why he talked about everything else but the report!

Mr. Speaker, I shall not support the amendment.

Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, before the House votes, I want to say that, in my opinion, it is a matter of some importance that the Leader of the Opposition ought to express his views on this amendment and on this report. I think you will agree the Leader of the Opposition is about to go out to seek the support of the people of Saskatchewan as a representative of a farm province, as possible premier of a farm province, and he ought to give his views on this report. It seems to me that the Leader of the Opposition has not only treated this debate with scorn and contempt by failing to take part in it, but this is sort of traditional with his attitude toward the House this session. Time and time again members on this side of the House have waited for the Leader of the Opposition to get up and make an announcement on behalf of his party as to important matters of policy. Time and time

April 5, 1956

again we have seen the Leader of the Opposition cling to his chair, or else his cohort from Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) or the member for Rosthern (Mr. Carr) have got up and spoken for the Opposition, and the Leader of the Opposition has remained silent. It seems to me that on an important matter such as this, we have a right to know where he stands, and the reason for his stand.

Mr. Speaker, we have been treated to a very touching performance, by the Opposition. Here we have a report which points out that there was a boxcar shortage in the fall of 1955. We have ample corroboration from newspapers, from independent people in this province, of the viewpoints of the Committee that there was a boxcar shortage. It is common knowledge. We have pointed out in this report that the Transport Controller has not exercised the powers which he has to remedy that situation. Now, Mr. Speaker, members of the Opposition have to choose. They have to decide whether they are going to be spokesmen for the farmers who have suffered as a result of this policy or lack of policy, or they have to choose whether they will be loyal to their colleagues at Ottawa.

The Opposition, I think, have taken a course which they will find is very unpopular among the people of Saskatchewan. I think that we ought to commend the Opposition for their Damon-and-Pythias loyalty to their brothers in Ottawa. After all it takes some courage to fly in the face of the considered opinion of the People of Saskatchewan and the considered opinion of this Committee, and I think they deserve to be given full marks for being willing to be wrong in order to stand right with the Hon. "Jimmy" Gardiner.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, there has been ample evidence presented to this House not only by the reasonings in the report of the Committee, that there was a serious boxcar shortage and that there was a dereliction of duty by the Transport Controller. Surely that is amply proved and, certainly, the words, the extenuations and the arguments of the Transport Controller, the person who has been negligent in this matter, should not be taken to override the opinions of every other authoritative person in the province. As he is the public official who has been negligent in his duty, surely his opinion ought not to outweigh the opinion of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, "The Leader-Post", the "Western Producer" and everybody else . . .

Premier Douglas: — And Mr. Howe.

Mr. Cameron: — I thought you said we were subservient to Ottawa?

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — My hon. friends opposite got a great deal of pleasure out of seeing the Transport Controller defend himself. I hope that, if I ever have anybody as a client who is accused of a serious crime, he can defend himself in the witness box as well as the Transport Controller did here in this Committee. He did a magnificent job of evading the issue. Every time he was asked about the boxcar shortage in the fall of 1955, he always gave us voluminous figures as to the handling of grain since December, 1955. He always managed to wiggle around the point — and I give him credit for being a very able and capable spokesman. But the hon. members opposite don't have to be that loyal to the Federal Government that they fly in the face of all who held an opinion in Saskatchewan, and that they sacrifice the interests of their party in the eyes of the voters. I suggest that this is a serious case of misplaced loyalty; that the voters of Saskatchewan are used to seeing the Liberal party misplace its loyalty, and the

voters won't be surprised, I suppose, by this new incidence of it.

So, leaving the matter of the Liberal party apologizing for the Federal Government's mistakes, I wish to point out that perhaps the most serious condemnation of their amendment is that they propose to delete clause (f) on page 162, which, referring to the support prices for agriculture, concludes in these words:

“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.”

The hon. member for Saltcoats castigates those words by saying they are meaningless. They may be meaningless to him; but to farm people who have had to go on year after year and generation after generation in Canada subsisting at a lower standard of living than the rest of the community, those words are not meaningless. Those words, I believe, embody the thinking in the heart of all agricultural people. Those words, I think, are the very concrete goal and aim. Those words set out the objectives of all the farm organizations since this province was formed, and the Liberal party in this House suggest that those words be deleted.

Well, Mr. Speaker, just what is the issue here? The issue is this. Shall agriculture go on being the unrewarded, the unprotected, the unremembered step-son of the nation? Should agriculture go on trying to function in an economy where every other major segment is protected by national policies designed to give them a stable market, or should agriculture have to pay its costs of production in these protected markets, have to buy gasoline at twice the price that it is just across the line – well, 50 per cent more just across the line, I will amend that; have to buy trucks and automobiles at substantially higher prices than their neighbours just on the other side of the line; have to pay more for all the goods that come from a protected industrial economy at higher prices than world prices, and then have to sell the fruits of their toil on the competitive markets where they compete with slave labour as my hon. friend from Maple Creek says in the Committee?

I suggest that the time has come when Canada as a whole is coming to recognize that agriculture is entitled to be treated as an equal partner in the economy of Canada; that agriculture is entitled to some kind of national policy which will assure to agriculture comparative treatment with that accorded to other segments. Everyone, of course, knows that costs of production in Western Canada are higher than they are just across the line. The cost of all manufactured goods is higher, and it is no answer for my hon. friend to say that farm implements are not subject to protective tariffs, because farm implements are not the whole cost of production or the whole cost of living. They are a small fraction of the total cost of living and carrying on a farm. The other items largely are protected.

I am not advocating that that protection afforded to other segments of the economy should be withdrawn. Nothing of the kind. I am suggesting only the same kind of protection be afforded to agriculture. Now it is not possible, by means of a protective tariff to ensure agricultural income, because agricultural products largely have to flow into export markets. The

April 5, 1956

farmer hasn't got the means or the wherewithal to sell a part of his product in the domestic or protected market, even if there were a tariff, and the rest of it on a competitive world market at another price, because the farmer does not control the sale of his product right through to the ultimate consumer like manufacturers do. The farmer is not in a position even if a protective tariff was erected against farm products, to take advantage of that protection. And so, we ought to recognize that a protective tariff is just simply a way of making the entire community subsidize the industry protected. In agriculture, that method or that technique is not available, and will not work. Some other means has to be found of giving agriculture compensating advantages, and that method is very well worked out in the scheme of parity prices. For that reason, and I see no answer to that argument, the Government of Canada has got to come to the point of considering the wisdom of adopting parity for agricultural prices.

My hon. friends opposite are very much concerned with the results of agricultural surpluses that might flow from parity prices. Well, there is an abundance of evidence to show that parity prices are not the principal factor in the growth of agriculture surpluses in the United States. There is plenty of evidence to show that parity prices are not the dominant factor; but let us be reasonable and realistic. Let us consider our terms of reference here. What do we mean by agricultural surpluses? Even assuming that parity prices were the cause of large surpluses of farm products in the United States, are those surpluses genuine surpluses or are they artificial? Are they bona fide surpluses of food? I am told, Eleanor Roosevelt has said, that one-third of all the families in the United States are not able to afford adequate nutritional standards of diet. At least another third are not enjoying a proper standard of nutrition because of lack of education, lack of knowledge as to what constitutes nutritious meals – food. Thus, in the United States alone, there is no real surplus of food so long as there are hungry children, and men and women – and there are hungry men, women and children there. And, of course, looking at the whole world picture, everyone knows that there is no real surplus of food anywhere, because there are millions of people who have never known what it is to be well fed.

The hon. member for Saltcoats by devious twistings has tried to show that hungry people will refuse food. Hungry people have never been known to refuse food, Mr. Speaker, and I certainly won't take the word of the member for Saltcoats when he says that hungry people have refused food. Hungry people have not had an adequate opportunity to have food, and I consider it is the primary function of governments in this 20th Century to devise a way, to devise a method, of putting food into the stomachs of hungry people.

I say that the most serious problem that we have today is the problem of distributing this food where it will be needed. There are no food surpluses. There is only a relative degree of scarcity between one part of the world and another. This food has got to be put where it can be used, and it is one of the greatest challenges facing mankind today to solve that problem. It is no use, then, for us to predicate our policies on the basis that there is a surplus of food. There is no surplus. There is no use for us to conceive that there are real obstacles to placing this food where it is needed. There are no real obstacles; the only obstacles are man-made obstacles. The principal, the chief obstacle to feeding the hungry people of the world is

our slavish subservience to outworn economic fallacies, to a belief that without money we must go hungry; to a belief that international trade balances must be equal; to a belief that food exported without corresponding exchange of gold, or dollar currency, represent a loss to humanity.

The precise opposite is true of all those propositions, and until somebody can bring forth some fresh approach to this problem of distributing the abundance which we can produce, the world will always be in dire threat of catastrophe of atomic war, pestilence, famine and all the rest of it. To say as my hon. friends opposite do, that we are in grave danger of surpluses of food by adopting parity prices is in my opinion to run counter to the philosophy taught in the Sermon on the Mount. It is contrary to the ordinary principles of sanity, the ordinary principles which sane people adopt in the dealings which they have with their own family and with their neighbours. As long as we are prepared to decide matters like this on the spurious premise that there is such a thing as a surplus of food, then we are bound to go wrong, Mr. Speaker. My friends opposite admit that the world today is crying for food. Let them admit that Canadian agriculture can produce far more food than it is now producing, and let them go along with us in trying to devise a price system which will make possible a greater flow of abundance into the hands and bellies of those who need it.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I want to just say one thing in reply to my hon. friend from Maple Creek. The hon. member from Maple Creek apparently is willing to slavishly follow the statements and the principles enunciated by Ezra Taft Benson. Well, if my hon. friend is so far from Washington that he doesn't know that Benson is wrong, then of course, he will wake up to it sooner or later. Farmers of the Middle west in the United States know he is wrong. Recent votes show they know it, and I predict that it is just a question of time until President Eisenhower will have it forcibly drawn to his attention that Ezra Taft Benson is wrong. These people who talk about solving the problem of surpluses by curtailing production are flying in the face of the goodness that has been placed here on this earth for mankind. They are desecrating this noble land by depriving people of the abundance which it can produce. In Saskatchewan, we are told that agricultural production can probably be doubled. Let it be doubled, Mr. Speaker. Let it be doubled! And if parity prices will result in that, then I am for parity prices. Absolutely separate and apart from the good that it will do for the agricultural industry itself, I am for parity prices if it means twice as much food. Surely we are not so hopelessly sunk into the slough of despair that we can't face up to and attack this problem of distributing these surpluses.

The Premier has made a very worthwhile and noble suggestion that, if we would take one-quarter of our arms budget and use it to distribute a part of this food, it would be a worthwhile gesture and a worthwhile cause. There is one answer. There are many others, many other possible ways of solving this problem. But let us not try to solve the problem by curtailing the amount of food. Let us not try to solve the problem by maintaining a system of prices that will drive the farmer out of production as we are doing today.

The hon. member for Maple Creek made quite a to-do about the fact that we had set up a Special Committee to consider farm problems, when only three years ago the Royal Commission sat upon those problems. Why, he said, this is duplication, or words to that effect; and then a little later on in his

April 5, 1956

speech, he tried to convince us that the situation changes very rapidly and suddenly. Why, he said, three or four months ago, we were concerned about the sale and exports of our wheat, and now the picture is altogether reversed, he said. Apparently when it suits his purpose he can see that conditions have changed, and that they can change very rapidly.

It is true that the Royal Commission did a very worthwhile job of examining into agricultural problems. Their report was undoubtedly written six months, possibly a year and one-half ago. The problem has become more serious since that time, and I think it was a very prudent move to re-examine the problem in the light of circumstances that have transpired since that date, and I think that the Report of the Special Committee shows that it was prudent to do so, because this Committee have found additional problems that were not apparent two years ago, and have therefore proposed additional solutions for problems that were not so apparent two years ago. After all his glowing talk of a resurgence of exports, I think that we should remember that even today total exports in this crop year are still lower than they were in March 1, 1955. It is true some new sales and some new markets have been developed – and I welcome them wherever they are; but let us not forget that total sales as at March 1st are still somewhat below what they were at March 1st the year before.

Premier Douglas: — And they are away below the year before last.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — And, of course, 1954 was a disaster year as far as export marketing was concerned.

Mr. Loptson: — The C.C.F. is responsible for that.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — The hon. member for Saltcoats' audacity is exceeded only by his ignorance. The hon. member for Maple Creek pointed out that there may be a very serious boxcar problem in the spring if the elevator terminals are cleaned out; when the roads open up there will be a serious boxcar problem. I have no doubt that is true. I have no doubt that the number of boxcars required in the last four months of the crop year will be greater, will exceed by a considerable amount the number that were supplied in the first four months of the crop years. There isn't any doubt about it. And I suggest that, if this Committee does nothing else than draw to the attention of the Federal Government and the Transport Controller the seriousness of this boxcar problem, and if it does result in the provision of a larger number of boxcars, this spring, than were evident last fall, the work of the Committee will have been justified. I am convinced that the visit of the Transport Controller here, the discussion which he had with this Committee – I don't want to discourage him altogether, because I think there was a good deal of profit on both sides in that discussion; but if that visit, this report and the discussion which has come out of this report, impress upon the Canadian Government and the Transport Controller the need for boxcars to the extent that a large number will be supplied in the spring to take care of this situation, I will be very happy indeed, Mr. Speaker.

I am not going to support the amendment for two reasons. First of all, I don't think it is our job to try to bail the Federal Liberal party out of its difficulty. Secondly, I think it is our job to . . .

Mr. Loptson: — To bail out the C.C.F.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — . . . lay out a far-sighted programme for agriculture, a programme which will ensure the continuing development of agriculture, and will provide more food for hungry people. Before I conclude, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say how much I look forward to hearing what my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition has to say about these matters, and I would hope that he will enlighten us as to his views. I would say that, if he does not, there will be many people in Saskatchewan who will be wondering really who is the Leader of the Liberal party.

The question being put on the proposed amendment (Mr. Dunfield), it was negatived on recorded division by 32 votes against 8.

The question being put on the motion: "That the Final Report of the Select Special Committee on Marketing and Farm Income be now concurred in," it was agreed to on recorded vote by 32 votes against nil, the following members abstaining: Messrs. McDonald, Horsman, Cameron, Danielson, Loptson, Ripley, Dunfield and MacNutt.

3.30 o'clock p.m.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor entered the Chamber and, being seated on the Throne and having assented to several Bills, was pleased to deliver the following Speech:

MR. SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY:

It is my duty to relieve you of further attendance at the Legislative Assembly. In doing so, I wish to thank you and congratulate you upon the work you have done. I wish also to express my confidence that the approval of the programmes and plans presented before you will continue to provide services necessary to the growth and future development of our Province.

Your Select Special Committee spent much time inquiring into markets, marketing and price policies as they relate to the urgent and pressing farm income problem in Saskatchewan. The report which you have adopted contains useful information on our farm economy and will be helpful at any future Federal-Provincial conference which deals with agricultural problems.

You have voted money for the Province's participation in the financing of a system of main market roads. This assistance will be welcomed by the municipalities and particularly by those living in the rural sections of our Province.

Your decision to further increase grants for education will be welcomed throughout the Province.

The decision of my Government to bear a greater share of social aid costs incurred in the Province will be of great assistance to the municipalities.

It is premature to judge if flooding conditions will be as widespread this spring as they were last year. My Ministers have assured me that they will promptly take whatever steps are necessary and possible to insure that hardships

April 5, 1956

are minimized.

Further reports of the Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life have been made available to you. I commend to you for close study these reports and those that will be available to you during the course of this year.

I note with satisfaction that the successful celebration of Saskatchewan's Golden Jubilee Anniversary ended with a well deserved tribute to the Golden Jubilee Committee.

I am pleased to note that you took the time during this Session to extend suitable honours to Frances Hyland, a native of this Province, who has distinguished herself in the field of drama.

Your decision to pass The Fair Employment Practices Act and The Fair Accommodation Practices Act will further protect the liberty of citizens of our Province.

It is gratifying to observe the growing industrialization of our Province. Legislation which you have passed increasing the borrowing powers of the telephone, and the power and gas utilities will enable them to continue servicing the growing needs of Saskatchewan.

The revision of The Credit Union Act and the amendment of other Acts relating to co-operatives will contribute further to the healthy growth of the co-operative movement.

Increased benefits have been provided under The Workmen's Compensation Act.

You have passed legislation authorizing the establishment of local government at Uranium City.

I thank you for the provision you have made to meet the further requirements of the Public Service, and assure you that the sum of money voted will be used economically, prudently and in the public interest.

In taking leave of you, I desire to thank you for the manner in which you have devoted your energies to the activities of the Session and wish you the full blessing of Providence as you return again to your respective homes.

The Assembly was then prorogued.

(Signed) TOM JOHNSTON,
Speaker.