

worked out so that it would become a functional concept, and I would respectfully suggest that consideration should be given—I do not know by whom—to this concept, which is, I think, a very worthy concept.

Senator HORNER: Mr. Brown, you mentioned the great advances that Russia is making in developing their northern areas. That of course is a good example. We could probably do that under a dictatorship. These Russian people are moved back there and there they stay, they have not the privilege of moving to any other part. There they are and they must do what they are told; they have no choice in the matter. There is no fear of any reaction at election time as a result of how they are treated. So it is really impossible to compete in that regard, that is in colder areas.

Mr. BROWN: I think if possible you ought to have Dr. Radforth come as a witness before this committee and have him describe the feelings of these people; he would be able to explain what is being done. He is interested mostly in muskég. I call him the muskeg king of Canada. He is a muskeg expert. He is a consultant for several of the oil companies and Government departments and he works with us at certain times mostly in matters of transportation across areas of muskeg, location of roads and so on, but in his work he has done a great deal of study of the nature of muskeg—and he purposely went over there to see what they are doing in that regard, and in the course of his travels he found out that there were people living in northern areas doing work which was not very rewarding, I would think, and yet they were happy and there was no question of them staying there because they had to stay there.

Senator BRADETTE: They are there working for mother Russia.

Mr. BROWN: Yes, but it is not a case of them being told to stay there, they like their work.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: To come back, Mr. Brown, to what Senator Wall was saying a moment ago. Would you mind explaining to the committee what is the basis of your judgment when you say the land that has been settled was put under cultivation more or less through a system by which every settler was granted let us say 125 arpents, equivalent to 112 acres of land. Do you look at this from an economic point of view?

Mr. BROWN: I think class "A" land in the clay belt is not as good as class "A" land in the south and therefore you need more land up there to make a living.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I do not say you are wrong.

Mr. BROWN: I remember a survey made up there for the present state of development—I think it was on 1947 and actually I think the development has gone down a bit since then,—we came to the conclusion after a couple of years of survey that settlers who were in there trying to make a go of it from an agricultural standpoint did not have enough land to bring them back a satisfactory return because the climate is against them for one thing.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: And transport?

Mr. BROWN: Transport is definitely against them, but also climate; years go by and they don't get anything.

Senator BRADETTE: I would like to make a last statement. I belong to the Cochrane district; I went there as a settler with my family from the province of Quebec. We went into dairying, and that was all that saved us.

We came there from the province of Quebec as primary settlers with no money; but when the time came to revolutionize from the settler's status to the farmer's status, 95 per cent of the settlers couldn't do it. That was the crisis we faced.

To give you an example of how serious was the situation in the Clay Belt, I had a brother who lived next to me who had 40 dairy cows, a very fine farm,