

## APPENDIX No. 3

not got figures here, but you probably know that for many, many years the land in question in Ireland has been one of the great questions of that country and that the British Government have been passing laws for the last thirty or forty years to enable the tenant farmers in Ireland to purchase their land, and Ireland has practically been transformed from a country of large estates, with tenants living under miserable conditions, rack-rents and things of that sort, into a country of peasant proprietorship. The same thing was done in Denmark. The Danish Government purchased the land and sold it to the farmers on about sixty-year terms, with a rate of interest of about three per cent, so that what practically happened in Denmark and Ireland was that the farmer only paid about the same amount a year as he was paying for rent, and it was an annuity, that is, in sixty or seventy years, as the case may be, he became the owner of the land. In the meantime his rent could not be raised, and any improvements he made on the land were not his own, but any benefits he got from co-operation or anything else belonged to him instead of belonging to the landlord in an increased rent. There is no doubt at all that students of agriculture or co-operation in Europe will tell you that the co-operative movement in Denmark would not have achieved the results that it has if the people who were farming the land did not own it. I only introduce this question as one of the reasons why it is desirable in the interests of not only the farmers, but the country as a whole, that long term credits should be provided for the farmers at the lowest possible rate of interest. Now, in the—

*By Mr. McKay:*

Q. Have you any scheme which you can outline along that line? Have you any suggestions to make to this Committee?—A. I do not want to place before you a cut and dried scheme, but I can place before you two suggested methods of introducing a system in this country, under the auspices of the Dominion Government.

Q. Separate and distinct from the banking system?—A. Oh, yes, entirely. Now, in some of our provinces we did have long term loan schemes under the auspices of the provincial government, but the resources that are available for these schemes are very far from being adequate to meet the needs of the situation. The Saskatchewan Farm Loan Board, which makes loans at 6½ per cent, on the thirty-year amortization plan, has loaned upwards of eight and one half million dollars, first mortgages, up to December 31, 1922, of which \$7,768,109.52 was outstanding at that date. The report of the Board for the year ending December 31, 1922, states that applications for loans were received during the year to the number of 415, for an aggregate of \$1,450,368. Ninety-seven loans were completed with an aggregate of \$361,120.36.

*By the Chairman:*

Q. There were applications for how much?—A. \$1,450,000, and they loaned \$361,000. They had 415 applications and they made 97 loans.

Q. Can you tell us whether those others were not complied with? On the grounds of their not being satisfactory, or on the ground of want of money?—A. On the ground of want of money.

Q. Are you sure of that?—A. Yes. I was reading the report. It says, "Most of the loans that were made, having been accepted by the Board in 1921 or earlier," so that they practically did not meet any applications that were made in 1922. "The Board was out of funds for a good portion of the year, and the books were closed on December 31, with a large overdraft at the bank." That shows that the Saskatchewan Farm Loan Board is nothing like able to meet the demands on it by the farmers of that province.