

any such balance remaining unpaid at any time action may be taken against me, and judgment may be entered by the said commission at any time.

Then there is one further paragraph:

For the purpose of taking possession and recovering such grain the said commission, its agent or agents, may freely enter into and upon my buildings, enclosures and lands, using such force as may be necessary for the purpose.—

I do not know whether that is the purpose for which the extra mounted police were engaged.

—The destruction or damage of the said grain by fire or any other means or in any other manner whatsoever, shall not release me from my liability for payment.

Now, this is a seed grain lien, Mr. Chairman. Anybody who is familiar with realizing on seed grain liens knows that the creditor must keep guard over such grain crop before it is threshed and marketed, otherwise his security is gone. Therefore as a rule the creditor puts someone on the farm to see that the threshing and the marketing are done with his knowledge and advantage. Consequently if after the threshing the farmer refuses to market the grain the lien holder can put on a team and draw it to market, charging the cost to the debtor. Can you imagine, Mr. Chairman, that any government is going to put teams on all these farms, haul the grain to market and charge the cost to the respective farmers in order to realize on the loans made? No government would dare do any such thing. But even if the government did take that step, would not that be the signal for those creditors who had prior claims on the grain—storekeepers, coal merchants, lumber dealers and others in the vicinity—to do the same thing, with the result that the poor farmer would be stripped by them as bare as the day he was born? Does anybody believe that that will be done? But that is the only way in which the government can recover on such liens if the farmer declines to market such grain when desired. There is this provision in the law, that if for any reason it is not expedient to take such action the first year it may be postponed until the second year, and so the horror of that will be hanging over thousands of farmers from now until the second fifteenth of August—a year and a half hence. Nobody in his senses believes that the government will realize on those liens. I don't think any hon. gentlemen believe the government will dare take that course under present conditions. The whole country would be outraged. Take the people down here, those prominent in churches and other organizations who sent out to the west a large number

of carloads of fruit and vegetables free—they did not ask for a lien from those to whom they sent those goods—if they heard that the government of Canada with its great taxing powers and financial resources had started to realize on their liens they would be scandalized. I am not exaggerating the situation at all. Unfortunately it is all too true. And we all innocently thought we were engaged in passing a relief bill to deal with what the Prime Minister described on the first of July as a “national calamity.” Supposing he had said at the end of his dramatic and very impressive speech, “I am going to provide shelter, food and clothing for the unfortunate prairie farmer, but I shall expect him to pay back the last farthing for this assistance, I shall expect from him a promissory note on demand, I shall expect from him a lien payable next August; I shall expect all these things in return for keeping him alive in the meantime;” if he had said that what would have been thought of him and of his government? Would he have got that wonderful speech blazoned across the entire country—and quite properly so, for it was a great statement. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, it never entered into the thought of any man either inside or outside this house that any such thing as taking liens would be done until the Minister of Agriculture in his perambulations throughout Saskatchewan was interviewed by a small deputation—it is not stated how many; we will say two dozen—and they intimated that they did not want to take charity. I am not permitted to quote what was said in another debate; the Minister of Justice (Mr. Guthrie) has his eagle eye on me and will not allow me to do it. But the Minister of Agriculture said he knew at that time the aggregate relief expenditures that would be outstanding before the next crop was harvested would amount to about twenty million dollars; that is, twenty million dollars would be expended for seed, feed, clothing, food, gasoline, lubricating oil, harness mending, and so on in that vast territory, including of course the adjoining provinces. Apparently he went out there knowing that that was the case, yet it never occurred to him whether that money would come back to the government or not, whether it was to be treated as a loan or a gift, until this deputation said: “We do not want charity.” Then he concluded he would recommend to his colleagues that promissory notes be taken from all applicants for relief before being delivered. Thereupon the promissory note policy was started. That is the story as partly recited by the Minister of Agriculture himself,