

which was appointed under the name of the St. Mary's and Milk rivers conservation committee to examine into the possibilities of the project about which I have been speaking. This committee submitted a report to the Minister of Mines and Resources in February, 1942. On page 12 of the report the committee pointed out that they believed this project was a desirable one for post-war rehabilitation in Canada; and in the report they pointed out the serious danger of Canada losing her share of the waters of the St. Mary's and Milk rivers because they are international streams, since that share was awarded by the treaty dated January 11, 1909, and stipulated by official order of the international joint commission dated October 4, 1921. I specially urge that the government proceed immediately with the St. Mary's dam of a capacity of 270,000 acre feet. This would cost roughly \$4 million. It would provide plenty of water to make up for the shortage which now exists in the irrigation districts in the Lethbridge area comprising 120,000 acres, and it would provide water for 94,000 acres of new land. These are very important matters. Therefore I commend to the minister's most careful consideration the Lethbridge southeast water conservation project.

I referred a moment ago to the beet sugar industry. May I turn the attention of the committee to that again for a minute or two? Any nation that does not or cannot produce its own sugar needs cannot be really free. Sugar is likely to become more important as the generations pass. Canada could easily produce her own sugar. One beet sugar factory like the one at Raymond, Alberta, in my constituency, can produce one-twentieth of Canada's annual requirements of sugar. Canada could produce all the sugar she needs in southern Alberta, south of Calgary. The beet sugar industry should, I maintain, be encouraged. I urge upon the minister that he bring influence to bear upon his colleagues in the cabinet to the end that this may be done. As I said a moment ago, the present government has been unsympathetic to the beet sugar industry, and has hurt that industry in Canada.

May I now turn for a few moments to agriculture in Canada, as it is affected by the rehabilitation programme. If agriculture is to be rehabilitated in Canada three things must be done. First, the farmer must have parity prices. This means the bonusing or subsidizing upward of the prices the farmer gets, and the bonusing or subsidizing downward of the prices of the commodities he has to buy. The subsidizing process should be

carried to the point at which every farm family would be able to have a modern home and a cultured, educated family free from financial worries. This should be the ideal. Anything short of that is unworthy of any government whatsoever that might have power in Canada. Second, the farmer needs full markets; markets in Canada to the limit of the capacity of Canadians to consume the goods, and markets abroad for all our surpluses, either through trade or through mutual aid so financed as to avoid increasing taxation or debt. The third need is generous credit facilities. If the minister will provide these three requisites to the farming population of Canada, he will have no need to worry about rehabilitating them, for they will take care of the rehabilitation themselves from there on.

I now turn to the question of housing. Some attention has been given to that matter up to the present during the debate. I maintain that the present housing programme of the government is altogether inadequate. The proposed assistance is not available to the very people who need housing assistance most. Money for housing must be made much more widely available so that the poor man, working for a low and uncertain income, may be able to possess his own home. Interest rates must be much lower than are now proposed, not more than perhaps two per cent. The repayment of the loan should be on the basis of the income of the householder. If he pays a moderate percentage of his income for a period of, say twenty years he should be guaranteed clear title to his home. Every family must have an opportunity of possessing its own home.

Canada exists for the sake of the people of Canada. Without plenty of patriotic, healthy and prosperous people, Canada will never grow. The people must come first. Measures must be taken to encourage an increase in the Canadian birthrate, and suitable housing provision would be one such measure.

Some people will say it sounds foolish to argue that if the householder has paid a certain percentage of his income for twenty years he should have possession of his home. May I just point out to hon. members that the administration in Alberta is proceeding on just such a basis. When they turn over, we will say a half-section of land to a returned man they say to him, "Now, if you give us a certain percentage of the produce of your land for a certain number of years, perhaps ten or fifteen years, you can have the land." I believe eight per cent is all that is called for.