

ballast from England, where there is at present one of the best markets for our grain and other products.

I have in my hand an article, headed "Big Boost for Grain Elevators" which appeared recently in the *Montreal Gazette* and clearly indicates the attitude of the businessmen of that city to competition from Churchill. It reads:

Grain storage space in Montreal harbour will be at least one-third greater by 1958 than it is today, it was announced yesterday. The increase will boost the port's capacity to more than 20,000,000 bushels and a possibility exists that even more space may be added later at downriver ports.

E. J. Desrosiers, Jr., president of the Montreal Corn Exchange Association, said "the news is welcomed as evidence that Montreal will continue to retain its dominant position as a grain shipping port".

He told the group's annual meeting that a 1,500,000-bushel addition will be made to Elevator B. Elevator 3 will be enlarged to handle another 4,000,000 bushels, as well.

Despite problems at the start of the navigation season last year, 118,000,000 bushels of grain passed through Montreal, compared to 83,000,000 bushels during 1955.

More would have been handled had 16,000,000 bushels not been routed from Churchill, Manitoba, Mr. Desrosiers said. That movement established a new record and was made at the expense of St. Lawrence River ports. Present bookings indicate the Churchill movement will be even greater this year.

I can understand the concern on the part of those persons who are interested in the shipment of grain through Montreal, but I say we in Saskatchewan are entitled to some consideration.

Some difficulty is being experienced by the farmers of western Canada in the marketing of livestock. Farmers in the east who specialize in the growing of, for instance, sugar beets and tomatoes supply canneries under contract. I believe even the tobacco growers today have a guaranteed quota on which they are assured a ready market at a fixed price. But the farmers in western Canada have none of these benefits. We hear it said that we should go into hogs or beef cattle. But it takes time and a lot of money to develop that type of farming. True, our hogs and beef cattle are not as perishable as tomatoes and sugar beets, but unless there is a ready and profitable market for the livestock it can ruin a farmer just as quickly as perishable products can. I believe the time will come when the farmer who raises feeders for beef will have to adopt standard business practice, and have a contract with the packer to take his stock at a fixed price. With such an assured market he could go to his bank and make his financial arrangements beforehand as business people do. But as the situation now exists the position of the farmer is so uncertain that he cannot make his commitments beforehand.

The Speech from the Throne said the Senate would be asked to set up a committee to study land use, and the committee has now been appointed. Well, honourable senators, I hope it may be able to make some helpful recommendations. But I am not one of those who favour big farms. I see by a recent news item that some of the prominent and more prosperous farmers of Ontario agree with my thought, that it would be a sorry day for Canada if her small farms were absorbed by bigger farmers carrying on large single operations. I believe that only certain sections of the Prairies are ideally suited for that type of farming. Even in the great northern part of the Prairies, where there has been heavy production of livestock and some grain grown, the people favour the modest-sized, family farm.

I think we in Canada are drifting toward the wrong idea that money represents wealth. More and more people have come to think that if you make a lot of money, and so increase the standard of living, that constitutes wealth. I say this whole concept of wealth is entirely wrong. During the remarks of the honourable Leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) in this debate, I posed the question of why it was that full-scale inflation did not ruin Germany. As yet no one has given me a complete answer to that question, not even a professor of economics in one of our largest universities. However, I think the answer in part at least is found in the frame of mind of the people of that country. Certainly we found during the Second World War how vicious the human being can be. But all the viciousness was not confined to Germans. What about the Russians, and the unearthing of some thousand Polish officers?

I come back to my proposition, that the real wealth of a country is the character of its people, and their ability and willingness to work. I have not the slightest fear for the future generations of Canada, for my children or my grandchildren, just so long as we do not entirely destroy or give away our natural resources. Our country abounds in natural wealth, but paper money is not wealth at all.

So, the question stands: how was Germany able to survive inflation and at the same time very nearly defeat the whole world? Besides that, she is today in the act of tearing down old and ruined buildings and replacing them with structures of glass and steel, and constructing one of the finest highways the world has known.

Italy too has done great things. If Canada and other members of the League of Nations had taken the action that then should have been taken we might never have had a Mussolini, or a Hitler, either. But these dictators