

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session — 10th Legislature
31st Day

Thursday, March 13, 1947

The Assembly met at 3:00 o'clock p.m.
On the Orders of the Day.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

BUDGET DEBATE

The assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer) that this Assembly do now resolve itself into a Committee of Supply.

Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I was just thinking that 13 Budgets have been brought down in this House since I became a Member of this House. It has not always been as large and as pleasant for the Provincial Treasurer to bring down his Budget as it is at the present time. I remember a few years ago when the total amount of cash revenue of this province was very little more than the subsidy which we now receive from the Dominion Government.

However, before I go into some of the features of this Budget, I would like to say a word or two in regard to my constituency. Our crop conditions during the last two years have not been anything to brag about at all; it has been pretty spotty. This last year, throughout the whole district there was a very, very, small crop. As a matter of fact, in one municipality adjoining my home municipality, every township except one — and in a block of 20 sections even that township — was in the bonus area. I think that will indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, the situation of the farmers in our district. Hence the ability and the incentive to pay increasing taxes from year to year is, I think, lagging considerably.

Now I wish to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer for the very efficient and concise manner in which he presented his Budget Address. It was a very adept performance; he knows his figures; but no doubt he had plenty of help to prepare the figures for him. However, I am sorry that I find myself in the position, Mr. Speaker, where I could not very well congratulate the people of the province on the enormous amount of money they are expected to provide for this Government for the ensuing fiscal year.

The gross farm income in 1931 was about \$70,000,000 in the Province of Saskatchewan; and mind you, Mr. Speaker, that was the gross income of the farmers in that year. Today we are approaching a budget in this province which is within a few millions of dollars of the entire gross income of the farming industry in the Province of Saskatchewan in the year 1931.

I am very disappointed to see, Mr. Speaker, that in this budget there is nothing to indicate to the farmers of the Province of Saskatchewan that they are part of the -economy of this province. We find that year after year there is this steadily increasing load of taxation, by one method or another, imposed on the farmers on the land. I should have expected,

March 13, 1947

Mr. Speaker, after the affluent and the buoyant revenues that have been received by the teacher – and of which he speaks every time he comes forward to present the Budget – and the enormous amount of money which is forthcoming from federal subsidies, that at least he could – of he wasn't able to take off the Education Tax is concerned, on the gasoline that you use in your farm trucks, in your farm tractors and for the operation of your farms in the province. That would have been the least that could have been expected.

I should think further, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers buy a tremendous amount of hardware, small hardware on their farms which goes directly into the production of the crop, livestock and grain in the Province of Saskatchewan, which make up a considerable part of our running expenses every year and we would have been glad to see at least the two-cent Education Tax removed from these articles which we need so badly and which we must buy. On the contrary, nothing has been done that would lighten the load on the producers of this province. Instead, they are putting on a heavier and heavier load of taxation every year.

We are now facing an increase of two cents a gallon on gasoline for cars and trucks; and to soften the shock, so to speak, we are told this is a tax the dominion Government is now surrendering to the Province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, may I say to you that this tax has never belonged to the Province of Saskatchewan. The Dominion Government saw fit in the War emergency in 1941, to impose certain taxes on all gasoline, agricultural as well as gasoline used for cars and trucks – as an emergency. They now see fit to remove that tax. They are removing taxes every day, to some degree, so that we can get back to normal. Now, here comes the Provincial Treasurer and he picks up this tax and he says, 'this has been given back to us.'

May I remind you, again, that this tax has never belonged to the Province of Saskatchewan. The Provincial Treasurer is simply doing as he did two years ago; he is just increasing the gasoline tax on our cars and trucks by two cents a gallon. Again, the average farmer is going to pay at least \$25 a year in increased taxation for car and truck gas.

There is another aspect of this thing. I think perhaps it is peculiar that, during the Municipal Convention, when all persuasion in the world was used by certain individuals of the Government to convince that Convention that they should impose more taxes upon themselves and take the responsibility for that policy of this Government, there was no one that put the true picture before that Convention. I could not very well believe that the Minister of this Government who spoke to that Convention does not know the fact and it is this: that in 1941 when the Emergency War Measure of three cents a gallon was put on by the Dominion Government, at the same time, in Western Canada – taking in western Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan, which get all their crude oil in by rail from Oklahoma and other fields in the United States – in order to offset that extra freight and expense of bringing that crude oil in – which is not paid by the eastern part of Canada who get all their oil direct to Sarnia, to Fort William and in the west to Vancouver – the Dominion Government put a subsidy of \$1.35 per 35-gallon barrel on all crude oil imported into Western Canada from the United States.

March 13, 1947

What happened? A year ago now, everyone will remember the Federal Government saw fit to reduce that subsidy by 45 cents per barrel – one-third of the \$1.35. And what happened, Mr. Speaker? Well, here is what happened: Everyone knows and I think the Members of this House know and I am sure the farmers of the Province of Saskatchewan know, that the price for the refined product went up two cents a gallon. That is what they did.

Mr. Nollet: — We ...

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, you anticipate something. You did not tell the Municipal Convention about that though.

Mr. Brockelbank: — On a Point of Privilege, Mr. Speaker, I would correct the hon. gentleman. I did discuss that matter.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, there is no Point of Privilege for the Minister.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Oh yes, there is. I did address the Municipal Convention on that very thing.

Mr. Danielson: — So that is what happened. Now if you look at the morning's Press, you will find what happened. The ceiling on gasoline was removed. At midnight of January 13th last, the other 90 cents per barrel subsidy on crude oil was removed by the Dominion Government. That means that it is twice 45 cents – 45 cents last year in increase of two cents in the refined product; twice 45 is 90 cents removed at midnight, January 13th, and you can anticipate – no doubt in the world – that we are going to have an increase in the wholesale prices of gasoline and petroleum products. What then is his idea? In spite of this, the Provincial Treasurer sees it, with these buoyant revenues and this tremendous amount of governmental income, to put this extra tax on the farmers and on the rest of the people – but after all, Mr. Speaker, so far as the Province of Saskatchewan is concerned the farmer pays it all. Some people may not like that statement. But after all, when the commercial traveller comes to my town and sells us a shipment of goods, whether it is overalls, or drygoods or groceries, or what ever it is, his expenses for burning gas at 10 cents a gallon tax, Mr. Speaker, are paid by myself and my fellow farmers who buy his goods. The same applies to the whole economic structure of the Province of Saskatchewan.

Now, then in spite of that, we are going to have the tax of two cents a gallon gasoline; but nothing for the farmers. He did not even see fit, as I said a while ago when the Provincial Treasurer was out, to remove the two-cent Education Tax on the gasoline and petroleum products that we use on our farms and in our farm tractors, today.

Mr. Fines: — You had seven years to do it.

Mr. Danielson: — Again, Mr. Speaker, other provinces have seen fit to pass on some of this handout by the Dominion Government – of

March 13, 1947

\$15.5 million for this province and in a corresponding amount for the other provinces. Alberta removed all the land taxes; there is no public revenue tax in Alberta, today. That has been removed by the Alberta Government. What did this Government do? Nothing doing! No chance of that! He is looking for more and he is getting it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely sure that the farmers of the Province of Saskatchewan will be very much disappointed if they ever look to this Government for any reduction in the load of taxation that is increasing year by year due to the actions of this Government.

This Government promised that they were going to take away the Education Tax; no doubt about that. They have more revenue now than this province has ever had and now they tell the people of the Province of Saskatchewan and the municipal officials and the school trustees, that they should go out and popularize this tax which was so much criticized by this CCF Party, which now constitutes the Government of this province, previous to the 1944 election. Mr. Coldwell said that this tax was abominable. The Provincial Treasurer said it was a regressive tax. Everybody else was out condemning that tax. Today, they have the gall to go out and ask the people to popularize this tax. Yes, it takes some gall to do that and you have it! You may as well call it the proper name, Mr. Speaker, because that is what it is.

Mr. Speaker: — The Hon. Member had better stick to parliamentary names.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, I have heard that expression used on the floor of this House before, Mr. Speaker, so I think that I should be allowed the same rights as anybody else.

I know, that it is going to be said in this House; look what we did to the school grants, to increase the school grants! I grant, Mr. Speaker, that the school grants are going to be increased. Equalization grants are being increased but I question very much whether the increase in these grants is any more than will approximately correspond to the increased amount of money collected through the Education Tax, through all this year. I question that very much. After all, this tax was paid by the people and it was strictly understood that the Education Tax was going to be used for school grants, payment of teachers' salaries and for nothing else. Everybody understood that. It was on that condition, in the terrible time which we were passing through in 1937, that the people of the Province of Saskatchewan accepted that tax and were willing to pay it. Today we find that part of that tax is used for other purposes – which was never intended, when the tax was put on the Statute Books, and which today, in my mind at least, is contrary to the intention of The Education Tax Act.

The people of the Province of Saskatchewan today, Mr. Speaker, are paying a load of taxes which they cannot possibly carry. When the time comes when we have to compete with other nations in markets of the world with our products and sell in competition with other nations, when the revenues and the bonuses and the set prices which we have had for a number of years and which we are still receiving come to an end, it is absolutely certain that the people of this province cannot then

continue to pay the taxes which we are asked to pay and which are increasing year after year.

I just wonder, Mr. Speaker, I found last fall up in my district, where we have had very poor crops in some parts for two years – and there is no doubt that such a condition exists elsewhere in the province – when we come to dig up the \$5 per person for the Hospitalization Act, \$30 per family, there were many, many families found it extremely difficult to get that money and pay that tax before the 1st of January. If it was not, Mr. Speaker, for this benevolence, or the benefits, we received from the Dominion Government through our PFAA, family allowances and these things we would be in a very bad position indeed – and by the way, that has taken the load off this Government. If the condition, today, was like it was previous to 1939, Mr. Speaker, this Government would have something to use its money for; that would be relief conditions all over this province in certain districts after two years of bad crops. Today, this Government has been asked to pay nothing for that purpose, due as I said, to the good prices for certain products which we produce, to the family allowances, to PFAA bonus and to raised final payments coming in from farmers' crops and through equalization payments of different kinds. These are the things that carry the people of Saskatchewan forward today on their own, so that they do not need to go to the municipalities and that certainly is not going to hand the credit for them to this Government. As a matter of fact that very condition has enabled this Government to spend its money recklessly on its Socialism without using it for taking care of an economic situation which would be inevitable without these policies I have mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to refer a little while to some of the statements by the Minister of Municipal Affairs. He took up the biggest part of his speech – or at least a good part of his speech – by criticizing the Leader-Post, telling what a terrible man operates that paper; that he was out to misrepresent him and his Government and there was hardly anything that he would not accuse that individual of. Well, I think he has his answer in this morning's paper, in that editorial. It would be very interesting to see the Hon. Minister get up on the floor of this House and explain that thing away. He would have a little harder time, or just as hard a time, as to convince the Municipal Convention that they should vote another \$1,600,000 for taxes on the people of this province – and he could not do that.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Bring in a motion and I will sure answer it.

Mr. Danielson: —Bring in one yourself. Well, he was rather peeved about the actions of the Municipal Convention in having the courage and the audacity to go to work and prove the directors' report to the convention, which advised against acceptance of this – should I say – benevolent offer that the Government made them – to put on this tax and collect for it, keep the money to be distributed according to their own convenience and as they saw fit. He was critical about this Convention's attitude toward that, 'because it had been known that I was going to come here and speak to them and they could have held that off until I arrived.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the Municipal Convention had good reason to reject that thing and kick it out through the

March 13, 1947

door, which they did; because I have never seen such a spineless Government in my life. They went to the Municipal Convention and said, "Here, please, if you will pass the resolution, asking us to do this, we will do this for you; but we will take the money and then we will hand it out, dole it out, wherever we see fit to suit our own purpose." that was the meaning of it. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is a very weak Government that has not got the courage to take responsibility for their own policies. It is a very weak and vacillating Government that has not that responsibility. This Government did not have that responsibility, Mr. Speaker, or did not have the courage to take the responsibility and say that they were going to put this tax on and give you back the money. Why didn't you do that?

Mr. Brockelbank: — We did!

Mr. Danielson: — No, you didn't! You didn't have, what we call the guts.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs, goes over there and makes a speech and then he complains that he has been misquoted, of course, all through that speech, but I notice, Mr. Speaker, that he accused us on this side of the House of lobbying among the members of that Convention.

Mr. Brockelbank: — I did not contend that the Opposition was lobbying at that convention at all. I said that there were certain persons, and if the Hon. Member has a guilty conscience, that is all right with me.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I will accept this explanation, but he certainly pointed at this group here and there was no one in this House that misunderstood what he meant either. But I noticed, Mr. Speaker, that on Thursday evening there were empty seats all over this House, of CCF Members and where were they? Well, some municipal men came to me and told me that they were all lobbying down at that Convention. One would have expected at the least that they would have been here cheering their Provincial Treasurer on such a magnificent budget; but they were absent. Even the Premier himself was absent. He had to go down there and try with his persuasion and skill of handing out nice-sounding phrases to convince this group of men to vote a tax on themselves.

Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Privilege. On behalf of the Premier, an aspersion should not be cast by the Hon. Member. The Premier had accepted an invitation to address the Rural Municipal Convention, months ago, long before there was any thought of this. For the Hon. Member to suggest that he went down to try to put this thing over is absolutely ridiculous and I think that if the hon. gentleman were a gentleman he would withdraw the statement.

Mr. Procter: — I think, Mr. Speaker, that under the rules of this House the Hon. Provincial Treasurer cannot take a Point of Privilege for another Member.

Mr. Fines: — Certainly, when he is absent.

March 13, 1947

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, I thought I was paying the Premier a compliment and I am certainly willing to do that anytime; when it comes to persuasion and being able to convince someone that black is white, he has no peer in this province. I know he did his best on that occasion. He did his best, but it wasn't good enough.

Well, Mr. Speaker, after all, when the Provincial Treasurer brought down the proposition of this farm gas tax in the House, a few days before the Convention, the statement so far as I remember it — and I read it very carefully in the press — was to the effect that two cents a gallon on gas would raise \$1,600,000 and that would be handed back to the municipalities. As I said, on the first morning of the Convention, they kicked that proposition out through the door; the Minister of Municipal Affairs addressed that convention — of I am wrong in this I am perfectly willing to have him correct me, Mr. Speaker — and added that they were prepared to throw the amount of money now in the Public Revenue Tax Equalization Fund, which is a trust fund and belongs to the rural municipalities, into the pot and add it to this \$1,600,000.

Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, I think the Speaker of the House has been very seriously attacked just now. I do not think that it is right. You, Sir, gave a ruling the day before yesterday, in connection with a motion in which you stated that certain money belonged to the Government. The hon. gentleman has now challenged that indirectly, by saying that this is money which belonged to rural municipalities.

Mr. Speaker: — The Point of Order is well taken. The hon. gentleman must withdraw the statement that the money belongs to the municipalities.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, Mr. Speaker, if that is your ruling, of course, I will have, according to the rules of the House, to withdraw the statement; but we know who paid that money in. The farmers did it on promise they get it back on an equalization basis. No doubt about that. If the Provincial Treasurer takes the responsibility now and says that this money does not belong to the municipalities or the farmers ...

Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, just a minute, that is not correct.

Mr. Speaker: — He did not say that it did not belong to the farmers.

Mr. Danielson: — No, Mr. Speaker, but he did say it belongs to the Government of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker: — You must withdraw the reference to the farmers. The Provincial Treasurer did not say that.

Mr. Danielson: — I withdraw that statement and I am going to substitute the one that the Provincial Treasurer said that this money belonged to the Government of Saskatchewan.

March 13, 1947

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed!

Mr. Danielson: — Well, Mr. Speaker, this money in any case was going to be added to the \$1,600,000. Then, Mr. Speaker, the next day, according to the press report, the Premier spoke to this convention. This ‘ante’ was raised a little bit and he said, according to the press report – I was not at that meeting – that the money that is now being paid, approximately half a million dollars for bridges and road grants could also be added to that fund; but even that was not sufficient to convince them ...

Mr. Brockelbank: — On a Point of Privilege, Mr. Speaker. If the Hon. Member could read something else besides the Leader-Post, I stated that at the convention. The speech on his desk mentioned the half million dollars which I stated there. The Premier may have repeated it, but I stated that.

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, that may be correct, but I know that it was in the press report of the Premier’s address.

Mr. Brockelbank: — I say again, I stated that.

Mr. Danielson: — So did the Premier. So, if both the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Premier used the same figure, well then I do not have to change my statement. As a matter of fact the ‘ante’ was raised in order to induce the farmers, or these municipal men from all over the province, to accept this thing, to swallow this bait and vote this \$1,600,000 tax on themselves which they had no right to do. I think every one of them realized they did not have the right to do it, because I heard man after man in that convention say this: “We were elected, last fall. We have been elected, but we had no mandate to increase the taxes on people by voting more taxes on the agricultural industry and increase the cost of production to the farmer.”

They looked on it in that way. They were responsible men who knew that they had certain obligations, certain responsibilities; but they were not going to step outside of their jurisdiction, Mr. Speaker, and assume a responsibility that was exclusively on the shoulders of this Government – to take the responsibility for their own tax policy and for their own policy in imposing taxes on agriculture. That is the point I wish to make.

Now, another thing the Provincial Treasurer made some reference to was the cancellation of the 1935-36 and 1937 seed. Well, I have nothing to find fault with in that; but there is one thing in connection with this situation, Mr. Speaker, that is entirely wrong. That is that, for two years now, people who have found themselves in a position where they have had a chance to sell their land or make a transfer, before that transfer could be made they had to come forward and pay up everything that was against that land.

I have in my hand a copy of a circular letter sent to all councillors, reeves and secretaries, dated April 18, 1945, and here is what it says:

It is not the wish of the Government that the municipalities collect these accounts. (Just above there he

March 13, 1947

referred to these seed accounts for these three years). “It is not the wish of the Government that the municipalities collect these accounts, but previous instructions apply in cases where title must be cleared.

Now, I came down myself, a year ago last June, to this building right here. An old gentleman, who lived in the western part of my constituency – his health broke down and he had to move to Vancouver; his health condition made that necessary. Then he had a chance to sell his farm, a very small farm at that, and not a very good far, Mr. Speaker. When he came to transfer the title he found that he was blocked. There was nothing that could be done. He sent me all the correspondence and the particulars and I came down to this building. I went to see the party in this building whom I could take to in regard to this and from whom I could get the real information and I got the information. I was quite bluntly told that he did not agree with the situation that it was an unjust situation. Don’t forget, Mr. Speaker, that this Government through the Minister of Municipal Affairs had told all the municipalities, on April 18, 1945 that it was not the wish of the Government to collect these accounts. In spite of that any person who found himself in a squeeze, in the unfortunate position, that he had to dispose of his property, clear his title and transfer his title, had to come forward and take the money out of his pockets and pay it. In this case I mention there was a considerable amount – I think close to \$800 against that little farm and when you took that out of the equity which that old man had in that farm, there wasn’t much left.

Now, that is the situation. Will the Minister of Municipal Affairs come forward, today, after the Dominion Government has cancelled \$44,000,000 that this province owed the Dominion Government, will he come forward now and play the game and say to this old man, to the municipalities and to all farmers, who have been treated in this way: “Sir, we will pay that back to you. We are going to give you the same break that the other fellow got who sat there and probably had the money to pay but refused to do so,” on your instructions; refused to do so and pay on your instructions. Will you do that?

Mr. Buchanan: — Was that done in 1935 in the cancellation of taxes at that time, to the farmer that worked out his taxes?

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, that was the best arrangement that humanly could be made and it was that a man who did not owe any taxes did not get any taxes cancelled. First of all, he got a big cancellation or reduction or discount on his taxes for the last two or three years just previous to that time, ranging from 20 per cent to 35 per cent all over the Province of Saskatchewan; and the man that had the biggest tax got the least discount. When the time comes he gets credit for two year’s taxes, Mr. Speaker.

Now, that is the situation. Where is the fair play in this way? Where is the fair play here? There is rank discrimination, Mr. Speaker; advising the people and the municipality not to pay; but when one unfortunate individual – there must be hundreds of them in the province – finds himself in the position through circumstances, old age, poor health, that force him to liquidate his farm, he is forced through circumstances to dig up that money. The Provincial Treasurer and the Minister get the

March 13, 1947

the money and now they say: "We are sorry. These fellows were told not to pay it two years or more ago, but we are sorry we cannot give it back to you." Now that is the policy of the Government. That is equity.

I heard one of the Members speaking here, yesterday, and he said they had at their masthead 'Humanity first', 'Christianity applied.' So that is the way you practise it, is it? We can see you now in your true colors.

Mr. Douglas: — You wouldn't recognize it if you saw it.

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister made a reference to my Leader and I think he included the Leader of the Progressive-Conservative Party, as being very 'dear friends' of Mr. Nelson Clarke. Yes, you did that. Well, now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know Nelson Clarke. I have seen his picture in the press; I have heard him speak and I have read a lot about him. I think he is an honest man. He has got, at least, the courage to say that he is a Communist. He is a Labour-Progressive; give him credit for that, because after all, the man who has the courage to stand up and say what he is, I have a good deal of respect for him. I do not agree with him, but I am sure I do respect him. Sometimes Mr. Nelson Clarke talks back to these men who pretend to be one thing and the chances are they are something else.

A few weeks ago, November 2nd, 1946 to be exact, he saw fit to make a statement in the press. I happen to have the statement here and I am going to read it to this House and surely that will answer any statement by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Speaker. He said this:

I see that Premier Douglas is telling the electors of Portage la Prairie that the CCF does not ant any help from the Labour-Progressive Party. Perhaps he has forgotten that he himself climbed the first rung of the ladder to political success with the very active and devoted help of the Communists of Weyburn constituency, in 1935; -- and that he was only too glad to get all the aid he could in a very hotly contested election.

I can read the whole thing, but that is sufficient at this time.

Mr. Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman's statement which he has just read from Mr. Nelson Clarke, is not true.

Mr. Danielson: — Of course, I did not expect the Premier would say it was true, Mr. Speaker. Then I understand that Mr. Nelson Clarke is not telling the truth; he is the person to accept the Premier's denial. I am just reading it because, after all, it is just as fair as when the Minister of Municipal Affairs stands up in this House and accuses the leaders of both the political parties opposed to his party of being bosom friends or close associates of Mr. Nelson Clarke: 'Dear friends' was the expression he used. It would appear like Mr. Tim buck, Nelson Clarke is quite a versatile gentleman and able to contact everybody.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw

the remark that the Leader of the Opposition is a 'dear friend' of Nelson Clarke.

Mr. Danielson: — I was very interested, Mr. Speaker, in the statement made by our friend from Wilkie. He does not speak very often in this House, but he sometimes has very interesting things to say when he gets on his feet. First of all, he started by telling me that they had some very good up-to-date and progressive co-operative associations up in his constituency. I am very glad to know that, Mr. Speaker. I am sure that is not his fault if they have. I think they have been built up and brought to their highly efficient state of development probably in spite of the Hon. Member for Wilkie. However, he made another statement: he was talking about the Silkin Bill in Great Britain and he, of course, showed why that Bill was a necessity over in Great Britain. I will not argue the point with him, because I am not sufficiently familiar to even say that it is not so; but I am going to try to deal with some of the things with which I have had a little practical contact.

In doing so he made this statement, Mr. Speaker, he said that we should not talk about legislation that has been passed, but look forward to legislation that might be passed in this House. That was the statement he made. Now, I was just wondering if there was not a hint in that we might have something like the Silkin Bill here. I am just asking that question. You know these hints coming from members who support this Government, are very interesting.

Another thing he said was that the legislation passed by this Government in regard to farm security was working so well, and had had no effect on the transactions in farm land, on the ability of a man who wants to purchase farm land with limited capital and all sort of things; that there has been no hindrance no stumbling block in their path. Now, Mr. Speaker, some time ago I happened to read an article by R.D. Colquette — I think he is editor of the Country guide. He said this:

But underlying many of the answers,

He had been dealing with why farmers leave the land and so on.

there is a tone of scepticism about politician's promises to help the farmers. The farmers feel that now, when stock and implements are fetching record prices, it is a good time to get out. Even South-Saskatchewan has voted for millenniums. Farmers prefer cash.

Then he said that one dirt farmer wrote to him saying:

I sold to a big farmer who had ten sections so that I would be sure of getting my money. I would have preferred selling to a man who needs the land and could have got \$5 an acre more; but agreements don't mean much nowadays in Saskatchewan.

I heard a radio broadcast from Winnipeg about a year ago, which I can read to this House — but I am not going to do so — dealing with exactly the same thing, having particular application to the district surrounding the city of Regina and mentioning how many farmers had to move off the farms because they had been sold from under them. These farmers were renters, had a

March 13, 1947

considerable amount of cash, were willing to pay, but they could not pay the amount of money which was demanded to make their ownership of the land absolutely secure.

Just about three weeks ago I happened to be in an office in the city of Regina, when a gentleman with whom I was not acquainted started to talk with me. He is a farmer, living back here on No. 1 highway, not so very far from this city. We talked for a little while and he told me that in the fall of 1945, an estate was closed up near here containing two half-sections with buildings and a well on both of them and it is a very useful and attractive thing in this Regina district to have good water on the farm. He said that the lawyer who came to act for the heirs of the estate discussed the situation with some of the neighbors out there. There were two young men – one was married with one child and the other one was married but had no children. This is what he said about it – I have it down here so as to make no mistake; I wrote it down, because it was so illustrative of the conditions in the Province of Saskatchewan at the present time. He said that one of these men had been making some money the last few years and they had \$6,000 a piece to put down on a half. This farm sold for \$40 per acre – that is each half section, Mr. Speaker, and that makes \$12,00 for a half section of land. This gentleman came into the city of Regina, spent about a day in here and he came back again the next day and he told these young men that he had consulted legal authorities in the city of Regina, had discussed the matter from every angle and that, in view of the conditions and the legislation in the province, he was sorry but he could not take \$6,000 – that's about half cash – on these two half sections, but that he would sell it for cash. He sold it to a person over here – a man with no family at home, an old man and old lady – I know this gentleman, by the way and I verified it – for spot cash and he paid them out. This gentleman said to me, himself: "I did not need the land, but it was such a bargain. And you know, I got 27 bushels to the acre on that land last summer." The first crop he took off went 27 bushels, No. 1 wheat. Well, Mr. Speaker, you are a farmer, you know what that means. The chances are he will get \$1.50 per bushel net; I think he will, when the final payment is through.

There is a concrete example, Mr. Speaker, of what this legislation does to the young men of this Province of Saskatchewan, with limited means, with limited capital, who want to go out and start in operation for themselves and get to become the owners of their own homes and their own farms.

Now that is the situation. I know these things are true – and in spite of what the Hon. Member for Wilkie says, this is the situation in the Province of Saskatchewan today.

I could mention a case up in my district, in the next town. I will not mention the names. A place was sold; all agreements had been made except the signing of the papers. For this very reason they were never signed. That is only six and one-half miles from my home and I know these things are true. Now this is the situation, Mr. Speaker, that we face in Saskatchewan today.

I notice, Mr. Speaker, that this Government, during the last Session particularly, are very sensitive of criticism. Well, I am sorry, but so far as I am concerned, I am going to continue to criticize this Government and I am going to criticize them just as strongly as I can, because I am convinced that it is my

March 13, 1947

duty to do so. We never had any sympathy, Mr. Speaker, when we were sitting on that side of the House. I can remember the two gentlemen over here, I can remember in the early days when ...

An Hon. Member: — Where? Here or there?

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, you will be over here pretty soon, if you ever come back at all – which is very doubtful; because I am sure you will never get back where you are.

When we were sitting over there, Mr. Speaker, in the first year after 1934, the first four years there were five of them here – and I am sorry there is none of the five in the House today. We had Mr. Williams, Mr. Hantleman, Mr. Macauley, Mr. Kemper and Mr. Stork. They were sitting right here. From 1934 until the election in 19348, we never heard anything except Russia – Russia was the ideal state, the ideal pattern for Saskatchewan. We heard nothing else but that. Then toward the election time, they commenced to switch to New Zealand and sometimes over to Sweden. but that was the pattern and there was not any beating around the bush about these things, because they were out and out to establish in the Province of Saskatchewan a state like they have in Russia.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to a radio broadcast – I think it was on January 16th, the Hon. Attorney General of this Government was talking on the radio and – the statement was not new; I have heard him make it in this House – this is what he said and I want particularly to draw it to the attention of this House, because if we say anything a bout that group over there, Mr. Speaker, why they are so tender skinned and so sensitive, that they fell quite insulted and very much peeved if we dare to talk to these gentleman as I am sure they should be talked to; the Hon. Attorney General said this:

We should set up courts to try and commit and convict; we should get the court to try and convict a man or woman who have consistently voted for the old political parties.

Mr. Speaker, I had some company in my house that night and was asked by one or two of them what that statement really means. Of course, I do not know what the Attorney General means all the time, sometimes I do not know whether he really knows what he means himself.

Mr. Douglas: — You have to be pretty bright to follow him.

Mr. Danielson: — Sometimes he has not struck me as being so bright, Mr. Speaker. My friends over here laugh; they laugh at that sort of thing, but isn't that exactly what has been done in countries in the world where Socialism dominates. Go over to Czechoslovakia; go over to Poland; go over to Russia; to Franco in Spain; to Peron in Argentine! Isn't that what is being done?

An Hon. Member: — Franco – a Socialist?

Mr. Danielson: — I said Franco in Spain; I said Peron in Argentine; the same type. They are all fundamentally the same and that is: “You think as I do or keep your mouth shut, or else we will fix

March 13, 1947

you, we will liquidate you.” that is the idea. Where the Socialist is the controlling power in the government this condition exists: they take those men and those women who have the courage to hold other convictions than the Government does. That is where they said: “Come over here, we want to see you,” and sometimes people don’t see them anymore. Now that is the idea. So I am not so surprised that the Attorney General should talk something along this line.

He made another statement. He called all political leaders of the opposing parties, “political gangsters.” that, from the group across the House, Mr. Speaker, who are so tender hearted when we criticize them! I can be pretty strong in my language, you know, Mr. Speaker, stronger than I am allowed to be in this House; but nevertheless, I have been getting by so far and I am going to behave myself so that I can still stay in this House. But sometimes, you know, when you see this thing, when you hear them over the radio, it makes your blood boil. And these are the fellows who have the never to call themselves Social Democrats and Democratic socialists. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is not such a thing in the world as Democratic Socialism. You know who talks most about that? It is Gromyko, Vishynski, Molotov and Stalin. They use the term democratic socialism more than any other men in the world today. And we hear it in this House all the time. Well, there is no such a thing, Mr. Speaker, as Democratic Socialism. Socialism is a totalitarian idea. It must be a totalitarian idea to succeed and the nations in the world who have embarked on that road have found that out to their sorrow. When we heard the Attorney General say that they should set up courts to try these men and women who have built the Province of Saskatchewan and built it up to what it is today, because they had the conviction and the courage of their conviction, to support the political parties of old who have stood for individual freedom, individual initiative and the right of the individual to his own destiny and to do his own business as he sees fit, then I am not surprised when we get this tuff off the radio from Members of this Government.

My friend, the member for Wilkie, also made a statement that I am particularly interested in, Mr. Speaker, because it has been a sort of “Charlie McCarthy chorus from one end of Canada to the other in the last few weeks. First of all, we heard it from Tim Buck down there; then we heard it from Nelson Clarke; then we heard it from the Communists in Manitoba, from Ministers on the floor of this House and everything else, and from the Member for Wilkie the other day – that Canada was going to be the Belgium of the next War. Well, Mr. Speaker, I just wonder what he had in mind. He did not tell us; but it would have been a very interesting discussion if he had seen fit to do so. I certainly would have liked to have had him elaborate on that statement.

Now, who is going to make Canada the Belgium of the next war? Who is going to do it? Is the United States going to do it? Is Japan going to do it? Well, Mr. Speaker, if these two questions must be answered in the negative, who is going to do it? The only nation on the face of the earth that could come over here and make Canada the Belgium of the next war, is Russia. That is the only nation on the face of the earth that can do that – and after all that would be nothing more than an extension of their policy, an extension of a fundamental principle in Communism which has been proven for the last 10 or 15 years, particularly during the last eight years, Mr. Speaker. Here is

March 13, 1947

what Russia has done. they absorbed Esthonia, Lithuania, Latvia, part of Czechoslovakia, part of Poland, part of Roumania and part of Finland. That is what they have done. Today they are doing their best to extend their ideologies to include Greece and Turkey.

I just want to ask the Member for Wilkie, or any of his colleagues who have spoken or will speak, to explain to us who is going to make Canada the Belgium of the next War. You heard this in Eastern Canada; CCF members in Eastern Canada spoke about this thing. It came into Manitoba. It came into this House and all the criticism is made against the imperialism of the United States. I would like my friends to go to work and read something what Mr. Bevin says on that insinuation and surely he will believe Mr. Bevin! I think Mr. Bevin realizes, today, more than any other living man, except probably some of the officials of the United States, what this world faces in connection with Russia and the schemes of the enfranchisement that that country has embarked on. Why does Mr. Bevin plead with the United States to go to the succor of Greece, Mr. Speaker, to send them aid, both materially and financially? Why does he do that? To save the one part of Eastern Europe today which is left from the blighting policy and the blighting influence of Communism. That is what he is doing it for.

One of the CCF Members in the Federal House made a speech at Estevan on October 16th last and here is what he said:

It is becoming necessary to use more and more dictatorial measures in order to maintain and advance our system by which we can build an order which can succeed in complete harmony with Russia.

An Hon. Member: — He corrected that.

Mr. Danielson: — I read the correction and it does not make one iota of difference in the meaning of it. You can split hairs all you like, but any man who understands the English language – and I do not profess to be any expert on it; but I notice there are other men in this House that do not understand it sometimes when they read some of these Bills in the House. I am looking at the Premier over there.

Mr. Embury: — Did you understand the Insurance Bill, Mr. Premier?

Mr. Danielson: — I am going to make a confession to the Premier. I read it three times myself before I saw what it meant; but I think he read it four times or ten times before and then he could not see it. but, Mr. Speaker, these are things that are serious. They should occupy the thoughts and minds of every one of us because, after all, today is the crisis in human history. There is no doubt about that. And instead of carping criticism, instead of trying to stir up strife and ill will with our best friend – perhaps with Britain, the best Canada has on the face of this earth – we should silence those who try to bolster up the policy of the nation who has shown by actual action what they are out to do.

I was just looking over some of the things that United States and Canada have been doing. Canada's aid to UNRRA was

March 13, 1947

\$154,000,000. The United States of America, if I remember correctly, paid 72 per cent of the total cost of that very charitable enterprise which has saved the continent of Europe from complete starvation. Canada gave away in lend lease a total of \$772,000,000. that does not figure in the aid that was given to Great Britain. That was outside of Great Britain. These are some of the records of this Nation and surely, Mr. Speaker, we can and should have the right to expect better relationships, better returns in goodwill and friendship from the Nation who benefited most of any of them by these benevolent actions of Canada and the other United Nations, than to have their spying system and their probing 'fifth-columns' probing into the machinery of state in this Nation and trying to obtain secret information on the atom bomb in order that they may be better ready when occasion demands, to use it against ourselves. These are things that I think every red-blooded Canadian should think about.

I was very much interested in some of the statements made by some of the speakers in regard to the Budget. Particularly, I was interested in particulars which have to deal with the agricultural estimates. There are some increases in the estimates for the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, but checking over these figures and checking over the amount of money voted for Agriculture last year, we find that these increases are more apparent than real. In the first place there is \$418,000 increase in the estimates for Agricultural Department which was really put in there to cover, as far as I can see, expenditures in connection with administration of lands, which has been transferred from the Department of Natural Resources to the Department of Agriculture.

If we take it, on the face of it, we find an increase in the Department estimates of \$792,597; but is this an increase? As I said, \$418,877 is a transfer from the Department of Natural Resources. That, at least, is the statement in the Budget; that it is for Lands Branch which was not in the Department of Agriculture administration, last year. It does not make any difference whether that money was spent in the Department of Natural Resources or the Department of Agriculture; that is not my point at all. What I do object to is that an attempt is being made to try to convince the people that there is an increase for this Department of \$792,000. As I said, it does not make any difference whether that \$418,000 is spent by the Department of Natural Resources, or is spent by the Department of Agriculture; but it is going to be spent for the administration of certain lands, which I do not think directly, in a sense, has any bearing on the activities of the Department of Agriculture so far as its relationship to the agricultural industry is concerned.

That may be planned by this Government for irrigation or something of that kind, which the Provincial Treasurer mentioned. However, that is the first time I heard about it and I expect we will hear from the Minister later on about this when we come to the Estimates in the House.

There are also small decreases in the Estimates, Mr. Speaker, of \$3,600 in the Field Crops Branch; but when you really get down to business you will see that when you take out this \$418,000 from the \$792,000 there is about a \$347,000 increase in the amount of money which the Department will have to spend for the next fiscal year. The principle increase is \$13,500 for administration. There is Agricultural Representative Service,

March 13, 1947

increased \$117,500 – well, we will hire some more field supervisors for that. However, a \$25,000 increase for Farm Labour requirements, which – I think that I am correct – is partly reduced, or partly repaid by the Dominion Government; not all paid by this Government. Then we have Publicity and Statistics – an increase of \$4,500. I was just thinking, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Agriculture could, at least, have his picture published in the Saskatchewan News four thousand five hundred times, for that amount of money; but that should go some ways towards putting out pamphlets and literature to enable them to inform the people about all the blessings this Government is rendering to them through the Department of Agriculture. Then there is \$180,000 – Grain and Fodder Branch. Well, now after all it does not make much difference where you put that money, nor in what Department you put it in; but surely, Mr. Speaker, that cannot really be figured as a proper expenditure in the Department of Agriculture as being something that benefits the work of administration, field services and propagation of field crops and all that sort of thing. After all, that is really a relief measure; it is really a measure to assist men who, by force of circumstances, find themselves in a position where they need assistance – whether it is municipalities as such, or individuals as such – where they need more feed grain for their livestock or fodder for their livestock. So, surely that should not be here; but it is here. So, when we check this thing down, we find that the increase is not so great as appears on the surface, for these items should not properly be credited to this Department as they have not any bearing on the administration and benefits that the Department will render to the people of the province during the coming year.

This is the third Budget this Government has brought down. Three years ago, in 1944-45, the Budget was \$34,167,000. Today, we have a Budget, Mr. Speaker, -- were it all in where it should be – of almost \$65,000,000. That is what this Government is going to spend and collect by some means or other, during this coming fiscal year. No matter where they put it, or whether they put it here or some place else; that is what the total amount really adds up to.

Now then, we have had an increase in the estimates of the Department of Agriculture during the last three years counting this budget, of \$495,000; that is what I call the actual increase for the services of that Department. But we have had an increase in the total budget of \$31,000,000 in that time, Mr. Speaker, and \$495,000 is slightly over one and three-quarter per cent in the last three years has been allotted to the Department of Agriculture. Agriculture is the basic industry of this province. Eighty per cent or more of all the economic returns of this province comes from that industry – and here we have the magnificent sum of one and three-quarter per cent of the Budget, over the last three years, being devoted to the Department of Agriculture, of the \$31,000,000 increase, as I said, \$495,000 can properly be attributed to that Department. Now then, I think this indicates quite clearly to you, Mr. Speaker, and to any unbiased person, that this Government has not a very great record for the farm community, or farm industry, in this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, ever since last fall, it was clear to anyone by the middle of December at least, or even by the first of November; it was clear to anyone who knows anything about Saskatchewan winters, that we were in for an extremely long winter and it seemed in every way that it was going to be a very severe

March 13, 1947

and hard winter. This was proven to be the case. With these facts before them and with the reports and request of rural municipalities and individuals throughout the part of the province which was particularly in difficult circumstances insofar as feed and fodder was concerned, we certainly had the right to expect that this Government, which has prided itself as being so efficient with all their planners, field supervisors and experts and all that sort of thing, would have had the energy and initiative to take the necessary action at that time to provide for any emergency that might fact them during the coming winter. We find, Mr. Speaker, that this was not the case. We find that nine municipalities, in the south part of the province mostly, applied for feed grain or assistance in some way or another in order to help to get some feed grain and 47 municipalities asked the Department of Agriculture for assistance for fodder in some way or another, either by freight rates or purchase and the shipping in of feed or fodder. That was a long, long time ago. Now what is the situation? In spite of the fact that in the month of October – I spoke of November, Mr. Speaker; that the winter was then setting in quite severe – but even in October there were applications received by the Department for 46 carloads of fodder; in November, 73 carloads of fodder; and in December 93 carloads of fodder. You can see by that 46,73, 93 – up, up, up, up, every month. This was to save some people in actual difficult circumstances that were facing a crisis insofar as their fodder and livestock was concerned. So now what happened?

Today, Mr. Speaker, in the southern part of Saskatchewan, there are hundreds and hundreds of cattle dead. I see the Provincial Treasurer smiling. Well, I know two individuals who lost over 300 head of cattle and they had been trying their best to get a few carloads of fodder in. Now then we find that in orders for fodder up to December 31st, the Department had received applications for 212 carloads – that is, for October, November and December, 212 carloads. There had been placed orders outside the province for 26 carloads, up to December 31st.

Mr. Nollet: — That is outside the province?

Mr. Danielson: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I can answer that question by reading the answer to my question. I asked this question myself:

- (1) On what day did the Department of Agriculture commence contracting for the purchase of hay or fodder outside the province?

Answer: December 6th, 1946.

- (2) How many tons of fodder were so contracted for, up to December 31, 1946?

Answer: 26 carloads, of approximately 286 tons.

Mr. Nollet: — How much was purchased inside the province?

Mr. Danielson: — Well, I haven't been able to find anybody that got any purchased in this province. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that if they amounted to anything at all, we would not need to be in ignorance about it, because the Saskatchewan News and the printing plant would certainly have taken care of that, Mr. Speaker; we

March 13, 1947

would have known all about it. This is the situation. Now I wonder if this had been the condition a few years ago, when we did not ask for tons or cars, but trainloads and trainloads of feed and fodder, Mr. Speaker. I remember these men sitting over here – there are some of them over on that side of the House now getting up and wanting to move the adjournment of the House to discuss the urgent and serious problem facing the people of the province. Day after day that was brought on the floor of the House, condemning the Government for not doing more than they were doing. That was the situation. And we had to go clean to Ontario and Quebec to ship in fodder, Mr. Speaker, and northern Manitoba. \$56,000,000 was used in one year for that purpose. This Government with the Treasury full of all kinds of money to pay their McLeods, Tamakis and Cadburys and all these fellows, the brain trust – evidently are short of funds when it comes to helping the farmers and the ranchers to get through a winter such as this. Either that, or they must be guilty of inaction, absolute inaction, because after all their books show applications for October and so far as I know there was nothing done until in December.

Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member has made some pretty serious charges here. He says that there are hundreds and hundreds of cattle died from starvation all across the province. I want to ...

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, he is going to have his chance and I am sure that the Minister will rectify anything that is not true when he speaks. But this is the situation, Mr. Speaker; if the printing plant, if the typewritings, if the circular letters and if the instructions that have gone forth from his Department, ever since last June or July, could have solved the feed problem of this province, so far as the farmers and the ranchers of southern Saskatchewan are concerned, then it might have been all over Saskatchewan. There is no reason why it could not happen that way; but the crisis has been in the south. If that could solve the problem of this province well then I am sure that everything should be lovely at this time – which it is not.

This is the situation and everyone of us knows that that condition exists. I myself have seen men come in from the southern part of Saskatchewan and with all that happened to them, it speaks well on my part. I heard them tell what conditions are down there and it was only by chance, by good circumstances, that an absolute tragedy did not happen there in the last few weeks. It certainly would have been a tragedy if the conditions which existed for two or three weeks during the month of February had continued into this month. So far, the weather conditions have been better and they have been able to do what they could do in order to alleviate a very difficult situation.

These are the things which should have been drawn to the attention of this Government; and I do not think that this Government should feel that they are unduly criticized; because I remember the days when there was nothing else but criticism coming from the Opposition side of the House and the condition was appalling in the Province of Saskatchewan when thousands and thousands of tons from the Province of Quebec was purchased by the Government and shipped in here.

An Hon. Member: — They didn't get enough.

March 13, 1947

Mr. Danielson: — Well, my friend was not here at that time. He was sitting pretty well up in the northern part of the province where he was fortunate, Mr. Speaker, to have some feed for his cows; but that is the situation and they will admit that they were taken care of. Well, they did not get enough; but so far as my district is concerned, I can truthfully say there was no livestock that died from starvation in that part of the country. That is more than what can be said about southern Saskatchewan today, Mr. Speaker.

I said something about taxes, Mr. Speaker, on the floor of this House, not very long ago and I was laughed at; I was ridiculed by some of the Members on the other side of the House. I made a radio broadcast here about ten days ago and I have received a number of letters from the people out in the country in regard to that. Some of them are very flattering to myself, but there is one of them just one too, that is very, very critical. This gentleman makes certain statements, of course, and for that reason in case he is listening in today, he can take in what I am saying now and that will obviate the necessity of me replying to his letter.

Mr. Sturdy: — Will you table the letter?

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, I can do that; but it doesn't make any difference. I will tell you what I will do, I will hand it to you and you can read it for yourself. There is nothing in that letter that I desire to keep away from you, for he is a CCF; he is a Socialist and he may be a communist – the longer he writes the worse he gets. Well, Mr. Speaker, I know the Members don't like this, but I cannot help that. I made the statement in this radio broadcast that a section farm in this province, today, an ordinary section farm – and there are hundreds of them; there are thousands of them – in the province has saddled on to it by ones means or another, by taxes or licenses or insurance, or some impost or another put on by this Government, burdens which will increase the operating cost of that farm. After all, a farmer on the land, his source of revenue is the land and I don't care what he has to pay, it has to come out of that land. For that reason these imposts are a charge on his production. They increase his overhead by \$194.80 in the typical case. I want to enumerate this to you, take exception to it all you like.

Mr. Sturdy: — What about Income Tax?

Mr. Danielson: — Well, my friend asks about the Income Tax. I can assure him that the farms in my constituency and in the eight million acres out of the thirteen million, last year, were in the bonus area in the Province of Saskatchewan. That is talking something that the Minister of Reconstruction should learn about. It might be a good lesson to him if he checks up on this. Saskatchewan is not wallowing in prosperity or flowing with money. We are not. A large part of this Province, Mr. Speaker, is living from hand to mouth today. I met a man from the south of Swift Current, not long ago and he said to me – and this is true, this is no story or fairy tale: “I haven't sold \$250 worth of wheat off my farm since 1942.” “Well,” I said, “What do you live off?” He said, “Well, I will tell you. We have a little bit of an irrigation scheme there and I had a wonderful garden. I milk a few cows – everybody milks a few cows; and we have been able to scrape up enough feed for these cows. We get

March 13, 1947

from \$9 to \$10 ... and even more for a can of cream. Between our cream can, our Family Allowance and our PFA bonus, we don't do too badly.

That was his answer. That is why I said, Mr. Speaker, that the Dominion Government's legislation and assistance to agriculture in this province has taken the load of responsibility for conditions that would be prevailing in this district off this Government's shoulders. That is why they can pride themselves that they have lots of money to spend for everything that they can think of without including some of the things that I think should come first.

Mr. Douglas: — I did not catch the figures. Did the hon. gentleman say million acres out of thirteen million acres in the bonus area, this year? I just want to check the figures.

Mr. Danielson: — No, no, I said last year. What I meant was 1945. There was eight million acres out of the thirteen million acres in the Province of Saskatchewan severely infested with drought. The yield on that acreage was very, very small. I have not got the figures, but the Minister of Agriculture can tell him that. All of that; every bit of that was not in the bonus area; but by far the largest percentage of that was in the bonus area; but by far the largest percentage of that was in the bonus area and I think in the last day or two it was stated in the press that the payment for 1945 and 1946 — it extends for that 1945 crop and 1946 — is the largest payment made by the PFAA since they started in 1939 and that applies particularly to Saskatchewan.

Mr. Sturdy: — Where do the funds for the PFAA come from? Do they not come from the farmers?

Mr. Danielson: — Well, I think the Minister knows, but if he doesn't know where it comes from, I do not mind telling him. He should ask someone or get someone's advice to dig up that information for him, everybody knows that a very small part of it, Mr. Speaker, comes from the one per cent reduction on the farmers' grain and the rest comes out of the Dominion Treasury. That is where it comes from — so far as Saskatchewan is concerned. Manitoba, of course, is an exception. They have contributed a good deal more than they ever got out; there are not many bonuses to speak of paid in the Province of Manitoba. Well, I think, Mr. Speaker, I am going to go on, he will have his chance to follow on immediately.

What I want to deal with is the program I have here, which applies to a farmer's increase in taxes. First of all he pays \$15 more for his truck licence than he did before this Government came in. He pays compulsory insurance on his truck, \$8 and an increased licence fee. I want to mention that the figures I am quoting apply to 1946; but that makes \$9. Then there is the one cent gas tax on truck and car gas. He put it down as \$10; but in reality that isn't enough because a farmer that runs a

March 13, 1947

truck and car both, Mr. Speaker, consumes more gas than to make just a \$10 increase. Put it down as \$10 tough. Then he has the car insurance on his car, \$5; and then this particular gentleman has three drivers' licences in his family. There are times and they all have to have individual driver's licence. for that reason, that is \$3 one for each of them. That makes \$8. And the minimum tax on 640 acres is \$1920; an increase in Hospitalization Tax which the Minister stated is just the same as a poll tax – and it is, I admit that – but everything that the farmer has to pay in taxes and imports is compulsory, Mr. Speaker, and comes off that land. There, you have his family tax of \$30 and one member of his family is come of age and he pays \$5 and he works on the farm. Therefore, you have \$35 that comes out of the production of that farm for that Hospitalization Tax. That makes \$194.80. Well, now I see my benevolent friends over there laugh.

Mr. Valleau: — How much was the Income Tax?

Mr. Danielson: — Well I am not sure this farmer has any Income Tax to pay, Mr. Speaker, but that remark reflects some of the intelligence and seriousness that he has put to this problem. After all, the Minister may sit there laughing but these men look on it as a serious thing. I am sure these farmers don't laugh at it, because they have got to pay these. So there you have it. Well now, of course, as the Minister of Natural Resources will say: "Well, he doesn't have to pay the Mineral Tax." I know that, but then he will confiscate his mineral rights so that will only help him \$19.20. So now we come to 1947. Now you can add, again, the new two cents a gallon tax, which puts at least \$25 increase on the overhead of operating this farm; two cents a gallon more gas tax. Then you can add that to the total and you have \$219.80. I will defy any person in this House to prove that this is not correct.

Mr. Corman: — Why did they vote us in the by-elections?

Mr. Danielson: — The Attorney General will find that out. It takes just so long till it commences to hurt, you know, and then the reaction sets in. I am going to tell the Provincial Treasurer the reason why some of them voted for them in the by-election. I think perhaps that might be a very interesting thing. Let me refer him to Mr. Carlyle King's statement at the moose Jaw Annual CCF Convention, when he told you why you were able to win the Morse by-election. He told you that if it had not been for the tremendous amount of work done there, the large number of workers and the amount of money and the pamphlets printed by the Government, at the printing plant and all the literature and a tremendous force that was put into that, he said you would have lost that by-election. There is one thing, Mr. Speaker, after all I haven't heard any of these Ministers who worked there like Trojans and who had all the money they had in the public treasury; they promised hospitals, loans and grants and salt factories and highways and I could not even get into a town without driving around two or three miles to circle around a government road improvement there. That was it. That was the reason. But even in spite of that you have nothing to crown about when it comes to the Morse by-election. The Government Members

March 13, 1947

there acted as if they were in opposition. They blamed the former Government for every mortal thing that I think has happened in the province. But the day is here, Mr. Speaker. The day when making excuses by pointing to former Governments and crucifying them is past. The Government now is before the people on its record and that record will be laid before them. They will have to judge it themselves and I have no doubt what that judgment will be when the time comes.

Mr. Douglas: — We will take you up on that any time you say.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, in answer to the Premier, Mr. Speaker, I am going to say that the time this Government will have its next election will be determined purely and simply on the political expediency so far as this Government is concerned. No other thing.

Mr. Speaker, I showed you what the cost to the farmers is for the luxury of having a CCF Government in the Province of Saskatchewan – or a Socialistic Government in the Province of Saskatchewan. And you have just started. They are going to get more and more taxes on them. This is not the end, Mr. Speaker. The taxes are going to continue to increase so long as this Government sits here. And the farmers of the province are the ones who are going to be the hewers of wood and the drawers of water, who provide the money. They are today, Mr. Speaker, because every nickel that this Government spends comes from the farmers' pockets; every dollar of it. And there is nobody that gets less consideration and less attention from this Government than the farmers of the province.

I am not so particularly surprised at that, Mr. Speaker. It stands to reason, for looking at the Treasury Benches, you haven't got anybody there that really has any interest in farming, except probably one of them or maybe two – but I do not think they have a great deal to say about what the policy of this Government is going to be. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that the farmer need expect any particular consideration, or even a thorough understanding or sympathy, from this Government, because from the teaching profession, from the preachers' profession – I think it is – and from the railroad, unions, I don't think the farmers across the Province of Saskatchewan need, as I say, expect any great things. If they do, I am sure they will be disappointed.

Mr. Douglas: — You have a great collection of farmers over there.

Mr. Danielson: — There is a great collection back of us.

Mr. Douglas: — How far back?

Mr. Danielson: — There are all kinds of them back of us here and I am sure that my friend does not need to think that there isn't. I am more heartened every day, Mr. Speaker, so far as the political fortunes of the party that I belong to are concerned and I can assure this House that the last few months have surely been very, very encouraging to me as a Liberal and the day is coming when you will find that the promises and gold bricks which you have handed out to the people before the 1944 election,

March 13, 1947

have, as Mr. Joliffe said, become a nuisance. They are insulting and they become a nuisance.

Mr. Corman: — Why have they called the Tories in to help them?

Mr. Danielson: — You will see. I am going to tell this Government that they should go very, very easy on our conservative friends, because, I am not so sure that there is one Member sitting on that side of the House who got election support from the Conservative Party and I think they will find that out when the time comes. Time works for the best.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about co-operation. I have not said anything about this thing, but I have had some verbal bombs from some of my friends over there and I don't dislike it at all. I have on different occasions stood in this House and warned the co-operative movement in this province from any entanglement with the Socialistic Government. I have done that and I am proud, Mr. Speaker, today, that I did no that. I can assure my friends over there from the north that everyone of them know that the co-operative movement and the men that lead that movement in the Province of Saskatchewan today, is on their guard. They know the danger that lurks in the Socialistic ideals to the co-operative movements and there is every indication that they are not going to do anything that will jeopardize their movement, they are not going to be led into, or permit themselves to be made any use of for fostering the political ambition of any political party – and when they do that, Mr. Speaker, they are, I think, doing the right thing, the only thing that will help the continuation and the growth and the welfare of the co-operative movement as a whole. I am sure that is right.

My friends, of course, started out right away back in 1934, even before that time, to climb on the back of the co-operative movement, maybe there is no particular reason to believe that any of the leaders among the early Co-operative Commonwealth Federation in this province had any particular love for the co-operative movement. On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, I know what happened in the city of Regina, when the Sherwood Co-operative Association went into the business of handling their own oil and asked for a location for their oil tanks in the city of Regina. Who were the men, who were the two or three men on the City Council, who brought about the refusal of that request by the City Council of the city of Regina? Well it was three men that were supposed to be CCF that opposed it and Mr. Coldwell was one of them. I can go back and give the whole history to my friends here, all right.

A Co-operative Company was formed by farmers of Sherwood Municipality, some years ago, in order to buy tractor fuel and gasoline in tank cars. They had no storage facilities. They arranged with the oil company to rent their plant on a quarterly basis. As this company only had storage for kerosene and gasoline, this Co-operative Company needed additional tanks for the storage of the cheaper fuel. So they asked permission from the City Council to put in such tanks. The President and Directors of the Company interviewed the Mayor and all the members of the Council personally. They proposed to locate on the south side of 10th Avenue, by the railway tracks between Albert Street and the Exhibition grounds and there were no residences in that whole

March 13, 1947

area, only coal and wood yards, one or two warehouses and other oil companies. The application was made to install two underground 1,000 gallon storage tanks for tractor distillate. The application was made to the Council, originally, on April 5, 1932. It was referred by the Council to the Committee of the Whole. The Committee reported in favor of it. The Council considered the application again and it was again referred to the Committee. This time the Committee made no recommendation. The matter again came before the Council on May 19, 1932, when it was refused, the vote being 7 to 4. Those who voted for the application were Aldermen Dixon, Froom, Malone, Gardner, Hyde and England. Those who voted against the application were Aldermen Coldwell, Rink, Ellison and Lindsay. The may was favourable to the application. The proposed work had been passed by the fire underwriters and had been approved by the Chief of the Fire Department. Just one more paragraph, Mr. Speaker, and he asked for it
...

Mr. Speaker: — I think I shall have to ask the Hon. Member to limit himself more to the subject of the debate.

Mr. Patterson: — What are the restrictions on the Budget Debate?

Mr. Speaker: — I am giving my opinion as to how this debate should be conducted. I think the duty of the Speaker is to keep it within reasonable bounds.

Mr. Patterson: — In the Budget Debate, as on the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne, there are no limits on what a Member may discuss or bring up.

Mr. Speaker: — There is no closure rule in the House and any speaker could speak for hours and hours on nothing connected with this Chamber. If it is not remotely connected with this Chamber, I think it is going a little too far.

Mr. Procter: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out that on one occasion in this House, on this debate, a certain gentleman spoke for four and a half hours one day and I think two hours the next day, reading in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker: — I was not in the Chair at that time. If I am going to be asked to conduct the proceedings in this Assembly, there should be some limit.

Mr. Procter: — Would you hear just a word on it, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: — Yes.

Mr. Procter: — There is a rule of closure to stop a debate. Now that is a matter for the consideration of the Government. If they will take the responsibility of enforcing the rule, all the Government has to do is amend the rules – if they want to take the responsibility for so doing; but at the present time, as

March 13, 1947

your Honour has pointed out, there is no rule of closure in effect.

Mr. Speaker: — That is true, but I think for the direction of the Assembly, some consideration should be given to keeping within reasonable bounds.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, I was just about finished anyway, but the Minister over here asked for this. I have just one more paragraph and this is a short one and it is this: (it explains the whole procedure).

By the wording of the town planning by-law, this application required two-thirds majority, so that, if three aldermen voted against the application it would be lost.

So there you have it. There we have the great champion of co-operation, Mr. Coldwell, when he had the opportunity to do something to launch the co-operative movement, when he had the opportunity to assist them in getting a location, he was instrumental in getting it defeated. So I say that this movement, which we are all proud of, I think and which has reached its height in the Province of Saskatchewan, perhaps more than in any part of the Dominion of Canada, was built up by the people themselves. It is a credit to the people of Saskatchewan that they have been able to do that and they did so, Mr. Speaker, on their own effort, by their own money, by their own business ability and by their own contributions of loyalty and support toward this business undertaking. These are things that I am proud of and so I think every other individual should be. But to try to use that movement for the purpose of gaining political office is detestable, is improper and should be condemned in the strongest possible terms by every individual that has the welfare of the co-operative movement at heart.

Now I have heard, of course, many times that that movement and the CCF are interdependent and even that it is part and parcel of this CCF or Socialistic Government. As a matter of fact, last summer, Mr. Speaker, a group of Co-operatives Cavalcade of business men from the United States came through this country and, by appointment or otherwise – I don't know how – it just happened that they came into the city of Regina at the time when the CCF Convention was on here and at that time the CCF had as a guest speaker, I think, a gentleman by the name of Dr. Laidler, from the city of New York. He was not with the Co-operative Cavalcade at all, Mr. Speaker; he did not belong to that group. Yet for some inexplicable reason which I cannot understand, when they left Regina, on Sunday morning, to go to Saskatoon, this particular gentleman was with them. My friends discovered, I think, inside a day or so, who he really was and he turned out to be the Director of the League for Industrial Democracy in the United States. And that League, Mr. Speaker, is the Communistic Party in the United States.

Mr. Douglas: — That is not true.

Mr. Danielson: — It is true.

Mr. Douglas: — Eleanor Roosevelt happens to be hon. president.

Mr. Danielson: — That is the Communist Party in the United States.

Mr. Douglas: — That is not true.

Mr. Procter: — It is true, all right.

An Hon. Member: — You cannot prove it. Prove it for us.

Mr. Embury: — You have Communists in your Party.

Mr. Douglas: — Name them. I challenge you to name them.

Mr. Embury: — Oh, go on with you, you are just showing off.

Mr. Douglas: — I am on my feet on a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. The Hon. Member has just made a statement ... I am on my feet on a Point of Order and there is no reason why I should be interrupted. I can't state my point with another Member on his feet and the Hon. Member knows that perfectly well. Interjections have been made that we are communists, that there are Communists in our Party here. I would like the Hon. Member who made that statement to name them, or withdraw the statement.

Mr. Patterson: — There is no Point of Order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Douglas: — But there is a Point of Order; a great deal more — that statement's a very serious statement to make.

Mr. Patterson: — There was no Point of Order.

Mr. Douglas: — I am asking for your ruling on that, Mr. Speaker. Is an Hon. Member of this House to be allowed to make such a statement without either substantiating it or withdrawing it?

Mr. Speaker: — Was the Hon. Member on his feet when he made the statement?

Mr. Douglas: — I don't care whether he was on his feet or not, he made the interjection from his place in the House.

Mr. Speaker: — The fact is there have been so many interjections that I have not been able to follow them. Too many interjections altogether.

Mr. Patterson: — Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that this gentleman, who was not a member of the Cavalcade of Co-operative businessmen ...

Mr. Brockelbank: — He was not a Liberal either.

Mr. Patterson: — Well, I never accused him of

March 13, 1947

being a Liberal. God forbid! We don't want that type in our Liberal Party at all. The Liberal Party would never invite a Communist from the United States to come up and address the Liberal Convention. I can assure my hon. friend that much.

Mr. Valleau: — He wouldn't come if you did.

Mr. Procter: — I am quite sure he would not; he would go quickly out the back door. But he might come to your back door. But he might come to yours.

Mr. Danielson: —He did come to theirs. Well, as I was saying, Mr. Speaker, he addressed the CCF Convention then for some inexplicable reason, this Dr. Laidler, this Director of the League for Industrial Democracy – Oh, what a fancy name – of the United States, was slipped into this Cavalcade and attached to it when he came up to our little town of Davidson. We had advance notice, of course, that this group was going to come. I have a list of their names, right here, for the whole group; and they are farmers and they are managers of co-operative organizations and they were led by a gentleman named G. Henry Carpenter, of Brooklyn, New York. We arranged in our community hall, up there, a fine dinner for these gentlemen. The Ladies Aid put on the dinner and it was a real banquet I can assure you. One of these gentlemen had expressed the desire, of course, that we might like to have this on Sunday. You know, we are pretty decent people up there; very nice people all of them, very strict; and they expressed the desire for a little turkey, just on Sunday. So we had three ministers there and one of them spoke and it made a very nice gathering.

After lunch was over, this Mr. Carpenter got up and launched off into a really political speech. He told us that, the night before, he had had dinner with the Premier of Saskatchewan and that he had learned more from him in regard to the co-operative movement in this province than he had known before and he said: "I am going to go back to my own state and that is what we should have for the co-operative movement down there, when we see what you fellows have got here, during the short time this Government has been in office." Why it was absolutely astounding, Mr. Speaker. Absolutely astounding.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Danielson: — I saw that, when it had got so far – I didn't want to do it, though I would have done it – somebody had to put that gentleman back on the track. Another gentleman did that very thing and he did it very properly, very efficiently and very nicely. That was not all. Before the gathering was over, this Mr. Carpenter called on Mr. Laidler – this Communist from New York, to address the gathering. He got up, squared his shoulders a while, then he started in. I listened to Tim Buck in the Wascana Park here a few years ago – and this Dr. Laidler delivered a real honest-to-goodness Communistic address. It was very right to the point. All I have to say is that the gentleman had a lot of courage.

We had a lady there, from Toronto, with a CCF button on and she was also one of those that accidentally slipped into this particular group – for what reason, I don't know. Evidently, it all happened accidentally here in the city of Regina

when they left, that morning.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, and again let me assure my friend across the floor, that we will never invite a Communist to address the next Liberal convention, or any other convention after that – and there will be lots of them in the Province of Saskatchewan. And let me tell them that this missionary effort on account of Mr. Carpenter, who took his cue, as he told us, from the Premier did not make any converts to Socialistic principles in the district of Davidson. The whole atmosphere at the end was far different, Mr. Speaker, from when we started. That left a bad taste in the mouth of every one that came there; and it was impudence on the part of these people coming in there and I am sure that they had been led, at least, to believe that they were on the right track when they did that.

I was sitting at the table, that day, between a man from Minnesota and a man from Iowa and when these gentlemen were speaking, one of them nudged me in the side and said: “Here, I hope you do not think he is speaking for us.” That is what he said. But there was your Communistic underground fellows working, working, working – and he was brought in here, or maybe he accidentally happened to drop in here, from New York, just at the time of the CCF Convention.

The Co-operative movement, Mr. Speaker, is in a critical situation – not financially, not because they have not a true name and good men to lead them – but due to the socialistic and Communistic element on that particular organization and they are working.

Now what is happening in Great Britain? I have it here, in the Scottish Co-operator, for March 30, 1946. Mr. G.D.H. Cole, the mentor of Mr. Coldwell, an able man no doubt in his chosen field, wrote a number of articles on the co-operative movement and its future relations with the socialist Government in Great Britain and I am going to read it to you, Mr. Speaker. I hope you will let me finish this article, because I think it should interest every Member of this House as it does myself. I want you to mark very carefully what this gentleman says. He is not a Liberal; he is not a Conservative, but he is a Socialist and an outstanding man in the Socialist Movement in Great Britain. In preceding articles he had elaborated the situation, what it leads up to and then he is trying to find a solution and here is where I want to start it: Sub-heading: “What Do Co-operatives want?”

The type of co-operator who believes the co-operative movement to have reached finality believes in co-operation and emphasizes its voluntary aspect, will probably prefer course ‘A’. (That is one of the solutions he suggests.) Because it will allow co-operative coal trade to continue and develop without any change in the existing methods. It must, however, be recognized that this course is most unlikely to be acceptable for long to Socialists, who will not be ready to acquiesce in a continuance of private profit seeking and ways to pool organized distribution of a larger part of the basic industry which has been transferred on the productive side to public ownership and needs to justify itself as a public enterprise by giving the whole public the best possible service. Socialists cannot possibly allow the public interest to be prejudiced merely in order to allow

March 13, 1947

co-operatives to have some private rivals with whom to compete for trade.

Course 'B' would be least as unsatisfactory and would lead to constant friction between the State and the co-operative movement.

Course 'C' would be worse still from both the socialist and the co-operative point of view and would involve gross waste of resources. Course 'B' looks more attractive to the co-operators who are not wedded to the voluntary principle but it is either a political practicality or a solution to which the co-operative movement is ready. Are co-operators prepared on a national scale to become a monopolist by law in the trade and therefore rule out course 'B', or vote as well as course 'B'.

Then he goes along and says the alternative statement:

That leaves only one course; that is the creation of a new kind of agency; or rather it leaves only either course 'E' or the alternative which I did not mention earlier because it would be evidentially unacceptable to the co-operative movement. Let me define it now. Course 'F' is that the state should take over the entire business of coal distribution as a state monopoly, thus pushing co-operation out of the field of action in which it has achieved a signal success. Please bear in mind that this is what the state under a Socialistic Government will be driven to do, as the guardian of the interests of all the consumers, unless it can come to a reasonable agreement with the co movement in the basis of course 'E'. What it involves is a new kind of co-operative society not standing apart from the state, but working closely with the state as a recognized part of the mechanism of Socialist enterprise. I am asking both co-operators and socialists, and the many who are both, to give careful consideration to this solution and not to be deterred from adopting it on the ground that it involves a departure from the voluntary principles. Where socialization has made it the basis, co-operation cannot survive on a voluntary foundation. We must either become the representative of all the consumers and act in partnership with the state, or be pushed out. I leave the argument there to be thought over for a time. I shall carry it a step farther in my next article.

Now then, there is Mr. Cole, a student and authority on socialism and he is quite frank and straightforward in saying what he thinks and he knows. He is not shielding anything. He takes and strips the problem bare and then puts it before the people so that they can see what they are facing.

Well, it is already happening in Great Britain, Mr. Speaker. The milk distribution which was the monopoly practised by the co-operatives in the city of Glasgow – I think it is – has, of course, been taken over there by the municipality. For Socialization over there – the term 'municipalization' used in many cases ...

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, would the Hon. Member permit a question? Would he oppose the municipalities taking over such services as

milk distribution?

Mr. Danielson: — Well, I certainly won't hesitate to answer my friend, if it comes to a question where the co-operative movement has already solved that problem and practically everyone that receives milk from the milk distributing co-operative organization is a shareholder and getting his milk at cost, and give a perfect service. I certainly would be opposed to any Government agency, whether it is local or municipal government, or the state or main government of the country taking over and dispossessing any co-operative organization doing that. That is my opinion and it is happening in Britain today.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Am I to assume then, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Member would not be opposed where those conditions did not exist, for example, in the city of Regina, would he say it would be all right here?

Mr. Danielson: — I am not going to tell the Hon. Minister what I think should be done any place, where I don't have any particular information about the local situation. No, I would be sticking my neck out like he does. I am not going to do that. But I can assure him, with the Co-operative Dairies in Regina here and with the efficient service that the present organizations are rendering in competition with each other, that I do not think the day will ever come when there will be any need of the city of Regina or any other city, taking over the distribution and handling of the milk. I do not think it will, because I think history has shown and shown conclusively, that services of this kind can be rendered cheaper, more efficiently, by people who are interested in the business, than it can be done by any government. You have the Co-operative Creameries in this city and I would say to this Government: before you go into that business, give the co-operative organization an opportunity to render that service to the people which they serve. I am sure that the people will be better served, at less cost to themselves, than any CCF Government, or any other government, will ever be able to do. I am sure about that part of it.

Mr. Howell: — Can I ask the Hon. Member a question?

Mr. Danielson: — This gentleman can talk when he gets on his feet. I have no apologies to offer, Mr. Speaker, for what I have said about the co-operative movement in this province and the political party which has been trying to use it and which has been using it in the last election, as a vehicle for obtaining power. Not at all. I have had proof of it time and time again. Many times since then I have had more proof of it. I have had people apologize to me for it. and I would say to these Socialists and to this socialistic Party: If they have any regard for the welfare of Saskatchewan, if they have any regard and respect for themselves, leave the co-operative movement alone! It is above party politics. Let us keep it there. And the men who really have the responsibility, today, of leading the movement realize fully, more than they ever did, the enormous risk that is involved and the responsibility that rests on them to lead the movement in the channels where it will become strong, healthy and serve of the needs of the people who have

March 13, 1947

agreed to that movement. I shall not support the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McIntosh: —Before the Hon. Member takes his seat, may I ask a question? Am I to take it from your remarks that you would be opposed to the Government assisting in the organization or promotion and organization of co-operatives?

Mr. Danielson: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that is a new departure for governments of the province at all, providing they don't stick their finger into what they are going to do. Governments since 1911 or 1912 ...

An Hon. Member: — Liberal?

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, Liberal Governments – have assisted to organize the Co-operative Elevator Company, the Wheat Pool, the Implement companies. I have here a list, Mr. Speaker, of co-operative organizations which the Government, when my Hon. Leader of the Opposition was Premier and that was just this last few years, of what they did in spite of the fact that the revenue of this province was not buoyant as the Provincial Treasurer said in his statement: Saskatchewan Co-operative Livestock Pool alone of \$2,200. that was in April 15, 1939. On April 7, 1939 -- \$10,000; August 14, 1939 -- \$1,100 – a total of \$13,300. All the loans were repaid with interest. That is what the co-operatives always do. They do not ask for charity.

Mr. Speaker: — Will the hon. gentleman answer the question?

Mr. Danielson: — Well, I am trying to show what has been done, Saskatchewan and I can go on here. Here is an amount of \$24,000, which was handed out to two co-operative organizations in the Province of Saskatchewan during the last part of 1939 and 1941 to help the co-operatives. We do not advertise it like you do.

Mr. J. Benson (Last Mountain): — Mr. Speaker, the first think I want to mention is the point made by the Hon. Member and that is in regard to the statements that have been made here in this Legislature especially in regard to American Imperialism and also, in regard to the attack that was made on General McArthur, who is now in charge of Japan. I want to say, Sir, that I completely dissociate myself from any of the sentiments that were expressed in any of those attacks. I think they were unfortunate and uncalled for. We have lived for a long time in friendly relationship with our grand neighbor to the south and I hope there may never be anything done by the people of Canada to break up that grand relationship. I think that our destiny in Canada here, is very closely linked up with the destiny of the United States and I don't think we should ever forget that for one moment.

First of all I want to refer to my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition. I regretted to hear that he had decided to retire from the active leadership of the Liberal Party and I understand from his statement that he made during the first debate that he was also, going to retire from the political life in this province. I want to say to him that I realize that he

March 13, 1947

became Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan during some of the most trying times that the province had experienced. Perhaps worse, was the government led by the late Dr. Anderson and I am sure that if he had been able to carry on the Government of the province during times such as we are experiencing at present, that he could have made much better showing than was made. But, the people of Saskatchewan decided during the last election that they didn't want the Liberal Party anymore in this election that they didn't want the Liberal Party anymore in this province. Of course he being leader of that party, he no doubt felt that perhaps the people of the province were ungrateful for the service that he had rendered during his long term of office. But, I want to point out to him that that grand leader of the British Empire, during the most trying times that the British Empire had ever experienced, met a similar fate in Great Britain. It seems to be the rule that even though public men do give the best service that they can possibly give to the country that they attempt to govern, for some reason or other the people of those countries invariably turn them out of office and sometimes we can't understand the reason why. I want to say to my hon. friend that I wish him a very happy future and the best of success in any walk of life that he chooses to follow when he retires from active service in this province.

Now, in regard to the speech delivered the other day by the Provincial Treasurer. I want to tell him that I have heard many Budget speeches delivered in this province and while I don't agree with everything that is in that Budget I want to say that he, in my opinion, made one of the best jobs of delivering a Budget Speech that I have ever heard in the Province of Saskatchewan. I don't want to praise him too much because I might cause him to get a swelled head and he would have to buy a new hat. Now, I hope that the optimism that he expressed during that Budget Debate will in future prove to be justified. Unfortunately I can't seem to feel that same optimism that he expressed and I believe that he knows because of conditions that we are beginning to experience that his supreme optimism on that occasion was perhaps not entirely justified.

I want to make a comment in regard to the form of the Estimates of this particular year. To me they are not as clear as the Estimates that had been presented to the House in the past. I suggested last year that perhaps we might copy the form in which the Estimates of Alberta were presented last year to the Legislature of Alberta, setting out a little more detail, so that we would have a better understanding of what we were passing but, I am sorry to say and I shall be very, very careful in my recommendations in the future, because if this is a result of the recommendation I made during the last Session, then I don't want to make any further recommendations for fear that they are more complicated in the future.

I met one of my supporters yesterday, in these buildings, and I don't think it is necessary for me to tell the House that I represent the best constituency in this province and have the honor to represent the very best people that reside in this province. I want to also tell you that the people who I have the honor to represent are extremely frank with me. The chap who I met yesterday told me that I wasn't to say anything or do anything during this Budget Debate that would cause the Government one moment of concern or give the Leader-Post a chance to edit the headline. I knew pretty well where I could go from that, but this morning I received a long letter from another one of my constituents and to make a long story short, he told

March 13, 1947

me that if I supported this Government, he would know what to do with me when I got back to last Mountain. So, you know the position I am in at the present time. I want to say that I am not particularly interested in any political party, I don't think that a party or any province is the important thing in the Province of Saskatchewan. I think the important thing is the Province of Saskatchewan and any particular party will have to take second place to the Province of Saskatchewan.

I want to deal for a few minutes with some of the election promises that were made during the last Provincial election and I want to say that election promises sometimes proves to be rather dangerous and half promises are even more dangerous. Now, I made certain statements myself during the last Provincial election and I am going to be on the spot when I get back to that constituency in regard to some of the statements that I have made.

For instance, the question of the Education Tax was raised and as far as I am concerned on that particular matter, I told the people that the Education Tax in this province could not be removed until the Government had found a similar amount of money from some other source. Now, the Education Tax is not yet removed and I am going to have quite a time answering to the people who sent me here, as to why that Education Tax hasn't been removed. They know as well as I that we have received many millions of dollars extra from Ottawa that we did not expect to get and we have also received considerable increase in revenue from various other sources, especially from the liquor profits. My friend behind here from Humboldt, yesterday, deplored the fact that the people of this province spend so much money on liquor and tobacco. Well, I want to point out to him that even though they do spend a lot of money on liquor and tobacco and cosmetics he added, those people contribute large amounts of money to the Treasurer of this Province because they purchase those supplies.

Another point I raised and I used it during the last election, I used to criticize the Liberal Party and I criticized them as severely as I knew how, in regard to administration. I told the people that they had at least one-third too many civil servants in the Province of Saskatchewan. I believe that if we reorganized the civil service that we could give more efficient administration with two-thirds of the civil servants that we had at that time than we could with that full amount. Now because of the increase in the civil service here, I am going to have quite a time explaining why I said the Liberal Party should be criticized because they had too many civil servants and then find that we have so many more at the present time. I am just pointing these things out to indicate to the House the situation that I am in when I get back to Last Mountain. Then I also told them and I believe that this is the policy of our party, that we were going to increase social services and the money was going to be of ... because of increased efficiency in the administration of the affairs of Government. Now I really believe that we could increase the efficiency of the administration in Saskatchewan and I believe by curtailing the number of civil servants, putting the province on a more businesslike basis, that we could save considerable money, but in regard to that particular problem or question, I am going to have some hard questions to answer. The general opinion of the people, I believe, the people that I have talked to and that I have met since the last election and who reside in my constituency, is that the Government is travelling too fast that the annual Budget is increasing too rapidly and

March 13, 1947

that the Government should now apply the brakes. I want to tell the Government that I am one of those who is very anxious that the Government should now apply the brakes. During the course of my remarks I am going to point out, if I can to this House, why I think the brakes should be applied at this time. A little progress that can be consolidated in my mind is far better than too much advance that cannot be maintained. A government travelling faster than the people want to go can become even more popular, even more unpopular than one that does not travel fast enough.

I want to review some of what I consider to be the most important advances or important services that have been provided for by this Government. I place first medical and hospital assistance to the old age pensioners. I place second, the increases in the old age pensions, that is the amount that is paid to them being now increased to \$30 per month. I place third, the increased Mother's Allowances and fourth, Health and Hospital Services. For a minute I just want to discuss the Health and Hospital Services.

In Saskatchewan we have free treatment, organized and carried out by the Anti-Tuberculosis League for all people suffering from tuberculosis. That service has been extended during these past years to the examination, if possible, of every person who resided in the Province of Saskatchewan. That free treatment was started here many years ago, we'll have to give the Liberal administration at that time the credit for that, the organization of that free tuberculosis treatment. Then we come to the free treatment that is now given in this province to those suffering from mental ailments. I think we properly give the credit to that particular treatment to the present Government. No government in the past, to my knowledge, made any attempt to provide that free treatment for those unfortunate enough to suffer from mental disease. Then I want to deal with the free treatment that we now have for the disease of Cancer and the three governments that we have had in this province are to be given the credit in my opinion for bringing about that free treatment for Cancer. Back in, I think it was about 1931 or '32, somewhere along there, the Minister of Public Health at the time, Dr. Munroe, brought in a Bill to provide for Cancer Clinics in this province. He was a Minister in the Conservative Government at that time. There was no assistance given, no financial assistance given, in regard to the treatment of that disease, it was merely a clinic, but that was a start. Then just during, I think it was the 1944 Session of the Legislature here, the Liberal Party introduced a Bill to make the treatment of cancer free to anyone who suffered from that disease. They were turned out of office and the present Government provided that free treatment for the care of people suffering from cancer. So I think in that particular case they are all entitled to their proper share of the credit that is due them for having established this service. And the fifth point I have in regard to important legislation, I place the Automobile Accident Insurance Act and I think the people of this province, generally agree, that that is something that was necessary and I believe that they generally approve of it.

The next item I place here is the larger school unit. Now perhaps I should have placed the larger school unit, the establishment of the larger school unit next to health services because I really believe that education should come next to health. I want to say that in my opinion there is growing dissatisfaction

March 13, 1947

in the province, in my constituency, at least in regard to the services provided by the larger educational units, larger school units. I have been talking to the chairman of one of these larger units and he is very much concerned in regard to the operation of his unit. In fact, he is worrying so much about it that he was nearly sick the day that I was talking to him. He wants to make go, he is one of my supporters and a supporter of this Government and he is doing his level best to make that unit work and to make it a success, but up to the present time he doesn't see the advantages, that is to the children, that he had hoped to find from the operation of that unit and that is why he is worried. We find that in the larger school units, we told the people that we believed the larger units would provide more efficient administration for school purposes. We find that there is not that efficient administration in the handling of school matters that I, at least, had hoped to find and I think perhaps the whole situation now had been in operation a couple of years, perhaps the length of time that it has been in operation is not enough in order to give it a fair chance and to allow it to work properly. But I do think that there should be a very close study made by the Minister of Education in regard to the operation of some of these units in order to see and assure that they will become a success.

Now I am not going to say anything more about them at the present time, perhaps when we discuss them later on I might have some suggestions to make, but I want to see the larger school unit become a success. I am one of those people who believe that there could be a tremendous advantage so far as education is concerned by the organization of the larger units, if that organization is properly carried out and carried out to its ultimate conclusion.

The next point I want to mention is the increased teachers' salaries. We ran into a situation in this province during the depression when the teachers were just about on the same basis as were the farmers of Saskatchewan. I am not blaming anyone for the condition that the teachers were in so far as salary was concerned at that time because the farmers of Saskatchewan could not pay anything in some cases towards anyone. I think there is a lot of credit coming to those young men and women who kept these schools going through that terrible period and some of them did not get very much for their work. Today the teachers' salaries have been better provided for but because of the condition that we passed through many years ago, the young men and women of this province left the teaching profession and now we are facing a drastic shortage of teachers. I think perhaps that one thing that is handicapping the larger units, I noticed in looking over the lists of the teachers in my particular larger unit, larger unit in which I live, in the rural school there were only two teachers in that whole area that had a permanent teacher's certificate. Many within term certificates and many with permits and the depression period is no doubt the cause of that condition.

The next part I want to mention insofar as good legislation is concerned, is the labor legislation and I think I'll have said enough in regard to labor legislation if I say that I consider that Saskatchewan has now become a Labour Union Paradise. I think that I can be justified in saying that, because we are told that labour unions from all over Canada are copying what is being done in Saskatchewan.

March 13, 1947

I want to deal with some other measure and I can't deal with everything the Government has done. I want to deal with the matter of Crown corporations. There are two classes in my opinion, of Crown corporations, one which I think is definitely a public ownership project and that is the ... corporation, the second that I think can become a good public ownership project is the bus service.

I want to point out to the Minister, who is operating the bus service, that the public of Saskatchewan where his buses are operating are entitled to more consideration than they are getting at the present time. The consideration that the travelling public are getting today is perhaps better than it was when the private lines were operated but the accommodation where some of the bus stops in this province is deplorable. I think that people out on the street, sitting on their suitcases when it is 30 below zero because there was no place to get inside when they were waiting for a bus that was a few hours late. Now, I think that should be corrected and I say that any company that operates a bus service, whether it is the Government or not, and operates it in a province with weather conditions such as we have, should provide proper service facilities at all their bus stops. If that can't be done then, I think, the service should be discontinued because it is a crime to see women and children sitting on the street, early in the morning waiting for a delayed bus and no place to get into. I think something can be done and should be done in regard to that particular matter.

In regard to the small industries, these small industries in my opinion come into what I consider the second class. One is the real public ownership project, the other is the small industries which I think the Government shouldn't touch at all. I think they are proper industries for private ownership or for co-operative ownership and so far as I am concerned, I would gladly support the Government to do everything within its power to organize all these small industries on co-operative basis and turn them over as soon as possible to the people that are operating them. Now, in regard to another type of service that we are given today, and that is, in short, compulsory insurance.

In some respect this insurance is compulsory, I don't like the compulsory feature of it, but I do say this, that when a government operates a business such as an insurance business, that business should be operated on the basis of given service and not on the basis of collection revenue because of that service. Perhaps you might argue that the insurance companies today operate on a profit basis and send their profits to eastern Canada. But I want to point out that if the Government does organize this insurance business on a basis of service, that they will be performing a real service to the people of this province.

In regard to the private industries, these small industries, the production in those small industries, is such that we have to give serious consideration to the cost of the production in those industries. In my opinion, industries run in this province or operated in this province are generally run on an uneconomic basis. We have higher power costs than they have in other favourable locations in other parts of Canada. We may have higher labor costs because of the advanced labor legislation that we have in this province and then there is the question of taxing. At the present time Government industries do not pay any taxes. I think that that is somewhat of an injustice to the corporation or the municipality in which those industries are situated and

March 13, 1947

something should be done to provide for the loss these various municipal bodies suffer because of the loss of taxes.

This question of industry in Saskatchewan is very definitely linked up in my opinion with question of farm production. In Saskatchewan we produce a surplus and we must be a market for that surplus. Now, in the past we have condemned economic nationalism as practised by various countries. We have stated and we believe and I believe firmly, that in order that Saskatchewan may sell its surplus products, we must have a free market in those countries that are willing to buy our surplus products. In order to get that free market, we must be willing to take manufactured goods from those countries that buy our farm products. There is no other way to sell it. We have condemned economic nationalism in Canada because of that fact, because of that restriction to market. I condemn economic nationalism as practised in Saskatchewan when we try to make ourselves a self-contained unit. I believe the people of Britain, who want our wheat, who want our pork and who want our beef are better able to manufacture clothing, boots and shoes and commodities of that nature than we are able to manufacture them here. I believe that if we expect to sell our surplus farm products to Great Britain then we will have to take the surplus goods that they produce in exchange for our projects.

I could make a break here, Mr. Speaker, if you would call it six o'clock. I haven't very much more to say about the industries that have been established in Saskatchewan.

I want to go on to a general discussion of the Budget. First I want to say that I was very much interested in the address of the Minister of Social Welfare. He adopted, I think, what I might say is at least in my opinion, a proper attitude of a Minister when discussing the Budget. He gave us a detailed report of the workings of his Department. He gave us information in regard to his Department to consider the Budget when we get into Committee of Supply, with some degree I might say of intelligence. I would like to congratulate him on his attempt to give us some information in regard to his Department. But, I think every Minister of the Government should get up and do the same thing in regard to his Department before we are asked to go into Committee of Supply.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs, he stated that the present Budget was the largest and the best Budget that has ever been introduced in this Legislature. I might say that very often good goods are done up in small parcels. The Minister of Municipal Affairs, he took a great deal of time in criticizing the Leader-Post in the future he had better read the headlines in our own paper for this last week and perhaps a little criticism in regard to the headlines in our own paper wouldn't be amiss. If his criticism has done the Leader-Post any good then I hope he will do a little criticism on our own behalf and perhaps that will do us some good.

I want, while the House is in recess, to state where, if I didn't like such a large Budget, I would suggest the slashes would be made. Mr. Speaker, if I started to slash on this Budget

March 13, 1947

I'd start to slash at the top and I would go clean to the bottom. And I believe that the Provincial Treasurer here if he just got up in the House and gave us his honest opinion would agree with me. He would start right at the top and go clean to the bottom. I want to tell him if he wants to make that beginning he will have my whole-hearted support.

The principles of a sound private financing should, in my opinion, be applied to public financing. I don't think there is any difference in fundamental principles there. The Budget should bear a definite relationship to the average production of the province and this average should be based over a long-term of years. I hope you get what I mean there. I think that we can't take into consideration our peak production, nor we can't take into consideration our lowest production and over a long term of years we should arrive at an average and that is the point upon which our Budget should be based. We will find some years that under a system of that nature we will collect more revenue than we can spend and in other years we will find that we will not collect as much revenue as we should spend. Now reserves should be built up during periods of prosperity to provide for established services during periods of recession and the established services should never be greater than can be properly maintained during a normal year. That is my idea in regards to a budget for this province.

The building of reserves has never been seriously attempted in this province. During the good years from 1924 to 1929 no reserves were established whatever in the Province of Saskatchewan. We had a Liberal Government in power. Sometime later when it became necessary to have the Governor of the Bank of Canada review the affairs of this province he condemned the administration during those years for not having established some reserves. Then, of course, followed in 1929 the beginning of the depression. Then for 10 years we had very difficult conditions in this province. We went into that depression without any reserves and the Government of that day had to cut services that were established previous to that time, because there were no reserves here available to take care of those services. Of course, the condition lasted so long and the problem got entirely beyond the power of the province to control and we had to seek assistance from Ottawa.

I believe that the present period of years through which we are now passing is a period of great prosperity. This prosperity has been brought about chiefly in account of the War. But we are bound to fall back and I think the Provincial Treasurer knows, today, that we are on the downward trend and in the very not too distant future we will be wishing that we had some reserves to take care of conditions that we are going to have to face. During prosperous years the people can provide for themselves. Therefore, I believe governments should, during those years, curtail expenditures as far as possible and during those years while expenditure are curtailed reserves should be built up. People during periods of depression are not so well able to take care of themselves and it is during those years that increased government expenditure should be carried out. Any farmer, any sound businessman will, during good years, build up reserves to take care of his slack periods. If he doesn't do that he can't carry on.

The farmers in this province went through conditions and I was one of them, that I don't want to go through again. And so

March 13, 1947

during these past few years, the farmers have improved their condition until today they are enjoying a better economic position than they have ever enjoyed in the history of Saskatchewan. But we can't quote that this period of peak prosperity can forever continue and so if we are looking to the future as we should look to the future, we will be setting aside some reserves and consolidating our own position so that we can take care of anything that may come in the future. And I say that if that is good business for a government.

Our Saskatchewan production has varied from a high in 1944 of around \$550,000,000 that is agricultural production, to a low in 1931 of approximately \$70,000,000. Revenue has varied since 1930 from a low of \$12,000,000 approximately to a high of \$40,000,000. Now I hope that those are extreme conditions. I see no reason why revenue if this Dominion-Provincial agreement is carried out could ever get down to that low point. But I want to point out to this House that if we ever go into a position where we only collect \$12,000,000 over and above the subsidy we get from the Dominion Government, then we are going to be in serious difficulty. I hope that time never comes. But, I believe that we should be prepared and try and prepare ourselves for any eventualities, after experiencing such as we have had in the Province of Saskatchewan. In my opinion, a budget of \$45,570,000 is too high for an average or normal condition in this province and in my opinion it could only be justified providing that substantial amounts are credited to reserve accounts. It is my belief that a normal budget for normal conditions in this province should not exceed \$35,000,000. Saskatchewan is entirely dependent on agriculture. The farmer has no definite control over the price he receives for his products, or the price he pays for his goods. He has to say how much when he sells and he also has to say how much when he buys. Prices for farm products are at a peak at the present time. There is little chance for much advance in the price of farm products.

Mr. Williams: — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

RESOLUTIONS

RESOLUTION RE – DOMINION NATURAL PRODUCTS MARKETING ACT

Mr. W.J. Arthurs (Melville) moved, seconded by Mr. Boyle (Kinistino):

That this Assembly request the Provincial Government to recommend that a Dominion Natural Products Marketing Act be enacted, with necessary powers to facilitate interprovincial marketing schemes, as a step towards giving greater protection and stability to co-operatives and producers generally to interprovincial and international trade.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the home consumption, has got to be shipped out of the Province of Saskatchewan, our grain, our stock, our butter, our eggs, everything has got to go out. And after it has gone over the Saskatchewan boundary we see that we have very little if any control over it. I think in this Resolution that the Federal Government will pass an Act enabling

March 13, 1947

legislation, that we will be in a position to have some control over what we are shipping out of this province, it will give the Provincial Boards an opportunity, in fact it will give them the necessary powers insofar as interprovincial trade is concerned, and that will be a wonderful benefit to the farmers of the Province of Saskatchewan. They said it will give us a lot of additional powers because if the Dominion Government would go forward and pass an Act along these lines, it will allow the boards under our Act here to have certain control and it will be a wonderful benefit to the people who produce in this province. There has always been a certain suspicion whether it is right or wrong with regard to the packers margin on what we ship out of this province. There is also a certain suspicion with regard to the difference between the grade of cattle corresponding with the grade of beef that was sold. Therefore, I believe that I think everybody in the House perhaps will agree with me that to make our Natural Products Marketing Act on this province work, that we got to have an abling legislation from the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore move this Resolution.

Mr. W.J. Boyle (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, in asking for a Dominion Natural Products Marketing Act, I believe we are asking for something that is very necessary at the present time. Eight out of nine provinces have a Provincial Marketing Act and to make them into very much use we must have a covering Dominion Act, so that the Provincial Act can function with any degree of success. In 1934, as stated by the mover, the Dominion Government passed a Dominion Natural Product Marketing Act, that was designed for the establishment of marketing schemes where the Governor-in-council was satisfied. First, that the principle market for the natural products is outside the province of production, second, that some portion of the product may be exported. Therefore, it is clear that legislation was intended to supplement Provincial natural Products Marketing Act.

Just what is meant by a Dominion Natural Products Marketing Act, I think this best can be answered to quote the text of the Draft Act as presented by the Canadian Council of Agriculture in March, last year. I will read the text of that Act:

An Act can prove the methods and practices of the marketing of natural products in interprovincial trade within Canada and in export trade and to make provisions for the regulations and control of the trade and commerce therein and to make further provisions in connection therewith.

Saskatchewan is not alone in asking for this Act, the Canadian Council of Agriculture, as I have stated, has been asking for this for years. Therefore, we as farmers of Saskatchewan, are backing up our own farm organization with this, Mr. Speaker. I take pleasure in seconding this Resolution.

Hon. J.L. Phelps (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I think it is significant that the Resolution was moved in the House by a member of the Railroad Organization. I was very much interested to hear his explanation and his observations over the years just exactly what has been happening. I think it should ... the minds of the Hon. Members of this House, that there was any need of it again, a need of

March 13, 1947

adopting the principle of organized marketing. Mr. Speaker, this is not a new principle, as certainly we have seen the results of the need of organized markets and the effects, not only on the economy of the province or the country as a whole but on the producer and on the industry concerned. The principle of organized marketing has been accepted for a long time and so far as this Government is concerned it is one of the policies of the group to which we belong. We have always taken the step in favor of any plan of organized market. Mr. Speaker, I think it is rather a great concern as to the method that is used. There are several methods that might be used to attain the objective of organized marketing and whether it is by the producers or whether it is by the Government acting on behalf of all the taxpayers of the Province of Saskatchewan, the citizens of the country. We have examples today of various forms of ... and organized marketing, that is by the producers and industries together, whether it is through a co-operative or by what method. Mr. Speaker, the main point is the objective concerned and if we go back to the early experience of the Wheat Pool, we recognize the difficulties that are often experienced in groping away toward that goal and that objective. I think there are so many examples that might be cited of the need of marketing agencies. Sometimes some might be inclined to think that we have a Canadian Wheat Board today, that we have all our wants fulfilled brought to the attention of this House, Mr. Speaker.

The other event, the need of organized marketing of another industry, the fishing industry, organized marketing in various other fields are still required in the Province of Saskatchewan. There are a large number of commodities that still require orderly marketing and I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that whether or not as a government we are prepared to go into it and this Government is. We cannot deny that this is an age of orderly marketing whether it is done by the producers, whether it is done by the Government on behalf of the citizens of the country or by any other measure. Just as soon as these products or very soon after, they get out of the producers hands, they get into organized groups who believe in organized marketing. As I said before, we believe that in the interests of the producer and the people as a whole that that organized marketing ought to be closer to all the people rather than to be controlled by small groups of people. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in lending my support to the Resolution that is now before the House.

Hon. L.F. McIntosh (Minister of Co-operation): — Mr. Speaker, Western Canada is wrapped up and coincides very closely with the history of marketing of those commodities from Western Canada. At the present time we are rather fortunate in having the Canada Wheat Board for the purposes of marketing wheat. However, there are a very large number of natural commodities, natural products, produced not only in Western Canada, but produced in every province from the Atlantic to the Pacific by Canadian producers, that have not the same measure of protection in the marketing as the wheat growers of Western Canada have. This was recognized by the late Hon. Robert Weir, when he was Minister of Agriculture in the Federal Government back in the 1930s to the 1934. Very largely as a result of his efforts there was placed upon the Statute Books of the Dominion of Canada, a Dominion Natural Products Marketing Act in 1934 and amended in 1935. Might I just mention, Mr. Speaker, that the only support that the Conservative Party got in

March 13, 1947

connection with this marketing legislation at that time from the opposition was received from the late Hon. Mr. Motherwell. Immediately following the passing of this Act and certain enabling legislation by the provinces of Western Canada, an effort was made to organize the marketing of eggs and poultry under that Dominion Act. I think it is appreciated, in reference to this particular Act, the Dominion go passed a Marketing Act and the provinces passed the enabling legislation. The provinces of Western Canada failed to get the necessary percentage of signatures in connection with the marketing scheme for the marketing of eggs and poultry and consequently at that time the scheme was not put into effect. I might hasten to say that the farmers of the Province of Saskatchewan gave the necessary majority while the farmers of the neighboring provinces did not quite reach the sixty-six and two-thirds per cent asked for under that scheme at that time. Ever since then organized agriculture, particularly in Western Canada and in recent years in other provinces of Canada, have paid particular attention to the necessary legislation to enable them to market to better advantage the products of their labor.

Following the defeat of the Bennett Government, the incoming Government referred the Dominion Natural Products marketing Act to the Privy Council. It was declared ultra vires of the power of the Dominion that a large body of public opinion at that time felt that had the enabling legislation passed by the Province been referred to the Privy Council along with the Dominion Act, the decision of that body may have been somewhat different than what it was. Following that, British Columbia became quite interested and passed a Provincial natural Products Marketing Act and organized certain schemes, particularly the schemes relating to those engaged in the fruit industry.

History tells us that British Columbia was obliged on more than one occasion to take their provincial Act to the high courts of this country. Later on, other provinces passed a similar Act. Today, the Province of Ontario are operating some 15 marketing schemes under their Provincial Natural Products Marketing Act as has already been stated, eight of the nine provinces in Canada have very similar provincial Acts to what I referred to, that they have in the Province of British Columbia and in the Province of Ontario.

In 1945 this Legislature passed a Provincial Natural Products Marketing Act. One of the great difficulties and one of the reasons why there aren't some marketing schemes organized under the Provincial Natural Products Marketing Act of this province is because of the lack of jurisdiction, the lack of power in the control of the marketing of the products in the Provincial and export fields.

In attending a conference called by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture in Ottawa, two weeks ago today, it is rather interesting to note that the primary producers from every province in the Dominion of Canada was represented, represented through the Canadian Federation of Agriculture and a strong representation from the provinces that are using their Provincial Natural Products Marketing Act for the marketing of commodities. This Conference passed unanimously a resolution asking the Federal Government, at this present Session, to place upon the Statute Books of the Dominion of Canada, a Natural Products Marketing Act. My fear at the moment is that the Government of Canada, rather than place a Marketing Act on the Statute Books will

March 13, 1947

probably ask for power to continue such marketing boards as they have had set up during the War years. This is not going to meet the requirements of the primary producers from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

In view of the many commodities that are produced, the many commodities that do not enjoy the benefits in the marketing field that wheat enjoys and in view of the importance of these commodities thereof it is felt by organized agriculture, it is felt by many Provincial Governments, that it is extremely essential in the interests of orderly marketing. In the interest of the proper merchandizing of those commodities that the Dominion Government without further delay give to the people of Canada the machinery that will enable those people most concerned to set up the kind of a marketing organization that in their opinion will give to them the greatest measure of security in the field of marketing their commodity.

Organized merchandizing of foodstuffs is becoming world-wide. National and international agencies are being set up in many countries throughout the land and I don't think anyone, regardless of their occupation, can quarrel very seriously with the primary producer when he is asking his Government to give him the machinery so that he can do the job. I have no hesitation, Mr. Speaker, in supporting the Resolution that was placed upon the Order paper by the Member for Melville.

Motion agreed to.

RESOLUTION RE – BOARD OF LIVESTOCK COMMISSIONERS

Mr. W.S. Thair (Lumsden) moved, seconded by Mr. Boyle (Kinistino):

THAT, IN THE OPINION OF THIS assembly, the Government of Saskatchewan should request the Dominion Government to set up a Board of Livestock Commissioners with adequate producer and consumer representation thereon, with powers to license, regular and control the facilities for assembling, transport, yarding and slaughtering, processing and packing, together with the facilities for grading and marketing of all livestock and livestock products.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in introducing this Resolution I would like to say that many good Acts, both Provincial and Federal, to assist farmers have been placed upon the Statute Books after a rather lengthy process of intensive educational work which in the end creates a body of favourable public opinion. Over many years, the farmers have been asking the Federal Government to set up an organization to market their livestock so that they would obtain a more just and fair price for their product. This has been generally known as a board of livestock commissioners, to operate perhaps in a somewhat similar way to the our Wheat Board and such is the nature of the Resolution I am introducing today.

In introducing this Resolution, Mr. Speaker, I might say that, as a farmer, I am very deeply interested in the marketing problems of the farmer whether it be either grain or livestock. In the few remarks I am going to make, I would like to deal particularly with cattle.

March 13, 1947

The future of the cattle market in Western Canada is not a very bright picture. I am speaking of the future; much confusion exists. At the present time very good prices prevail and we are shipping large quantities of boned beef and other beef products to Great Britain and to the United Nations' Organizations. But cattlemen and ranchers have misgivings as to the markets some two years hence or more. The livestock producers – the cattlemen again in particular – have the bacon market for perhaps two or three years very definitely assured, but are definitely worried about these postwar markets. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that prices are good and that now is the time to take some definite action as to the setting up of a Board of Livestock Commissioners to get a better price for the farmer.

I might say that, even at the present time, there is a prediction in our neighbor to the south of, perhaps, a recession, and I quote from the Leader-Post a statement made from Washington on March 7th:

The United States Bureau of Agricultural Economics says that forces now at work seem to indicate a business recession late in 1947 and a down-turn in prices particularly livestock and some food products.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the marketing of livestock has occupied the attention of the Members of the House of Commons as well as Members of this Provincial Government in past years. I would like to bring you a few statements of the Members of the House of Commons, very briefly perhaps, as well as from some farm organizations to back up and prove the general support of this motion. I would like to go back to 1935, Mr. Speaker, and just make a short quotation from the Royal Commission on Price Spreads, page 172 of this report, where they offered certain conclusions:

As a step toward the solution of some at least of the problems which we have outlined in discussing the matter of marketing of livestock, we recommend the establishment of a livestock board under an appropriate jurisdiction.

It then sets out some ten clauses which are very much in line with the resolution that I am offering today. They are rather lengthy so I am not going to deal with them. There is a further conclusion, taken from the same page of the Price Spread Commission which says:

There is need for organization of the marketing of livestock and especially cattle in this country to ensure world producers a fair price, something which he certainly does not receive at the present time.

That was away back in 1935. I might also quote from Hansard of the same year, from Mr. Ted Garland, who I am sure all of you recall as the Member of the House of Commons at that time for Bow River, with reference to this Price Spread Committee, on which there was considerable debate in the House of Commons on that date, June 7th, 1935:

If the Minister (speaking of the late Hon. Robert Weir, of Melfort, Federal Minister of Agriculture) really wants to know what I think about the marketing of livestock, I think we should have our packing plants owned as public utilities or co-operatively. Until the producer is in a position, both in knowledge and in finance, to take over

March 13, 1947

and operate them co-operatively, I think they should be operated as public utilities for the time being.

I might even make a quotation from the Federation of Agriculture, from Mr. Hannam, urging the establishment of a Board of Livestock Commissioners; but I will not take the time to read it.

To further emphasize the great importance and the need of a board to handle all phases of livestock marketing, I could quote from our own report of the Reconstruction Council under Dean Cronkite which, I believe, was set up by our late Liberal Government, on page 76 this statement appears:

The position of the livestock producer in the postwar period will depend to a large extent on market conditions and feed supplies. The farmer is still dependent on national marketing policies to create the demand for his products at prices which will make it possible for him to remain in business.

That was the report, as I say, of the Reconstruction Council under Dean Cronkite.

I would like also to quote from a brief submitted by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture to the Prime Minister, Rt. Hon. W.L. MacKenzie King and his 14 Cabinet Ministers, in March, last year. I quote just the closing paragraph to further substantiate the need of a Board of Livestock Commissioners:

Our livestock producers are still convinced that a suitable livestock policy should include the setting up of a Board of Livestock Commissioners to be followed by a complete grading system for all livestock to apply from producer through to consumer, with greater consideration given to overseas marketing, storage and handling facilities for our export meat products.

That is the finding of the -Canadian Federation of Agriculture before the Prime Minister and his 14 Ministers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is one which has been introduced in this Legislature in other years and also in the House of Commons for a number of years. I would like to quote, if I may, again, from a very similar Resolution which was introduced by William Bryce of Selkirk, Manitoba, on October 10, 1945, in the House of Commons, Ottawa. I am just going to give you one brief statement from the address by Mr. Bryce in introducing this Resolution, wherein he said:

Might I point out to the House that this is not a political gesture, but something that the farmers have voted for ever since I came to Canada, 26 years ago. Farmer organizations all over the Dominion have repeatedly asked for this legislation.

Later on in his address, Mr. Bryce said:

A Board of Livestock Commissioners has been endorsed by 400,000 farmers across Canada.

which I believe is a true statement.

It might be interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that in the

March 13, 1947

debate that followed, the Members of the House of Commons, of practically every political stripe took part and gave general support to this resolution. I might even name Mr. Mark Senn, MP for Haldimand, who is the agricultural expert for the Progressive-Conservative Party at the present time; Robert Fair, MP for Battle River; Mr. Ross of Souris; Mr. Joe Burton from Humboldt; E.D. Fulton from Kamloops; Mr. Townley-Smith from North Battleford and others.

I could likewise quote from our Wheat Pool or our Livestock Producers Limited, which is affiliated with the Wheat Pool, in their statement, last summer, when they asked for a Board of Livestock Commissioners. I will put it very briefly: they have a six-point policy here which I am not going to take the time of this House to read; but they likewise were unanimous in their support of a Board of Livestock Commissioners.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to list some of the problems of the producers of livestock at the present time and I believe most or all of these problems could be finally overcome by the creation of a proper board of Livestock Commissioners with producer representation. I live close enough to Regina here to notice, in the fall of the year, when I used to ship cattle myself before I became a Member of this House – I don't have the time now – the cattle glut on the market in the fall of the year which has been mentioned by former speakers on the Marketing Act. Generally speaking I have found – and I have made some investigation into this matter – that the price of choice cattle or the very top grades remain practically the same. But I have seen the invoices and the prices received by more than one farmer, as well as my own experience and they show that on the market most grades of cattle are graded down in the fall of the year from one, one and a half to two cents per pound, by the grading of the stock. Secondly, where there is the collusion in agreement at times among the packers, which has been unfavourable to the producer and I think this operates in the fall of the year particularly. Third, it might be the arrangements by the Federal Government. I might say that the livestock breeders and other organized farm or cattle associations are asking for the export of both beef and feeder cattle to the United States when the British needs are sufficiently satisfied to take this glut of the market, which they used to do some years ago.

I might say that the sale of feeder cattle under the quota system, years ago, worked very satisfactorily particularly in the fall of the year and even now, Mr. Speaker, the farm organizations are urging token shipments to the United States in order to keep in contact with that market right at the present time. I do not know whether that would be a good thing or not, but that is what some of the organizations are asking for.

Then, fourth, there might be the use of funds under the Agricultural Support Act. And I might say quite frankly from what little I know about it, the Agricultural Support Act seems to have been of little avail to the Saskatchewan farmers to uphold the price particularly in the fall of the year.

Then there are one or two other matters I would like to speak on. One is the suspicion of the packer and the packer's margin, or his profits being too great. I am going to quote a statement here from a book. This book is by the National Leader of the CCF Party, Mr. M.J. Coldwell. It is a book that is one of the British Commonwealth series, and I think you will agree

March 13, 1947

with me, Mr. Speaker, that it is good company, because we have first, "New Zealand, the Work in Democracy", in this series of four books. I might say, "New Zealand, the Work in Democracy" is by Walter Nash. There is also, "Toward a Better World" by Jan Christian Smuts; "Canada, and the Fight for Freedom," by Prime Minister MacKenzie King and "Left Turn Canada" by M.J. Coldwell. You could not find any fault with a book coming from a series alongside of MacKenzie King's good book. I am going to give you a quotation from this and it has to do with the packer and packer profits. On page 136, it has this to say:

Two huge packing houses, Canada Packers and Swift Canadian Company control 86 per cent of the packing house industry and as a result they can dictate prices to the farmer as well as to the consumer in the city. Canadian Packers Limited prospered throughout the depression. Its earnings more recently have ranged from 76 per cent on its subscribed capital investment, in 1938 before the War, to 116 per cent in 1940 and 112 per cent in 1942. This is denied by the spokesman.

Everyone here will recall the spokesman or the manager of Canada Packers who denied these statements.

This is denied by the spokesmen for the companies who relate earnings not to the money that investors have actually put into the business but to what they call Stockholders' equity. The stockholders' equity consists partly of capital investment, but largely of profits that have been made out of the farmer in the past.

I am sure, this must be quite correct because I have a little clipping in my hand of January 30, 1947, taken from the Leader-Post in which Hon. J.G. Gardiner spoke of profits. He says these extra profits of corporations belong to the people – and that is what we are after through this Board of Livestock Commissioners. Mr. Gardiner made a statement to that effect, when he told Canada's big corporations that the profits which were not required for their business were not their profits, and thus were liable to taxation. Over the radio, he went on to say they were the money of those who applied their labor to the natural resources of the country to produce wealth and if they do not or cannot pay them out in wages, local taxes, widespread dividends, then we must tax them. The monies obtained must be redistributed through the Provincial payments to the areas from which they came. But, anyway, Mr. Gardiner is in accord with Mr. Coldwell in this point, I believe, with regard to the profits of these big corporations.

Just one more little statement regarding the problems of the farmer and that is the lack of continuity of grade standards between producer and consumer and this has to do with the rail grading of beef. I am not going to go into that at all, I am just going to make a statement here which came from our own Wheat Pool, or from the Co-operative Livestock Producers under the Wheat Pool: (I believe perhaps rail grading will come, maybe in the future, of beef):

The chief answer to this problem appears to be the adoption of rail grading for cattle as soon as producers are ready to accept such grading and have satisfied themselves that with a Board of Livestock Commissioners, such grading would be more equitable and in the interest of all concerned.

I am sure that that would receive the endorsement of everyone.

Now, in closing I would like to say that I believe the answer to practically all the problems I have mentioned is that which is advocated by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture and by farm organizations and MPs and MLAs all across Canada, pretty much, and that is the establishment of this Board of Livestock Commissioners.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the Livestock producers of Saskatchewan, along with those of other provinces believe that there is a better method of marketing cattle than the present so-called packers' system and are asking year after year that a livestock marketing scheme or board be set up along the line suggested in this Resolution which I am presenting.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore move this Resolution.

Mr. W.J. Boyle (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to second this Resolution, I would like to state to this Assembly that I have been a livestock producer here in Saskatchewan for about 38 years, so I believe I know something about the livestock industry. First, I would like to discuss, if I may, the hog industry and what the Livestock Board might accomplish in this regard.

We have a bacon contract with Great Britain which I think should be filled if at all possible. For if we wish to hold the British bacon market, we must endeavor to be able to have a steady supply of the right quality of bacon, month by month, so that the Old Country trade knows that we are in a position to supply that market.

What is the hog situation at the present time? There is not enough hogs being produced, therefore we should try to do something about it. This reduction has not developed overnight. On two previous occasions in two resolutions introduced in this Assembly I have endeavoured to bring home to our Federal Government what their Feed Grain Policy was doing to the hog production of this province. On one of these occasions, our Federal Minister of Agriculture was reported as commenting that, if we were not satisfied, we should do something about it provincially. Now, nobody knows better than he does that we have no control over the Federal Government's Feed Grain Policy nor has the province the financial ability to bonus hog producers as he seemed to suggest.

I am in favor of the Livestock Board because I feel that it might be able to give the producers some confidence that he has not previously had; give him some assurance that he would get a proper grade for his hogs, a grade that had some relationship with the bacon that is being shipped out. He wants to be assured that when he has had his hogs graded that grade is the grade that will be sold to the consumer, or shipped to Great Britain, not bought by the packers at one grade and sold as another.

I do not know whether all Members of this House are acquainted with the statements that we get back from our hogs when we sell them. Anybody that does not know, I have some here, and you will notice there are 14 different grades of hogs, that they

March 13, 1947

can grade our hogs into. The price we have quoted through the daily papers is for number one grade. The packers have 13 chances, 13 columns, to cut your hogs down. So, anybody that is not perfectly familiar with the system can understand that it gives the packers quite an advantage. There is only one grade 'A'. The 13 other columns can grade your hogs down, everyone of them has a different cut from Grade 'A' Bacon. If you turn to the back, you find some explanation of how they grade them. A Grade 'A' hog must weigh from 140 to 170 pounds, dressed weight. They must be of a certain length, a certain maximum of fat and so on. If he weights more than 170 pounds – if he weighs 171 pounds – he goes down into Grade 'B'; he gets a different bonus; he gets a different price – all for the matter of one pound. It is all right to say you have to draw the line some place; but we often wonder if a hog that does in at 171 pounds comes out as a 170 pound hog.

Anybody who is interested can examine these statements. They are all official statements – Burns and Company – and it is quite an instructive document to anybody who has not seen them and does not know all about selling hogs.

I believe a Livestock Board would help to get our hog production in a more continuous and steady supply and get away from the extreme fluctuations of production we have had in the past.

On previous occasions that I rose in the House I predicted what was happening to our Saskatchewan hog production. If I may, I would like to quote just how that has been disappearing. In 1944, we had almost \$60,000,000 worth of hogs produced in this country. In 1945, it was down to a bout half that, and this year it is down below \$20,000,000. That means, in three years, we have gone down from \$60,000,000 to below \$20,000,000. That is something we should all be concerned about, because that is one form of diversification which means that we have not all our eggs in one basket. Again, a \$60,000,000 hog industry in the province not only makes work for the farmers, it makes work for the packing houses and helps all along the line.

I would like to compliment the Minister of Agriculture on his policy of having the farmers put up feed reserves in advance, so that in case of short crops they will not have to sacrifice their livestock as they have had to in the past. I believe he is setting a good example for the Government doing some of this themselves. I believe it is a step in the right direction.

I believe a Livestock Board would have a very good influence in seeing that consumers get a more steady supply.

On January 3, this year, the Federal Minister of Agriculture announced a rise in the price of bacon to Great Britain of \$4 a hundredweight, the rise not to take place until September 1st; but on January 13th, they allowed the price to rise \$2 a hundred and it was also announced that the domestic price would be allowed to rise. I have here a clipping from the Western Producer:

It was announced in Ottawa, Thursday, an increase of \$2 per 100 pounds on export bacon would result in the price of lard increasing 7 cents per pound; dockages, 7 cents per pound; wieners and other cooked products 6 cents a pound and bacon will go up 4 to 7 cents per pounds.

March 13, 1947

So that if they allow the bacon price to go up \$2 per hundred at seaboard, they allow lard to go up seven cents. Lard is what they get from our cheap hogs, hogs that are cut down from Grade A.

I think that should demonstrate to anybody that we need somebody with some control that will look after the producers' interest. Therefore, I have great pleasure in seconding this Resolution.

Mr. J.S. Aitkin (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, the Resolution has been so ably presented by the Hon. Member for Lumsden, the Hon. Member for Kinistino and the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources that it is hardly necessary for me to say very much and I don't intend to but there are a few things that come to mind. The first is that, many of our institutions in this country have grown up in a sort of haphazard way and that is true of the system of livestock marketing as I recall it, oh, quite a few years ago. It always seems strange to me that we had to ship our stock to Winnipeg. It was much the same system I suppose as our friends and neighbors to the south of us when they used to ship their stock to the packing town of Chicago and the result of course was, in Chicago, at least, that you built up a packing town where conditions were very crude. They were exposed by a well-know socialist, Mr. Upton Sinclair and if any of you have ever read, "The Jungle" you will realize that that was one time that private enterprise made an awful mess of things.

In Winnipeg, I think, things were better. I have been on that market a few times with carloads of cattle. I have never been in the abattoirs and I wasn't anxious to go in them, but I was always sorry for the stock that had to come such long distances, they seemed to suffer so much. I have seen them suffering in the cold of winter and the heat of summer and even after they got to Winnipeg, they were often bought there and reloaded to go to other markets. I am sure it could not, but have a very detrimental effect on the final product when and where it reached the consumer. Well, that condition has been corrected now and we have abattoirs nearer the various towns and cities in Saskatchewan.

Here, I might just say, speaking for my own constituency, in the Hanley constituency, are very much pleased with the new abattoir of the Intercontinental Packers with we have in Saskatoon, it has solved most of our stock raising problems, that is our marketing problems. We have no long hauls now, no shipping to Winnipeg. We haul them in there by trucks and the cattle get in there in good condition, cattle and hogs and there are no long periods of transportation. I should also like to say in passing that I am pleased to see that that packing house, I believe, is one of the best in Canada in so far as making a high class product goes so that we see what can be done.

There are two words here, assembling and transport which I would like to say a few words about. This assembly is still haphazard as far as shipping by carload is concerned. If we want to produce a real first-class product, more care must be given to assembling.

Now the Hon. Member for Arm River and I sometimes differ and probably always will differ upon the matter of the Labour Government in New Zealand. But if ever I could get hold of a

March 13, 1947

few good New Zealand lamb chops and sit down with him at dinner, I am sure he would agree that that was really a first-class product. I can tell this House a little of what that product is. The greatest care is taken. The farmer in New Zealand doesn't look over his lambs and say, well, I think these are ready to go to market and he ships them. Before lambs are sent to the abattoir in New Zealand, a man comes from the abattoir, a man who really knows fat lambs. He stands in the run there and the lambs are run past him. He places one hand on them and with his other hand he either puts a chalk mark or he doesn't and all those with a chalk mark are ready to ship. I followed these lambs into the abattoir and saw them after they were hung up on the hooks. I didn't see a variation of more than three pounds in weight in all the lambs I saw and I saw, oh, at least 100. So that there is where something must be done, I think, in the care of assembling because if you really want a high-class product, a little extra organization is neither here nor there.

The producer is always ready to pay a little more for a high-class product and we have to meet the needs of the consumers.

I know that a great deal still needs to be done. As I have said we have grown up in this Western country in a sort of haphazard way of stock markets and if we really want to produce a first-class product we have got to get down and really organize and see that that product from the time it leaves the farm until the time it reaches the consumer's table is handled in the best, most scientific manner possible. I have much pleasure in supporting the Resolution.

Mr. H.E. Houze (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the House to certain practices which have been established in connection with the marketing of livestock and livestock products. Now, first of all, probably, we have the practices of the packers. Secondly, we have country buying. Thirdly, we have real grading of cattle and then we have real grading of beef and we have live grading of hogs of which so much has been said and then we have the manipulating of our livestock markets.

Now I don't know of any group of producers which has been exploited so much as the producers of hogs, in the last number of years. Real grading of hogs was first brought in with a view of producing a hog that would compare favourably with that of our rivals from Denmark and going to the British markets. Now real grading of hogs is all right but the practise which has been brought to the attention, and that is of having a hog that probably weighed one pound less or one pound more being penalized to the extent of three or four dollars and that is passed back to the producer of the hog. This has not been a very profitable thing for the man who has been breeding the hogs. And I am just wondering this winter about the trimming the farmers would get in marketing their hogs which they were feeding when our railroads were blocked up and trucks and everything else and these hogs couldn't be on the market. Now, everyone has been told that a hog that weighs a certain amount goes into one market and a hog that weighs another weight goes into a different market. I am not just sure that they do go into that market because I believe that this extra pound, or this extra two pounds or four pounds, doesn't make very much different when it comes to shipping them overseas. I don't think that

March 13, 1947

probably the hogs that weighed 168 pounds, Mr. Speaker, went into a different market probably than the hogs that weighed 180 pounds. Nevertheless, the man who produced the hogs got probably \$4 less and that hasn't been very clearly emphasized where this \$4 went to. Now I am not going to say that the retail butcher got the \$4 and I have never yet seen a butcher shop that displayed a carcass of pork where he said this is at a discount of \$3 or \$4 because it was a couple of pounds less.

As I have said before, the facts that were first introduced with the view to produce a type of hog that would compare favourably with that of the Danish product. I don't think that our hogs ever were inferior to that produced in Denmark, but I believe the British people like the cure that the Danes have better than they do ours and probably was a little more favourable to it. Now I do not say that the factors of it went on without it having certain favourable things in connection with it, but nevertheless the packers used this to a considerable extent in buying their hogs. Now the practice of the packers at the present time is to create the impression among our farmers and among the producers of livestock that if you ship those hogs, or if you ship those cattle in directly to the packing plants, that you are going to save a little money by not having them go through our co-operative stockyards or our public markets. Now any person that has been shipping hogs for a number of years knows quite well that if you take in probably 20 hogs into a truck and you drive directly to the packing plant and you have in that some hogs weighing 300 pounds and you have some hogs that weigh 150 pounds. but the minute they go to the packing plant and they are in possession of the packers and no one else has any chance of bidding on those hogs. In fact that's their private property and you must really not go there to buy anything that doesn't compare favourably with them.

The same thing happens with cattle. A lot of cattle go into market and they go directly to the packing plant, instead of to the public market. If they went through these public stockyards and they were graded there, both the cattle and hogs, there may be somebody there who would want to buy a bunch of light hogs. They weigh 150 pounds probably live weight, just about the weight that it is very probable to feed them. Instead of that, they are not given an opportunity to be placed on the market. They go directly to the packing plant and no person has a chance to bid on them. The same way with our cattle. The cattle go to the stockyards. They are not probably finished and those people do send them directly to the packers and they go in there. The public is not given a chance to sort those cattle or look at them or in any way bid on them. They go directly into the plant and they are sold there and boned or any other way of the process and no person has a chance to buy them. If this stock was going directly into the stockyards where it would be publicly owned stockyards or co-operatively owned or whatever it might be. There is no doubt there would be certain expenses on it, but after all the factors would take that off and the farmer doesn't know it.

For instance, a farmer sends in 10 head of cattle into the market and he says take those cattle directly to the packing plant. He says I expect to get 10 cents a pound for this. All right the trucker takes them in. He takes them into the packing plant and to the surprise of the farmer probably who is with him, the man comes along and says, oh, I'll give you 11 cents for that one. You've got two more there that are worth 10½ cents

March 13, 1947

and the rest of your truckload is probably worth 9½ cents. He makes three or four half dollars there which the farmer naturally thinks he is getting given to him. On the other hand he gives away seven or eight half dollars on the other end that he forgets all about.

Cattle and hogs handled through public yards do cost a little more than when they are put right directly into the packers' hands. But in the long run the packer is a very shrewd fellow and he takes that off in the buying of the hogs, or in the buying of the cattle. And, we have today in Saskatchewan good stockyards, we have in Moose Jaw a good stockyard there that is co-operatively owned, it is well managed and it is run on a very good system. For a number of years they have been unable to even pay taxes on this yard there. Due to the fact so many people ship their livestock directly into the plant and whether you handle 100 head of cattle or 100 head of hogs to that stockyard, you have the same overhead expense and the same costs every way.

There is another thing that enters into it and it is the weighing of cattle and hogs at plants. I am not going to suggest for a minute that scales are not right, that we haven't got honest people weighing those stock, but I never get so where you have got the odd pounds on any stock that is ever shipped in. And cattle at the price they are today, hogs at the price they are today and with the odd pound, we'll say seven, eight or nine, it amounts to quite a bit of money on a carload of hogs, cattle, when they are slaughtered off one or two at a time and passed through the stockyard. Another thing that enters into it is the packer's indemnity. In Saskatchewan today our TB in our cattle is probably the lowest of any place in the Dominion of Canada. Yet at the same time the packer's indemnity fund has increased and today we have to pay more for this, into this fund for some of our cattle than we paid two or three years ago. There is a big fund set up which amounts to up in the millions of dollars to protect this industry where cattle are condemned and where our cattle are the healthiest in Saskatchewan and in the Dominion of Canada. Beef grading has been abdicated and the grading of cattle on the hoof. This has come up time and again at different meetings. It came up in our Beef Producers Association and it came up in livestock selection and it has been thought that this would be a pretty complicated thing. Although I think there should be some supervision over the sale of cattle which can be done more in the stockyards than it can in the public plants, as you know in Vancouver in British Columbia, they have the grading of beef and all beef sold there is fed. We haven't got it here in Saskatchewan and probably it is a thing which might come up at the next livestock meeting.

Now manipulating the markets is a thing that the packers are experts at. I am going to just show you how the market of livestock can be manipulated in the Province of Saskatchewan to the debit man of the producer. Not so very long ago one of our commission men received an order for 20 carloads of fat calves. Now there were 20 carloads at that time of fat cattle on the market but the man that got the order didn't go out and buy more cattle on the market. He went out and ran around the country and bought those cattle in different places in the southern part of the province. After he bought them and came back in, the commission firm here who have a lot of cattle kind of reprimanded him for his action and going away and buying those

March 13, 1947

cattle because they had the cattle there on the market. He said this: "If I had stepped onto the market and bought those cattle, there were 20 carloads of cattle which were on order which I had to fill, I would have raised the market 25 x 100. On the other hand I wanted to buy 20 carloads more of cattle and it was my duty to go out in the country and bring those cattle in from the country and ship them directly away where they wouldn't affect the market at all."

Now this is one way it can be manipulated. Another way that the packers manipulate those markets is by having country buyers at different points in Saskatchewan, or Alberta or any place, still they have operating on both sides of the line. As you know, some buyers have known that in late years ago people got a good lesson about that because some fellow in Saskatoon went broke. But at the same time it is the idea of the packers to do this. He has an object in mind when he sends one of his buyers out in the country and he wants to buy a number of carloads of hogs or cattle at a definite price. Because he knows that those hogs are coming in and if there is three, or four, or five hundred hogs or a thousand hogs coming into the Moose Jaw market, he can sit back in his chair, up in the packing plant, and he need not go to the yards to buy one of them. He can set that market at 25 cents or 50 cents a hundred, he doesn't need the hogs -because he knows those hogs are coming in from the country and going to be there for him the next day.

I think that all livestock should in some way go through a public market. I am not abdicating that rail grading of hogs, I think that there has been a detriment to it in the past and the packers have made a real clean-up in manipulating this hog grading. I am not too sure that these hogs were discounted to two or three dollars a hundred didn't eventually go out to the British market. I think the fact that grading hogs probably on the hoof, then going to the plant afterwards, to a public market and have them graded there, would be much more advantageous to the producer of these hogs. I think that we should, in some way, pass legislation in this Government. I don't think we have the right to do it here, but I think that we should abdicate in some way to appoint a board of livestock commissioners to bring about the grading and marketing of all cattle and hogs on the public markets in Canada.

Motion agreed to.

RESOLUTION RE – FISHING INDUSTRY ASSISTANCE

Mr. H.L. Howell (Meadow Lake) moved, seconded by Mr. Lee (Cumberland):

That this Assembly, being of the opinion that our Fishing Industry should be established on a firm economic foundation, request the Government of Saskatchewan to urge the Federal Government:

- (1) To make immediately available the benefits of the "Fisheries Price Support Act, 1944" to the fresh water fishing industry;
- (2) To establish a Marketing Board with each province interested having representation on such board for

March 13, 1947

the purpose of marketing fresh water fish and allied products,

And, further, that this Assembly ask the Provincial Government to consider the advisability of further assistance to the fishing industry by means of improved distribution, transportation and storage facilities.

Mr. A.T. Procter (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, the Resolution on the Order Paper to which I am speaking is one of those Resolutions which shows how closely associated international affairs are with the events and doings of private individuals. It would seem a long way from the motion to say that the present condition of the fishing industry in the Province of Saskatchewan particularly the white fish industry, is very closely related to a private crime in the city of Chicago. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, a considerable number of years ago a very wealthy gentleman died in Chicago leaving a son and appointing his doctor as the trustee under his will for the son of approximately \$1 million. When the son was about to attain the age of 21 years, the trustee, of course, would have to hand over the fund and hand over an accounting for the fund. He conceived the idea of impregnating oysters with the cholera, or typhoid germs and gave a certificate that the young man died from typhoid germs. The Yellow Press of the States took the matter up and there were great headlines in the press with the result that the oyster beds were investigated. The charge having been made that the oysters became infected from sewers and it was afterwards proved that the particular bed from which the oysters that the young man had eaten came from a bed that was not infected. The doctor was prosecuted and unless he has recently died, is in prison.

As the result of that situation, Sir, certain measures in respect to food control were taken by the United States and the next link in the chain arose from a suit over a carload of tullibee from Lake Winnipeg, shipped also, I think, to Chicago, to one of the United States cities anyway. The shipment was disputed by the purchaser and the vendor went to Chicago and sought settlement. The purchaser refused settlement and said that he would bring the matter of this shipment of tullibee before the Pure Food Administration of the States and he had the tullibee investigated. There they found a worm infecting the fish, known I think the technical name is a triaenophorus. The scientist who made the investigation found this thread-like worm in the tullibee and jumped to the conclusion that it was the source of the tapeworm which effects human beings in the continent and great publicity was given to it. As a result, tullibee were rejected completely from the United States market and the tullibee industry has suffered from that ever since. Shortly thereafter, another shipment was made from Lake Winnipeg. This time a whitefish and, again, a great dispute arose between the vendor and the purchaser as to these whitefish and in the course of the dispute one of the parties raised the point about the tullibee being infected by this triaenophorus and they said the whitefish also were infected. An examination of that particular shipment established the fact, beyond doubt, and you will see how the thing built up to the present situation. The Pure Food Administration, who is charged with the administration of the pure food laws in the United States, after considerable discussion, arrived at the plan by which they would admit carloads of whitefish provided that the tolerance, on a certain tolerance of this triaenophorus worm. The amount of the tolerance was

March 13, 1947

never given out, and in actual fact the practice arose that a graph sample was taken of a car of whitefish. I think the number was 25, were taken out and if this sample showed above the tolerance on which they were admitted, the carload was rejected. These rejected cars were, quite frequently, shipped back and later sent to another point, and you will readily understand, Sir, that in taken the sample it was largely a matter of chance. Twenty-five fish from one part of the car might show infection over the tolerance, 25 fish from another part of the car might show in infection below the tolerance and in the one case the car would be admitted and in the other case the car would be refused.

This, the life habits of this triaenophorus were fully inquired into and to put the matter very shortly, it was found that the triaenophorus had a life cycle somewhat as follows: the triaenophorus when taken into the body of the whitefish hatched out and bored through the skin, he didn't perforate the skin. Sometimes he was of course, expelled and sometimes the fish died and so forth. At a certain stage in this development, he would be freed into the water for a period of about two weeks and there he was eaten by another sort of a water beetle called a Cockerpond. This water beetle, a very small animal, and the triaenophorus at that stage was a little more than a very short thread. The triaenophorus in its turn was eaten by the whitefish and so the cycle was continued.

A scientific investigation of this worm was made by various authorities including one of our own. I think the gentleman's name was Professor Ross, he was a professor of Biology at Saskatoon University. Professor Ross has given his certificate that this worm or this parasite is absolutely harmless to human beings in properly cooked fish, but unfortunately, Sir, the one of these parasites is making its home in the living flesh of the whitefish. It creates a cyst surrounded by a very unpleasant looking substance and sufficiently of a disgusting nature to allow the pure food laws of the United States to operate.

The condition was keep very largely secret because the parasites being innocuous to human beings, probably wished to advertise the matter particularly until such time as the rejection on diseased fish became such as to threaten the fishing industry. There were two views as to what should be done about it.

There was a conference held during the time of the former Government with the various officials both of the Province of Manitoba, Alberta and the Dominion officials. They decided against giving a great deal of publicity; they also decided on a plan by which the lakes could be inspected. Again, that is largely a matter of chance to a certain degree in that it is possible to take samples out of a lake at one end and find it infected; take samples out of a lake at another end and find it is not infected and in fact cases have been known where samples have been taken out of a lake and both ends were infected and the middle was not infected. However, there is one gentleman in the fishing industry when the matter had gone this far who thought the best thing to do was to advise all his customers of the situation. I have no hesitation in saying what I have said here on the floor of the House tonight because this gentleman sends out some 50,000 letters in all to various customers and hoped for customers so that very wide publicity was given to the whole condition in the industry. Furthermore, I think my hon.

March 13, 1947

friend, the Minister has given a certain amount of publicity also to the matter and I propose to deal with that very shortly.

There was a conference just prior to the last election and which had not been completed when this Government took office. The views of the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources at that time, Mr. Speaker, were somewhat different to the views he expressed here the other night. He is reported in the Star-Phoenix of August 24, 1944, when speaking at Wilkie, to have said that instead of boasting about how much fish we shipped, we will tell how much fish we ate. He stated, like the fish, most of our lumber is going out of the province. We must and shall reserve some of this produce for our own people to use in post-war development. Then he went on to deal with the question of fish hatcheries and so forth in connection with the fishing industry, but at that time it is rather evident that he did not consider the export market of such value as he has now evidently arrived at the conclusion that it is.

Mr. Phelps: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct my hon. friend if he got the impression that I think the export market is the only market. I still regard the home market as a very important market. I don't want the House to be under any illusion about that.

Mr. Procter: —I didn't suggest to him that he doesn't pay any attention to the other market, Mr. Speaker. Now I think the next knowledge I have of the hon. gentleman's activities was that shortly after this other meeting he attended the meeting at Big River. I am quite sure that the Hon. Minister will remember all about that meeting because quite a big day was given to him and at that meeting a holiday was declared for the school children and he met a great many of the fishermen of the North. By this time he had learned that the tolerance was to these cysts in 50 pounds, I think it is. At all events at this meeting he gave publicity to the tolerance and told them all about the difficulties we were having in connection with the fish. I may say, Sir, that throughout this whole period much of the fish that was sold in Saskatchewan were round fish and not filleted. I say further that this faction has always existed in whitefish during all the years that we have been eating whitefish and nobody has suffered any ill results from eating whitefish. I presume that many of us will continue to eat whitefish notwithstanding the infection.

It seems we were told the other night that another conference is to be held and that there is to be another Commission. In the meantime, however, the hon. gentleman, with his usual industry and vigor and impetuosity, undertook to get into the fish business and handle the fish business. We all know, Sir, that there have been a number of fish filleting plants and there have been these other things of which he spoke and to which I'll refer a little later on in my address. We were told, I think, in the Province of Manitoba, the people were told by the Premier that the Government had five fish filleting plants. Then we asked a question in the House and I think we were told that there were two fish filleting plants and one fish filleting plan under auction. We have never been able to discover the true intricacies of all the operations of the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources in connection with the fish business. In fact, Mr. Speaker, you will have noticed and we on this side of the House have asked a number of questions in reference to the

fish industry and I have just taken the trouble to mark a few of the answers in this Session that we have received. Whenever we have tried to learn anything about the fish industry in the Province of Saskatchewan the answer has been that it was not in the public interest that the questions should be answered if they were at all material. I must confess, Mr. Speaker, I have always had a sneaking idea that it was not in the interests of the Minister of Natural Resources that the questions should be answered and that influenced the answer rather more than the matter of public policy.

Mr. Phelps: — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a Point of Privilege, there is no insinuation that it is not in the interest of the Minister of Natural Resources not to answer the question, the answer was given, the answer sticks, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Procter: — The answer, Mr. Speaker, is that he claimed that it was not in the interest of public policy that we would receive the information for which we have asked. That has been roughly the answer to every important question in connection with the fishing industry that we have asked for. Amongst the places where the fish filleting plants were established by the Minister in his haste and impetuosity was, I believe, the plant at Lac La Ronge which is not a basic fishing lake. And which has resulted, I am informed by those who are more familiar with the fishing industry than I am, necessitates a great deal of trucking of fish into that plant with all the attendant expense thereon.

Now, Sir, I believe also and I hope sometime the Minister will take an opportunity of telling us about this. I have been informed that there was what we might call an unofficial inquiry into the Minister's activities in the fishing industry by a CCF committee at Flin Flon and that the —min's doings did not receive the assent from that investigation which one might expect from a committee of that kind. However, not being a member of the committee and not being in the inner councils of the CCF Party, either in Saskatchewan or in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, I am unable to speak with the proper authority on that point.

The other night, Mr. Speaker, we had an opportunity of hearing the Minister's speech in connection with the fishing industry here in the Province of Saskatchewan. I must confess that speaking for myself after the Minister was through, I was more confused as to his activities in the fishing industry than before he started. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that in that address the other night, we were told first of all, that prior to the Government's intervention in the fishing industry of the North, no fisherman owned his equipment and that now he does own his equipment. Well, that would seem to show that there has been a vast improvement in the fishermen's condition. We were told that private operators ...

Mr. Phelps: — Again, I didn't say that there were no fishermen, I said, few fishermen, few actual fishermen and that statements stands. That there were few not no actual fishermen.

Mr. Procter: — I am not going to quarrel, Mr. Speaker, with the hon. gentleman about a few fishermen. I will take his word for it that there were few fishermen who owned their equipment I

March 13, 1947

take it that the Minister would agree with me that there are a considerable number now own their equipment and that would seem to indicate an improvement. Then we were told that when this fishing industry of the North was in the hands of private operators, that the private operators only operated when the market suited them and that at the present time, the Government is operating all the time. There again, I think that the conclusion might fairly be drawn that there has been another big improvement in the status and standing and economic position of the fishermen.

Then we were told about the gypsy fishermen having been done away with and the Minister tells us that as a result of actions that he has taken the Americans confidence in the grading of our fish has largely been re-established. I cannot fail to see, Sir, how under those circumstances there could be an improvement in the fishermen's condition. Now the Minister referred to plugged cars of fish of private operators. I am just going to say this, Mr. Speaker, you and I and everybody else that had anything to do with the wheat business in the Province of Saskatchewan know that it isn't only fish cars that have been plugged in this province. There have been elevator men and even the odd farmer or two that plugged cars and as a result of a system of proper inspection those gentlemen found that it was highly unprofitable to plus cars of grain. I should think that with proper inspection in the fishing industry it could be made equally unprofitable for a private operator or anybody else to plug a car of fish. Because evidently from what the Minister said the procedure was somewhat the same, shoving the poor fish in the ends of the car and the good fish near the door and so forth and so on.

Now, then we were told all about the portable freezing plants and the portable smoke unit. I am quite satisfied there again there must have been an improvement in the fishermen's business in the North. Then we were told that supplies shipped in by these wicked private operators were overcharged to the fishermen and evidently the Minister has taken some steps to improve that condition. Then we were told that the Government, for the first time, in the last year and one-half shows a balance on the right side of the ledger in its dealings with the fishing industry. Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether I am one of these socially-minded persons of which we hear so much in this House from time to time, but I know that the Minister claims to be socially-minded and I am sure that he wouldn't mump the poor fishermen so that in the last year and one-half for the first time the Government is on the right side of the ledger in dealing with the fishermen of the North unless there had been an improvement in the fishermen of the North's condition, which would justify that method of dealing with them. We know, of course, that the royalty has been placed on the fishermen of the North. Then after we are told all these good things, Mr. Speaker, what do we find? Well, the Minister tells us first of all that the filleting plants cannot be expected to pay dividends and that is evidently quite true because in the first report, the only report we have had of the Fish Corporation, a loss is shown. So there we being to get the first idea of premonitory chill that all is not well with the fishing industry.

I took the trouble to do a little investigating into that Fisheries Report and I may say that the Government Fish Corporation appears to have paid the fishermen for fish, \$143,000,

March 13, 1947

and that they were holding to pay the balance of the initial price. Some \$22,000 which would indicate that they paid the fishermen a total of \$165,000 or will pay the fishermen, a total of \$165,000. Then I took a look to see what the fish had been sold for and I found that the Fish Corporation had sold the fish for \$183,000. Then I found that they had collected royalties of \$3,000 and then I found that they had put through another charge for warehousing and so forth for \$7,500. Then I found they finished with a loss of \$7,700 approximately. In other words, Sir, they bought \$165,000 worth of fish from the fishermen and they sold that fish, partly realizing on the fish sold and partly on other charges which I have indicated, to an amount which came to \$201,200. It would seem to me that the spread between \$165,000 and \$201,000 having regard to the normal profit on undertakings of this kind, is certainly not very favourable to the Minister and his Corporation. I further found that according to that report, it cost the Minister \$61,579 to do the fish business which with all these other charges amounted to \$201,200. I wasn't surprised there was a loss, but I was intensely surprised at the amount that had to be expended to do that amount of business. But let us go on a little further, Sir, we have had the preliminary chill in connection with the fishing industry. Then I found that the initial price for fish being paid by the Government this year, is five cents a pound. I found that last year, at least, in some of the lakes and in a considerable number I am advised the price paid by the private operator to the fishermen was 16½ cents a pound.

Mr. Phelps: —Mr. Speaker, I rise here on a Point of Privilege. I am sure the Hon. Member doesn't want to leave misinformation in this House. I said the other evening when a person wanted to compare prices they should in all fairness be compared with the same line. Now, Mr. Speaker, the five cents a pound, that my hon. friend mentions is for fish from "B" lakes for filleting. He jumps from that to 16 cents which is not the fish for filleting and I don't care what companies ...

Mr. Procter: — I understood, Mr. Speaker, the Minister to say that he was giving five cents a pound for all the bulk fish, as an advance. That wasn't fair and I was about to go on when the Minister interrupted me to say that, of course, there are certain lakes where undoubtedly the amounts that can be realized by the fishermen who fish at the lake is not much as could be expected by the fisherman who fishes certain other lakes. The nice surprise, Mr. Speaker, normally advanced is about two-thirds of the expected price and if we take, add another two and a half cents to this five cents, we get seven and a half cents. Now while I quoted 16½ cents as the price paid last year by private operators in some of the lakes, I also want to tell the Minister that I am advised that, for instance, we will take the Meotoa Whitefish now, I think by the trade name as Meotas that they realized approximately 30 cents a pound.

I am told that the latest shipment realized from 14 cents to 15 cents per pound. There is a special reason for these Meota Whitefish, the Hon. Minister knows now if he didn't know then and that is that these fish weighed 1½ pounds to about 2½ pounds. They reached their prime at a period when a special demand for this particular type of fish and that they are given that name. As a matter of fact, I think, since the Minister has been dealing with this thing the fish were dumped on the market and competition

March 13, 1947

with Alberta fish and Manitoba fish and as a result the Saskatchewan fishermen took quite a considerable part. But these addresses made, but as I say we haven't been able to get from the Minister the real details of the fishing business. I am not surprised that it is rude to answer our questions where under the circumstances I have outlined, Mr. Speaker. I think if I was in the Hon. Minister's position, I wouldn't want to give more information about the fishing business than I could help. However, I have pointed out all these advantages the fishermen of the North have received from the hon. gentlemen. I pointed out the other day that the fishermen were leaving this province, some of them for Alberta, some of them to Flin Flon. In fact I think that yesterday's paper, there was an article again, that some outfits were going to withdraw \$100,000 worth of equipment from this province because of the operations of the Hon. Minister. Now what does the Minister conclude with? He concludes that these suggestions, that the Federal Government must come to the assistance of the fishing industry of the North or it is going to disintegrate. He even goes so far as to say, that the basic industry of the North must be reorganized before people engaged in it, flock out from the North.

I must confess, Sir, that I find a great deal of difficulty in understanding the first part of my hon. friend's speech in which he tells us about all these improvements of conditions. You will remember what they were, Sir, that these gypsy fishermen had been stopped and the equipment had, they owned their own equipment and all this sort of thing. Well surely, Mr. Speaker, if that is the case, I can't now understand when having wound himself up in his own verbosity till we come to the conclusion of his speech. The Hon. gentleman now tells us that if the Federal Government doesn't come to the assistance of the fishermen in the North the fishing industry is ruined or that the basic industry must be reorganized or the people engaged in it brought out of the North.

Incidentally, Sir, I might point out that in his Budget Speech, the Hon. Provincial Treasurer told us that there has been a decline of \$200,000 in the value of the commercial industry in the Province of Saskatchewan and further gave us the figures that the value of the fish at railhead. Now not at the lake, Mr. Speaker, the value of the fish, commercial fish at railhead in the Province of Saskatchewan, has been the sum of \$1,184,145, approximately \$125,000 less than the year before. I am quite sure that if the Hon. Minister keeps on the way he has been keeping on, next year we can look to still further decrease in the value of the fish from the North. But what I do not understand, Mr. Speaker, is this. Why does the hon. gentleman quote that for the first time in the last year and a half, the Government is on the right side of the ledger when it is quite apparent from the fact that if the fishing industry is to be saved the Dominion Government must intervene? It is also quite apparent that if they don't, we are going to have to move the fishermen out of the North. There is something to me that smells fishy in the fish industry. The Government appears to be making a profit to be on the right side of the ledger for the first time. But the fishermen, in spite of the advantages that they have received, they seem to be on the wrong side of the ledger for the first time. And socially-minded governments such as this, is headed in this Department by such a socially-minded gentlemen as the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources, as you surely see to it that either the Government speedily gets on the wrong side of the ledger and the fishermen get on the

March 13, 1947

right side of the ledger as the first step to saving the fishermen of the North so that we won't have to bring them out.

Now, Sir, further than that, I see that in the estimated revenue from the fisheries branch in the current Budget on our table, it is estimated that the Government is going to take out of the fishing industry one way or another, \$80,000. I think the reference to the Public Accounts will show last year that the Government took out of the fishing industry approximately \$63,000. Now, yes, it shows what it put in, but surely socially-minded gentlemen such as the Hon. Minister for Natural Resources isn't going to leave these fishermen in foremost state that they appear to be in at the conclusion of his remarks. And at the same time continue to take \$80,000 out of a commercial fishing industry, that are out of a fishing industry, then the whole commercial fishing industry of the Province of Saskatchewan was only valued at \$1,184,000. Those figures, Mr. Speaker, to me indicate that, like a great many other socialists that I know, the Minister is very socialist with the other fellow's property but not so socialist, or socially-minded shall I say, when it comes to expending the money over which he has control. They piled us in the streets for the total value of \$1,184,000 from which it is estimated that this socially-minded and socialist Government is going to take \$80,000. Even though it may be necessary if we don't improve the fishermen of the North, to take them out of the North, Mr. Speaker, these things do not seem to jibe.

Now, I would like to suggest to the Hon. Minister that he should immediately take up with the Government for the immediate relief of these men. The advisability of giving a bonus of some kind to the fishermen to help them out notwithstanding the wonderful progress that they have made if they are in this position. It has occurred to me, Sir, that when we pass this Resolution, because I am certainly going to do anything I can to help the fishermen, that the first thing that the Dominion is going to say to us is, well, what are you fellows up there doing? There is your fishing industry work, \$184,000 and you expect to take out of it \$80,000. Now you are down here wanting us to do something for the fishermen. Hadn't you better take your part of the \$80,000 to begin with, that would seem to me to be the natural approach from the other fellow's side of the fence.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity of going to Ottawa and trying to get money from the Government down there. I generally was referred to the Hon. Dr. ... the Deputy Minister and he is just about as tough a bird to get money out of as there is in the Dominion of Canada. He is also one of the ablest financiers and one of the ablest financial men in the Dominion of Canada. I want to say that we are extremely fortunate that we have men like him in charge of the Dominion revenue. Otherwise when men like the Hon. -Minister of Natural Resources went down there, I am afraid no matter how large the Dominion revenues might be, it would be completely broken.

Now, Sir, I am going to make another suggestion in connection with this Resolution. I am going to suggest to the Hon. Minister that the wise time to appoint a commission is before you start doing everything. I know we have had several examples of commissions to do things and then other commissions to advise that commission what they ought to have done. In fact, Mr. Speaker, you will remember on one occasion I had made a reference

March 13, 1947

to a commission that we appointed to advise a commission very much to the Hon. Premier's ... in one of our Bills here in this House. The next year I noticed the commission to advise the commission was done away with. Now, am going to suggest that before we do go to Ottawa at all that we attempt to help ourselves. I am going to suggest to the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources that before he gets into any further over his head in the fish business that he wait for the findings of this Commission. The first thing we know, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate his haste, but the first thing we know by the time the Commission he proposes to appoint in the Conference, that he proposes to hold, has made their recommendations, the Hon. Minister will have done so much in the fishing industry it will be impossible to find either the fish or the fishermen and a new condition will arise that will require another Commission to advise on the Hon. Minister's activities from the time the first commission was appointed. I do suggest, Sir, that the Hon. Minister restrain himself, contain himself, have a little patience, wait until the report of those men who know something about the fishing industry comes to his desk. Then Sir, I am going to suggest that the Hon. Minister read it through carefully and that he not hastily pass it to some gentleman in his Department who involved us in the condition in which the Hon. Minister already appears to have involved us in, in connection with the fishing industry of the North.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the Resolution. I am going to do it for this reason, that I feel that the fishermen of the North are entitled to all the protection that we, in this House, can give them. I feel that the Hon. Minister has now created a monopoly in the fishing industry in which those who might come to the assistance and help of these men are no longer able to do so by reason of the action the Hon. Minister has taken. I am going to support in on the grounds, Sir, that just the same as every other Socialist industry that has ever been undertaken, those unfortunate enough to been delivered hand and bound into the hands of the Socialist monopoly running that industry need all the support from us, all the support from the Dominion Government, all the support from the Lord on High, that can be granted to them.

Mr. Speaker, I shall support the Resolution.

Mr. H.L. Howell (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, there are just a few things that I might draw to the attention of the Members in concluding this debate. My opinion is that the Member, who has just spoken, has strayed a long way from the Resolution. His attempt has been to belittle in my opinion, the accomplishments of the Federal Government with respect to reorganizing the fishing industry of this province. In my opinion the Department of Natural Resources, the Minister of Natural Resources, has done a very good job in that regard, that the Government has not put the fishing industry on the rocks in this province, not be any stretch of the imagination as the Member for Moosomin would like us to believe. I want to point out that the Government is only into the business to the extent of about one-third of the total, so that these private dealers have a very good opportunity to go ahead if they will and carry out the program that the supporters of free enterprise think they might carry out or would carry out if they were left to their own way. but here, they have an opportunity in this province of going ahead and showing what they can do if they will. There is one or two other arguments that I might refer to

March 13, 1947

also, we in Saskatchewan have a comparatively small part in inland fishing of Canada. It is very difficult for us in this province to write the whole inland fishery situation. I would say it is impossible for us to write the whole situation for that reason. I think that we are doing the right thing to ask that the Dominion Government co-operate with the various Provincial Governments that are interested in this problem and willing to co-operate together to solve the problem by an united action.

I wondered, when the Member who just sat down, I was speaking, I wondered when he was talking about the plugging of fish cars and plugging of cars of wheat and so on, I wondered what his Government had done, when it was in power to stop that practise. If he realized that it was bad business, realized that it was dishonest and detrimental to the fishing industry of the -province. So far as I know there was no attempt ever made by any government in Saskatchewan to put an end to that practise until this administration took office some two and one-half years ago. I am very glad that that was done, if it is necessary to restore confidence in Saskatchewan's fish in the export market.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this Resolution receives the unanimous support of this House.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:40 o'clock p.m.