

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session – Tenth Legislature
33rd Day

Monday, March 17, 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. A.T. Procter (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate my good friend the Hon. Provincial Treasurer of this province on the manner in which he presented the Budget Address. I am more than glad, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate him on the manner in which he moved that Address because, sir, that is about the only feature of the whole Budget Address on which I can congratulate him and I would not want the Address to go by without some acknowledgement to the Provincial Treasurer of the work which he did in that connection.

Once again, Sir, we have a Budget introduced by the Provincial Treasurer, higher still and higher; the highest that has ever been introduced in this House; the largest imposed on the people of this province and one without commensurate benefits to the people of the province for the moneys which are being taken out of their pockets.

At the back of the printed budget Address, Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer of the province has always included tables showing the various per capita taxes, the increase in taxation year by year, the distribution of the taxes collected amongst the various departments and it is there, Mr. Speaker, that we really see the bones of the Budget, unclothed with the verbiage which the Hon. Provincial Treasurer puts on those bones to make them look more appealing to the people of the province and, Sir, I have referred to those tables at the back of the Budget Address now on our desks.

The per capita tax – and, let me say, Mr. Speaker,, -- as we all know, the per capita tax is the tax in relation to every man and woman in the Province of Saskatchewan and indicates what they individually have to pay; the per capita tax in that schedule in the year 1936 was the sum of \$17.21. That is practically 10 years ago, Mr. Speaker. By the year 1946, the end of the last fiscal year, the per capita tax has risen to the sum of \$47.70. To this must be added, Sir, the \$5 hospital tax which is not included in the Budget figures or in the tables. We, therefore, have actually a total of \$52.70 collected by the Provincial Treasurer in this Budget, or proposed to be collected in this Budget, from every man, woman and child in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, I do not think the

hon. gentleman is doing it deliberately, but he refers to the per capita tax. The document I tabled in the House the other day does not make any reference to the per capita tax. What he is quoting is the per capital revenue on revenue account of \$17.31 and now \$47.70. The per capita tax, the item is \$6.11 and \$15.58. It is entirely misleading what the hon. gentleman has been quoting.

Mr. Procter: — well, I accept the Hon. Provincial Treasurer's statement, Mr. Speaker, but the relationship is exactly the same, the per capita tax and the table, the table is set out and it is the last table in the Budget Address and referring to that table we find this. It is headed, "Per Capita."

Mr. Fines: — Read the heading.

Mr. Procter: — 1936. I have read the heading, "Per Capita."

Mr. Fines: — Per Capital what? No, that is not the heading.

Mr. Procter: — The word is "Per Capita." Now the first table – and it does not matter what the Hon. Provincial Treasurer calls it – the first amount for 1936 is \$17.31 and the last amount on the tax for 1946 is \$47.70, the figures that I have given.

Mr. Fines: — On Gross Revenue account.

Mr. Procter: — Now, it does not matter how the Provincial Treasurer may dodge the matter, or dodge the issue. The fact is that on that same table which is produced year after year, this figure has risen from \$17.31 to \$47.70, and does not include the \$5 which has been collected from the people of this province for the hospital tax. That represents, Sir, an increase of over 300 per cent in ten years in revenue.

Mr. Fines: — No, no!

Mr. Procter: — No, in ten years, because I have not added on the additional \$5,500,000 which he proposes to collect in the year 1947. This is in addition to this sum of \$52.70. Now, sir, when we remember that this does not include the taxes collected from our people for municipal purposes by the local municipal councils; it does not include the school districts and health unit taxes, it does not include the taxes paid to the Dominion Government ...

Mr. Douglas: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Procter: — Yes, you will hear more about that and I hope you will like it.

Mr. Douglas: — Nobody likes it.

Mr. Procter: — It does not include the automobile accident insurance charges for the coming year. Even the Provincial Treasurer, I

March 17, 1947

suggest to you, Sir, might well have hesitated to impose the further burden on the people of this province, which he is now going to impose, of an additional \$5,500,000. That, Sir, is in round figures, another \$7 per head for every man, woman and child in the Province of Saskatchewan. No wonder, Mr. Speaker, the people of this province are beginning to feel that this Government's taxation is intolerable. This year, we have again an increase in the burden of taxation. Our people again pay more and benefit little. Statisticians tell us the average family in the Province of Saskatchewan consists of five persons. An average family in the province is now contributing to our Provincial Government, through one source or another, over \$260 per capita. I ask you and I ask the Members of this House, Mr. Speaker, to ask themselves what are we getting for this amount! The tables to which I have referred show that since 1943 ...

Mr. Douglas: — Inaccurately.

Mr. Procter: — I do not wonder that the Premier does not like those tables. You know those tables, Mr. Speaker ...

Mr. Douglas: — On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. Since the hon. gentleman has referred to me not liking the tables, may I say that I object to a person reading a table and refusing to read the heading. The heading says, "Comparative Statement of Gross Revenue, Under Revenue Account." The hon. gentleman keeps referring to them as taxes. I think that most people who have read the table and listened to the hon. gentleman's inferences from it will recognize that the tables have been most inaccurately quoted.

Mr. Procter: — No, I was not going to speak on the Point of Order, I was just going to say that I had explained all that already.

Mr. Speaker: — I think the Hon. Member is referring to the same figures in relation to taxes he mentioned before. I do not think the Point of Order is well taken.

Mr. Procter: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not blame the Premier for getting up and trying to becloud the issue. If I had presented to the people of this province this kind of a Budget and that kind of a table, I would be inclined to think perhaps like the Premier and I would endeavor to get up and cloud the issue somewhat, create some doubt about the matter; but the fact is the table is not prepared by me but prepared by his own Provincial Treasurer; it is a comparative statement of all these years, and the figures are as I have shown.

Now, sir, not only do the tables show that; but it shows that since 1943 – the last year the Liberal Government was in office – the increase in those figures is more than double the amount for 1936. Is it any wonder that, in the light of these results, the population of this province as shown by those same tables, has dropped from 930,000 to 823,000 in the same period? I am glad to have the Provincial Treasurer check me up with these tables; if he will just whip over the page, he will find that figure on the next table, I think it is.

Now, Sir, between this Government's legislation and its taxation on the Government, I suggest to you, is fact wrecking the province. Further, I suggest to you that these tables show another situation which you and the Members of this House will be interested to hear about, having regard to the fact that these tables again do not allow any rosy colored pictures or explanations. We find this: the cost of administration and general government – and I think the Provincial Treasurer will agree with me that is what is popularly called the Civil Service and it really means all the employees of the Government – has also risen. It has risen since 1943 from \$2.66 for every man, woman and child in the Province of Saskatchewan to \$3.75 for every man, woman and child.

Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, another Point of Order. I have no objection, but the hon. gentleman asked me to correct him if he goes wrong; but I would like to point out that these tables are for the year ending April 30, 1943 and he is referring constantly to the “last year of Liberal administration.” He would be much more accurate if he took April 30, 1944. He is just one year out by taking 1943.

Mr. Procter: — Again, Mr. Speaker, the tables are not, as I read them, just in the fiscal year, but in annual years.

Mr. Fines: — Oh, no, it is not!

Mr. Procter: —Certainly there is nothing to indicate in the tables that it is for the fiscal year.

Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Privilege, the statement says that it is a “Comparative Statement of Gross and Per Capital Expenditure” for the years ending April 30th. Now, my hon. friend can surely read.

Mr. Procter: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, yes, I will accept that. I had overlooked that in ...

Mr. Fines: — It is not the first thing you have overlooked.

Mr. Procter: — Oh yes, but it does not change the picture very much. I will just correct the figures and my hon. friends will be even more regretful in a moment.

The table at the end of 1944 for the same year was \$3.01. It had risen by 1946 to \$3.75. But now, what happens? The Provincial Treasurer tells us that there is going to be an increase of \$1,000,000 in the cost of Civil Service in this 1947 Budget, the one that is coming. Again, in round figures, our population being 823,000, that means that the cost of our Civil Service is going to be \$5 per head for every man, woman and child in this province. That is \$3.75 plus \$1.25, in round figures, Mr. Speaker, that this extra million calls for. In other words, Mr. Speaker, every man, woman and child in the Province of Saskatchewan, during the year 1947, is going to have to lay on the Provincial Treasurer's desk, in some manner

March 17, 1947

or another, \$5 for the cost of the Civil Service in this province and that has risen from the figure of \$3.01 at April 30th, 1944. This Budget means, Mr. Speaker, that more than the value of one out of every four bushels of wheat as grown in the Province of Saskatchewan, last year, according to the figures the Provincial Treasurer gave us, must be delivered to the Provincial Treasurer to carry on the activities of this Socialist Government of his in the next ensuing year. This Government means, as I have said, that every man, woman and child in the Province of Saskatchewan, must provide \$5 and lay it on the Provincial Treasurer's desk that the Cadburys, the Sheps, the Schumiatchers, the McLeods and all that other army of alleged experts and scientific advisors may tour this province making their socialistic experiments at our expense. They will, Mr. Speaker, I presume, work the 37½ hours per week, while the great part of our people, who provide that \$5 per capital, will toil rising with the dawn and retiring long after dark from their labours.

The Government laughs about that. Well, they may laugh, Mr. Speaker. The people of this province are not going to laugh about it at all. A year ago the teacher used these words in his address and quotes them again, this year: "The people of Saskatchewan will not be frightened by a \$50,000,000 Budget or a \$60,000,000 one if necessary. They will measure a government by the way it spends the money." The people of Saskatchewan Mr. Speaker, will measure this Government by the way it spends its money and when the proper time comes, they will deliver the same age old verdict that appeared on the walls when Belshazzar was feasting that, you will remember, Sir, that the Government is indulging in now – "mene, mene, tehel upharsin" – "weighed, weighed in the balance and found wanting."

Mr. Douglas: — That happened in 1944.

Mr. Procter: — Now, Sir, I want to turn to another feature of the Budget. I have said before and I repeat it today, that the municipal governments of this province are in exactly the same position relative to the Provincial Government as the Provincial Government was in with the Dominion Government, that just as the Dominion Government made a grant to the Provincial Government to relieve them of part of their burden, so should the Provincial Government make a grant of part of the amount received from the Dominion, in the recent conference, in the municipal governments.

In his Budget Address the Provincial Treasurer has attempted to answer that contention. He says, and I quote:

During the past two years the province has relieved the municipalities of many responsibilities which have assisted them very greatly and this year we propose to assist them still further.

To the same effect was the address of the Premier, recently, given to the convention of rural municipal men in this city. The Provincial Treasurer says that school grants have increased \$2,000,000; that provision of health services has been undertaken by the province at a cost of \$2,000,000; that road grants have increased \$432,000 and the increased social services for mothers and neglected children have relieved the municipalities of their expense.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the legislation of this Government has not only not relieved the municipalities of any burden, but has actually imposed on the municipalities a far heavier burden than they ever had before. In fact, Sir, may I suggest to the Provincial Treasurer that, if he assists and continues to assist, the municipalities as he has done since he has been in power, very shortly the municipalities of the province will be completely bankrupt.

Mr. Fines: — They do not look it.

Mr. Procter: — If there was assistance given backwards, it has been the assistance that this Government has given to them. Take the matter of teachers' salaries. I think we can all agree that the teachers were underpaid during the depression years. I think we can all agree that the teachers were entitled to receive and should have received, a larger minimum salary when conditions improved.

Mr. Douglas: — It is a little late to realize that.

Mr. Procter: — But let us also recognize that, when this Government imposed that higher minimum salary on the school districts, it imposed a far heavier burden of taxation on the school districts of the province also, a burden far greater than any increase in the grants from this Government to the rural and village school districts. In other words, the minimum salary was raised far beyond the additional grants given and the difference had to be put up by the municipalities. Every increase in school grants that I can recollect and I do not except those made by the Liberal Government or by the Conservative Government — every increase in school grants made has had conditions attached to it. Those conditions could have forced the school district, in order to get the benefit of the grant to increase its taxation on itself and thereby created a far greater liability on the part of the district than the grant that was received. Even the basic — the original basic grant — grant of \$200 was given on the condition that the school district kept the school open for 200 days a year and there is nobody that would suggest that keeping the school open could possibly be done for \$200 a year, or \$300 a year, as it later was raised to.

Now, whatever may be the merits of the larger school district, I think and I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is the general opinion of people of this province that, whether the large unit is more satisfactory or not, it has cost the ratepayers considerably more money in taxation than ever before. This Government imposed that burden on the school districts and to say that the school districts a whole have received any relief from their taxation or any relief from their burdens because the grants have been increased by \$2,000,000 is, I submit to you, Sir, absurd. Every increase in grants has been accompanied by legislation which forced an increase in taxation. Similarly the provision of health services, even though it has cost the Provincial Government \$2 million in grants, has cost the municipality very much more. It has cost the residents of health regions and of rural municipalities many times \$2 million to establish the services required by the legislation. The hospital tax to which I have referred alone amounted to \$3.5 million.

March 17, 1947

Mr. Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask him a question? He just made the statement that the amount spent by the people in the health regions has reached a great deal more than the extra money that we gave them. I wonder if he will elaborate that and tell us how much they have spent.

Mr. Procter: — Well, I referred to the whole picture of health grants. The grants are increased to the hospitals; but again \$3.5 million collected for hospital tax, then in these health units, the municipality levies a rate and gets a grant from the Government, that rate was never levied before. Therefore, as I point out, Mr. Speaker, every action of this Government not only causes this Government to spend more money, but it causes the local authorities, whether it be the health units, school districts or the municipalities, to spend more money than it spent before. I have yet to learn of any grant where the Government pays 100 per cent of the additional costs of the service required from the local units, whatever it may be.

Let us now consider the case of the old age pensioners, mother's allowance recipients and so on. The Premier told the Municipal Conference that that burden had been lifted from the municipalities. The Premier knows — and I am sure no one knows it better — that the basic pension of the old age pensioner and of the mothers' allowance recipient was never in this province a direct charge on the local municipal authorities. In many of the provinces it was; in some, one-half of the basic old age pension, the \$25 pension, was charged back to the local municipalities and collected from them. Similarly with their mother's allowances. In others a third was charged back; but in this province there never was any charge back for that basic pension. Now, it was because there never was any charge back, Mr. Speaker, that the local authorities were left to provide the medical relief, the hospitalization and supplementary grants in needy cases, that is the history of that ...

Mr. Valleau: — Additional maintenance?

Mr. Procter: — Yes, additional maintenance — supplementary relief is what I called it. In most of the provinces, as I say, a portion of the basic \$25 old age pension and blind pension grant was charged back; in this province under Liberal and Conservative and CCF administrations, it never has been charged back. That is not charged back to the municipality at all. Then, as a matter of fact, there is no difference in actual facts between the notice the Minister now files in the Land Titles Office and the caveat. He sought to create some kindly feeling by taking off the caveat and filing a notice. It has the same effect because a great many people disliked the caveat being filed; but this notice the Minister files is just exactly the same in effect as the old caveat. I have told him that before. And I do not wonder he smiles ...

Mr. Valleau: — I do not believe it yet.

Mr. Procter: — Because he may put it over some people but he cannot put it over me, Sir. These same principles apply to the other social services when the province is raised to a scale of relief, the municipality was required to bear a portion of the

raised amount. Now, I am not saying that all these things, or that some of these things, were not good things to do, but I do say that it is most unfair to the local municipalities, school districts and health units to say that this sort of thing has taken any burden from them. It is for that reason that I pointed out some time ago, Sir, that if the Government continues to assist them at the rate which they have been going, they all will be bankrupted by the assistance.

There is another thing: every time the Provincial Treasurer takes an extra million or so out of the pockets of the people of this province to pay his Civil Service, we who are left in those districts have just a million in our conglomerate mass less to pay these extra budget costs.

Mr. Sturdy: — Do you object to increased salaries?

Mr. Procter: — Do I object! I object very, very strongly to this extra 1,700 civil servants you have put on since you took office and if I were you I would keep quiet about it, I would not say anything about it. If you think that the fact that you have increased your Civil Service 1700 in less than three years, you have been in office is getting you any kudos in the Province of Saskatchewan, you are entirely mistaken.

Mr. Douglas: — We will see about that.

Mr. Arthurs: — May I ask a question?

Mr. Procter: — Well, you told me the other day when you were on the radio that you would not answer my questions when I was on the radio. Now, you can take your own medicine and sit down and ask me after the radio time is over.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the situation as to the \$72,000,000 of seed grain and relief the Provincial Treasurer says he has relieved the municipalities of. May I point out to you again, Sir, that here, once more there is actually no relief to the municipalities at all. I do not intend to go into the merits or demerits of the seed grain settlement today. I am only going to say that as a result of the actions of this Government, the man who at considerable sacrifice, paid his own seed grain, bought his own seed grain, or even the man who repaid his seed grain account has been sold down the river in this settlement. Many farmers have taken the attitude that they would repay neither seed grain nor relief advanced by the Government even though it was that seed grain and that relief that enabled them to re-establish themselves during these better times which a fortunate providence has given to the province. Now, these men, who at personal sacrifice, paid that money are callously told by this Government that not only will they not get anything back to put them on an even footing with the men who refused to pay, but they are told that they have got to dig down in their pockets again and help pay for the man who has had his debts cancelled.

But it is not that phase of the matter I want to deal with here today. I want to refer to this question of whether the \$72,000,000 has been lifted from the municipalities. I hope I have not driven the Provincial Treasurer out of the Chamber,

March 17, 1947

Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Douglas: — It will take more than you to do that.

Mr. Procter: — The Provincial Treasurer tells the people of this province and particularly the municipalities, that by cancellation of seed grain and relief, he has lifted \$72,000,000 from the backs of the municipalities. He has not lifted one dollar from the backs of the municipalities. The municipalities held these farmers' notes for the seed grain and relief; the Provincial Government held the municipalities' notes for the same seed grain and relief and in approximately the same amounts. Then the Dominion Government held the provinces' guarantee and treasury bills. Now, when this settlement was arrived at, the only thing that was done as far as the municipalities were concerned, with a few exceptions, was that the farmers' notes they held were wiped out as a debt due to the municipalities and equally the municipalities' debt to the Provincial Government was wiped out and similarly in the settlement recently arrived at, the \$54,000,000 of treasury bills, most of which was for that class of stuff, were wiped out from the province; but it is just like taking the money out of one pocket and putting it into another. An asset has gone and a liability has gone that was equal to the asset. That does not help them any. The cancellation cost this Government practically nothing and it benefits the municipalities nothing, except insofar as it benefits the individual farmers in the rural municipalities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few remarks as to some of the speeches of the hon. Gentlemen opposite in this debate. I hope that those hon. gentlemen whom I may overlook will not feel too insulted and will not feel that it is any wilful omission on my part. It is simply a question of time and a question of dealing with the big birds first, again.

First I want to deal with my hon. friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs. As I have said before, Mr. Speaker, and as I repeat today, the Leader-Post does not need me to defend them. They can do a much better job of their defence than I can. I do like, however, to see a reasonable amount of fairness in our debates towards those who cannot come on the floor of this House and defend themselves against charges made on the floor of this House, where they have no opportunity of replying. I have had a fairly long experience in public life and I have probably had as many speeches reported by the Leader-Post and other papers of this province as most of the public men in this province and may I say this, that unlike the Premier, I have never to my knowledge been misquoted yet ...

Mr. Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, did I claim to be misquoted? I have been making no claims of being misquoted.

Mr. Procter: — Oh, I have heard the Premier repeatedly getting up and saying that he has been misquoted. In fact, when we read all these things back to him and he does not like to hear them, he generally gets up and says that he was misquoted.

Mr. Douglas: — You are having a pipe-dream now.

Mr. Procter: — Oh! You remember, Mr. Premier, that famous quotation from the Calgary paper, or was it the Edmonton paper, “that if one farmer was foreclosed in this province that you would resign?”

Now, as I say, Mr. Speaker, I have never had occasion to feel that I have been misreported. Men in public life are human and they make mistakes; and I have no doubt that unknowingly they make statements which to them had a different meaning, and to their hearers have a different meaning. I have no doubt that, quite often, the statement is capable of two interpretations and the men who make that kind of statement should not blame the reporters; they should blame themselves. Then, of course, there is another type of politician who goes out and makes the statement that he thinks is, at the moment, going to assist his party, but later on there is a sting in it like the scorpions tail; and when that is thrown up to him, oh, the refuge that he takes is, “I was misquoted,” and that is another explanation of a lot of misquotes. Now I am going to say, Mr. Speaker, that I heard myself, in the hotel at which I stay, the night before the article appeared in the Leader-Post at all, about this two-cent gas thing, from one of the municipal men, that the Government was going to put it on anyway just as it came out next morning. I was not there. I do not know what the Minister said but that fellow got the same idea the reporters got.

Mr. Douglas: — He got it on the train coming down.

Mr. Procter: — He got the same idea as the reporter got. Just the same, at that United Church Conference at Moose Jaw when you spoke about the penicillin, Mr. Premier; they got a wrong idea of the picture altogether and you have never corrected it yet.

Mr. Douglas: — It was correct then, it is still correct.

Mr. Procter: — Now, I want to go further. I want to say that, on Friday last, the reporter for The Commonwealth – at least that is who he told me he was – speaking over the ‘phone, called me up to make sure that something I had said in the Fish debate, a night or two before, with my hon. friend the Minister of Natural Resources, would not be wrongly reported. I appreciated it very much. I thought it was the proper action for him to take; but that same paper, The Commonwealth, is the official organ of this Government and I have here in my hands, Mr. Speaker, the issue for Wednesday, March 12, 1947, and you can see the amazing headline on it: “The Budget Reduces Taxation.” Is that not a beautiful headline for this Budget? An increase of five and one-half million, and The Commonwealth comes out with a headline of, oh, about an inch and one-quarter, maybe an inch and one-half wide: “Budget Reduces Taxation;” “New source of revenue may be needed;” “Gasoline tax down one cent.” Well, Mr. Speaker, anybody reading those headlines in The Commonwealth would believe that this Government was taking a cent off the gasoline tax. The truth of the matter is that the Dominion Government took three cents off and this Government put two cents back on. I do not know just where this Edmonton Bulletin came from, Mr. Speaker, but when I have a little more time I

March 17, 1947

will be glad to look into it.

Mr. Douglas: — Read the headline.

Mr. Procter: — I do hope that if it came from the Premier, that at the next United Church Conference, he will go right back to them and tell them the truth about the penicillin situation and explain how mistaken he was in his remarks on that occasion.

Mr. Douglas: — I was not mistaken and nobody knows it better then the Hon. Member that I was not mistaken.

Mr. Procter: — And he can explain one or two other things at the same time, Mr. Speaker. Now, if the headlines in the Leader-Post misrepresented what the Hon. Mr. Brockelbank said to the Municipal Conference, I wonder what Mr. Brockelbank – and I imagine he must have some control or some say over this Commonwealth paper – will say about these headlines in respect to this Budget: “Budget Reduces Taxation;” “Gasoline down one cent,” and all this kind of tripe, Mr. Speaker ...

Mr. Brockelbank: — That is a free press!

Mr. Speaker: — Order, Order! A little less interruption and the Hon. Member will get along faster with his speech.

Mr. Procter: — ... and not one of them has got up and denied a word. I have sat in this House and I have listened to them talk about how this capitalistic press misrepresents this and misrepresents that and misrepresents the other thing. I never in my life, Mr. Speaker, saw what I would regard personally as a greater misrepresentation of fact than this socialist press, of this socialistic Government, in its report in The Commonwealth of March 12, 1947, of the effect of the Provincial Treasurer’s Budget. Why, even the Provincial Treasurer has got to laugh when he looks at it, Mr. Speaker, and so have I. Even the Provincial Treasurer has to laugh when he looks at that report and so have I. Now I do not think there was anything else in the hon. gentleman’s speech that requires my attention.

I want to deal for a few minutes with the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and I am sorry that he is not in his seat and I suggest to the Government that they had better send somebody out and get him in because I would not like to say what I am going to say in his absence.

When our Provincial Minister of Agriculture undertakes to criticize the Hon. Mr. Gardiner, the Dominion Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, the first thing that flashes into my mind is an old saying I heard many years ago: “Who are you pushing, said the ant to the elephant?”

Mr. Douglas: — Better let sleeping dogs lie.

Mr. Procter: — When the Provincial Minister of Agriculture starts to push Mr. Gardiner around, it is very much like the ant trying to

push the elephant.

Mr. Douglas: — It is like that when you try to push the CCF around.

Mr. Procter: — Now, the Minister of Agriculture had to go back to 1938 to start in on the distribution of the 1938 crop and you will remember he said it was a very fair distribution except for one thing, that out of that crop the unpaid vendor of a farm implement, a binder, a combine, or whatever it was — I am glad to see the Minister of Agriculture come in, Mr. Speaker, -- got a few cents an acre for the use of the binder. The Minister is evidently one of those socially-minded persons who would forbid repossession of the implement by the party or the company who sold it on the one hand and at the same time allow the purchaser to wear out the implement, harvesting the crop that keeps him on the land.

Now, let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the allowance for the machinery in 1938 was discussed with many of the farm organizations of this province and rates that they considered fair was agreed upon and the Minister of Agriculture should know — I do not think he knows much about this question at all — but he should know that the part of the crop that went to the implement company, in 1938, was simply an allowance to meet the wear-and-tear on the implement for the harvesting of the 1938 crop, because for many years no payments had been paid. We had refused to allow the companies to take any action and it was certainly getting to a stage where it was most unfair that the implement would be completely worn out and at the same time nothing could be collected for its use. That same allowance was made to private owners and I may say that in this province under socialistic government exactly the same allowance is being made today and I refer to The Threshers' Lien Act and all these other Acts whereby a man who provides the combine or threshing machine to thresh the crop is given a lien on the farmer's crop for the amount of his threshing bill. The principle behind that is exactly the same as the principle that was behind the allowance of so many cents an acre and so much a bushel that was allowed for the use of a binder and a combine in harvesting the 1938 crop; only the present lien is many times the amount that was allowed to those people.

I suppose that to be of a character where you could see anything wrong in telling the owner of a combine that he cannot repossess it but the other fellow can use it for threshing his crop and at the same time telling him that while the fellow that is using it for threshing; harvesting the very crop that is going to feed him, the fellow than owns the combine and made it possible should get nothing, well, maybe I suppose you have to have the type of mind, like the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, to see anything wrong in that.

Now, next the hon. gentleman dealt with what the Dominion Government has done for Saskatchewan and says that they have taken, according to the figures as I took them down, \$69,000,000 in taxation out of this province, some twenty-odd million of it by income tax and various taxes that he spoke of and I do not think there was any doubt the Minister of Agriculture wanted to leave the impression that the Dominion Government was not giving Saskatchewan much in return. Now, Sir, we have in this province, as I have already said, about 823,000 people. That is roughly

March 17, 1947

one-fifteenth of the people in Canada and I, for one, feel that we should bear one-fifteenth of the proper expenses of the family of Confederation, the Dominion of Canada. I am completely tired and fed up with being considered the 'weak sister' of the provinces, who are always going to Ottawa for a handout, who never have any money of their own, who are never able to pay anything and must always go down asking for reductions, grants and cancellations. The fact of the matter is, I at least and a great many other people in this province, are proud of this province. We know it is a good province. We know it is one of the best provinces in the Dominion of Canada or in the world, to live in and we are prepared ...

Mr. Douglas: — It was never better before.

Mr. Procter: — Yes, for a few years they can stand you fellows, but believe me you are spoiling it just as fast as you can and it will not be a very good place to live in when you put in your totalitarian policies because already quite a few people are seeing where they are going and getting out of it.

Mr. Douglas: — We are just getting rid of them.

Mr. Procter: — Now, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, a great many of us are prepared to see the Province of Saskatchewan pay its share of expenses to the family of Confederation, to the Dominion Government; but I got curious to see what we did get from the Dominion of Canada last year. First, let me say this: the Hon. Minister of Agriculture contented himself with saying that we paid in \$60,000,000 to them. Well, I can make up a much better statement than that and I am satisfied that we paid considerably over \$100 million in taxation to them.

Mr. Douglas: — We were just being modest.

Mr. Procter: — Well, that may be so; but there was not much modesty in what comes next. First of all, the Dominion of Canada returned to Saskatchewan approximately \$16,000,000 under the PFAA benefits, last year. Then they returned \$20,000,000 of benefits to the province under the Family Allowance Plan. Then they gave us that nice little handout of \$15,000,000 of an extra subsidy. Then they cancelled treasury bills ...

Mr. Fines: — We have not seen it yet.

Mr. Procter: — Oh, well, I do not think you have much doubt. God help you if you do not get it, because this Government would surely bust.

Mr. Douglas: — That is not a gift.

Mr. Procter: — They handed over \$15,000,000 of a subsidy. Then they handed over a cancellation of \$44,000,000 of Dominion treasury bills and then they handed over dairy subsidies to our farmers of about \$3,500,000. They handed over old age pensions — three-quarters of the \$25 item — about \$3,000,000. They handed over for veterans' pensions about \$2,800,000. They handed over

rehabilitation payments and gratuities of \$5,500,000. They handed over unemployment out-of-work benefits of \$3,000,000, and then we have the normal subsidy before, which is now \$8,000,000. That totals up, with a few of these other things, to something somewhere around \$113,000,000 that we have got back just in those amounts. Now, on top of that, Sir, we have received the expenditure they make in connection with the wheat acreage reduction bonus; the experimental farm, the seed wheat subsidy; the RCMP; the PFRA; the public buildings and post offices, and so forth; and then, on top of that, we have all these moneys that are coming from this scheme in the future, part of which has already been spent in connection with irrigation plans on the South Saskatchewan River.

Mr. Douglas: — What did they spend?

Mr. Procter: — Oh, they spent a lot of money. I think the Minister of Highways never went out in his life and surveyed roads and took levels and so forth without spending money. At least I know I never did. And he never made engineering plans without spending money and I have seen a lot of these plans and surveys when I was looking into that famous bridge question, so perhaps you had better not say anything more, Mr. Minister of Highways.

Mr. Douglas: — We have got past the plan stage anyway.

Mr. Procter: — Now, there is the picture. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture standing up in his place to tell this House that Saskatchewan had paid \$69,000,000 to the Dominion Government, and got nothing back! I have not had the time to make a complete list of the payments back; but those total roughly to \$113,000,000 that came right back to this province from the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, if we could only be assured that this Government itself, in its expenditures, could return us pro rata on its expenses to what the Dominion Government apparently is returning us, then I would feel a very, very great deal happier about this Government's position.

The next point I think the hon. gentleman dealt with was the hog production in the Province of Saskatchewan and I was rather interested about that because it just shows how this Government is running its affairs. Here we have the Minister of Agriculture getting up in his place and telling the people that the reason there are no hogs, is the Dominion income tax and that is what is discouraging it and so forth and so on. And about a day or two before, I received in the mail, a paper, letter or pamphlet, or whatever you want to call it, from the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan, Department of Agriculture, dealing with hog production in the Province of Saskatchewan. And the pamphlet — I don't know whether you would call it a letter or pamphlet — was signed by one. E.E. Brockelbank, Director of Agricultural Representatives. Now I am quite sure that is not the Hon. J.H. Brockelbank, the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Reading this pamphlet I am very, very sure that E.E. Brockelbank cannot possibly be CCF because this pamphlet is a very intelligent document. Let me read one or two paragraphs from the pamphlet. Before we launch into a discussion, and remember this is Mr. Brockelbank,

March 17, 1947

Mr. E.E. Brockelbank, of the Minister of Agriculture's own department, who writes these words that I am now going to read you.

Where there is only a small income there is no income tax and if the income tax bears heavily on anyone his income must be substantial. Is the AFU (I suppose that is the Alberta Farmers' Union) admitting that the farmers of Alberta are fairly well off?"

Now we go over to the back of the second page:

During Christmas week the price of B-1 hogs on the Calgary market was \$18.30 per hundredweight dressed. The average market hog ought to weigh about 200 pounds, around 150 dressed, making its market price \$27.45. On top of that there is a \$1 premium for B-1 hogs, bringing the price to \$28.45. That leaves \$10.66 for the farmer for his labor and management. If he has one extra brood sow and she has the average litter of seven pigs, his extra taxable income from that sow would therefore be \$74.62 a year on the basis of only one litter a year.

And then the last paragraph – and I won't read the whole thing – is this:

And yet the AFU official claims that, because of the income tax burden on the production of more hogs, farmers would not do it.

It is very clear that Mr. E.E. Brockelbank writes an excellent letter. It is very clear that Mr. E.E. Brockelbank, the Minister's own Director of Agricultural Representatives, believes there is good money in hog production in the Province of Saskatchewan. It is very clear that he thinks that income tax has mightily little to do with the drop in production of hogs and I suggest to the Minister that it is going to be very embarrassing for all of us, including himself and his agricultural representative, if he is going to get up in this House on the one hand and tell the farmers of the Province of Saskatchewan that the Dominion income tax stops the production of hogs and his Director of Agricultural Representatives tell them there is good money in it and that the income tax is not a very serious feature of it and then on the other hand his Department is going to keep on sending out letters ...

Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, will the Hon. Member permit a question. Can you tell us the cause of the drop?

Mr. Procter: —As soon as I am off the radio – the same as you told me. There is the fairness of the socially-minded Minister. The Minister was speaking on this very question and I wanted to ask him a question about this very document from which I am reading and which would have made it entirely unnecessary for me to take up the time in connection with this and the Minister shouted at me: "The Hon. Mr. Brockelbank has taken part of my

radio time. I am not going to let you take the other part," and he refused to answer. Now I am handing him back exactly the same treatment.

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I shall have to correct the Hon. Member for Moosomin. I certainly did not take any time from the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Williams: — On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, I will admit I am the guilty one.

Mr. Procter: — Oh, pardon me, pardon me! But these Ministers are so far in the wrong generally that it is mighty hard to put the finger on which is the one that is worst in the wrong. It was the Hon. Minister of Telephones, Mr. Williams, that he accused of taking his time. However, that is the way they operate. No, when it comes from us or some other fellow it is all wrong, but when it comes to them it is all right.

Next we come to this famous gazette case down here at Fir Mountain. I do not blame the Hon. Minister for one moment, Mr. Speaker, for not wanting to go into that case on the floor of this House. I think that there was a clear presentation by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition of what had taken place. We have had no explanation, we have been given no explanation and my own opinion is that there is no explanation. But at the time when it should have been given if there is one, was when the Hon. Minister was speaking and referring to it. However, I want to say something else. The hon. gentleman has had something to say about the question of money spent in other departments. Now, in view of the fact we have Mr. Brockelbank in his Department putting out one line of talk and his Department putting out a directly opposite line of talk, it is a jolly good thing for the agricultural people of the Province of Saskatchewan that some other Departments are spending some money for their benefit because it would appear to me that the money the Minister spends is not going to do them much good, Mr. Speaker. I am going to humbly suggest to the Minister of Agriculture that he perhaps call a council meeting and see if he cannot get all the other Ministers to spend part of his appropriation. The only one that I can think of that would make a worse mess of it than he himself, is the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources and I would suggest he leave the Minister of Natural Resources out of it because he apparently got into the fish business and you remember the other night he ruined all the fishermen and suggests we may have to bring them out of the North, unless the Dominion Government will come to his assistance.

Mr. Phelps: — But what about the suckers in the South?

Mr. Procter: — Yes, and you caught a lot of them too, both up north and in the south. I would not have believed, prior to the 1944 election, that there were so many suckers in the Province of Saskatchewan, until I saw the results of the election vote. I will admit they are still, Mr. Speaker, fishing for the suckers but they are not having such a good catch now. Even the suckers are beginning to get wise.

Mr. Douglas: — They got wise in 1944.

March 17, 1947

Mr. Procter: — Yes, they have got wised up a whole lot since 1944, Mr. Premier, too. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not mind them; but like to have these gentlemen trying to befuddle me because they do not have too much success.

Now, Sir, there is another thing that I want to point out to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, I have here in my hand a pamphlet, an address by one John A. Atkins of Bracebridge, Ontario, at some convention down there and I suggest that the Minister of Agriculture should give some consideration to the thoughts that the gentleman expressed. He is a dirt farmer in Ontario and I am going to read a short paragraph from his address:

The hard-working, thrifty people of Canada, who work long hours, have been compelled to surrender their rights and an increasing part of their earnings, to relatively high-paid short-houred people, who have forced uneconomic prices and costs upon everyone in the pretence and sometimes the belief, that they were sharing employment; but what have they accomplished is to insure future idleness that they will share as unemployment.

I remind the Minister of Labour of that view expressed there. I would remind the Hon. Provincial Treasurer of that view expressed there, that “the hard-working, thrifty people of Canada, who work long hours, have been compelled to surrender their rights and an increasing part of their earnings to relatively high-paid short-houred people.” That, Mr. Speaker, is going on in this province today. We are being told that the work week is to be again shortened. This farmer is, I do not know the man; never heard of him; do not know whether he is Conservative, Liberal or what he may be. I do know that he is not CCF from the address that I hold in my hand. I do know that he is not CCF and he goes further:

Creating and sharing idleness has however, become an established practice in Canada. When a farmer looks at factories, he looks to them for his needs produced by people who are willing to exchange their labor with him on a basis which will lower his costs and increase their real wages. He sees in Canada’s factories a potential industrial production that will raise the standard of living for farm people, factory people and all the Canadians. He sees the prospects of an expanding Canadian market for his produce and greater opportunities for his children ...

He goes on to deal with that whole question, Mr. Speaker.

I referred to the Civil Service a little while ago. This man suggests that, in Ontario, the agricultural workers are working over 70 hours a week. I think perhaps that there are periods, at least, when we in this province do not work quite that length of hours; but you know and I know that the agricultural people of this province, who are the backbone of this province, are the people who are working the long hours. You know the result of all this sort of thing that this Socialist Government is doing: neither laborers nor farmers are benefiting; that we are being continually forced into a spending spree and that, as this man says, “the creating and sharing

idleness has, become an established practice in Saskatchewan.

As this whole picture goes on the real wages are not going to the people who should have them; that the real wages are not even benefiting the people who are being treated in the manner that our people here are being treated; that it is of no benefit to a man to increase his wages \$10 a month if you increase his cost of living \$15 a month, that is the whole vicious circle that is going on.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this whole Budget is based on that same wrong principle, that principle that you can spend yourself into prosperity; that you can continue to take from the actual producers of the wealth of this province, money to pour into the provincial treasury, for him to take thereof this large proportion for labor benefits, for clerks, for administration expense, and then to funnel it back into unprofitable Crown corporations and socialistic experiments that are ruining this Province of Saskatchewan. That the time has come, as said by the Hon. Member for Last Mountain – one of the few CCF Members in this House who has an independent mind, who has a clear vision, who sees the picture from the viewpoint of the great majority of the people of this province and I have rarely heard a more concise statement of what this Budget means, of its effect, of the results that have come from it, of the mistakes the Government has made in it, than was made in that Budget Address by the Hon. Member for Last Mountain. I want to say to you, Sir, that not only is that the case, but I wish to associate myself with the Hon. Member for Last Mountain, in the remarks he has made in that connection.

Sir, I suggest that by now you will possibly have received some faint idea that it is not my intention to support this Budget. Before I sit down, however, I will be very glad now to answer the questions of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and the other hon. gentleman, I don't know, he is gone. Well, I guess it wasn't anything worthwhile anyway.

Mr. Nollet: — I would like to ask the Hon. Member: a farmer raised a broodline now and got a litter of pigs from each, what would his position then be with respect to income tax, assuming he raised 30 or 40 sows, kept 30 or 40 brood sows, not all little ones?

Mr. Procter: — Mr. Speaker, the best thing I can do, it is very evident the Minister does not know what is going out of his own Department, I suspected he did not know much about his Department; the best answer I can make to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture is, that he read this circular letter or pamphlet of February 4, 1947, from his own Department signed by E.E. Brockelbank, to which I referred and I will be glad to send a copy of it over to him by the pageboy and he will see there a while series of statements in connection with the whole hog business.

Mr. Nollet: — That is a good answer.

Mr. Procter: — Yes, it is a good letter, too, but I between it was not a CCF that wrote it.

March 17, 1947

Mr. H.E. Houze (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer for the way he put this nice Budget before the House. The people of the province, Mr. Speaker, will not mind a larger Budget if the money is wisely spent. In years gone by we heard about this Budget, but we never saw anything of it after that. We must remember that the price of farm machinery this last year has jumped about 12½ per cent. We must remember that if we go to buy a car now, we pay \$1,800 for the same car that we paid \$1,100 for back in 1940. Everything else has jumped accordingly. You go down in the city and you see meat, for instance, advertised in stores and it is up to 54 cents a pound.

We should commend the Government on our health services alone. If any place on this continent was in need of health services, it was the Province of Saskatchewan. I think the people realize that our ambulance service along has been very beneficial, especially in this winter with the amount of flights that have been made over this province of ours, everyone of which has been very much to the benefit of everyone.

The Government has had the problem of adjusting our seed grain which was a big problem. As you know this thing was handled and mused over for years and years; but eventually it was settled in a very fair manner.

Our road program has been extended and we are now building a system of roads that compares favourably with any roads built on this continent. While we have not yet made it perfect, this is the first time now in 38 years that I can drive home on a gravel road to where I live.

The Government has been getting a lot of money through the sale of liquor and I feel must the same, Mr. Speaker, as the Hon. Member for Humboldt, that I do not get much kick out of the profit made out of liquor.

An Hon. Member: — Do you get any kick out of the liquor?

Mr. Houze: — Somebody asked about the liquor. Well, I do not like to have a drink so much water to get such a little bit of alcohol. Personally, I believe that the sale of beer in this province should be more controlled. I believe that the sale of beer in hotel premises should cease at seven o'clock in the evening. If you lived in the country where we have country dances in schools – and we have dances in our villages – and if you go in there, next morning, you will see the streets or the roads, littered with bottles and I believe that this beer could be controlled much better. If you happen to be in a hotel you will see, on the night of a dance, young people coming in there and buying case after case of beer and taking it out to their cars. This has happened. I would not say that the sale of beer should be discontinued altogether at night, I believe that probably on one night in the week, say Saturday night, when the farmers come to town, it might be sold.

Last year we heard a great deal about our insurance policy we have also heard a great deal, this year, about car accident insurance policies, but I think that the Government should be commended for what they have done in that connection. During

last summer, down in my constituency, we had two very bad car accidents. In one accident three people were killed and the other, one person was killed and had it not been for this Government insurance, I think that the Government would have had some people here that they would have had to look after from now on.

While I am on the subject of insurance. I think I should say a word about our fire insurance. As you know, since the Government came into the insurance picture, our premiums have been greatly reduced and I want to say here, in connection with the Pork Packing Plant at Swift Current – of which I happen to be a director – that in 1946, we put \$200,000 worth of insurance on with an agency in Swift Current. Now this amount of insurance was spread by the agency over 11 different insurance companies. The rate on this \$200,000 of insurance amounted to \$4,875. Last fall, we decided to change our insurance, or asked to have tenders received and the Saskatchewan Government offered to insure those buildings and equipment for 55 cents a hundred. Previous to that we paid \$2.42, so we changed to the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office and we made a saving of \$3,842. In other words, the Saskatchewan Government took on the same amount of insurance for \$1,035 that the line companies took on for \$4,875 which made quite a saving to the co-operative.

Now, in regard to school units, probably there has been much said about that in my constituency as in any other place and I am not adverse to a better system of education. You know what happened when our boys enlisted for the army and went for medical examinations. In this examination for the army, I think there were 1,300 boys from the Province of Saskatchewan who could neither read nor write the English language. So I do say that there is a great need for improvement in our educational system. This school system of ours needs careful planning, because at the present time there is a general influx into urban centres off the farm. When times get a little tough on the farm, or in the country, the trend is that people go back to the land; but when times are real good people go into the villages and towns and the straight wheat farmer is no longer a rural resident. He does not, as a rule, live in Saskatchewan more than six months in the year and when he is living in Saskatchewan you will find him living in town. One man, with modern machinery, can operate a section of land and not work more than 40 days in a year. He is a ‘miner’ in every sense of the word. He takes everything out of the soil and puts nothing in, and as a rule he will not even grow seed or grass.

During the Session we have heard a great amount of figures on wheat and what happened in 1932. We have heard about the fish and the wonderful things up North, but we have heard very little about the man who is producing livestock on the farms. After the election in 1944 I was pleased to note that 80 per cent of the Members elected were farmers. Today, in checking them over I notice 35 Members in this Legislature that don’t even own a cow and to the gentlemen on my right here, I think the Opposition have one cow amongst the five of them.

Mr. Feeley: — Are you sure it is not a bull?

Mr. Nollet: — They have plenty of bull all right.

March 17, 1947

Mr. Houze: —In fact, one Member the other day told me that the cattlemen in this country and the stockgrowers, the cattlemen particularly, were a detriment to the wheat growers. He said it definitely cost them millions of dollars to keep us; it cost the wheat farmers millions of dollars to keep us. Now if we look at this province and you draw a line across from Moose Jaw to the west and to the north, you will find that the area from north of Moose Jaw to the Saskatchewan River and to the Alberta boundary, you will find that this area is more or less mixed farming country. You will find that we have good farmers in there and you will find that we have a lot of farmers who are not so good; but the whole country is what you would call a mixed farming country, or a semi-ranching district. Some farmers have real good homes, large tracts are suitable for grain growing, but, on the whole on account of climatic conditions, straight grain growing is more or less of a gamble. The land is hilly, as you know. Some is stony, some is rough; but on the whole, the texture of the soil is fair. We have sandy ridges running across this from east to west and then we have our valley. It is generally admitted that the farmer who has been careful, who has not bought too much land and who has not gambled on the grain exchange, has made a fair success of the business; but in spite of all the drawbacks I am glad to say that the man who has farmed economically has now got a good home and is pretty fair shape, although I will admit the percentage is against him in the way of straight grain growing.

I am glad the Minister of Agriculture is a practical stockman and I believe he is following the right course in his policy that the cattlemen and ranchers will soon be assured of something definite in the way of permanency and a definite way in which to grow cattle. You can get into wheat growing and have a crop in 90 days, but it takes much more than three years to have any returns from livestock – I mean the cattleman and the rancher.

You know as well as I do who put the farmers out of hog production. We can talk about income tax and we can talk about everything else, but the farmers were not going to be fooled any longer about hogs. The dilly-dallying program of the Minister of Agriculture at Ottawa put the farmers in this province out of hogs, because the man that was feeding his own grain, was feeding wheat, barley and oats that were worth 15 cents a bushel more than the man that he went into competition with who was buying his feed. Farmers do not like to do that. Our Minister of Agriculture now is a practical man and I am sure that these ranchers will have no more fear that they won't have something permanent on the ranches.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have been in power almost three years and the ranchers have been more or less in a quandary as to what they were going to do, because we have not had a permanent lease issued in all that time. the policy that has been pursued in connection with ranches up to the present time is not very favourable and I have every reason to believe that from now on the administration of the lands under the Agricultural Department will be better. The ranchers will feel more confident in the future and I am pleased that the Minister is realizing the necessity of arriving at some way to create a surplus of feed for such winters and we have gone through now.

There has been a lot of livestock lost in a district that was not very big. The district from Val Marie to, probably

Wood Mountain has been hardest hit for the last two or three years. The snowfall has not been very great for a number of years and ranchers were inclined to take it as a matter of fact that every year would be the same. This winter, we have had more snow in that particular district than there has been in any other part of Saskatchewan. the policy of creating a feed bank is something that should receive very serious consideration. The good rancher and the good stockman, you don't need to bother much about him. It is the speculating fellow, or the fellow that wants to go back and 'mine' the ranch off the same as the wheat farmers want to do with their land, that is going to get into trouble. But the real old rancher that has been down there for years and years, you don't have to bother very much with him, because he just keeps enough cattle that he knows he is sure to have enough feed to put them over.

We have had a lot said, Mr. Speaker, about PFRA pastures and there have been several created in that part of the country of which I speak, from Shaunavon probably to Assiniboia and all through that country. But on some of the best tracts of land where a community pasture should have been established, nothing has been done. The reason there has been nothing done to that part of the country is that we had two or three farmers probably in the centre of a big district who were a little reluctant about moving out and being moved to a more suitable place. Again, a lot of those farmers who were in there had made a fair success of what they have tried to do and they were fairly comfortable. But their land has been classed as land unsuitable for agricultural purposes and I think the Minister of Agriculture would be well advised to set aside some amount of money in order that these men, who are 60 to 70 years of age and who are in the centre of a tract of land that is unsuitable for agriculture purposes, should be paid a decent remuneration for their holdings and not asked to go up into the north country and start to hew out a new home in the bush.

That policy was adopted in Montana, a few years ago, when just the same conditions arose over there as we have in this country, where you had a big influx of settlers who moved out of the stock countries, went up north and stuck it out for two or three years and finally came back. Now the land in Montana across the line is not much different from our land here in Saskatchewan. But what did the Government in Montana do in connection with those settlers who were on land that was unsuitable for grain growing? Over there, 30 years ago, that country was pretty well settled and they had fair roads in that whole country north of Hinsdale, Montana, over to Glasgow and up to the border. they did not ask those settlers to go. They did not say: "We'll move you off; we'll pay the cost of moving you and we'll pay you that." No, they didn't do that. They said, "We'll buy your farm from you" – and a lot of those men sold their half-sections for \$2,500 cash and some of them came across the line to our country. That is the policy we should follow out in connection with these people off this land that has been condemned for agricultural purposes, where they go by year after year and they do not make any headway, but still they have good homes and they are reluctant to leave their homes. I don't blame them, after they have lived for 30 years in this province, own a home and haven't had any more relief than the fellows on the good land. Now when it is going to be taken over and made into pastures I think that we should definitely pay these people something and let them settle decently in one of our little towns and live there.

March 17, 1947

If we look at the area of land in Saskatchewan, we have 160,000,000 acres, I believe, of lands. The area of arable land – that is land that comes in the class of agricultural – is 60,000,000 acres. Of this 60,000,000 acres, 33,000,000 acres is suitable for grain growing. We have 27,000,000 acres that are unsuitable for any kind of grain growing and it is not advisable to even attempt grain growing on that land. What is going to become of this 27,000,000 acres of non-arable land we have in this province, if you do not give these stock growing men some reasonable assurance that from now on they will have a lease?

I was interested in the report that was made by Mr. Alec Cunningham, last year, who went out and made a report on the progress of agriculture in our country and Maple Creek and all over. He said, in that report, that the stock growers, or the small ranchers, had made a reasonably good job of maintaining their stock and had reasonably good assurance that they would be in fair shape and self-supporting.

Stockgrowing in this country and the livestock amount to quite a figure. If we take the 1945 figures, the gross income from all our grains in the Province of Saskatchewan amounted to \$277,000,000. In the same year our livestock and our livestock products amounted to \$28,000,000 or in other words, the gross income in the Province of Saskatchewan amounted to one-third from livestock; that is one-third of all the other things.

I do not think I am going to burden you very long in my talk. I would like to conclude my remarks by mentioning the horse-packing plant in Swift Current. I am going to give you a few figures and if any of you want to look at the picture of the plant, it is here. But here is what happened in southwestern Saskatchewan. The ranchers were overburdened with a surplus of horses that did not amount to anything. There was no value for them. In fact there is no value for them yet, outside of the use they have been put to and they were eating up a lot of grass that otherwise would be more profitable to cattle.

As a result of that, the first meeting was called at Val Marie, to see if something could not be done in the way of getting rid of our surplus horses. The market was explored all over Canada and the United States and the price then paid for horses was about one cent a pound. In fact, sometimes, they had to be delivered for that much money. Now since the plant has started up, the price for those same horses has gone from \$20 to \$30 a head, and the farmers have realized more than a million dollars of surplus out of them. A steady market for surplus horses is now a reality. By taking surplus horses off the market, the price of a good workhorse has been stabilized and increased. The prices for good workhorses have increased more than \$30 per head. The co-operator, through its subsidiary organization, shipped 1,091 workhorses to Poland. A better price was obtained and the producer benefited from all profits. A further payment of \$4 per head will be paid for those horses in the near future, if it has not been paid already. Now, the price of those little horses that went to Poland was \$49 per head here in Saskatchewan. That was paid and they were horses that weighed from nine to twelve hundred pounds. They did not want any bigger horses and we could have got more of them away had we been better organized at the time. We got rid of those little horses because they were a drag on the market; but they had to be broken.

I am going to give you a summary of what has happened in the plant at Swift Current. There have been 48,000 horses purchased and there have been 45,500 head slaughtered; that is altogether, taking in the figures that I said about shipping live horses. The total value of all products shipped from the plant amount to \$3,000,000.

Here is our financial position at the end of 1946, on December 31st. I might say that the Saskatchewan Government did help us materially in getting this underway. They guaranteed a loan of the start, first of \$150,000 and we were assisted in every way co-operatively. This plan is entirely a co-operative plant and is managed and controlled by the people who put the stock in there. It is not a Government enterprise in any sense of the word, but it has been assisted materially through them. We borrowed from the Belgium Economic Commission \$150,000 and at the present time, we don't owe them a nickel. The Saskatchewan Government guaranteed a loan of \$150,000 and it has been paid down to \$51,000. The Dominion Government advanced, through the Canadian Commercial Co-operation, an amount of \$250,000 and, today, we owe them \$44,000. The plant during its operation period, at the time it started in October, 1945 – we had great difficulty and couldn't get along very well for the first while on account of labor. As you know we hired men in Saskatchewan and Alberta to work in those plants and they were all 'green' and we could not get laborers that were accustomed to that sort of work. So we did not get along very well for the first two or three months and we had breakdowns, but on the whole, these plants showed a net profit on operations up to December 31st of \$400,000. Now the plants in Alberta and Saskatchewan, today, employ 400 men and I do not know how long it will be, but this co-operative will be in a good financial position by the time we get through with the horses in this country.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am going to support this Budget. I know it is a high Budget, but if as I said before, the people get some value for it, they won't mind paying.

Mr. A.W. Embury (ASVR Area 2, Mediterranean): — Mr. Speaker, at the outset of my remarks, I think I should probably say again what I have said so often in this House before and that is that I am an Independent, I speak for nobody but myself and the people I represent. There is no politics in this matter. I have said it so many times and have been misquoted recently, so often, that I think it is necessary for me to start out by saying that I am Independent and have no political liaison with anybody, in connection with anything I say in this House. Nor I think should I omit the opportunity of saying that when I do speak in this House and I do hold a high office in the Legion, it is important for me to say that the Legion is in no way committed by anything. I say. It is important, I think, from the standpoint of that great organization that they be not wedded in any way to what I say. The views are my own and those of an Independent only.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in rising upon this debate, I should like to associate myself with those who have complimented the Hon. Provincial Treasurer for his delivery of the Budget Speech. I cannot agree with him in the long term plans which he has for this province and I do not subscribe to the ideals of Socialism with which he is imbued, but I know a good salesman when I see one, even if he is trying to sell us a bad product. Good

March 17, 1947

salesmen everywhere the world over have always been able to make a bad product look as though it is worth buying, even if you do not actually need it or actually want it. Russia may have needed Socialism, it is pretty strong medicine, but she may need it, in its chaotic and unenlightened condition in 1917. I think it is probably fair to go further than that and say that probably Russia has derived some benefit from the Socialism and the Socialistic theories under which she has been obliged to carry on since that time. Russia may even progress and reach our standards in Canada by evolving to our Western democracy in time; but we do not need socialism here now, we had that during feudal times and we progressed beyond it.

Mr. Speaker, the historic significance of this debate is that it is upon this debate and by the means of this debate, that the people through their elected representatives retain the power of control over the money required for the purposes of the Crown. It was by the acquisition of this constitutional right and power that the House of commons gained a formidable and effective weapon by which she could control the whole policy of the Crown in its government of the country, notwithstanding this power in the Commons the prerogatives of the Crown continued to be exercised either by the King's judges and by other royal prerogatives of varying sorts. In the early time until today, the King's judges, who had the functions of interpreting, carrying out the laws as enacted by parliament and the whole system has evolved as one of dual control with all the safeguards which that implies. I suggest that the efforts of this Government to deny the rights of the people the right of access to his Majesty's courts and the various tendencies which we heard mentioned during this Session and on this debate, that tendency of this Government as part of the Socialist plan and that Socialism does not subscribe to the principles of impartial justice. In the theory of Socialism everything must be run by a government edict. It is done for the purpose of changing – this Government shows that tendency -- because it is for the purpose of changing our system of government in the wise and enduring system of dual control where the courts have a function to a Socialist system of totalitarian control. Any system in which impartial courts of justice function to interpret the laws is not satisfactory to any Marxian socialism, one power, one alone, must govern in a Socialist totalitarian state.

Now, on this Budget debate, it is no longer a question of forestalling the threatened tyranny of a reigning monarch, the threat of tyranny comes from a different place altogether on this occasion. The threat of tyranny in Saskatchewan, today, Mr. Speaker, comes from a group of people I call them demagogues, who seek to usurp a totalitarian control of our democracy. They impose on our tolerance and upon our freedom. Today, in Saskatchewan, illiteracy has been reduced to the smallest fraction. The standards of education have risen to a very considerable extent in the last few decades. Coupled with this, the standards of living of the people in Saskatchewan are such that nearly all of our people have access to a radio and they all read magazines and periodicals. Any demagogue who is practised in the arts of persuasion and rebellion can reach the ear, the eye, of hundreds of thousands of our people and this can be done, I may say, Mr. Speaker, whether the demagogue in question happens to own a radio or not. These are the people who threaten our democracy today. They are the people from whom the threat of tyranny can come. Our security against such people, Mr. Speaker, cannot be found on this debate, but only

can be found at the polls; but from this debate it is only possible to expose further the totalitarian aims and objects of this Government. I think I should be fair to say at the outset that I am thankful to see that there is some indication, at least, that they are a little afraid of the wrath to come at the polls. It seems that we are going to see them now at the polls as champions of some forms of private enterprise. It seems we are to have a little respite before the real work of dismemberment is resumed.

Mr. Speaker, any student of Russian history would recognize this relaxation in the plan for what it is. It is not a conversion to commonsense; it is sort of a political expedient. In 1921, when the Bolshevik Socialists were opposed by a rising tide of public opinion in Russia, because the more extreme socialists at that time were pressing ruthlessly forward with their plans for socialism, Lenin prevailed upon the councils of the Communist Party at that time and introduced what was known as the NEP, the New Economic Policy. That was a temporary delay of the plan; that was not a change of the plan. Under that policy it was decided to institute a system of banking and credit to allow a certain measure of private enterprise to flourish for the time being. The more substantial farmers of Russia at that time, the Kulaks as they were called, owned their own land – alas I say were called, there aren't anymore of them – who owned their own land were allowed to retain their land and their possessions for the time being. It is true that the Government pressed its plans for collective farming, they did it under the NEP (New Economic Policy) by less drastic means. Later on they installed displaced persons and veterans of the Wars on collective farms, equipped by the Government; owned by the Government. In many respects they are just like the collective farm which is being encouraged by the Government yonder, a free basis by every means at their disposal. Not only just by means which I have suggested, but by every other means, and we have seen similar encouragement by our Ministers of this Government. The land-starved veterans; people who cannot get on any other land are encouraged by this Government to go into a collective farm. They call it a co-operative farm; a collective farm to me is pretty much the same sort of thing.

Mr. Sturdy: — How about letting the soldiers decide that?

Mr. Embury: — The Hon. Minister says, how about letting the soldiers ...

Mr. Douglas: — May I ask a question? Do I understand that in his opinion there is no difference in a collective farm and a co-operative farm? I just want to be clear on that point.

Mr. Embury: — I said that, yes, Mr. Speaker. The Hon. Minister of Reconstruction and Rehabilitation says, "How about letting the soldiers decide that." Now, the Hon. Minister knows very well that a great many soldiers are applying to get on Crown lands and there are not Crown lands available for them. There has been a very considerable difficulty about accommodating all the men that they would like to accommodate. I know that. I have here a letter from a Member of this House ...

March 17, 1947

Mr. Sturdy: — The Hon. Member knows ...

Mr. Speaker: — Is that a Point of Order?

Mr. Sturdy: — A Point of Privilege. The Hon. Member knows that all the veterans of the Matador farm volunteered and requested that type of farming project and that is our ...

Mr. Patterson: — What is the Point of Privilege?

Mr. Sturdy: — The Hon. Member stated or inferred that they were forced into that type of organization.

Mr. Embury: — I never said such a thing.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Embury: — Well, now I said they carried collective farming on a free basis in Russia very much the same as the Hon. Minister is endeavouring to do at Matador, today. That is what I said and the records will show it.

Mr. Douglas: — That is a pretty weak argument.

Mr. Embury: — However, I will go further than the Hon. Minister's statement that there is no compulsion at all because I believe it is fair to state that there is some compulsion and, if he will sit down and listen to me for a minute, I will try and explain to him what form that compulsion takes.

I had got to the point where I was explaining, Mr. Speaker, that a great many of our chaps are endeavouring to get on land. There isn't enough to go around. Some of it is in the hands of the Government. The Minister has told us in this House, but if he has not, it is indeed a fact that they have several applications for the one piece of land and, of course, the applicants who have failed are left in the position where they cannot get any land and have to look elsewhere. They would have no other place to go. Now it is at that point that the Hon. Minister comes along and says to a man that has been turned down: "Well, you may have been turned down on this application, but if you are willing to go into a —co farm, or a collective farm — a co-operative farm, as he calls it — why then we can do something for you." He says that to them. Well, I say that, when you say that to a veteran who cannot get on land elsewhere, he is not in a position where he can choose for himself at all. He has got to fall in line with the Minister's proposal and that is a form of compulsion. It is the only form of compulsion that I alluded to, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Sturdy: — The Hon. Member knows that there is no compulsion at all, it is all voluntary and his statements are incorrect with regard to the matter under discussion now.

Mr. Embury: — Well, I will accept the Hon. Minister's statement if I

must, but I would just like to read this letter to the House. This is a letter written by my hon. colleague, Mr. Dobie, a Member from Canada and it is a letter written to a man whose application for land has been refused. I will show the letter to the Minister himself if he wants to. I do not want to mention names in public because it might involve these people in a controversy. It says this, and this is a letter written to the unsuccessful applicant after my hon. friend had just seen the Hon. Minister and he writes this to the unsuccessful applicant:

Mr. Sturdy states quite frankly that there is no question of a change being made from the last hearing which he feels is a right and proper decision.

That is the one in which the applicant lost out.

He also states that yourself and a comrade of his had been offered land elsewhere and had also been offered the opportunity of joining the co-operative farm at Matador.

Mr. Sturdy: —What is the matter with that?

Mr. Embury: — Well, that is the kind of encouragement that I am referring to. To get a man, Mr. Speaker, who is starved for land, looking for a place to go and the Hon. Minister has to turn him down and I have no doubt he had to do it quite properly, but he encourages the co-operatives. Very, very similar to the sort of thing that went on in Russia.

Mr. Sturdy: — I object! I object!

Mr. Embury: — Mr. Speaker, it was not until after the first five-year plan in Russia that the New Economic Policy came to an end. The Government was more firmly in the saddle then we saw them come along and compel all the farmers to go onto the collective farms – all of them and all the people carrying on under the relaxed conditions of the New Economic Policy were purged too; and that was when we saw the true socialist at work. We see the same thing evolving right here in Saskatchewan. When the Provincial Treasurer in his speech, or when the Government by their representations today seem to tell us that there is going to be some room in Saskatchewan for private enterprise after all in some forms of capitalism, we want to remember that his leader, his deskmate, said, “We will not rest until capitalism has been eradicated in Saskatchewan.”

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Embury: — May I draw the attention of the House to the applause. The intention is there and where they seem to fall away from that, or seem to try and lull you into a false sense of security that is not what they are going to try and do, I invite the public to remember the determined overall long-term plans of this Government, for their destruction. The Hon. Provincial Treasurer may think that he can lull his victims into a false sense of security in this matter until after the next provincial election; but if I were them I do not think I would take a chance on it.

March 17, 1947

Recently in this debate we have heard the references made to various press reports and criticisms of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture. I am sorry he is not in his place. In reply thereto the Minister of Agriculture has stated that in making his observation about Yankee Imperialism being a danger to world peace, he explained that his object was to preserve world peace by the establishment of a universal brotherhood, I think he said. He went on to urge pretty much the same defence of the Russian foreign policy that is being urged by Molotov and others before the United Nations. Now, Mr. Molotov, he says these things and probably knows what he is talking about, in his point of view. He is a Russian and no doubt he is fully informed and up to the last minute in international affairs. He speaks openly for his country as a Russian and I admire and respect that. I do not believe that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture knows what he is talking about. I do not think he is informed. I do not think that at all. I do not see how he could be out here. And he is supposed to be a Canadian. He is supposed to be on our side of this argument. That is one of the significant factors of it that occurs to me. All of the Hon. Minister's inflammatory remarks were provoked because I had the temerity to ask that the Government reassure the public that the CCF had no sympathy for the Communists of Canada. Now, instead of giving us the assurance, members of the CCF Party have done the exact opposite. They have applauded and condoned the Communists in Canada repeatedly ever since. In this debate the other day the Premier rose in his place – it was out of order – and asked me to make a speech, when the Hon. Member for Arm River had the floor and he asked me to name the Communists in the CCF. Well, Mr. Speaker, as everybody knows, the Communists are taught to bore from within to hide their real allegiance if it suits their purpose. If I was equipped with a search warrant to see which ones of the CCF had their Communist Party cards in their back pockets, keeping them hidden and their CCF Party cards out where you could see them, I might be able to do a quicker job for the Hon. Premier. But I think I can give him a pretty fair answer and perhaps a helpful one too.

Mr. Valleau: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Privilege. I did not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman until he had finished his paragraph. I took down the sentence, "Members of the CCF have condoned and supported the Communists." Now I cannot speak for the CCF ...

Mr. Patterson: — What is the Point of Privilege?

Mr. Valleau: — I will come to that. I am a member of the CCF and I have not condoned or supported the Communists. I, as a member of the CCF, can express my personal opinion ...

Mr. Patterson: — The Hon. Member has a personal privilege. If he wants to raise that personally, he is entitled to do so; but he is not entitled to get up in this House and raise a Point of Privilege for some organization which has nothing to do with this House.

Mr. Valleau: — On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. I am not raising a Point of Privilege for an organization. I am raising a Point

of Privilege for myself. A general charge has been made against an organization of which it is well known that I am a member and, therefore, as a member of that organization I cannot refuse to ignore the fact that I am being slandered through that organization and it is on that Point of Privilege I ask the Member to withdraw his inference to the effect that the CCF had condoned and supported Communists and that some CCF member can carry a card of both parties in their pockets. I am asking him to withdraw that statement insofar as it refers to myself personally. That is all that I can do in this House.

Mr. Speaker: — The Point of Privilege is well taken.

Mr. Embury: — Then I will withdraw it as against that gentleman.

Mr. Douglas: — A Point of Privilege, Mr. Speaker. Should not he save the time of the House if each Member of the House has to get up individually and ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw it. I am sure that instead of putting the Members to the trouble of getting up individually and asking him to withdraw, he would make a blanket withdrawal now and save the time of the House, or he will name some Member in the House whom he thinks carries that card, or to whom that statement applies.

Mr. Embury: — Now the exact words I used were these, Mr. Speaker. If I may find out just exactly to what words they were referring, I believe I should withdraw those portions of them if that is your ruling. I withdraw them because I must, of course. These are the words: “If I were equipped with a search warrant” ...

Mr. Douglas: — No! Before that! Mr. Speaker, we want the exact words said about the CCF organization condoning Communism.

Mr. Embury: — I am going to quote the exact words whereby they did it in this House, if that is what you are talking about. No, this gentleman’s objection was that I made the suggestion and I said this:

As everybody knows the Communists are taught to bore from within. If I was equipped with a search warrant to discover which ones in the CCF kept their Communist Party card hidden and their CCF Party card out where it can be seen, I might be able to do a quicker job for the Premier.

I think that is the one objected to.

Mr. Valleau: — Now, I will just read this on a Point of Privilege, Mr. Speaker, to explain the words I objected to were these which I took down. “Members of the CCF have condoned and supported the Communists.” Then it was followed up by the inference which I did not take down, but which has just been read that certain members of the CCF carry two cards.

Mr. Procter: — You ruled the other day that no political party has a

March 17, 1947

stand or privilege in this House.

Mr. Valleau: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order I would object just as much if the Hon. Member said I was condoning and supporting the Liberal Party or the Conservative Party.

Mr. Embury: — I said I would withdraw in regard to him, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Douglas: — On the Point of Order. I do not want to spend too much time on the point. It is not a matter of the CCF Party it is this: if each Member has to get up and ask him to withdraw and he has to accept their word, why should not the Member withdraw for all Members of the House, to save time?

Mr. Embury: — I have said I would withdraw about ten times to get on with this thing and because I must.

Mr. Speaker: — Well, go on then.

Mr. Embury: — And now, to go on, Mr. Speaker, my point is going to be this. The reason these charges of Communism have been made by me is because of the remarks made in this House. It is my submission and I think not an unreasonable one, that you can tell a Communist by what he says, what he does. To do this, you first must look to see what known or acknowledged Communists have been saying and doing, to see whether there is any pronounced similarity. For example, I agree with my hon. friend for Arm River when he says he finds something to admire about Tim Buck. You do not have to go on a witch hunt with Tim Buck. You know where he stands. When Tim Buck says that Yankee Imperialism is a danger to world peace, we know that in Russia they would like to have that idea put across. Tim Buck says it. Tim Buck says that magnificent fighting General McArthur is Hiro Hito and a Fascist or something discreditable, we know it is because Russia has not been able to gain concessions in Japan which it would like to have and that McArthur has prevented this some way, we know that, Tim Buck says it. Tim Buck says, yes, he says, yes when Tim Buck says give away your secret of the atomic bomb or words of that effect and advocates that, the Russian solution to that international difficulty, we know that the Russians want that, Tim Buck says that. I do not say they are wrong, mind you. I do not even know what the secret is, let alone whether they ought to give it away or not. I have an idea the Russians have the thing anyway and want to know how far the Americans got with it.

As I say, I do not know anything about it and I doubt whether anybody in this House does either. When Tim Buck says, kick the American soldiers out of Canada, as he did the last time he was in Regina, or words to that effect, I gather that Russia feels that we should vie more closely with these great northern neighbors of ours. Perhaps he is right, I do not know. I do not receive any instructions from Ottawa, or Moscow, or Washington, or anywhere else. But when Tim buck says that, we know where he is getting his instructions from. When Tim Buck says Canada will be the Belgium of the next war, as he did the last time he was here in Regina, and spoke publicly, I gather that is in the interests of Russia to have us in sort of a

terrified frame of mind if the conference was to give more concessions to them. I happen to know that Tim buck is wrong when he says that because Canadians do not frighten that easily, at least not the ones I have the honor to represent. When Tim Buck approves of Communist led unions in Canada. We know these things. It is quite all right and we are not worried about it when Tim Buck says these things at all, but as I say we do not have to go on a witch hunt for him, he has the courage of his convictions, he is perfectly open and frank about these matters and this is a free country and he is entitled to say and do as he pleases, within the law. There is on objection to it at all. I do not agree with him. I think as some wise man said, Voltaire I think, I do not know whether I can quote him properly, but he said in effect, I don't agree with what he says, but I would defend his right to say it with my last breath and he could go right ahead as long as he is not going to be subversive about it.

It is the man who does not acknowledge this allegiance, that we are worried about and who hides his real allegiance, that is the man we are worried about, not the man who comes out in the open. Mr. Molotov says he is working for world peace, we know that is the viewpoint of his great country and he is their spokesman. all right, what are we supposed to think when the Hon. Minister of Agriculture says these things, what are we supposed to think when he says them? Surely, surely, Mr. Speaker, any reasonable man, who listened to the Hon. Minister make these remarks is entitled to make the query in his mind, has that man got any commonsense, that is the point I wish to make in case, to become Canadians instead of Yankees.

Mr. Nollet: — On a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, what I say in this House Tim Buck, the Hon. Member opposite, or anyone else. I was speaking of a different thing, I am talking in terms of United Nations. the Hon. Member knows that.

Mr. Embury: — What is the Point of Order?

Mr. Speaker: —The Point of Order is, the Hon. Member is charging that the Minister of Agriculture, by inference, is not a good and loyal subject of His Majesty.

Mr. Embury: — May I speak to the Point of Order? The Hon. Member for Notukeu-Willowbunch rose in his place the other day and by inference in the same way suggested that I was a Fascist. Surely if he can call me a Fascist, I can call the hon. gentleman over there a Communist and if I must withdraw it, I do so, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — My ruling on the Point of Order is this: if the Hon. Member is inferring that the Hon. Minister is not loyal in his support of the Government and the country, then it must be withdrawn.

Mr. Embury: — Now, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. Member for Moosomin pointed out, there is nothing illegal in this country about being a Communist. I have done no more than to do this. I have

March 17, 1947

repeated what the Hon. Member has said, I must withdraw, however, if that is not to be allowed in this House. I will withdraw it because I must and for no other reason.

The Hon. Member for Arm River told us the other day of the occasion of the visit, think he said, the General Secretary of the League of Industrial Democracy, which is what the Communists are pleased to call themselves in the United States of America, everybody knows that. On that occasion, the Hon. Premier improved the shining hour by lunching with the gentleman in Regina, according to the Hon. Member for Arm River, who said these things on the floor of this House the other day, on this debate. The Premier does not deny that, as a matter of fact on the contrary ...

Mr. Douglas: — I do deny it, Mr. Speaker. the Hon. Member does not need to bring my name into it. I did not deny, in this House, having lunch with Dr. Laidler. I do deny for any man in this House to make the statement that Dr. Laidler is a Communist or that he belongs to any communist organization and my hon. friend cannot prove otherwise. Just some gossip on the street and he comes to this House not proving it.

Mr. Embury: — I am simply repeating what the Hon. Member for Arm River said on this debate the other day, perhaps the Hon. Premier should have tried to have that ruled out of order on the previous day.

Mr. Douglas: — I did try to get it ruled out of order last time, but I also took it from the source from which it came.

Mr. Embury: — We took the opinion, Mr. Speaker, we hold the opinion and I think we are entitled to express the view that the League for Industrial Democracy, I think is the name of it, is a well recognized Communist organization in the United States. Now, I do not believe it is out of order for me to say that about them. I do not believe the Hon. Premier is taking the proper point of order when he rises in the House to defend the League for Industrial Democracy in the United States, but I do say this in connection with it, that when the hon. Member for Arm River was telling about the interesting social gathering which took place with the General Secretary of that organization, here in Regina with the Hon. Premier, the Hon. Premier rose in his place, very quickly, and said that Eleanor Roosevelt at one time had been an honorary member of it. I would like to make this comment in connection with this, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Premier shows a remarkable familiarity with the organization in question and I am just wondering how many more of this executive he happens to know so well.

Mr. Douglas: — I am not ashamed of knowing any of them.

Mr. Embury: — You are not making a bad job at it. In years gone by, in the 1930s, the Hon. Provincial Treasurer himself, used to sit as chairman at meetings at which Tim Buck spoke, these things are widely known.

Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, I completely deny that. Never in my life have I been chairman of any meetings in which Tim buck spoke. Never in my life!

Mr. Douglas: — You aren't getting very good information for your speech. Better get better information from Tory headquarters.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Embury: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I will have to take the gentleman's word for that and I do so, but I hope the gentlemen of the Press have head him say that, and that it will be repeated.

Mr. Douglas: — You hope they just hear what you say.

Mr. Embury: — For instance, the other day, Mr. Speaker, we had ...

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, is it not out of order for anyone to refer to, or say that he hoped the Press will take note?

Mr. Embury: — Very well ...

Mr. Douglas: — He is out of order most of the time.

Mr. Embury: — Not long ago in Regina, Mr. Speaker, we had the spectacle of Schumiatcher, famous Herr Schumiatcher, who was an employee of this Government, talking of taking himself down to the peoples' forum and advocating a Socialist doctrine contained in Article 12 of the Constitution of the USSR and the theme he was referring to was this: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work." Now, Dr. Schumiatcher used the word 'need' instead of 'work' for the local consumption, but I suggest that where we have an employee as a high executive in this Government going out in public places saying these things, led by implication at least, he draws the Government into it, these things are done, the public are saying these things, they are wondering a bout them. It is all very well for the Hon. Members to take the line that it is out of order for me to raise these questions. It is all very well for these champions of the right of free speech to try and interfere and stop these things being said by one means or another, they are bound to be said and they raise a real question in the minds of the public.

Now, that is not all, Mr. Speaker, on the floor of this House we had the Hon. Member for North Battleford, who got up and said this, that he would prefer to have a Communist leading his union to a Liberal or Conservative. He did not say that he wanted a CCFer or that he would prefer a CCFer; but I imagine that a CCFer would be all right for the hon. gentleman, because as far as I can make out ...

Mr. Valleau: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, this is referring to

March 17, 1947

a previous debate. I suggest that it is out of order to refer back to that debate.

Mr. Procter: —They are getting pretty hard-pressed.

Mr. Embury: — They are getting pretty well down to the bottom of the barrel with their objections, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker.

Well, now I take it that he does not mind a CCFer leading his union, but that he would not mind a Communist either; anyway, he would sooner have a Communist to a Liberal or a Conservative, but I imagine his preference is equally between a CCFer and a Communist because there is not much difference between them. The Hon. Minister of Labour described in this House the other day, the tragic murder referred to by the Hon. Member for Rosthern, in this very debate; the tragic murder of a man called McNear, who was a high official in one of the American Railway Companies. It was pointed out that his death was caused by being shot by one of his own employees, I believe the Hon. Minister of Labour said.

Mr. Williams: — That is not true.

Mr. Embury: — What he did say was that he did not suppose that very many labor men in Canada or in the States would be sorry that that happened. that is what he said ...

Mr. Williams: — On a Point of Privilege, Mr. Speaker, what I said was that the employees of this particular railway would not be sorry, especially the relatives and friends of the two men who were murdered a year ago by McNear's gangsters.

Mr. Embury: — I believe that the actual words are on the dictaphone machine here; they should be checked. But the Press has them pretty much as I remembered them. It said: "I doubt if labour in the States or this country were particularly sorry to see that happen."

Mr. Williams: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. The hon. gentleman should not come here picking out things that have been said the last week or two. He is speaking on the Budget. I think he should stick to the Budget or things that have been said by persons in this debate.

Mr. Embury: — Well, this was referred to by the Hon. Member for Rosthern in this debate and by others in this debate. I can understand why the Hon. Minister of Labour would make every effort he could to deny the right to any other member to speak his mind about such an extraordinary statement and as long as I am within the rules of this House, subject to your Honour's rulings in these matters, I propose to proceed and to give such emphasis to such inflammatory remarks as I am able to. Here we have the spectacle of a Minister of the Crown condoning and applauding a wicked murder. Nothing less, a wicked murder ...

Mr. Williams: — I did not applaud it.

Mr. Embury: — Of condoning, condoning, I withdraw the word applauding; but condoning, no.

Some Hon. Members: — Withdraw!

Mr. Embury: — I have withdrawn once; condoning a wicked murder, nothing less. It is incredible to me that the people of Saskatchewan would place any confidence in such a Minister, let alone place him in a position where he is the one who must take the lead in finding a sensible solution to such problems as we may have in labour. By implication at least, he seems to advocate the solution of such troubles by force and violence.

Mr. Douglas: — Shame, shame!

Mr. Embury: — Shame on him.

Mr. Speaker: — I think the Hon. Member should withdraw that statement.

Mr. Embury: — Very well, I withdraw, but that sort of thing, Mr. Speaker, comes straight from the Communist book, straight from the Communist book, that sort of talk.

Mr. Williams: — Mr. Speaker, what is this that comes straight from the Communist book?

Mr. Embury: — This business of condoning wicked murders, wicked murders: straight from the Communist book, Mr. Speaker, and the field of labour relations is under the administration of a man who expresses these remarkable views. Perhaps one might be justified in concluding that he would prefer to see employers so taxed and plagued that they would have to go right out of business altogether, then the Government could take over and that would be Socialism. It is one way of getting there, Mr. Speaker. It happened in Russia and I suppose it could happen here. The Hon. Minister has introduced labour legislation strengthening the hands of the union executives enormously. The party at large, seems to encourage the Communists in the unions and thus the Socialists gain control. That is one way of getting there, it all helps. Rome was not built in a day.

I am going to make a suggestion that the proper light in which the labour legislation of the Hon. Minister should be viewed is this: that they are uncompromising in their encroachments upon the employer. They do it for the purpose of imposing intolerable conditions on the employer; that is, shorter hours, heavier wages, until the business cannot stand it — not, I am going to suggest, as a matter of policy; not simply to improve the conditions and the conditions of employment of the employees at all, but simply as one of the means by which they are going to liquidate private enterprise.

Mr. Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I do not like to interrupt the Hon. gentleman, but he has apparently no idea himself how to keep an order. He is not imputing motives, in that he is saying that

March 17, 1947

this House, which passed legislation, passed that legislation not for the purpose for which the legislation said it was being passed and which the Member, who introduced it, said it was being passed, but for some ulterior motive which he is now proceeding to give. It is out of order.

Mr. Embury: — May I speak on the Point of Order, Mr. Speaker? I have very carefully confined myself to a criticism of the policy of no individual at all. I suggest that the policy is going so far that it is actually done with a view to liquidating the employer in aid of Socialism, which these gentlemen advocate. It is their theory of government. I make no personal charges in connection with it at all. My argument is this: simply that the policy may be designed to be so uncompromising as to assist Socialism rather than actually to assist the employee. Now that is not a personal reference to the Hon. premier or any Member of the Government.

Mr. Speaker: — On the Point of Order: to my understanding, the Hon. Member dealt with the Minister of Labour and unless he dissociates the Minister of Labour from his remarks, he must withdraw.

Mr. Embury: — I would dissociate the Minister of Labour. I do not believe that he is the one that thinks up these ...

Mr. Douglas: — Well, Mr. Speaker, it is not only the Minister of Labour, but any Member of the Government or any Member of this House ...

Mr. Embury: — Maybe it is Dr. Schumiatcher, I don't know. Must I withdraw that part in respect to the Government?

Mr. Speaker: — You certainly must.

Mr. Embury: — Well, I carefully explained that I did not refer to any Member of the Government. I am criticizing the policy. If it is open to that criticism and the Government is so sensitive about these criticisms that we have got to withdraw everything we say, why I will withdraw them. I am saying what the effect of the policy is going to be in my view. My point is this, Mr. Speaker: the express purpose of improving conditions for the working men is the sugar-coating on the pill. The pill itself is Socialism and when you have swallowed it you have swallowed it before its caustic effects take effect.

Mr. Douglas: — Sounds like Ex-lax!

Mr. Embury: — There is nothing particularly surprising, Mr. Speaker, about this Budget. It is simply the Budget of a government embarked on a totalitarian plan. Here we have, what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, the Government showing expenditures running up to something like \$65,000,000. After all, we here cater to the need of 800,00 people only. apart from our vast areas, vast tracts of land, in human administration of the people that we cater to in bodies is very much

smaller than will be found to be catered to by the London County council or the city council of the city of New York, or Montreal, or even Toronto. We make a great deal too much of ourselves it seems to me. But to build up a \$65,000,000 budget to cater to those needs seems to me to be impossible. I associate myself with the critics of the Government when they criticize the enormous size of this Budget. But I think the significant thing in connection with it is that there is nothing surprising about it, if you think of it as a budget of a government embarked upon a totalitarian plan. If it has been reviewed at all from last year, I think I would have been prepared to place some confidence in the Government's assurance that some form of private enterprise was to be allowed to flourish after all. As one would expect in the general view of the figures of this Government, substantial increases have been made in many departments essential for a totalitarian control. The grant to the executive council is being increased from \$138,000 up to \$188,000 odd. It is imperative in a totalitarian system that the executive council be developed and expanded and its influence increased.

The grant to the Provincial Auditor is accordingly to be increased as the encroachments of the Government are increased. The grant to the Bureau of publication is increased from \$76,000 to \$132,000 nearly doubled, so that the Government can enlarge its propaganda activities.

I have no quarrel, Mr. Speaker, with many of the undertakings of this Government. It is the vicious totalitarian aims and objects of the party that are causing me anxiety and anxiety to every man and woman in Saskatchewan. I have no objection to the increase in the old age pensions; I rather feel it should be larger. I have no objections to the activities of the Health Services Planning Commission, although I notice that the grant to them has been reduced, rather than increased, from \$1,795,000 down to \$1,737,000. No doubt we will hear more about that on the Estimates. I have no quarrel with this Government in endeavouring to set up the feed banks and taking other sensible steps for the improvement of farming conditions. None of these things are peculiar to Socialism. Socialism is merely the political philosophic of Communist Russia. I am not interested in imposing our democracy on Russia; but I am interested in preventing Russia from imposing here Socialism on us.

Mr. Valleau: — What about England?

Mr. Embury: — You are going to hear about that in a minute if you do not rule it out of order.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I must ask the Hon. Member to withdraw that statement: "If you do not rule it out of order." I rule here.

Mr. Embury: — I take that back. This Government seems to be engaged in a deliberate attempt to thrust Socialism on us. They won't rest until capitalism has been eradicated. That is their manifesto; and that is what the Premier has repeated. That is what they have done in a large part of the insurance business and they are starting to do in the garage business and the adjusters and they have done it to the bus companies. We are all down on their list for liquidation somewhere and it is only a question of how far down on the list we are. They follow

March 17, 1947

the usual well recognized pattern of communist propaganda and planning. In aid of that program they espouse the cause of Russia in financial and international affairs, whether they know what they are talking about or not. They use blasphemy. Our labour laws, it seems to me, criticizing the laws, seem to be designed to help labour. They do not seem to be designed to help the employees, the laws themselves; they seem to be designed only to impose intolerable conditions on the employers, so that the employers must fail and the Government can take over, just as was done in Russia in 1925 and 1931. The Minister of Labour himself applauds – no, I am wrong – condones the assassination of McNear and that sort of thing was also done in Russia. They encourage, as far as they dare, the plans for collective farming as was done in Russia in 1923, so that in the end all must be subjected to that system when the long-term plan is fulfilled. That is my fear. They interest themselves in the control and the subjection of the professions, not, I suggest, to cure any abuses which exist, as no evidence of any abuses came before the committee and none are referred to in the report. It was done in Russia and it must be done here too; it is all part of the program. They tax the people to the very limit of their power. The Hon. Premier and the Hon. Provincial Treasurer himself stated, that we had reached the limit and we would have to find some other sources before he could raise the Budget any further, next June.

Now, I say that they tax the people to the very limit of their powers and by means of such schemes as the Road Accident Bill or other schemes to build up enormous surpluses, not for the purpose, I suggest, of giving good government, but rather for the purpose of raising the position of the Government so that it eventually may stifle private enterprise entirely, farmers, tradesmen and all. That was done in Russia. They cleverly pretend to relax the plan now and then. In the pursuit of their plans they hesitate and give some concessions as was done in Russia, in 1921 and 1922. When asked to condemn and denounce the Communists in Canada. They refused to do that. I asked them to do that and they refused. Mr. Speaker, the English Socialist may be misguided, but they are patriots and they condemn the Communists whenever they can be recognized. I do not know whether it is because they desire the public support of the Communists in Canada that this party does not attack them, or perhaps it is because they do not want to find themselves in the position of condemning their own spiritual leaders in political thought and I suggest that because, instead of condemning them when challenged to do so, they encourage them and follow their lead at every chance.

The Hon. Premier has asked me to name the Communists in his party. There does not seem to be much doubt that they are there. In answer to him let me tell him this. You name them; you are sleeping with them. You not only name them, let me say this to him – not only name them, name and get rid of them.

Mr. Douglas: — I did not make the charge, you did.

Mr. Embury: — I challenge the Hon. Premier, Mr. Speaker, for the second

time. Let me say this to the Hon. Premier, through you, Mr. Speaker. For the second time of asking, I am asking him to denounce the Communists in Canada and all their works. And until he does so, I have no confidence in his Government and will not support this motion.

Mr. A.T. Stone (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of important matters from my own constituency and I am afraid that, although I do not intend to take a great deal of time, I will not have time before recess to finish and I suggest you call it six o'clock.

The Assembly recessed until 8:00 o'clock p.m.

Mr. Speaker, before the House recessed I said that I had a couple of things that I would like to bring to the attention of the Government and I think that this is a good time to do it. But, before doing so, I would like to add my congratulations to the Provincial Treasurer for the able manner in which he presented the Budget Speech. I want to assure him that I have every confidence in him. He has not let us down as yet and I do not think he will in the future.

I also am going along with those who are not alarmed at the extra increase in the Budget. Rather I am more concerned about the decrease in the spending of the Dominion Government in goods and services. When we realize that, in 1944, they were spending about \$4,000,000,000 in goods and services; that this was reduced in 1945 to \$2.4 billion and again, in 1946, to \$1.7 billion and that again this year there is a further reduction, it causes one to have quite a concern. It is true that there has been an increase in private capital investment and increase by Government financing of exports. But neither of these can be expected to be continued indefinitely and I rather think that all that amount of money taken out of circulation in such a short time is bound to have some effect on the economy of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say how much I appreciate at last the fact that something is being done towards 'streamlining' the education of our children. It has been a matter of concern for lots of citizens in this province. We felt that in the past our children have been praying for a university education; very few of them have ever reached university. The rest have been sent out blindfolded to seek a job, a vocation, not knowing what they were best suited for and oftentimes finding when they did get the job they were entirely unsuited for that vocation. We felt that if our daughters for instance, want to become a nurse that they should be given some idea of what is expected of a nurse and the kind of conditions and wages she would expect to work under. We feel the same way about our boys. If they want to become locomotive engineers or miners, they ought to be given some guidance before they go out into the world.

We have been very much concerned that our children have never been given any idea as to what a co-operative is and the important part it plays in society and especially in this province. We are also very concerned that our children have never been told anything about a trade union. In fact, most of our children go out into the world today, with a fear of trade unions — a sort of something sinister that they should keep away from.

I haven't much time for the educationist who has put up the

March 17, 1947

feeble excuse that they haven't had teachers to tell our children some of these things and I am glad, at last, although I was beginning to wonder if our Government, too, had missed the boat and I am glad that a start has been made. I feel that something in the near future must be done for those thousands of children who are forced out into the world before they ever reach Grade 9 and I think that possibly we may get around to that in the very near future.

I would like to say just one thing about the Department of Labour. I think that in the Department of Labour there is a very important Branch; I refer to the Apprenticeship Branch. I think that the people of this province are paying dearly for the fact that we have mistreated our skilled trained workers. We have given them no protection and we have driven most of our good men out of this province. Today we are paying for it. We are not only paying top wages for men that possibly could not hold tools for the men we used to know in days gone by; but we are also not getting the speed out of these men that we did in the past. I am sure we have all at one time noticed buildings going up day by day and now it is pretty hard to notice the progress on a building from month to month. I think that that has been a fault of past administrations. We have allowed the culls from other parts of the Dominion to come in here and cut the throats of our skilled workers to the point where we have forced them out of this province and I am afraid we will never see them back again. I think that this Department can do a very important job for the people of this province and save them a lot of money. I am a little afraid that perhaps we are not giving it the attention we might. I think that we are trying to economize a little too much and I would sooner see no job done at all than half a job. I think that it is going to pay out in dividends to the people of this province if we do a good job and bring the standards and qualifications of our tradesmen up to at least that of our neighboring provinces.

I just want to say one thing about the Department of Health. I think that in the Department of Health there is a 'forgotten sister,' and I think that forgotten sister is the Branch of Nutrition. No doubt they are doing some work out in the rural districts. I have felt that they could make a more spectacular showing in the urban centres. I felt that, by doing that, they could attract more attention from the rural districts. I am a little afraid that the reason that this Department has not been given the recognition it should have is possibly because of the preponderance of professional men in the administration of our Health Department. I am sure that that Branch has a good staff and if they are given the support, both morally and financially, they will do a good job. I think that it is very necessary. We are spending plenty of money on the curative side and I think we could spend a little more on the preventive side.

That pretty well brings me now, Mr. Speaker, to what I wish to say. I have listened to my deskmate, the Member for Watrous, Session after Session, get up like a voice in the wilderness about Manitou Beach and I have felt that our Parks Branch is possibly forgotten by our Minister of Natural Resources. I do not think that he had had time to get around to it. It seems to me that this Branch is in a rut. It is time that they got around to the idea that what was good enough in 1908, is not good enough today, in 1947. I feel that they should get together and plan out possibly a long-term plan; something that will benefit more of the citizens of this province. Unfortunately,

Mr. Speaker, I have never been able to see any of them. I neither have the time nor do I have the money. There are thousands like me and there are thousands who have yet to make their first trip on a railroad.

I have a selfish motive in bringing this matter up, because the city of Saskatoon, which I have the honor to represent, is possibly the most poorly located centre in the province in regard to a health resort. Our best between is the National Park at Waskesiu. There are not many of our citizens who have the time or the money to go to that park. Not many can leave late Friday afternoon or early Saturday morning and not worry about punching the clock on Monday morning. We find that we haven't a good place within any reasonable distance. Manitou Beach, it was hoped at one time would be popularized by the people from Saskatoon. I think there are two reasons why that has never come about. One is because it has never been made attractive enough, and the second and the most important one is, that it is a little too hard and a little too far to get at. Had the Canadian National put a branch line down to the beach and put a good beach service down there, it may have helped, but they did not find it necessary to do that and so, we in Saskatoon, are poorly off as I have already said.

I do believe that we should give a thought to the idea of setting up parks, of providing more recreational beaches for more of our citizens and at the same time we can combine it for the tourist traffic. I know, I am sure that, along the river bank at Saskatoon, not very far out of the city, a very nice little park can be made without very much money being put into it. I feel that on Wednesday afternoon, Saturday afternoons, Sundays and so on, our families can go out of the heat and the bustle of the city to this little place along by the river. I feel, too, that it would be quite an attraction for the tourists. Saskatoon is just about half-way between the border and Waskesiu. It would be a good stopping off place for the tourists. I do hope that something better is done in the way of our parks.

I would also like to reiterate the remarks that the Hon. Member for Watrous has made, several times, that many of these so-called health resorts that are on our highway map most decidedly should be taken off; they are nothing but a bunch of eyesores.

The other point that I want to bring up is the matter of natural gas. The citizens of Saskatoon have been quite interested over this point for a number of years. I think that it was in the early '30s that a private syndicate asked for the contract of putting natural gas in from Turner Valley. The idea was voted down by a very, very small majority and it was not until about 1938 that another syndicate asked for the right to pipe in from Lloydminster. This time a good large majority was given to that company. The money was posted down and they were to have gas within the year. Unfortunately, of course, the War broke out and they had a legitimate excuse for not putting it in. Since the War, however, the excuse is that they cannot get the proper size of main. They can get pipe big enough to supply Saskatoon, but while they are laying the main they want to lay one big enough to come on to Moose Jaw and Regina.

It is my honest opinion that it is going to be a good many years before we can expect natural gas in Saskatoon from private corporations, if ever; and I do hope that this is not just a

March 17, 1947

lot of 'eyewash', and I do hope the Government sincerely goes into this matter as soon as possible. I am sure they will get the support, not only of Saskatoon, but of all those between Saskatoon and the gas field. I feel – and I think that everybody will agree with me – that this is a field for public utilities.

There is not a great deal more that I wish to say at this time, Mr. Speaker. I have heard the Leader of the Opposition tell us what a tough time he had to budget during the hard years that he was the Treasurer of this province and I want to say that I am quite certain that this Government could not do any worse job than his Government did, or any of the other governments previous to him. I am sure that this Government cannot give our citizens any less than those governments did and with that, Mr. Speaker, I will support the Budget.

Mr. D.S. Valleau (ASVR Area 1, Great Britain): — Mr. Speaker, I have one or two remarks that I would like to make on the subject of the Budget. I find that, listening in this House, the conversation and the speeches sometimes stray some little distance from the actual subject of the finances of the province. Often in looking over this little booklet of the Estimates that we have before us, I find that it is very difficult to relate any of the topics under conversation being discussed to any particular item or even to any particular department. Now I am not going to criticize that too deeply, because I love to ramble as much as anyone else.

I shall start out though by dealing directly with the Budget and giving the reasons why in general I think it is a good Budget.

The chief criticism that has been levelled against the Budget, as such, is that on the one hand, taxes are high and on the other hand it is not giving enough services. Now it strikes me off-hand, Sir, that that is a contradictory criticism which I have heard often from Social Credit supporters; but it does sound strangely in this House when we hear people arguing on the one hand that taxes should be lowered and on the other hand that services should be increased.

It brings to mind the oft-reiterated statement which we have heard in this House and out of it that nobody likes taxes. I kept repeating that sentence in my mind and as I did so I began to wonder exactly what are taxes. How do we know when a certain payment is a tax and when it is not?

Last Christmas, my wife and I were very fortunate; we were able to find in a Canadian city a washing machine and able to buy it and the price which we paid for a gasoline washing machine was \$189. Later we happened to be in an American city and looking through their department stores we saw exactly the same washing machine to the last detail – exactly the same – and the price of \$98. I started to wonder – that difference of almost 100 per cent. Is that difference due to taxation? It could possibly be due to the tariff. On the other hand if I bought a washing machine in Canada, which was made in Canada, and which did not have a tariff item charged against it, but nevertheless was taking advantage of the tariff in order to charge a much

higher price. How would I say that I do not like washing machine 'A' because its high price is due to taxes and nobody likes taxes; but on the other hand I do not object to the payment I make for washing machine 'B' because its cost price, although equally high, is not something that we can say is due to taxes. And it becomes quite clear that the reason we object to paying high prices is not because one object has paid a tribute or a levy to the state and another object has not. It is not because a woollen blanket is made in the Saskatchewan Government Woollen Mill and another woollen blanket was not. The reason that we object to paying high prices for goods or services is because sometimes we are not quite certain that we get full value. But persons who spend their money anywhere in Canada are satisfied if when they spend their money they believe that they get the full labor value for the product which they receive and using that criterion, it is the only method by which we can judge whether or not any given budget is too high or too low. If a budget has been increased, but is still giving full labor value back to us for every cent we put into it, then it is not a question of whether people like taxes or whether they do not; if they are getting the services back then the average reasonable person is satisfied.

I wonder just why the age-old prejudice against taxes, as such, has come about and I would say that my opinion is, that the chief reason for this is that for generations and for centuries people have not received full labor value in goods and services for taxes. In fact beginning in the early days of the feudal system, when there were no taxes, the villain paid the lord in goods and services and the lord performed a service to the serf who worked for him. The lords and knights in turn did military service to the serf who worked for him. The lords and knights in turn did military service for the king and nobody worried much about taxes. But gradually the King found that if they maintained mercenary armies and paid them and instead of requiring the knights to serve them as warriors they took tribute – or as they call it – scutage or shield money from the knight, that they could use this to hire armies, the knights were happier and the king was happier because he had a mercenary group, which would serve him in unquestioned loyalty. The result of this was that the state itself became a body separate from the people and a self-perpetuating body, maintaining its police force and its military force, chiefly as a means of protecting itself from revolts from within or foreign conquest from without. And the taxes were levied for that purpose and for the purpose of maintaining the private life of the rulers of those days.

The Liberal revolution, which gradually changed this system, and the growth of modern capitalism, did change it to a large extent. But we find that even today a large percentage of the taxes, which the state levies, in taxes which are used for the purpose of the preservation of the national sovereignty of that particular state and for the preservation of military power. The public debt and the vast extent of our taxation has always been, and I think still is, the tribute levied on the people for the purpose of maintaining armies for protection or for conquest. And it is this kind of taxation which the people have come to feel that they object to, because goods and services are not returned directly to the people for those particular values. It can be argued that military service is necessary for the protection of the state. Nevertheless the rank and file of the common people do not see the actual physical things coming back to them and that is one reason for example that during the War when

March 17, 1947

taxation rates went quite high that many of the people felt that taxation had reached a very high level and that budgets were too high and should be slashed to the end of the War. On the other hand if taxation had still been carried on at the end of the War on a scale like we were taxed during the War, and instead of spending the equivalent amount of money for military purposes, an equivalent amount had been spent for peacetime reconstruction, what a vast amount of reconstruction we could have had.

I suggest that the reason people keep saying that nobody likes taxes and the reason that we criticize budgets simply because we say that they are too high, is because the only yardstick that we are using to judge whether a budget is too high or too low is how much other states have used during the past history of the world to spend for a national defence and national survival. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that is an entirely fictitious and fallacious method of reasoning; that we should at this time in history begin to judge budgets by how much states here and in other parts of the world find it necessary to spend for peace, instead of how much they find it necessary to spend for War. I am using that criterion looking at this measly little Budget we have in Saskatchewan. If Saskatchewan were at War maintaining our existence, we would pass it in ten minutes. If atomic bombs were being dropped in Saskatchewan and we needed it for ARP or for civilian defence – it would be just a token to call this House to put it through or an amount twice as high.

But today, when there is no War and when we are trying to develop certain services which will protect us on the peacetime front then we find that people saying the taxes are too high and repeating the criticism that has been made of the old scutage or shield money, which was first levied for military purposes only. It could be said that when the states of the world reach the position where – using the arguments that have been used – when the states of the world reach the position where military armies are no longer necessary, it might be said that taxes will no longer be necessary. The state will still need monies to carry out their services, but when armies are abolished we may say at that time taxes will be abolished, because people will be getting full services for everything they put in. And we certainly cannot describe such things as the Health Services Plan, for example, as taxes, because I think that everyone in the province recognizes that they get full service back for the \$5 which they put in.

Now, coming down specifically to one or two items in our Budget, I notice that in the Department of Reconstruction and Rehabilitation (other Departments have been referred to – this is one of the Departments that I am particularly interested in as a veteran's representative – I note that there is a vote of \$250,000 for housing. Now, Mr. Speaker, as a representative of the veterans and conscious of the desperate necessity there is for housing in this province, I cannot see how I conscientiously could oppose a vote of that nature. I could oppose it if I had reason to believe that we were not going to receive value back. But in the last few days I have had an opportunity of inspecting some of these housing units – particularly, just yesterday, I had the change to attend the community apartments where the university student veterans – some of them – are being housed in Saskatoon – and I am certain that if past experience is any criterion this money will be spent to a very effective purpose in developing housing for veterans.

Just underneath it there is another item of \$250,000 for land clearing. I have also had the opportunity of inspecting the area in which this land clearance program is being carried out – I mentioned it to the House on two previous occasions, both last Session and this – and I think I would be justly censured by any veteran I met anywhere on the street, if I were to stand up in this House and say I was opposed to that expenditure. At the moment the policy as I understand it, is to take in huge tractors – huge by the ordinary farmer's standard – scrub pilers and scrub cutting equipment. They have established a camp, and are carrying out a clearance and breaking program according to the most modern technological methods. It cannot be said that they are using an individual enterprise system, but any of the Members of the House, who have sat on homesteads – and I myself spent some early years of my life in a log cabin – will realize that the man whittling away with an axe to clear a quarter-section is something which is 30 years out of date. It would be a tragedy to sentence veterans to go into pioneer areas and begin all over again, according to the methods of their fathers. This clearance program – the land has to be cleared. Everyone recognizes that it will have to be cleared – and I am not just sure, Mr. Speaker, how the various Members in this House define socialism and I am not just sure what they mean by Totalitarianism; I am not even sure what some of them mean by private enterprise – but when I see the trees falling down when I see the scrubs being piled into wind rows; when I see the black furrows being turned over in this huge area, I do not worry much about what they call it. I know the land is being broken and that until that land is broken, veterans cannot get settled; and how and where and how many are to be settled, I will worry about afterwards. At the moment, I cannot see how I could reasonably vote against an item of \$250,000 to be spent for the purpose of land clearance. Sir, I just cannot see that.

Then I recall, again, a conversation which I had, yesterday, with some medical students who are attending university at Saskatoon. They itemized to me various categories of students, who, this year, will be eligible to try to enter the pre-clinical years of university training. As they outlined it, their medical course consists of two pre-medicine years, two pre-clinical years and then the fifth and sixth years of medical school training. A number of veterans will graduate this year from their two pre-medical years; a number of civilians will graduate; a number of men who are Bachelors of Art, but who also have their pre-medical years, also will graduate and possibly some who have been turned down in previous years will again be trying to make the pre-clinical. In all, they estimate that approximately 300 students will be applying for entrance to the pre-clinical years, this year.

The number who are allowed to enter the pre-clinical course apparently is governed by the facilities available in Canada for future training in medical schools. That is, no greater a number can enter pre-clinical course than is allowed to leave that course to continue in medical school after they have passed. The result of that is that the various universities, for a number of years, have had a quota system. Apparently Saskatchewan's quota has been 24 and as I understand it, the quota is still 24.

Now, in peacetime, when we might have had a pre-medical class of approximately 60 men and elimination from 60 down to 24 would not have been a great hardship, either to the students or to the community as a whole which loses the balance to go

March 17, 1947

into other careers; but out, of course, of approximately 300 who will be eligible, to cut that down drastically, slash it down to 24 who are able to go on because of facilities, is a hardship to the students themselves and I think it is a definite hardship to the province at this particular time in history.

Due to the conditions of a large number of veterans graduating from the services of the university training and due to the fact that the Department of Veterans' Affairs is paying tuition at this particular time, today we have a unique opportunity to get a large number of doctors for the province where we desperately need them. I suggest, Sir, that these veteran students going in for medicine, due to their experience in the Forces, to the fact that they have been medical orderlies and they have seen the sight of blood, know whether or not they can take it, whether or not medicine appeals to them as a career. They are in a much better position to choose whether or not they desire to enter the medical field than civilians of 17, 18, and 19, fresh out of high school, who have not had the experience of years and experience in the Forces to help them in making up their minds.

I feel that, in view of this situation and also in view of the fact that the medical school that we are starting probably will not be ready to handle this sudden surge for some little time, a number of alternatives are open to us. We can attempt to persuade other universities in Canada or in the States, or in Great Britain to accept larger number of students; to increase our quota. That would be a stopgap. I think the chances are that we could get a number accepted in Great Britain, but again the difficulty is that, as I understand it, the Department of Veterans' Affairs to this date has not agreed to pay fees for veterans studying in Great Britain. We could try to find some method of arranging that the priority for the quota of 24 should be given to the veterans, this year. Last year, I believe it was divided in a ratio of so many of the new civilian students, so many of the veterans, and so many of the BAs.

These veterans as an age group are approximately 26 years of age and those entering freshman high school approximately 17, 18 or 19. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the veteran who cannot enter his pre-clinical years at the age of 26 or 27 or 28, is going to have to go out into the world and get a job and support his wife and family and he is through. He cannot wait two years until our medical school is ready and then come back. The civilian on the other hand, at the age of 19, can easily wait until 21 and then continue his training if he has his heart set upon a medical career, and is the type of man who is willing to make sacrifices and in emergency, sacrifices are necessary. I think that a good argument could be made for limiting the quota to veterans at this particular time.

However, a much better solution would be to find some method of speeding up our medical hospital scheme and our medical school. I am not sure how it could be done. It may be technically impossible to do so. If it were possible by any expedient whatever to have a temporary staff housed in various buildings that we could get wherever we could get them – to use the General Hospital, or the DVA Hospital in Saskatoon, or whatever hospitals we could – and by some stopgap method such as that bring about some type of training to bridge this period of one

year or two years, or possibly three years, between the time when these veterans will be graduating and the time when our medical college will be ready, I think that that would probably pay rich dividends to the province. It would result in quite an increase in the number of doctors in Saskatchewan and it would also result in quite an increase in the quality of the students graduating. It is obvious that a selection of 24 from 60 in peacetime would not be nearly as high a qualitative selection of 60 from 300 at the present time. To begin with I believe probably that the 300 will have a much higher aptitude for medicine, a much greater desire to continue in medicine and probably a higher intelligence quotient and much greater experience and the process of selection has been carried to a much greater degree.

The surge of veteran training is reaching its peak now – this year, next year – then it will taper off rapidly and those who have to leave their medical training to get jobs may be lost to us. We have had difficulty in Saskatchewan in retaining our doctors. Those who have had to go to other centres often make their medical affiliations and connections in the city where they study and the result is that frequently they do not return to us. If we were able to train men who have already sacrificed in the Forces, who are making terrific sacrifices now to take their pre-medical years; if we were able to give them the chance to finish their courses and remain in the province, I think that they would be prepared to make some sacrifices to remain in Saskatchewan, because my conversation with the few that I did speak to, convinced me that there are at least a large percentage of them who have ideals and who would like to see our medical schemes in Saskatchewan and the general health of our people improved and succeed.

Now, that is just one of the thousands of problems with which the Government is faced continually and from time to time, I cannot possibly see how we could bring in a stopgap program without spending a lot of money. I cannot see how we can do it by any reduction whatever in the present Budget. I think that the Government has been making tremendous strides to get the medical school established and my only criticism, Mr. Speaker, is that we have not been spending enough and have not got it started faster; that we may lose a potential 100 doctors because we are two or three years too late.

Of course, we cannot say it is too late, because ‘it’s better late than never,’ but it should have been here 10 years ago. There are times in the history of a province or of a nation when you have to take drastic action, I think that with the backlog of depreciation in buildings, health and all the social welfare material conditions of the province that accumulated in 10 years of depression and five years of War, we have to make them up fast, because if we do not, we do not know what the future may bring. There may be sudden depressions – that’s what a lot of us fear; but there may be other things. There may be a sudden epidemic; there may be biological warfare. There might be clouds of atomic gas. People have to be prepared for three things and I cannot see how we can possibly be prepared when we barely have half enough doctors in the province to look after our ordinary needs, let alone emergency needs.

In view of these things, I cannot see how Members can rise in this House and say that this Budget is too high. If it were not for the fact that the Provincial Treasurer would say that I

March 17, 1947

am not economically wise or sound, I would say that it is not half high enough.

Now, I think I will exercise the prerogative which other Hon. Members have exercised from time to time and wander a little bit. When I was a little boy back on the farm – I may still be a boy; I am not quite so little – I used to have the job of going out to bring the cows home every night. I often used to walk bare-footed through the dark pastures and the forest looking for these cattle; and it is unwise to train your children to be bookworms and read, if you expect them to go after the cattle on dark nights. I had a tendency to read Kipling and a tendency to read ghost stories, and one line stuck in my mind and stayed there, that I used to repeat to myself on these trips. I would hear an owl hoot and I would think possibly it was something chasing me, or see a rustle in the trees and think about the ghosts and reincarnations of the things I had read from Kipling. I would repeat that line of poetry about “a man who walks a dark and lonely road dares not turn his head because he knows a frightful thing does close behind him tread.” And as I repeated that line, I would become more and more scared; and it was really foolish to do that. In time, as I grew older, I learned to put such foolishness behind me. I did not scare myself by statements like that and became the man who was not afraid of ghosts that you see at the moment. But, I think that it is something that some people in various ways never do get over. All of us have some people in various ways never do get over. All of us have it when we are young, but some people see ghosts all their lives. We have heard the stories of the old maids who look under the bed every night – I am not quite certain whether they are looking for ghosts or not; but I can think of a statement, similar to the line of poetry which I just quoted to you, which I used to scare myself at that time – a statement which we have heard over and over in this House: “The Hon. Premier has said, ‘we will not rest contented until capitalism is eradicated’.” I think that those who use that line or similar lines and repeat them over and over till the very sound of them becomes a fearful thing and scares them by its sound, are using that old ghost routine that the youngsters out after cattle use on the lonely farms. I think that psychologically, it is a bad thing for them and that they should get down to hard material things and look at realities instead of hypotheses. There is a danger in allowing a person’s mind to go too far and being scared by your own imagination.

That is all I have to say on the charges of Communism, for example, that have been thrown around, this afternoon. I listened to that particular speech carefully, as you may recall, Mr. Speaker, I was up on one or two little points of order, but I do not recall anything else in that particular speech that I should reply to here.

Nevertheless, the international situation is referred to in this House frequently and something that, I think is another bogey which is going to extremes, is the feeling we see in some of our newspapers – I am not certain whether the Leader-Post has this feeling or not, Mr. Speaker; it is hard to tell sometimes if they feel it or not – the feeling that is accepted in some quarters, that a Third World War is inevitable. I dislike that type of fatalism. I refuse to believe that anything is inevitable and I refuse to accept inevitability so long as I have strength to fight against it. I believe that a Third World War, with the present potentialities of killing, would be a terrific catastrophe and the chances are that it would wipe out man from

the earth altogether.

In view of that fact I am willing to take all the steps that I can and to survey all the avenues of escape that are open from that grim and terrible prospect. As a result, I can look at the American Imperialism, I can look at what has been called Soviet Imperialism, I can look at what has been called British Imperialism and I can still believe that by proper studies and by trying to keep ourselves away from any hysterical conclusion jumping, we may still achieve a peaceful and fruitful world society.

Now, many of these things are matters of opinion, but my opinion is that we, in that future society are going to have to evolve a new type of society. By new, I mean that we are going to have to evolve a society in which the soviet system will accept the principles of political democracy and a society in which the American system will accept the principles of economic democracy and the best avenue to achieve that society is by working through the middle road now being evolved in Britain. If Britain can succeed in her tremendous experiment to be the bridge between these great conflicting world systems then the world is saved; but if Britain does not succeed, I cannot see much hope. the statement is made – and we see cartoons in the press – that we are, today, seeing the decline and fall of the British Empire. I rather regard that as the changing of the caterpillar into the butterfly; it is a transition stage to a much greater role in world history than she has ever performed before.

I was glad to see that my hon. colleague and seatmate, the Member for the Mediterranean Area, did give the British Labour Party credit for a few things. He did say that he would not charge them with being communistically inclined or totalitarians. I am glad to see that, because I had a unique opportunity while I was overseas, Sir. I was able to attend a conference, a luncheon held by the executives of the British Labour Party to welcome to London and to a conference being held there of the Socialist Parties of the British Commonwealth. They had the Labour Party from Australia; the Labour Party from New Zealand and Mr. Coldwell, Mr. Percy Wright and Mr. Clarence Gillis, from Canada. I rather imagine that in the clean-cut way in which the Labour Party in Britain has disassociated themselves from Communism, they would have been shocked had they known that these three men were the representatives of a party which is so often charged with having communistic tendencies. I do not think that they felt that at all; and I had the impression, at this conference, that they regarded themselves as the party which was to bridge the gap between the violence of American Capitalism and the violence of Russian Communism and I sincerely hope that there is such a meeting ground.

I was strengthened in that hope the other day by reading reports in the Daily Herald by Mr. Morgan Phillips, reporting on his trip to the Soviet Union. Morgan Phillips was a man that I met at this conference. He had just been elected to the position of Secretary of the British Labour Party – a fiery little Welshman with tremendous organizing ability. He was to succeed Mr. Middleton who had been the former secretary of their particular party. I was quite impressed by Mr. Phillips, because he was one of the few officials in the Labour Party that I met who was absolutely and completely certain that they were going to win the next general election in Britain. For that reason I respect his judgment very much. I also respect his ability,

March 17, 1947

because he probably had as much to do with organizing that victory as any other man in England.

Mr. Phillips and Mr. Lasky and several others – I don't recall the names, offhand – made a trip to the Soviet Union to inspect the trade unions there, to contact various Russian officials and, in general, to carry a goodwill mission from the Labour Party of Britain to the Soviet Union. While there they had the opportunity of having a two-and-one-half hour interview with Stalin. I think that that shows that Stalin himself appreciated the wisdom of these men, because a two-and-one-half hour interview is not granted by that gentleman very often. Beaverbrook, Churchill and Roosevelt are about the only men who could rate interviews of that duration. Morgan Phillips, in reporting on the result of that particular interview, said that in the course of conversation Stalin complimented the British Labour Party on the progress which they were making and suggested that he could see no reason why a co-operative system could not be evolved, Britain proceeding in her way, the democratic constitutional way, and Russia proceeding along the path that she has started and that in the end the systems could so balance and harmonize that there would be no necessity whatever for clash in the military or political field and great possibilities of co-operation in the social and economic fields.

Now, I think, Sir, that that is a very optimistic sign when the men at the top in these two great movements see the possibility of future co-operation and future harmony and I think it is unfortunate that interviews such as that receive so little publicity in North America and in Canada. Every inflammatory statement that is made in Britain is instantly echoed here; but we do not see the statements which suggest that things are not as bad as we are often told.

I think, that we are going to have to get over the idea that we are quickly negotiating and building up for an inevitable conflict and begin to think that we are negotiating and building, all of us in our own way, for an inevitable peace and an inevitable history in which the world will rise to greater and greater heights in which we will achieve everywhere a true economic and true political democracy.

I think, Sir, I have given you the reasons why I feel that representing the veterans, I must vote for those items on the Estimates which have to do with the rehabilitation of veterans. I think, I am never satisfied, I will never admit that we have done everything that we can; but I think that this Provincial Government has made a very creditable showing in the rehabilitation measures that it has taken. I do not want to be prejudiced; I will say that, on the whole, the Federal Government has done a fairly good job too. I reserve the right to criticize both in detail all the way; but on this particular Budget as a whole and on the Estimates as proposed, I feel that I must support it.

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

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:25 o'clock p.m.