

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Tenth Legislature
Day 10

Thursday, February 19, 1948

The House met at three o'clock

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Debate on amendments re Old Age Pensions

The House resumed, from Wednesday, February 18, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. M.H. Feeley (Canora) for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, and on the amendment thereto moved by Mr. Danielson.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. Mr. Fines: —Before proceeding with the Orders of the Day, I have an announcement I would like to make to the House. We have a maturity of approximately \$5,000,000 coming due on April 15. We have been successful in having the whole issue refunded. The rate of interest is slightly higher than that which prevailed a year ago. This is a part of some \$15,000,000 which was refunded in 1944 by my friend, the hon. Leader of the Opposition; \$5,000,000 of this was matured last spring, \$5,000,000 this spring, and the other \$5,000,000 in 1954. In 1944 it was issued for a four-year period at a rate of interest of three and three-quarters per cent. We were successful in getting \$1,100,000 on a short term five-year basis, at a rate of interest of three and one-quarter per cent, bonds to be sold at 99.32, which was a yield to the investor of 3.40; \$3,900,000 of three and three-quarter per cent debentures maturing February 15, 1962, at a rate of interest of three and three-quarters per cent sold to the investor at 98.39, yielding 3.90, the average interest rate for the whole thing being approximately three and three-quarters per cent, which, in view of present market conditions, we consider to be a very excellent rate for the province.

Mr. Speaker: — On Friday last I deferred my ruling with respect to the admissibility of a statement contained in the proposed amendment of Mr. Danielson, the accuracy of which had been called in question by Hon. Mr. Douglas (Weyburn). the statement to which objection was taken reads as follows:

“the monies for such supplemental allowances having been voted by this Legislature at its last Session.”

Inquiries I have since made lead me to doubt the accuracy of the statement, and hence its admissibility. The difference of opinion concerning it seems to have arisen from the interpretation placed upon remarks made, or a reply given, while the House was in Committee of Supply on the estimates, last Session. Unfortunately, no record of this discussion is available to me. However, since the point arose, I have been informed by the hon. member for Arm River that he is agreeable to the deletion of the statement to which objection was taken. Consequently, if the House consents, the debate may proceed on the amendment, which will then read as follows:

“That this Legislature regrets that Your Honour’s advisory decided in 1947 to discontinue the payment of supplemental allowances to Old Age and Blind Pensioners.”

February 19, 1948

May I take advantage of this occasion to suggest to the House that motions presented should be in the form of a proposition upon which the House may, and can, express its opinion by a simple affirmative or negative. I would refer hon. members, in this connection, to Beauchesne's 3rd Edition, page 131, 2nd paragraph. However, the practice has grown up, over the years, of allowing motions to appear on the Order paper containing what purport to be statements of fact in their contest. In my opinion, this is not a good practice and should be discouraged as much as possible; but since it has been followed in recent years, perhaps it might be well for me to suggest to hon. members that any statements they may incorporate in motions presented should be statements of fact upon which all are agreed, and the accuracy of which is not open to challenge. May I remind the House, also, that the irregularity of a part may, and can, invalidate the whole, the pertinent citation in this connection being Beauchesne, 3rd Edition, page 134.

If the House agrees on this deletion, the debate may continue on the amendment with the disputed statement deleted.

The Assembly agreeing, and the debate continuing on the proposed amendment, as follows:

That the following be added to the address:

“That this Legislature regrets that Your Honour's advisors decided in 1947 to discontinue payment of supplemental allowances to Old Age Pensioners.”

Hon. O.W. Valleau (Provincial Secretary): — May I first express my appreciation of yourself, Sir, and the members of the Opposition, doing me the courtesy of allowing the debate upon this particular amendment to stand over until this time. I think possibly the House may gain, in some respects, by the time which has elapsed since the remarks of the hon. member for Arm River. I am quite free to confess that had I gone on the debate immediately after that, the tone of my remarks might have been somewhat different from what they will be, I hope, today; for I must confess that I was annoyed, and very greatly annoyed, at the thought that an hon. member of this House would come into the House for the purpose of making political capital out of the welfare of our senior citizens of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — On a point of order, Sir: I object to that term “political capital”. I consider that I am just as much interested in the welfare of old people of the province as is the hon. member, and if there is anyone who is making “political capital” out of it, he is the one!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Is the hon. member prepared to withdraw?

Hon. O.W. Valleau: — I withdraw the statement readily, Mr. Speaker. I am very glad that the hon. member is not concerned with matters of political expediency; that his record in regard to the debate the other day was as pure as the driven snow off a well-worked summer fallow.

Before dealing precisely with the matter of the debate, I would like to take a moment or two to answer some of the questions which were raised by the hon. member in the course of his address, last Friday. The first one – and I am not sure whether I correctly understood the question – was when he inquired if any of the pensions were being cancelled or taken away because people were in hospitals. That is the way I understood the question; but I noticed in the local Press that the member was reported as having said “mental hospitals.” There is a difference in the situation. A pensioner going into a mental hospital cannot receive a pension. that is in accordance with the Dominion Government regulation. In regard to going into another hospital, the situation is somewhat different. There is no objection to the pension being paid, but we found in our experience that in certain cases pensioners were going into hospital; that even after a doctor had certified that they could be removed to their own homes, the pensioner’s friends and relatives refused to remove the pensioner and in many cases paid no attention whatever to the pensioner excepting to come around once a month and obtain an endorsement of the pension cheque. I am informed that in one case we found a pension cheque actually being cashed in the United States while the pensioner was in a hospital at the expense of the people of Saskatchewan; so we decided – and I think all members of the House will agree – that pensions are not being paid for the purpose of supporting non-dependent relatives of the pensioner, and we laid down the rules under which that portion of the pension might be applied to the hospital care. In the first place, the pensioner must have been in hospital for at least sixty days; in the second place, the diagnosis must indicate a more or less indefinite stay in hospital. that is, if at the end of sixty days it looks as if they are going to go out in three weeks or a month or even six weeks we pay no attention to it. In the third place, the pensioner must have no dependents whatever; and in the fourth place, we must be convinced that the pension cheque is not being expended for the benefit of the pensioner. When that situation arises, we go to the pensioner and ask his consent that the hospital or, as it is today, the Hospital Services Planning Commission, be made trustee for the pensioner’s cheque. Our authority for doing that is found in the Dominion Government regulations, which state:

“Where a pensioner is being maintained in any institution appointed as trustee for the pensioner, the pension authorities shall pay to such institution the whole or such proportion of the pension as is considered by the pension authority to be a reasonable sum for the maintenance of the pensioner; and they require the institution to make available to the pensioner therefrom a sum which it considers a reasonable amount for his personal use.”

They have made that arrangement. There are, of course, some pensioners in hospitals who can make no use whatever of any funds. They are senile, or not in a position to spend any money. On the other hand, there are some who are in that position who do receive certain small amounts which they use for the purchase of certain small comforts for themselves, stationery or

February 19, 1948

stamps or reading material, or something of that nature.

Mr. Procter (Moosomin): —Before you leave that point, will the Minister permit a question? What is your arrangement with Old Folks' Homes such as St. Hubert's and St. Anthony's, when Old Age Pensioners are put in them?

Hon. Mr. Valteau: — We have no arrangement with those Homes. The person who goes into those Homes makes his own arrangements, or his relatives make them for him, with the Home.

Mr. Procter: — What happens to the cheque?

Hon. Mr. Valteau: — In some cases, I understand, they are appointed as Trustees; in other cases the cheque goes to the pensioner himself.

Mr. Procter: — What about the Old Age Pensioners in the tuberculosis sanatoria?

Hon. Mr. Valteau: — I am not familiar with that. I cannot give you the answer offhand. I will give my hon. friend the answer some other time. I might say, returning to those who are in the hospitals, the number involved at the present time totals 26, although to hear some of the discussions one would think approximately half of our pensioners were paying half of the hospital bills.

Mr. Procter: — There are many more in these Homes, though.

Hon. Mr. Valteau: — Yes, but those who are in the Homes, Mr. Speaker, have made their own arrangements with the Home for their support there. The second point that I would like to take up, Mr. Speaker, arising out of the hon. member's address the other day, was an article which the hon. member took the time to read, which was originally published in Maclean's Magazine, written by an unknown author, quoting certain unnamed individuals. May I take this occasion to again say what I said on Friday last – that while the article is correct, in that I was in Ottawa last spring, and that I did go to see (as is perfectly natural, that is the reason I went to Ottawa) officials of the Department of Health and Welfare – I was in the Minister's office for possibly three or four minutes – outside of that the article is a complete fabrication. Nothing printed in that article has any measure of truth whatsoever, and I make that denial, as I said last Friday, on my responsibility as a Minister of the Crown. I was rather surprised – not when I saw the article in the magazine – but when I noted that in the days following, the Hon. Paul Martin, Minister of Health and Welfare, did not come to the defence of the members of his staff. Those of you who read the article will recall that credit for the information is laid to members of the Department of Health and Welfare. In other words, it accuses the members of that Department of

having broken their Oath of office. yet I say here today, Mr. Speaker, that there is no question in my own mind that any member of that Department has violated confidence in any way, shape or form. Those are the people who come into our office, as they go into every other Old Age Pension office in Canada, every year. Every file, every letter written, every bit of accounting is available to those people. They do not talk to us about other provinces, and I am absolutely certain that men like Dr. George Davidson, Mrs. Sinclair, the Executive Assistant to the Deputy, Mr. MacFarlane, in charge of Old Age Pensions, and the other members of that staff whom I contacted while in Ottawa, last spring, did not say anything, in any way, shape or form, to any newspaper reporter or magazine reporter. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, the statement originated in the office of the Minister. The Minister did not have the intestinal fortitude to back up the story and so laid it on members of his own staff, and did not come to their defence as I would do, and as I am sure any other member of the Crown here would do, or the hon. members of the Opposition sitting opposite. If your staff break their Oath of Office, you let them out. If they do not, you defend them; and that was not done.

That was not all, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for Arm River read this statement in the House the other day, and you, Sir, and the members of the House will recall that on that occasion I inquired who the author was, and the hon. member refused to give it to me. He said that he knew. He said, "Oh, I will tell you some other time," but he refused to give that information to the House; and you, Sir, will recall very clearly that the rule following in this House is that an individual making an address, who refuses to give the name of something that he is reading, must take personal responsibility for the item which he is reading. That was a rule which was followed very strictly – as the members who sat with me in Opposition will remember – during the years of Opposition. In other words, the member for Arm River put his own name and responsibility behind this attack upon these civil servants that I have named in the Department of Welfare at Ottawa; and I wish at this time to disassociate myself and, I am sure, every other member of this House, from that entirely unauthorized and unsupported attack upon the probity and integrity of those people who work for Health and Welfare at Ottawa.

Mr. Danielson: — Read it!

Hon. Mr. Valleau: — Possibly I might also deal with another article which appeared in Liberty Magazine, which also, while not presumably of as high a quality or character as MacLean's, nevertheless has a certain widespread circulation. The issue of Liberty came on the newsstands in the City of Regina and I secured a copy on the ninth day of December, and on the tenth day of December I wrote to Liberty Magazine and asked

them if they were prepared to give me the same space in Liberty to reply to the article. I received no reply whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, and ten days later, on the twentieth of December, I sent a telegram to the Editor of the magazine, again asking for permission to use space in Liberty to reply to that article. On the second day of January I received an answer to my telegram, in which the Editor of Liberty apologized for not having answered it sooner because he said I did not put my address on the telegram. In other words, the Editor of Liberty Magazine could not find out how to contact the Minister of Social Welfare in the City of Regina, because the address was not included in the telegram. He kindly offered me, not the same amount of space, but said that if I would put my answer into a paragraph or two they would be glad to insert it in what they call their "Vox Pop" column.

A Voice: — The Freedom of the Press!

Hon. Mr. Valleau: — Yes, Freedom of the Press! There are members opposite, Mr. Speaker, who apparently cannot understand those of us who sit on this side of the House, those of us who have been working for years and years in the C.C.F. organization — who do not believe us when we tell them that there is in Canada dictatorship — a dictatorship which has extended to control those mediums through which information is given to the public, such as the daily press, and national magazines; and yet we have here two instances, two cases alone, where so-called national magazines absolutely refused to give to a Minister of this Government the opportunity of replying to what were unquestionably vicious attacks. One can understand why the Province of Alberta found it necessary to take the action they have taken. Probably during the years they have run into the same difficulty with which we are faced here. In making that remark, I would like to say this — that I do not wish it to apply in its entirety upon our local Press. My own experience has been that while we do at times have complaints from in the local Press, at least they are not as one-sided, as absolutely determined to keep us out of the public Press, as apparently are the papers and magazines of Eastern Canada.

Then the hon. member proceeded to deal with what he claimed to be the average old age pensions paid in the province of Saskatchewan back in 1943. At that time he was stating that the Premier had mis-stated the amount of pensions which were paid at that time. He had in his hand a copy of a report of the Child Welfare Branch and Old Age Pensions Branch for the year 1942-43. Now, as all the members of the House know, that was from May 1, 1942, until April 30, 1943. That was tabled in this House during the Session in the spring of 1944. It is the only time that I have ever seen a report of the fiscal year which contains material other than that of the fiscal year for which the report was given; but the first five paragraphs of that report

paragraph of that report says this: "This report covers the period of the fiscal year ending April 30, 1943, but I feel that some reference should be made to the two increases in Old Age and Blind pensions, made in the province of Saskatchewan in July and September, 1943, respectively."

In other words, the report starts out by saying very definitely and plainly that it does contain material which did not properly belong to the year for which the report was written.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — They thought there was going to be an election that year.

Hon. Mr. Valleau: — Well, I was not going to be so unkind as to suggest that. The hon. member for Arm River continued to read, and he read it a half-dozen different times: "Average Old Age Pension, year 1943, was increased to \$22.90." Then he would turn it over and would say, "This is the 1942-43 report, and the hon. Premier will recall that in spite of my objections, and in spite of the fact that I was trying to straighten the matter out, he did that at least a half-dozen different times. Yet, that first paragraph clearly and plainly states that this was not material properly belonging in this document and that it pertained to a period after this document's books were closed. I am sorry the hon. member has gone out, Mr. Speaker, because I wanted to make a comment upon his action at that time.

Hon. Mr. Phelps: — Couldn't take it!

Hon. Mr. Valleau: — There are only three explanations as to why the hon. member would do what he did in the House, the other day, with this report. The one is that he cannot read — and we all know he can read, he has done it for ten years, I have heard him doing it here in the House for ten years; the second is that he is trying to mislead the House — but I cannot say that, Mr. Speaker, because it is unparliamentary...

Mr. W.J. Patterson: — Then why say it?

Hon. Mr. Valleau: — I do not intend to, although I would have said it, had the hon. member been in his seat. The only explanation that I can give, which is plausible at all and charitable to the hon. member is, that he may be able to read but he does not understand what he does read.

Mr. Procter: — May I ask the hon. gentleman a question, Mr. Speaker? If you were referring to the pension year of 1943, would you use the 1942-43 report or the 1943-44 report?

Hon. Mr. Valleau: — If I were referring to it I would use the month of the year to which I was referring. If I were referring to 1943 only, the logical thing would be to take the end of 1942-43 and the beginning of 1943-44.

February 19, 1948

This is the 1942-43 report, which improperly carries material which belonged in the 1943-44 report.

Mr. Procter: — I ask you which of those would be understood to be the '43 report – the one that covers nine months of '43 or the one that covers three months of '43?

Hon. Mr. Valleau: — In answer to that question, I would say that in this House if someone referred to the 1943 report, any member who knows anything about the business of the House would know that the speaker did not know what he was talking about. You can get away with that out in a country schoolhouse, but here, we are familiar with using the dual numbers, '42-'43, '43-'44. there is no such thing as a 1943 report.

Mr. Danielson: — On a point of privilege, I have been accused of using wrong figures...

Hon. Mr. Valleau: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member talked for two hours and a quarter...

Mr. Danielson: — I am going to have...

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Danielson: — I am going to say this, Mr. Speaker. I also quoted another figure. The question asked in the House on Wednesday, February 27, 1946...

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. member made his speech, and the hon. Minister is now replying to it.

Hon. Mr. Valleau: — In March, 1943, — and this is taken from the 'Labour Gazette', and I have all the figures for every province in Canada from September 1942 to June 1947 — the average pension paid in 1943 in the province of Saskatchewan was \$17.53; in Alberta, \$18.69; in British Columbia, \$19.28; in Manitoba, \$18.78; in Ontario, \$18.86. You have to go down into the province of Quebec before you find a province paying a smaller average pension than was the province of Saskatchewan at that time. No wonder the hon. Minister in charge of the Old Age Pensions Branch did not wish the '42-'43 report to go out to the public without being able to include into it something which would make the picture of Old Age Pensions appear just a little bit brighter.

We will take just a moment to deal with the history of pensions, in order to arrive at some conclusion as to whether the motion which is before the House at the present time should be endorsed by this House or not. The pensions originally were brought into effect in the Dominion of Canada by the late J.S. Woodsworth, original Leader and Founder of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Danielson: — Of what? When did he ever lead the Dominion Government?

Hon. Mr. Valleau: — I see my hon. friend across the way does not agree with that statement. I meant Leader of the C.C.F. Did I say "Liberal"? Well, my heartfelt apologies are due to Mr. Woodsworth. I never insulted a man so much in my life.

The hon. member does not agree that Mr. Woodsworth was mainly responsible for the bringing into effect of pensions in Canada. that reminds me of a little story that was told of a certain old lady back in the years before public assistance was readily available. This old lady had come completely to the end of her resources, she had no friends, no relatives; and so, after all the food was gone in her home she knelt down one evening by an open window and offered up a prayer to the Lord for assistance to her in her difficulty and trouble. some of the young men passing by overheard her, and thought they saw an opportunity to play a joke on the old lady. They rushed down to the corner grocery store, got a basket and filled it full of groceries, and they brought it back and placed it on her doorstep. The old lady, having finished her prayer, came and opened the door, saw the large box of groceries, and promptly fell on her knees again to give thanks to the Lord again for having answered her prayer. The young men who had been hiding around the corner of the house came out and mocked her and ridiculed her, saying, "The Lord did not send those to you, we brought them to you." The old lady looked at them quietly and said, "Boys, I don't care if the Devil himself brought them, it was the Lord that sent them!" Well, I do not care if it was Mackenzie King himself who brought pensions, it was J.S. Woodsworth who sent them to the Canadian people.

The Liberals did not like paying pensions. they started out paying fifty per cent of the pensions and charging the other fifty per cent back to the province. It was not until the Hon. Mr. Bennett, who had promised in his election campaign of 1930 that his government, if elected, would pay all of the pension – it was not until he came into power that the Dominion raised their contribution to seventy-five per cent. Now, he had promised to pay all of it, but he did come up to seventy-five per cent, which was a pretty fair implementation of his promise – rather better than one would expect from leaders of the old political parties. We go along, then, until we come to 1943, in the province of Saskatchewan. There we find that the Liberal Government of that day was paying a pension which was \$2.47 below the maximum possible. Now, it is the experience of every province that your average does not come up to the maximum. There are always some people who are getting a partial pension. In June, 1947, for example, Saskatchewan was paying a pension of \$24.32 – that is, without the supplementary bonus on the \$25.00 rate. Alberta was a little lower — \$24.09; British Columbia, \$24.19; Manitoba and Ontario were slightly above, with \$24.51. The average will usually run – going over the months, one will note that – in provinces which are paying as close to the maximum as they can – will usually run around fifty cents below the maximum payment possible. But here we have \$2.47 below the maximum! May I draw the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, to this – that this motion which is before the House at the present time is a motion of non-confidence. The members of the Opposition are attempting to persuade the members of this House that the Liberal Party in this province should be brought in, or should be allowed to form the government in this House, and not the present Government; and so it is only natural that we should be interested in, not only what the Liberal Party promises to do, but in what the Liberal Party has done in the past.

February 19, 1948

Mr. Procter: — May I ask the hon. gentleman a question, Mr. Speaker? Is it not a fact that as the yearly income was raised, the amount of the pension went up with it in relation to the top of the pension?

Hon. Mr. Valleau: — You mean the income allowance?

Mr. Procter: — Yes.

Hon. Mr. Valleau: — Yes, but at that time there was just as much leeway between the maximum pension and the income allowance as there was after the \$5.00 was put on. the pension was \$20.00 a month, \$240.00 a year, and the income allowance was still \$110.00 or \$120.00 above that, at that time.

Mr. Procter: — It was raised to \$365.00 and then to \$425.00

Hon. Mr. Valleau: — In spite of that, all we have to do is go to British Columbia, Mr. Speaker, and we will notice that under the same conditions British Columbia managed to pay at that time a pension of \$19.28, and Manitoba \$18.78, at the same time that Saskatchewan was paying \$17.53. We all remember, of course, those of us who are in public life, and those of the pensioners who are still alive, who were living at that time, and all of their friends and relatives – we still remember the administration of Old Age Pensions during those years. We remember, for example, that a married couple, although qualified in every other way to receive a full pension, only received \$30.00 instead of the \$40.00 to which they were entitled; and that, Mr. Speaker, was from the Party which today is going around this province promising to pay everybody a pension of \$40.00 per month.

Then, instead of bringing their pensions up somewhere near the maximum allowed under the Act, the government of the day brought into effect, from the Statute Books, provision which allowed them to pay a supplementary bonus, and started paying a bonus of \$1.25, which was announced as being the provincial share of the \$5.00 increase in pension. I do not know what they would have done to me if I had paid a bonus, or recommended to the government that this House should make provision for the payment of a bonus of \$1.25. When we came into power we paid \$3.00 and then we raised it to \$5.00; but they paid \$1.25 supplementary bonus – they paid it for all of two months, and then the Dominion Government raised the pension to \$25.00 and what happened the bonus? Did they pay \$26.25? Oh, no! They paid a pension based on \$25.00 a month. Maybe we should, Mr. Speaker, have brought in, in the next year, an amendment to the Throne Speech condemning the Liberal Government of this province for having, in the words of Mr. Martin or Mr. Tucker – I am not sure who it was – “pocketed Dominion money” – possibly that is what we should have done under those circumstances; but we did not do so because we believed that the principle of the Dominion Government paying three-quarters of the pension is sound. Right here and now, I would like to challenge the Opposition, before this debate is finished, to tell us whether they are prepared to line up with the Government of this province in demanding that the Dominion shall

continue to pay three-quarters of the pension. I would like to know that. After all of the literature that has been spread around this province, stuff put out by hired writers, to which we cannot get a reply inserted in any way, shape or form, they never yet have had the courage to come out and nail their colours to the mast (unless, of course, we go to some of Mr. Tucker's statements, and I dislike quoting Mr. Tucker because, to be perfectly frank, I do not know whether I should be so unfair as to lay on the members of the Opposition the statements made by Mr. Tucker. I am not entirely sure that they agree with him.) I have here a statement made by Mr. Tucker, and reported in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix on July 29, 1947: "I repeat the demand that \$40.00 should be the basic Old Age Pension in Saskatchewan, with the federal treasury contributing \$22.50 a month and the provincial government adding the requisite \$17.50 a month to make up the \$40.00." Yes, Mr. Tucker, I would like to know if the members of the Opposition, who are appealing to this House on a vote of confidence for the support of the House, are prepared to go out and say to the Dominion Government – "No longer do you have to pay three-quarters of the pension in this province. You pay what you think is right and we will make up the difference." I would also like to know where they propose to get the money to do that?

I have here in my hand the address made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition in the budget debate last year. The hon. member was criticizing two or three things. Among others he criticized the budget for being too large. He said, "The budget is an extravagant and an unjustifiable one, and I shall not support it". Then, earlier in the debate, he said this: "It is, of course, rather disconcerting to see the amount to which the total expenditure for this purpose is reaching;" (That is the expenditure for Old Age Pension,)" and the very considerable percentage of the total expenditures of the province, that are being provided for a comparatively limited number or percentage of the population."

There you have two statements of policy. In the first place the Leader of the Opposition says our budget is too large; in the second place he makes the statement that too great a percentage of that budget is going into the Department of Social Welfare. I would like to know what other expenditures in the Department of Social Welfare he wants us to wipe out in order to provide the extra two or two-and-a-half million dollars which Mr. Tucker is running around the province promising to the people?

Here is where they might get it – and again I will quote the Leader of the Opposition in the budget debate last year. "I mean it is something that sound men will observe, who realize that every dollar that they spend has to be collected from somebody. It may be from the clerk who is working in a store for \$60.00 or \$70.00 or \$80.00 a month; maybe from the man who is working in a garage for \$125.00 a month; maybe from a man who works in some larger institution and gets \$150.00 a month." There is where the Leader of the Opposition said we were going to have to get the money to pay social services, and there is where the Leader of his Party is going to have to go to get the money if he continues in his campaign to relieve the Dominion Government of their expenditures for pensions in this province. It would be interesting to know just where the hon. members stand, on this particular question.

Then we go on to a little brighter period. We go on into the year 1944-45, after the election campaign of 1944. We paid a bonus, but first, before paying that, on January 1, 1945, we started making provision for all medical care to all pensioners and their dependents. I know the member for Arm River the other day washed that out – he just waved his hand over it, it did not amount to anything – but I am going to say this, that if anyone attempts – if any government attempts to take that away from the Old Age Pensioners in the province, they are going to hear an awful holler. I do not know of any service which has been rendered by this government, or any government of Saskatchewan, which has received the public acceptance that medical care for these senior citizens of Saskatchewan had been accorded in this province.

During the first year or so of the medical scheme, the cost is running somewhere in excess of \$3.00 per month. Today, the cost is right in the neighbourhood of \$5.00 per month per pensioner, very close to \$5.00. The Premier tells me it is \$5.08. I should say, just here, that I regret that this debate is taking place on the Throne Speech. It could more properly have taken place on the budget debate, where information would have been available to the members which obviously I am not at liberty to give to the House at the present time. \$5.08! Then, on May 1, 1945, we raised the pension by paying a \$3.00 bonus – raised it to \$28.00

Mr. Procter: — Was that \$5.08 a month for all the pensioners?

Hon. Mr. Valleau: — Yes, \$5.08 a month per pensioner is the cost of the medical care to the pensioners and their dependents within the province of Saskatchewan. the \$3.00 which was added as a bonus on May 1, 1945, had we adhered to the division of costs which was incorporated in the Dominion Pensions Act, the Dominion would have had to match it by a payment of another \$9.00 which would have brought the pensions in Saskatchewan up to \$37.00. I would like to read the provision in the Act, which was put in, back in 1931 (this is the Dominion Act), and which has never been questioned in the House, has never been repealed, stating: “The Governor in Council may make an agreement with the Lieutenant-Governor in Council of any province for the payment to such province, quarterly, of an amount equal to seventy-five percentum of the net sum paid out during the preceding quarter by such province for pensions, pursuant to a provincial statute, authorizing and providing for the payment of such pensions to the persons and under the conditions specified in this Act, and the regulations made thereunder.”

We felt at that time, however, with the Dominion Government just in the concluding stages of a war, possibly we could help along a little bit for a while. We did not want to wait until the war was over – we had been promised during the election campaign of 1945 by the Liberal Party, all the

different things they were going to do when they got into power, and thinking that the millennium was just around the corner, we proceeded to say – “We will look after our pensioners; possibly it is going to take Ottawa two or three or maybe six months before they come along with an increase in pensions. In the meantime we will see that our people do not suffer any more than is necessary. We will raise the pension.” Then, in August 1945, there came the famous Dominion-Provincial conference on reconstruction. I am not going to go into that today – I think all the members have seen these proposals of the Government of Canada – they were going to pay all the pensions over age 70! They promised to pay half the pensions on a means test between 65 and 70! They were going to pay three-fifths of the hospital care, and of doctor care, medical care! Instead of your hospitalization costing you \$5.00 individually it would only cost you \$2.00 and the Dominion Government would carry the other three. They were going to look after all of the employable people in the province who, through no fault of their own, were out of work! they were going to give us grants for the rehabilitation of civilian handicapped! They were going to provide a large sum of money for expenditures in years when depression threatened the country! In fact, if there was anything that was not included in that, it was because they could not think of it. That was in 1945.

We waited – we waited until the spring of 1947, and rumours started to circulate that again the Dominion were thinking of raising the pension, and again we said to this House that we did not see any reason why the old people of this country should have to wait until the Dominion finally got around to it – that we would go ahead and raise the pension ourselves, up to \$30.00 At that time I had no information, and no other member of this Government had any official information, as to what the federal authorities proposed to do – whether they intended to raise it to \$30.00, to \$35.00, to \$40.00, or to \$50.00 per month. Speaking in the House, and presenting his budget, the Hon. Mr. Fines stated this: “We are still hopeful that we can get the Dominion to pay their regular seventy-five per cent of the cost on the basis of at least \$30.00 per month. Therefore, the province is prepared to raise the maximum pension payable to Old Age Pensioners and Blind Pensioners to \$30.00 a month, effective April 1.”

Well, as I say, we did not know what the Dominion were going to do with regard to pensions, but along in June that year, the Hon. Mr. Martin, Minister of Health and Welfare at Ottawa, brought his amending Bill to the Old Age Pensions Act, in to the House at Ottawa, and in that Bill he raised the pension to \$30.00 per month. After all the promises made during the election campaign of 1945, after the promises made in the Dominion-Provincial conference, of all the things they were going to do for the provinces and for the people of Canada, he came along with an additional contribution – not of \$35.00 a month, or \$40.00 a month or \$50.00 a month – he came along with an additional payment – not even of \$5.00 a month, but an additional payment of \$3.75!

Something was said in this House the other day about a “mountain in labour bringing forth a mouse” – I think it was the Leader of the Opposition. Well, no mountain in labour ever brought forth a more puny and

emaciated mouse, than Hon. Paul Martin brought forth in that Bill; and then he had the nerve to say this (I am reading now from Hansard, June 18): “The government (that is the federal government) is very much aware of the need for improving the lot of our aged people. Our older citizens are the people who have built this country and made it the nation it is today. I firmly believe this parliament (this parliament, the House of commons) will recognize that it has a solemn obligation toward those who, on reaching their later years, find themselves in need of assistance in maintaining themselves.” And so he says, “We will give them \$3.75, and if the provinces think they should have any more, they can bloody well put it up themselves.” Pardon me, Mr. Speaker. that is the basis of the entire address which was delivered in the House that day. It runs on for pages. First he runs over all the things at much greater length than I have done, over all the promises made by the Liberal Party over the last half-century, the promises made in the Dominion-Provincial Conference; covering up, so far as he is able to cover up, the paucity and niggardliness of his own program; and recognizing that that \$30.00 a month was not anything like that which should be paid to the pensioners of the Dominion of Canada, he attempted to cover up by laying the onus of making that provision upon the different provinces of Canada. He presumed to stand in his place in the House of Commons and try to dictate to the various provinces across Canada what they should pay in addition to their share of the \$30.00 pension. I can understand how the Old Age Pensioners of this province, I can understand how the general public of this province, can say to this House and to this Government – “thee should be an extra amount paid to the pensioners” – but I fail to understand how a Minister of the Crown at Ottawa can do as Paul Martin did last year, say “I’ll pay the Dominion’s share up to \$30.00 a month, but the provinces should pay their own share and that much in addition.” It is quite obvious where Paul Martin stands, on paying three-quarters of the pension; quite obvious that again he is trying to get back to where the Liberal Party started, which was paying one-half the pension; and that, after having concluded agreements with seven of the nine provinces in Canada, under which we are paying to the Dominion Government, or under which we have agreed to refrain from entering the field of income tax, corporation tax, and other forms of taxation. They got everything they asked for in the Dominion-Provincial Conference, and they came along and in answer to it gave us \$3.75, and then had the unparalleled impudence to go to the provinces and say – ‘here is what you and you and you should pay’. Mr. Martin was in a hole on that occasion.

Someone has said that the only reason the Liberal Party has been in power for so long in Canada is because of the political ineptitude of the Conservatives, and I have never seen a better illustration than the little history of what happened the day following Mr. Martin’s statement. Premier George Drew, of Ontario, who apparently saw a chance to make some political capital, promptly came into the Press on the very next day, saying – “Ontario is going to pay \$40.00 a month pension.” In place of embarrassing Mr. Martin, all he did was pull him out of a hole, because from then on, Mr. Martin was

able to say to the other provinces, "See what Ontario is doing. Go Thou and do likewise!" I will come to what Ontario is actually paying, before I finish.

Mr. Procter: — It strikes me there was a little 'ineptitude' on your part, too.

Hon. Mr. Valleau: — We paid the \$30.00 a month pension as and from April 1. The Dominion Government finally got their legislation through the House, proclaimed it in September 1947, that was last year, retro-active to May 1, 1947; and on that occasion we did exactly what the Liberal government ahead of us had done – I am ashamed to admit it – I do not think we could be condemned any more than to say we followed the pattern being followed by the Liberals, although possibly I am condemning myself more by saying that than anything else I could say – but at least the Liberal Party is not in a position to criticize the action we took. They, in '43, paid \$1.25 pension and when the Dominion raised the pension to \$25.00 they were quite content to allow their supplementary payment to lapse. This year, when the Dominion Government came along and raised the pension to \$30.00, we allowed – temporarily, as the Speech from the Throne indicates – the supplementary bonus to lapse; and had the other provinces of Canada done as we have done, had they protested, I am quite sure, Mr. Speaker, that public opinion would have forced a revision of that figure of \$30.00 in the amendment to the Old Age Pensions Act at Ottawa last summer.

A Voice: — Too many Liberals!

Hon. Mr. Valleau: — There is no provincial government in Canada that can continue to pay or continue to carry full and complete health services – social welfare services. That is completely beyond the capacity of a provincial government; and only those of us who are in this work and who have been trying to do a reasonable job, see that every time we make an advance larger fields open before us; it is only those who realize just how far beyond the ability of the province is this particular problem. I welcomed those proposals which were made in 1945. I thought that with those, possibly we could, in this Dominion of ours, do something reasonably decent for people who cannot provide for themselves; but it has become more and more impressed upon my mind that this is a situation which is going to need Dominion help. I would like to say this – I would like to say this again to the Liberal Party in the Saskatchewan – to the members of the Opposition – I would like a definite, clear-cut statement from that Party and from that Opposition as to where they stand on the implementation of the Dominion-Provincial proposals. Are they again prepared to line up with this province or with this government in the province of Saskatchewan and the people of Saskatchewan, and say, "We will use out utmost endeavours to the very limit of our ability to see that those proposals are implemented"? As yet, I have failed to hear that promise, or that pledge made by any speaker for the Liberal Party in this province.

February 19, 1948

The other day, in the debate, the hon. member for Arm River was so – shall we say ‘unwise’ – as to make the statement that the Saskatchewan paid less in pensions than any other province in Canada. No, no, pardon me, I will take that back. What he said was that no other province in Canada paid less. Let us take a look at that. For the purpose of comparison I am going to suggest that since each of the provinces’ average payment (especially those from Ontario west) runs about fifty to sixty cents below the maximum, in order to avoid confusion we should accept \$30.00 as the amount which each is paying on the basic pension, instead of trying to work it out actually to the last one or two cents which we have here. The province of Saskatchewan pays a quarter-share of \$30.00 per month, which is \$7.50. The cost of the medical is just over \$5.00 per month.

Mr. Danielson: — May I correct the hon. gentleman? In the statement I made, I was not discussing any medical or hospital scheme. That came later in the discussion.

Hon. Mr. Valleau: — I’ll say the hon. member was not discussing medicals! He waved his hand – “Oh, that does not matter; we do not want to talk about that!”

Mr. Danielson: —I did not, and he knows it!

Hon. Mr. Valleau: — But I am talking about it, and I am the one who is trying to make this speech, if the hon. member will hold his seat for just a few moments.

Mr. Danielson: —Mr. Speaker: He is drawing an absolutely wrong impression, and trying to convey a wrong impression of my statements...

Hon. Mr. Valleau: — I could not give any more wrong impression than you already have.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, you have done your best. I do not think you can make it any worse.

Hon. Mr. Valleau: — So far as pensioners are concerned in this province, the Province of Saskatchewan is paying its quarter-share of \$30.00 — \$7.50 per month, plus medical care, which at the moment is costing us just over \$5.00 per month, making a total payment by the Province of Saskatchewan, of \$12.50 per month per pensioner. That is provincial funds. In addition to that, of course, is the contribution of the Dominion Government.

British Columbia is paying a quarter-share — \$7.50. In addition to that they are paying a \$10.00 bonus, and they are paying some medical costs, although nowhere near on the scale that are being paid – they divide the medical costs between the municipality and the province. In the province of British Columbia their total payments will be somewhere in the neighbourhood

of \$17.50. Actually they are considerably less than that, because of the income allowance, but we have agreed to accept the figure as though they were paying the maximum amount payable.

The Province of Alberta pays \$7.50, plus a \$5.00 bonus. They also have a medical scheme, very similar to that in Saskatchewan. My information is that there are a few minor restrictions as compared to ours; but when they were framing their Act they wrote to us, asked for a copy of our Act, a copy of our regulations, and any details of administration which experience had shown us, in order that they might have a guide. In other words, "Where Saskatchewan Leads, Others Follow". Let us assume that their medical plan is costing the same as in Saskatchewan. That gives Alberta \$7.50 plus a \$5.00 bonus \$12.50; plus \$5.00 for the medical, \$17.50; but deducted from that is ten per cent of an amount of \$20.00 which they charge back to the municipalities for pensioners coming from those municipalities. They will charge up to ten per cent of the pension up to \$20.00, which makes it possible – and in most cases they do – charge \$2.00 back, which reduces Alberta to \$15.50.

I do not propose at this time to enter into any criticism of other provinces. That is the thing farthest from my mind, but I would like to draw your attention to one other figure in connection with Alberta. Our expenditures per capita for welfare services, other than pensions, is \$4.49 during the current year. The expenditure of Alberta is \$2.68. In other words our expenditure per capital of population is sixty per cent higher than the Province of Alberta. I am going to suggest that no member of this House, either in Opposition or on the Government side, has the slightest desire to see Saskatchewan's welfare services put into the position that those are in Alberta. Again, it is not my business to tell Alberta how they should spend their money, but I do say that so far as Saskatchewan is concerned, what we have tried to do is to bring along a balanced welfare program, and not concentrate simply on one branch and allow other branches to get into the position that the other services are in, in Alberta.

Then we have the situation in Manitoba. The hon. member for Arm River apparently reads 'MacLean's very faithfully, for he told us that Manitoba was paying a supplementary bonus. Manitoba is not paying a supplementary bonus. They paid \$1.25 back in 1943 and that is the only supplementary bonus they have ever paid. Last year in March, they repealed the section of their Old Age Pensions Act which gave them the authority to pay the bonus, and that repeal was made effective in May, 1947. They had not even the statutory authority, at the moment, to pay a bonus. So down in Manitoba, the provincial government is paying \$7.50 per pensioner, against Saskatchewan's \$12.50; and in Manitoba they charge back half the provincial cost to the Municipality; so that actually the province of Manitoba is paying \$3.75 per month per pensioner as compared to Saskatchewan's \$12.50.

A Voice: — There is a Liberal Premier there!

February 19, 1948

Then we go down to Ontario – and I notice the hon. member for Arm River had some very nice things to say about Ontario. Well, if I had to depend for re-election on what John Diefenbaker could do for me I would throw bouquets at the conservatives myself!

A Voice: — And did for them!

Mr. Patterson: — What about the Tories in Weyburn? Who did they support?

Hon. Mr. Valleau: — Are there any left down there?

Mr. Patterson: — Ask the Premier.

Hon. Mr. Valleau: — Down in Ontario, as I have already told the House, the Hon. Mr. Drew hit the public press the next morning with the statement that they were going to pay a \$10.00 bonus — \$10.00! Look at it! Count it! I question very much whether he consulted any of his Cabinet – the Minister in charge of Pensions, or the Department. I question that very much. I do not think he did; and the entire government has been busy ever since trying to get away from that promise – and they have done very well. The Province of Ontario is paying a one-quarter share of the \$30.00 – that is \$7.50; and in the month of January this year, their bonus, averaged out over the pensioners, amounted to sixty cents per pensioner per month. He promised \$10.00 and gave them sixty cents. Even Mackenzie King could not beat that!

Then we go down to Quebec. Quebec has not, and never has paid a supplementary bonus. Their cost per pensioner was \$7.50 against Saskatchewan's \$12.50; Ontario, \$8.10 as against our \$12.50; the Province of New Brunswick, they pay no bonus, never had to pay a bonus, do not propose to pay a bonus – and their share of the pension is \$7.50; the Province of Nova Scotia...

A Voice: — These are the good Liberal provinces!

Hon. Mr. Valleau: — The Province of Nova Scotia, which has been widely advertised as paying a \$5.00 bonus – add this (after a page of explanation of what they do) – “I hope that I have made this clear. I confess it is a little involved. Perhaps I might add, although I am sure you understand it already, that there is no general supplemental allowance paid to all pensioners such as you are doing in your province.”

Here is what Nova Scotia does – they pay a quarter of the \$30.00, and then in cases that the pension authorities deem needy, and where the maximum pension plus any little income the pensioner may have does not come to \$425.00 a year, they pay an additional bonus, which at its maximum, is \$5.00. They do not give the actual expenditures that they make under that, but from the trend of the letter I think we can judge that it is extremely small, and only paid in a very limited number of cases. Possibly we would be doing Nova Scotia credit if we said another fifty or sixty cents on an average – say \$8.00 there – Saskatchewan, \$12.50.

Prince Edward island pays no bonus and has no medical care.

The criticism inherent in the Resolution, as to what the Province of Saskatchewan is doing in regard to, not only pensions, but the Welfare Service in the –province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, I maintain is not well taken in comparison with other provinces.

Might I sum up by again drawing attention to the nature of this amendment to the budget. As I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, this amendment is a vote of want of confidence. I have tried, during this last three or four days, to work out the policy of the Liberal Party. I worked it out partly from the remarks of the hon. member for Arm River the other day, partly from the budget debate of last year, partly from the experiences that the province of Saskatchewan had with the Liberal Party when it was in office; and I would like to give you the Liberal platform on that basis, then I would like to give you the platform of this Government, in order that the House may have a clear idea as to which choice it should make.

The policy of the Liberal Party: (1) Let Paul Martin dictate what the policy and payment should be in regard to pensions. That is what they have been doing ever since last June. (2) If necessary to put the policy across, be prepared to slander civil servants, both in the province and at Ottawa. This I might say, is reasonably safe, because a civil servant, by the nature of his employment, cannot answer back. (3) Allow the Dominion Government to reduce its proportion of pension payments, and do not trust the Dominion to put into effect its promises to the Dominion-Provincial Conference. That again, very obviously, should be included in the plank of the Liberal Party. (4) In order to get the money, they are not going to raise the budget, they are not going to increase the total amount spent on the budget or on social welfare out of that budget; therefore, the only way they can increase pensions is by decreasing other services. So their policy is to cancel all the Mothers' Allowance payments and force the municipalities to support the people who are presently on Mothers' Allowance. In fact, they will have to cancel all their contributions to municipalities for social aid, and they still will not have enough to pay what they are talking about. And so as the main plank in their program they will have to chisel on all the Old Age pensioners and reduce their pension by an average of at least \$4.00 per month. They have already seen how, back in 1943, when the pension of \$20.00 per month, they were able to chisel \$2.00 off it; and with the pension at \$40.00 they should be able to chisel \$4.00 off it. Lastly, they would fire all the trained Social Welfare workers and replace them with Liberal "heelers".

Compared with that, I would like to give you the policy of this Government, summed up: (1) The policy of a balanced program of social welfare work, carried out by a trained staff, in which we attempt to give fair and reasonable treatment to all those people, who, in the province, are unable to care for themselves. (2) To continue the programs of relieving municipalities of welfare burdens. This is not the place, Mr. Speaker, but some time I would like to take a little time of the House to deal with the extent to which the Province of Saskatchewan has relieved the municipalities. (3) A recognition that the provinces

and the municipalities cannot carry a complete program of continued assistance without federal participation and aid. that, Mr. Speaker, is the problem – the question – facing this House at the moment. Are you prepared to agree with the Liberal Party, that the Dominion Government should pay less than three-quarters of the necessary pension? Are you prepared to do that? Or, are you prepared to say that in view of the fact we have given up many of our revenues, in view of the fact that today we are barred from many of the taxation fields, in view of the ever-increasing importance and need of welfare services (of which many of us are only now becoming aware), we recognize that we are going to need help from the federal authorities?

Mr. Speaker, I shall oppose the Amendment.

Mr. W.J. Patterson (Leader of the Opposition): — Speaking to the Amendment, Mr. Speaker, which, as the hon. Minister has very correctly said, is in effect a vote of want of confidence, I think this House would be justified, in connection with this particular issue, at least, to vote want of confidence in the present government.

The Minister's justification for the action taken by the –go – he is comparing what has been done in the province of Saskatchewan with what has been done in other province s; but we understood, in Saskatchewan, Sir, that we now had a Government that was not greatly concerned with what other provinces had done, that it had set an objective for this province, and that objective was "Humanity First". Having failed in that respect, I say this House would be quite justified in supporting this Amendment on the very basis that the Minister had suggested – that it represents a vote of want of confidence in this Government.

This debate has been rather an unusual one, Sir. A week ago tonight, the Government apparently was quite prepared to let the debate stop and the vote be taken, notwithstanding the fact that up to that time only one member of the Cabinet had spoken, namely, the Premier himself. Ordinarily, members of cabinets in this and other legislatures take advantage of the debate on the Address, to review the activities of their Department, and to outline future policies; only this recent amendment has, to some extent, revitalized the Government and carried them away – or broken them away – from the campaign of self-satisfaction and self-glorification along which they had been sailing. This Amendment has raised an issue which too many sincere and conscientious members of the C.C.F. Party regard as a major one, and is the first crack in the walls of C.C.F. complacency. One C.C.F. supporter – quite a sincere and active one – said to me, in the words of Bergen when he speaks to Mortimer Snerd – "How could they have been so stupid?" Now they are busy trying to explain that stupidity.

May I first of all commend the member for Arm River for having brought this particular issue to the attention of this Legislature, and having raised this debate in regard to this question. You have ruled, Sir, against the use of certain terms or words in this Legislature, and we accept your ruling. You have ruled, in the past, that such a statement as “half-truth” is acceptable – is parliamentary. There is a little question in our mind as to just what percentage above or below “half-truths” can be accepted. For instance, would it be unparliamentary to say that a thing was forth per cent true? To say that it was fifty per cent true would, of course, be parliamentary because that exceeds the limit that you yourself would accept.

When we are talking about honesty in government – the Premier, in his broadcast in January took great credit to himself for the fact that none of the members of his Government had been accused of any personal dishonesty – and I quite agree with that – that is a fact. Fortunately, in Canada, as in Saskatchewan, over the years, very few men occupying public office have ever been accused of monetary dishonesty. There is no case that I know of in this province, and very few cases over the entire history of our Dominion.

But there is something else, Sir, that is equally important to monetary honesty. The idea is all too prevalent that most politicians are “in it for what they can make out of it.” Well, I can subscribe, as a result of a good many years of experience, that I do not know of any politician who ever benefited his position particularly from a financial point of view by reason of being in public life; but when we talk about honesty and integrity, I hope that when the Premier was down in California giving those lectures on ethics, the subject of one of them, at least, would be “Honesty and Integrity in Public Life”, and that in discussing that subject he would explain to his class that integrity and honesty of statement was quite as important as integrity in actual money affairs, and that no man could be accepted as having lived up to the high standards that we would expect of him if he was content with “half-truths”.

(continued on page 22)

Now, that integrity and that honesty must apply as I say, not only to monetary matters but to statements, whether they appear in official reports or in radio broadcasts or statements made from the platform or public addresses made in this legislature. In other words, 'honest in word as in deed'.

Something has been said about the vote taken in the House of commons on June 26, 1947, and I agree with the hon. member from Arm River that the statement made in this Legislature by the Premier approached much closer to the actual facts than has been his practice in his addresses throughout the length and breadth of the province.

Premier Douglas: — I have no objections to the hon. member quoting whatever he likes, but the fact is, that the whole statement to which he is referring is a statement which was made on the Debate on the Motion. You already ruled the other day that in discussing this amendment, we could not discuss questions which had been raised on the motion. Now, if we are going to be allowed to discuss both the amendment and the motion together that is excellent, others of us will be given the same privilege.

Mr. Speaker: — Our ruling is in accordance with what information I gave, but as the hon. Minister in referring to the amendment, dealt with some of the things that happened at Ottawa, I think the hon. member is in perfect order.

Mr. W.J. Patterson: — Well, not referring to anything that the Premier said or not referring to anything that the hon. Minister of Social Welfare said, may I explain to the House exactly what took place at Ottawa. A resolution introduced by Mr. Knowles to increase the amount of Old Age Pensions to be paid by the Federal Government was brought in on a debate on the main bill, and the Speaker ruled it out of order, and I will read from Hansard exactly as it appears on page 4791. Mr. Speaker, resumed the chair and the chairman of the committee made the following report: "When the Bill No. 339 was under consideration of Committee of the Whole, Mr. Knowles moved that section four be amended by deleting the words, thirty dollars, from line 20 and substituting instead the word fifty dollars. The Chairman ruled the amendment Out of Order on the ground that the amendment would increase the amount fixed in the Bill and this could not be done except with the consent of the Crown. From the chairman's decision Mr. Knowles appeals. The House divided on the question; shall the ruling of the chairman be confirmed? — and the ruling was confirmed on the following division: —"

We have had similar discussions on debates in this House but

I think every member in the Legislature would agree that the ruling of the chairman under the circumstances was a correct one.

Premier Douglas: — How did Mr. Tucker vote?

Mr. W.J. Patterson: — We will come to that in a minute.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Tucker did not come to it.

Mr. Danielson: — How did Knowles vote?

Mr. Patterson: — The speaker's ruling was challenged in the question as I have read to the House, the House divided on the question, 'Shall the ruling of the chairman be confirmed?' And up and down the length and breadth of this province Mr. Tucker has been derided and has been accused of having voted against the increase of Old Age Pensions to \$50 per month.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, that is not correct. He has not been accused of voting against it; he has been accused of not voting at all.

Mr. W.J. Patterson: — I stand corrected, Mr. Speaker, he has been accused of not voting when he had an opportunity of getting \$50 a month for Old Age Pensions. Well this, Mr. Speaker, comes in one of those fifty per cent truth categories, and I think maybe it is hardly that; if I did, I would say it was perhaps less than 50 per cent, but with your ruling in mind I am going to place that adjective against it.

Now what did the records disclose? Mr. Tucker did not vote, he states that he was paired.

Premier Douglas: — Oh! He was absent. He was not paired, he was scared.

Mr. W.J. Patterson: — Well, he was not there to vote, therefore he must have been scared, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Argue was not there...

Mr. Danielson: — He must have been scared.

Premier Douglas: — But Mr. Tucker was there.

Mr. W.J. Patterson: — The record does not show it.

Premier Douglas: — He admitted he was there.

February 19, 1948

Mr. W.J. Patterson: — He did not admit he was there.

Mr. Argue was not there and a number of others; were they scared? Are they equally to be condemned because we have not a \$50 Old Age Pension in Canada today?

The Premier told us he visited an Old Age Pensioner in the hospital and how appreciative he was. He could not have been one of the pensioners the Minister of social Welfare has been explaining to us, whose pensions are paid to a trustee for some reason or another. The Minister told us there were some 26 – I think it was – and a couple of years ago there were 62 Old Age Pensioners in the province where the government stepped in and collected the pension or, at least, they appointed a trustee to do it and allowed him what they thought he should have.

Now 15 years ago in this province a party was formed, its primary objective was the establishment of a planned socialized state and the complete eradication of Capitalism. One of its leaders at the time stated that land is a social instrument and should be used for the benefit of the state. It made its rallying cry ‘Humanity First’. Now I want to analyze some of the platforms and some of the promises made by this party during that 15 years. As I stated at the outset so concentrated was its interest in the establishment of a planned socialized economy and the eradication of capitalism...

Mr. Speaker: — I must remind the hon. gentleman that my ruling is he must speak to the amendment.

Mr. W.J. Patterson: — Well, I was just going to say, Sir, that in that platform, its first one in 1933, there is very little reference to Social Welfare and there is no reference at all to Old Age Pensions. However, they corrected that and in the following election in 1938 issued a leaflet, which I have in my hand; an Old Age Pension of \$50 per month after 55 years of age, ‘vote CCF and protect your old age’. Issued by the CCF Central Office, Regina. This particular one was given to me by somebody in Moose Jaw, and it has an imprint here authorized by the Moose Jaw constituency of the CCF and if my hon. friend, the Attorney-General was here, I would relieve him from any responsibility for this particular pamphlet because in 1938 he had only thought his way as far as the Social Credit Party; so he is not to be blamed or held responsible for this particular leaflet. But that was the promise in 1938, with no reference to the responsibility of the Federal Government.

Then in 1944 we had a Provincial election again, and the CCF party issued a manifesto outlining its policy with reference to certain

matters of interest to the people of Saskatchewan and here it says, and it is the only reference to Old Age Pensions, "The CCF Government will increase the amount of the Old Age Pensions and Blind Pensions and will seek the co-operation of the Federal Government in lowering the age at which pensions will be paid." That was the only help they wanted from the Federal Government, was to reduce the age. Then in that same election the CCF program for Saskatchewan; Old Age Pension legislation is under the authority of the Federal Government but the cost of pensions is shared by the Federal and the Provincial governments. The CCF will press the Federal Government to increase the amount of the pension and to make it available at the age of 65 instead of 70 as at present. If necessary the CCF will act alone to raise the amount of the pensions". Here are some cases, this particular one was issued in the constituency of Notukeu-Willowbunch that has a photograph of the hon. member for that district. It says, "The CCF government will give increased Old Age Pensions." Here is another one issued especially for labour and urban consumption; "A CCF government will raise the amount of the Old Age Pensions and will bring pressure to bear on the Federal Government to reduce the age to 65". And still another one along the same lines, all uniform in this respect; no reference to the responsibility of the Federal Government and its responsibility for paying 75 per cent about which we hear so much at the present time but all of them consistent in this, that a CCF Government will do these things without any reference or any aid from the Federal Government.

Now, I think that the record of the present government in respect to Old Age Pensioners up until last fall was to their credit. First of all they introduced the system of Medical and Hospital Services and they provided a supplemental allowance of three dollars per month in 1945. May I point out that in all of those things the Opposition offered no criticism, supported the vote in the Legislature as we did the vote in the Legislature in the Session of 1947. At that time, and I can only quote from the speech which was made by the Minister himself, our understanding was that it was a continuation of and extension of the Provincial supplemental allowance because in his budget address of March 12, 1947 he said, "During this present debate it has been announced in this House that we propose to increase the pension by two dollars a month". No reference to aid or help or necessity of the Dominion Government coming into the picture. And the budget speech of the Provincial Treasurer which he referred to: "Therefore the province is prepared to raise the maximum pension payable to Old Age Pensioners and Blind Pensioners." All of this was to be done by the province without regard to what might happen at Ottawa.

Now I am going to suggest that the action of the Provincial

Government in discontinuing payment of supplemental allowances which were voted at the last Session of this Legislature, constitutes a lack of confidence in the Legislature. Some other term might best describe it; but that at least is what the Legislature thought it was doing; that is what the Legislature expected it to do, and I suggest that the announcements made in September 23 and 24, 1947, indicate a disregard of the Legislature by the government and the clearly and definitely expressed wish and will of this Legislature. It is rather interesting to go back now and read the statement, that appeared in the Press on September 23, 1947, and see how skilfully camouflaged the decision which the government had taken, and it was not until the thing had been read over two or three times that anyone began to realize that the government had decided to discontinue the payment of supplemental allowances and that the provincial treasury was going to benefit by the increase made at Ottawa, rather than the Old Age Pensioners. Now that was all the more surprising in view of an interview given by the Premier at Saskatoon, on June 21, when the announcement had been made that the Federal Government proposed to increase the basic pension. In that statement the Premier said he had hoped the Federal Government might remove the means test or implement its proposals on pensions made at the Inter-Provincial Conference in 1945. For this reason the government had delayed consideration of whether Saskatchewan's share should also be increased: "As soon as the new Federal Bill becomes law, Saskatchewan Old Age Pensioners will receive \$33.75 a month." Now that is a statement; that is not a public address. It is a statement given to the Press in Saskatoon on June 21, so I say in view of that statement and it was with considerable surprise, that the statement of September 23 and the September 24 statement were received not only by Old Age Pensioners but by the public generally.

Premier Douglas: —Is that statement attributed to me?

Mr. W.J. Patterson: — Why, yes, it appeared in the 'Leader' on June 21, 1947, and headed "Saskatoon, June 21; Premier Douglas of Saskatchewan said, Friday, his government would not make any decision and say whether Saskatchewan would follow the line of Ontario and increase Old Age Pensions." He then wound up his statement with this, 'As soon as this new Federal Bill becomes law, Saskatchewan's Old Age Pensioners will receive \$33.75 per month'.

Now I say in the light of that, the statement of September 23 was rather surprising, and it does not seem to be in line – as I said before – with what this Legislature had intended and certainly would have decided had the matter been in the hands of the Legislature as a whole. Then for a little while we had some statements that the

government did not have legislative authority and heard a good deal that we would have to wait until this session.

Well the Old Age Pension Act that is on the Statute Books of the province at the present time was put through by the present government in 1945. Consequently they can hardly accuse themselves of being ignorant of the conditions or the provisions of the Act and one of this is this: 'The Lieutenant Governor in Council may provide for payment by the province of a supplemental allowance for such a period and under such conditions as are deemed expedient to pensioners or such of the them as may be designated by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.' A provision of that kind has been in the Old Age Pension for some time, but it is certainly in the one that is on the Statute Books at the moment and it was on the Statute Books of June and September, 1947, so that so far as the statutory authority to pay this supplemental allowance and to continue it there could be no question. Well then, you may say what about the money. The government now argues, as I understand, that the increase in Old Age Pensions voted at the last Session was not expected to be sufficient to continue the five dollar supplemental allowance for the year. Now that is something the Minister can tell us at the proper time, but at least there was a vote for Old Age Pensions and supplemental allowances. There is nothing to prevent this government, and they have exercised that right and privilege in the past, when any vote becomes exhausted or nearly exhausted to obtain a governor's warrant, and have the money voted in the supplementary estimates at the following session. They did not have a vote in the estimates when they bought the brick yard or when they started the woollen mill or seized the box factory, but they found the money to do it, and the moneys voted for those purposes were confirmed at the following session in the supplementary estimates. And I can assure the hon. Premier and the members of the Government that had his government seen fit to carry on the supplementary allowance and obtain a governor's warrant, the supplementary estimate for that purpose would have gone through, so far as the group in this House is concerned, without any comment or criticism or objection of any kind. Whether he could not expect that same support from his own followers I do not know.

So that the two claims, first of all, that the money had not been voted, and secondly, that legislative authority was required, fall by the way-side. On October 10, 1947, the Old Age Pensioners' Association met in Prince Albert and passed a resolution. An immediate provincial government increase of \$10 per month in the basic Old Age Pension was asked in a resolution passed almost unanimously.

and just about the same time the CCF Federal member for Moose Jaw stated that 'Both Governments failed the Pensioners'. Addressing the Moose Jaw Trades and Labour Council he criticises the government of Canada and goes on to say: 'The Saskatchewan Government in turn disappointed thousands of citizens when it decided it could not pass along even this meagre sum to pensioners.' I think it is to be regretted. So I think I have indicated sufficiently the justification for the Legislature of the Province of Saskatchewan at this Session voting for this amendment even if it does impose or involve a vote of want of confidence in the present government of Saskatchewan. I think what I have told you is enough to indicate that this present excuse that other provinces are not doing any better, or not doing as well, is not a fair justification or a fair excuse for us evading our responsibilities; and this cry which is being heard about the Federal responsibility, the whole history of this party for 15 years, as I have indicated to you, this is the first time it has been raised. In the past they have been prepared to accept the responsibility and have promised to do these things. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendment.

Mr. J. Benson (Last Mountain): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to have a few words on this particular amendment and I do so because the question has been raised that it is a want of confidence motion in the government.

I want to point out to the House that already on this debate we have had a want of confidence motion, and I question whether or not the rules of the House will allow us to have two want of confidence motions on the same question. We voted on this particular issue a few days ago; 'We respectfully submit to your Honour that your Honour's present advisors do not possess the confidence of the citizens of Saskatchewan'. And as you know, all the members on the government side of the House voted confidence in the Government. This is another amendment brought in on a specific item, and I want to read it to you; 'This Legislature regrets that your Honour's advisors decided in 1947 to discontinue the payment of supplemental allowances to Old Age and Blind Pensioners.'

It was my understanding when the Budget was passed, last year, that we did vote the money for the government to continue to pay this supplemental allowance. It is also my understanding, after several years of experience here, that when the government does not have the money, that the government has the power to continue any payment that it desires, believing that, because it has the support of the people behind it and the support of the members of the legislature, it can come to this legislature with supplementary estimates and have that money voted. Now a question of this nature causes

me to refer to the rules under which we conduct our affairs here. We have already voted confidence in the government; now we are voting on one specific item, and I maintain that if this is made a want of confidence motion, and I maintain that it cannot be because we have already voted on that question, then it deprives the members of this legislature from expressing their true opinion on this particular question. I was rather surprised when the Minister, who I am going to congratulate for the defence that he made here on this what I consider to be a regrettable matter, but I do not think that he or any other Minister on any particular question should get up in this House and wave the big stick. And he knows – so far as I am concerned at least – it does not matter to me whether the Minister or any one indicates that any particular item is a want of confidence motion, it is not going to affect my vote on that particular item.

Now, I have made many mistakes in the past and sometimes I admit my mistakes. Perhaps it keeps me busy admitting the mistakes I have made, and on this particular instance I am going to say, quite frankly, that I think the government made a mistake, and I think they made a stupid mistake, and I am going to urge the government to get up and admit it was a mistake and tell the people and the Old Age Pensioners they made a mistake and tell them they are going to do their best to rectify it. I am going to support the amendment.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed this afternoon a very beautiful piece of political side-stepping. The Leader of the Opposition, who stood in his place last year on the Budget and said that he was ‘disconcerted’ about the fact that we were spending too large a portion of the Budget on a relatively small proportion of our people, namely the Old Age Pensioners, is now standing up deploring the fact that we did not spend more. If that does not represent ‘crocodile tears’ I do not think I ever saw it.

Let us have a look at the situation as presented by the Leader of the Opposition. He began by saying that a week ago tonight we were ready to quit as only one Cabinet Minister had spoken. The Leader of the Opposition does not know when the Government proposes to quit, and there was no intimation that the government intended to quit the debate at all. The Leader of the Opposition can draw his own inferences if he likes, but the Government is not asking any instructions of the Leader of the Opposition as to when to put up its speakers.

Mr. W.J. Patterson: — The Premier knows that the communication

February 19, 1948

between the two parties is usually through the Whip and if he sends over a message to a certain effect, are we to accept that or are we to disregard it?

Premier Douglas: — We expect you to accept it of course.

Mr. Procter: — That is what you sent over.

Premier Douglas: — But the fact remains that the government never indicated its desire to discontinue the debate at all. We are not prepared of course to put up all the speakers and allow my hon. friends to wait until the debate is almost over. But the question of revitalizing the government, of course, the government does not need any revitalizing from the member for Arm River.

When we come to the question of half-truths the Leader of the Opposition has now taken up the cudgels for the absentee leader of the Liberal Party in this province, and he is not trying to excuse him on the grounds that the motion which Mr. Knowles moved regarding Old Age Pensions, asking that they should be raised to \$50 a month, was ruled out of order and the vote was on the Speaker's ruling as I told the House the other day.

Mr. Danielson: — You did not tell it any place else though.

Premier Douglas: — The member from Arm River was not any place else to know what I told. As a matter of fact I told it on the platform with the Leader of the Liberal party there, which is a place the member from Arm River has never dared to get. I think a lot of people would like to get him there.

It is taken for granted in public divisions that those who are in favour of a motion will, of course, support that motion and appeal against the Speaker's ruling, and vote against the ruling.

Mr. Procter: — Whether his ruling is right or not?

Premier Douglas: — They would not move the motion or support the motion if they did not think it in order; therefore they vote against the Speaker's ruling. Mr. Diefenbaker the part-time colleague of the member from Arm River...

Mr. Danielson: — Why did Coldwell not vote for him?

Premier Douglas: — ...he said 'I was paired with the hon. member from Hochelaga' and so on and had he voted he would have voted against the Speaker's ruling. Mr. Coldwell was not present; but Mr. Tucker was present, and had he been in favour of this motion he

could have, at least, supported the motion; he could have got up and suggested that by unanimous consent we would be allowed to debate this motion. He did nothing of the sort; stayed in the House and refused to vote either for the speaker's ruling or against it.

Mr. W.J. Patterson: — Where do the records show that he was in the House?

Premier Douglas: — He was seen in the House, and when I raised the question in the Yorkton debate, he admitted he was in the House, but said he could not vote because he was paired. There was no record of him having been paired.

Mr. Procter: — Is the hon. premier suggesting that members of this or any other House, when they know the Speaker's ruling is right, should vote against it?

Premier Douglas: — I am suggesting that when a group of people are in favour of a motion and are pressing for the passage of that motion they would not be asking for that motion to be passed if they did not think it in order. Therefore, they are bound to speak against the Speaker's ruling if they consider it in order and are in favour of it, and he has ruled it out of order. If Mr. Tucker thought the speaker's ruling was out of order, he could have voted against the speaker's ruling. I am not complaining that he voted for it or against it, I am complaining he did not vote at all, and my hon. friends cannot wiggle out of it, and Mr. Tucker has not been able to wiggle out of it either.

Now the Leader of the Opposition – this is not the first time – has made reference to these patients who are in hospital and who are being looked after, and he said it was very nice of me to visit this old gentleman, but he would not be getting his old age pension if he was one of these 26 people. I have heard this being discussed over the radio by some of the lady speakers for the Liberal party, which is probably one of the most unfair and uninformed types of argument carried on in this province. In the first place these Old Age Pensioners who went to hospital care by the Provincial Government, nor medical care, nor surgical care, nor drugs, nor dental care, nor glasses, they did not get it at all. Now as the Minister has pointed out this afternoon, when an Old Age Pensioner has been in there more than 760 days and the prognosis shows they may be in there for six months or a year, are the authorities to continue paying \$30 to them, per month, lying in bed when they do not need it and pay at the same time \$150 per month for their hospitalization and pay for their medical care? Now if it can be shown that they need it, if they

have a house on which the rent ought to be paid, or dependents, it is still paid; but if they are lying in bed and have no dependants why would you continue paying the \$30 a month when you are also paying \$150 a month for their keep, which is what we are paying, and in some cases more? So, very properly, we say when there is every indication that they are going to be there for a long time, part of the pension will go for the comforts and things they need, and the rest of it will be applied on their hospital bill. Do you know what that still leaves, Mr. Speaker? That still leaves a bill of \$130 a month to be paid for in addition to paying for their drugs, medical and surgical care. These people are not being cheated out of anything. they are getting good treatment such as they never got under any administration in this province, and they know it; and I do not consider this hypocritical concern that has suddenly been evinced by gentlemen who did very little when it was their responsibility to look after these Old Age Pensioners.

The Leader of the Opposition quoted the CCF program and quoted some CCF supporter who was very perturbed about what we had done, and went to some length to show what the CCF program had been over a period of years. One thing he did not tell us is what he is advocating. He was invited, this afternoon, by the Minister of Social Welfare to say where he stands and where the Liberal party stands. Does he now stand with Mr. Tucker and think that we should pay \$40 per month on the basis of \$30 shared by the Federal Government and a \$10 Provincial bonus? He does not say that – How can he, when he stood up in his place last year and said he thought we were paying too much at \$30; how can he now advocate \$40? So he does not stand with Mr. Tucker. Is he with Mr. Martin? Mr. Martin said the Federal Government should only pay its share of \$30 and anything extra should be paid by the Provincial Government. In other words, in order to save Ottawa money, who already has a surplus of over half a billion dollars, we should take a little more out of the Saskatchewan people. Is that where he stands? He does not say. As a matter of fact he does not stand anywhere on the issue, except to seek some political advantage by raising the questions on which he thinks the public sentiment can be roused on this question.

The statement has been made by him, made before by the member from Arm River, that monies were voted at the last Session of the Legislature and I quote his words, 'What the Legislature though it was doing was providing for a supplementary allowance'. Now I am not sure that the Leader of the Opposition can speak for what the Legislature thought it was doing, he can only speak for what he thought he was doing, and in this case it might be that Mortimer

Snerd's phrase about 'how could you be so stupid' is very appropriate; because if he had taken the trouble to look at the sum of money involved and the sum of money which this Legislature voted, he would have seen that that sum of money provided for paying our share of a \$30 a month pension. Because already Ottawa had announced they were going to raise it; did not know how much, but we were providing for paying our share of the \$30 a month pension, and I may now say – I do not know if it is proper for me to say it until the Provincial Treasurer has brought down the supplementary estimates – but even as it is, paying our share of the \$30 a month pension, the estimates voted by the Legislature last year have not paid all of the Old Age Pension. There will be supplementary estimates, something over half a million dollars, because Old Age Pensions have cost more than this Legislature voted.

Now it is all very well for the Leader of the Opposition to say first, that we have authority by Order in Council to have extended this. That is true but we could not do so without appropriation by this Legislature. It is true he said the Lieutenant Governor in Council could have brought in a warrant and could have brought in a supplementary estimate. He said we would have had no trouble getting it through from his group. Well this is a big change; last year he objected to it being too much; last year he was 'disconcerted' about it being too much.

Mr. W.J. Patterson: — I did not vote against it.

Premier Douglas: — Did not vote against it, but he was 'disconcerted' because it was too much. Are we to gather from that that if he was disconcerted once that he would likely be disconcerted twice, and have another amount brought in as a supplementary estimate? We had no appropriation from this Legislature to do more than was done, namely, to pay the Provincial Government's share of the \$30 a month and to pay a supplementary bonus during the month of April until the Federal Government came into the picture; and that is what we have paid.

Now the member for Last Mountain suggests that we should admit very frankly that we made a mistake and that we are prepared to rectify the mistake. I never mind admitting that I have made mistakes as I have made many of them in my lifetime and expect to make a good many more. But if we made a mistake, the only mistake that was made was when we submitted estimates to this Legislature,

February 19, 1948

last year, in which we asked for a sum of money to pay Old Age Pensioners, and this Legislature gave us that amount and we made it very clear to the Legislature that this would pay our share of the \$30 a month. There might be a gap in between the time when the Federal Government came in and the time when this five dollars extra would be payable, but this is what we were providing for. Maybe we should have asked for more, got a larger issue from the appropriation; as it is, we are half a million dollars short of what is necessary to take care of the Old Age Pensioners.

Mr. Procter: — Do you not know that you already had a supplementary allowance voted previously for three dollars, I think it was the 1946 estimate?

Premier Douglas: — No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Procter: — Ask your Minister, he knows.

Premier Douglas: — The member is quite incorrect. The three dollars which was introduced in 1945 began on the eighth of May and we introduced in March of that year the Budget, so it was provided in the 1945 – 46 Budget; the money was contained in the appropriation. It was not provided for in a supplementary allowance.

Mr. Procter: — And thereafter you increased it with a normal amount of pension. He knows it and you know it.

Premier Douglas: — I know exactly what I know and I do not need my hon. friend to tell me.

A Voice: — If the Dominion Government had not increased the pension to \$30 a month would the Provincial Government not have continued to pay it for the balance of the year?

Premier Douglas: — We would have been compelled to, and to bring down here a large supplementary vote; but, as I say, we were going on the assurance which the Federal Government had already given to us and already given to the House and announced to the country, that there would be an increase in the Old Age Pension.

Hon. O.W. Valleau: — We had already told the House.

Premier Douglas: — Yes, we had already told the House we proposed to pay the \$30; not that we were going to pay \$33.75 or \$33.25, but that we were going to pay \$390 and that was what we asked this House to appropriate money for. With reference to whether or not this is a vote of confidence, certainly I do not think any person could say whether it is nor not except the Rules of the House. The Rules of the House have always been that any amendment to a Speech from the Throne or the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, and any amendment to a budget, are motions of want of confidence. That is, in this Speech from the Throne, the government has set forth its legislation and its program and upon the approval or the disapproval of the members it is decided whether or not the government can proceed with its work for the Session.

Now any amendment which prevents the passing of that motion as it stands, giving full assent to the government's program for the Session, seems to me can only be interrupted as a vote of non confidence; just as a vote on The Budget is a vote to withhold supply from the government. Now, I will say one other thing – and that is this – the thing which my hon. friends have not mentioned in their discussions, today. First they have not said what they are prepared to do themselves; where they stand with reference to this thing; \$40.00, \$35.00, or \$30.00 – not a word. The other thing they have not done, is that they have not attempted to defend for one moment the record of what they did in caring for Old Age Pensioners. In 1943-44 the total votes in this province – Old Age Pensioners, contribution by the provincial government — \$1,017,000. In the year 1947-48 — \$2,606,000 – almost two and a half times as much. The total vote for social welfare, 1943-44 — \$2,422,000; in 1947-48 — \$5,919,000 – more than twice as much; almost two and a half times again.

It comes with very poor grace from a group of people who were as stingy and as mean in handling the Old Age Pensioners, as any government that ever sat on the Treasury Benches in the Dominion of Canada; to come in here now and talk about the treatment that is being given to Old Age Pensioners, at a time when they are receiving the highest Old Age Pension and the most complete medical care that they have ever received in the history of Saskatchewan!

The other thing they have not mentioned; not only what we have done and what they have failed to do; they have not mentioned the fact that in the Speech from the Throne, the government suggested it is prepared to do what the member for Last Mountain has just suggested. That is, we are prepared to help to meet this situation; the cost of living has risen so drastically in the last year that we are prepared to make some additional payment. Did we do it? As I said the other day – not as a supplementary bonus – any payment which is recommended by this government to this Legislature will be recommended as the provincial government's share of total pensions, of which we expect the Federal Government to pay its share. We are not prepared to do as my hon. friends are – sell Saskatchewan down the river for the political advantage of Ottawa. We are going to insist that Ottawa will be kept to its 75 per cent share.

Did any government that came to the other provinces, as this did in 1945, set out a whole series of things they were prepared to do; asked for certain tax fields; from seven of those provinces got those tax fields? We are still waiting for them to deliver the social services which they offered and the responsibilities which they promised to assume. Not only have they not assumed those responsibilities, but

they have consistently tried to shovel onto the provincial government responsibilities which are properly theirs. We are going to insist that any pension paid in this province – 75 per cent is a Federal responsibility. As a matter of fact they should be paying 75 per cent of the health services for Old Age Pensioners; they are not paying any part of the health services. I therefore suggest, Mr. Speaker, due to what this government has done – the fact that we are now paying the highest pension ever paid in this province – now giving the most complete care – and in view of the fact that in the Speech from the Throne, we have given advance notice of the fact that we propose to ask this Legislature for the appropriation to give them additional financial assistance; that the members of this Legislature ought to support the government's announced program, and to defeat this amendment.

Mr. Valteau, Jr: — I wish to refer to the statements that have been made with reference to old Age Pensioners – I believe there were 26 of them who go to hospitals, and while in hospital their pensions are paid in trust to the institution, to be administered on their behalf. I will give you a case that occurred in my experience. An elderly gentleman, who was not capable of looking after himself very well – he was living in a cold shack in the centre of a town; the shack was possibly ten by twenty and rather dirty and very cold when I visited him last November; the man was shivering there, and I went to him and asked “Why are you here; who do you not go to this home which is ready to receive you – this institution?” But, the man said he hated to go because if he goes his pension will not come to him anymore; it would be paid in trust. I considered all the circumstances and advised the man to go and I think I was instrumental in helping to persuade him to go and to allow his pension to be paid in trust. But this man was not a provincial Old Age Pensioner, and he was not going to a provincial hospital or to any hospital, or to any institution. He was a veteran of the last war drawing War Veterans' Allowance from the Federal Government, and he was being offered the chance to enter Government House, which is administered by the Department of Veterans' Affairs; and they insisted, before they allowed admission into this hospital – he was not a bed case; he would walk; he could go down town – before he could be admitted he would have to surrender his sole income to the Department of Veterans' affairs, to administer for him in a trust account. that was not the half of it; this man had been on War Veterans' Allowance for some lengthy period of time; he was gassed in the last war; but he did not own a suit of clothes. He walked around in an old set of overalls. He told me that for a possibly fifteen years he had been eating as little as possible each day; and for the last ten years he had gone without one meal a day. That is,

he had only two meals a day; and he had not owned a suit of clothes for as long as he could remember; but he had been saving his money – putting it aside so that he could get a little bank account and be a little bit independent – of course all the bank account had come undoubtedly, from the War Veterans' Allowance that he was receiving – but he had built up three or four hundred dollars in a bank account; and as the condition to going into this convalescent Home – which is a virtual soldiers' paradise, a beautiful place for a man to stay – but as the condition to going, he had to surrender his bank account to them to administer as a trust account as well – not only his pension, but his bank account. But, those were the regulations and I have considerable confidence in the integrity of the officials of that Department. I advised this gentleman to go because I said the compensating factor would probably make up to him the things that he would lose. He replied, he did not mind having them administer his pension, but he would lose his last right to call money his own if he gave up this bank account. Finally he decided he would go out and buy a suit of clothes before he went, but I understand he has gone since.

I do not have it on paper; but I know of that particular case, and correspondence in that case; and I understand that is the general policy of the Department of Veterans' Affairs in all cases such as this. Since Mr. Tucker is the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans' Affairs, I presume, that Mr. Tucker, in administering any such department, would adopt an exactly similar policy: certainly a policy much more drastic than any policy applied to Old Age Pensioners – the 26 entering the convalescent or terminal care hospitals in Saskatchewan.

I just thought the House should be clear on that point, to realize that this is not an unusual procedure on a part of the province; it is a procedure similar to procedure adopted in welfare work, and apparently is a procedure similar to procedure adopted in welfare work, and apparently a procedure applied, across the board, by the Department of Veterans' Affairs.

Now, dealing more particularly with the Resolution, or the Amendment, asking “the Legislature to regret that His Honour's advisers saw fit to discontinue certain payments.” And in its original form it said it saw fit to discontinue these payments, “the monies for which had been granted by the Legislature...

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! We are not discussing that portion today.

Mr. Valleau: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not discussing that portion; but I think it is quite in order to discuss whether or not they were voted, because all the speakers before me have discussed that; and have argued whether or not they were voted. I will agree, Mr. Speaker, that it is not correct for that to be in the motion as the expression which this Legislature must express itself on; but it is quite correct for us to decide

whether or not it was true; because we cannot decide how to vote on the original, or the remaining portion of the Resolution, unless we know whether or not it is true. I am suggesting, Sir, that because the member for Arm River voluntarily withdrew it, he was admitting it was untrue; and since it is untrue, I cannot see how the members of this Legislature can condemn the government for not spending monies, when we had not voted the monies.

Mr. Hooge: — I just want to say a few words in connection with, and associate myself with, the remarks that have been made by the Leader of the Opposition in connection with Mr. Tucker. As I understand the situation, he disclosed by the Records of Hansard, the motion was before the House in connection with raising the pension to \$30.00; and some C.C.F. member made a motion to the effect that the word \$30.00 should be deleted and \$50.00 substituted.

Now, I know very little about the rules of this House, and certainly know less about the rules of the Dominion House; but even I know this elementary rule, that a motion of this kind could not be made by someone other than a Cabinet Minister; and I was quite sure that the Mover of that Resolution knew that since; and I think that he certainly knew the fate that that motion would have; and that the speaker would immediately rule it out of order. I think, very likely, his sole reason for introducing, the motion at all, was in order to get a certain amount of publicity in connection with it; and that is precisely what happened — As soon as the Resolution was introduced, the Speaker, of course, ruled it out of order — and then in order to get a little more publicity in connection with it, the Mover appealed to the House.

Now, if your Honour makes a ruling — a proper ruling, as you do in most all cases — you would expect the members of this House to concur, if someone has the temerity to suggest the ruling is not proper. I do not think the question of whether Mr. Tucker voted on this, is of primary importance — It was not a question on this Resolution, at all. It was merely a question — is the Speaker right or is he wrong; and it was so patent that he was right, that even if Mr. Tucker had not been paired with anyone, I would not have blamed him for ignoring the thing altogether, because it was of so little importance and was bound to be ruled out. I submit, that the fact that Mr. Tucker did not vote, is no indication whatever as to what views he entertained concerning this motion as to whether pensions should be raised to \$30.00 or \$50.00. It has been stated by some...

speakers before – and the idea has been ridiculed – that Mr. Tucker suggested to the length and breadth of this country, that pensions should be raised to \$40.00. So his views in this regard are very well known; and to suggest that because he did not vote on this question, he must have been against raising the pension from \$30.00 – revising it upwards – is just preposterous; but the unfortunate thing is that some politic capital is being made out of this, and the fact is read about that a Resolution concerning the raising of Old Age Pensions, was actually voted on; while this is not the case at all. The only matter that was voted on, was whether or not the speaker's ruling was correct or not. So I think it is most unfair to Mr. Tucker to make the suggestion that he abstained from voting when there was a Resolution before the Committee – that the Old Age Pensions should be raised from \$30.00 to \$50.00.

Mr. Burgess (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — I have listened with considerable amusement to the Debate this afternoon. for instance, it would seem as though it is a matter of great importance as to what Mr. Tucker did or did not do. Personally, I think Mr. Tucker is a person of no great importance to this Legislature; who has been greatly over-rated both by C.C.F. and Liberal speakers. What he did or did not do in Ottawa is not, in my opinion, very important. The question of what we do here in Saskatchewan – as a Government and a Legislature – ought to be, at least, important to us.

Now, in the first place, I have considerable regard for the ability of the members who sit in Opposition. I knew, last year, that we did not vote money enough to pay a \$5.00 supplementary allowance to the Old Age Pensioners, and I quite gave them credit for being smart enough to know it too. I would not even suggest they were that dumb. I think that the Old Age Pension Resolution, which was brought up in connection with the Address in Reply, is nothing more nor less than a question of politics; and because I do not know very much about politics – and usually stick my foot into it when I start talking politics – I probably should have stayed in my seat. But the question to me is that Old Age Pensioners by having something done for them – largely as a result of propaganda and educational campaigns carried on by progressive people such as Mr. Woodsworth – have become a very popular thing with the public. The somewhat discredit old political party are very anxious to pose as the greatest and best friends of Old Age Pensioners. The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that they could have criticized this government much more effectively, if they had criticized us for slipping somewhat in attending to the things that are purely the responsibility of a provincial government. That is, that they have not been accepted at all by the Federal Government.

February 19, 1948

In my opinion, I would be much more tempted to vote on their behalf, if they had said that we had not looked after Mothers' Allowance cases, as well as the Old Age Pensioners were looked after.

Mr. Procter: — We might do that yet.

Mr. Burgess: — Yes. As a matter of fact you would have a real case. the only reason, in my opinion, that this Resolution was introduced at all, is a political reason – but that is against the rules of the House; maybe we're not supposed to suggest that – but I think the idea is, that if the C.C.F. government in Saskatchewan could somehow be placarded over Canada, as being in someway derelict in their duty to Old Age Pensioners – it might be very good political capital.

The campaign that has been carried on in the Press – particularly in the Liberty Magazine – would seem to me to back up that idea. Now, as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I think we have done quite as well for our Old Age Pensioners in Saskatchewan, as we have done for other people who need the help of the government. We had done just as well for Old Age Pensioners as we had done for Mothers' Allowance cases – as I have mentioned before; and we did better for Old Age Pensioners than we did for cripples.

Now, the C.C.F. have not yet succeeded in getting the Federal Government, for instance, to help with that. You would not expect the Liberals to think of that first. They have been educated by all propaganda into recognizing the Old Age Pensioners. they think it is a political good one. Now, maybe it is – I do not know; but I think it would be a lot better from their point of view, if they would actually tell us what they proposed to do if by chance they were the government; and if, as the Premier said, they were able to back it up by what they did do when they were the government. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I do not think I would support at this moment, a \$40.00 pension for Old Age Pensioners, coming from the Province of Saskatchewan, unless those who proposed it could show me that they were able to do something as good for the other people who are just as helpless as the Old Age Pensioners.

The question of want of confidence that was brought up – it seems to me that it should be possible to criticize a government and still have confidence in it. I know that some people say that cannot be done – that you either have to agree with it or else you have no confidence in it. I have never, for one minute, agreed to that idea

but, I do think – not that I would be voting want of confidence in the government if I voted for this Amendment – but I would merely be taking a political bait on a pretty poor hook, if I swallowed the Amendment that has been offered by the Liberals in this particular connection – and voted for the Amendment.

The question on the Amendment being put it was negatived by 42 votes against 7.

SECOND READINGS

Mr. Connon: — The remarks I made on moving first reading of bills (Items 1 to 18) standing under my name on the Order Paper, apply equally to the second reading of the Bills. I would ask, therefore, the permission of the House to Move second reading of Bills No. 26-43 inclusive, in one motion. These Bills, as I previously indicated, contain the Amendments believed necessary to make the various professional Acts conform with the recommendations of the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments which were approved by the Assembly on March 29, 1947. I believe these Amendments would be better considered and discussed in Committee, Mr. Speaker, and I would therefore move that the Bills be now read the second time and referred to the Select Standing Committee of all members.

The motion for second reading was agreed to.

Bill No. 18: an Act to amend The Veterinary Services Act, 1945

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — In moving second reading of item No. 2, Bill No. 18, in connection with an Amendment to the Veterinary Services Act, I merely wish to explain that this is a simple Amendment to guarantee that the thousand dollar grant will go entirely to the paying of the travelling expenses of the Veterinary engaged in connection with the Veterinary Service Districts. Some Veterinary Service Districts have been making a practice of deducting some of our grant to take care of incidentals and this Amendment and the purpose of it is to insure that the entire thousand dollars will go to match the grant of the Veterinary Service District Board. Mr. Speaker, I therefore move second reading of the Bill.

The motion for second reading was agreed to.

Bill No. 19: an Act to amend The Brand and Brand Inspection Act, 1943

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — In moving second reading of Bill No. 19 in connection with and amendment to The Brand and Brand Inspection Act, 1943, I merely

wish to explain that we have not only run out of two-character brands, but we have run out of positions to place them on, and we are asking that the three-character brand be permitted for general use. I wish to move second reading of this Bill.

The motion for second reading was agreed to.

**Bill No. 20: An Act to amend The Provincial Lands Act
(Hon. Mr. Nollet)**

Mr. Embury: — I wonder if the hon. Minister would be good enough to allow that matter to stand. I make the suggestion to him because today a judgment was handed down – very likely one of 35 pages – from which I think the House would like to have the considered opinion in respect to it, as it will relate to this particular Bill, on second reading. It might well be that the matter could be discussed better in Committee, but I suggest to the House that until such time as we can consider the judgement fully, that it would be in the interests of the Debate to let the matter stand. (Consideration deferred)

Bill No. 21: An Act to amend The Horse Breeders Act

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — In moving second reading of Bill No. 21 – an Act to amend The Horse Breeders Act – I just want to explain that under The Pure Bred Sires Areas Act, stallions twelve years of age must be registered. Under the regulations of the Palamino Horse Association of Canada, registration certificates are not issued until the animal becomes two years of age. It was agreed, however, that the Palamino Association would inspect their stallions at the age of one year; and it was agreed by the Horse Breeders' Association, that the inspection age of stallions could be reduced from 30 months to 24 months, and this Amendment provides for that. With this explanation, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill.

The motion for second reading was agreed to.

Bill No. 22: An Act to amend The Stray Animals Act

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — In moving second reading of Bill No. 22 – it is a simple Amendment to provide that the feed allowance and pound keeper's fees be revised upwards due to the increased cost of feed grain and generally. With that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill.

Bill No. 23: An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Insurance Act

Hon. Mr. Valleau: — I am proposing in this Bill amendments of three general types. The first two are general; then there are a number of sections proposed is the result of a study made, over the past several years, of problems

that have arisen in the interpretation of the Life Insurance provisions of The Insurance Act of the several provinces since the last revision in 1935-36. The Act was passed originally in 1924 and it was the intention that it be revised every ten years or so, in order to adapt it to meet the problems of the intervening years – the problems that are brought to light by experience. The remainder of the Amendments deal with Group Life Insurance. When The Saskatchewan Insurance Act and the other provincial Insurance Acts were written originally in 1924, Group Life Insurance occupied but a very small part of the general Life Insurance business. Since that time, it has grown tremendously and it is felt that the sections of the Act should be brought up-to-date in order to deal more adequately with the problems and the selling of Group life Insurance. I might say that the Bill, which is before the House, is agreed to by the Association of Superintendents of Insurance across Canada; and I am informed that it is being introduced in each of the other Legislatures in substantially the form it is presented to the House here. I move, Mr. Speaker, second reading of this Bill.

The motion for second reading was agreed to.

Bill No. 24: An Act to amend The Department of Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Act, 1944

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Certain activities under my Department, including our machine shop and repair depots, spray paint, housing – that we feel can be better financed out of advance accounts, rather than the present procedure. This method would tend to speed up the payment of accounts and also result in increased efficiency. With this explanation, I move second reading of this Bill.

The motion for second reading was agreed to.

Bill No. 25: An Act to amend The Highways and Transportation Act.

Hon. Mr. Douglas Minister of Highways): — This Bill is to give the Department control of irrigation ditches which we hope will be built in this province in the not too distant future. Those of you who have had occasion to travel through the Province of Alberta, may have noticed the difficulty they are having from irrigation ditches not being controlled, and give you a great deal of highway trouble. This amendment will simply make it necessary for anyone constructing an irrigation ditch within 300 feet of a highway, to receive permission from the Department. I move second reading.

The motion for second reading was agreed to.

The House was adjourned at 5:45 o'clock p.m.