

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session - Tenth Legislature

Monday, March 8, 1948

The House met at 3 o'clock

BUDGET DEBATE

The House resumed, from Friday, March 5, 1948, the adjourned debate on the proposed notion of Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair (The House to go into Committee of Supply).

Mr. A.T. Procter (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, may I express to you and through you to this House, my very sincere appreciation of the act of the House in suspending the rules of the House to permit me to ask questions from my chair. It has been of great assistance to me throughout the Session, and I appreciate that suspension of the rules very much. May I say that I am not sufficiently expert as a mathematician to figure out exactly that it has meant, but in speaking to some of my hon. friends in the Opposition, they suggested that, in pounds weight, this privilege suspended would have otherwise been sufficient to raise the Parliament Buildings six inches; but I do not think that is just correct.

May I also thank the members on the opposite side of the House who have been so kind as to express their appreciation of the work I have been able to do in this House. As you know it is not my intention to continue in the political field, and I shall carry with me a very deep and warm regard for all the members of this House of whatever party they may belong to.

In the heat of debate it is very easy to wound and offend, and I fear that, on past occasions, am not altogether to be absolved from that charge, but I would like to assure all the members of the House of my very high regard for them, and might I just say, Mr. Speaker, that paraphrasing the words — I think it was of Cardinal Newman — "While I hate the sins of the hon. gentlemen opposite, I love the sinners", and may I say, Mr. Speaker, their sins have been black indeed.

Particularly may I refer to my hon. friend the Premier. I appreciated his remarks to a very great extent. You know, Mr. Speaker, I have not been taking quite such an active part in the House, this year, and have had more opportunity to study the hon. gentleman's technique and listen to his defence of this Government, and may I say that we in this Province are extremely fortunate that the hon. gentleman devoted his talents to politics

March 8, 1948

rather than to Criminal Law. I fear me, Sir, that if the hon. gentleman had gone into Criminal Law there would not have been a single murderer hanged in this Province, since 1944.

I would like to refer for a minute or two to the remarks of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. I have sat with him in this Chamber longer than with most members, and may I assure the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs that, if it should be my happy fate to attain judicial preferment and his unhappy fate to bow before me in that capacity, not only he but every member of his Government will be assured of the utmost consideration. It is a sound principle both of church law and of state laws that a man shall only be punished according to the light which he has "and these be they that sit in darkness".

While I am doing an this congratulating, I want to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer. I congratulate him on the manner in which he presented his Budget. His presentation was such that if the Budget could have been made acceptable it would have been acceptable from that presentation. As I observed the hon. gentleman standing there, with his handsome face, his beautiful flow of language, his eloquence, I thought to myself what a wonderful talent he had, had it been devoted to the right task, but it seemed to me the hon. gentleman must have been speaking with his tongue in his cheek at certain portions of that Speech; in fact, I could almost see him smile as he delivered it. My hon. Leader has dealt with this Budget and I do not intend to deal with it at any great length. He has criticized it much more ably than I am able to do. This, the largest Budget by nearly \$7,000,000 that has ever been delivered in the Province of Saskatchewan, has been introduced in the face of a crop failure concerning which I shall have more to say, over more than half the Province of Saskatchewan, a crop failure, worse than that of many of the same parts of that area between the years 1930 and 1940. It has been introduced in a year when this Government tells us in the Throne Speech that many of the gains, one in agricultural production in the past four years, are now being lost, that consumers are finding their purchasing power seriously curtailed, and many are hard pressed to secure the necessities of life. Yet, Mr. Speaker, it is a Budget that presses heaviest on agriculture and on those of the low income brackets. The main items of revenue from that Budget come from the Public Revenue Tax, Education Tax, Gasoline Tax, Motor Licence Tax, and these constitute a very large portion of the anticipated revenue. All these bear most heavily on agriculture and on the small income class, where this Government tells us that agriculture is losing its gains and that many are hard pressed to secure the basic necessities of life.

If this Government believes those things which they told us in the Speech from the Throne, I suggest that they had no right to introduce such a Budget as this at this time. If this Government did not believe the things they said in the Speech from the Throne, then equally, I suggest, they have no right to tell the people of this Province what they have told us in that Throne Speech. Every thinking person who has studied this Budget and the Speech from the Throne is asking himself the things which I am saying at this moment, and trying to find out how it is that these two things have happened so closely together. Every thinking person is either charging this Government with an attempt to deceive the people of the Province as to our actual economic conditions, or with a callous indifference to the needs and the necessities which they see before the people of this province. I am not going to deal any longer with the Budget except to say that it is idle for the Provincial Treasurer or any other member of this Government to stand here or anywhere else in this Province and say that taxation in the Province has not been increased.

To use but one illustration, what does a man think who knows that at the time the Liberal Government left office on the fourth of July, 1944, he was paying a Gasoline Tax of seven cents a gallon and today is paying 20 cents a gallon? Is that an increase? Does this Provincial Treasurer deny it? That is only one instance of the increase in taxation that has taken place here in this Province. True, they might try to camouflage it by saying the Dominion Government reduced their tax by three cents. The Dominion Government told us when it was put on, that it was put on for the purpose of bonusing that industry so we could have cheaper gasoline. The same time that the Dominion Government took it off, this Government increases the tax by two cents having already increased it by one cent before; and they say they have not increased taxation! What does it matter in what particular tax the increases have come — they have come in almost every activity of this Government. The fact remains that this Government is taking from the people of this province almost double the amount that the last Liberal Government took when they held the reins of office.

Is it possible to get this money from us without taking it out of our pockets, and how can the Government take other than by direct taxation or indirect taxation, or by this subsidy from the Dominion Government? Do we not contribute our portion of the revenues that go to the Dominion Government and come back to us in the subsidy? People throughout the province know that not

March 8, 1948

only has this Government increased its direct taxation on the people of the province, but they know, further, that as a result of the measures and acts taken by this Government, they in their local municipal governments are paying far beyond anything they ever contributed before, and they charge this Government with direct responsibility for that increase.

It is common knowledge throughout the length and breadth of this Province that the real acme of the Socialist activities of this government have been introduced in the north. As my hon. friend from Athabaska said; "they have been the guinea pigs of this Socialistic experiment".

What are the industries of the north? We have the timber industry, the fishing and fur industries. It is in those three major industries of the north that this government has clamped on an iron dictatorship to try out their State Socialism first. It has been done in the northern area because it is most difficult for the result of their activities to come out of that portion of our province. That is not the most vocal part of Saskatchewan, it is the place of which we in the south — as we hear these things that have come down to us — ask more and more; "What is the new situation in the north?"

First, let us see the Budget Speech of the hon. Provincial Treasurer, and I wonder if he realized himself what he told us and the people of this Province in that Speech about those industries in the north and the effect of his Socialistic policies in that district. Well, he tells us in his Budget Speech that the production and value of timber and timber products are down though prices for timber and timber products have risen. That is the first of those northern industries, and the people of this province know that there is a universal demand for lumber and know that all the lumber that could be produced could be sold; they know too, that the prices of lumber have risen. So that, here in this industry, we find that Socialism has resulted in lesser production and lesser value in that industry.

Next he tells us, in that same Budget Speech that the production and value of Fisheries are down though last year the "King Fish" of Saskatchewan promised us a fisherman's paradise with the fishermen prosperous and contented. Again, one of the Socialized industries of this Government; yet the Provincial Treasurer, after the present experience says: "the value and production of the fisheries of the north are down".

Then the Fur industry: it is true that the Provincial Treasurer and the hon. Minister of Natural Resources do not quite get together on that. The Minister of Natural Resources says that as a result of his policies, the men in the fur industry received about \$120,000 more; but the Provincial Treasurer says, in his Budget Speech, production and value of the fur industry of the north has decreased. It is a little difficult for me to make these two statements meet together, although the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources did admit that, in many furs, the trappers of the north were getting less than they had received before. But this is not difficult for myself or any other member of the House or any other resident of the province of Saskatchewan to understand, and that is, that wherever the 'iron hand' of Socialism has laid its blighting touch, there, first, we see decreased production, decreased values, discontent and all those things that have followed the experience in other countries as well as this. And we have heard our Premier tell us he will not rest until Capitalism is eradicated in the Province of Saskatchewan.

In the face of the very facts, that in those industries where they have carried their program furthest, we are faced admittedly by the wrong information from their own Provincial Treasurer, that production and values have gone down. It might have been excusable if production had gone down and values had gone up. It might have been excusable if values had gone down and production had gone up; but we see there the definite statement from their own mouths that both go down. That, Mr. Speaker, has been the experience in Russia, in Romania, and in every country where they have tried this would-be panacea for our economic ills.

Mr. H. Gibbs (Swift Current): — Not doing too bad.

Mr. A.T. Procter: — Not doing too bad? I do not know how my hon. friend can say they are not doing too bad when we consider that in everyone of those industries that is the picture that is presented to us. I do not know how my hon. friend can say they are not doing too bad when we heard from the hon. member from Athabaska the true conditions of the industries of the north, and when I myself heard in this House the impassioned address of the hon. Minister of Natural Resources defending his policies, and then, today, see printed a one-cent cheque, a four-cent cheque, an eight-cent cheque, a twelve-cent cheque, the second distribution and the final payment to those poor misguided fishermen that have no recourse but to submit to the tyranny of this Government.

March 8, 1948

I wonder if my hon. friend remembers as well as I do how he told me about one year ago today, when I compared the prices being paid at the time the private industries and Government exports were in competition, when I asked him to explain how it was that the Government price was so low as compared to the price paid by the private fishermen. Do you remember what he told me, Mr. Speaker? He said, "this is just the initial payment. These men are going to get another payment and then in the finish they will be well ahead." Though they have been exploited and so forth and so on, I wonder how much further ahead that poor misguided fellow was that received the one-cent cheque. I wonder if he went out on a that with the proceeds of it; whether he expended it in riotous living, or whether he used that one-cent cheque for clothing for his wife and family. Perhaps when my hon. friend, the Minister of Natural Resources next speaks, in this House he will take the opportunity of telling us how much fish that man delivered to get a one-cent cheque; how many pounds of fish the fellow delivered that received the four-cent cheque, and the same with the eight. Yes, Mr. Speaker, these things catch up with us.

My hon. friend the Minister of Natural Resources denied, one year ago in this House, the lumbermen were moving out of the north, when I charged him with it. He told before this House that there were more lumbermen up north than ever before. I had not returned to my home seat six weeks when I saw his statement in the paper: "Yes, the lumbermen were moving out of the north". Is it conceivable that I, a private member of this House, living in the southern portion of the Province, could know better than the hon. Minister that the lumbermen were moving out of the north when he told me in this House they were not, denied the accusation that I made, and did it take him, the 'Stalin' of the north, six weeks longer than me to find out the true situation! Sometime, I hope the hon. gentleman will explain that to me.

When I accused the hon. Minister and his department and above all — his pet amusement — the Fish Board with making mistakes in the north, the hon. gentleman denied it. No! No! This was doing away with those evils of private industries, and so on.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, we heard him, the first time in all the years I have sat in the House with the hon. Minister of Natural Resources — and I want to congratulate him on it — for the first time I heard him say they had made a few slight

mistakes. Perhaps if my hon. friend lives long enough — he certainly will not live long enough to experience the pleasure of sitting in this House till that length of time — but he may yet admit that he has made a great many mistakes, particularly in relation to his Socialistic policies and his support of those policies. After the hon. gentleman sat down and after his impassioned defence, I listened to my hon. friend from Athabaska, a plain simple statement of the men who know the facts. I then listened to three hon. Ministers of the Crown trying to confuse him and badger him while he was making that statement of facts, and it was apparent to me that on the one hand we had the plain statement of a man who knew the facts, a man who perhaps has not had all the advantages some of us in this house had, who is simply down here telling us the situation as it was, and that speech carried convictions, not only to me but to all those who heard it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the hon. Ministers of this Government that people are beginning to lose confidence in their statements and justly so, when we find the situation that is arising from time to time, where these things are denied in this House and immediately admitted outside.

I would like now to turn my attention to the question of highways, and I am sorry the Minister of Highways is not in his place, if he is in the House I hope he will get into his place.

Premier: — The hon. Minister is ill at the moment.

Mr. A.T. Procter: — I am very sorry to hear that, but notwithstanding that, so important is this question that I cannot lay off him, Mr. Premier.

Premier: — I am not asking you to do that, I was merely making the statement that he was ill.

Mr. A.T. Procter: — Our present Minister of Highways seems to be of the opinion that vituperation and vehemence can take the place of administration and it cannot be done, in the Department of Highways at least.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank: — You thought it would take the place of highways.

Mr. A.T. Procter: — Well I do not know whether the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs is just right in that statement, and I hope he will

March 8, 1948

have some comments to make a little further on when I have reached the highway subject.

No matter how lovely the Minister of Highways and those who support him may rant, the plain fact is that the people of this Province know the highways of this Province were never in as poor shape as they are at the present time for years, and there is no doubt about it. There is one thing these hon. gentleman forget: there are many activities of the Government of which the ordinary individual on the street knows very little and has very little opportunity to see; but the people of this Province travel the roads when they can, and they know the bumps, and know what has been done and also know the conditions. It is idle for these gentlemen to get up and tell the people of the improvements in the highways when the people know there is no improvement. When I was home this weekend, in my own community, they are taking up private subscriptions to get the Manitoba snow-plows to open a road into Moosomin. That is the greatest criticism of this Department, that has happened yet. I was not going to say anything until my hon. friends started to mumble and mutter and chew about it, so now you can take that and swallow it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Moosomin always got it before.

Mr. A.T. Procter: — Moosomin never got as much in one year or four years of my administration as the hon. Premier got, last year, in the constituency of Weyburn, what was it — \$500,000, nearly one-sixth of the total highway money of the Province and the Minister of Highways got another \$290,000 and something on top of it. That is why the highways of the province are no good.

I listened to the hon. member from, Kindersley-Kerrobot, talking about highways, and I must apologize for referring to a previous debate. I hope you will permit me to do so, but if you object to that, I will say I heard the statement from the leader of the Social Credit on the radio as a result of what was said, and it was to the same effect. He purported to give the figures for grading and gravelling during this Government's term of office, and I listened to the hon. Minister and I heard what he said about it. Now, Mr. Speaker, just let me refresh your memory, if permitted, with what the hon. gentleman from Kindersley-Kerrobot said. "The last four years the Liberals were in power — that is 1940 to '43 inclusive — they built 671 miles of provincial highway and 169 miles of secondary roads. The first two years this government was in office, they built 757 miles of provincial highway and 25 miles of secondary road. This past year

they built or rebuilt a total of 500 miles — add that up and see what you find." Add that up and see what you find and he goes on to average 210 miles a year and some 1273 miles of gravel. I wonder why the hon. gentleman took those particular years?

Let us refer to the highway reports and see how they bear out the contention that has been made. First let me say, the Deputy Minister and practically all the senior members of the Department of Highways are the same men who were in control when I was Minister of Highways, and I want to say that, notwithstanding the comment of the hon. Minister of Highways, there never was a department with more loyal, more able, more efficient men than that Department had when I had the honour to be the head of it, and I resent the remarks of the hon. Minister in respect to that Department. The people in this Province know that, while I was Minister of the Department of Highways, there was no politics in it and I have been complimented on it many times.

Premier: — And no highways.

Mr. Procter: — Yes! And I did not give a contract to a butcher in east Regina to do gravelling like this Minister did.

Hon. C.M. Fines: — What about Mrs. Burke?

Mr. Procter: — I never gave Mrs. Burke a contract in a my life.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Oh! Oh!

Mr. Procter: — No! And I did not let one to a butcher in east Regina either, and you will account for that before you are through.

Now let me read the report of the Deputy Minister of Highways, at the time I left office for the year ending April 30, 1944: "It is encouraging to note that only 637 miles remain to be graded to standard out of a total of 8,006 miles." Now there were 637 miles out of a total of 8,006 miles remaining to be graded to standard when I left office in the April, 1944 report.

I will now take my hon. friend's report for the year ending the 30 April, 1947, and what do we find? We find that there is still not constructed to Provincial highway standards, 494.99 miles. I wonder how it is possible for the hon. gentleman to get these figures of construction of highways and still have practically 500 miles of the 637 left to do. That is not all; and I can tell his one thing more

March 8, 1948

for his information: up to the end of this report there was 76 extra miles taken on the highway system, and they reported 8,082 miles, but still try and make this jive out of 210 miles a year of grading and this amount left, and the amount left to do when I left; it is not possible to do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us take a few figures about the actual gravelling, and again let us not take any casual statement. Let us go to these reports for 1944 and 1947 of the Highway Department. Let us look at the gravelling situation, and for the benefit of the hon. members there is a table showing everything in the report, and I am reading from page 11. When I left office April 30, 1944, there was 4,872 miles of this system that had been gravelled, and what does it show at the present time, April 30, 1947. The gravelling had risen to 6,028 miles, a matter of some 1,200 miles, and I give him credit for it. To be absolutely fair — and I want to be fair — the report I have quoted does not cover the 1948 gravelling. So that, in the first three years of office they did 1,200 miles of gravelling; but to point out another thing, in the first two years — 1938 and 1939 — the Liberal government, that has been so wrongly condemned, gravelled — and you will find it in the Report . . .

Mr. M.H. Feeley: — It is like the gravel, hard to find.

Mr. Procter: — It is like the gravel, hard to find, yes; because what you do not know, and apparently your Minister of Highways does not know, is the life of a gravel road is about seven years, and that is the normally-travelled gravel road.

Let us get back to this question — my friends do not like it — but in the year 1938-39, under my administration, we gravelled 607 miles; and in 1939-40 we gravelled 773 miles, so that the first two years of our administration, we gravelled 1,380 miles against some 1,200 miles of this Minister in the first three years of his administration — and how I would have loved to have had the revenues this man had, when I was Minister.

Let us look at the grading. In the first two years of that term we built new sub-grade; first year, 1938-39, a total of 219 miles, and in 1939-40, a total of 227 miles. Again, what record is the best? And we were building under conditions when the war was on, when the relief was at its height, when it was almost impossible to get money — and look at the revenues these gentleman have had. Let us take a glimpse at the secondary highways, and remember this, Mr. Speaker, that in spite of that editorial in the "Leader-Post",

this morning, secondary highways to the people of this Province are, in many cases, just as important as Provincial highways to the tourists. They are the basic road on which they take their produce to market, and we, in 1938-39 graded to standard 164 miles, and in 1939-40 graded to standard 287 miles, and this Government graded, in 1947, 16 miles — a wonderful record — how pleased the people must have been that received that 16 miles!

I want to tell the hon. Minister of Highways one other thing before I leave his Department. He has said that when he took office there were very few engineers in the department, and I admit that is true; and I am rather proud of the fact because most of our engineers were young men, able for war services, and there was hardly a month that went past that some of those engineers did not notify us they were leaving the Department to go over and fight and do engineering work to enable us to win the war. The hon. Minister of Highways, his first concern was the welfare of the C.C.F. party; he was out organizing for the C.C.F., and then he had the fearless effrontery to stand before me in this House and condemn that Department because we did not have engineers. If I had been that hon. gentleman, that is one question I would never have raised.

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs has gone out now, and I wanted to take him for a little ride. How did it come, that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs is speaking for the Minister of Highways in connection with highway grants? They have always been under the Minister of Highways, where in my poor judgement they should remain. I would like to say to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs that we had a first class example of what happens when the Minister of Municipal Affairs seeks to speak for the Minister of Highways in connection with highway matters. In the first place anybody but the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs would have known that, all through the war years, grants were made to rural municipalities, and the municipality was unable to spend the grant and, therefore, they turned it back, and the grant does not show as having been made a money grant. That was fittingly neglected altogether when he and the hon. member for Arm River were disputing about the grants to municipalities in Arm River. I am speaking from memory, as I have not the books of the Department available; but I venture to say that, in some of those war years, 40 percent of the grants authorized by me, as Minister of Highways, to rural municipalities, were not expended and were turned back, and so they do not show as municipal grants on the record; but the money was made available to them by the

March 8, 1948

Government, and they could not spend it — and you yourself, I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, had municipalities in that position. Also, in giving those figures for grants, the Minister of Municipal Affairs neglected to mention that in our grants we gave grants for bridges, and a municipality was frequently given the choice to take either a bridge or a grant for road work.

That is not the main ground of my complaint to him, however, but the main ground is the fact that the system he uses is absolutely unfair in this 'equitable' grant. The first thing that should be considered is not the mill rate of the municipality, because municipalities have to put their rate down, or the value of the land — if it is low value land — does not warrant the payment of the taxes and the municipality gets tax title for it, so it is the financial standing of a municipality that should be considered. The second thing I want to say is: the fact that a municipality has two highways running through it frequently imposes a heavier burden on the municipal roads than if they had no highway at all, because all the oil men and truckers going out from the cities out across on municipal roads from one highway to another to take a short cut, and that is a very important feature in connection with an equalization grant or any other grant to a municipality. The extra crossing of those municipal roads may actually impose a higher burden on the municipality than the amount of highway benefits.

I want to say, too, that points submitted in connection with the equalization grants are the length of time the municipality has been established. An old-established municipality is not entitled to the same consideration as one of the newer municipalities. There is the size of the municipality, municipalities in the province vary from six-township municipalities to twelve and fourteen townships; and there are some of them larger than that. Another factor is whether the grant is to be made on a main market road or a side road. There is the question of the amount the municipality is prepared to contribute itself to the work, and the question of the proximity of gravel. Another question is the amount of equipment for the doing of the work, whether the travel lanes in the municipality are such as to justify the Department in making a substantial grant far beyond the ordinary grant where two or three municipalities combine together on a project to take a secondary road from one town to another. I have no more time to deal with the question of highways, and am leaving it to the people of this Province to judge that question and say just how satisfied they have been, and say whether they consider it fair that \$800,000 out of last year's appropriation

went into two seats, particularly when the Rosetown seat had as such money as it had in the two previous years of the hon. Minister's administration. I am perfectly willing for any member in this House to go to work and check up what I gave to my seat and put it alongside what this hon. Minister give to his seat, and see which one of us was fair and just.

There is another point more important than that I want to get along with. From time to time I have sat in my seat and heard the Patterson Government described as a 'do nothing' Government, the Government that made no plans for the future and so forth. I want to say to the hon. gentlemen opposite that today the plans of the Patterson Government, in combination with the Dominion Government, made for the situation that is arising in this Province today, is the reason that the hon. members in this House have hardly mentioned the question of relief or the seed grain problems and debt adjustment. I have the whole thing here that I am going to deal with.

During that period we were faced with two things that we had to do, and I am speaking of the period of 1935 on to the end of the drought. First, we had to meet the problem of drought conditions and handle it as best we could, and next we had to plan, in conjunction with the Dominion Government, to see to it that, so far as could be done, those conditions would never hit the economy of the Province of Saskatchewan with the same impact as they had in those years when we were not prepared for them and when the province had never experienced anything of the kind. The first step — and may I say this: you do not find this plan laid out by any body of experts. It was worked out by Ministers going to Ottawa and discussing the problems with the Ottawa Ministers, and was worked out by consultation in our Departments and by the Governments evolving mutual schemes to fit one into the other. The first one was the enactment of partial crop insurance plan they call the P.F.A.A. to insure that the farmer could put in, and prepare for, his next crop. Now everybody knows what the P.F.A.A. is and everybody knows what it has done for the people of this Province and is doing today for the people of Saskatchewan. And let me show you a map of this Province which shows in color (blue) the crop of less than eight bushels an acre, and, in red, the crop of less than four bushels an acre, and you will see that more than half the province had a crop of less than eight bushels in 1947, and a crop of (over a quarter of the province) below four bushels. I know my hon. friends will say, "look at the price". If you keep your

March 8, 1948

seed out of a four-bushel crop of grain it does not make an awful lot of difference if the price is \$1.35 a bushel or 50 or 60 cents a bushel, because the extra two and a half bushels will not amount to very much in the terms of money.

The second thing was the enactment of the Farmer's Creditors Arrangement Act that took care of the farmer that was bankrupt, and assured that he could not be put off his land and he would get a new start. It did not matter how harsh his creditors were, he could go under that Act, and he got a fair and just settlement and could not be put off.

The third was the P.F.R.A. — I am giving the Dominion things first — and that was so that in the areas most commonly subjected to drought there would be islands of feed and seed grain through irrigation.

The fourth thing, the introduction of the plan of orderly marketing of grain. We discussed this problem that if it was possible to carry the good years partly into the bad years on the participation payment plans, those payments would relieve the impact of a sudden crop failure.

We then had the introduction of the plan of payment of Family Allowances. That was discussed and was part of the settlement of the plan to meet the future conditions in these drought areas: a supplementary plan to insure the families of having something for the women and children to work with.

Then was the readjustment of Dominion-Provincial relations, and that was arranged by us, and this outfit over here — this Socialist Government — got the benefit of it.

Premier: — A lot of arranging you did about it.

Mr. Procter: — Oh yes, we did. You would never have had that Conference at all without our arrangement. We were working for it for years.

Premier: — We could not even find the agenda when we took office.

Mr. Procter: — You were just a pimple on a pumpkin, taking advantage of it after it was all done.

The next thing was an Unemployment Insurance scheme to take care of the industrial workers in time of depression.

The next was a more generous provision for the aged and blind, and my hon. friend the Premier tried to take credit for that, the first raises, until I pointed out that Mr. Patterson arranged that first raise at Ottawa, for he (the Premier) was a Dominion M.P. at that time.

The next was a wider provision for Social Services and Health. That was the Heagerty Plan and this Provincial Premier, who afterwards admitted that his Hospitalization Scheme is simply a 'piece-meal' pending introduction of the Heagerty Plan to me and this Legislature — he himself had made that admission — he went out and criticized the Heagerty Plan prior to the '44 election.

Premier: — On a question of privilege, I hate to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but at no time did I criticize the Heagerty Plan; but I did criticize the Liberal Government at Ottawa for dropping it in the wastepaper basket from which it has never returned.

Mr. Procter: — Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier did not, many of his co-workers did, because I heard a lot of them kicking in Saskatoon about the cost, .and so forth and so on . . .

Premier: — Your second statement is as true as your first.

Mr. Procter: — Well then, if that is so, Mr. Premier, you criticized the Heagerty Plan because there is no one who does not know that your men criticized it, and do not try and put it over me, Sir.

Premier: — Nonsense, you are not kidding anybody but yourself.

Mr. Procter: —The next thing was a scheme of Public Works and expenditure to 'cushion' the return of the Military Forces to civil life in the event of an industrial depression at the conclusion of peace.

There is then the long-term policy or the establishment of lower prices for agricultural products and the supply of cheap farm credits for farm improvements, and the provision of money for housing and other improvements. We also assumed certain responsibilities in all those negotiations, and I am going to shortly

March 8, 1948

give you those, Premier.

First of all we agreed that the Province was prepared to withdraw from the field of taxation in the succession duty and those other things which the hon. Premier has done.

The next thing we were to make available Provincial land for large pastures and irrigation schemes so that these islands of which I spoke could prepare feed and seed to come into the picture. We also agreed that we would withdraw as far as possible from cultivation the sub-marginal lands not fit for farming. Then we agreed to take steps to insure security of tenure and occupation for our farming population under The Civil Rights Act and The Farm Contracts Act. And let me say to the Premier again, his piffling Farm Security Act does not amount to a snap of the fingers compared to the security of the farmers of this Province as given by The Limitation of Civil Rights Act and Farm Contracts Act. The farmers will be just as safe as long as they have those two acts.

Next we agreed we would take steps to see that the farmers retained sufficient out of their crop to provide their seed, living expenses, working expenses, and enable them to continue out of this year's crop — however small it might be — to next year's crop. And you will find that provision. These gentleman came in and simply lifted it out of our Act and stuck it into The Exemptions Act and The Farm Security Act.

We also agreed to assume such share of increased costs of Social Services as might be agreed upon by the Dominion Government, and increased costs of Health Services also agreed upon by the Dominion Government. We agreed there should be an adjustment in the financial relations between the municipalities in the province. That is something these gentleman have not done yet. When we got this adjustment, from Ottawa we had discussed, and arranged that there would be a whole canvass of the situation of the municipalities, and part of that benefit would be passed on to local municipalities; but the hon. Provincial Treasurer grabbed the whole thing.

We then agreed to make provision of an equitable share of any plan for Public Works that might be undertaken, — and I suppose the Premier will say he cannot find those plans. Why, there are yards of them in my office, covering a hard surface road from North Portal right up No. 11 to Saskatoon; covering No. 1 highway; covering No.'s 14 and 5 highways also cross highways on No. 4 and so on.

Then we agreed to assume the Provincial share of any increase in Old Age Pensions — and you know there has been a pretty full debate about that. We agreed we would surrender to the Dominion Government the certain fields of taxations which has been done.

We agreed — and it was recognized by both Governments — that there was going to be, in all probability, a problem after the war and that notwithstanding anything any Government could do it would be necessary for private industry to step into the breach both in the local municipal matter and as an individual matter to provide a cushion of employment and funds during the period, which everybody anticipated would be much more severe than it was when all our army came back to civil life. But our mistake was we were too busy arranging all these correlating plans to get out and tell the people all about it, and we were just too honest to take the Provincial moneys and use them for pure political propaganda. Today there is no hesitancy about taking the Provincial moneys for political propaganda by this Government, and perhaps if we had taken a leaf out of that book we would be sitting over there today.

Premier: — Perhaps if you had put some of the plans into operation it might have helped.

Mr. Procter: — Well, the best thing to answer the Premier's comment is this map. If it had not been for those plans, with that crop failure that happened, last year, you would have been so busy handling things the way you and your Minister of Agriculture do, that you would not have had time to touch any of your Socialist stuff. If you could not handle that little proposition down at Gravelbourg of two or three municipalities, last year, but let the cattle die, what you would have done if you had been in our place I hate to think of. And, Mr. Premier, just let me say this; if you check up, as I have done on the agricultural report of previous years of that depression, you will find that actually there was more crop in most of the years except 1937, in the (what you call) "hungry 30's", than was grown over the western half of the Province of Saskatchewan, this year. Those plans bore fruit, and you are the men who are getting the benefits; and I just wish you had your nose rubbed in the relief and feed problems that the Patterson Government had theirs in. It would have been better for this Province. You would have had the Province starving to death just as you starved that fellow's steers down at Gravelbourg.

Premier: — Don't think half of them were not starving to death.

March 8, 1948

Mr. Procter: — Well, I am telling you today as a result of these steps we have taken, you never hear relief or feed or any of those things mentioned, and that is the work of the Patterson Government along with the Dominion Government — the thing you refer to as the 'do nothing' Government. They did more in one year for the people of this Province in real benefits than your Government has done in the whole of its term.

I want also to clear the record — probably my last speech, and at the risk of tiring the members — I am going to put something on the record about this stuff, Mr. Speaker. I am tired to death of hearing this Opposition described as being the representatives of the 'big interests', of being men 'born with a silver spoon in their mouth', as being the them men 'of the ruling classes'. I am going to give you a short sketch of the five of us. On my right the hon. Leader of the Opposition, the member for Cannington, born, son of a section foreman of Grenfell. His first job was herding cattle at \$5 a month and raised himself to where he was Premier of this Province. On my left, the member for Arm River, son of a Swedish immigrant who landed in this province with \$17 in his pocket and worked for years as a hired man until he was finally able to afford a quarter section; now a member of parliament. Behind me, the member for Athabaska, born on a homestead, a Metis, up near Duck Lake, and now member for Athabaska. On the other side of him, the member for Rosthern, son of a Dutch Immigrant who came here from Russia, a Mennonite, and worked as a hired man. His father worked on a farm to acquire a homestead. Then there is myself. My father came out here in 1879 and homesteaded on a quarter-section of land that was not worth a hoot, 35 miles to Winnipeg before the C.P.R. was built across this country; and I never owned an overcoat longer than a mackinaw in my life till I went to college. I heard the hon. gentleman from Notukeu-Willowbunch talking about the difficulties of this doctor that, if he were married, he would have some \$82 to put himself through medical college. From the day I received \$25 a month as a law student, I never received another dollar towards the assistance of my law education. I camped in a tent out at Elm Park. A fine group of representatives of the 'big interests' with silver spoons in our mouths; a fine bunch of representatives of the ruling classes. That is a short thumbnail sketch of the five of us. You know, Mr. Speaker, there is not very much wrong with a political economy of a country that such men as we become members of this Legislature; one of us, the barefoot boy herding cattle, Premier of this Province for years, and all of us

sitting here elected by our constituents. The Premier said the other day, "a man cannot escape the influence of his background", and that is one of the few times the Premier and I were in agreement. What kind of a background is that to be tabbed by theme hon. gentlemen opposite as representatives of the 'big interests', born with silver spoons in our mouths. Why, some of us did not have spoons at all.

I know what some of the "big interests" have said to me when I was getting some of this legislation through for private security. They said to me, "Why the C.C.F. cannot be any worse then you are anyway". That is what they said to me. That is the kind of representative I was.

Now that they have said all these things about my party, I am going to say something about the C.C.F., and I hope they will like it.

I want to tell them that they consist of two groups; one group is Communist, and one group is no more Socialist then I am, and I can point out in this House the representatives of the two groups without the least difficulty.

Mr. H.O. Hansen (Wilkie): — Can you name one of the Communist members?

Mr. Procter: — Well if you want it, I think you are one. And I will tell you something else: there is more than that; they were reported on by the Mounted Police when the Communist party was illegal. If you want to check the files in the Attorney-General's Department, you have it right in your teeth. What about your seat-mate?

Mr. J. Gibson (Morse): — May I ask the hon. member a question: He was talking, a few moments ago, about what groups they represented, and was trying to draw a picture of his background. Would the hon. member tell me what group his Government was representing when they sent the collectors out to the municipalities in the Province, when wheat was selling at 50 cents a bushel, and had this collector suggest to municipalities that they collect for the 1938 seed on the first five-bushel quota?

Mr. Procter: — The group we were representing were all the people of the Province of Saskatchewan, and when that seed grain was cancelled these little groups were drawing \$35, \$45, to \$50 a month. The farmers down at Assiniboia threshed 32,000 bushels of flax in one year, and got \$2,000 of seed grain cancelled. Don't talk to me about that stuff; I

March 8, 1948

know more about it than you do.

I am going on, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to talk to the Communist part of this group, but the farmers and workers, and my friend here asked for it because I could not have said that unless he had asked for it. They have partaken of the black mass and they have sold their souls to the evil one. As far as they are concerned they follow the party lines to destruction and it means destruction in this country just the same as it meant destruction in Rumania, in Yugoslavia, in Czechoslovakia. I want to say, there is never a time there is not hope for redemption for a man and they can follow the steps of Hlagdun and get back into where we can respect them. But I do want to say a word or two to the other men, the group who think they can hide behind the name they call the themselves, "Democratic Socialists!"

For them there is yet time to repent. Some of those gentlemen got into this party because there was a wave and they wanted political preferment. Some of them thought they were getting benefits of one kind and another; some honestly believed that in Social Democracy, they could do something beyond what has been done by others . . .

Premier: — On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, not for myself but for the other members of the House, I am sure the hon. member knows he cannot impute motives, and he cannot suggest that any member joined a political party because he wanted political preferment any more than I could say my hon. friend joined his party to get judicial preferment.

Mr. Procter: — Well perhaps I used the word member. What I meant was member of a party not a member of the House. Some of these members of the House, I think most members of the House have fairly high ideals whatever group they belong to, except my Communist friends and I do not think they have any ideals at all. I believe everything the member for the Mediterranean Area said about the Communist party, and I associate myself with him in those remarks, but I am talking to these other gentlemen in the C.C.F. party who call themselves Social Democrats and who, heretofore, have worked on this idea that there was some kind of new philosophy that could improve on all the old philosophies. I just ask those gentlemen to consider what has been the history of these Democratic Socialists wherever they have been tied up with the Communists in all these other countries. We have now it. They tried to work with the Communists in Rumania; and what happened; they tried to work with the Communists

in Yugoslavia, what happened? What is happening in Italy, France, Bulgaria and all these countries? There is only one thing that can happen there and this is that in the end they are swallowed up by those more ruthless men who govern that other end of their country and I ask, and the time is coning in this country, as it has come in these European countries, where each one of us has got to re-examine his soul and his ideas. I ask these members to do that; to see where they are going. Are they going to discard everything this country built up over the years, the scheme that made men like myself and my colleagues here able to come to this Parliament to represent our people, able to hold any office in the gift of its people, for the kind of thing that is happening today in Czechoslovakia? If those men have no consideration for themselves, have you no consideration for your families and the little children that are growing up?

I think you will gather, Mr. Speaker, I am not supporting the Budget.

Mr. D.S. Valleau (A.S.V.R.): — I would like to ask the hon. member — he was dealing with the Social Democratic philosophy — whether he would include in his remarks men like Ernest Bevin and Clement Attlee?

Mr. Procter: — Well, Mr. Speaker, as far as Ernest Bevin and Clement Attlee are concerned, they are up against exactly the same problem that the better type of men I have been speaking to in the C.C.F. party are up against. You may have noticed in the paper the other day where they said "The time has come where the Labour party is going to take a stand and we are going to kick these Communists out before they swallow us up". My hon. friend, the member for the European Area had better look to his position mighty quick and kick these other fellows out, or else he will be swallowed up along with the others.

The Debate, on motion of Premier Douglas, adjourned.