

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN

FIFTH SESSION — TENTH LEGISLATURE

Friday, March 12, 1948.

The House resumed at 3 o'clock

BUDGET DEBATE

The House resumed from Thursday, March 11, 1948, the adjourned debate on the Motion of Hon. C. M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair (the House to go into Committee of Supply).

Mr. D. M. Lazorko (Redberry): — In rising to take part in this Debate I want to first congratulate the Hon. Provincial Treasurer on the excellent Budget brought down to this Legislature; a Budget of increased social services and a higher standard of living for the people of this province. We, in this Legislature, have heard considerable criticism of this Budget, saying that it is too large. My only criticism of the Budget is that it is not large enough to provide all the services and development so necessary for all of the people in this province.

In Redberry, and the northwest portion of the province in general, we had an almost total crop failure, this year, and the assistance given by this Government, through the Department of Agriculture, to the people in this area of crop failure, has been of great help to all the people there. But the decontrol of coarse grain prices has hit this area harder than anything else during the past year, and it has almost virtually crippled hog production. Mr. Tucker, speaking in Radisson, October 30, 1947, referring to decontrol said: "I am certainly very sorry for the people who have to buy feed". I believe the people of Redberry and the surrounding area will be glad to know Mr. Tucker's attitude in this respect. Speaking at the same meeting, Mr. Tucker spoke at considerable length to the audience of the 'racketeering' going on today under the administration of this Government. Well, Mr. Speaker, 'that isn't the way I heard it'. I think we all heard something about the 'racketeering' here, several days ago. I believe it is only the first spark of the fuse that was lit, and I want to say 'let us wait until the bomb explodes'. Those 'racket chickens are certainly beginning to come home to roost' now; and they remind me of the roosters who, after having a good give and take fight retire to some corner of the farmyard and stand there dejected, red faced, and with drooping tails.

Instead of racketeering, I have found development and increased social services in my constituency, and in the rest of the province. When we take a look at the power picture in Redberry, we find that the branch line from Saskatoon to Radisson has been completed to Battleford, and that many farm homes along this line have been hooked up for service. Another project from Blaine Lake through the towns of Krydor, Hafford, Richard, Speers and on to Denholm will be completed not later than 1950. This project, which

March 12, 1948

should have been completed sooner, was set back because of the necessary development work at Unity, and the necessity to 'tie in' the generating facilities at Unity to North Battleford, Saskatoon and Rosetown, which would 'tie in' with the whole provincial power set-up.

We have a rural electrification project under consideration at the present time, in the southern part of our constituency. When we look at the record of the Power Commission, and at the power picture in the province, in general, we find that in 1947 we had a total of 45,000 services in the province. We heard considerably about this here in the Legislature, yesterday. Taking away the 22,489 subscribers that were bought with the Prairie Power Company, Dominion Electric Power Limited, and Canadian Utilities, we find the net Power Commission services in the province were 22,598, including 430 rural subscribers. In 1944 we had a total of 12,989 subscribers; that is a net increase of services of 9,609 from 1944. In 1946 alone we put on more new services in this province than was put on between the years 1931 and 1941. And that is a record that any government can be proud of.

Mr. Tucker, speaking at the same meeting that I mentioned before, said that when a Liberal government is elected in Saskatchewan they will pay an Old Age Pension of \$40, and reduce the age limit from 70 to 65. Mr. Speaker, in the very near future we will be paying \$35 per month for Old Age Pensions, which will be our share of a \$50 pension; and I believe that Mr. Tucker could not be in a better position than he is at the present time to bring it up, not only to \$40 but to \$50, and reduce the age limit to 65.

Speaking on health, he said that the Liberal government will put into operation an approved scheme, of which the Federal Government will contribute 60 per cent and the province 20 per cent and the municipalities 10 per cent. I think the municipalities in the province will be interested to know that they will be required to pay, under a Liberal administration, \$2,000,000, which will be almost, or more, than five times the total equalization grants they are receiving at the present time. But, Mr. Tucker forgot to tell us who is going to pay the other 10 per cent.

When you look at the health question, in general, we find that Old Age Pensions, Mothers' Allowances and Social Aids have been considerably increased from 1944 — in some instances almost doubled. We have also instituted an Ambulance Air Service which has saved hundreds of lives in this province. This Government has also been giving construction grants to municipalities to help them build hospitals.

We have heard so much about this Budget being too large, I would ask where a Liberal government would cut services to reduce the Budget. If any one of these to be curtailed, the people of Redberry would be very interested to know, and I think the rest of the people would also be interested to know.

In Hafford we had a thirty-bed hospital opened with the assistance of this Government. We had a ten-bed hospital built in Borden with the assistance of this Government. The people of Hafford and Borden, and other areas of the province, where they have no hospital facilities at the present time, are interested to know if a Liberal government, endeavouring to reduce the Budget, would cut these grants that the present Government has been giving.

In the Borden hospital, which the Government has helped to build financially, my child was not the only child which was brought into this world, and by a refugee doctor. I have met a good many refugee doctors in this province, and I am glad to say that I have watched them in their work, and have become acquainted with a good many of them, and I find that they set bones, heal sores, alleviate pain the same as any other qualified doctor of this, or any other land; though their work, having been much more closely associated with misery, suffering and destitution, in the lands they come from. The Saskatchewan College of Physicians and Surgeons believe they have a fight on their hands with Premier Douglas and Dr. Rosenfeld: if the medical profession has a fight on its hands, I say, it is not with the Premier and his staff; it is a fight with the people of this province, who buy their bread and butter. Members of the medical profession are no saints in a sacred guild, as in ancient times; they are members of a modern democratic society, and should take their place, as such, in this society of ours.

The hon. member for Moosomin, was reported in the Leader-Post, on March 9, to have said the following words: "We" (I presume he means the last Liberal government) "have adjusted the financial relations between the municipalities and the province". I took the trouble to look over the adjustments with the municipalities, wholly or partially, in the constituency of Redberry.

Mr. A. T. Procter (Moosomin): — That is not a correct statement. I said "we on our part undertook that we would adjust the relations".

Mr. Lazorko: — Well, Mr. Speaker, that is not the way I read it in the paper. What I was going to say is: on looking over the seed, feed and relief question, we found no adjustments to any municipality north of the North Saskatchewan. There were some adjustments which, I think, the people of this House, and the people of Redberry, will be very glad to know of. In 1937 these municipalities received total market road grants of \$947; in 1938 — \$5,252; and I believe we had an election that year; 1939 — the grand sum of \$131; 1940 — \$754; 1941 — a big 'goose egg'; 1942, four years after the last election — \$2,825; 1943 — \$2,622; 1944 — \$8,715. Our Government has given to these same municipalities; 1945 — \$4,000; 1946 — \$7,973; 1947 — an authorized equalization grant of \$14,050, which will be the same, I believe, for 1948, if not possibly greater.

March 12, 1948

Mr. G. Herman Danielson (Arm River): — What about the fellow who did not get anything? You got his money.

Mr. Lazorko: — The picture of the highways in Redberry is much the same. In 1938 and 1939 we had 26½ miles of highway constructed; in 1941 we had 12 miles of highway gravelled; there was nothing more done under the Liberal government. Since we took over, we have constructed 11½ miles of highways; constructed 12 miles of secondary highways; and reconstructed 36½ miles of highways, a total of 60 miles. We have graveled 48½ miles, and regravelled 1½ miles, making a total of 50 miles of gravelling.

When we look at the educational picture we find that schools received a total, in equalization grants, the last year of the Liberal administration of \$27,636; these same units, now included in the units of Saskatoon West, Blaine Lake, North Battleford and Medstead, last year received \$185,759. That, Mr. Speaker, is besides the repairs and special building grants that some of the municipalities, or units, received, that I mentioned before.

When we look at the insurance field, we find that the Government has received tremendous support in the insurance business from our constituency. Further, on The Automobile Insurance Act, I believe the people of Redberry will be interested to know, that we have received, in the benefits to Redberry alone, over \$12,000; where under the Liberal administration there was no such insurance before. I want to say here that there are several families, where death occurred due to accidents, which would have been destitute under a Liberal administration, which, today, are very well provided for.

We have received bus service. On No. 40 we have a daily bus service each way, including Sunday, between North Battleford and Prince Albert. On No. 5 we have, daily, each way, including Sunday, both Government and Greyhound.

When the Opposition say that the Budget is too large, I wonder if we can get an answer from them, as the people of Redberry would certainly like to know, if, in their endeavour to reduce the Budget, they would cut the grants to municipalities for road building; whether they would cut the grants to our schools; whether they would cut the appropriations on the building of highways, or whether they would endeavour to take the bus service out from our constituency.

Members of legislatures, and the Parliament, in the past, have coasted into provincial and federal seats on promises of railways, highways, bridges, relief, jobs and many other promises of less concern. We have had, in our constituency, year in and year out, every time the election came around, a promise of railways, and also of highways. I believe the people of Redberry, and the people of Shellbrook, will be glad to know that construction work will begin on a connecting road between No. 40 and No. 12 this year.

We have also had some work done on a highway connection between highway No. 40 and No. 55, last year, which is to be continued this year. Also I believe we will have location work done on a connection between No. 40 and No. 5 which will, when completed, give a short and direct route for people all the way down from Big River, Spiritwood, all the way down to Saskatoon; and it is reasonable to expect that when these roads are completed these same people will receive bus service also. I would like to know, and the people back home would certainly like to know, if a Liberal government intended to curtail highway expenditure.

This year, we are having money set aside to provide recreational facilities on the west side of Redberry Lake, where we will eventually have a summer resort. If the connection between No. 40 and No. 5 is located and built reasonably close to this resort, it will make this resort available to all the people in the surrounding area; right down from Battleford, Prince Albert and Saskatoon. In this lake we have whitefish, as mentioned on many other occasions before; we also have pickerel. We can have good boating and fishing on this lake. We have good grounds for cottages; we have good grounds for different kinds of recreation and sports; and we have grounds where we can make a golf course that will be second to none in this province.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, we come to the fish. This year we took out from Redberry 60,000 pounds of grade "A" whitefish. The regulations, as far as the limit from where the fishermen can come in to fish, set at 20 miles this year, the yardage used in nets, and licences and everything else, was not set by the Department, but was set at a public meeting by the fishermen from around Redberry Lake, this fall, in Hafford.

Having been up at Meadow Lake, this fall, I heard a very interesting conversation. I was given to understand that a certain Mr. Clark, who had fished on a very large scale in the Meadow Lake area, this fall, decided to move up to Lake Athabaska. In the home where I was, father and son were discussing the son's departure with Mr. Clark. The father said to the boy, "Now, son, will you come back broke and in the hole, as usual, from these fishing expeditions?" The son answered, "No, Dad, not this time; one lesson is enough. That is why I am getting enough provisions, clothes and everything else, now, and taking enough money with me so that when I come back in the spring I will receive my cheque for my work in full".

I received a letter, a few days ago, from one of my constituents who spent nine years in the North — and I do not mean Regina Beach or Saskatoon; I mean the north end of the province. He knew, personally, and very well, Len Waite and his father, Dick Hall, Jules Marion, Alex MacDonald, Dave Overly, Geo. B. Rizer; and many others. He say a good many teams go in from the Central part of this province, from around Wynyard, Kandahar, Elfros, and he saw these teams come out of the North in the spring, each horse having at least half a dozen gunnysacks stuck under their collars, so that these horses would not crawl through their collars, and leave behind the collars, harness, the teamsters, and their profits.

Mr. Speaker, I want to quote part of the letter: "I was listening to a broadcast from Regina, on March 3 last, when the member for Ile à la Crosse caused me to have a great feeling of disappointment. I was very much upset by what I took to be an authentic report from that member, and when you have read this letter, you will probably see why I was disturbed. I spent nine winters there — that was about the second winter of the fishing in that part of the country, as far as I know. In those years I knew every point, every bay and every fishing camp and the owners of same, on the following lakes: Dore, la Plonge, Smoothstone, and I also know every bend in the road from Big River to Cheecham on the Alberta Waterways railhead. I would like to say that I do not remember whitefish at more than four cents on the ice, and down, and, furthermore, not ten per cent of the fishermen got anything like that; and really got a satisfactory settlement when they came out in the spring. I have seen more than one, eight to ten-team swings, come in in the fall with rings, tassels and bells on; they were the pick of teams, but, with very few exceptions, when they went out in the spring they looked, for all the world, like the picture of Napoleon's retreat from Moscow. That was not all; when they came to settle for their winter's work they heard those famous last words 'you are in the hole'. There was still an outlet for these teamsters; there were three things they could do — sell the team, drive home, or send home for money to get out on. I have many good friends there, men whose names are legendary; I was very proud to know them — men like John Coleman. J. D. Derossier of the Hudson Bay Company, Alex Laliberte of Bowville, Narcisse Morasity of Sled Lake, Jim Cummings of Buffalo River, and not forgetting D. Symons, lately deceased, of Flin Flon. As I listened to the broadcast, which I recently mentioned, I thought it could be possible that the sitting member of Ile à la Crosse might have been too young to know the ins and outs of that great North country in those first years. I mean that he never knew it the way we knew it 35 years ago. I hope that nobody has occasion to find too much fault with the present set-up, or to praise the old system as we old freighters knew it.

"I would like to say, too, that through want of knowledge people criticize. To me this criticism contains a certain ingredient to which I am allergic — it is about the same as the formula used by the natives in the North to stop them from sticking to the ice in cold weather; anybody from the far North can give you any information you need about that."

Mr. W. J. Patterson (Cannington): — Who signed that letter?

Mr. Lazorko: — Mr. Speaker, I take the responsibility for quoting this letter from a constituent whom I have known for the best part of my life.

Mr. Tucker, speaking at Radisson, October 30, as I mentioned before, toward the end of his speech said these words: "We" (I presume a Liberal government if elected here) "would ask fellow Canadians to come and develop the North and guarantee not to take them over". We have heard just a sample of the development that has been going on in the North.

Further, I believe a good many people will remember different concerns, possibly including Winton Bros., who had the privilege of clearing out some of the best timber in Prince Albert area and Big River, and when they best of it was gone, sold out and went elsewhere to spend the proceeds that they earned in this part of the province.

The hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. A. T. Procter) was reported in the Leader-Post on March 9, to have said the following words: “‘Guinea pigs’ of the Government Socialistic experiments have been the industries of the North”. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that if they had been ‘guinea pigs’ in an endeavour by this Government to provide permanency of employment for the people of the North, and a permanent year income, and in an endeavour to raise the standard of health and education and life itself, for those people, I have no quarrel with it. I think it is far more humane and Christian than traffic in vanilla and lemon extract.

We have heard a lot about Communism. I want, in passing, to say a few words on this myself. First of all, statesmen did not prevent the downfall and abolition of the divine right of kings of the feudal age, and certainly they will not prevent the downfall and abolition of capitalism. The teeming millions in Asia, the East Indies, Africa and the rest of the world are today stirring, and will sweep, eventually, into oblivion Chiang Kai-shek’s Dutch oil barons, the colonial empires of the dark continent and all their accessories. I am glad to say that the British are today taking a different attitude — they are not holding their colonies by force of arms but are building a commonwealth of nations by extending independence and self-government to their once colonial people, which is the basis of the principle of the brotherhood of man. I want to add that neither bayonets or even atom bombs hold back Communism, but that independent self-government, and democratic rights to all people certainly will. Social democratic nations today are the only strong bulwark against Communism, and they will be the only guarantee of world peace in the future. I believe that eventually they will bring the dawn of a new day and age, — an age of security for all people; an age of freedom for all people, and an age of happiness for all the people of the world.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to quote a verse which expresses my feelings, and my beliefs, far better than I can myself:

“I would like to know,
 when life is done,
 That I had filled a needed post;
 That here and there
 I paid my fare
 With more than idle
 talk and boasts;
 That I had taken gifts divine —
 The breath of life
 in manhood time —
 And tried to use them,
 now and then,
 In service of my fellow men.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the Motion.

March 12, 1948

Hon. John W. Corman, K. C. (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, as I have the opportunity of talking to the good people of Saskatchewan over the air, every Friday night, I have not asked for any of the Legislature's radio time and I intend to detain you only for a few moments.

My friend, (and I mean it) the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) has the distinction of having made the longest speech in the House. I, for one, Mr. Speaker, always enjoy listening to him. He has, however, set such a record for verbosity — and I use the word in the kindest sense — that should stand for some time, if not for all time. If one is to gain distinction in this House, in the face of that record, it can only be done by going to the other extreme, and, for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I intend today to make the shortest Budget speech in history.

There has been only one reference to myself, or to my Department, that, in my opinion, calls for explanation or clarification. The hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. A.T. Procter) said there were reports in the Attorney General's office from the R.C.M.P. on the political activities of some members of this House. I wish to state that such reports were asked for, and obtained, before I took office: and I further wish to say that there are no reports even suggesting that any member of this House was, or is, a Communist. I want to further say — and I say this, Mr. Speaker, definitely and without reservation — that I have not used, nor will I ever permit, the police under my control to use their facilities to spy on either friend or foe.

I will, Mr. Speaker, support the Budget.

Hon. Woodrow S. Lloyd (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this Debate with no small amount of pride — pride because of association with the Government and the Provincial Treasurer, that has been able to place before this House, this year again, the record of achievement such as it has, and a record of promised performance for the following year. I rise with pride for at least one other reason, Mr. Speaker, and that is pride at being a member of a group which has, as recently as last evening, Sir, provoked such an attack as it did, from such a source as it did.

Most of my remarks I intend to direct to the address given last evening in this House by the hon. member for the Mediterranean Area, (Mr. A. W. Embury) that self-styled 'humble' solider — a bit arrogant and overbearing perhaps, Mr. Speaker, for a humble person, but, nevertheless, that self-styled humble person, with the little moustache and the big voice. He rather strikes me as a person who might like everybody to wear moustaches because he wears a moustache.

He has been reported as having said, in a previous Debate in the House, that he called on all decent people to agree with him. Last evening, he suggested that it was not possible for any reasonable-minded person to disagree with him. It seems rather a sweeping statement, Mr. Speaker, for a self-styled 'humble' person to make. Yet, it is not long ago that

other groups, similar in composition to this group, were being similarly attacked by other people in other countries. It is not long ago that similar groups such as this, made up of labour union leaders, leaders of co-operative movements and Socialists, found themselves the first to be honoured with the attentions of Mr. Hitler and his associates. They were the first to be honoured by being placed in the concentration camps, and the first to be honoured by having the greatest percentage of their group liquidated.

It is not so many years ago, Mr. Speaker, that the benevolent industrialists, of whom the hon. member seems to be much in favour, were providing millions of dollars to back Adolf Hitler and his Nazi regime, in order to save free enterprise in Germany. They didn't call it free enterprises; I suppose they still called it monopolistic capitalism in those days. I would not like, in saying that, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that the hon. member for the Mediterranean Area is deliberately backing a Fascist movement; but, using his own terminology, I would say — as he said to us — that he is one of the poor, misguided people who, out of his lack of understanding, is certainly assisting.

To return for a moment to this reference of the 'humble' person to all decent people, I should like to read a column entitled 'I Wonder', which appears in the Kindersley "Clarion", under dateline February 26, 1948, which has this to say: "I wonder what is meant by 'decent' people. I wonder if the member of the Saskatchewan Legislature for the Mediterranean, who also happens to be the president of the Saskatchewan Command of the Canadian Legion, was acting decently when he attributed indecency to anyone in Saskatchewan who did not unite to turn the present Saskatchewan Government out of office. I wonder if a greater insult was ever offered to a greater number of people than this insinuation. I wonder if the said member (Mr. Embury) realized that the people of the province elected the present Government, while turning 'thumbs' down on the Conservative Party which he, apparently, considers himself to be representing, although elected as a soldier member. I wonder if this man realizes that two-thirds of the soldier vote was polled in favour of Socialism, and that he handed a gratuitous insult to these lads, as well as to thousands of First War veterans, when he made the statement that all decent people of Saskatchewan should unite to turn out the present Government. I wonder if this member considers himself more decent than the Premier, Mr. Douglas, or the Speaker, or the 50 odd Ministers and members who represent the people in the present Legislature. I wonder if it would be very difficult for most people of even middle age to recall actions of the two parties, whom Mr. Embury would apparently like to unite, that could not, under any circumstances, be referred to as 'decent'. I wonder if it is decent of a man, who is president of a strictly non-political organization, to bring the matter of a petitioner's political belief into question when asked for his organization's support in a matter of such vital interest as an attempt to reduce the cost of living. If some of us could forget our biased opinions, and try to see the other fellow's point of view, occasionally, would it not go a long way toward peace and amity in this old word? I wonder!"

March 12, 1948

Mr. Embury: — Who is the author?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — He has had some criticism . . .

Mr. Embury: — I asked who the author is.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — I do not know. I merely stated that I was reading from the 'Kindersley Clarion' under 'I Wonder', February 26, 1948.

Hon. G. H. Danielson (Arm River): — Is it an editorial?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — No, I did not say it was an editorial. I said it was written in a newspaper.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Embury: — Do you take the responsibility for it?

Voice: — Who is the editor?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Well, it is published in the paper, Mr. Speaker, and I think there is no need for me to take the responsibility for any reading.

Mr. A. T. Procter (Moosomin): — Surely, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, we are entitled to know whether it is a letter, an editorial, or what it is.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly willing to table it. I have stated it is not an editorial. It is an article in the paper.

Mr. Embury: — You were talking about order!

Mr. Speaker: — There is no point of order there. Every member in this House has been quoting, quoting, quoting ad infinitum.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, that is contrary to what was ruled in my case.

Mr. Speaker: — If I had ruled in your case you would have a stack that high.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, I proved the source of my quotations — every one of them.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member gave us, as I understand it under the rules of this House, the periodical and date. I have never heard anyone suggest before that they should give the author.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — The hon. member for the Mediterranean (Mr. A. W. Embury) had some criticism of this Co-operative Commonwealth Federation group — and I do wish he would study the name, Mr. Speaker — because we had published a manifesto. I can understand that it might be a bit of a shock to his humble, nervous system to realize that here is a political party which honestly puts before the people the basis of their program. I fail to see anything very dishonest about that. On the contrary, it seems to me the honest sort of thing to do. The Regina Manifesto has been in wide circulation for a considerable number of years, and the people of the province have had ample opportunity to study it.

In the course of his words, last night, the hon. member began to describe to the members of the House why it was that he had changed his opinion with regard to this Movement. Dealing with some of the things which he said had caused him to change that opinion, he had reference to the Larger School Units. He suggested that the aim of the Larger School Unit was, not to improve educational facilities, but purely to enable the government, through the Department of Education, to more closely control what was being taught, and how it was being taught, in the schools. Well, Mr. Speaker, there is only one remark to make to a statement like that, and that is ‘Phooey’ — with a capital ‘Puff’!

If we had wanted to control the schools completely, then the organization of Larger School Units would have been about the last thing we would have wanted to do, because in the development of the Larger Unit, in addition to giving educational improvements, we also strengthened the teachers’ organization in this province, and we have strengthened the trustees’ organization in this province, and we have, as I say, strengthened the whole educational situation. Those are not things that people do when they want to get control over institutions. That action, in strengthening organizations — functional organizations — throughout the country, is consistent with the action of the government in other cases. This government has acted to increase the strength of labour unions throughout the province; it has acted to increase the strength of the Co-operative Movement throughout this province; it has acted to increase the strength of the farmers’ educational organization in this province — and we did so quite deliberately. May I say to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, that the strength of organizations such as these is the strength of democracy. It is organizations such as these that provide the real bulwarks of democracy.

In further reference to this matter of wanting to get control, I wanted to ask him a question about this, yesterday, but he wasn’t answering questions. The question was this: When the Government of Alberta decided to organize their province into Larger Units, did they do so just for the sake of getting control? When the Government of British Columbia organized the entire province into Larger Units, did they do so just for

the sake of getting control of it? It seems to me those are questions which the hon. member, if he is honest, would have to answer by saying 'yes', and yet the reasonable person will know that was not the reason. We have established the Units here as in the other provinces. The Units in this province, under our legislation, have the opportunity to vote themselves out, if they so wish. They have not that opportunity under the legislation in Alberta or in British Columbia.

The Unit idea was not our idea, Mr. Speaker. It was in effect for a great many years in older countries — England and Scotland and other parts of the British Commonwealth, and in other parts of Canada — before this Party came into power. It is interesting to note, in the first Larger Unit in Canada, organized in the Peace River area in British Columbia, it was set up without a vote and without a School Board, by a Liberal government. The Administrator was appointed by the government, and he did and conducted the entire business of that particular area. When the Province of British Columbia moved again, just a year or two ago, to complete the organization of the province, they did so entirely by legislation, at one fall swoop. We might quote differences in other provinces. Down in New Brunswick, for instance, where they have a number of Larger Units at the present time, they have a Board of seven members. Four of those members are elected by the people residing in those areas; the other three members are appointed by the government of the province — by a Liberal government. Now, I do not know whether they want to control them or not, but that is what is going on in that particular province.

It seems to me we must look at this matter of Larger Units in a much broader way. Democracy has certain positive postulates, and among those I think we would have to include at least these three: first, a willingness to share both our strengths and our weaknesses with other people for the good of all; secondly, the willingness to provide maximum opportunities; thirdly, the willingness to do all we can to take care of our children. The Larger Unit inculcates those principles — it is a matter of sharing responsibilities and sharing of strengths. It is a matter of making for more equitable opportunities. It is a means of providing better educational care for the children of this province.

The hon. member had some reference to Section 77. When I tried to correct his interpretation of it, he said, in his usual humble way, that he would show us up. Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to read it to the House. His inference was, that by means of this Section the Minister of Education could appoint a supervisor or superintendent or something and take complete charge of the affairs in the Unit. He had some reference to the hon. member for Moosomin arguing this when the Bill was passed. I do not recall that particular feature of it — he may have; but I want to read Section 72 of The Larger Units Act, and The Larger Units Act was

originally passed in this House by the previous administration. Now, Section 27 of that Act is the same as Section 77 of the present Act, with the exception that in the present Act the word “unit” is used instead of the words “school division”; and it says this:

“(1) Upon the establishment of a school division the minister shall appoint a superintendent of schools for the division and shall assign him his duties” — which is what the minister does in every area in the province, whether it is a Larger School Unit or not, and which is what ministers of have been doing, I presume, ever since we have had Ministers of Education in this province.

“(2) The superintendent shall exercise general supervision over all schools and teachers in the division and over the work of the secretary treasurer and office of the divisional board. He shall confer with the divisional board in matters pertaining to education in the division and shall advise the board thereon, and shall attend all meetings of the divisional board”. This, Mr. Speaker, is the ‘iniquitous’ section which was put in there to enable us to control the destinies of the school children of the province.

My hon. friend is a lawyer. I don’t know just how much confidence I would want to put in his legal interpretation, if he interprets other statues as he willfully interpreted this one, last night. I would like to point this out, that there always has been power in the School Act whereby the Minister could appoint official trustees, and a number of these official trustees were from time to time appointed. It has been the general practice of the Department — the only practice it could follow, probably — to appoint is superintendent as an official trustee. We have been gradually getting away from that by appointing the sub-unit trustee or some person in the district.

As another indication, to show how we are getting away from departmental control of the schools, I make this reference: in 1943 there were 46 so-called supervisors in school districts. Under another section of the Act, the Minister may appoint ‘supervisors’ who can take charge of school districts’ financial affairs — cheques have to be signed by him, and so on. In 1943, there were 46 of such. To-day we have decreased that to eight. We are, as I say, getting away from the idea of controlling schools directly.

Another one of his arguments was that everything that could be accomplished by the Unit could have been accomplished by individual districts. Well, I think the logical response to that, Mr. Speaker, is — if that is true, why don’t the individual districts do it? The answer to that is fairly simple. It is not any reflection on the people in those districts; it is

not any reflection, as has been suggested, on the school boards of those districts. Most of the school boards of the local districts have done a fine work; and Heaven knows, Mr. Speaker, that keeping a school going in this province under a Liberal administration, they deserve medals! The fact is, they have not the machinery to provide these services which they would like to provide. Well, if the hon. member does not want to take my word for it — and I quite appreciate the fact that he won't — then he might ask himself why did the other provinces take this step. He might go to any Department of Education in the Dominion of Canada; he might go to the University, or a hundred and one other places, and find good, adequate answers. But, if he is so sure of it, then I suggest that he has some duty to tell us how it could be done — how, for example, could the rural school districts, acting individually, have a salary schedule for teachers? How do they go about providing facilities for rural high school students — doing things such as has happened up in the Kindersley Larger Unit, where the town happens to be a part of the Unit, and where, collectively, they have been able to add some five rooms to their present high school plan — rooms which will provide a diversified high school education for not only the students of the town, but the students of the country around — and are in the process of providing a dormitory which will accommodate some ninety students! How do the individual rural districts go about doing that?

How do they go about taking the action they have taken at Humboldt, where, by virtue of an agreement between the unit and the town a similar program is in the process except that there is no dormitory? In this particular case the Unit, may I say, is providing some \$6,000 towards the capital cost, and that is one reason why the taxes may be up a bit. Or, how do they go about doing what they are doing down in Weyburn where, by virtue of agreement, the Larger Unit of Weyburn and the city are coming to provide vocational facilities for the students of that city and that part of the country? Reference was made to the fact that the Weyburn tax rate was some seventeen mills. One of the reasons for that is this: the Weyburn Unit is paying some \$16,250 toward the provision of these facilities for their students — they are paying for them — they are not going to be carrying a burden of debt for the next ten years in regard to it.

How could the rural districts, operating individually, provide central library service, or one library service, or circulating library services? How could they provide a helping teacher to assist those schools in which there were considerable problems for inexperienced teachers? How would they make their area a 'promotion area' for teachers? How would they go about purchasing supplies in bulk, and consequently getting a saving? How would they go about paying for their buildings as they go, without going into large debenture costs?

The reference was made to the matter of increased costs. It is granted — I have said it before — that there have been increases in educational expenditure. I have never argued that the Larger Unit would decrease the expenditure — I have argued that it is essential that we increase educational expenditure; but two points I do argue: I argue, first of all, that there has not been an increase in all parts of the province, as the hon. member stated last night, and as he was supported in saying by some of the members who sit to his right; secondly, I argue this — that the great mass of that increase is not simply because the area is organized as Larger Unit. Total expenditures are higher — yes, considerably higher — and one reason, as I said before, is the increased cost of all things that must be bought; and my hon. friend, when he supports the free enterprise system, when he supports the removal of price ceilings, is contributing to those increased costs. Increased teachers' salaries have caused a considerable increase in expenditures.

I received a Trustees' Association bulletin this morning, in which there was a report from the Larger Unit of Kindersley, and they pointed out that the increase in salaries in that area since 1945, the first year of the Unit, amounted to some 40 per cent. Now, they had increased in 1945 over the year previous, before the Unit was an organization; but since the Unit has gone into operation their salaries have increased forty per cent. That is a pretty legitimate reason for increased costs. The tremendous building program that has had to be undertaken is another reason.

Of course, there are many districts in which there has been a considerable increase in cost, and these are the districts in the Units whose assessment is higher than the average assessment of other districts in that particular area. I do not know whether my hon. friend objects to that or not. I think it might be pointed out that he, himself, lives in, and enjoys the privileges of, a Larger Unit of School Administration. His youngster goes to Lakeview School, the same school to which my youngsters go. Now, Mr. Speaker, if we could organize a school district whose sole responsibility it was to operate Lakeview School with the property adjacent to it, I am quite certain that we could operate that school for a mill rate considerably less than what we are now paying in the City of Regina; but, on the other hand, the people who live over in the Imperial district would have a much higher mill rate than they now have. Ours would be particularly lower, if the people who live in the vicinity of Central Collegiate, kept that collegiate operating and we could send our youngsters there for some \$50 in fees. That is what happens when you haven't got a Larger Unit.

Because the hon. members are somewhat chary of accepting my statement, I want to place on the record some statistics, and I have selected three Larger Units, more or less at random — the Larger Units of Hudson Bay Junction, of Biggar, and of Assiniboia. We have in Hudson Bay Junction one of the low assessed Units in the province; in Biggar, a Unit with a medium assessment, and in Assiniboia, one of the more highly assessed Units.

March 12, 1948

When I am discussing these figures, I want to compare the rates that were being paid in 1944 or 1945, before the respective Units were organized, with the rates in 1947; but in comparing those figures I ask that we remember that without the Unit organization there would have been increases in teachers' salaries, increases because of fuel costs, increases because of repair costs, increases in caretaking costs, increases in the cost of supplies — all of which makes operation more expensive.

I think it would be fair, in general, to say that it would take at least three mills more to operate the school to-day than it did in that particular time.

We won't consider what it would cost to build as has been built in these areas, to improve libraries or to provide assistance to high school students or high school facilities. We will waive all those for the time being.

In the Hudson Bay Unit there were, at the time of organization, some fifty-nine districts. Forty-three of those districts had either the same mill rate as they have to-day, or they had, prior to organization, a higher mill rate. Now, those forty-three districts would all require a higher mill rate than that to operate to-day. Six more of these districts were within three mills of the present rate, and their rate, if they were operating to-day, individually, would be at least equal to the Unit rate. In that area, then, forty-nine out of the fifty-nine districts are not paying more because of the Larger Unit organization. A number of those districts are actually paying less. Ten out of the fifty-nine — some of them will be paying more than they would have been, and some may not. The spread, incidentally, in the mill rate at that time, was from seven mills to forty mills; and I submit that if the Larger Unit had done nothing else than to equalize that tax rate, it would still have been worth while.

Turning now to the bigger Unit, in which there are eighty-one districts — twenty-two of these districts had, in 1944, before organization, a mill rate as high as it was in 1947, or higher — twenty-two of them — so all of those twenty-two would have had a higher mill rate to-day. Twenty-three other districts were within three mills of the present rate, and consequently they would have had to-day as high or a higher rate than they now have. In other words, for forty-five of the districts in that Unit, there has been no increase in mill rate because of the Larger Unit, and in a number of those forty-five, there have actually been a decrease — that is, in forty-five out of the seventy-nine. In the other thirty-six, there possibly has been some increase, and in some there certainly has. The spread in that area, Mr. Speaker, was from a mill rate of nothing to a mill of twenty-five. I might just mention here that there has been an increase in salaries alone, in that area, of some \$18,000, which would have required another two mills at least on the area.

The third Unit is that of Assiniboia. Assiniboia is, as I have said, one of the more highly assessed units. It is one of the Units which does not receive any more equalization grant, in whole, than it would if they were operating individually. Out of 114 districts, seventeen of these had the same or a greater mill rate in 1944. Twenty-seven more were within three mills of the present rate; in other words, forty-four out of the 114 show no increase because of the Unit organization; and the spread, in this case, was from a mill rate of nothing to a mill rate of twenty-seven.

Recapitulating that, Mr. Speaker, 138 of the districts in these three typical units show no increase in mill rate because of the Larger Unit, and many of them will show a decrease. 116 of them showed some increase. In other words, more than half of the districts in those three typical Units, from the north, the central and the southern parts of the groups; more than half of them showed a mill rate which is not greater than either it was before or it would have had to be, operating themselves — not considering that they are getting more services than they were, and have had better servicing than in the past.

Now, I hope that the hon. Members will take some cognizance of those figures. They are from the records. They show that the statements they have been making are not made with a knowledge of the circumstances which exist in the schools of this province.

I want to just take, for a moment, one area which is not organized as a Unit — the area lying adjacent to the City of Regina. It is a very highly assessed area; there are 98 districts in that area, 62 of which have a mill rate greater than they had a few years ago. This is the interesting part about it — where in 1944, the range in mill rates in this area was as between one and 18½, the range to-day is between one and 24. You see what happens? Again, it is the district with the light assessment and the high mill rate, that has to increase its mill rate more to pay for its services; and that again is one of the reasons for the Larger Unit.

Mention was made by the hon. and ‘humble’ member for the Mediterranean of the textbook “World of To-day”. I thought he would have taken for granted that the issue was pretty well a dead issue, but he attempted resurrection. I do not want to spend much time on it; but I do want to just repeat again some of the references which indicate, again, how totally incorrect the inferences are which the hon. member is making.

I would point, first of all, to the authors of the textbook, one being an employee of Ryerson Press in the City of Toronto, the same firm which, I believe, prints the educational material for the United Church Publishing Company; the other, a member of the staff of the College of Education in Edmonton, Alberta. I would secondly mention that this text had been in use for some eight years in the province of Alberta, mention that it was accepted by the Educational Council and reviewed by the Educational Council after the attempted attacks on it.

March 12, 1948

I would refer, again, to what the North Battleford teachers had to say about it. I read that they said, according to the 'Leader-Post' last year, and according to the 'Star-Phoenix' of February 22, 1947 — "Textbook neutral — No Reason for Fuss". I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that is sufficient evidence to satisfy most people; and I would suggest that if the hon. member wants further evidence, he can turn to the leaders of the Conservative Party and ask them what they think about it, and I would suggest no very humble person would, in the face of such evidence, insist on continuing it.

I want to make mention, just very briefly, of the cumulative records again, which the hon. member looks upon as a diabolical instrument of a Socialist Government. I refer once again, as I referred last year, to favourable editorial comment in the Saskatoon 'Star-Phoenix', accusing the Regina 'Leader-Post' of playing politics with this. I refer again to the fact that it had been okayed by city superintendents here in the City of Regina, who are not employees of this Government. I would just like to mention, too, the substance of a letter which was received in the Department of Education, this fall. A man who teaches in one of the larger non-public schools in this province wrote in to say thanks for the cumulative record folders which he had requested some time ago. He said a year ago he had refused these folders, but had changed his mind since then. He had read some books on it; he was better-trained in guidance now, and realized these were very valuable helps. He went on to say that it had been, in his opinion, much maligned because people did not know what they were talking about when they talked about it.

Now, the hon. member gave us in his address some reasons why he came out of the cocoon a moth instead of a butterfly, and I think it might be in order, because of that, for me to attempt to state some of the reasons why I, myself, came out as I did. I know that many of them are the same as those which other members of this group had. Probably one of the very important reasons was that we have seen too many people grow old and die before their time — too many people grow old and die before they had ever had a chance to rest and to play. We had seen too many people losing their homes and losing their farms, too many people becoming entirely dependent upon the state, through the medium of a relief cheque. I, personally, have seen too many youngsters, in the rural school where I used to teach, coming to school without overshoes, and sometimes with holes in their shoes; coming to school with lunchboxes without fruit, without cookies, and generally not balanced. I have seen too many youngsters leaving high school, youngsters who should have had a chance to get further agricultural training, or to have become lawyers or doctors, but who were denied that chance because the financial system under which we live does not give them the opportunity which they deserve; and I have seen others leaving university, only to join (not many years ago) other unfortunates on the freight trains. We have seen too many people killed in two wars in one generation, with a major depression sandwiched in between, to hold much conviction with regard to this system which they would like to perpetuate.

It seems to me there have been several tremendously important incidents in the social history of Saskatchewan. A number of years ago, during the 1920's, I think it was, some of the farmers of Saskatchewan decided that they, the farmers, were capable of owning and operating their own grain marketing machinery, and those farmers have, as we all know, built one of the greatest — probably the greatest — grain marketing machineries in the world, here in this western province.

We have seen in this province a group of farmers realize that they themselves were capable, without outside assistance, of owning and operating a co-operative oil refinery, one of the largest, if not the largest — at that time — co-operative refineries in the world.

We have seen these groups of people realizing that it was in their interests and that they were capable of organizing and running small businesses all over this province. We have seen these people realize they were capable of owning and operating a co-operative wholesale, and through that, of owning and operating a Timber Board sawmill, coal mine, and then of going into the field of oil production.

These same people, joined by others, knowing that successful and logical extension of their own control over their own destiny, decided in 1944 that they were capable of governing themselves and so elected a C.C.F. Government, and these same people, out of the same strength of experience and wisdom, will, when election time rolls around, return once again that Government, confident that they can continue to govern themselves.

I shall support the Motion.

Mr. J. Benson (Last Mountain): — It is rather difficult, Mr. Speaker, for me to follow such an eloquent speaker as the Minister of Education. Last night my deskmate asked me if I was going to take part in the debate to-day, and I told him that I was. He said he was glad of that, because he said, "It's a good thing to have one member of the Opposition on, each day". Now, I do not know just why he would think that I was a member of the Opposition, because in the past I supported every good thing the Government has done, and I have frankly told them when they have done something of which I did not approve.

I just want to read a small extract from a speech made by one of the cabinet ministers just recently, to a Convention in Saskatoon.

"The responsibility placed upon you, as well as upon the members elected to the province Legislature, is a serious one. In these days when we fear that democracy may fall by the wayside, the responsibility placed upon the elected representatives of the people is greater than ever. Nothing can do the cause of democracy more harm than to have those elected representatives fail to give good service to the people who elected them."

I agree entirely with that statement. Further on, he says:

March 12, 1948

“It is perfectly natural and proper that there should be honest differences of opinion. When we disagree, we listen to each other’s arguments, and our own opinions are always modified because we listen to the other fellow’s point of view.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is one time when I agree with the Minister of Municipal Affairs, so I want to tell my hon. friend that I am not in opposition yet.

This afternoon, I am going to divide my address into two parts. First, I am going to deal with the question of democracy — democracy, as I see it, and as I think it should be carried on; and during my remarks on democracy I am going to quote from various sources — sources that I think are authoritative — and I am sure, because I have taken those sources from the supporters of various political parties, that this afternoon, on some occasions at least, I am going to have all the members of the House agreeing with what I have to say.

I said, a couple of years ago, that I was concerned about democracy in Canada, and especially in Saskatchewan, and I want to tell you that I got into a little trouble because of that statement. I want to quote from some authorities, so that we might understand what democracy really means. During last winter, when I was in Regina, I got hold of all the books I could find on the question of democracy in the Library, and I read religiously, during all the spare time that I had. After I had perused what I could find in the library on democracy, I ran across a copy of “Life”, with an editorial page on democracy. There I found the best definition on this matter of democracy.

First of all, I would like to tell you what Thomas Mann said: “Democracy is that form of government and of society which is inspired above every other with the feeling and consciousness of the dignity of man”.

Then I would like to quote from David Lilienthal, a United States congressman. He was accused by one of his colleagues there of being a Communist, and so he defined Communism as he saw it, and also democracy. He said about Communism:

“The fundamental tenet of Communism is that the state is an end in itself, and that, therefore, the powers which the state exercises over the individual are without any ethical standards to limit them”.

Speaking of democracy, he said: “Traditionally, democracy has been an affirmative doctrine rather than merely a negative one. I believe, and I do so conceive, the constitution of the United States to rest upon, as does religion, the fundamental proposition of the integrity of the individual, and that all governments, and all private institutions, must be designed to promote and to protect and define the integrity and the dignity of the individual”.

Then I come to a more detailed definition of democracy, and because, Mr. Speaker, I think this question is so important in the world and in Canada, and in Saskatchewan to-day, I want to read this complete definition. This definition is called 'the Common Cause definition'. A group of American educationalists studies this question for two years, and then arrived at this definition, under several headings:

“Democracy means personal worth. Every human being is precious in his own right, and is always to be regarded as an end, never merely as a means. The State is made for man, not man for the State. Here is the foundation of all humane conceptions of life, and the ultimate source of all other articles of our faith.

Democracy means freedom. All men should participate actively in selecting leaders, in shaping the laws, and in discharging responsibilities of government. Every man should be free to think and speak, to write and create; to approve and criticize, to assemble and organize; to choose an occupation; to move from place to place, to improve his condition; to worship God as he chooses, to follow the dictates of his conscience; to pursue in his own way truth and happiness; freedom is the ancient, eternal and implacable foe of totalitarianism, and every form of tyranny over the bodies and the minds of men.

Democracy means equality; recognizes no races, casts or orders, commissioned by God or qualified by their own aptitude to exploit, government or enslave their fellow human beings.

Democracy means rule of law. The structure and factions of government should be clearly defined in constitutional provision. The entire political process of election, legislation, administration, and judicial division, should be conducted according to the rules and principles freely established by the people. All individuals in minority should be protected in their rights and liberties against the passion of mobs, the vengeance of their Party, and power of privilege, the tyranny of police, the caprice of officials, the ambitions of mad men, and the arbitrary invasions of government.

Democracy means public morality. It means a mobile and progressive society in which any man can make his way according to his own talents, inclination and beliefs; a society which makes available to all an abundance of opportunity and work, in health, in education, in social relationship, in human enlightenment, in all the arts and sciences of life.

Democracy means individual responsibility. All men should be disciplined by a sense of common brotherhood, a devotion to the general welfare, and a love of truth and justice. If men employ their liberties merely

March 12, 1948

to fulfill their own selfish interests, if they are callous to wrongs and inequalities, if they are indifference to the public good, they will surely sink back into bondage. Democracy surpasses all other social systems in its demands on the time and energy, as well as the virtue and understanding, of the citizen.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just want to quote a brief item from Mr. Laski, the noted British Socialist. I noticed my friend across the way quoted from him during this speech, yesterday. Mr. Laski said:

“The ability of democracy to survive the attacks of Communism and Fascism will depend on its ability to adapt its principles and its machinery to a changing condition. We need a thorough overhauling of political institutions.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it was about seventeen years ago that I first spoke in this House, and I remember well, back in 1929, when I first entered this Chamber and watched the conduct of public business in this House, I was very much surprised as to who we carried on our public business; and I am sure these new members who came in here four years ago, for the first time, were surprised too, when they saw how we conducted government in this province.

I want to tell the Government here, to-day, that I am not complaining about the manner in which they carry on the affairs of this province, as a Party Government, because the institution has been long established, and they are merely following in the footsteps of their predecessors and in the footsteps of government for hundreds of years. The Attorney-General said, a few days ago — and perhaps it was a year ago — when he was dealing with some particular matter in this House — “What was good enough for Queen Anne is not good enough for us”, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that our legislative machinery is even further back than the ox-cart days, and that we should do something to bring it up to date. In my opinion, we do things upside down in this Legislature. We do things upside down in the various parliaments in our country.

I want to deal briefly with the Party System. I believe the Party System can be justified on two counts: first of all, it can be justified for the development of a program or platform, as an educational organization; and, two, can be justified for the election of its candidates; but I believe that a Party’s power should cease at that point, after candidates for this Legislature have been elected.

I want to refer briefly to the democratic methods of the various Parties. In my opinion, the methods of the Liberal and the Conservative Parties are the same, and I believe that, because of the methods followed by the C.C.F. in this country, the methods of the two old Parties have been brought more up-to-date. We know that they used to hold conventions — some

of them — about once in twenty years, and when their conventions were held so infrequently there could be no democratic control of their organization. Contrast that with the methods of the C.C.F.! The C.C.F. Organization, as a political organization, is democratically controlled. It is controlled by the members who go back to the various polling booths in this province and in this country; and the control goes right on up through, until the time we elect our representatives. But after we have them elected, then I maintain the control should cease, and in the C.C.F. it does cease.

There is another factor in regard to the Parties and democracy, and that is the method by which the campaign funds of the various parties are obtained. We knew from records, especially in the House of Commons in the past, that the two old Parties received their campaign funds largely from the vested interests, and you will remember on one occasion Mackenzie King, because of the disclosures made, said that the Liberal Party had sunk to the depths of humiliation.

Where do the C.C.F. get their Party funds from? They get them from the members of the organization, and in that way it is very definitely democratically controlled. I am not much of a believer in the Party System. I believe in it, so far as it has operated in the past until the election of its candidates; and I believe that we could take a good lesson in democracy by examining the methods of our Wheat Pool organization in this province. That, to my mind, is the most democratic institution that exists anywhere in Canada. The people who own that organization, control and operate it in a thoroughly democratic way; and I believe that the methods used there — the methods of co-operation that are used in our Wheat Pool organization — could well be applied to the method to be used in our political organization. I believe that we could make some great improvement by adopting the means used in our Wheat Pool organization.

After a member has been elected — first of all, I might say that he has been sponsored by a political organization, but many people often support a particular candidate, who do not support the Party to which he belongs — but after a member has been elected, it is my view that he represents, not the Party that sent him here, but all the people of the constituency that sent him here; and as democracy believes in majority rule, I believe that we should provide some means whereby every member elected to this Legislature is elected by a majority of the people of the constituency that sent him here. That does not always follow; and because I believe that he should be elected by the majority, I believe that we should bring about some reform in our voting system. Because of that reason, I am in favour of the Single Transferable ballot, in the single member constituencies; I am in favour of proportional representation in multi-member constituencies. I am not going to say any more in regard to the Single Transferable ballot at this time, because I noticed to-day that notice is given that we were to have The Election Act up for amendment, and perhaps there will be an opportunity when that Act comes into the House.

March 12, 1948

After the members are elected, I want to discuss a situation so far as they are concerned, after they get into this Legislature. In theory the members — and in practice — should be the true representatives of the people who sent them here; but, unfortunately, I have come to the opinion, after many years in this House, that the elected members become more or less representatives of the political party that sent them here, not of the people of the constituency that sent them. In theory the members are the servants of the people, but in actual fact they become rubber stamps, caucus-influenced, with no real sense of freedom or independence.

To back that statement up, I again want to quote from some authorities. I think the C.C.F. will recognize that Mr. Laski, of Great Britain, is one of the best authorities, and he says:

“Parliament is not a collection of experts. If it were, it would be even more unsuccessful in its performance than it is. The private member has, for the most part, been reduced to the status of a voting machine.”

So, you see, that is not only my opinion! He has lost all direct initiative, especially in the realms of finance. Now, as you all know, Rt. Hon. Ramsay MacDonald was twice Prime Minister of Great Britain, and in his “Parliament and Revolution” he said: “A private member has become a mere follower and supporter of the Government, with little initiative, little independence, and little power. The notion that it is the business of an Opposition to obstruct, has given rise to an Opposition policy to waste as much time as possible. This is having disastrous effects upon parliament, and has brought servitude to the Cabinet in its train, together with closure rules which destroy discussion”.

Now, I want to come to a supporter of my hon. friends — the Hon. Mr. Power. He said in an article that he wrote for Maclean’s Magazine just about a year ago: “Let us restore at once, and then go on to enlarge, the civil liberties of the Canadian people. Let us have an immediate return to parliamentary government in the fullest meaning of the term. This involves the responsibility of the Cabinet to the House, and it means the reform of parliamentary procedure to make democracy work. It means restoring the dignity of the individual elected representative of the people by giving back to him the job he was chosen to do. The power of parliament needs urgently to be re-asserted”.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier made this statement in the House of Commons in 1910: “Party Government, as we know, can be the highest conception of public duty, but partyism as we know it, is nothing more than a mere scramble for office. I would therefore suggest that important questions be submitted to a committee, so that Parliament be able to consider the subject intelligently, away from the narrow atmosphere of partyism”.

Now, I am coming a little nearer home. Last winter, in 'The Commonwealth' there appeared a speech by Mr. Corman. He referred to some charge of Mr. Tucker in regard to party control — party solidarity, and he said:

“This is the first time I ever heard any responsible person in a democratic country advance the theory of party solidarity. You can take it from me, there's 'no such animal'; except in the dictator totalitarian countries.”

I just wonder where Mr. Corman has been living these last twenty years! The fact that the budding Premier of this province was the first one to raise it in Canada gives us some idea of his conception of democratic practices and principles. Cabinet solidarity is a recognized part and parcel of constitutional representative government, but party solidarity — never! And he goes on:

“No private C.C.F. member is compelled to vote against his convictions and his conscience. You had examples of independent voting at the last Session, from the C.C.F. members, and you will have it again. Our members are not regimented or forced into rubber stamps. They are free men and women, as they should be in a democratic country. The theory of party solidarity originated and developed with Hitler, and I do not think the people of this province want any part of it.”

Mr. Ramsey MacDonald made his statement long before Hitler came on the scene.

I just want to read from a radio speech by Mr. Corman on party solidarity:

“Its private members are free men and women to vote according to their own judgment. General acceptance of the doctrine of party solidarity originated by Hitler would make a responsible government a delusion and farce. It is doubtful if political freedom was ever at a lower ebb in Canada than it is to-day.” (He makes this last statement in the same speech.)

I am glad that in some respects I can agree with the Attorney-General, because I believe that political freedom is at a very low ebb in Canada to-day, and I believe that if we will really make democracy work — bring about true democracy in the world, and in Canada, and in Saskatchewan, because I believe in starting at home — then I do not think we have any need to fear Communism or Fascism or anything else.

In respect to the Cabinet: you remember that Mr. Ilsley said, in the House of Commons a couple of years ago, that a Cabinet derives its authority from the Crown, and is not responsible to Parliament. Of course, any

party man that believes that — then we can understand how the Legislatures of this country and how the Parliaments have lost their control over the Cabinet.

How about our Cabinet in Saskatchewan? The Cabinet in this province is, in theory, responsible to the Legislature, but in actual practice it is not. The Cabinet here was selected by some of the members in the Legislature, and some who had nothing to do with the Legislature. By that, I mean that the members who support the Government take part in the selection of the Cabinet, and then some people who are outside — we all know that. The people who represent their constituencies, who are not supporters of the Government, have no part whatever in selecting the Government of the province; and, of course, they agree with that system because they believe in party politics.

Then I want to mention the Party caucus. In my opinion, the Party caucus is the most vicious institution in the Party set-up, and I want to ask you (and every member in this House knows that a caucus is a secret organization), if there is any place in a true democracy for secret meetings of part of the representatives of the Legislature, where important decisions are sometimes made? I believe that the only justification for a Party caucus is as a means of discovery, for the government that happens to be in power — as a means of discovery.

I would like to just read what Mr. Ramsay MacDonald said, on the caucus, and Whips. This, again, is taken from “Parliament and Revolution”:

“There is perhaps no greater scandal in the whole procedure of the House of Commons than the use of Whips. Party followers, irrespective of their own convictions, are thus practically compelled to vote as the Cabinet, or indeed, often the Minister, has decided for them. This is really a comparatively recent growth, and has arisen because Parliament has become more completely an instrument in the hands of the government, and the floor and the division lobby arena of a never-ending partisan conflict. The most trivial and unessential details of a Bill are thus regarded as matters of confidence in the Government, and the free criticism of the House and the responsible action of members are being suppressed by the Party machine. This has been carried to such an extent that members are ceasing to act as responsible representatives, and are losing the capacity so to act.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say that any member comes into this House and votes against his convictions, but I am going to tell you, from actual experience, it is not a very easy thing to do — to come into this House and vote against something that the government you are supporting is bringing out. That is not an easy thing to do; and I can understand, and I do believe that in the past, legislation has gone through this Legislature, to which a majority of the members of this Legislature did not agree to — not since this Government came into power, because the House is too one-sided, but during the years 1929 to 1934 the House was very evenly divided; you could get a majority in the caucus of the government, but add the minority in the government caucus to the Opposition in the House and you had a

majority against some bills that were passed, and I do not think that is a good thing. That is one reason why I am opposed to the Party caucus as a secret instrument which decides — sometimes, I will say — the policy of the government. Just sometimes.

Now, what about the Legislature? I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that to my mind this has been, for some reason or other, the most futile Session of the Legislature that I have ever attended. I cannot explain it, but that is the feeling that I have. Our Legislature, I think, is not much more than a second or a third-rate debating society. We call one another names in this House — I do not know what part of democracy that is; it is just a case, here, of “the pot calling the kettle black”, and we are trying to continue democracy in Saskatchewan, or improve it, under that method. Every member seems to have a pre-determined Party bias, which, in my opinion, destroys intelligent discussion.

Another effect caucus-government has on the Legislature is the lack of attention of the members when the House is in Committee of the Whole. Those of you who read the paper a few days ago would notice that they said we were carrying on one day here without a quorum. That was corrected a little later in the newspaper, when the reporter found out that the quorum was not twenty members but about fifteen.

I want to come to this question of the Budget, but I am not finished yet with my discussion on the matter of democracy and the methods of the Legislature.

When we vote on this Debate, on which we are to vote, perhaps, to-day, we have to vote for it — all or nothing — we have to take the good and the bad; and people could rightly say, ‘Well, you voted for all the bad legislation’ — if there is any bad legislation — or, ‘You voted against all the good legislation that this government has passed’. I say it is an impossible situation.

So far as the Budget is concerned, during the Budget debate there is very little consideration given to that Budget. We are allowed, under this particular debate, according to our rules, to talk about almost anything at all. Then we come to the Supplementary Estimates, and we find that in that particular case it is just a matter of the government having spent a lot of money that the Legislature did not vote, and we vote for it after the money has been spent. I am not condemning this Government, mind you, on that score. It is a tradition that has been built up — and I think we should change some of these things — we should really bring our machinery of democracy up to date.

Then there is the question of Want of Confidence. I had a quotation on that, but I must have mislaid it. It was also from Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, on this question. I do not believe that, in a proper democratic institution, any measure introduced by the government at any time should be considered as a Want of Confidence motion, and the only time that you should

March 12, 1948

be called upon to vote Want of Confidence in a government is when a motion is introduced to the effect that you no longer have any confidence in this government. In Great Britain, Ramsay MacDonald, while he was Premier, set aside this rule regarding Want of Confidence, and, while he was in power, he was defeated on government measures ten times between January and August, 1924. "Until recently," he said, "this question of Want of Confidence, and government measures being termed Want of Confidence motions, had not developed".

I have a few statements here taken from Mr. Laski's book, "Political Democracy":

"Sir Robert Peel was defeated in 1834 on an amendment to the Address . . ." but he didn't consider it a Want of Confidence. "In six years, from 1834, the Melbourne Government was defeated 58 times. The Aberdeen Government was defeated three times in a single week, in 1853. Mr. Balfour was beaten in Committee of Supply in 1903 . . ."

I want to point out to you that when a government indicates that any government measure is going to be a Want of Confidence motion, it means forcing members who may be opposed to their particular measure to vote for it; and I do not think that that pressure should ever be put on any members in the Legislature. That has been done already, in this present Session, and it has a tendency to destroy our democratic institution and that freedom of speech that we love so well.

Now, I would just like to say a word as to how the Legislature should be organized. I believe that when members of the Legislature come through those doors they should leave their party affiliations outside, if that is possible; and I think if we would just try it for a little while, perhaps we could do it.

I believe that the members of the Legislature should be able to feel, as soon as they set foot inside this Chamber, that they are free and equal and independent. This is the institution, here, where we must save democracy, and there must be no curtailment on the freedom of any individual, if we are going to accomplish this. I believe that the Cabinet, in a true democracy, will be chosen by all the members in the Legislature. Of course, I can understand that I haven't a supporter in the House at the present time for that, and I think perhaps that is a little too far away; but I am going to say this: I believe that we really have a democratic government in our municipal councils, and the sooner we can get to that position in this province and in this country, the better off this province and this country will be.

I also believe that there should be a very close relationship between the ministers of any government and the members of the Legislature, and I think something could be done in Saskatchewan to-day to improve that

relationship between the members of the Legislature and the Cabinet.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Would you amplify that?

Mr. Benson: — Yes, I could amplify it, if you would like me to. I will just give you an illustration as to what I mean. For instance, when any particular problem arises in any constituency — say, just for purposes of example, to show what I mean — when a delegation from a municipality of a hospital comes in to the government and asks for a grant for a hospital, or to build a certain piece of road in any particular member's constituency, I do not believe the government should make that grant without first consulting the member of that constituency. The member of the constituency represents those people, and if the government makes a mistake on making a grant for a certain piece of road, the member has to take the responsibility; and I think, in matters of that kind, he should be consulted, and there should be a definitely close relationship between all members and the government.

I want to say to my hon. friends across the way, that relationship did not exist between the Liberal Government and the C.C.F. members when they were in power, but I believe that a C.C.F. government should extend that relationship to the members in the Opposition; for after all, if we believe in democracy, those members who are elected in the Opposition are the representatives elected by the people for the constituency that they represent, and should be treated as such. I do not know what the present government does in regard to that particular matter, so far as the Opposition is concerned, but I hope, from my illustration, that the Ministers will understand what I mean.

Mr. A. T. Procter: — Some of them came to me and got them.

Mr. Benson: — Yes — some did, and didn't get them. I was one who went to my hon. friend, and I would just like to tell you about that. You know, they started to build No. 22 up in my district, from Southey to Bulyea. They built it all but about three miles and then, for some reason or other, the outfit was told to pull up and pull out, and it did so. I came down here, but I could not persuade the Minister to leave that outfit there and complete that three miles. Then it took me about three years to persuade the Minister of Highways here, to send another outfit in there and complete it; but I want to say to the Minister of Highways — he is not here now — that he did complete it, and he graveled it, and the people in that district are now happy. So, you see, my hon. friend used to know how to say "no" to members who were in the Opposition at that time.

I might tell him that the other day a good friend of mine told me that the most important word in the English language was "no" — and he certainly knows how to use it.

March 12, 1948

There is another illustration that I want to use, and that is in regard to the conduct of government business. We all know, as members of the Legislature, that we have no right to initiative in this House. We cannot move a resolution here, saying that the government should start a shoe factory — we can't do it! But the government, as a Cabinet, can start a shoe factory, come back to the Legislature and tell us they have bought a shoe factory, and all we can say is 'yes' or 'no' — but we've got a shoe factory; and I maintain, the proper procedure should be, in any business institution, that by resolution we should indicate to the government that we think the government should establish a shoe factory, and then the government would be instructed to investigate the possibilities and report back to the Legislature, when the Legislature would then decide whether or not the government should establish a shoe factory. I hope you will understand what I mean. That would be doing things from the bottom up, rather than from the top down.

I do not know whether I have made any converts here, this afternoon, or not, but I suppose not. However, I have expressed my views, and I appreciate the fact that the members have listened while I expressed what they might consider to be 'peculiar' views in regard to democracy in this province.

Now I come to the question of the Budget. The remarks I made last year in regard to the Budget will apply again this year. Perhaps I should say they will apply even more so. Before I really discuss the Budget and the size of it, I might say that the government has, according to the speeches that have been made in the Legislature here on this particular debate, won ample approval for the Budget that has been presented to the House, and some of the members have said that they wished it was bigger, while others have said that next year it will be bigger and better than ever.

I want to say to my hon. friend, the Provincial Treasurer, that I commend him for the excellent address he gave the House on the Budget. I think he did a good job of convincing the members that this Budget was okay in every respect. I want to refer him, though, to just a couple of sentences in his Budget speech. He said: "At the present time the agricultural industry may be said to be in a position of watchful waiting. The situation is the result of crop conditions in 1947, and certain federal policies which have given rise to some uncertainty and no small degree of anxiety".

I want my hon. friend to know that I agree with those statements, and I can understand his concern and his anxiety. I believe that the Provincial Treasurer really believes that this Budget for Saskatchewan is a little too high.

Before I go into the question of the Budget — and I am only going to do it briefly, because you all remember what I had to say about it last year, and that still applies — I just want to deal with a few questions that have arisen during the past year — comment on those first, and then deal with the other afterwards.

First of all, I want to say a few words about the Education Tax. Mr. Speaker, this Education Tax in this province has become a political issue. The people who put it on, now say they will take it off if they get back into power. The Conservatives say they will take it off, but I don't think there is very much chance of the Conservatives getting into power in this province because they just haven't enough supporters in Saskatchewan to get into power; but we may have some kind of a coalition.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — You're not serious in that?

Mr. Benson: — No, no! I mean that the Liberals and Conservatives are going into some sort of coalition to try and win the next election. I might say to my hon. friend, here, quite frankly, that I think the C.C.F. is going to win the next election. They are going to lose some seats — although I understand that some of my colleagues here are so optimistic, they think they are going to win every one; but I am not going to make any predictions on how many they are going to win, or anything of that nature; but I do think they are going to win the election.

Now, the C.C.F. pledge is to lower taxation by refunding the public debt at lower rates of interest, and to repeal the present Education Tax as soon as possible. That is what we told the people, and I do not enjoy being a political hypocrite. When I was on the other side of the House I criticized the Liberals for putting that Education Tax on, and I am glad I have one colleague in the House who speaks out against the Education Tax. I think several of the members gave their constituents to believe that if a C.C.F. government was elected we would abolish the Education Tax. I was very careful, during the campaign, and I said that we would not abolish it until funds were found, from some other source, to take the place of that Education Tax; but I really believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Education Tax could have been abolished, and I tell my people that, quite frankly.

I think that this year, perhaps, as my hon. friend from Swift Current said, it would have been a step in the right direction again if the Provincial Treasurer had taken the Education Tax from clothing. That is a matter that we are going to have to face during this coming election campaign, the question of the Education Tax — we can't get away from that.

Then there is the question of pensions for the disabled. We really promised the disabled people of this province that we would provide some small pension for the disabled people. Well, we have not yet provided a small pension. They are given assistance through the municipalities, upon application for that assistance, and the provincial government pays half of that particular assistance; but to them it is more or less a stigma of relief, and is certainly not in the same category as a pension.

March 12, 1948

Now, another question we are going to have to face is this question of the importation of officials into this province. Perhaps it was necessary to bring people in to Saskatchewan from other provinces of Canada, from the United States, and from England. I want to say that I have nothing against any of those people — I think they are all fine gentlemen that have been brought in here — but I really believe that we had people in Saskatchewan who could have done that work.

And I want to say to the Minister of Co-operation that I was rather surprised when, about a year ago, he appointed a person from Toronto to go to Great Britain to represent Saskatchewan. Mr. Graham Spry is a supporter of the C.C.F., I know. And he is a very, very capable individual; but I really believe that we have people in Saskatchewan who are just as capable as Mr. Spry to represent Saskatchewan over in Great Britain and Europe. I am pointing this out to-day because I believe we are going to face these questions when the next election comes along.

In regard to the Larger School Units, we have had an excellent explanation of how they are working, and the benefits to be derived from the Larger School Units, but we are going to have to face the issue of the method in which those Larger School Units were brought into being in this province, and I tell you, so far as my constituency is concerned, that is the worst issue the C.C.F. has to face in that particular constituency.

There is another matter that I do not like very well, and that is the question of civil service in politics. I do not believe — while I supported the Bill when it went through — the way that particular Bill is working out, I do not believe it is a good thing. I believe that if we had just left it alone, let the civil service take part in politics if they wished or leave it alone if they wished — of course, they can do that under the Act — but the civil service to-day do not know where they are at. I am sure of this, that if a prominent representative of the civil service goes out and does political work in this city, and the Liberal Party comes back into power next election, that person will be fired. I am sure of that, and I do not think it is fair to the civil servant that he should be approached in any way, so that anything should be done to jeopardize his position.

I want to say something about the socialization of land, because that, too, is going to be an issue in this next election. I am going to tell the members of the Opposition who are shouting about socialization of land in Saskatchewan to-day, that they are just wasting their time, because I do not think if they sent a hundred people out into the constituency of Last Mountain and told them that the C.C.F. were going to socialize their land, and I was the C.C.F. candidate, that anyone would believe that I would ever vote for the socialization of their land — so they are wasting their time.

Mr. Burton said, in the House of Commons — “We do not advocate the socialization of any property, be it a farm or otherwise, unless it comes within the category of a monopoly, or otherwise gives to an individual or to a small group of individuals the opportunity to dominate and exploit their fellowmen.” Of course, Mr. Bowerman, in answer to a question in the House of Commons, said, “Yes, we are going to socialize everything”. There seems to be a difference of opinion there, in regard to that particular question, in the House of Commons; but I want to put it straight, so far as I am concerned, that I do not believe in the socialization of land. I believe that the family and the farm home is the foundation of our Saskatchewan society, and I believe that they should occupy their own homes; and I believe that the C.C.F. Government here will back that particular opinion.

Another question that is coming up is that of the soldier’s lease on school land. I am going to tell you, quite frankly, that I have not had one complaint from any Returned Man about the lease. I have had some complaints from men who were granted land and then it was given to some others; but so far as the lease itself was concerned, I have had no complaints, and I think it is a good system. Those men go onto that land and they can farm there without any debt — no interest to pay on any debt — and I think that is a wonderful thing; and at the end of ten years they have the privilege of purchasing it. Some of our friends are worried about the price they will have to pay. Perhaps it would have been better if some limitation of price had been placed in that lease agreement, but I have never yet run across any veteran who has complained in any way about his agreement under that particular system — not in my constituency.

Now, I just want to say a word about highways. In Saskatchewan, there has been some criticism in regard to the condition of highways, but in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the trouble in regard to highways in Saskatchewan — and this will be an issue in the province — is that we have too expensive a highway system in this province for our population; and I do not believe that this province can maintain the present system of highways as laid out in this province with the population that we have at the present time — not from its own resources — and there is only one solution that I can see to the highway problem, and that is, if we can get Dominion Government assistance to build and construct main highways — some main highways east and west, and north and south, then the province could take care of the rest.

We have heard a lot during the last few days in regard to democracy — Socialism, I should say. I have tried, this afternoon, to outline what I think would be democracy in this province, and I believe in social democracy, with the emphasis on democracy. I am coming to the Budget itself now, for just a few minutes; and I am going to suggest again, as I did last year, that when we are considering the financial affairs of the province, the first thing that should be done during a Budget debate is to have a complete report from every minister of the Government, in regard to his Department, not have them come in, on the last day, after all the members have spoken.

March 12, 1948

We should have a complete report of the financial situation in each of those departments, so that we could deal with the matter intelligently. We have to deal with it as we do to-day, in a hit-or-miss fashion — vote for it and we don't know what it is all about. The Budget should be considered as an ordinary financial statement. It should be considered without any party bias whatever, just the same way as the Board of Directors of the Wheat Pool present their financial statement to the delegates of the Wheat Pool. That is the first thing they do. They consider it, page by page, until they have gone all through it, and then they pass or reject it. My hon. friend, who sits beside me, knows that is true, because he acted as Chairman for that Wheat Pool organization for many years.

As I have already indicated, I think that the Budget for Saskatchewan is too large. Last year, I urged that the Government apply the brakes, and while I am not complaining in regard to the amount that has been collected this year, I am not going to complain in regard to the amount that has been collected without increasing the taxation, providing a considerable share of that amount is placed into Reserve to take care of bad or worse years to come. I think there are two occasions when it is unfortunate for a new government to come into power; one is at the depths of a depression, and the other is at the peak of prosperity. When a government comes into power at the depths of depression, that government hasn't got a ghost of a chance to make good, because there are no reserves built up to take care of bad years. When a government comes into power at the peak of prosperity we have the other extreme — revenues are good, everybody is urging everybody else to do something to spend more money, with the result that our Budgets are bound to go up, expenditures are bound to climb; and I maintain the proper time to spend money is when the revenues are low, and the proper time to curtail expenditure is when revenues are high. We should, in times of prosperity, build up reserves to take care of times of depression.

Now, I happen to have had the experience of sitting in this House through the worst depression we have ever had, and I sat on this side of the House, supporting the government of the day, and I know the conditions that Government went through; and that is why I am concerned, to-day. I know what happened then and I want to tell the Government to-day that while we have established many social services, and they are to be congratulated for having the welfare of the people at heart — when we establish social services, and they are to be congratulated for having the welfare of the people at heart — when we establish social services that we cannot maintain we are going to face a serious situation later on; and we will find, as the Anderson Government found, that when you have to curtail services in any way, the Government immediately becomes very unpopular. The Leader of the Opposition, who sat in the House during the last depression when the Anderson Government was in power, was on that side of the House when they had to cut school grants from \$1.50 to 50 cents a day and I believe that that one item, more than anything else, defeated the Anderson Government. I am just throwing that out as a warning as to what might come in — perhaps — the near future.

Now, because I have pointed out some of the things that I think the Government should have been a little more careful about, I want to just mention the things that I feel the Government is to be commended on.

First, I would put the Air Ambulance Service. I think everyone in Saskatchewan has a good word for the Government because of that. Next, I would put medical and hospital assistance, as well as the increase in Old Age pensions and the medical and hospital assistance given to the Old Age pensioners and the recipients of Mothers' Allowance. You will notice I put the question of health ahead of education. I believe the health of the people is more important, even, than their education, and I would put health, any day, ahead of education. I realize this — that in order to properly take care of the health of the people of this province, it is a problem beyond the people of Saskatchewan, and we will have to have assistance from the Dominion Government in order to establish a complete health scheme in this province.

Then there is the matter of education. There have been advances made there, and we are going to come to the point where we should have some federal responsibility, I believe, in the matter of education. The Constitution of Canada to-day says that education is a provincial issue, it is the responsibility of the provincial government, and unless the Constitution of Canada is changed there will be very little chance of obtaining any assistance from the federal government, so far as education is concerned. Of course, there is some assistance given to-day, through various technical organizations and so one, through the Department of Education, but it is very, very small.

I want to say a word about the Crown corporations, just to make my stand clear before the members of the Legislature. I divide the Crown corporations into two classes, such as power, telephone, the bus service, for instance. Those classes of public service and Crown corporations are a monopoly — or can be a monopoly — and I believe they are proper ventures for a government to undertake; but I am not in agreement with the government going into small industries. I stated my reasons, last year, and I want to re-state them to-day. I am going to give you the fundamental reason why I do not believe the government should get mixed up in small industries; and that fundamental reason is that a government is a referee of the people. It should be an unbiased referee of the people that is governs, and when a government goes into competition with its own subjects, it cannot be an unbiased referee. Now, I think that is a fundamental principle, without any other argument that I might advance in regard to it.

I just want to deal with the Budget for a moment, in its relation to agriculture in this province. I believe, Sir, that any Budget in Saskatchewan must bear a definite relationship to our chief industry, agriculture. I have some maps in my desk — the member for Moosomin used one

March 12, 1948

the other day, which indicated the situation that existed in Saskatchewan to-day, on account of crop failure. I could show you that again. I also have the one for Alberta and Manitoba, which would show you how very small an area is in the crop failure area, in both Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

The reason I brought those maps — and if anyone wants to see them they can look at them later, as I have them here — was to show this, that in Saskatchewan we are subject to greater fluctuations of weather conditions than they are in either the province of Alberta or in the province of Manitoba. We are more dependent, in Saskatchewan, on our basic industry. In Manitoba and Alberta, they have far more other resources than we have in this province. That is the reason, I say, our Budget should always bear a definite relationship to agriculture.

I went down to the Department of Statistics, and obtained the agricultural production from 1926 to 1947. It is estimated for this year at \$434,000,000. Now, we find the fluctuation in all those 22 years goes from \$70,000,000 to as high as \$543,000,000. The last four years, when revenues have been so buoyant in this province, our agricultural production has been: \$327,000,000 in 1943; \$543,000,000 in 1944; \$409,000,000 in 1945; \$399,000,000 in 1946; and \$434,000,000 in 1947. The highest years in that whole 22-year period! The average for the whole 22 years is \$215,367,000.

Now, if we want to finance on a perfectly sound basis in Saskatchewan, we should base our Budget on the figure \$215,367,000 — the average; but I believe we would be safe if we stepped that average up to what is considered the parity year of 1926 — \$289,000,000. In round figures, if we introduced expenditures for this province on the basis of agricultural production of \$300,000,000 per year, I think we would be safe. During the years when we had a production over \$300,000,000 we should build up reserves. During the years when we got down to the point where we had, perhaps, \$70,000,000 as an income, we should spend some of those reserves to carry on the services.

I want to point out to you that during some of the depression years, we suffered crop failure, and we also suffered low prices — a combination of the two; but in 1932 we had a good crop in Saskatchewan. Because of the low prices, with that good crop, however, we received practically the same income in 1931, 1932, and 1933. We had a total crop failure in 1931, a good crop in Saskatchewan in 1932; and to-day, we have no guarantee that we won't have those same price fluctuations. We have no guarantee that we won't have same drought conditions. I hope we never have them again; but so long as we have our present

economic system in effect we have no guarantee about the prices, at least.

If we look at the world situation to-day, as my hon. friend has looked at it, and when he expressed concern about the outlook, I think we should very, very careful. I always have had the belief that when we have good crops — we have lots of money — people can pretty well take care of themselves. Some cannot, of course, but there is no way, once you have established a service, of fluctuating it up and down, as a depression comes along. The government that establishes that service has to maintain that service or the people will put them out.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have kept you quite a long time this afternoon, and I appreciate the attention the members have given me. I want to say to you that while I am criticizing the Budget and I believe the government should curtail expenditure as much as possible during these good years, I am not going to oppose the Budget on the vote. I am going to do my best, Mr. Speaker, to point out to them, as the estimates are considered in the House, where I think they might have saved money; but the people of Saskatchewan are sometime, this summer, going to have the opportunity to decide, and as I said before, even with this high expenditure, I really believe the people of this province are going to send the C.C.F. Government back into power in Saskatchewan.

Mr. M. H. Feeley: — I wonder if the hon. member would answer a question, before he sits down?

Mr. Benson: — I won't promise to answer it, but if I can, I will do so.

Mr. Feeley: — I would like to know what percent of the present Budget he feels should be laid aside for reserve; and in view of the fact that he did not suggest higher taxation, I take it that his idea is to reduce expenditures. I would like him to state just where he thinks the expenditures should be reduced.

Mr. Benson: — Mr. Speaker, that would take another Budget speech to answer my hon. friend's question; but I would like to say that if I were the dictator, say, in Saskatchewan for the last four years, I would be putting at least \$15,000,000 out of that present Budget, or those present estimates, into a reserve account.

Mr. P. A. Howe: — What items would you cut?

Mr. Benson: — I will tell you on the estimates.

March 12, 1948

Mr. W. Burgess (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I have listened to a great many speeches in this Legislature on this Budget debate, and each speaker said something that made me think I would like to comment on what he had said.

If I were to do that, I would exceed the record set up by the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson), and would certainly make the longest speech in my life. I do not believe I have ever spoken for longer than thirty minutes on any one topic, in this Legislature. I will admit I have often spoken. But this one, Mr. Speaker — I give you fair warning — I think is going to be longer than any other speech I have ever made.

Some of my friends, or former friends perhaps it would be more correct to say (because I used to have friends in the Liberal Party), tell me that I will never see the Legislature again, after this Session. That does not worry me a great deal one way or another, because, first of all, they are not always right in their prophecies, and secondly, it is entirely up to the people of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley as far as I am concerned.

There are one or two things that I wish to say before I leave, as I have said, possibly forever. In the first place I want to join, very briefly, with those who have congratulated the Provincial Treasurer on making a fine Budget address.

It was interesting, and I think it is quite an art to deliver an address of that type and make it interesting. Certainly I could not do it. I could not deliver an address full of figures and statistics, that would be interesting. It was a work of art from that standpoint, and it has other good qualities — although, Mr. Speaker, perhaps because of some congenital disturbance in my make-up, nothing is ever perfect.

I would like in the few minutes that are left before supper, or dinner — whatever they call it in the city — to say a word or two about the constituency of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley. I have never done that since I have been a member. I did not know it was usually done until I learned it from reading Hansard.

First of all, I did not think it would really be fair to the other members to start to brag about Qu'Appelle-Wolseley. I do not want them to think that anything I may have to say is intended that way. I believe in understating a case rather than overstating it, and so I am going to try and be very lenient . . .

about that; but the fact remains, of course, that Qu'Appelle-Wolseley and that district — it might even include part of the constituency represented by the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. Procter) — that area of Saskatchewan lying here and between the Manitoba boundary, is the part of the country that really made Saskatchewan. The people who came here and demonstrated that there was a country here worth opening up, were the people who made the experiments: the experiments in local self-government; the experiments in educational activities. The first homestead that was legally filed on Saskatchewan, was in the constituency of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley, but there were hundreds of quarter-sections taken before that homestead got filed — cases where the man came in and squatted, as they called it, and started this western country. You are not an old-timer, down there, unless you have been there for sixty years. I heard one of the member say, in speaking that the old-timers went to his constituency some 25 or 30 years ago. Well, no old-timers went to Qu'Appelle-Wolseley 25 or 30 years ago. Those are the 'foreigners', the new people, who have only been there for 25 or 30 years.

Hon. C. C. Williams: — They are just tourists.

Mr. Burgess — Yes, they are just tourists. By the way, I might even have a colleague in these remarks, in the person of the Hon. Minister of Labour, because I believe he had the privilege of being born down in that part of the country.

When this prairie country was being opened up, it was in that area that the idea of dry-land farming was introduced. It was there that they actually suffered near starvation before there were governments to institute relief arrangements. I believe they were the people who had the first seed grain debt in Saskatchewan, and they tell me that some of them are still registered against the homesteads of the efficient people who got them before the turn of the century. Some people homesteaded there in 1882, but after they had evolved a system of dry-land farming with summer-fallow, which made for some security in western agriculture, and the Experimental Farm was established at Indian Head, and the frost was more or less defeated by Marquis wheat, and the rust was pushed back by rust-resistant wheat, it was the progressive farmers of that area who mostly experimented with the new developments. Now, that is not finding fault with anybody else. They had the opportunity; it was at their door. Their experience was made available for the rest of Saskatchewan.

The same thing applied to their experiments with farmer organizations: the first Grain Growers' Association, the first grain growers shipment of grain, the first farmers' elevator, the first co-operative stores, the first member of the Wheat Pool. It does not matter very much what you bring out in Saskatchewan, but the first one was down at Qu'Appelle-Wolseley. And naturally they like to continue in the lead a little bit, and so it might be said, perhaps, that in some respects we do not feel that we are being just exactly treated right when we are told that No. 1 highway has a priority of number six, or something like that. Frankly

March 12, 1948

we do not like that. I think the member from Moosomin (Mr. Procter) will probably agree with me on that. Perhaps it is not No. 1 highway, but it is No. 1 to us. That is not what I stard to say before supper. I am going to say some of those things after supper.

When we think of these people, who, having made all these experiments by having set up their farmers' organizations and having always used the idea that these organizations should be non-partisan and non-political, I want to assure the hon. members who have some worries about 'an iron curtain in a velvet glove', that in the Province of Saskatchewan, if the people of the other constituencies bear any similarity to the people of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley, there is nothing to worry about. They will look after all of those problems.

Mr. Speaker, having talked for ten minutes trying to think of something to say, I suggest that you call it six o'clock and I will start my speech after supper.

The House took recess at six o'clock.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. Burgess: — Mr. Speaker, when we recessed for dinner . . .

A Voice: — Supper.

Mr. Burgess: — . . . I had just been tossing a few rambling observations about the privileges of the people of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley, but we should, I think proceed with the discussion of the Budget and things relative to it.

We listened, this afternoon, to speakers who introduced very important topics, and as the member for Last Mountain (Mr. Benson) dealt at some length with the problem of democracy, certainly, there is no more serious problem facing any Legislature, particularly one the majority of whose members are of the C.C.F. persuasion, than the making of a functioning democracy; and with many of the things that the member said, I am in complete agreement. For instance, I would have to compliment him on reading the definition of democracy, out of 'Life' magazine, because last year, in February, I quoted the same article out of the same magazine. But we have to be realists in this problem of a functioning democracy. I agree with him that the place of a private member in a democracy, must take on added importance and added responsibility in this twentieth century. I agree with him that we should give thought, and serious thought, to reform which may be needed in our parliament set up, in order that all of the brains — if there are any — can be used in the solving of the problems which we face in this day and in this age. I agree with him in that many of the institutions, or many of the recognized procedures, are scarcely suited to the present age. But I think I could hardly follow him in the argument that all of us should make up the Budget. As a

matter of fact, just as our constituents have to delegate to us as private members, the responsibility of making decisions on their behalf, to some extent we have to do the same thing for the Cabinet.

I believe, in spite of the fact that the Budget we have before us is a fairly good one, that if any member of this Legislature, including the Hon. Mr. Fines, had been writing it to suite themselves exactly, it would be different than it is. A Budget, naturally, has to be a sort of compromise. It has to be an attempt to assess, to some extent, the various necessities; and one argues, one thinks one thing must be done, another thinks something else is needed.

In this forming of the Budget, I believe that we are attacking the most serious responsibility of Legislatures, because I think that the most important function of a government, of a parliament, is to assess properly the incidence of taxation. It is to place the burden — if you call it burden — of the carrying of the responsibilities of government, on the proper shoulders; and it is to divide the revenues in a way that will give the greatest benefit to the people. In doing that, and in trying to meet all of the demands, and in trying to assess the taxes properly, there must, of necessity, be some compromise even such reasonable people as the member for Last Mountain (Mr. Benson) and myself would not agree on all of the clauses of any Budget. We have to give and take. If I were going to criticize the Budget from that standpoint, I would say that possibly the Provincial Treasurer has followed too closely the absolutely orthodox ideas of finances. On the other hand, it is a good policy under conditions in which we find ourselves, to as far as possible reduce the fixed charges — that is to say, reduce the debts — so that we will not be faced with an undiminished interest charge.

To the extent that the C.C.F. Government in Saskatchewan have reduced the debt in the province, I would say that they are entitled to the thanks and the congratulations of the people of Saskatchewan. It is good business for the individual to get out of debt. The best thing that has happened in Saskatchewan, in the last few years, has been the fact that individually, municipally, and to some extent provincially, we have reduced our debt. Unfortunately, and perhaps that cannot be helped, but unfortunately in doing that — at the time that that was happening — our Federal debt has greatly increased. That is the curse of the economic system under which we live, that prosperity only comes through people individually or collectively increasing their debt. It is an absolute fact, Mr. Speaker, that individually we have been more able to get out of debt, municipally we have been more able to get out of debt, by reason of the fact that, as a nation, we have been greatly increasing our debt.

Now, as I say, we must be realists and agree that a Budget must be, to some extent, a compromise. I agree that a government to remain in office, must have the support of the members who profess to support it, on the Speech from the Throne and on the Budget. On the Speech from the Throne because it is a general outline of government's policy, and if you do not agree with the policy in its general outline, than you do not agree with them at all. I would say that you must give them support on the Budget

or else you do not agree that they are fit to handle the business. But, Mr. Speaker, there I stop: I believe that every member has, and should have, the right to exercise his independent judgment on any other Bill that comes before the House. I think that we should have some changes in the idea of the responsibility of the private member to support Bills. I do not think any member should be placed in the position that Mr. Tucker, for instance, said himself he was placed in, with reference to taxing co-operatives, when he said he spoke in opposition to it because he thought they should not be taxed; but he voted for the Bill that was there, because to do anything else would be want of confidence in the government.

I contend that I can and have, in this Legislature, voted against measures the government proposed, and at the same time had confidence in it. I think that that should be recognized quite clearly, and rules, if necessary, should be changed. In this day in which we live, whether we like it or not, whether we agree with the theory or not, governments are more and more going to be concerned with the carrying on of business. Now, that is not to say that necessarily they must be in business as principals, but government regulations, both Provincial and Federal, are coming to have more and more to do with the way in which you do business. In the complex civilization that we are building, more and more regulation becomes necessary because more and more individuals are becoming dependent for their living and their life on other individuals or on other groups of individuals far removed from them. So the government, by the very nature of things, must enter into the picture more and more. I do contend, Mr. Speaker, that our parliamentary system was not designed to handle that sort of a situation. So I suggest that the topic brought up by the member for Last Mountain (Mr. Benson), is one that should receive the serious thought of every member of this Legislature.

I do not think he has all the answers. I do not think that he would even argue that he has. I do not think any of us have the answers; but I do think we are not giving as much thought to that angle of government as we should, because we in the C.C.F. Party were organized for no other purpose than to make Democracy function in the interests of the people of this province.

I listened to a number of speakers — Opposition speakers — who argue or appear to argue, that the C.C.F. was something that had been foisted on the people of Saskatchewan by some smart group of agitators, or whatever you would like to call them, who had brought in some ideas from somewhere and put it over us. Mr. Speaker, that did not happen. The C.C.F., as we have it in Saskatchewan, did not come from anywhere. It grew here in Saskatchewan. It may have been influenced; some of the individuals in it may have been influenced by books they read from other places — naturally they would be. But from the very earliest in my recollection, the people among whom I live, have been trying to figure out means whereby the things they want, in way of government, would be made possible. They tried Liberalism and Conservatism — they tried them and tried them — and in the Liberal Party and in the Conservative Party there were many good men. There were many men who sincerely and

earnestly tried to improve the condition of the country. But in both of those parties there was too much reaction; there were too many of the people in those parties that became imbued, apparently, with the idea that the maintenance of the Party in office, was the most important thing that they had to consider. And the people found that the legislation that was necessary of the enlargement of their opportunities was not forthcoming. So 25, 26, 27 years ago we had what we called the 'Progressive' uprising in Western Canada — a movement that grew directly out of the farm organizations of Saskatchewan, in an attempt to put on the Statutes books of Canada legislation which they had fully decided was necessary. At that time there was a great felling of opposition to the idea of 'Partying'; they were not going to have a Party at all. True, they called it the Progressive Party, but they said that the trouble is a Party system. They were going to get away from that, and they were going to be independent; they were going to vote very question on its merits. We do not even want government. All we want is that the people who are the government, will do the things that we want done. They went down to Ottawa, and Western Canada almost elected them 100 per cent. But because they did not have a very unified policy, because they were working each one as individuals, we did not get as much results as could have been hoped for, or was hoped for.

Then the same people looked around. What was the matter with that organization? And they formed another one, and they called it the C.C.F., and it was suggested, for instance, by the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) that clever speakers, such as the hon. Premier, had sort of sold us the idea of the C.C.F. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the contribution made by the Premier to the C.C.F., he did not invent it. Personally, I decided to be a C.C.F. before I ever saw him. He did not come along and sell me the idea of a new approach to our political problem. He expresses it very fluently on the platform — I will admit that; not many people in the Dominion of Canada could express any political doctrine as fluently as he does. But this idea of a democratic people's organization is deeper than that. It is bigger than the Premier or M. J. Coldwell., or the whole Cabinet in Ottawa, or all the members of this Legislature. It is something that had its genesis in the hearts and minds of ordinary people. That is the organization that controls the C.C.F.

The member for the Mediterranean Area (Mr. Embury) spoke about who dominates the C.C.F. Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak for all of Saskatchewan in the same extent that I could speak for the people of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley, that I know better than anyone else; but I know that the Communists, for instance, and the Communists' philosophy, have no more chance of success in Qu'Appelle-Wolseley, than none. Neither has Fascism any chance in Qu'Appelle-Wolseley. Nor do I think any of those theories have any chance in the Wolseley. Nor do I think any of those theories have any chance in the Province of Saskatchewan, unless those who profess to be leaders and who accept responsibility of leadership, fall down on the job terribly bad.

This Party was not organized to institute Socialism. This Party was organized to give effect to the ideal of the people of Saskatchewan — a Democratic Government and as much Socialism as was necessary for their welfare.

March 12, 1948

The hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson), in his remarks, suggested that there is only one kind of Socialism. I wonder, would he say that there is only one kind of Capitalism? Mr. Speaker, I think one of the first things we ought to do, if we are to hold debates and keep them on a reasonable level, would be to define our terms. There may be only one kind of Capitalism, but certainly there are many kinds of Capitalists. There maybe only one kind of Socialism, and that is the kind of Socialism that means the welfare of society (that is my definition of Socialism) rather than the welfare of capital. If Capitalism means, on the other hand, that the only thing that is important, and the only thing that should have consideration of government, is capital, I would not even suggest that that was the only definition of Capitalism, or that there was only one possible kind of capitalists, and that he was a rascal who robbed all his neighbours. But there are people who are Capitalist who did not hesitate to rob their neighbours.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is only one kind of Democracy, and that is the kind that was so well defined by the member for Last Mountain (Mr. Benson), this afternoon, quoting from an article in 'Life' Magazine, this afternoon. That is the only kind of government that we want in Saskatchewan, a government that is interested in nothing except the welfare of the individuals that make up that society. But we have to get down into the cases where we actually introduced things.

We suggest that the school system, for instance, would be better handled under a Larger School Unit of administration. Someone says that is not Democracy. Why is it not Democracy? It does not matter how big the district is or how small the district is, they could both be Democratic. The important thing, or the problem that we have to face as legislators, is how we will get the best results for the people who are of importance in the school — the children. And to argue that by making the district larger, and by making the School Board more important, you are taking control away from the school and putting it into the hands of the government, frankly, Mr. Speaker, to me is one of the most unreasonable arguments I ever heard. I do not maintain that the Larger Unit of school administration will answer all the problems of education. I do not maintain that many of the things that it does, could not have been done in some other way. Possibly, they could. But what I cannot understand is why, when we start to argue a question like Larger Unit of administration, we cannot argue that question on its merits, without suggesting, or definitely stating, that it is a part of some diabolical plot that is being perpetrated on the people of Saskatchewan.

The same thing applies to industrial development. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I have my doubts about the advisability of the government carrying on business ventures as principals unless they are prepared to class them as natural monopolies. On the other hand, I do not think there is anything wrong with the Government of Saskatchewan experimenting with possible industrial development for Saskatchewan. I do not think there is anything wrong in fact I think it right, that the Dominion Government experiments with agricultural process, or with new varieties of wheat and whatnot;

experimental farms, and that sort of thing. They tried to encourage and increase agricultural production. But we have, after 50, 60, 70 years in Saskatchewan, found we have no industrial development to amount to anything. We found that we could not persuade, by anything we had to offer, the industrial magnates of Eastern Canada, or the United States, to start up in Saskatchewan. It is true that General Motors, for instance, came and built a big plant in Regina. But after the plant was built, that is all it amounted to as far as in industry was concerned — usefulness principally in war time. They tell us that our policy drives industry out of Saskatchewan. You cannot drive industry out of Saskatchewan. I do not care what fool measure this government might bring in, they would not drive industry out of Saskatchewan. We did not have any industry in Saskatchewan to drive out.

When the Liberals, or rather the Conservatives started to experiment with Estevan coal and built a briquetting plant, and when the Liberals and the Government at Ottawa carried it further and demonstrated that Saskatchewan coal could be made into a satisfactory fuel, they did a good job for the people of Saskatchewan. There is nothing wrong with it up to that point; nothing wrong with it at all, except the fact that they did not protect the investment of the people of Saskatchewan, in what they had been doing. There would be nothing wrong, in my opinion, if this government can demonstrate that a woollen industry can be carried on successfully in Saskatchewan; they will have done a good job for the people of Saskatchewan. There would be nothing wrong with it further — in fact it would be an advantage, in my opinion — if having done that, they turned that woollen mill over to the co-operatives or even to an industry, under proper safeguards, so that the people's investment and the people's rights would be protected. We would be doing good work. Or, we would not be doing any harm if we continued it, as a government enterprise, as long as it proves itself to be a reasonable proposition.

The member for the Mediterranean Area (Mr. Embury) suggested that all of the money that was spent on industrial development, might better have been spent on educational grants. As a matter of fact I was interested in hearing that, because it is not so many years ago when people who supported the same political opinion that he professes, argued against universal education at all. As a matter of fact, it is one of the strangest things in history that the Tory of one generation fights to maintain the things that the Tory of the previous generation fought to prevent. That has been going on for centuries. The liberals — and I am using a small “l”, Mr. Speaker — and the reformers, through history, have brought in proposals. The Tories — and again I am using a small “t” — have always maintained that all the inheritances of the ages would be wiped out if that fool measure was introduced. Nevertheless it got introduced, and then, when somebody came along with a further reform to it, they fought as hard as ever to maintain that.

The ‘little country schoolhouse’, in Upper Canada, was fought against by the Conservative or Tory of that date. “What did these

March 12, 1948

ordinary bushwhackers need an education for, anyway". But the little country schoolhouse, with the little country school board, is the basic of our Democratic system, today.

The same thing applies to the Trade Union Act. The same thing, Mr. Speaker, applies to the courts. I will take second place to no one in this House — not even any of the men learned in the law, including the Attorney General — in my idea that we must have a rule of law; that we must have courts which shall receive the respect of the people of the country. But these courts must be set up by legislative authority. It is just the same idea at the Crown. The reason that we have in this British country what the poet calls 'the loyal passion for our temperal King', is because the King and the court hold their power by virtue of the power that was granted to them through the legislative machinery of parliaments like this. It is only when people like us forget our responsibility — people like us legislators — and make appointments and bring courts into disrepute through not being properly set up, that there is anything wrong with it. And if it becomes necessary for Legislatures or Parliaments to change the basis upon which Courts are established, then those Parliaments and those Legislatures have just as much right to do that as the other Parliament or the other Legislature had to set up them in the first place.

It was suggested, for instance, that articles by such people as Dyson Carter, were something that would wreck the Province of Saskatchewan, and it should not be printed. Mr. Speaker, the first time I read anything of Dyson Carter's, it was in MacLean's Magazine, which is supposed to be, according to their own admission, Canada's national magazine. I, for one, would not suggest that MacLean's Magazine was Communist, or that MacLean's Magazine was trying to sell Communism to the people of Saskatchewan, when they published the article by Dyson Carter. Furthermore, I am one of those people who believe so strongly in free speech and free thinking, that I would insist, almost, in being permitted to read the opinions of anybody. I am so sure that I can decide for myself what is good for me, that I am prepared to read even Karl Marx.

I do not think that you have to stick your head under the pillow and feel frightened because somebody introduced some literature written by somebody that you did not agree with politically.

Another criticism that was advanced was that our Social Services would be built up to the point where we could not carry them. That is a fact; it may happen that we will have a Social Service set up so high that we will be unable to carry it. If that happens, why will it happen? It will not happen because the people of Saskatchewan stop working; they will keep on working, they will keep on producing. And even in spite of drought over any average period of years that you would like to take, we will be able to produce the food that is necessary for all the people of Saskatchewan. We will be able to produce enough more to trade on a basis of equity for the other things that we would need to have. And if, in these prosperous times, we had built some more hospitals, if we had trained some more doctors, if we had trained some more nurses, and even if the financial

system should go to not so bad that the cheques would not be cashed in our banking system, we will not be any less able to look after the needs of our people if we have set up the machinery to do it with. It may be a headache for the people who are faced with the responsibility of government. It probably will be a headache, because people have become conditioned so much into putting the 'dollar sign' on everything; but it will actually be easier to care for the sick if we have the hospitals and the doctors and the nurses, than it would be if we had the money and did not have these things.

The only thing we need feel awfully frightened of, as far as the province is concerned, is that the people of Saskatchewan cease to be industrious, and cease to put their skill into the developing of the resources. It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that there is nothing that will so encourage people to do those necessary things, as the feeling that, having done it, they will get their fair share of the compensation or the reward. The problem of government is the laying down the basis of equity for these things.

The problem of legislators is not to pick out the best political catches that they think they can imagine. The problem of government is not to call one another names. It is to do what the Scripture says: "come, let us reason together". That is what we are supposed to be here for, and in doing it partisanship has very little place. The less of it we could have, the better. We need the approach of a free man, with a free mind, to the solution of the problem. If, in the solution, we have to adopt some measures which some people call Socialism, that will not do any harm provided those things are in the interest of the people. But please do not let us run away with this idea that the C.C.F., or that any number of them, are agents of some foreign power. They are the representatives of the progressive-minded people of Saskatchewan, using what little brains they have in trying to solve the problems which are big enough. The name of the Party or the group that is doing that, makes very little difference.

The member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson), when he was quoting Colin Cameron — I think he comes from Vancouver — seemed to me to answer his own argument better than I can, when he was quoting from Colin Cameron and he said: 'They discussed the question of the socialization of land objectively, and that they had shown willingness to discuss any proposition'. Okay, that is Democracy, and that is what you ought to be willing to do; and having discussed it, that same group in Saskatoon turned it down. Certainly every C.C.F. convention that I have ever been at, where it was proposed, turned it down. I was not at that one; but it was not even a convention — it was a group of people who met for study. Study groups — some people say they are a terrible thing. If we had had more study groups in Saskatchewan, we would have had better government in Saskatchewan and we would have had it sooner.

There is no reasonable argument that can be advanced against a

March 12, 1948

group of people meeting together and discussing any proposition. That is freedom; that is the thing we stand for, and that is the thing that makes the British people great — that they are prepared to look any fact in the face and consider any proposition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to adopt Communism. We are not going to adopt Fascism. But we are going to progress in Saskatchewan, and if the C.C.F. does not give us progress in Saskatchewan, the same people that organized it, will organize something that will give them progress. The people that organized the C.C.F. are not worried about tradition. They got over the hurdle of changing their Party once, which is the hardest time. They could change it a second time easier. The first time, for most things, is the hardest. This Party has to keep to its knitting, and bring something and do something, and continue to do something, like the Premier said: “If we stopped it would not be long before they would say, well, what have you done for me lately. We will have to be doing something all of the time”. And it will not be the taking away of people’s liberties that will keep us in office; do not worry about that. We will have to be doing things that they can see, and adding to their liberties.

The people of Saskatchewan recognized, a long time ago, that they had to work together to get the results they needed. The old-timers that I spoke about before recess, learned in their pioneering days that they could not get along without their neighbours, and that is why they were ‘sold’ on co-operation, so easily. That is why Saskatchewan leads Canada in progressive government.

I could have wished — as far as the Budget is concerned — that it would have been possible to do more. I could certainly wish that it had been possible to do more in Qu’Appelle-Wolseley — I am glad the Minister of Highways is here now — because, as I was saying before recess, Qu’Appelle-Wolseley got a little ahead of the rest of the province.

(continued on next page)

They recognize that they are a little better blessed than the rest of the province, but they are not willing to sit and wait until the rest of the province catches up to them before they have any more progress. We recognize that we have better municipal roads than most other people, but we are not satisfied to ride over the same old bumps until the rest of the province get their roads all built. As a matter of fact, what I am trying to indicate, Mr. Speaker, is that we haven't enough of those nice new C.C.F. roads in Qu'Appelle-Wolseley.

I would have liked to see pensions for the crippled brought in — referred to by the member for Last Mountain (Mr. J. Benson). I think it is one of the things that we should be doing something about. I think it is even more necessary than raising the Old Age Pensions — not that I am suggesting for one moment that the Old Age Pensioners are getting too much, but rather that the others are getting too little. I do not think that it is wise at any time for any one group to get too far in advance of other groups of equally helpless people.

There are a number of things that I could have wished to be done, but, at the same time, I cannot suggest that these things should be done and that the Education Tax, for instance, should be dispensed with. As a matter of fact, as I said after supper, the most important function of government is studying the incidence of taxation. And I am here to say that we have lots of taxes that are more unfair than the Education Tax, whether it was put on by the Liberals or whoever it was put on by. I am a believer in everybody paying taxes; I am a believer in direct taxes, so that the people know they are paying. I am a believer in taxes that do not cost too much to collect, so that half the money the taxpayer pays does not sometimes get into the revenues at all. There are lots of things worse than the Education tax: there are some things bad about it. If someone could invent some sort of a tax that didn't cost anything it would be wonderful. Our Social Credit friends say that they have the answer; that they have some scheme that provides taxation revenue without any contribution from anyone, but I think they are the only ones who make that suggestion. We will have to make contributions from our production in order that things can be secured for the people. The Budget that has been brought down, it seems to me, has done that reasonable well, reasonably fairly, and is just about as little as can be spent to give the people the services that they must have, and I shall vote for it.

Mrs. Beatrice J. Trew (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, so much has been said in this Debate, and so excellently well said in many cases, particularly that of the hon. Provincial Treasurer, that I hesitate to add any more. As the days have gone on I have been receiving from my constituents more and more letters giving some of their reactions. And so, as their mouthpiece in this Legislature, I must have a few things to say.

This year, the constituency of Maple Creek, which I have the honour to represent, like that of the hon. member for Gull Lake (Mr. A. C. Murray), had varying crop returns, the south portion suffering a very considerable crop failure, and then northern part faring much better. In the southern area, where much of the stock had to be liquidated, last fall, Federal policies raising the cost of grains they had to buy, and failing to take a firm stand with the packers during the labour dispute, did great damage. I would like to quote a few lines from one letter received the other day: "It was all right for some of the farmers who had everything seeded in rye; those farmers are O.K. The ones that had everything in wheat, oats and barley will have a hard time to pull through, especially when the Federal Government took off the ceiling price on oats and barley, that ruined every farmer who had pigs, or some stock. We had to give them way for nothing, because we could not afford to buy the dear feed, as this is now three years in succession where we have had no crops".

You may wonder why all the farmers in the district I referred to weren't in rye. Well, unless one was fortunate enough to have begun while the price was low, it was not easy to get enough money together to buy the seed necessary, at \$3 to \$4 per bushel. Besides that, the uncertainty as to the price of the grain when that crop would produce a crop to be sold made many pause. In fact, the whole situation, with respect to rye, in my constituency, serves to impress more strongly than every on my mind the need for orderly marketing and guaranteed price.

Some rather amusing things happened, as, for instance, the case of a farmer in our district who nearly went crazy 'phoning, wiring and driving hundreds of miles to get repairs for his combine, because it was holding him up for two weeks, only to find that he was \$2,000 richer because of the delay.

It is apparent to the vast majority of our farmers that that is not a sane or desirable condition under which to farm. There can be no long-term planning of farm activities, so as to get the most production from the land, while there is so much uncertainty about prices on either grain or livestock.

The letter from which I quoted previously brought another problem to my attention: that of a farmer who, through circumstances over which he had no control, finds himself with a very poor crop — some of his neighbours in the same boat but not a sufficient number to come under the benefits of the Prairie Farm Assistance Act. Much correspondence has come to me every year, and this is no exception, from farmers whose township, or a sufficiently large portion thereof, did not qualify for assistance; but yet, because of some freak of nature denied them the rain given to the majority of their neighbours, they had a crop failure. I am not sure to what extent this is

March 12, 1948

true over the rest of the province, but I know that, in our part, in every year when there is not an overall bumper crop, the rains are very spotty. There is nothing the very best of farmers can do to induce the rain to fall on his land if the clouds do not agree to it.

There is, too, a very wide variation in soil, within many of our townships. The farms on the borderline very often find themselves without bonus payments because they are too close to soils that withstand drought better than theirs. So I hope that this Legislature will continue their pressure on the Federal Government to amend the Prairie Farm Assistance Act, so as to make payments possible on an individual farm basis. Some improvements in the Act have been made but, in my opinion, at least, it will never be satisfactory while arbitrary boundaries exist.

One thing I was happy to note in the Budget was the increase expenditure in the Agricultural Department. Results of our provincial Department have already been felt, and appreciated, in the Maple Creek constituency. Here I would like to join with other members, who have congratulated the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. I. C. Nollet) on the improved Agricultural Representative Service. Other members have mentioned in detail the things they are doing. I just want to say that the agricultural representatives are beginning to get right to the people who need their services the most. Formation of local committees is doing much to bring home to the individual farmer his own responsibility for good farming practices, and an understanding of his own problems, and their solution.

In this respect I would like to offer one suggestion to the Minister. It is a suggestion I have previously made to him, and to the head of the Agricultural Representative Branch. It is that more effort be made to get municipal councils to appoint members other than themselves to these local committees. While it may be true that one is liable to find people of consequence, people regarded as leading farmers, in municipal councils, I think it is also true that the council does not include all those interested in the agricultural well-being of the community. And, it is also true that, usually, the rural municipal councilor has too much to do in connection with his work as a councilor to give sufficient time to do the work of the local agricultural committee. Unfortunately, in too many cases the rural municipal council, I find in my constituency, is the committee; and the farmers of the district are not sufficiently aware of the possibilities of self-help and democratic pooling of ideas, through the committee, to make the best use of it. I know that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. J. H. Brockelbank) is in agreement with my viewpoint, and that he is trying to see that that is done. I am urging that they try a little harder.

As I said before, the service is functioning better and better in increasing production and in increasing better farming practices, but it could, I feel, do more. The bringing of the representative to actually live within his district has been a good move. When two years ago, for instance, I received a wire from farmers in a certain area requesting advice with regard to their fall rye, which they were afraid was a total loss from frost, I was able to contact the agricultural representative immediately, and he went and gave such advice as he could. In the past our representative has never been nearer than Swift Current, 100 miles or more away from his district.

Of late years, many farmers have been experimenting with winter wheat, but the consensus of opinion is that it is an extremely risky experiment. The results varied from good success in the Sceptre district, where I am told there was one field of over 60 bushels to the acre, to complete failure around Maple Creek and the Consul district, where the fields had to be reseeded in the spring, owing to winter or spring killing. Many of us in that part of the province are looking with interest, to the present experiments of our agricultural scientists in developing a perennial wheat, although I know there will be about another ten years before there are any definite results from their work.

I have spoken before in this House of the need of very serious study and action in the problem of the farmer who is situated on land unsuitable for cultivation. It is not that I don't realize that something has been and is being done, but I would like to see it given more attention. I have been in this province for 30 years — not an old-timer, according to the member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. W. Burgess); but, even so, many people to the southwest, at least, recognized that that was a problem even then. It seems to me progress toward solving that could have been faster.

I would like to quote a paragraph of another letter received two days ago. Speaking of the Robsart-Govanlock area south of the Cypress Hills, the writer has this to say: "That territory has some very large P.F.R.A. leases along the international boundary line. These leases have operated since the hungry 'thirties, and have been an unqualified success. We now have our provincial Department of Agriculture developing the Spangler place, south of Govanlock, and they mention that that is an irrigation project for the growing of feed. Along with that development should go the extension of community pastures, and with those the over-grazing problem might disappear". In another part of the same letter he said: "As far as the cattle numbers go, almost the only revenue derived from the farms here, the last three years, has been received from the sale of stock. That being the case, I can see no solution to our problems down here, by reducing the size of the smaller cattle herds". He favours, as I do, more and more community leases being gradually substituted for privately-held leases.

In fact, as this Assembly found out in answer to a question asked, last year, by the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. P. J. Hoogie), residents of Maple Creek constituency believe very strongly in social ownership. I draw your attention to the answer as it appears on page 193 of the 1947 Journals: "Co-operative Associations have been organized for various types of agricultural production services as flows" and for Maple Creek constituency it lists nine co-operatives, all livestock ones: the Battle Creek Livestock Co-operative Association; Big Stick Stockmen's Co-operative Association; Claydon Grazing Co-operative Association; Heck Livestock Co-operative Association; Lemsford Stockmen's Co-operative Association; Rush Springs Community Pasture; Sand Hills Stockmen's Co-operative Association; Signal Valley Community Pastures; Maple Creek Livestock. And if the members have been noting questions this year, they will be aware of the fact that a community pasture has been established in the Robsart area, called the Arena Community Pasture.

I recognize, of course, that there is, in the Cypress Hills especially, some land that is purely ranching, but I am referring to the areas where a mixed-farming economy is the practical one. In speaking of community leases, I do not think it should be necessary that these should show a direct profit — at least for the first years. A community lease that will service from ten to twenty families would create so much indirect benefit that present benefits might be ignored a little. I know that in its endeavour to ensure the best use of our grazing land, the Lands Branch has been brought to a realization of the extent of this problem. The fact that there are, practically always, many more than one application for each piece of pasture land posted, shows there is much greater demand than supply for provincial lands. As I understand our Department's policy, it is to encourage as much co-operation as possible, and certainly where large enough leases can be secured, community pastures, combined with good farming practices to ensure winter feed, together with the Department's program of feed conservation, will do much to ensure a sounder agricultural economy in the southwest.

Now, Mr. Speaker, after this, you may be surprised to know that one of the matters causing much concern in our part of the province just now is the simplified income tax forms put out by Ottawa for our farmers. It must be remembered though, that, especially on the Empress line of the C.P.R. running northwest of Swift Current, we have some of the best land in Saskatchewan, comparing favourable with that of the Regina plains. It must be remembered, too, that, as I have already mentioned, many farmers, because of the price of rye and because of favourable fall and spring weather of late years, giving a fair crop of all rye, have been for the first time in their lives placed in the income tax brackets. Back in the 'thirties, most of our farmers, even if they had been making our returns before, discontinued doing so because of the futility of reporting, year by year, a deficit.

But now that, at last, and for a short time I am afraid, they are 'in the money', our Federal Liberal Government is making sure they get their share of it. Besides the bewilderment at the intricacies of the 'simplified' form, and the resentment at some of the questions asked, I noted a feeling that discrimination was being shown against the Western farmer; a sort of 'why are we being picked on' feeling. It is hard for the man who at last has the money to get his land clear of mortgage and feed and seed relief debt, to understand that he must pay income tax, even before that back debt is paid off, as to that I was much interested, and I think the hon. members will be, in the answer received by T. J. Bentley, M. P. for Swift Current, to a question asked in the House of Commons. The question was: Has there been, or are there now, the same number of income tax inspectors in proportion to the number of farmers in all provinces as there are in Alberta and Saskatchewan?" The Hon. Dr. J. J. McCann, for the Taxation Division, gave the following answer: "No information as to the number of individuals operating arms in Canada. However, based on the latest available statistical information, both as to the number of farms in Canada and the amounts of cash income derived from the sale of farm products in Canada, the following comparative statement is furnished in answer to the question asked by the hon. member for Swift Current". Now, I am not going to quote all the answer, which was in six columns, but part of it is as follows: Number of farms in Alberta, 89,541; number of farm assessors, 39; number of farms in Saskatchewan, 125,612; number of farm assessors, 55; number of farms in Manitoba, 44,448; number of farm assessors, 31; number of farms in other provinces, 436,363, number of farm assessors, 88.

That is, in the prairie provinces, with about 25,000 farms, we have 126 farm income tax inspectors, while the other provinces in Canada, with nearly 450,000 farms, have only 88 inspectors. It would seem to me that the feeling of being 'picked on' might have some basis in fact. They might say that the farm income is bigger in the West. Here, from the same answer, are the average farm income per farm assessor, which should give a fair picture of that. Averaging the prairie provinces, I find that the average farm income, per farm assessor, in the prairie provinces, is \$6,583,000, in round figures. For all other provinces in Canada, the average, per assessor, is \$9,415,000. In other words, when our farmers think there is an excessively large number of income tax inspectors in the West, compared to the rest of Canada, the answer from the Taxation Division at Ottawa would seem to bear that out.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to be misunderstood. I am not arguing against the paying of income tax by farmers. I have been most outspoken in condemnation of any evasion of income tax payments; but in this, there should be equity, and no one part of our economy should be made to feel that they are being singled out for discriminatory treatment.

There is much more I would like to say both about the constituency of Maple Creek and the Government program, but I think we are all weary of speeches. So I will say just this one thing more about Maple Creek: those of this House who are accustomed to think of the dry southwest plains should visit our Cypress Park. The Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. J. L. Phelps) got his eyes opened with surprise when he first came to our Park and saw the beautiful evergreen trees, the streams and the lakes, and experienced the exhilarating climate of Cypress. He knows, too, I hope, that last summer, a visiting botanist discovered there a very rare orchid, of a species not found anywhere else in North America. So, if any of you want a holiday, next year, I hope you will visit Cypress Park. If you do, you will find a graveled highway from Maple Creek south the Park, and if the members should wish to go farther south, the gravel extends down to the end of highway No. 21. No. 13 is not graveled yet, but a beautiful new grade has been built as far west as Govanlock — I hope the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley won't be too envious. I would not want the Minister of Highways (Hon. J. T. Douglas), to feel too complacent, because there are two more stretches, one from Eastend west and one farther south on highway No. 46 that need some attention, and I intend to keep that need before him until he does something about it. If, when you visit Cypress, you want to come up to Lemsford to see me, you will travel north of Maple Creek on highway No. 21, on one of the best stretches of road I have seen in the province. The Department of Highways had quite a problem there, in dealing with sand that had to be clay-topped and then graveled. The work was done by a Government road outfit, whose foreman is a very well qualified man, and a resident of the constituency, who is doing a very fine job in demonstrating the efficiency and comparatively low cost of highway construction done by a Government outfit. This road will be completed to Leader this coming summer, we expect.

Some of my fellow members, who may have listened to me before talking about Highway No. 21, will be interested to know that I was told, last summer in Swift Current, that the members of the Highway Department there were calling it the 'Trew' highway, because I had talked so long, and so incessantly, about the need of an all-weather road there. I want to congratulate the Minister of Highways for the good start they have made on bringing our roads up to date. In that respect we have been much neglected in the past under Liberal administration — just getting a little 'sop' thrown to us at election time. In this connection, I would like to pass this on to the members of the House: I read in the 'Maple Creek News', last summer, what I consider to be a great compliment to our C.C.F. Government. The 'news' is distinctly anti-C.C.F., supporting the Liberal Party in its editorial policy. Last summer, after commenting on the excellence of the road being constructed, the editor said: "Now, if it was a Liberal or Conservative government in power in Regina, we would know there was to be an election this year, but with that bunch of 'Socialists' in power we don't know where we are at".

I have had to smile very often during this Session when the Opposition have been talking of the bad roads of the province, and claiming that this Government is doing no work. It reminds me of the meeting Mr. Tucker held in Leader, last fall. While the meeting was going on, truckers were putting down the last of the gravel on highway No. 32 — the first gravel that has ever been seen on any highway in our neck of the woods. So, when I went to hear Mr. Tucker, naturally I wondered what he would say about highways. Well, he told a different story to his usual one — he said, in essence: “If Mr. Douglas had just taken the right attitude with Ottawa, they would have helped him with the roads for Northern development”. Very interesting was the inference he left, that if his Party were in power in Saskatchewan they would get Federal help. My thoughts went back to Prime Minister King’s famous ‘not one five-cent piece’ statement.

There is just one more thing I want to say. We have been told so often of school taxes being increased because of the establishment of larger units, but I would like to show a few with a reverse trend. I may say that one of the things that impelled me to speak in this Debate was the fact that I received two or three letters from people in my constituency offering me, voluntarily, some instances of tax reductions since the C.C.F. had come into office. I am just going to mention one of them tonight. For instance, in R. M. 111, Maple Creek, in 1944 there was collected the sum of \$7,474.90, with a mill-rate up to 13½. Last year, 1947, under the larger unit of the administration, the mill-rate was down to 12, and the sum raised was \$7,666.60. One of the reasons for this reduction in the mill-rate was because of the inclusion in the Unit of land that had never before been taxed for school purposes. Since most of this was ranchland from which much wealth has been, and is, being derived by its owners or lessees, I think that is another of the good results of the Larger Unit. So highly regarded in monetary value are our pasture and ranchlands that I have heard complaints that even yet they are not paying their fair share of educational costs. However that may be, it is certainly, to my mind, a right principle, that where taxes are to be raised on land, all of the land should pay its share. Of course, the Unit then becomes responsible for the education of any children residing there. It seems to me that one of the very best things about the Larger Unit is just that there is some local authority to assume responsibility for all school children’s education. Under the small school districts this wasn’t always so. In our area many schools have been closed for lack of pupils. I was interested in the ingenious explanation I heard somewhere of the decline in hog population because of the larger unit closing schools; but I assure you that the closing of our schools is not because of the larger units, but simply because of shifted population. In a district where only two or three pupils are left, there is now a Unit Board to be responsible for arranging and paying for transportation to another school, or for providing dormitory or other accommodations. The many, many benefits to the children concerned

have been told of before and I will not retell them tonight.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, there is just one thought I would like to leave with this House. Tonight, we have listened to a very worthwhile address from the member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley, but too often we have argued and talked, it seems to me, of a lot of fantastic things, such as 'iron curtains' in Saskatchewan; 'Reds' in the C.C.F.; 'dictators' in the North etc.; but I want to plead with the hon. members to spend more time considering how we can bring about, as a province, world peace. I believe we can play a real part of feeding those who need it. I do not think we are going to stop Communism, or prevent a war, in the way some people think. We, in this province, have great potentialities in food production — let us stop fighting imaginary bogey-men and concentrate on better methods of production, giving security to our farm producers so they can do their best without fear of sickness, or old age, or accident crippling them financially, in feeding the world. Because I think this Budget is designed for that purpose, I shall support it.

Hon. L. F. McIntosh (Minister of Co-operation and Co-operative Development): — Mr. Speaker, I was very interested, and found it extremely difficult to disagree with the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley, when he spoke of the large number of pioneers who contributed their help in founding our democracy, in the constituency which he has the honour to represent. I found it difficult to disagree because it was in that constituency that I first learn of the many contributions made by the citizens of that constituency to the welfare and community life of that section, and, later on, the province of Saskatchewan as a whole.

I rather regretted that the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley did not dwell more fully on the tremendous contribution made by the pioneers of that district in the building of community life, in the laying of the foundations for a great democratic society. I expect, also, in the years to come when historians get around to writing the current history of that section of the province of Saskatchewan, they may be in a position to mention, Mr. Speaker, that Qu'Appelle-Wolseley was the first in sending to this Legislature, a bachelor who was grounded in the philosophy of democracy and co-operation.

I was very interested in the remarks made by the member for Last Mountain (Mr. J. Benson). I think, after all, he had many things to say that are worthy of very serious consideration on the part of this Legislature. But I fail to understand how it is possible to deprive a certain section of our citizens of their full right, as citizens of this province and of Canada, as was suggested by the member for Last Mountain, when he questioned the right of giving civil servants the right to participate in the political economy of this province. After all, it is extremely difficult to lay the foundation to a great democratic institution when you are, at the same time, prepared to deprive any of her people from participating as citizens in the right of building a democratic society.

I would like to say to this member for Last Mountain that there are some essentials in building a democratic society, and possibly one of them is to extend to each and every one the full right of citizenship, and probably go on, Mr. Speaker, and say that you cannot have a democracy when and if you have a people more concerned with their individual welfare than that of their community. Might I go further and say that democracy is a way of life — it finds its roots deep in the individual, in the home and in the community. And I am sure that the member for Last Mountain would not object to me quoting a few lines taken from page 39 of that famous book “National Being” when the late Mr. Russell said there: “Wherever there is rural decay, if it is enquired into it will be found that there was a rural population but no rural community”. In building our democratic society we must, of necessity, recognize that the home is more important than the individual, and the community more important than the individual.

I was rather interested in the member’s address, representing the Mediterranean Area, he tried to visualize around the corners of this Assembly, spooks of various kinds. He visualized behind the seats and under the desks certain types of individuals, certain types of Socialists, Communists. He was rather critical of the legislation, rather possibly because the ‘I’s’ were not dotted and the ‘T’s’ not properly crossed, and he endeavoured to leave the impression that there was a danger of the members representing the Government bringing into existence in this province a form of political economy that he could not endorse. And when I listened to him I recalled an incident that I witnessed in one of the main-line towns east of the city of Regina, back, I believe, about 1929 when, following a meeting we were holding there in the interests of the co-operative movement, we attended another meeting called for this town, and taking place that night. It was addressed by those who posed as the Ku Klux Klan. Those addressing that meeting, and our own group, were taking a train out of that main-line town that evening, going east, and we met over in the station. We were there for about an hour and they were expounding the virtues of what they were advocating. They said the infiltration of the Ku Klux Klan could be found any place. It could be found here, it could be found there, if it was only looked for. One said: “Look, take this dollar bill issued by the Dominion of Canada, and hold it up to the light. There you see the form of the Pope”. We were all looking and we said, “Where?” “Can’t you see it?” said he “There it is. Can’t you see it?” “No, we can’t see it”. Well, Mr. Speaker, I understand that was the organization that was supporting the Party which the member for the Mediterranean speaks so eloquently for, in this House.

Back, I believe, in 1934, the late Mr. Bennett, as Leader of the Conservative Party in the Federal House, had introduced, on behalf of the government, what was known as the Natural Products’ Marketing Act, later on declared ultra vires of the powers of the Dominion House of Commons. Nevertheless, that Act was one of those far-reaching pieces of legislation

that has been placed on the Statute Books of any legislature, or the House of Commons, up to that time. That legislation was designed for the purpose of regulating, controlling and marketing any and all of the commodities that agriculture might wish to market under that legislation, if agriculture so desired. That legislation made provisions, Mr. Speaker, for those who might organize to market livestock under that legislation, going into the packing companies and having a continuous audit of the books, in order to determine whether or not the packing companies were getting an undue share of the consumer's and producer's labours. It had many other features, and to think that the hon. member for the Mediterranean Area (Mr. A. W. Embury) would get up in this House, yesterday, and cast reflections upon the legislation passed by the only government that was every truly elected by the people of this province!

I think it was back in 1929 — and I know the member for Arm River (Mr. G. H. Danielson) will correct me if I am wrong — when he was elected as a delegate for one of the largest farm marketing organizations in the Dominion of Canada. I believe he served for two years; I believe he served from November of 1929 to November of 1931. Again, if I am correct in my memory, it was in the summer and fall of 1931 when the organization that elected him as their representative within that particular sub-district, put on a campaign to bring under provincial legislation full control of the marketing of all of the wheat produced in the province of Saskatchewan, I believe that the hon. member for Arm River, as the delegate for that organization, would have probably, and probably did, endorse the stand taken by the organization in which he was one of the officials.

Mr. Speaker, I was rather proud of the Fourth Budget, introduced in this House by my good colleague the Provincial Treasurer. It was a Budget reached by compromise; it was a Budget in which all of the hon. Provincial Treasurer's colleagues had a part. If there is any criticism of the Budget, the criticism should be leveled against the Cabinet and not any individual. But I would like to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer for the very able manner in which he put together the thoughts and expressions of the Cabinet when, through compromise, they reached the figures quoted in this Budget.

I know that many of us would have liked to see more dollars for education, more dollars for health, more dollars for agricultural, and, naturally, more dollars to develop sounder democratic principles through co-operative help.

Shortly after the Budget was brought down in this House, the newspapers reported the Provincial Treasury of the province of Alberta bringing down their Budget. And the newspapers reported what the Budget might be in the province of British Columbia, this year. I believe the figures were

used in this House the other day. The records of the Budgets of these two provinces should, at least, be an indication to the critics of the present Provincial Government's Budget in this province, that there is very substantial increase taking place in the demands of the people of the various provinces of Canada, and a tremendous increase in the cost of those things that go into the administrating of the affairs of any province in the Dominion of Canada.

May I, Mr. Speaker, just in passing, make mention of the record of the British Labour Government, when it quite recently won its 37th by-election, I believe a record in the history of British parliamentary procedure, or parliamentary government.

Some criticism has been leveled against the actions of the Government in the field of timber, in the field of fish and in the field of fur. And I was rather interested in picking up 'The Western Retailer', a magazine published by the retail trade of Western Canada. Going over to page 18, I noticed this: "The first sawmill recorded in Saskatchewan operated in Il a la Crosse in 1860, answering the demand for settlement timber. At Fort Qu'Appelle in 1871, Archibald McDonald used lumber from Mission Lake to build fur-carrying boats for the trip to Winnipeg. The birth of the lumber industry took place at Prince Albert about 1878 to 1880. The machinery for the mill was brought in from Winnipeg, in Red River carts. One of the earliest sales of timber took place at Green Lake in 1882". But what I wish to draw to the attention of this House, in particular, is another part of the same article, where it says: "A typical example of how enterprising individuals can use the bountiful resources of Saskatchewan, to provide a better living for themselves and their fellowmen, is the newly established sawmill at Nipawin owned and operated by A.G. Lanz. Mr. Lanz started operations in 1940 at Grassy Lake Timber Reserve, just north of Nipawin, and, at that time, he employed eight men, and a number of horses, to haul the logs. In 1948, we find Mr. Lanz operating his sawmill with fully modern equipment, consisting of two caterpillars and three White trucks, with Columbia trailers, which trucks are capable of hauling logs 48 inches across. Mr. Lanz has moved his mill to Nipawin where he is now producing 28 to 30 thousand feet of rough lumber daily. 48 men comprise Mr. Lanz' payroll at the present time". I do not think it is necessary to deal with the other criticisms in connection with fish and fur.

Then there was something said about the highways. Under date of March 9th I received a letter from one of my constituents, and I am sorry that the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. A.T. Procter) is not in his seat. This letter said: "After listening to the very eloquent and bombastic speech of Mr. Procter, the Liberal member for Moosomin, I was prompted to write to you. Mr. Procter on March 8, 1948, speaking from the Floor of the Legislature

March 12, 1948

spoke at some length about the extensive road and bridge construction carried out by the former Liberal administration. He also stated that his constituency did not get nearly as great a percentage of the money spent on roadwork as the hon. Minister of Highways has spent on his constituency of Rosetown. If Moosomin did not get the money, I can assure you that our constituency of Prince Albert did not get it. The only time we saw any road equipment moving around here was the week before the election, and the week after election it was moving back in the other direction”.

I must, of necessity, hurry on, Mr. Speaker. But I would not like this opportunity to pass without making some mention of the contributions that are being made in this province — that are being made in other sections of the Dominion of Canada and in other countries of the world, by the common people, in the building of a sound constitutional and democratic government.

I want to refer first to the contribution made by the farm people of the province of Saskatchewan. It is quite true that the first agricultural organization of importance in the economic life of this province was organized by men who used Indian Head as the point to deliver their grain. Step by step, from one frontier to the next, these men laid the foundation of what has become internationally known as one of the outstanding achievements in co-operative grain handling and marketing, The Saskatchewan Co-operative Producers. As far back as 1938 the late Henry Wise Wood, in attending an international wheat conference at Kansas City, Missouri, stated that the next step would be international marketing. Many of the members of this Legislature will recall the storm of protest that was raised, both nationally and internationally, against that statement. They will recall that the Winnipeg grain interests, the Chicago-Liverpool interests, spearheaded a terrific barrage of propaganda against the Canadian Wheat Pool and the late Henry Wise Wood. Twenty years later, we have the signatures to an international agreement. True, not all the countries have signed, or intend to sign, but three large exporting countries have agreed to export annually 500,000,000 bushels of wheat, and 33 importing countries have agreed, in turn, to take that quantity of wheat.

The vision of these common men and women, the vision of the producer, after a constant struggle, is now at the point of being realized. I was particularly interested, Mr. Speaker, in attending the International Conference of Agricultural Producers, held in London in the spring of 1946, to find 32 different nations sitting around a common table. They were there from China, India, Africa, and they were there from many of the continental European countries, but they represented 32 different nations, and they sat around a common table discussing very vital questions. The cultivated acres of the world produce a sufficient amount of foodstuffs to feed the peoples of the world on the basis as enunciated by the late President Roosevelt in the Atlantic Charter, and if the cultivated acreage can maintain that standard of living, then can we, as the producers of the foodstuffs of the various nations of the world, devise a system of distribution in which we can carry the foodstuffs from the producer to the consumer at the least possible expense to the consumer and to the producer.

I was extremely proud, Mr. Speaker, of the leaders of the agricultural movement of this country, at that time. I was extremely proud of the leadership which they gave; proud of the contributions and the suggestions they had to offer. The agricultural organizations of this Dominion of Canada played no small part in bringing about an international wheat agreement, step by step, from the little old loading platform in the eastern part of this province, and the little old flat, warehouse elevator, to the Grain Growers' Company and the Saskatchewan Elevator Company and the Saskatchewan Co-operative Producers; from the local to international markets, has been the record, Mr. Speaker, of men who are more interested in the welfare of the people of their community, and their province and their country, than what they are in regard to bogeys that have been thrown around this House by men who are more interested, possibly in the protection of their particular philosophy of life than they are in the community welfare of the citizens of this province.

Mr. Speaker, one could go on at some great length in dealing with the accomplishments of the common man. The accomplishments of the common man in this province, in this century; the accomplishments of the men in the older lands; and one could speak at great length of the co-ordination of their efforts in the national organizations, co-ordinated for the purpose of endeavouring to build for themselves a future more secure than anything that has been known in the past.

There are one or two rather important matters that I would like to mention. One is in connection with the marketing of a commodity known as rye, prior to the lifting of the ceiling. I quote from a broadcast made by Mr. A. R. Stevens, September 30, 1947, over CKCK. Mr. Stevens said: "Let us take a look at rye and rye bread. A short time ago rye was quoted on the market at approximately \$4.09 per bushel, but there was a domestic price on rye of 66 and 5/8 cents per bushel. In order to keep this domestic price in effect, provision was made that when a miller purchased a quantity of rye he was requested to submit his invoices for the purchase to the Commodity Purchasing Board at Ottawa, and he received a subsidy from the Federal Treasury of the difference between the domestic price of 66 and 5/8 cents, and the price he paid".

Now, Mr. Speaker, rye was purchased by millers in Canada. I expect that rye was purchased by distillers as well as millers. And with a ceiling on the domestic price of 66 and 5/8 cents on one hand, and a speculative market, on the other, which drove rye to over \$4 per bushel, and the domestic purchaser of that rye was able to go to the Federal Treasury and get the difference between the quoted price and the market, that he paid for it, and the 66 and 5/8 cents per bushel. There are some people who would be inclined, or wish, to forget about some of the prices quoted for wheat back in 1932.

May I on this occasion, Mr. Speaker, quote from a radio address delivered on November 25, 1947, by George W. Robertson, Secretary of the Saskatchewan Co-operative Producers. He said, in part, and I quote: "To-day I looked over the street price of barley, according to the price list issued at that time and I found, sure enough, that on October 5, 1932, the street price of No. 6 CW barley, at a 24-cent freight rate point, was one cent a bushel. A grower, delivering 100 bushels of barley that day, would have received a settlement of \$1". Then he takes the top grade of barley and he quotes the price on October 5, and 6, and he found that the top grade of barley, No. 3 CW, was selling at seven and one-half cents per bushels. Then he goes into rye, and he finds that the lower grades of rye were selling at one-half of one cent per bushel on December 14, 15 and 16 of 1932, and the top grade of oats 2 CW, for seven and one-half cents.

Then he turns his attention to wheat, and on December 16, 1932, a farmer delivering seed wheat, at a 24-cent freight rate point in Saskatchewan, received three and one-half cents per bushel for 60 pounds. A farmer delivering 100 bushels of seed wheat that day received a settlement of \$3.50, or \$1.16 per ton. The top grade of wheat was quoted, the same day, according to a statement here by Mr. Robertson, at 20 cents a bushel. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that the history of grain production and marketing in this province has justified the belief in the prairies of Western Canada by the pioneers that the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley spoke so glowingly about. These men, after all, tried, were patient, in 'letting George' solve their problems for them. They moved millions upon millions of bushels of grain into the hands of the private grain trade, into the hands of the operators of country elevators, and into the hands of the operations of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, and they found that these people could not be relied upon to solve their problems. So there was a sufficient number of community-spirited men in Western Canada; men who thought more of the welfare of the community than the individual welfare; men who realized they were not sufficient unto themselves; men who realized that they could not live without the assistance of their neighbour, banded themselves together and, step by step, from the turn of the present century up to the present time, have built the marketing of their wheat into an international marketing organization. In the process, Mr. Speaker, they did something more; they did something we should never forget — they broke one of the greatest monopolies that had a strangle-hold on the farmers of Western Canada, by the united efforts of the agricultural people of Western Canada; in building the marketing machine, they destroyed one of the greatest monopolies that existed in Western Canada.

I say tonight, Mr. Speaker, that there is a technique known to thousands of people of this Province, thousands of people in Canada, a technique known to hundreds of thousands of people the world over, whereby they can band themselves together for the mutual protection and benefit of each other. I speak of the co-operative way of life and the co-operative way of doing things. That is the technique that is spreading itself throughout the world. That is the technique that is building a Democratic society. That is the technique that has been practised for hundreds of years in the country in which the member for Arm River originated, and he, of all people, should realize that when you get groups together, to band themselves together in a co-operative way to solve their problems, that Democracy is assured.

Here in the Province of Saskatchewan, during the past four years, we have found our co-operative memberships increasing from 230,000 to 477,000. Does that look as though the Government that sits on this side of the House are attempting to destroy the Democratic rights of the people of this Province?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I had intended tonight to quote from a book called "Treason's Peace" by Armbruster. It is a story of a great industry, a story of building national monopolies, international cartels; it is a story of how "Fifth Columnists" were built throughout many important countries of the world. Probably some day we will have more information in regard to that, but such newspapers as this — "Top criminals of Second World War were men behind huge cartels"; "Farben leaders' set behind the war" — make me just a little bit inclined to the belief, Mr. Speaker, that we have citizens among us that are inclined to support that kind of a political and social economy. We are struggling here to win our economic Democracy; people of our province are satisfied that they have won political democracy. They are satisfied they have won their political liberty and are asking this Government to assist them in winning for themselves their economic liberties. If I could have the opportunity of choosing between political liberties and economic liberties, I would choose political liberties feeling I would be in a position to fight for my economic liberties. The people of this province have chosen their political liberties, and are now going forward to fight for their economic liberties.

I would like to close, if I may, by quoting some remarks made by the late President Roosevelt when he said: "Today we are faced with a pre-eminent fact that if civilization is to survive we must cultivate the science of human relationships, the ability of all lands to live together and work together in the same world — at peace. There can be no peace in the world now save a common peace,

March 12, 1948

and no prosperity save a common prosperity. If we fail in this task assigned to us by history, and we allow a fear-ridden world to lapse into atom bomb hurlings, then the revolutionary climb of mankind, which has lasted for centuries, will be broken into chaos. It is now or never. Are we worth of this challenge?"

I say the people of the Province of Saskatchewan are worthy of this challenge. Day by day, moving from one frontier to another, they are building for themselves a kind of a Democratic society. They are building for themselves a kind of political and social economy that, if other provinces and other counties in the world were doing likewise, we would have no fear as to our ability to carry out the suggestions made by the late President Roosevelt in the quotation I have just made.

I have no hesitation, Mr. Speaker, in supporting the Budget.

Hon. I. C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, at the very limited time at my disposal I would like to, as well as possible, give a resume and outline of the activities of the Department of Agriculture.

I was pretty much impressed by the suggestion made by the hon. Member from Last Mountain, stating that the Ministers were perhaps giving too little time and have not paid sufficient attention to giving a report and resume of the activities of their department over the years. Before doing so I would like to congratulate the hon. Member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley in having given a very thoughtful contribution to the Debate on the Budget. I should like also to give recognition to the excellent contribution given by the hon. member from Maple Creek. Being a women member it was surprising to me that she dwelt practically at length on the problems of agriculture which, after all, are the primary problems in Saskatchewan, and which is the basic industry; not only for own province her but the entire Dominion. I wish, therefore, at the outset, to point out to the House that agriculture will always be the basic industry. This is fundamentally true because all life finds its origin in the soil. By this same token those engaged in tilling the soil have the most noble of all occupations since they are most closely associated with the divine force of creation itself. Although the primary importance of agriculture in the economy of Saskatchewan and the nation is generally an accepted fact, so well accepted indeed that it is often just taken for granted and then lost sight of in the other problems, though seemingly for the moment, primary, are relatively speaking only secondary to, and depend upon, a healthy and

sound agriculture. With the present great demand for the extension of telephone power, educational and social services, we are too often prone to forget that unless we stabilize and correspondingly expand the overall output of our agricultural plan upon which these other services are predicted, then the basic economy upon which these services are built could well be unable to support the superstructure of these other services.

It is opportune, therefore, to restate the relative importance of the agricultural industry in relation to our Saskatchewan economy as well as the Dominion. Comparative figures of income from agriculture are quite significant. Manufacturing values — for instance — in Canada have only recently overtaken farm values. In 1928, manufacturing values stood at 35 percent of the total net value of Canada's production, while farm production was 36 percent. Up to 1928 and 1929 the products of farm origin amounted to one-half the value of Canada's total export. I might say, in 1947 the total export value of agricultural products was \$1,017,000,000 compared to the next largest, wood products and paper of \$625,000,000. It is also worthy of note what agriculture contributed greatly to Canadian industrial activity. In 1941 available statistics on this point show that 39 percent of Canada's manufacturing plants were engaged in processing farm products, and of still greater significance is the fact that up to 1935 the increased value added to these agricultural products by manufacturing — more specifically, the value added to farm products through manufacturing — was nearly \$2,000,000,000 in 1940. This was more than double the cash income from farms for the same year. The net income for the farms for that year was \$765,000,000, which is an indication of the tremendous contribution that agriculture gives in the processing of farm products. It also indicates that the farmers, as such, do not receive a corresponding income from the raw materials they sell to the processor to the extent the processor enhances the value of them, and the customer purchasing at this enhanced value.

The importance of the agricultural industry is further bolstered by the fact that practically one-half of the domestic market for city manufacture is provided by the Canadian farmers. We often overlook the tremendous domestic market we have right here at home, and it is well to restate again that 50 percent of that market is furnished by agriculture in the Dominion of Canada.

For the benefit of the House I should also like to mention the 1941 census figures which show that 1,130,000 of the Canadian population — 14 years and over — were gainfully engaged in agriculture, and that is about 25.2 per cent of the total population. In manufacturing, the corresponding number engaged, from 14 years up, was 749,000.

March 12, 1948

In Saskatchewan the percentage of the population resident on farms is 57 per cent according to the 1941 census, and approximately 80 per cent of the total net productive value in Saskatchewan is derived directly from agriculture. It can, therefore, clearly be seen that services generally, transportation, electrical, telephone, professional and various other trades and activities in all the cities, towns and hamlets of the Province, are absolutely dependent on the agricultural economy for healthy and vigorous economic life. Agriculture is beyond a doubt the very corner-stone and basis of our entire economy.

With all this in mind, the need for stability and increased production in Saskatchewan is of paramount importance if we are to sustain a proper balance between the potential output of our agricultural plant and the ability of our agricultural economy to sustain a tremendous demand for increased services generally. This problem is one, then, in which we are all vitally interested.

Now a legitimate question to ask would naturally be; Can we increase our overall agricultural production in Saskatchewan? In this connection I would just like to point to the records established during the war years:

Cattle Production	(1939)	1,147,000	(1945)	2,000,000	— peak year.
Hogs	(1939)	500,000	(1943)	1,754,000	— peak year.
Poultry	(1939)	9,500,000	(1944)	20,703,000	— peak year.

I might say with hogs we are down again at the present time to that 500,000.

It must be borne in mind that these tremendous increases in agricultural production took place at a time when there was a shortage of labour on the farms in Canada, and in Saskatchewan particularly.

We know that Federal fiscal policies to a large extent affect the production policies of the Provincial Government and are dependent largely on the fiscal policy at Ottawa. We recognize that by the large numbers of resolutions that come before this Assembly, at practically every Session, drawing the attention of the Federal authorities to some particular matter that deals with fiscal policy. However, in spite of the fact that fiscal policy is not always such that it will encourage production policies in our province, nevertheless the Provincial Governments are responsible for a production policy and we must do the best we can.

With this responsibility in Saskatchewan and the desire to obtain some stability in our production, and the necessity for increasing our

overall production, I think we should just take a look at the potential of Saskatchewan to achieve these goals. Perhaps a good illustration would be to look at the Province as one large operating farm unit. When we do so, we find we have in Saskatchewan approximately 162,000,000 acres of land, and find that, in that land area, we have approximately 8,000,000 acres of water, and when one flies over the north country — north of Prince Albert — one would imagine that at least two-thirds of that country is water; but, nevertheless, the fact remains that out of the 162,000,000 acres we have only 8,000,000 acres of water in Saskatchewan. That points up a very significant factor, and it simply means we are very short of precipitation in our province. As the hon. member for Maple Creek pointed out, during the course of her address, moisture is our chief problem, and I believe the hon. member from Last Mountain also referred to the fact that there is no province in the Dominion of Canada where the variability of production is as great as it is in Saskatchewan.

By quoting further figures and breaking down the area of Saskatchewan, I would like to indicate added problems. We find in the 162,000,000 acres of area we have approximately 80,000,000 in the surveyed area of the province, and find that breaking that down again to the occupied farm area we have some 60,000,000 acres presently occupied. To break down again, we find, out of that 60,000,000 acres in the occupied area, there are 33,000,000 acres under cultivation and 27,000,000 acres that will never be cultivated. These are lands that are suitable only for grazing or other productive purposes. When we break down the 33,000,000 acres of cultivated land we have, we find there are only 8,000,000 acres of land that classify from very good to excellent farm lands, about 8,000,000 acres, the type of soil we have in the Regina and Rosetown districts, the kind of soil, in other words, that you can engage in straight grain farming, year after year, with no great danger of loss of fertility. That leaves 25,000,000 acres of land of a soil classification from good to poor and, in some cases, marginal, in the cultivated area. The reason I refer to that, Mr. Speaker, is imply the fact that this particular soil — the 25,000,000 acres of cultivated land, and the 27,000,000 acres of pasture land — upon the proper utilization of this land will depend as to whether we are going to be able to get agricultural stability in Saskatchewan and at the same time get some increased production out of this agricultural plant of ours here.

The problem of utilization has been given recognition, too, in the past, through P.F.R.A. and, as we all know, the period of settlement has passed and the period of production has gone. That point was driven home to us during the dry years of the 1930's and that, together with an

economic depression, involved a relief bill to Saskatchewan of approximately — I should say from the beginning of the history of Saskatchewan and inclusive of the 1930's — we had a relief Bill of some \$186,000,000, which points up again the great necessity of definitely entering now into a period of soil conservation and rehabilitation of our agricultural plant in Saskatchewan. Let me say to the House, the problem of land use and utilization in Saskatchewan is simply enormous. I am certain that, given a good agricultural representative service, active local committees and a general interest in soil conservation methods and land use methods, cultural practice, we can, not only get positive stability in this Province in matters of always having sufficient feed and fodder supplies, but we can also increase our overall agricultural output in this province. These two objectives are absolute 'musts' as far as we are concerned.

As pointed out by the hon. member for Last Mountain, we do not possess any great extensive mineral resources as yet known to us. We are practically dependent entirely on our agricultural economy, and it does give me a degree of concern as to whether the people of this Province are going to continue to be able to sustain the services we should have in this province and which the agricultural economy should be able to support properly.

To give you some indication as to the size of our agricultural plant in Saskatchewan, it might be of interest to the hon. members to know that 38 per cent of the cultivated acreage of the Dominion of Canada is right here in Saskatchewan. We have a big plant, but we also have natural hazards to contend with, and the Department of Agriculture is making a very concrete attempt to meet the problems involved. Our increased Budget is largely in those particular branches that have to do with soil conservation and with this problem of forage crop production.

I would like now to deal just a bit more specifically with this problem of land utilization. I have just given a brief indicant of the scope of the problem, and we have tried to develop a consistent policy in the Department of Agriculture. For example, if we — as we do — emphasize diversification, then we must carry consistent policies right the way through that will encourage diversified agriculture. To that end we have devised a grazing lease policy and a cultivating lease policy that we feel will give encouragement to livestock raising, and livestock raising is a 'must'. We are also giving encouragement to forage crop production to properly utilize the grazing areas we have, as represented by the 27,000,000 acres of grazing resources we have, and the 25,000,000 acres of land where there is a real problem not only of

restoration of fertility but also erosion by both wind and water.

I would in this connection like to give a résumé of our immediate problems. We are, in Saskatchewan, short each year approximately 1,000,000 tons of fodder. That is largely due to the fact that, since the advent of the combine, you do not see the large straw reserves of former years. In addition to that the more attractive prices for grain growing have induced a great number of people to get away from forage crop production. The overall result is that we run approximately 1,000,000 tons of feed short in this Province, which in turn means, in more often too many cases, our livestock come through the winter in poor shape thereby causing a lot of economic loss.

The records carried on in connection with livestock breeding under range conditions or ordinary winter weather conditions, indicate the tremendous loss in weight, in comparative ages of livestock, runs as high as 400 pounds for an adult cow that had received proper nourishment from calthood up, as against an animal pasture don poor pasture and put through the winter in a make-shift manner.

We have, and recognize that we are going to have, this shortage for some time until we can develop our long-term policy. We endeavour to devise policies again that will be consistent both in the long-term policy and the emergency policy. We have placed the emphasis on self-help, and hope that in time we will be able to activate our people towards solving their own problems by assisting them solve their own problems first. As an example, in our emergency policy on feed, this year, I would like to indicate the size of the problems — other members have referred to it. We have a P.F.A.A. payment in Saskatchewan, this year, of some \$15,000,000. That will involve payments to around 50,000 farmers, and that is the largest P.F.A.A. payment we have received since the inception of the P.F.A.A. policy. That gives us some indication of the extent of the crop failure in Saskatchewan, and we certainly were seized with the size of the problem that had to be met in connection with providing feed, seed and fodder for the farmers in the drought areas. By first of all developing a policy and doing a tremendous lot of extension work in connection with utilizing every available bit of feed and fodder in a particular district, I believe we have overcome a major disaster.

I want, here, to pay tribute to our field staff who in many cases went without vacations in order to stay on the job during this

March 12, 1948

critical period of time. As a result of their work and activating thousands of hands to the task of first of all utilizing every available bit of feed in their own particular area. I have had reports come to me — and have, as a matter of fact, seen throughout the country more feed in some of the deficiency areas than we have ever had before in those particular areas. As a matter of fact in some areas where we thought we would have to ship feed into, we actually found we had a little surplus there. All of which goes to prove the value of an expanded agricultural representative service that can carry out an intensified campaign in connection with solving a major problem by activating thousands of hands to the task.

The second feature of our self-help policy was freight assistance on the movement of equipment to the surplus areas and then paying one-half the freight on the hay itself, up to \$3 a ton, going back into the deficiency areas. That was designed to assist the man who was short on cash and long on ambition. True, there was a similar policy other years, but the only difference, this year, we really endeavoured to bring the man in the surplus area in contact with the man who needed the feed. We gave assistance by listing the quantities of hay in the surplus areas against the need in the deficiency area. I might say we had 15,000 tons of hay listed with us in that connection, and we acted as an intermediary in getting the two together. Anyone who was unable, for some reason or another, to go out and put up hay himself with his own equipment, was given the opportunity of making contact with some farmer on the list in a surplus area, and we paid one-half the freight for him to \$2 a ton back into his district.

In addition to that the Government also contracted for hay, recognizing that, in the event that the winter was unduly prolonged, we would have a little more to fall back on. I might say all of this hay was never meant to go into a reserve and was all moved into consumption very, very rapidly. In addition, we still have some 2,000 tons in our feed reserve for next year that we do not intend to move into consumption at all, this year. I believe, all in all, Mr. Speaker, our field staff, generally, have done a very creditable job. I would like to give the House some indication of the amount of feed that was moved, as well as the amount of fodder that was involved.

Under the self-help plan we had moved in, before November 15, some 6,000 tons of fodder both by truck and rail and paid freight in the amount of \$12,000. In addition to that we shipped in grain and paid freight in the amount of \$50,000, all before November 1, on some 786,000 bushels of feed. In addition to that again, the Government itself shipped in some 200 carloads of fodder besides.

We have at the present time listed with us on the same basis, the names and locations of people that have feed and seed available for the spring seeding operations. We have some 152,000 bushels of grain listed that will be available to any man in any location to meet his seed needs this coming spring. I might say I am a little concerned about the supply of oats, and might be very frank about it that there was a tremendous movement of coarse grains from the province, last fall, which we endeavoured to control and, as mentioned before to the House, I endeavoured to enlist the support of the Federal authorities in the matter of keeping ample supplies of feed and seed in the terminal elevators at Moose Jaw and Saskatoon, but regret to say, without any concrete results.

I should like to turn for just a moment to our long-term policy. Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the long-term policy we realize that the basic solution will have to go back to the individual farmer himself, and much will depend on the type of policy the individual farmer carries out particularly with reference to providing ample supplies of both feed, seed and fodder for his own future needs. We have given tangible encouragement to this by assisting him under the forage crop plan under which we supplied seed at cost, with a weed inoculum, in the spring seeding program of last spring, 1947, to 541 farmers involving approximately 5,000 acres, and in the fall seeding program we furnished sufficient seed for 3,275 acres of land to some 239 farmers. In addition to that again, we furnished, free of charge, forage crop seed for demonstration plots in the amount of some 1,000 acres and the Land Branch in addition sowed on the municipal reserves and on provincial projects 10,000 pounds of alfalfa, 49,000 pounds of brome grass, and 46,000 pounds of crested wheat grass. I regret very much that I am unable, because of limited time, to indicate to you the projects on which that seed went. I will mention just one reclamation project, at Mortlach, Saskatchewan.

There are vast areas in this Province; just to indicate to you the problem of land utilization, we have, north of Mortlach, a good case in point where settlers endeavoured to go in there and farm in the usual way only to find that in the "Hungry 30's" their land drifted. But the one natural advantage there is that the water table is very close to the surface, ideally situated for the growing of forage crops. We have carried on reclamation projects there, last summer, and we intend to expand the same. It is just an ideal location for the growing of alfalfa, and we hope to bring that land back into use and establish a fodder reserve. It is not all a case of irrigation in Saskatchewan.

March 12, 1948

I think it is largely a matter of storing all our surface runoff, and building up small projects, and developing other projects, like I mentioned at Mortlach. There are others in the Province I would like to talk about where the natural conditions are perfect for the production of forage crops, but time will not permit.

I want to say I regret I have not more time available to be able to deal with my Department in an orderly way as I intended to do.

To point out the need . . . now we in Saskatchewan are probably not as conscious of the erosion and loss of fertility that has taken place. I think when we had soil conservations from the United States come up and attend our conferences here, some of the things they told us of the loss of fertility and top soil in the United States is astounding. We have always prided ourselves on the depth and fertility of our soil, but these 25,000,000 acres of ours I am talking about, and really concerned about, are eroding and the fertility is drifting away by wind and water very, very rapidly. I would just like to say to hon. members, as you drive through the country and you notice in some of the hilly country the depth of the soil on top of the knoll as compared to the hollow and you begin to see the white land on top of the knoll, that is a danger signal and simply means we are going to need forage crop production in that type of land. We would like to see all of our land put to the use intended by nature. Have you gentleman ever noticed, as you drive through this country and see a vacant house someplace on a hill, all you need to do to find out the history of what happened in that particular case is to look at the soil and there you see the whole history written right there. We are definitely past the stage of settlement and production and in a stage of endeavouring to rehabilitate our agriculture in Saskatchewan, and I cannot say or repeat too often that we are in a very exposed position. Anything we do and any money we spend in the direction of soil conservation here and getting overall stability is most important. It is an A1 problem. If we do not pay some attention to it soon, we are going to find ourselves out at the end of the string. I can say, quite frankly, if we are going to continue to support the kind of Budgets which are absolutely justified, and the people want these services, we have to pay greater attention to our basic industry here.

Here is what a great soil conservationist in the U.S. said to a man by the name of Professor Grant McEwen. Now Dean Grant McEwen, of the University of Manitoba, had occasion to go down to a soil conservation conference in the state of Minnesota at the beautiful little town of Albert Lea that I know so well, down there. Here is what Doctor Bennett, the outstanding conservationist in the U.S.,

had to say about conditions down there. Mr. Bennett's statements about soil losses are alarming. He deals in big figures, but the lesson they teach should be clear:

“As a result of soil erosion in the United States some 50,000,000 acres of crop lands have been lost and another 50,000,000 acres almost a loss. About a 100,000,000 acres of the 450,000,000 acres of crop land which we have left is being depleted at such a rapid rate that it should be protected within the next 10 or 15 years in order to prevent irreparable damage.”

Here is a statement by Professor Ellis, an outstanding Canadian soil conservationist. I asked Professor Ellis who knows Canadian soil as few people do, to comment on this, and here is his reply:

“Erosion of soil by wind and water is the most serious cause of soil deterioration in Canada today. In many areas in western Canada it has become acute, and in others it is becoming more and more serious with time. Evidence of deterioration by soil erosion can be seen in many places.”

These are the various sights you and I see as we drive around the country, where you see the fine top soil drifted up at the road allowances, where you see the hummocky land. I will tell you gentlemen we have a big job of reclamation and soil conservation to do in this Province of ours.

For the next ten minutes I would like to deal with the changing type of farm economy we have here in Saskatchewan. We have a problem that has been posed through the mechanization of agriculture that we must recognize. Someone mentioned, this evening, the number of operating farm units in Saskatchewan as being 125,000. Do you know it was 140,000 at the beginning of the war? We dropped that much in that period of time. I had a letter, today, from a farmer that pretty well indicates the trend of the times, and this man is a farmer who has been operating with horse power. It is all right to talk about ideologies and that sort of thing, but we have a problem here and here it is. Here is one of those that was liquidated, that formerly, in 1939, represented one of the 140,000 operating farm units in Saskatchewan and here is what he writes:

“I would like to ask you for information about a farm and home that I can keep my family alive. I have no place after the first of April. The farm where I am living has been rented to a different party and I am unable to rent anything, not even a house where I can put my family. I have a wife and six children. I would like to buy a

March 12, 1948

half-section of land on very easy terms, but I am unable to pay \$8,000 or \$9,000 cash. I only have horse machinery and work with horses, and it is very hard to please land owners with horse power. Last year I had seeded 200 acres of crop, and I did not thresh one kernel of grain, so you can see how much money I have.”

This is quietly going on all the time, and this man will wind up possibly going away to work in a factory unless we can place him on other land. We have a big job of resettlement to do. I do not like to see this tendency continued towards larger operating units. We have a big job of resettlement to do. I do not like to see this tendency continued towards larger operating certainly cannot meet it by legislation and saying the farmer can only have so much land; that cannot be done. But little farmers, like this man, can help themselves if they wish, and they should be encouraged to do so. They should be encouraged to ‘pool’ their machinery resources and, if necessary, their land resources.

I was pretty disappointed when the member for Arm River got up and referred to the Matador co-operative farm as being regimentation and collectivization; that is utter nonsense to talk that way. As the hon. member for Qu’Appelle-Wolseley said: “for Heaven’s sake, let us reason this out and see what we can do about these problems”. There is a wonderful example where these boys are incorporated under The Co-operatives Act, and it is the problem I am thinking of; and I think we must encourage people like this to get together and purchase this large expensive farm machinery, and when they do that we are going to get good cultural practice and will eradicate the weeds that cause a deficiency in crops estimated as high as an \$80,000,000 loss to this province every year: \$80,000,000. By introducing modern machinery and good cultural practices we can enhance our agricultural wealth production to that extent.

If I had the time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on and from remarks made by the hon. member for Maple Creek and refer to what her district board is doing down there in matters of soil conservation and moisture conservation. It is most exciting and phenomenal what we can do once we get our local agricultural committees interested, and the best and most capable young men sitting on those committees. It is the most remarkable job we can do in increasing the overall output of our agricultural plant. If we could only increase our average yield by two bushels that would take care of all the municipal services in the province, and I think it is worth while. It is a “must” in our policy. I would like to be able to go on and read to you the recommendations from the district board in the hon.

member's constituency, from Maple Creek, where they have actually now taken the scientific knowledge and research they have had made available to them. At their district board meetings — the kind of meetings our hon. Leader of the Opposition referred to as having all experts there and just a handful of farmers — there was at those meetings one representative from each municipality, and we were mighty glad to have Doctor Dion and the rest of the people out from the extension staff of the University. They have done a terrific job at terrific self-sacrifice to meet the needs of 33 district boards. There has been a tremendous increase on the calls on their time and services, and I do not think it very nice for the Leader of the Opposition to speak disparagingly of this particular type of meeting. It is these representatives that bring the information back to the local committee and the farmers and the result will be your moisture conservation, your soil conservation, your good farm practice, and we want the poor farmer to come up to par with the good farmer, and we are trying to channel this information down in the most democratic possibly way. There is a natural affinity of interests between the scientific worker and the farmer on the land, and we like to bridge the gap that existed before, between them. We have built up the co-operative extension program, fitting in as it does with our agricultural representative service including the University, the Dominion Experimental Farms, and are taking the scientific knowledge and research back to the farmer to actually apply it. We have reams of information stored away on research and all of these projects that we must get out to our agriculturists. It is far better to do that than to build another building at the University. Far better to get out the information we have and get it applied.

To go on, I will complete my discussion. The 'machine age' has created problems both in farm tenure and farm production methods that cannot be ignored. The position of the small farmer is certainly not a happy one. I would like, Mr. Speaker, to put on record my interpretation of the C.C.F. land policy, and I have carefully put it down here for purposes of the record.

The C.C.F. position on the land question is that the farmer on the land should received the full social or personal benefit form his production. A clear title to the farmer is one necessary requisite. This has been denied him by the Land Companies and Mortgage Companies and Loan Companies; therefore, the C.C.F. is against the monopoly ownership of land by people who do not till the soil but exploit the farmer who does. If it is a question of title, the C.C.F. wants the farmer to have title, no one else. Security to the farmer comes from the

crop he produces and the share of crop he gets for his own personal benefit. To this end, if a man wishes to obtain title, then the conditions of the contract between debtor and creditor must be such that the farmer will get the title and the full benefit derived from the crop he produces. The same applies to lease agreements, which must provide the optimum return to the lessee. The matter of the farmer owning or leasing land, therefore, is not as important as the amount he gets for his own personal use from the crop he produces. Still more important factors regarding security are: (1) a farmer must have a sizeable farm unit that will maintain the necessary equipment to adequately operate that unit for the greatest and most economical volume of production and return on capital investment. The small farmer is handicapped in this regard but he can greatly — as I stated before — lower his overhead in production cost by voluntarily pooling expensive machinery with his neighbour on a co-operative basis, or he can, if he so desires, pool his implements and land resources as well. The whole purpose here is to be able to take advantage of the latest type of farm machinery necessary to efficient and economic production. (2) to reduce production cost to the lowest possible level in relationship to advancing prices of farm equipment in order that the greatest possible net return be obtained by the farmer himself. Of course much will depend on the amount of crop he must either pay on his agreement of sale or mortgage, or under the terms of the lease agreement he may hold. Given a fair and just contract in all cases, the farmer will have his opportunity to security of tenure and maximum social benefits.

The long-term lease contract of the Provincial Government is a model pattern the land-lords could well follow. In the interest of the man on the land they are invited to do so. Likewise, the agreement of sale should provide equal sharing of loss, due to the natural hazards of nature, by both parties. If the land companies are really desirous of seeing the farmer eventually own his land, they will hasten to incorporate in all lease agreements and contract agreements of sale, and mortgages, a provision for a reasonable crop-share payment, and will also share the burden of economic as well as natural losses by either reduced payments or forgoing payment of the principal and interest in crop failure years. Their solicitude for the farmer should, therefore, take a tangible form; if not, their often expressed hope that they are interested in the farmer owning his title is open to serious question. I invite the loan companies and land companies to do this. If they play one game fair, farm security legislation will be unnecessary to force them to give security to the farmer. It naturally follows, therefore, that the C.C.F. is not

interested in the socialization of the farmer's land, but are definitely interested in security for the farmer on the land, and his security, as previously mentioned, depends on his ability to produce crops economically, and, secondly, the return he receives for his labour.

As stated at the outset of my address, greater returns to the farmers are of national importance to the economy of Canada. The matter of reorganizing agricultural production methods to meet a mechanized and changing agricultural economy is not a question of socialization; it is a question of facing squarely up to the problem of giving full opportunity to our farm people to receive the full blessing held up by modern mechanization to the end that living conditions and social amenities be provided for our rural people on a level presently enjoyed by the people in urban centres. With modern mechanization of the farm must also come modern and up-to-date homes and standards of rural life.

It is high time the farmers of Saskatchewan received the greatest possible benefit, not only of more leisure time but of greater opportunity for cultural, recreational and social amenities. This must be done to again attract our young people to rural life. In conclusion, therefore, it takes very little imagination to visualize the great task ahead and what can be accomplished for greater overall agricultural stability and increased production in the enormous agricultural plan of Saskatchewan. It is an exciting challenge, and with determination these great goals can be reached. My greatest ambition, Mr. Speaker, is to set policies in motion in that direction to the end that we may have a more stable and prosperous agriculture and a more secure, healthy and happy farm people. The Budget provides for and gives recognition to the great needs of agriculture; but much remains to be done, and I am sure agriculture will, in the future, receive the full recognition it deserves as our basic industry. The allotment to agriculture this year is concrete evidence of this.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

Mr. Speaker: — Is the House ready for the question? It is my duty to inform the House that the Mover of the Motion is about to exercise his right to close the debate. Anyone who wished to speak should do so now.

Hon. C. M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, I should like first of all to thank all the hon. members for the very kindly messages which they have given to me. I would like to thank them for the congratulatory remarks. I do not take it as a compliment to myself alone; I take it as a compliment to the program of the Government which the Budget interprets in a financial way. I take it, too, as a compliment to the Government for the achievements of the past few years and, as such, I appreciate very much the kindly things that have been said.

There is a great deal one could say in closing a debate which has gone on for some twelve days, and in which some 30 speakers have taken part. I have enjoyed, very much, the addresses given in the House. Particularly did I enjoy the address given by the Leader of the Opposition. I was more convinced than ever, after listening to the address of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, that the Budget is a very sound one, because, throughout the length and breadth of that talk that he gave in this House, there is no criticism whatsoever that can be justified of anything in the Budget Address. I enjoyed also, this afternoon, the address given by the hon. member for Last Mountain. While it is fresh on my mind, I would like to just reply to one or two of the statements which he made. I have no intention of getting into the philosophy of our parliamentary institutions, I think possibly there are some ways in which we could improve our parliamentary system of Government; but we must never forget that this system is one which has been built up throughout the thousands of years of representative Government. The best things of various countries of the world have added to it from time to time, and the very fact that this parliamentary system is still being followed in Australia, New Zealand, Great Britain and in Canada, in those countries which today still retain their Democracy, I think that in itself, is one very good recommendation as to why we should be slow at making any great changes.

I would, however, like to deal with the criticism of the hon. member in connection with the Education Tax. He made the statement that, "it should have been abolished, or at least it could have been taken from clothing"; and yet, you note, the very next statement he made was that we should have put into effect a pension for our crippled people in this Province. Well now, Mr. Speaker, the point I would like to make is this: throughout this Province it is altogether too common a criticism of our people that we should be spending a great deal

more money on certain services, and yet we should be reducing taxes at the same time. I want to say here, in my place, tonight, that if we are going to expand services in the future as we have done in the past three years, we must be prepared to pay for those services; they cannot be provided without being paid for. You cannot increase services and at the same time reduce your sources of revenue. The education tax would mean \$6,000,000 wiped out, and I want to ask the hon. gentleman what \$6,000,000 services would he suggest we cut out! I should be very interested, as we go through the Budget, to have these items pointed out to us.

There is only one other matter I wish to deal with, and that is the question of civil service in politics. He suggested we should go back to the old system. Mr. Speaker, I would rather have it in the Act, the civil servants may, if they wish, take part in politics — allow them to do it legally, than to go back to the old system where they did take part in politics contrary to the Act . . . We had evidence read by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, yesterday, which showed not only did they take part in politics in their after-working hours but during the day.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition asked me if I would be good enough to table the statistics with relation to the farm income for the past year. Unfortunately, this information was not at hand when I gave the address two weeks ago. I would like to summarize, and with the consent of the House then place it on the record as it appears in this form, the customary form in which we put this document at the back of the Budget Address.

Continued on page 80 . . .

CASH INCOME FROM THE SALE OF FARM PRODUCTS**(Thousand Dollars)**

	1945	1946	1947
Wheat	190,443	184,955	182,076
Wheat Participation Certificate	5,208	23,216	45,403
Coarse Grains	69,624	53,688	73,904
Flax	7,177	6,740	17,127
Total Principal Field Crops	272,452	268,599	318,510
Cattle and Calves	51,832	56,057	46,384
Sheep and Lambs	1,540	1,584	1,167
Horses	1,107	1,765	1,872
Hogs	30,713	19,277	19,226
Dairy Products	19,012	19,995	22,782
Poultry	13,124	13,368	5,153
Eggs	10,508	9,625	8,699
Livestock Products	127,836	121,671	105,283
Miscellaneous Products	9,330	8,912	10,311
Cash Income from Farm Products	409,618	399,182	434,104
(X) Supplementary Payments (P.F.A.)	2,901	12,461	9,838
TOTAL CASH INCOME	412,519	411,643	443,942

(X) Payments made under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act are made in two payments, 60 percent in December and 40 percent the following March.

Now the hon. Leader of the Opposition went on to criticize the fact that our mineral production had not risen as rapidly as it had in neighbouring provinces. He pointed out the number of claims that were staked in the Province of Manitoba compared with the number here but why is there such a difference? We all know that, last year, in the Sherritt Gordon and Lynn Lake district of Manitoba, a new nickel mine was discovered, a nickel mine which has all the earmarks of being as great a mine as the International one in Sudbury, Ontario, with the result that people swarmed in by thousands to stake claims. Now, if we could hit something like that in Saskatchewan, I have no doubt, that the figures would be reversed.

I would like to remind this House, again, that in 1944 mineral production in this Province was \$20,000,000 and, last year, it was over \$32,000,000, an increase of 60 per cent which, I think, is very good.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as it is eleven o'clock, I would ask leave to adjourn the debate.

The House adjourned, without question put, at eleven o'clock p.m.