

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session — Eleventh Legislature**  
**9th Day**

**Tuesday, February 22, 1949**

The Assembly met at 3:00 o'clock p.m.

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Kuziak for an Address-in-Reply.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Tisdale):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, it is going to give me a good deal of pleasure to pay to you my compliments. I cannot say “ditto” to what anybody else has said. I want to say something for myself. I want to say that, in my experience, not only have you shown in the past that you have the ability to preside in this Assembly and to give decisions to maintain the best decorum and order that could be expected, not only have you achieved this to your credit in the Chair which you now occupy, but also you are well known when you are out of that Chair and out in the province as a doughty campaigner.

You, Sir, have had the honour to represent one of the oldest constituencies in this province for over ten years; a constituency which was, once upon a time, quite a stronghold of the fast-diminishing Liberal party; a constituency where the name of Archie McCallum was not unknown in days of yore, and it is all the more to your credit, Sir, that you can get out and fight a good campaign, and can, when you go up those steps, leave behind you any partisanship and carry out your duties to the satisfaction, I am sure, of all of the members of this Legislature.

I want also, Mr. Speaker, to say a word of two about my predecessor, Mr. J.L. Phelps. I want to tell this House that no one ever took his job more seriously, no one was more sincere, no one ever worked harder at a job than did Mr. Phelps, and in addition I would say that no one in the short space of four years accomplished so much of what will remain in the future to be recognized as good as did Joe Phelps when he was Minister of Natural Resources and Industrial Development. I consider it a privilege and an honour to follow him in that portfolio.

I wish also to compliment the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) on his elevation to his present position, and to the leadership of the Liberal party in this province. The Leader of the Opposition is, I am sure, finding some little difficulty in making the necessary adjustments. That was well illustrated when he referred to members on this side of the House as “members in the opposition” when he was making his speech in this debate. It was pretty well illustrated, too, in some of the campaign posters and headlines, and we can be thankful, all of us I think, that he did not go quite as far as was done in the country to the south of us where they actually had papers published on the 3rd of November with the headlines “Dewey Sworn In”, “Business Gains Seen” actually came out like this. The Chicago Tribune also had the headline. Here is a picture of Mr. Truman holding up the issue of The Chicago Tribune with the headline “Dewey defeats Truman”. So the Leader of the Opposition is going to have some difficulty in making the necessary adjustments, but I hope he has before him a long career as Leader of the Opposition.

I want also to say a word or two about the former Leader of the Opposition, the member for Cannington, Mr. Patterson, whom I know a good deal better than I know the present Leader of the Opposition. In all seriousness and kindness, I want to say that I believe that the member for Cannington made for the Liberal party, because of his much longer association with the Liberal party, almost an ideal leader for that political party in this province. He knew how to keep out of trouble most of the time, and, particularly, Mr. Speaker, he knew how to keep in line with the party, to keep in line with the hand of Mr. Gardiner that controlled the party at Ottawa, and which still controls the remnants of the Liberal party machine.

The Leader of the Opposition is going to have a little difficulty right here, because I noticed that, when he was talking about rural electrification, he took quite a different line from his chief, Mr. Gardiner, at Ottawa. I would just like to sound a warning for him that there may be difficulty if he is not careful not to cross the party line as explained by Mr. Gardiner. I have in my hand a clipping from the Winnipeg Free Press of April 28, 1948. It is not so old. The article reads:

The Rt. Hon. J.G. Gardiner, Minister of Agriculture, has his own formula for rural electrification — a good windmill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this may be a case of really patronizing home industry, I don't know; but we have even some better authority than the Free Press. I have here Hansard for April 27, 1948, in which Mr. Gardiner says:

We like to talk about irrigation developments; we like to talk about water power development: great expenditures of money. We have got into that habit, but I would not care how close a power line was to my farm, I would not put electricity onto the barn from the power line.

That is what Mr. Gardiner says. And in another place he says:

We have the wind; yes, you pay \$150 for a windmill, etc. etc.

And so I would just point out that, even though we are doing for the first time in the province of Saskatchewan something serious about rural electrification, the Leader of the Opposition was off the Liberal party line in his speech the other day, and he would be wise, probably, to get back in line with his chief, Mr. Gardiner.

**Mr. Tucker:** — May I ask the hon. member a question? Is he aware that we adopted this plank “Rural Electrification” in our program of 1946, at our convention; that it was laid down as a policy of our party two and one-half years ago?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I knew that, Mr. Speaker, but over the years I have grown to not pay too much attention to what is in the platform of the Liberal party.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, I do.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — And this Hansard is April 27, 1948. Now the hon. Leader of the Opposition should not be asking me this question, he should be asking Mr. Gardiner this question. He is asking the question in the wrong place.

**Mr. Tucker:** — You talk as if you did not know what our programme was.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I am also, Mr. Speaker, just a little bit disappointed with the Leader of the Opposition — I want to be frank about this; I was disappointed in that he, coming from the House at Ottawa, did not appear to know a little more about the rules of this House and have a little more respect for the rules of debate. We can hand it out and take it here in this House. This House has not been famous for being particularly just a “tea party”. We get down to serious work and we speak plain; but I am sure that under your guidance, Mr. Speaker, he will make some progress along that line.

I want to refer also to one of the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition in regard to this C.C.F. meeting in Saskatoon, which was supposed to have been held on June 9 last, supposed to have been attended by a group of civil servants who came down from Prince Albert in a government plant. This, Mr. Speaker, is very typical of a great deal of the kind of information and the kind of stories that Liberals get hold of and talk about outside of this House, and inside of it. This is a classic example, and this one, except for the fact that it was not on June 9, it was on June 8, and except also for the fact that Mr. Gray did not come from Prince Albert at all, but was at this home west of Saskatoon and drove into Saskatoon his own car, and except also for the fact that none of the people who came from Prince Albert were civil servants, neither Mr. Wheaton, nor Mr. Norris, nor Mr. Weir. Mr. Norris was working part time on a day-to-day basis, but was not a civil servant. Mr. Weir, as far as I know, never has been a civil servant. Thus, except for the fact that they did not come in an aeroplane, except for the fact that it was the wrong date, that Gray did not come from Prince Albert at all, that the others were not civil servants and that they did not come in a government plant but came in a private car, otherwise, Mr. Speaker, the story was true.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Would the hon. Gentleman permit a question? The car they came in, was that a government car paid for by the government?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I stated it was a private car. The car was owned by Mr. Norris, if the worthy member would like to know, and that is typical of the kind of story that we hear talked about.

I want to refer to one of the statements made by the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff). He said the government should get rid of compulsion in fire insurance. I suppose he would likely say in all other kinds of insurance, too. I suppose he would include the automobile insurance as well. You know, Mr. Speaker, we are in fairly good company on this question. I want to refer the House to a speech made by the Hon. Winston Churchill in London not so long

ago either. All the gentlemen over here were grown up and adult when he made this speech on March 21, 1943; the whole text was published in The Globe and Mail. I am sure the hon. member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) must have had this because every Conservative in Saskatchewan must take the Globe and Mail. London, March 22, 1943 — and this is what Mr. Churchill said in that speech:

The time is now ripe for another great advance, and anyone can see what large savings there will be in administration once the whole process of insurance has become unified, compulsory and national.

Mr. Churchill goes on:

Here is a real opportunity for what I once called 'bring the magic of averages to the rescue of the millions'. Therefore you must rank me and all my colleagues (that will take in the member from Moosomin) as the strong partisans of national compulsory insurance for all classes for all purposes from the cradle to the grave.

What my hon. friends would like to do, I am afraid, is to destroy a service like that given by the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office and to destroy the benefits that it is bringing, and will bring in the future, to the people of this province.

**Mr. Tucker:** — On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. It was never suggested by us to do away with that service; just remove the compulsory feature.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, may I argue that that is not a question of privilege.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Just stating our position.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — That is another little speech. Now I believe it was also the hon. member for Melfort who made some reference to the fur marketing policies we have been following. He referred, specifically, I think, to the north end of Montreal Lake district, where payments go out from the Fur Marketing Service and an additional payment, probably an interim payment and a final payment; and he said these small payments have led to a situation where there has been a tremendous amount of bootlegging of liquor. Now, I would assume this must be because the people have more money than they know what to do with, when they go out and buy liquor from bootleggers. So this story just does not hang together — that you cannot on the one hand say that the amount paid to the trappers is too small and on the other hand say that they had too much money and, therefore, it had led to a whole lot of bootlegging. It may be that there are some bootleggers operating in that area, and if any of my hon. friends can do anything at all or give any information to help to stop that kind of traffic, I would advise that they give that information to the Attorney General instead of just telling that kind of a story.

As a matter of fact, the Fur Marketing Service has rendered a service to the trappers of this province which is very difficult to calculate in dollars and cents, but it is certainly well into the hundreds of thousands

of dollars. My hon. friends sitting across the House know very well that the people who previously bought furs bought them as cheaply as they could; that they bought muskrat skins and beaver skins and fox skins for half their value. Did they ever raise their voice in protest because the trapper was being cheated? They never did. They believe that that kind of business is smart. That is the kind of free enterprises that they believe in; but when we have established a Fur Marketing Service which means that the trapper has a way to get around the fur dealers and to get his furs sent direct to a market, which is one of the best auction markets in the world today where he can get the full value for his furs, they object to it. We know that there are a good many tricks being played. We know that it is a common trick of traders, of fur dealers, to go out to the trappers who have a number of muskrat pelts, look at his pelts and say: "Now if I could buy those pelts, I could give you about \$3 apiece or \$3.50 apiece for them," — knowing full well that he cannot buy them, that the true value is about \$2 or \$2.50 apiece, and if he could buy them he would be offering 75 cents or \$1. We know, too, we have received shipments of furs, consignments of furs, for example, half a dozen fox skins, on the suggestion of a dealer, split his shipment of one dozen foxes into two lots, and sent half of the number to the Fur Marketing Service and sold the other half to the dealer. The dealer has the opportunity to look them over and pick out the good one; and then when the returns came back they would compare the returns. We know that kind of thing is going on, and it does disturb some of the trappers who wonder what has happened; but a lot of them are getting more wise to this situation all the time.

I believe it was the member for Melville (Mr. Deshaye) who stated that there were thousands of muskrats frozen in the swamps in his constituency this winter, or every winter. I would point out to the House that it cannot be avoided that there are some casualties among the muskrats when they are wintering over. Through our policy of conservation and control, we attempt to get the best information with regard to the number of 'rats and the water levels. For example, last fall we had a fall season for trapping muskrats, and issued licences to trap a considerable number of 'rats in areas where it was quite evident that the water was too shallow, and that the 'rats would be frozen out during the winter. It is a part of our programme to do that, but, as I say, you just cannot avoid running into some of that loss, but I doubt very much if there were very many thousands of 'rats frozen, or even very many hundreds. I would think that was a very large number for an area such as in the constituency of Melville.

I would point out, also, that in the fur business in the province, we have organized fur conservation blocks in the north of the province, and in those blocks we have organized fur advisory councils. For the first time the trappers themselves are having the privilege of taking part in deciding the number of animals that should be taken, making sure that they will have a crop left for next year. They do that; and they are taking part in the democratic control of the means whereby they make a good deal of their living, and I want to pay a compliment to the fur advisory councils who are doing that work. These trappers in the conservation blocks do a good deal of work in taking a census of the muskrat and beaver in their conservation blocks. Then on the basis of the census, a quota for trapping is set.

In regard to game in the province: first in the far north, we recognize that the game in the far north — the moose, the elk, the caribou, the game birds — are, first of all, important to the need of people who are permanently resident in the north, and who are dependent for a good part of their living on that game, and it is our policy that they shall have first consideration. No one from the south, no one from any place else whose living does not depend on it need expect to go into the north to shoot moose if that is going to mean endangering the economics of the north. We believe that those resources should be maintained for those people. We intend to follow that policy. In regard to caribou, a considerable number of hunters go in to hunt caribou, and for the same reason it may be necessary for the preservation of the caribou, which has great economic importance in the north, to say that hunters from outside cannot go in to hunt caribou. In the south it is a matter of regulation, control and enforcement, if we are going to maintain our stocks of game animals and game birds for future generations in this province.

A compliment should be paid to the officers of the Game Branch who are very active in their enforcement work. They do a great deal towards getting the information out to the public in the maintenance of the game in the south of the province. The members of this House, the public in the province of Saskatchewan, if they want to see game maintained in this province, game birds and our big game, can be of great help in assisting with the enforcement of The Game Act, and when it becomes in the eyes of the public the wrong thing to poach on our big game or to hunt illegally, then we can be sure that we will be preserving our game in this province.

A good deal of difficulty has been experienced in the past in regard to certain predators such as crows, and magpies, who are enemies of our game birds, rob their nests, and so forth. There have been campaigns carried on to reduce the numbers of crows and magpies through the Fish and Game League and with the co-operation of our department. Timber wolves in the far north have been a menace to the game. We were paying a bounty of \$25 per head. We felt that we were just a little too popular, because we were paying a bounty just about twice as large as the neighbouring provinces, and in the Northwest Territories no bounty at all. The Liberal government at Ottawa will not pay a bounty in the Northwest Territories.

**Mr. Tucker:** — May I ask the hon. member a question on that point? Has any conference been requested to come to any agreement about putting the bounty in all the provinces and in the Northwest Territories to \$25?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker. Our game officials confer quite regularly with the officials of the Indian Affairs Branch of the dominion government, and these questions have been discussed. I was just going to say that we have reduced our timber wolf bounty to \$10, which is pretty well in line with the provinces on either side, and would be completely in line if we had a \$10 bounty in the Northwest Territories. In regard to coyotes . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — May I ask another question, Mr. Speaker? Does the hon. Minister consider that bounty adequate?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that that is a question that can be easily and quickly answered. There is a good deal of doubt. I was just going to talk about coyotes. Looking over the whole record of the payment of bounties for this class of animals in the United States — they have had long experience there — the general conclusion is that the payment of bounties has not been successful in taking care of the situation. Practically all of the States that have had a long experience, have abandoned the idea of paying bounties. This is a situation, for example; we can expect that there will be probably 15,000 or 20,000 coyotes killed in this province without any bounty, just incidentally, by the casual hunter, farmer and the trapper. The first thing you do when you pay a bounty is you pay — if it is \$5 — \$5 apiece for all those which would have been killed anyway, before you start to get any benefit, and so we decided, with this information, that the best thing we could do was to quit the coyote bounties altogether. There has been a good deal of work done in parts of the United States with regard to systems of using poison to destroy the coyotes in different ways. I am not going into the details of those systems, but they are being used quite effectively in many places in the States and further study is being given to that particular method.

It would not be right at this time if I passed from the subject of game without giving some credit to the Fish and Game League branches in the province of Saskatchewan. The officials of the branches, the membership of the branches, have been very co-operative and have been helpful in carrying out good game policies in this province. I want to publicly thank them for that co-operation.

Now, to change the subject, Mr. Speaker, and get back to the question of fish. The Leader of the Opposition, I believe, stated that the government bought trout fillets at 8 cents per pound, and sold them at a very high price. I do not know what he said the price was; but he also said that these were very delicious fish, and I agree with him. In that he was correct. But, as a matter of fact, the government has not, to my knowledge, bought any trout fillets, unless it was for some of the institutions for consumption in those institutions. I presume that when he said the government he meant the Fish Board. The Fish Board has never bought any trout fillets at all at 8 cents, or any other price. I do not know where he got that idea. The Fish Board . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The hon. member has made his speech . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — On a question of privilege, the hon. member must not misquote me. I have the right to rise in this House if he states something that I did not say.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — All right. Tell us what you said.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I said that they bought this trout at 8 cents a pound. I did not say they bought trout fillets at 8 cents a pound. I said they bought the trout at 8 cents a pound.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Well, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The hon. member is quite within his rights to correct a statement that is ascribed to him; but the hon. member must realize that when a man is speaking continual interruption is not generally in good taste.

**Mr. Tucker:** — If the speaker is addressing the Assembly and is going to make mis-statements, Your Honour will surely grant me the right to correct him.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member, as I have stated, if he is being misquoted, has the perfect right to rise on a point of privilege and ask the person to correct the statement. The hon. members of this Legislature should know that when it comes to the matter of asking a question it is the prerogative of the member speaking whether he may ask it. But the hon. member, if it is indicated by the member who is on his feet that he does not prefer to answer these questions, then he must have the right to do so.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I have certainly no desire and no need to misquote the Leader of the Opposition, but I listened carefully. We differ in this, and I will accept his translation, but I was listening very carefully, and if I did not hear trout fillets at 8 cents a pound, well, it was funny business. Maybe he did not mean to say it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member accepts the correction then?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I accept the correction. I realize the Leader of the Opposition does not know much about fish, and I am very glad to know that he knows this much because I thought he did not know a fillet from a trout. As a matter of fact, I still don't think he knows very much about fish, at least the kind that are in the lakes. He has a good line and a hook on it, and nice bait on it, but still he does not know much about the fish in the lakes.

The hon. member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) stated, I believe, that in regard to Redberry Lake, the regulations were so complicated that it is almost impossible to get any fish. This is how complicated they are: last November a meeting was held in Hafford hall, and the press statement which the member for Redberry referred to I now have in my hand. I take it is the press statement; he did not give me any date. In this press statement, I said:

I wish to emphasize very strongly that since the beginning of fishing operations in Redberry Lake a few years ago, annual meetings have been held with the fishermen and the regulations which are in force are discussed in detail with them. On November 24 of this year (that is 1948), it was agreed that it would be better to discontinue domestic fishing and have a commercial season. It was also agreed that these fishermen would be permitted to take home 100 pounds of fish each for their own use.



Now, I would like to ask, or put it up to, the member for Redberry, what he would do about it. These fishermen, who are living close to the lake and had been in the habit of fishing there for the two or three years there has been commercial fishing going on, wanted to have some commercial fishing to get a chance to make a few dollars. Had we issued domestic licences we would, of necessity, have issued a couple of hundred, maybe more. There would have been no commercial fishing at all. The question he would have to decide was whether it was more important to have somebody from North Battleford, or some place else, get a domestic licence, come in and spend a lot of time and catch maybe two fish, as he said the other day, at a cost of \$6.75 a pound, or to have the fishermen themselves have a job for a few days in commercial fishing. The fishermen wanted the commercial fishing, and that is what they got. They wanted a limit of eight miles around the lake. We did not give them it. We said that was setting it down too small, and making it much too small a group. Any fishermen within 20 miles can fish. Of course, not everybody within 20 miles of the lake wants to fish. There were no domestic licences issued this winter at all. It must have been the year before if anyone got a domestic licence, and if the member would give me the names and the dates with regard to the times his friend went to get a fishing licence and had to go back a second day, I would be glad to look into the matter; but it appears to me that he is only interested in having something to grumble about, and not interested in getting anything cured at all. If he was interested in getting it cured he would have reported the incident; that is, if he was interested in serving the people of that constituency.

I have before me what appears to be the script of the Leader of the Opposition, and it says:

I saw different places in the north. I saw, for example, in the summertime, some trout fillets, some of the most beautiful fish I have ever seen at Lac la Ronge, brought in. You know what they are paying for those fish, those fish fillets? Eight cents a pound.

**Mr. Tucker:** — That's exactly what I said, Mr. Speaker, "for those fish".

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, once in awhile I make a slip of the tongue, too, and I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition likely just made a slip of the tongue when he said that.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is trying now to back out of accepting my statement as to what I said. Now, I repeat that I said "you know what they are paying for those fish". Now, I submit that the hon. member must accept that statement.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. No member has to accept something that is not true. Here are the words: "You know what they are paying for these fish, those fish fillets? Eight cents a pound." That is the record of the Leader of the Opposition's words.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I will accept that he meant to say fish, not fillets. I agree with that; that he meant that. As I said, he did not know much about fish, and probably did not understand the difference between fillets and fish.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Very funny.

**Mr. Marion:** — What do you pay for trout?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, in the Committee of Crown Corporations, we shall be glad to answer detailed questions like that. At the present time I am not going to take the time to do it.

To come back to Redberry Lake: the situation in Redberry was partially explained by the member. The fact is that in all probability it will not be very many years until there will be no fish problem in Redberry Lake because Redberry Lake is becoming more saline every year, and it is on the margin now of where it will support fish. In fact, they are not spawning, and in all probability in a short time that lake will not any longer support fish.

He also said that we took out 7,000 pounds of fish and there were five officials there. Well, this is another one of those stories that has a grain of truth in it. We took out fish all right, but it was not 7,000 pounds; it was over 9,000, and there were not five officials, but there was one Fish Board officer and the Department of Fisheries Branch field officer — two of them. That is a pretty good record for Liberals to be that close to being right. In addition, I would point out that 2,000 pounds of this fish was sold locally at the lake, not at \$6.75 a pound, but at 16 cents per pound. The people in that area could buy fish. They were sold it in small quantities at that price, even though the price that could be procured on the market was at that time a good deal higher. Maybe we were wrong in selling fish at that price.

**Mr. Deshaye:** — Would the hon. member permit a question?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Well, make it snappy.

**Mr. Deshaye:** — I wonder if the hon. member can tell me if the trapper can catch white fish and not sell them to the Fish Board, but keep them for his own consumption?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Well, trappers don't catch white fish. It is the fisherman that get white fish, and the politicians that catch suckers.

**Mr. Tucker:** — You people are expert at that. You should know.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I have just been fooling around so far, and I am very glad to see, if we have any Liberals in this House — and I guess it is a good thing

to have a few — that my hon. friend from Gravelbourg (Mr. Culliton) is here. I enjoyed his speech yesterday very much indeed, and his speech reminded me of the story about the man who wrote out a speech then he wrote down marginal notes along the sides so that when he was going over the speech he had this marginal note: Argument very weak here, holler like everything. The hon. member's speech was very weak in fact and logic, but it did make up in rhetoric and noise. He can do a good job of it, and if he had a good case he could really do it fine. He gave four reasons for the election results here in Saskatchewan. I am not going to take time right now to analyze the election results except just to say that we won the election, and we were also able to carry a recorded vote in the House yesterday, which is rather important. The first point that he raised was that there was nothing for the farmers, and referred to security and debt adjustment of the past. Well, Mr. Speaker, in this question about nothing for the farmers, again this is something just like the other stories that I have been quoting today. The member for Gravelbourg apparently has been reading *The Leader-Post* or some other fictitious publication like that, instead of reading the official records. If he would read some of the official records he would know that it is absolutely untrue to say that no debt was cancelled by this government. I can tell him that in 1938 all the Liberal government did was to have the Attorney-General, then Mr. Davis, issue a statement which was circulated, which had no backing in law and which, among other things, said that the machine companies had to get their payments before the farmer reserved expenses for his living. That is the kind of a statement they issued.

But to come back to what has actually been done, I will start with some of the little things first. In the Farm Loans Branch of the Department of the Provincial Treasurer, there have been adjustments totalling almost \$150,000 in two years. In the northern re-establishment — my friends should not forget that northern re-establishment — in the depression years they took people from the south of the province, they sent them into the north, very often onto land which was not fit for agriculture at all. They gave them a homestead entry on it, and then they kept them on relief a part of the time. They advanced them enough, sometimes, to get 10 or 15 acres under cultivation or to buy a team of oxen. Later they got more advanced and they bought a team of horses for them. They would buy two or three old, secondhand machines which were cast-offs from the power farms in the south — sulky plows, a mower — and then, with a cow and a pig or two, they expected these people to be self-supporting.

When we took over, between the relief and the re-establishment advances, these people were in an absolutely hopeless position to ever think of owning their land, poor as it was, and being able to support themselves. We cancelled all of that old relief and we put into effect a plan for settlement on an adjustment basis of the re-establishment accounts, with a standard provision that every time one of these settlers paid \$1 in, he got credit for \$2. Under that plan these settlers have been benefited by many, many thousands of dollars, and many of them are paying off, or have paid off, the indebtedness on their land. That cannot be classed as just nothing, and that still is just in the few hundreds of thousands.

Then we find also that we cancelled all of the old seed grain accounts for 1935, 1936 and 1937 — \$21,833,000. Is that nothing? The portion cancelled

of the old seed grain advances which go back as far as 1917, from 1917 until 1935 — \$7,300,000, making the total in the three items of almost \$40 million. When you add to this the cancellation of the old relief accounts, which was pretty close to 100 percent a provincial loss, a provincial liability, in the sum of \$33 million, you have a total of \$72 million. For anybody to get up in the House and to say that nothing has been done towards cancellation of the debt is simply ridiculous. You can get away with it as long as you have the floor and nobody else has a chance to talk, but you cannot get away with that kind of stuff forever.

I want also to say a word or two about The Drought Area Debt Adjustment Act that the hon. member mentioned. I will tell you what The Drought Area Debt Adjustment Act was. It was an agreement between the Liberal government of the province of Saskatchewan and the mortgage companies for the purpose of reinstating the mortgages in this province. That is what it was for, and that is what it accomplished. The mortgages in this province had got into such a bad shape that the total amount owing in many, many cases was far more than the land was worth even in normal times, and at depression times it was going at 50 percent or less of its normal value. The mortgage companies had already lost the accumulated interest on those mortgages, and more than the accumulated interest. So the Liberals did a horse trade: and what did they trade? The Liberal government traded the interest they had already lost; the Liberal government traded the credit of the municipalities, the assets of the municipalities and the school districts of this province for a 'horse' that was not worth anything — the interest that was already lost. So the municipalities and school districts found themselves without assets and the mortgage companies found themselves reinstated with a first mortgage that could be sometime, so they hoped, collected. That was The Drought Area Debt Adjustment Act. If I had had anything to do with that, I don't think I would go around and brag about it at all.

One thing that the member from Gravelbourg did not tell us, when he was talking about the crop failure clause in The Farm Security Act, one thing that the Liberals never tell us if they can help it, is whether or not they are in favour of the principle of the crop failure clause or whether they are in favour of a policy which means the pyramiding of debt in crop failure years, which has taken place in the past. I don't know where they stand, but they have certainly shown no enthusiasm for a safeguard like the crop failure clause which would prevent that accumulation of debt, and it was the friends of my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, who saved the mortgage companies the expense of taking The Farm Security Act to court, by taking it to court for the mortgage companies — the Liberal government at Ottawa.

The second reason given by the member for Gravelbourg was the failure to assist the rural municipalities. This is good, Mr. Speaker. I have before me a record of the grants to the municipalities that are located either in whole or in part in the Kinistino constituency for a number of years. I find that in 1935 these eight municipalities received \$3,891 between them in grants. Two of them got nothing; the other six got the \$3,891. In 1936 they only got \$150 between them. Just one municipality got that, and the others got nothing. Of course, there was no election in 1936. You see, there was a federal election in 1935 and the Liberal government in Saskatchewan, which had been the "Charlie

McCarthy” of the Liberal party in Canada, had to do something about it in 1935 to help win the election, so they did get nearly \$4,000 in grants in 1935. In 1937 they were up again to nearly \$3,000, but only two municipalities shared the grants out of the eight. But, Mr. Speaker, in 1938, oh, that was a great year. They say that all the farmers in Saskatchewan only remember 1915 — that was the year of the big crop — but we should remember only 1938 in the Kinistino constituency because there was not a municipality that did not get a grant that year, and the lowest grant was \$512, and the highest grant was \$4,514. The total was \$12,796. That was the year of the provincial election. In 1949, Mr. Speaker, I will give you, or the Leader of the Opposition, or the member for Kinistino one guess as to what they got. Nothing. There was no election that year. They did not need any votes. In 1940 they got very little in grants, \$1,615. Now, if there was ever a nasty deal pulled on a group of innocent municipalities, it was pulled in 1940, because that was the federal election year, and those eight municipalities should have had, according to the good old Liberal system, \$4,000 in grants; but my friends, the leaders at Ottawa, sprang an election in the middle of winter when they could not do any road work. So the poor municipalities did not get any grants at all. That was really a nasty, and that is the way it goes.

Then the figures go in 1941 — \$382; next year is \$1,800; the next, \$2,700; the next, \$3,400; the next, \$2,700. In 1946 and 1947 we started on a little different system — \$6,900; in 1947-48, \$10,250, and in 1948-49, \$13,000 on the equalization system. My hon. friend is just itching to ask where we got the money. You know, Mr. Speaker, I could just as well have had this for the constituency of Last Mountain. I get it mixed up with that Conservative constituency of Lake Centre, because he seems to be so closely associated with it. So pardon me for that. And I could have had this just as well for that constituency, telling exactly the same story as this. He wants to know where the money came from, and I want to tell this House that I don’t think that the Liberal government had any intention of returning that so-called reserve fund to the municipalities. I don’t think so because here is what would have happened had they done it. There would have been in a municipality one man who might have contributed on account of one quarter-section \$100 towards that fund, another man might have contributed nothing. The only fair way, if they were going to make any refunds — man, oh man, Mr. Speaker, I’d like to see the day when the Liberal government ever started making refunds — the only fair way they could do it would be return it to the individuals. It never belonged to the municipality, that money. It never did. It belonged first to the people, and then to the government when the tax was paid, and no municipality, in my knowledge, has ever made any adjustment of the back taxes because of a change in the assessment within its borders. They just don’t do it. So that is where they got the money. Now, that is enough time on that question.

Something was said about taxation too, and I would like to point out to the House that in 1928 when we had a Liberal government in this province, rural municipalities paid \$18.9 million. In 1929 when we had a Liberal government for most of the year, they paid \$19.1 million. In 1930, when we had a Conservative government they paid \$19.6 million dollars. In 1946, they paid \$17 million. In 1947, they paid \$17.4 million, and in 1947 the levy was \$18.8 million. As a matter of fact, the taxes levied in the rural municipalities now, with all the additional services, are less than the taxes that were levied in the rural municipalities in 1928.

Now, it is all very nice to get up and make a good fellow of yourself by harping about high taxes, but it is a good idea to look back in history and find just where the situation stands. I know that due to the re-assessment of land in the province, which was started by the Liberal government — for which I give them credit, but if there is any blame coming they will have to take their share of the blame too; but this new assessment made a much greater difference between poor land and good land, so that there are cases where you can take that good land which was formerly assessed low, and find that there has been an extreme increase in taxes.

Mention was made of the gasoline tax, and I would point out to my hon. friends that there are only, I think, three provinces in the Dominion of Canada with Liberal governments, and each one of them has a 13 cent gasoline tax, 3 cents higher than Saskatchewan's. The only two provinces lower than the province of Saskatchewan are Alberta and Manitoba, neither of which is a Liberal government: one, if there is magic in coalition, has been purified by coalition, and the other is a Social Credit government. Both of these provinces have comparatively small highway systems, and the situation is different altogether; but if my friends want to compare it, there they have it. New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island have 13 cents apiece; British Columbia 10 cents; Ontario 11 cents, where they have a Conservative government; and Quebec, where they have I don't know whether you would call it a Conservative government or not — I guess it is — they have 11 cents there, and we have 10 cents here. So again, I say it is quite easy to talk, to make a lot of noise about it; but it is a good idea to get the facts.

Mention was made of the Larger School Unit by the hon. member for Gravelbourg. He said that one of the reasons for the election results was the way the Larger School Unit was put in. The hon. member is hedging a little bit about that, you see. He does not like to be against the larger unit, and so he says it is "the way the Larger School Units were put in". Well, what would my hon. friend like? Would he like large school units put in the way they were in British Columbia? They haven't got a Liberal government there. They have a coalition government with some Liberals and some Conservatives. All at once, without any vote, and with very little democratic control among the people, if any at all, they put in a practically completely centralized plan of education. I would like my hon. friend to comment on that plan in the province of British Columbia some time — a completely centralized plan — and how they tie their comments on that with their comments in regard to our Larger School Units here. Or, possibly, he would like the Large School Units to be introduced in the manner of Manitoba, where you have also a coalition government except that I believe they still have a Social Crediter or two in the government in Manitoba. I have in my hand an editorial from the Winnipeg Tribune — I understand a little bit of a Conservative paper — and it is dated January 21, 1949, quite recent. The Hon. C. Rhodes Smith is the Minister of Education in Manitoba. In politics, he is shown in the Parliamentary Guide as a Liberal-Progressive, with a "C" in brackets after it. Now, I don't know whether the "C" in brackets after it stands for Conservative or Coalition, but he is certainly a very interesting combination. You have Liberal-Progressive and Progressive Conservatives and Labour-Progressives. They are all mixed up together. My hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition used to call himself a Progressive at one time.

**Mr. Tucker:** — And I'm proud of it too.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Yes, I'm proud of that fact. In fact, that is one of the saving things about the Leader of the Opposition, that he might return again to a role that is progressive. The Winnipeg Tribune says, referring to the Minister of Education there:

He stated that he felt the large unit of school administration such as has been set up at the Dauphin area, brought definite advantages to children of the district.

I have never heard my hon. friends over here say whether or not the large school units have been of advantage to the districts or not. I have never heard them say a word about it. I would like to hear the hon. member for Melfort, who used to be a councillor with the Teachers' Organization, express himself on that question sometime. And then the editorial goes on to say:

The Department of Education was given permission to set up two experimental larger school units in 1946. Actually only one was established, and then the department seemed to go to sleep.

Well, that is natural, Mr. Speaker. It is quite natural for a Liberal-Conservative government. Then, again, it says:

Mr. Smith has now broken the silence and stated that he is in favour of this progressive step.

Now let us make up our minds. Let us have the men on the opposite benches make up their minds as to whether this is good or not. If it is good, let us take less than a hundred years to do it. Maybe we don't have to do it as suddenly or as quickly as British Columbia.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Why don't you have a vote on it, as you promised?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — We had some votes.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Why don't you have one the way you promised?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — We'll have some more.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Gravelbourg also mentioned as one of the reasons for the results of the election a policy of regimentation and control have destroyed the economic stability of the lumbermen, fishermen and trappers. I take it — it may not be word for word — that is the meaning of what he says. Now, it happens that I represent a constituency which produces more lumber than any other constituency in the province, and I am still here. It happens, also, that Torch River constituency is a high producer of lumber and timber products. We have here a member for Torch River (Mr. Denike). Prince Albert constituency also produces quite a bit of lumber and I have for my seatmate the member for Prince Albert (Hon. Mr. McIntosh). Shellbrook constituency produces quite a bit of lumber, and over here sits the member for Shellbrook (Mr. Larsen), on this side of the House. Meadow Lake and Turtleford, two out of

the six constituencies. You see, my friends have been going around the province trying to make out we lost the election in northern Saskatchewan. When you win four out of six that cannot actually be marked won as a loss. I would call that a win.

**Mr. Tucker:** — What about Cumberland and Athabaska?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I am coming to that, too.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us take in these six constituencies I have named: Tisdale, Torch River, Prince Albert, Shellbrook, Meadow Lake and Turtleford, and, in addition, add the two far northern constituencies of Cumberland and Athabaska, and take the total vote. We find this: the C.C.F. candidates in the eight constituencies got 23,108 votes, and we find the Liberal candidates got 21,042 votes. The C.C.F. candidates got more than 2,000 votes more in that area, where the C.C.F. were supposed to be defeated. What is the member talking about? I might mention to my hon. friend for Athabaska (Mr. Marion), I did not include him as a Liberal because I see he was an Independent. As a matter of fact, we had two Independents up there, and a Liberal who ran away; he did not stay to the end of the game. As a matter of fact, that Liberal is becoming quite famous for that. He was first in there and won the by-election by acclamation, I believe it was. He represented Athabaska constituency, and then my hon. friend managed to get the nomination, and I am rather surprised at my hon. friend for Athabaska sitting with the Liberals in this House, Mr. Speaker, because I am sure . . .

**Mr. Marion:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Well now, make it privilege.

**Mr. Marion:** — I am glad to have the honour to be sitting with the Liberal party.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, that is no point of privilege. My hon. friend may be glad of the privilege of sitting with the Liberals; I cannot do anything to improve his taste, but I do want to say I am pretty thoroughly convinced that officials employed by the Liberal government did their best to engineer things so that my hon. friend would not get the nomination in that constituency.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, a charge has been made by the hon. member, and I want to tell him that that charge is untrue.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Someday, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Athabaska will be around to see me, probably, and I will show one or two things, and they will be very interesting too, I can tell you that.

When we come down to these two northern constituencies — I want to say a few words about these two constituencies. You know, since we were elected in 1944, we started a programme in northern Saskatchewan which, as the years go by, will become increasingly important to the welfare of those people in the north of the province. We started, for example, these schools in the north. There



were mighty few day schools in the north, and the Liberal government at Ottawa has, up to now, refused to establish day schools for the Indian people in northern Saskatchewan. This reminds me of a story about a very ardent Liberal gentleman being introduced to some Liberal Leader of the Opposition — I do not think it was my hon. friend — and he introduced the leader to all his seven boys. When he finished up he said to the Liberal leader: “You know I have seven great boys there, all Liberals except that younger one, and he learned to read and write.” Education, Mr. Speaker, in northern Saskatchewan will be most important to those people in the future. The Liberal government that sat on these benches here, and advisedly I say ‘sat’, and the Liberal government at Ottawa, neither of them had ever done anything worthwhile to carry a modern, practical form of education to the people of northern Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? I wonder if he is aware that during the past year the federal government has spent more than \$1 million on education in the Northwest Territories?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — They still have not any day schools in northern Saskatchewan for the Indians, and my friends all know there is no other way to carry practical education to those people. We are doing it for the Metis people, and the other people who are residents in that area, and a good many of the Indian children are attending our schools, and are getting the education that should be provided for them by the federal government, I think, when we take this question of education into consideration.

When we look over the vote in these northern constituencies, I find — there has been a lot said about the fishing in northern Saskatchewan — in some polls where the Fish Board has operated there has been pretty well an even break, or the Fish Board has had a majority. In some places it has gone the other way. For example, in my friend’s constituency at Buffalo Narrows, the Fish Board does not operate there, but they have experience with a private operator there, and they voted 104 C.C.F. against 66 for one Independent, and 28 for another Independent.

**Mr. Marion:** — What capacity did that private operator have in the election?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — No capacity at all; but that is what they voted. Take at other lakes, like Ile a la Crosse, where the Fish Board does not operate at all; they voted a strong majority for one of the Independent candidates. Also at Portage La Loche where the Fish Board does not operate. At Snake Lake, where the Fish Board does operate, the break was about even. Way in the north at Dore Lake and Camsell Portage and Stoney Rapids, it was nearly solid for the C.C.F. So it is entirely erroneous to state that it was either Fish Board policy or the fur policy that affected the election in those two northern constituencies.

**Mr. Marion:** — We call it compulsion.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — There was other compulsion probably had more effect than that. For example, in Cumberland constituency, at the north end of Montreal Lake, there were 23 C.C.F. and 6 Liberals. That was one of the places where we have a fairly big trapping project, muskrat and beaver. There we got substantial support from those people. I think all that is necessary is that those people realize they have a programme being carried on that is for their benefit.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal for a few minutes with the lumber question. I believe it was the member for Melfort who mentioned the margin in lumber price. Before I deal with that I want to say, Sir, I am very glad to have reasonable assurance, at least, that the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Gravelbourg are at last in favour of the Wheat Board handling the coarse grains in Canada. They are in favour of a policy under which farmers will be compelled to market, not only their wheat, but their oats and their barley to the Canadian Wheat Board. They should be proud to have at last got into line.

**Mr. Tucker:** — On a question of privilege. The hon. Minister is misrepresenting our position to this House, and I wish . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I give him all the credit in the world for their position in this House. I am giving him a pat on the back.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! When an hon. member rises from his seat on a point of privilege, or a point of order, he certainly will have the courtesy of this House. To make statements outside of that, as you know, is not in order.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have said that the hon. Minister is misrepresenting our position by saying 'at last' we have taken this position. Our position was laid down at the Liberal Convention in 1946, and that position we have taken now was laid down then. To say we have taken that position 'at last' is to indicate we have just done it now.

**Mr. Speaker:** — That is not a point a privilege or a point of order.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Again may I say I have read too many Liberal platforms in the past to become too enthusiastic about what they have in their platform. They have one great quality, the Liberal platforms, they last a wonderful long time, because nobody uses the planks in them. They keep them brand new and shine them up a little for each election. I would like to know if that was put into the Liberal platform in 1946, why did they not do something about it? What was the idea of the Liberal government decontrolling coarse grains when the coarse grains had passed out of the hands of the producers, when the farmers who had suffered crop failure had not yet bought their supplies of feed, and when the exporters, to a great extent, and the larger grain traders had control of that grain? They

decontrolled it and up went the price. The Liberal party may get to be very old, but they will never be able to explain that one away. They can talk about getting into the right place on coarse grains in 1946, but if they did they got out of it again pretty quick, and they did not do anything about it, as the records show. They have been fiddling around with coarse grains as if they could not do it, trying to find all the excuses for not doing anything about it. They can put wheat under a Wheat Board, but Mr. Howe, or somebody, makes the excuse they have to get the consent of all the provinces, knowing that would delay things, and maybe they would not get the consent, and they would not have to do anything about it. That is just how much the Liberal party had its tongue in its big cheek when they put it in the platform in 1946.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I say that is incorrect, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Well, now, we will assume it is correct, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberals are in favour of the Wheat Board handling coarse grains and wheat. We will assume that is correct. I still have my mental reservations about that.

In the question of wheat and coarse grains, here is a product that is completely alienated from the Crown. The government has no ownership in this at all. It is grown on land most of which is privately owned. It is not a natural resource. My hon. friends over here, for the sake of being on the right track politically, have had to back up that kind of a programme marketing grains through the Wheat Board. They had to do it; they could not get out of it. Then I hear them in this House say that people should have the right to sell their fish, fur and timber where they like. The timber has not been alienated. It belongs to the people of this province, and yet they say the people of this province have not the right to market their own timber, which they own as a natural resource, through a Timber Board. Could anybody be more illogical? I could not expect anything like that from any place else except from the Liberal party when it suits their political purpose. They cannot take up a position like that; they cannot blow hot one way on coarse grains, and cold on lumber and fish. It just does not work out. The people of Saskatchewan, when they elected a C.C.F. government — twice they did it too, the only time the Liberals got trimmed twice in succession . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — You sound surprised you got elected.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — When the people elected a C.C.F. government in this province, they voted for the C.C.F. policies. Part of that C.C.F. policy was for the development and use of our natural resources to get the most we could out of them. My hon. friend for Melfort talks about the terrible margin there is in lumber prices; but I want to tell him that he is exhibiting the fact that he does not know very much about the situation, or is not telling the whole story, for the simple reason that private lumber companies — I will name a private company, The Pas Lumber Company, and in private enterprises there just is not any better company to deal with than The Pas Lumber Company, nor are there any nicer people to deal with than the officials of the company. They have large timber berths in this province . . .

**An Hon. Member:** — They have?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Yes, that is right. They have a very efficient operation; they are capitalists; they are making a margin on their lumber far wider than the Timber Board is making because they are able, through the size of their organization, to get their lumber produced cheaper than we can get it contracted through the Timber Board. None one of my hon. friends over here ever raised his voice because of the margin that The Pas Lumber Company has in their lumber, because of the margin any other capitalist company . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — (Inaudible interruption)

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Just wait a minute please . . . because of the margin any other capitalist company has in any other product. That is smart, according to their philosophy.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is making mis-statements. I rise . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Tucker:** — On a point of privilege . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! When an hon. member makes a statement he accepts the responsibility.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Of course, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member said that we never raised our voices against any margin of profit being taken by any person in a private position in this province. Since I have been in this House, I have raised the question of the raise in the price of coal, and what the hon. Premier had to do with it.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw that statement, when I said the hon. members had never raised their voices against a margin. I will take that back, I am wrong. They have, but that is all they ever did raise. They have raised it on different occasions . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — You have done nothing about it. You are in power.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — . . . they appoint a Royal Commission on one thing and another at Ottawa — farm machinery — they raise their voice, that is all they do.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Why don't you appoint a Royal Commission as you promised?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I would like to give to the House a little bit of information with regard to some of the previous operations of the Timber Board: 52.4 percent of the total amount received for the lumber by the Timber Board went to the actual contractor-producer of the lumber. I think, in almost any industry where there is such

process of manufacture carried on that will probably be the highest percentage of the gross return that actually goes back to the producer. 9.7 percent went to the Department of Natural Resources, to the people of this province. Do they object to that? If they do, let us hear from them. 2.4 percent was the cost of dry piling; 11.6 percent the cost of planning; 2.9 the cost of insurance; 8.7 the cost of freight; 4.8 is the cost of the general overhead of the Timber Board, including the head office and field offices of the Timber Board over the whole province. We are carrying on an operation handling 40, 50, 60 million feet of lumber all across the province, and it takes some organization to do it. 7.2 percent in that year of 1946-47 was the actual profit made by the Saskatchewan Timber Board.

Now you see, Mr. Speaker, if the people of Saskatchewan had not, through their government, been doing this for themselves, and making that 7.2 percent, if some of the big lumber companies — the MacMillan Lumber Company in B.C. for example — had been in here and had a corner on the whole thing, and if they were making 15 percent, it would be all right as far as the Liberal party in the province of Saskatchewan is concerned. They would not protest against that; but this is a different thing. They do not want the people to own, control, develop and get the benefit from their resources. They want to give them away to their friends.

I want to say a word about our forests. Our forests do have a tremendous economic value in this province, and the actual forest products that are harvested is only a small part of the economic value of the forests; but over a long term of years that will be substantial. The actual income to the province is not so tremendous, but today it is pretty well doubled from the average when the Liberals were in power. They object to that.

There is also a great value in the forests, and economic value in the protection of our countryside. On the plains area, the prairie area, it is recognized that either the natural grass or something to replace it is a protection which must be maintained. In the forest area I do not think there is any substitute for the forest to protect and maintain our land, our fur and our game; continuous revenue, year after year, with very little work, to maintain our fish and our streams and lakes. Take our forest off and soon the game will be gone, and soon the fish will be gone. Erosion will take place when the forests are gone, and the lakes, rivers and streams will become silted, and the fish will die. The soil itself, where it is valuable in the forest area, is also protected by the forest.

Besides the economic value, there is great aesthetic value too; the value of the forest as a playground. To get into the outdoors of the forest either in winter or summer is a wonderful holiday to have accessible to the people of a province. Then there is the beauty of our forests. When we take all these values we cannot help but realize our forests are worth conserving, protecting and developing.

To do this we must, first of all, have a good forestry plan of utilizing of cutting the right amount. We cannot go on forever cutting more than the annual growth. The Forestry Branch is working that out, working on plans of cutting so that industry can be established and maintained forever on the production of that forest area. That is what we want for stable production in the future.

It is important, too, that we protect our forests, not only from the exploiter, but from fire. In this I want to appeal to members of this House to do everything they can, and I want to give them some of the information with regard to fires, as an illustration of what can be done. I want to tell my hon. friends opposite, though I am going to use a comparison between 1937 and 1948, I am not suggesting the 1937 figures are any reflection on the Liberal government. Conditions were bad, but no worse than in 1948. In 1937, there were over 76 million feet of estimated merchantable timber lost by fire. Last year there was over 7 million. In 1937 there were over 1.6 million acres of young growth burned, an area that might have been a productive forest area in 20, 50 or 100 years from now. Last year there were 67,000 acres.

The credit for the improvement is, to a great extent, in the improved methods of fighting fires.

**Mr. Tucker:** — May I ask the hon. Minister a question, Mr. Speaker? 1937, we know, was the driest year we have had in 20 years. Were those figures for 1937 the worst figures over the last 15 years?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — No, 1937 was not the driest year. Last year was a drier fall, with less rainfall in the north. Now, that is right.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Have you the actual precipitation?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — No, I have not that with me, but it is correct. In a great part of northern Saskatchewan the ground was actually drier than it was in 1937. There is no advantage that way. As I said, I am not criticizing the Liberal government on this question at all. I want to point out the horrible disaster if we ever get to the position where 7 million or 56 million feet of lumber or where 67,000 or 1.5 million acres of nice young green forest are destroyed by fire. The best way to prevent this loss is to prevent fire. I hope every member in this House will do everything he can to build up, in the people along the edge of the forest area, a sense of ownership in their forest — because they have that; they are getting good provincial revenue from it, \$1 million a year — so that they will co-operate in the protection of those forests. Ninety percent or more of all forest fires that injure the forest are man-made, either along the edge of the forest or by trappers or hunters, or just travellers in the forest. We could save for the province hundreds of thousands of dollars if nobody would light a fire that was ever a danger of becoming a forest fire. In 1937, the fire fighting costs were \$414,000, nearly half a million dollars, and last year it cost us over \$100,000 to fight fires. These are serious things and I know we can never conquer this except by getting the full support of the people of this province.

One thing more I want to say about the forests is the development by way of roads. I think I can safely say with pride that we have really achieved something in the past four years in getting roads into our forests, roads which not only serve the purpose of taking out the products of the forests, but also serve as fireguards within the forest itself. According to the best figures I can get, in these four years we have built ten times as

much road in the forest which is negotiable with an automobile as was built in all previous time since the province took over in 1932, up until 1945. Roads are necessary, not only for travel, but for fireguards, and also to allow our people to enjoy our forests.

I wish to deal with just one other question. There has been a good deal said in this House in regard to what is sometimes termed “materialistic communism”. I want to say a word in this House about materialistic capitalism. I agree that both communism and capitalism are purely materialistic, and I think this is a classic example of materialistic capitalism that is available today. On April 21, 1943, when we had a war on, Mr. J. Gordon Hardy, the president of the Falconbridge Nickel Mines, said, to the annual meeting in Toronto, these words:

Incidentally, you will be glad to hear, as I was, that through indirect channels it is reported your Norwegian refinery is safe, and it is being maintained. It is in operation by your Norwegian staff, under German control, on the same Norwegian nickel copper ore production we formerly handled on toll basis.

That is what he said. You know how this news arrived?

**Mr. Loptson:** — Is there anything wrong with that?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — My hon. friend says there is nothing wrong with it.

**Mr. Loptson:** — I asked you if there was anything wrong with it.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — There certainly is something wrong with it when people who are supposed to be on Canada’s side in a war can be glad that for the sake of making profits for them the enemy has a plant to produce munitions of war. There is something wrong with it. Those people were the kind of people whose patriotism you could doubt. They thought more of the profit they made out of the nickel than they did of the bullets that might be used to shoot Canadian soldiers. I am surprised that my hon. friend from Saltcoats should question whether there is anything wrong with it.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Mr. Speaker, that is not the case at all.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Do you wish to make a speech or ask a question?

**Mr. Loptson:** — The Germans had the mines, and they were going to develop them anyway.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Sure they were going to keep it going, if they could at all; but that someone in this country would be glad they were keeping it going. There was a ‘scorched

earth' policy practised, and when you had to retreat you had to destroy the things that would be of value to the enemy. This was a long piece from the 'scorched earth' policy. It was handing over to the enemy the means whereby he could win the war. I am glad to know where my hon. friend stands on that question.

I want to bring just a few quotations to the House before I quit on this question that so often has been raised. I am not going to argue the point at all about communism and socialism, I am just going to bring some pretty good witnesses. I have in my hand a copy of the St. Matthew's Parish Magazine, which I believe is an Anglican Church magazine published in Regina. It is for May, 1948, and there is an article in it written by the Rev. Dudley Kemp under the heading of "Nationalization in Britain". This is what the Rev. Kemp of the Anglican Church says in this magazine:

While Britain was in the process of becoming the richest country in the world, its labourers toiled up to 14 hours a day, from the age of seven on, until death mercifully supervened to draw its gentle veil over suffering humanity.

Materialistic capitalism. He also says in this same article:

The Labour party may conceivably fail in its attempt to restore the country to its former prosperity, but none need fear, as do some Americans, that the dark shadow of communism hangs over the economic planning of the British Isles. What seems to be much nearer the truth is that nationalization saved England from communism. So perhaps the most ardent Tory — the most ardent one we have, anyway — should be grateful to his Labour brothers for doing something which he, as a Tory, could not have done without wrecking his own party in the process.

That is from a church magazine.

Now I come to some witnesses that I admit are not so good, but probably they are worth considering. This is the Prince Albert Herald, and it says:

Berlin vote held 1,333,000 slaps at Reds.

Further in the article it says:

The vote swept the Socialist party into power in the western part of the city. Like the Christian Democrats and the Liberal Democrats who ran second and third, the Socialists are anti-communist.

In a moment of weakness the Prince Albert Herald published the article. Then we go to the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, and the headline says:

Berliners give Reds stinging rebuke.

And in the body of the article it says:



The Social Democrats who demand the socialization of Germany along the lines followed by the British Labour party scored possibly the greatest victory in the history of their party. They emerged with an absolute majority which gives them working control of the next city and borough government, under western allied auspices. The social triumph assured the selection of Ernst Reuter, outspoken anti-Red, as Berlin's Lord Mayor.

**Mr. Truman:** — Are you going to read how Truman beat Wallace? Truman said he was not a socialist.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to get into arguments between these people who argue as to whether or not they are socialists. That is all right.

I think that is enough evidence on this question. I do not think there is need to produce any more. I think if we look at the situation calmly we will realize that the people who believe in the right of the people to own the resources of their country, develop them, control them, people who believe there are some forms of private ownership which must not be trusted to private hands, those are the people who really believe in all-out democracy. In the hands of those people, whether they be in Canada or Britain or Europe or New Zealand, democracy will be well looked after.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

**Mr. P. Prince (The Battlefords):** — Mr. Speaker, I wish at the outset to associate myself with those who have already spoken to congratulate you on your appointment to the Chair of this Legislative Assembly. Your re-election for a second term is an indication that you have in the past performed your duty honourably and well. I wish also to compliment those who have already spoken, and particularly the younger members from both sides of the House, who have amazed all who have heard them because of their self-assurance and their facility of expression.

With particular regard to the mover and seconder of the address, I want to say that I know from past experience their task was not an easy one, because it is somewhat difficult to adjust oneself to these new surroundings.

I appreciate the honour of having been elected to represent The Battlefords for a second time. Neither am I unmindful of the responsibility to the people of my constituency, to the province, and to Canada as a whole, which being a Member entails. I realize, too, that the democratic system of government in which we believe depends a great deal on the honesty and sincerity of those in public office, and I know that it is in that spirit that we have all assumed our duties.

I suppose it will be said of me that I received the support of the Progressive-Conservatives and the members of the Social Credit party in my constituency. I have no hesitation in expressing appreciation to those who

claim allegiance to those parties for the support they gave me. I appreciate too the support which I received from the hundreds and hundreds of people who voted C.C.F. in 1944, and who in 1948 decided that they had had enough of the socialist experiment. I want to say too, with regard to the mover and seconder of the address, that they were not hesitant about expressing their all-out belief in socialism, so the issue is clear, and I must add, it was not always so in this House prior to 1944.

To you who have not visited that beautiful part of Saskatchewan in which the Battlefords is situated, let me recommend a holiday journey to that part of our province. You will find that there is much that is interesting. You will enjoy a visit in the city of North Battleford, with its many fine modern buildings and miles of hard-surface streets. In fact, you will note that it is as clean, progressive and as attractive a small city as you will find anywhere in Canada.

Situated there, overlooking the mighty North Saskatchewan River, is one of the most important institutions of this province, the hospital for those who are mentally ill. A walk through the grounds in mid-summer will let you see one of the finest views in western Canada, and the flower garden that would rejoice the heart of anyone who loves flowers. We are not all horticulturists, but I am sure we all love flowers.

If you cross over to the south side of the river, you will find the old historic town of Battleford. One of the oldest judicial districts in Saskatchewan is situated there. You will have opportunity to visit the first Legislative Building, built in the days when Battleford was the capital, and now occupied as a college, but in which the historic significance, I am glad to be able to say, is being carefully preserved by those in charge. How convenient for us northern members if the capital had never been moved to Regina.

A place of great and increasing interest is the Mounted Police Memorial, where buildings which were within the palisades at the time of the rebellion of 1885 have been reconditioned, and in which are housed relics of earlier days. I wish to commend — if that will satisfy my hon. friend, and I do so unhesitatingly — the government and the former Minister of Natural Resources for the work done in connection with that museum. I wish to commend, too, Mr. Campbell Innes, the Curator, a former Superintendent of Schools, for the work he has done in connection with that museum, not only during the past few years, but for the last 30 years or more, to help retain for posterity much of the early history of what is known today as north-western Saskatchewan. I want to repeat here a quotation I used some years ago on the floor of this House, in an appeal to have preserved the historic buildings still in existence at Battleford: "They cannot look forward to posterity who do not once in a while look back to their ancestors."

To come back to more modern enterprises, we have there the irrigation farm. I suppose this could be termed an annex to the hospital for the mentally ill — that is, to the main building. A suggestion has been made before by me, and I repeat it again, that the site of the irrigation farm would be ideal for a home for the aged who have become mentally ill, and can no longer be taken care of by their relatives or friends. Under the present facilities, which are

terribly inadequate, these old people have to be sent to the mental hospital. This is a problem which, in my opinion, should be dealt with just as soon as it is possible to do so.

To get back to the irrigation farm, as it is known, there are some 800 acres under cultivation and irrigated, and the general result of this undertaking has been an outstanding success from an economic standpoint, to say nothing of the help it has been in the occupational treatment of patients. This work was undertaken at the persistent instance of the late Dr. J.W. McNeil. It was his brain-child, and is in itself a monument to his vision. Dr. McNeil was the first superintendent of a hospital for the mentally ill in this province. His contribution in that field is known far beyond the boundaries of our province and is well known, not only in Canada, but in the United States as well.

I would like to suggest to the government that so imposing a structure as is situated there, and an undertaking so worthwhile, should not go by the unassuming name of 'irrigation farm'. As a fitting tribute for work well done, and in recognition of outstanding service to suffering humanity, I would suggest that what is known today as the 'irrigation farm' should in future be known as the 'McNeil Memorial', or by some similar name, which associates the name of the late and respected Dr. McNeil with the project.

For further enjoyment on this holiday journey, I would suggest that you spend a few days at the lovely summer resorts of Meota and Cochin. These are situated on the beautiful lakes of Jackfish and Murray. There you can relax and forget all your troubles. If you are fond of fishing, it is there for you; if you like to swim, the water is just right. That is why representations have been made, and are being made, by the people of north-western Saskatchewan that a provincial park area be established at Jackfish and Murray Lakes. There is definitely a lack in that part of Saskatchewan of suitable recreational facilities in the towns and villages of this area, and to provide these is financially impractical insofar as individual communities are concerned. The formation of a centrally-located provincial park would enable people from all walks of life to enjoy the relaxation and recreation so essential to the maintenance of a proper standard of health. I, therefore, sincerely commend this project, as did my predecessor, to the favourable consideration of the hon. Minister of Natural Resources. Tourist traffic has become an increasingly important industry; and in order to attract tourists much needs to be done in this province, and this project is one that would have definite appeal in that connection.

As you travel through that part of the province, you will see many fine farms, the culmination of the work started by the early pioneers. Our people, like elsewhere in this province, are of various origins, but they are now, thank heavens, all known as Canadians and, irrespective of origin, are making their contribution towards making our province a worthwhile one in which to live. The Battlefords have always been known as a mixed-farming area, and I am of the opinion that it is due to that fact that our farmers have been able to weather three successive years of crop failures as successfully as they have. I was pleased to note articles lately emanating from the Department of Agriculture either through the Minister or his Deputy, stressing the danger of a single crop economy.

During the recent election campaign there was much talk, and not a little boasting from the supporters of the government about all the government had accomplished during its terms of office. The record was not nearly as impressive as C.C.F. spokesmen endeavoured to make it appear, with the result that, while the government was returned, it no longer represents the majority of the people in the province. The previous government, elected in 1938, was faced with many problems and difficulties. In 1939 war was declared, a war in which we were not only fighting for our way of life, but for our very existence. All the energy of our people was directed towards the day of victory. When the C.C.F. government took over in July of 1944, a well-garnished treasury was awaiting them. No government in Saskatchewan has ever taken office under more advantageous conditions, conditions which permitted expansion and development, and because of which it would have been possible to do great things. I suppose it would be called unfair if I should criticize a socialist government for having gone all-out to make of our province a socialist state, and thereby endeavour to prove to the people that socialism was sound in practice. May I now, therefore, suggest that, having found out that the Marxist doctrine is a false one, that the government face facts, accept realities and proceed to give this province a sound, businesslike administration.

The members of the C.C.F. party are no more humanitarian in their outlook than are the members of any other party. We must be realists and practical to achieve the standard of living we want for the people. Human nature is what it is, and no amount of legislation will change it. We all, I am sure, admit that every citizen of good will must be assured of well-being and security, not only of food, housing and clothing, but also of education, health services, good working conditions. In this day and age those things have become the legitimate rights of any man conscious of his dignity as a man. I do maintain, however, that the primary responsibility of the state when old age or misfortune robs the individual of his power.

Prior to taking of office by the present government, we heard much about all those free services we were going to get. I need not enumerate them; they were shouted from the house tops. We heard plenty, too, about production for use and not for profit, and that iniquitous system which the C.C.F. party calls the 'profit system'. Once in office the C.C.F. party decided that since the profit system must produce a profit they would go into business, and the profits would take care of all those free services we were going to get. So they established a shoe factory, a woollen mill, a tannery, to say nothing of some other industries. They even took over a boot factory. To their sorrow they have found out that that system to which they referred as a profit system is a profit and loss system, and that it is often easier to show a loss than it is to make a profit. What little information is available indicates that, on the whole, Crown Corporations have been a dismal failure.

**Premier Douglas:** — Oh, no.

**Mr. Prince:** — Why not admit that they were an experiment which has not produced the anticipated revenue? That being the case, why does not the government do what any sound-thinking business man would do, no matter what his field may be, and charge these failures up to experience? I am of the opinion that the longer the government waits in making this decision, the greater will be the loss. I feel sure

that the government would gain in prestige by following such a course, because the people of the province know that the deficit now being incurred has to come out of their pockets in any event, and it would be that much saved. To drain the revenue from established government undertakings, such as the telephone system, to carry these experimental plots is not good business and will lead to disaster.

We are all agreed that there are in this province natural resources which are lying dormant for the lack of risk money or capital to provide for their development. It was reported that the hon. Premier had, during the course of the past few months, made trips to Great Britain and New York to endeavour by his blandishments and his charm to convince some of these terrible capitalists that they should come to Saskatchewan and take a chance. The Premiers of other provinces do not appear to find it necessary to travel about the world to tell people about the wealth that can be found in their territory. How can this government expect to invite and induce people with the necessary money to come here and invest it, and almost in the same breath make it known that they think the whole system of private enterprise out-dated and through, that the only system is one where the state controls the means of production, distribution and exchange?

Natural resources are of no use unless they are turned into serviceable goods. The incentive of reasonable reward makes people take risks, work hard, and think hard. Our nation would never have reached the status it enjoys today had it not been for the spirit of enterprise, the courage and initiative of her people. I maintain, too, that those same qualities are not in evidence in those countries which are under control of socialist or communist governments. Socialist governments are expensive as we are finding out to our sorrow in Saskatchewan. Experts, members of Boards of one kind or another, and civil servants generally, must and have to be paid like people in any other occupation. In Saskatchewan, the ratio of public servants to population is much higher than it is in any other province of Canada.

One fact which this government appears to have overlooked in its activity is that legislation does not produce wealth. I can only redistribute wealth which has already been created. Before, however, government can distribute wealth, that wealth must be produced. In plain ordinary language that means work. Labour legislation will never alter the immutable law which says that all compensation of any form depends upon production, wages, interest and profit.

It is an unfortunate fact in this province that the government has sought to keep employer and employee apart. In their opinion, nearly every employer is a parasite, unless, of course, that employer happens to be the government. It is not a wholesome attitude on the part of those who should act as mediators in any dispute between management and labour. The basic purpose of industry is to serve. In fact, it cannot succeed unless it renders a service. In any dispute, the employer has no right to claim any inherent privilege, and consider that he is a law unto himself. On the other hand, no labour leader is justified to stir up trouble and discontent. In the final analysis I do not think it should be questioned that the needs of a community rank above those of any group or groups irrespective of whom they may represent.

I would like to make a few observations with regard to the remarks made by the mover and seconder of the address. The hon. member for Canora (Mr. Kuziak) quoted an article which appeared in the magazine *Liberty*, in which our hospitals for the mentally ill were condemned and criticized for not taking proper care of those who are their responsibility. If I am not mistaken, the hon. Premier categorically denied the contents of this article. If he did not, I think he should have. The C.C.F. party had been power for some time when that article was written, and had had the opportunity to rectify some of the work of the administration, if it deserved a condemnation such as was contained in the article referred to.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that our hospitals for the mentally ill are a credit to us, as are our sanatoria. I think it unfair to those who have given their services to the care of those who are mentally ill should be so criticized from the floor of this House. I know, and the hon. Premier as Minister of Public Health knows better than I the difficulties of recent years due to the lack of trained personnel and other factors such as accommodation, the problems with which it has been necessary to contend. I maintain that all the personnel that has had the responsibility of operating those institutions have done an excellent job.

The hon. member stated that another mental hospital was under construction. I think he is misinformed because that is not the case. The work of construction has not yet been started. I do hope, though, that this time it will not be just another hole in the ground like the University Hospital at Saskatoon.

The hon. member for Canora also made reference to the total use of all the resources by all the people. Let us ask yourselves this question: who is getting the most from the natural resources, the government of Saskatchewan or that of Alberta? In Alberta those with capital were assured of a reasonable reward if they were successful. As a consequence, private enterprise risked its money and is today paying into the treasury of that province millions of dollars. We have heard so much in this province about free services, but if you want them, go to Alberta where free enterprise capitalists, and not the common man, pays the shot. I hold no brief for the Social Credit party, but I will say to their credit that when in 1935, to their amazement, they found that the people of Alberta had placed on them the onus of governing the province, they recalled that in their programme was a clause under which they were to take the natural resources. They had the good sense though of inquiring as to the practicability of that policy from a government standpoint. They found that more money had gone into the ground than had ever come out of it, so they said to these terrible capitalists: "Go ahead, you fellows. We'll get our share in royalties if and when you strike it rich." It is too bad, Mr. Speaker, that our C.C.F. government did not have the good sense to pause, ponder and investigate before they went all out for socialization of our natural resources.

The government of Saskatchewan, now several years too late, announces that it intends to encourage owners of private capital to invest their money in industrial ventures in the province of Saskatchewan. They are going to entice private investors into the oil and gas business. The speech from the throne states:

Exploration for petroleum is assured in large areas by agreements which, at the same time, reserve for the province a percentage of all productive areas which are discovered . . . With full realization of the value of these products to the province, this work will be further encouraged.

I wonder if the government intends to encourage the oil industries to invest their money in this province by means of the resolution passed at the provincial convention of the C.C.F. party held in Moose Jaw in July, 1946. This resolution states — and I quote from the Commonwealth of August 7, 1946:

Whereas the existence of natural gas and oil in commercial quantities in the province of Saskatchewan has been proven conclusively;

And whereas the C.C.F. as a socialist party believes in and advocates the public ownership of the natural resources of this province for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan;

And whereas a resolution was passed at the 1945 provincial convention urging the government of Saskatchewan to undertake the development and distribution of natural gas and oil in this province;

Be it therefore resolved that we urge our government to take steps towards the implementation of the C.C.F. policy for the development and distribution of natural gas and oil under public ownership and control and for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan.

At this 1946 C.C.F. convention, Mr. Makaroff was alarmed at the announced intention of the C.C.F. government to encourage the investment of private capital in gas and oil in Saskatchewan. I quote from The Leader-Post of January 27, 1946:

Mr. Makaroff also wanted to know how it was that the provincial government-controlled Bureau of Publications had issued a statement to the effect that it would now be easier for private concerns and individuals to develop provincial oil and gas industries. This was not in accord with basic socialist principles, he said, and would probably dampen the ardour of any members.

Mr. J.L. Phelps, speaking as Minister of Industrial Development, was apparently successful in subduing Mr. Makaroff and the other members who might have suffered from dampened ardour. Mr. Phelps is reported to have said:

The provincial government is permitting private enterprise to develop northern oil resources because it does not feel ready to take that step itself, but the government will move at the appropriate time.

The hon. Premier tells the Legislature and the people that his government will now stimulate industry by inviting capitalistic investments. I wonder if he intends to persuade the capitalists with money to invest in gas and oil development by means of the resolution passed by the C.C.F. national convention in the city of Winnipeg, as recently as August, 1948, when they set

up the much lauded “first term programme”. Here is what this programme has to say about the gas and oil industry — and I quote from the C.C.F. Commonwealth of September 8, 1948:

A C.C.F. government will formulate a national fuel policy and will promote public ownership of coal, electricity, gas and oil in co-operation with the provinces, so that these essential reserves of power may be used to the best advantage of the whole economy.

To expect that people who have accumulated reserves and have money to invest will invest their money in this province under conditions such as these is an insult to their intelligence. It is time the Leader of the Government made the position of his government and his party in this province clear on this matter. If he intends from henceforth to repudiate his socialist principles he should say so. If he is discarding the 1946 resolution of the C.C.F. party convention on the matter of gas and oil, he should make this new position he has adopted clear. If he repudiates the first term programme adopted by the national C.C.F. convention in Winnipeg a few months ago, he should tell this to the public, and to the oil interests. The Premier told the House that:

Today the eyes of the world and the oil industry are on Saskatchewan.

Alberta oil men might take issue with the Premier’s contention that the great gas and oil developments are taking place in Saskatchewan, and they seem to be well justified in this attitude. I notice that in The Leader-Post of February 17, 1948, in a press dispatch from Edmonton, it states that three oil companies have paid a total of more than \$5 million to release two sections of land in the oil-rich Redwater field. The final paragraph of this news item reads:

The lease sums raised to nearly \$11 million the income received by the provincial government from oil land leases, oil and gas royalties, fees and rentals during the first ten and one-half months of the current fiscal year.

In the few years before the 1944 election and before the C.C.F. took office, the oil companies had expended large sums of money looking for oil in an area just a few miles south of Regina. They discontinued their activities after the election.

The hon. member for Canora stated that depressions were caused by capitalism. Anyone who has made any study of the situation knows that it was Hitler’s policy of militarism that had much to do with the economic situation throughout the world in the 1930’s. The 1930’s are meat and drink to our hon. friends opposite. They thrive on adversity. At that time, for self-preservation, democratic countries encouraged industries which were not economically within their sphere, and advocated isolationism. The same hon. member stated that the only time you could have prosperity under free enterprise is during or near periods of war.

In the year 1815 a world war ended with the Battle of Waterloo. Following that year and for 100 years, there was no other world war until 1914. I am well aware that in that 100 years there were some local wars, so



local as to have no perceptible effect upon world economic conditions. There was the Crimean war, the Franco-Prussian war of 1870, and the Balkan Wars of 1912 and 1913. These, as I have said, were wars of local effect. Now, Mr. Speaker, would any C.C.F.ers be so bold and reckless as to say that for a whole 100 years between 1815 and 1914, because there was no world war, there was therefore no prosperity.

Let us come to more recent history, the period between 1919 and 1939. Previous to the present period of prosperity, the few years of greatest prosperity enjoyed by the farmers of Saskatchewan was during the years from 1925 to 1929. Could any member opposite tell you what war was being waged during that period? That was not only not a period of war but was the only few years of really peaceful prospects between 1918, the end of the First World War, and 1939, the beginning of the Second World War. That was the period while Stresemann was in power in Germany. The Locarno Treaty was signed in 1925. By the signing of this Treaty, Germany voluntarily entered into an agreement with the other European powers to maintain the boundaries in western Europe as laid down by the Versailles Treaty. At the signing of that Treaty, for the first time since the start of the First World War, a German diplomat and a French diplomat shook hands. During this period the allied troops were withdrawn from the Rhineland, ten years before the time stipulated by the Versailles Treaty, and Germany joined the League of Nations. The great Briand-Kellogg pact, renouncing war as an instrument of national policy, was freely signed by Germany. These were the days of the Dawes and the Young settlements of the reparations problem. Because of these events, Europe breathed more freely, trade resumed its natural channels; and just because this was a period of peace and increased international security it was a period of prosperity.

In 1929, the first rumbles of the depression were heard. In 1930 Hitler won his first success at the polls in Germany. He revived all the animosity and antagonism which the Germans felt at the loss of the war and the signing of the Versailles Treaty. Prospects of peace disappeared, and the world moved more rapidly towards the depression of the thirties.

Everyone knows that there have been periods of prosperity at times other than periods of world war.

The hon. member for Canora stated that North America was prosperous because of her natural resources. That is partially true. I want to add, however, that people who came from foreign lands did so because in Canada they would have the opportunity to own something, that they would not be interfered with the government in their efforts to establish themselves in this new country, and they were not afraid of the difficulties and hardships which pioneering in the new land entailed.

It seems to me that the mover and the seconder of the address did not have much in which to bite in the speech from the throne, as was clearly pointed out by the member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski). To illustrate this I would like to tell a short anecdote which I am sure no one will take offence at. This good friend of mine was standing in the street of a village in that part of the province from which I come. I do not know what the occasion was but some exuberant Scot came out to play the bagpipes. A French-speaking

Canadian friend of his came along, nestled up to him and said: "Arry, do you like that music?" My Scot friend glowered at him and said: "Of course I do." He said: "Why does he not play a tune?"

I am not a judge of bagpipe music, Mr. Speaker, so I don't know whether or not the critic in this instance deserves to be slain. But the speech from the throne reminded me of that little anecdote because there is certainly no tune to it, and certainly there is nothing martial about it.

The hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) referred to the removal of the objectionable features of the application of The Education Tax Act. I wonder if he thinks the farmers find nothing objectionable to paying education tax on farm fuel, or the man with a large family who has to pay education tax on clothing? The hon. member went after some of the large corporations, and he did so in a manner which is rarely done nowadays. Our C.C.F. friends usually just talk about the 'big shots'; no names are mentioned. He mentioned one of them in particular. He did not say anything about the Imperial Oil, because he knows, along with the other people of Saskatchewan, they would like to see the Imperial Oil Company do work in Saskatchewan such as it has done in Alberta. He stated, though, that Procter and Gamble had made a profit of \$65 million. He left the inference that this profit was made in Canada alone. This is not correct. This profit was made through the operations of these people in different parts of the world. The true facts are that the Canadian operations of this company have been subsidized by the parent company, and they have recently invested \$5.5 million in their Canadian plant, which capital comes from outside Canada.

I don't suppose these people were particularly concerned by the statement made by the hon. member. What is of concern to me is that we cannot expect people with capital to come to our province if we make them the subject of attack. Further, if we are going to be true to the oath we have taken as members of the Legislature, if we are going to be true to that system of government by the people in which we believe, we must be fair, we must be honest, whether or not our discussions are of concern to the humblest of our citizens or the biggest of our so-called big shots.

We want risk capital to come into Saskatchewan. I concur with the Premier when he says that; but I cannot concur with him when he reverses his position and says that the present system is through, and the government should own and operate the means of production, distribution and exchange.

**Mr. A.L.S. Brown (Bengough):** — He never said that.

**Mr. Danielson:** — He certainly did.

**Mr. Prince:** — That statement was made that corporations or companies passed on to the consumers the income tax which they have to pay to the federal government. I am sure a lot of people would like to know how that is done. The statement indicated confused thinking about income tax. Ordinarily any business concern which is producing articles to be consumed has to produce and market them at a price set by competition with other businesses producing the same article.

**Mr. Walker:** — The hon. gentleman has misquoted me. May I correct the statement? He said private business may pass on the income tax to the consumer. I was referring to monopoly business when I so said. I said it was most prevalent in monopoly industry and I distinguished between monopoly and ordinary business.

**Mr. Prince:** — I do not know that it makes much difference whether it is a business I might operate, or some company might operate.

I am trying to point out that people would like to know how you could pass your income tax on to others, because a manufacturer, whether he is small or large, has to produce and market his goods with other businesses producing the same article.

The Minister of Education (Hon. Mr. Lloyd), in his address, made reference to the British government and its resemblance to the C.C.F. party in Saskatchewan. The British government, too, is beginning to find out that what in theory appeared sound beyond question is not sound in practice. In that respect also they resemble, I hope, the government of Saskatchewan. Recently Mr. Ivor Thomas, who for twenty-five years had fought for the Labour party and held an important post in the government, crossed the floor of the House, and I quote some of his remarks when he addressed the British House of Commons, and explained why he had taken the position he did. Here is what he said:

It is perfectly true that nationalization of iron and steel was mentioned in the Labour party's electoral programme, and I am proud to say that this seems the main reason why the government are going ahead with this measure. I am quite certain, however, that the wiser heads among them and among hon. members opposite realize that this is a most unfortunate measure at this time, and they can well wish that some means could be found of avoiding this issue. But that is one of the difficulties of the rt. hon. gentlemen on the government front bench. They are so much the prisoners of formulae.

Later on in his remarks he said this:

Hard work, thrift and honesty no longer pay. The paths of duty today lead but to the tax gatherer's office. The incentive of financial independence, which has been the main spring of our economical life for centuries, has disappeared and nothing has taken its place. Those who have no savings see no point in trying to accumulate any; those who have are encouraged to spend them before the tax gatherer gets hold of them. The government have created a paradise for the football pool and the bucket shop, but they have undermined the foundation of our industrial greatness.

There is, Mr. Speaker, another respect in which the C.C.F. party in this province resembles the socialist party in Great Britain. Each has one story for home consumption and another one for export. I am going to read from a publication, and I quote:

Socialists still try to kid the public that the great mass of the people are better fed than they were before the war. They still take the line Sir Hartley Shawcross developed at Chapelcowan on June 8, 1947. Taking it all around it is probably true to say that the standard life of the average man and woman in this country is higher than it has ever been. Three days later the Daily Herald in a leading article said: 'While a comparatively few citizens are eating less than they did, while our diet is less varied than we should like it to be, millions of our people in the working class are much better fed today than they were before the war.' Mr. Strachey, in a speech at Carlisle on December 5, claimed the nation's food supply was only slightly less than before the war, although it was plainer. That is what our Ministers say at home. They have a different tale for export. Advertisements published in newspapers throughout Canada, on behalf of the Emergency Fund for Britain, contain this announcement: 'Says the British Minister of Food: We are living on marginal nutritional standards, and there is cause for anxiety lest this should have adverse effects on physique and health. Everything you can send us is wanted, and urgently wanted.' The tale the Ministry of Food tells in Canada is the true one.

It is not good strategy in these modern times to have one story for home consumption and one for abroad. I wish to quote from a speech made by Mr. Wright, C.C.F. Member of Parliament for the constituency of Melfort, in an address before the students of St. Francis Xavier University in Nova Scotia. He said, in part:

We wish the people would get away from the idea that it takes lawyers and specialists to run a government. In the interests of democracy we in Saskatchewan have applied the home-spun principles we have learned from running our farms and small businesses at home, and we have done reasonably well.

No provincial government in Canada has hired so many experts, and in some instances the term 'expert' might be an exaggeration as have the present government. They have hired the odd lawyer, too, and one of them of whom I know appears to be getting out from under and leaving the province. That is just what is wrong with this government. They have gotten away from the homespun principles learned from running their farms, small businesses, and homes.

The C.C.F. party always tried to associate its movement with the co-operative movement. There is a tremendous difference between co-operation and socialism. Co-operation stands for self-help, and socialism for government help. Socialists in the co-operative movement insist that co-operatives should work for government ownership. Many think that co-operatives take in practically everything. People generally never will agree upon all of the good things, and therefore, their societies, which are the co-operative societies, cannot spread themselves out over church, state or workshop. Co-operation does not confiscate any property; it enters into equal competition with the other methods of business. If it does the job well or better than they do, it succeeds. In other words, the ultimate success of any co-operative enterprise depends upon its efficiency in serving the consumer, in proper relation to the labour employed, and not wasting its assets; in other words, preserving its capital. Co-operatives will only grow as they

demonstrate their superiority to the consumer or producer who needs their services. Co-operation is not akin to socialism, but is its very opposite. Co-operation is a union of free individuals having a common purpose, and so long as the common purpose is not one that is antagonistic to the best interests of mankind in general, it is a legitimate expression of free enterprise.

I contend that in a free and democratic state one of the main purposes of government from an economic standpoint is to preserve free enterprise. I do not mean to preserve it by spoon feeding it with tariffs and bonuses, or enabling it to gorge itself at the expense of its workmen and consumers, but to preserve competition which, in the long run, is the chief protection that the consumers have. Where competition is no longer practical, as in the case of certain public utilities, the only answer is that such an industry should be operated by the state. The trouble with this government is that it is suffering from too much government-in-business, and what we need is more business in government.

In his contribution to the debate on the amendment, the hon. Premier made to the House a statement about C.C.F. Crown Corporations. He referred to some of them as “problem children”. I could not help but contrast his statement with the brave and boastful statement made in this House about a year ago, before the provincial election. At that time the Premier talked about the spectacular profits being made by the Crown Corporations. The Saskatchewan News, in reporting that address, used this caption: “Crown Corporations show Net Profit over \$5,000,000 declares Douglas.” Of course, as the Premier’s further statement indicates, but did not make very explicit, all but about a half million of the \$5 million profits claimed came from the Power Commission and the Telephone Company. These were not C.C.F. industries at all; they were established by Liberal governments and form no part whatever of the C.C.F. socialist experiments.

When one starts to examine the \$600,000 odd dollars of profit which is claimed for the C.C.F. ventures a lot of it quickly disappears. The Crown Corporations had paid no interest on the huge sums of the people’s money which they had borrowed. They paid very little indeed into the sinking fund which should have been built up for the purpose of amortizing the bonds sold early in 1945. The huge cost of the so-called planners and experts, whose main duty was to advise the government about these industrial ventures and direct them after they were established, was charged not to the industries, but to the general funds of the province. These three items alone, if paid by the Crown Corporations, would take up nearly all, if not all, of the \$600,000 profit claimed for them.

One thoroughly defunct “problem child” he referred to was the shoe factory. When the shoe factory closed and the employees were laid off just before Christmas, the hon. Minister of Education, Chairman of the Corporation which administers the shoe factory, stated that it had “been closed down for the winter months”, and that the move was made “in accordance with the policy announced some time ago, and the seasonal practice in the trade”.

If the Minister of Education knows anything at all about the shoe manufacturing industry in Canada, he knows that it is not part of the policy to close down during the winter months. I have in my hand the November Bulletin of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics on the production of leather footwear in

Canada. The last month for which it gives production figures is November, 1948. It indicates that ever since the month of July, 1948, the output of leather footwear had been constantly increasing. It gives figures for 1944, 1945, 1946 and 1947, and nowhere do these figures indicate any layoff during the winter months as being the seasonal practice of the trade.

As a matter of fact, this shoe industry was doomed to failure from the day it was born. In May, 1945, the government announced to the press that the machinery and equipment of the Midwest Shoe Company Limited of Winnipeg had been purchased, and also that a Mr. Franklin, one of the owners of this machinery, had been engaged to supervise the installation and the running of the machinery for the C.C.F. government. Since my early days I have been associated in a modest way with the running of a business. I make no claim to possessing any special business ability, but if a Mr. Franklin of Winnipeg or anybody else came to me with such a proposition as the government accepted in May, 1945, I would immediately become highly suspicious of him. Here is Mr. Franklin, one of a group who owns this machinery, and was using it to produce shoes, at a time when there was a market and a good price for every pair of shoes produced. Obviously he is not making a success of it, because he is willing to sell his machinery to the C.C.F. government in Saskatchewan and accept from them a salary for operating that machinery. Very naturally, in less than a year we find Mr. Phelps announcing to the press that "Mr. Franklin left the employ of the factory by agreement two weeks ago".

Had the shoe factory not been selling shoes to the provincial government at, probably, more than they are worth, this socialist experiment would have been exposed long ago. The C.C.F. shoe industry was utterly and completely incapable of entering into competition with private industries in the manufacture and sale of shoes. In order to keep in operation at all it had either to sell its shoes to the government for more than they were worth or seek from the retailers a price at which they could not possibly sell these shoes.

I again urge the government to dispose of these as rapidly as possible, so the public treasury, which should use its money for increased old age pensions, mothers' allowances and school grants, will not be burdened with the task of paying the losses incurred to make it appear that socialism is workable in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I shall oppose the motion.

**Mr. J.W. Horsman (Wilkie):** — Mr. Speaker, up to the present time I have just been an interested listener to the events that have taken place in this House — quite an interested listener. I would like to congratulate the speakers who have already taken part, especially the new speakers on both sides of the House; I think they have acquitted themselves very well indeed, and I only hope that I may be able to do half as well as they did.

I think we are privileged to have as the Speaker of this House a man who is noted for his fairness and impartiality; and I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate him on his appointment. I think it well

deserved. We believe, under his guidance, if we do go wrong he will probably put us right, and we expect his judgment will be fair and impartial.

Most every member who has spoken so far has made some reference to his own constituency, some reference to the means by which he was elected and, in many cases, some reference to the people who supported them. There were two new members in this House making their first address, and it seemed to be quite a subject from members of the government that these two gentlemen were elected with Liberal and Conservative support. Now, my case is slightly different, Mr. Speaker. In the election in my constituency we had four candidates — all the kinds there were besides communists.

In the election previous to this one, in 1944, the C.C.F. candidate had a good substantial majority. This time, when the Tory vote was no doubt taken up by their own candidate, although if I got any support from the Conservatives — I believe I got some for personal reasons perhaps — I am proud of it, and I appreciate every vote I got, no matter where they came from, but I think it is very plain to everyone that the vote that turned the majority of the C.C.F. into a defeat must have, of necessity, been from men who before were supporters of the C.C.F. party. It looked that way to me. I do not know whether that is a laughing matter or not to members on the government side of the House, but in listening to the speeches so far from that side I have been struck by one thing; they went back pretty well over the years, perhaps in some cases not far enough, but their opinion seemed to be that there has never been anything of any good done in this province, never any good legislation placed on the statute books of this province, and even the principal progress that has been made by the people of this province has all been made since 1944. I don't think that is exactly right, to take the years from 1944 to 1948 and draw a comparison between those years, those years when revenue was an all-time high, and compare them to some time in the thirties, or even to the four years previous, after we just came out of a great depression. I don't think it is a fair comparison.

Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me to do so, I would like to go back over the early history of this country, and I think I can prove to members on both sides of this House that at least considerable progress was made in this country long before we heard of the C.C.F. party. I know there are many members here who took part in the early settlement of this country — must have been — and I know they will not have to strain their memory at all to remember what conditions were like about 1907 or the few years before, when the country or most of the country was settled, and how the people flocked in from almost every place in the world. They came, many, of course, from Eastern Canada, the United States and the British Isles, and so on, but thousands of people came in here from Europe, from Russia and from the Balkan States, and every country in the world.

They flocked in here and settled on the land. You will remember the rush to the Land Office in those early days when people were filing on homesteads; you will remember the streams of teams and wagons going out on the trails, people going out to try and build themselves new homes on these plains; we remember those things, ox-teams mostly, and the little sod shacks that dotted the prairie not so many years ago, forty years or less; the little

towns along the railway, in many cases where there was no railway, towns built before the steel was laid, and things like that. Look at the thing today and look at it four years ago, 1944 — we don't need to come past that date. Those little sod shacks have long since been replaced, modern farm homes are everywhere now, and the ox-teams, where do you see an ox-team now? Many, many years ago they were replaced by modern farm machinery of all kinds; the horse and buggy by the motorcar, and so on. The little shack towns are now groups of very fine, modern business establishments.

The people who came from all these foreign countries, especially from Central Europe and Russia, came for a variety of reasons no doubt. One inducement was free land, which was an inducement to everybody who came here, but one of the great inducements to those people, when they came from those countries here, was because they believed that in Canada they would be privileged to enjoy a life of freedom they had never known in their own land. I believe that; I think that is what brought most of them.

We, between us, have built a wilderness into one of the greatest grain-growing areas of the world, in less than 40 years. As individuals many of us may not have done anything to be proud of, but it is what a nation does collectively that counts, what you do together, and that is what we have done; we have turned this area into one of the greatest grain-growing areas in the world.

I want to say all this development — and we do not need to come past 1944 — that we have seen, and which a great many of us have been privileged to take some part in, was all done under a system of private enterprise. It was all done under this terrible capitalistic system that we hear condemned so often in this House. The most amazing thing is that in almost all those 40 years we were under the administration of a Liberal government.

We watched the development of this socialist party with a great deal of interest, everybody did, an offspring, you might say, of the hard times in the thirties when people were dissatisfied, there is no doubt, and governments are blamed for whatever conditions there happen to be when they are in power; and the system grew, of course, in those times. Now they came out with a different political ideology than anything we have ever been used to. They are socialists, and by their own admission they are proud of being socialists, and we accept the fact that they are socialists. I have no complaint to make of a man because he is a socialist. If he believes in socialism and knows what the word means, and what the definition of the word is, it is quite all right for him to be a socialist. Of course, under socialism, the socialists believe in public ownership, not only that you go right into socialism. This party has said they will create a completely socialized economy. Now, when any political party tells you they are going to create a completely socialized economy, we know the people who have said that are socialists, they admit it and are proud of the fact. Well, a completely socialized economy means just that: a socialized economy, that is what I would say; I cannot see any other meaning for it.

Another thing we used to hear a lot about was “production for use and not for profit”. Now, production for use and not for profit is a very fine thing perhaps, as it might apply to someone else, but when you apply it to yourself, it might not be so good. I do not think most people, farmers — we are



mostly farmers in this country — would go out this spring and put a crop in, and stand the wind and the cold and the hardships connected with putting in a crop if they knew they could not make a profit, regardless of what their crop might be. That is production for use and not for profit.

I remember, a couple of years ago, listening to a broadcast by Winston Churchill. I don't think anyone in this House or anywhere else will doubt the wisdom of Mr. Churchill. He was speaking about socialism, this very thing I am speaking about now — the profit motive. I think that profit is the just reward of labour and if you don't give a man a profit he will not work. I cannot remember very many things Winston Churchill said that day, but I do remember this one thing: he said: "Remove incentive and compulsion must follow." Now, if you take every profit motive out of business and try to produce for use and not for profit, that is just what you would be doing. I think those words of Churchill's are very wise, and we know he is a very wise man. I think it is all right for a man to be a socialist. I admit that. If he wants to be and knows what it is, if he is willing to have the principles of socialism applied to himself and his business, regardless of what his business is; if he thinks of socialism just as it applies to someone else, then I think it is a very unfair attitude.

We hear a lot, of course, about capitalism. We hear it condemned; and there are certain things you can condemn about capitalism, let us admit that. In this House we do hear a lot about ungoverned capitalism, unbridled capitalism, and words to that effect. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think most of the talk about ungoverned capitalism today is nonsense. We do not need to go out of Canada to prove this. We have in Canada certain utilities that belong to the people. We have the greatest railway system in Canada, and in that way set the rates of rail traffic. We own the Canadian Airways, and we set the rate of their traffic. We own the Bank of Canada, and through that bank currency and interest are controlled to a very great extent. Under the Bank Act of Canada, the government exercise control over the chartered banks as well. Every government in Canada, municipal, provincial and federal has some control over business and I don't think there is any such thing in Canada as ungoverned capitalism. I think socialism, Mr. Speaker, is a very fine dream; I don't think it will ever work out in practice. In the first place, I don't think many people want it, even those who support socialism and say they are socialists. I don't think they want it applied to themselves. That is the unfair thing about it.

I would like to deal briefly with some of the things this government has done which affect the agricultural industry of this province very much. One of the first things this government did when they came into power was to establish the Larger School Unit. We know that was established without the people having a vote. True, there was a means by which a vote could be taken, but it involved so much labour and time that I am quite sure it was a foregone conclusion, arrived at long in advance of that legislation, that in the great majority of cases there would be no vote taken because no one could take the time and energy involved to see that that vote was taken. Most of the people in this country, wherever the units were formed, found themselves in the Larger School Unit, and they found the Larger School Units established by Ministerial order.

I would like to state that I have been connected with rural school work in this province most of my life. I served 20 years as Secretary-Treasurer of my own school district, and many years since on the municipal council. In all those years I have been in direct contact with rural schools, naturally, and I am quite willing, of course, to admit the larger administrative unit has some virtues. One of the greatest things that was supposed to be of great benefit about this scheme was the equalization of the tax rate over a large area, that would help people in real poor areas so their mill-rate would not have to go too high in order to operate a school. But expenses have increased so much — and I don't mean teachers' salaries exactly — administrative costs and everything like that have gone up to such a terrible amount since the institution of these large areas that it pretty well offsets any benefit those poor areas might have got on account of the equalized tax rate.

I hope you will pardon me if I mention on my own municipality. I am familiar with conditions there, and I think they are typical; our municipality is no better than the rest. I would like to say that the only difference we can see, so far, under this Larger School Unit, is that the taxes are a little more than doubled in our municipality, and we see no corresponding increase in the efficiency of the school. In my own municipality, the year before the larger unit was instituted the average mill-rate for school purposes was a little less than seven and one-half mills. That was increased the first year to 15 mills, and this is what it is today — just a little more than doubled. As I say, it is a typical municipality, a pretty fair municipality, must about the same as the rest of the municipalities in that area of my constituency, but there are people in that municipality with patches of pretty good land — it is all pretty good land — paying today as high as \$60 a quarter-section on school taxes alone. Our mill-rate for municipal purposes has never been raised in ten years I don't think, and we have provided a scheme of full health services in that municipality since 1934; but when this larger unit was formed, our mill-rate for the schools just a little more than doubled.

As long as there are crops, and as long as the price is good, people can pay these high taxes — it will not hurt them very much, but when you get bad crops, and we are experiencing them now — for the past two years half of this province has had a sub-normal crop and many districts a complete crop failure. We have been in the bonus area up there for three years in succession, and we have not had a decent crop since 1944. We are now beginning to feel the pinch. We will go right back to where we were in the thirties if we are not careful how high our taxes go. There is only one result — you cannot help it — taxes will go into arrears, pile up, and you will get a burden of taxes that people will never be able to wipe off. These high school taxes will just make it that much worse.

We have the same old schools there we built years ago, as far as rural schools are concerned. Some of them have been repaired to some extent, some of them painted and repaired, but many of them have not been touched. In most every case where there has been any repairs to speak of done to schools in that area that school district had a large cash surplus before they went into the Larger School Unit, and under the terms of the contract, or whatever you might call it, they had a few years to spend that money in the improvement of their schools, and that is what they are doing.

We have no better teachers that we ever had. It has been mentioned in this House by several speakers about the young teachers with very few weeks normal training, and so on. I don't want to be critical in any way of the teachers. These little girls who go out and try to teach the schools do the very, very best job they can do. In many cases they are not doing too bad; not for a bunch of kids. I say they are no better than they were; that is something no one can deny, that the teachers are not better, and I don't think the standard of education is any higher. In many cases, as I say, the cost is doubled or more.

I know and admit that everything is higher, but I think what makes costs so terribly high in most of these areas is the higher administration cost. I would mention one thing in particular. In most every area — I suppose in every area — the repair men hired by the Unit Board are hired to go around and do little repair jobs on the schools, little jobs that were done before by the local school board, and it was done free. In many instances, as no doubt many of you know, there are instances of a man driving 30 or 40 miles probably to do some little job that would not take ten minutes after he got there, but he had to be paid for mileage both ways — little jobs the school trustees used to do, but ask them to do those things today and they will tell you: "Why should we do it? They pay a man for that. That is his job, let him do it." And things like that are running out of all line, I am pretty sure of that.

I hope you will pardon me, too, but there is another thing I would like to mention: the school teachers' salaries. The salaries for the last four years, of course, have been compared with the previous years, but they did not go back quite far enough to make those comparisons. I remember, in my own school district, years ago in the early twenties, we paid as high as \$1,500 a year to a school teacher to teach a public school. In all those years down to 1930 when everything crashed I don't think we ever paid less than \$1,200, and I am pretty sure that was the same in every other district. Then it got to a time when we could not pay the teachers; there was not enough money; everybody was broke — a condition, of course, blamed by our friends over here on capitalism. They may be right for all I know. I don't think they are, but it is a fact that back in the twenties they were comparable, or you could make a fair comparison with those years and those of the present time. After the last war prices were high, crops were pretty good, and everybody had money. I maintain, in those years the rural school teachers were just as well paid as they are now.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the government should be responsible for a great deal more of school finances. I know that before this government was elected to office they said, and they said plainly — that education should be the responsibility of the provincial government. I would not go that far to say that education should be the complete responsibility of a government, because I like to see these things in the people's hands. I like to see them own these things and have some responsibility for them. That is why I do not want to see the government pay the whole shot; but I do think they should pay around 50 percent of it.

I would just like to tell you a story of my own district, and I tell you this story because I spoke about my own municipality. This school district is just typical of all the other districts there, no better than the rest, no

worse. There are lots better municipalities in the district, higher assessed and everything. We had a very good group of people there — we have a good group of people all over that constituency, I might say, people of different religious beliefs, different racial origins, but they are very good citizens. I have always been very proud of them, and the fact they have given me this very great opportunity to serve them. I think our first school was built in 1909. The mistake was made that is commonly made — the school was built too small. It was big enough to accommodate the few pupils there at that time, but it soon became crowded. The young fellows, and my Dad was one, who were on the Board at that time, there were a few things they naturally overlooked. There were a lot of bachelors around the country, and I was one. There were dozens of young fellows my age, just kids, and we got tired of living alone and batching, and began to look around for someone to share our solitude, or do away with our solitude, and we did persuade certain young women — most of them fell for it — to get married. Of course there was the inevitable result, and that old bird they call the stork made regular trips, here and there all over the district, and he kept it up, and kept it up, and the first thing we know we had a whole lot of youngsters growing up there, coming of school age, and our school was too small. So we had to start in and build another school, which we did. The next time we built it big enough. I was not on the school board at that time. They built it big enough, but they made their mistake that time too, and did not put a basement under the school. It was hard to heat as it was a big school; I believe it is the biggest schoolhouse in that area. After I got on the school board I decided we should put a basement under the school so we could have a furnace and heat it better, and a place for the children to go down and play in the winter when it was too cold to go out in the yard. We asked the people about it and they said: “Sure, go ahead.” So we did, and we made all these improvements. Then we needed a stable, and we thought we could buy the lumber if the people would build the stable. We asked the people and they said: “Yes,.” We hauled the lumber, we hauled the cement, and we hauled the gravel, and when we were ready one morning, every man in that district who could drive a nail was down in there, and that night the stable was completed. Now, I would like to see that tried today in the Larger School Unit. I would just like to see you try it and see what they would say. They would say: “Go to the Unit Board; why should we bother? Why should we do all this work. Go to the Unit Board, they have the money, and let them do it.” That is the way it is when you take things out of the hands of the people themselves.

Along about 1930, or in the early days of the hard times, a lot of these children were grown up to an age when they needed high school instruction and people were pretty well all broke, and they could not afford to send them to town to high school. An agitation arose in the district to teach Grades IX and X in the public schools. That is one thing I never was in favour of, including high school grades in the public schools. To teach ten grades and do any good with them, they either have to neglect the smaller grades or else not do anything with the higher grades, and I think it is a bad condition. We decided to organize a rural high school. The public school was just about ready to open and we called a meeting of the people of that district, and everyone was there that night. We put the proposition up to them, and with the exception of one man in that district, they told us to go ahead. We thought we would use the basement for a high school room. So we immediately got a couple of carpenters working, and they put in more light, laid a lumber floor over the

cement, lined up the walls with plaster-board, partitioned off the furnace room. We ordered the furniture, and in less than ten days we had a teacher hired and that school was in operation with 20 pupils. That school ran for ten years, and I am very proud of the result. We did it ourselves because we were interested in it. I could tell you of three boys who attended the high school there, afterwards attended the University of Saskatchewan, and every one of those boys won a scholarship each year he attended university. I could tell you of girls who got their high school there, at least Grade XI, and went out and got nurses certificates and are registered nurses today. Many others got school teachers' certificates and things like that. Many of them, of course, did not go on but just got their high school or Grade XI, but they would not even have got that in the great majority of cases if it had not been for that little school. That just shows you, Mr. Speaker, what people can do when they have something in their own hands they are responsible for, and are taking an interest in. I think it proves something I have often said, that local self-government is the rural basis of democracy. I believe that.

I would like to say a word now about the municipalities, and about municipal grants, and things of that nature. We know, of course, that the basic grants for municipalities at the present time is \$500 a year. That is a very small amount of money for times like these with buoyant revenues. It might have been all right back in the thirties when nobody had any money; but now, when the government revenues are up to over \$50 million, I think the grants should be greatly increased. Of course there is the equalization grants which have been mentioned in this House by several members. We know, too, the source from which that money was taken to establish the equalization grant fund. There is no secret about that: the overpayments on public revenue taxes.

**Premier Douglas:** — Oh, no. My hon. friend is confusing the equalization grant with education. On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I am sure my hon. friend is not trying to mislead the House. He has simply confused the equalization grants for education with the equalization grants to the municipalities.

**Mr. Horsman:** — I was certainly referring to the municipalities. I was not speaking about schools.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Mr. Speaker, I might say it is very difficult to hear the hon. gentleman over here. He is very difficult to follow.

**Mr. Horsman:** — I am sorry I have not a louder voice, Sir.

I say this money belonged to the municipality before it was ever paid out in these equalization grants. Is that not correct? I believe it is. It is quite a simple thing to give a person something that belongs to them in the first place.

**Premier Douglas:** — It belongs to the taxpayers.

**Mr. Horsman:** — The money was transferred to the Department of Highways, and was paid out in these grants. Under the terms of that grant — I will deal with the first year it was paid out. It is different now. Unless your mill-rate for road purposes was eight mills or more, you were disqualified right there and you did not get the grant. I think that is correct. That was changed the next year and the other qualification were the topography of the land, how hard it was to build roads, were all points in your favour. If it was rather easy to build roads, then it was against you. Also the number of provincial highways built through your municipality were points against you. Under certain circumstances the municipality did get the grant. After the first year we got a grant, and we got a grant last year, but it was not anything like big enough. I think these grants should be greatly increased; I think at least \$3,500 or some figure around there should be paid to the municipalities as a basic grant. I think it would pay the government to do that. I am quite sure you are all familiar with cases like this where you start out to go some place, and you will drive on a good highway most of the distance, then you have to turn off a clay road. It gets wet, and it rains or something, and you are stuck and cannot go any further. There is a gap which must be filled by the municipality. The government will never be able to fix all the roads in this country; we know that, they cannot do it. This is a country of great distances and unless someone fills that gap through these places where there are no highways, then we will have mud roads forever. I admit we have a lot of good highways in this country; but I think if a municipality is progressive enough to build a good road, they should at least have the assistance of the government to put gravel on that road. If they got about ten miles a year gravelled in each municipality in that way, in ten years you would have 100 miles of gravelled road in each municipality, and you would be able to go almost anywhere. I think it would pay the country to do it. I really do.

These main highways are, of course, of great importance. We have a hard-surface road from the American border up through Weyburn and north; I think the intention is to build it right on to Prince Albert some place. It is a very fine road, and a great asset to the country. It will be a great convenience to tourists when they want to come up here in the summer to fish or something like that. They will stop and spend some money through the country; they will buy gasoline for their cars; they might even buy the odd crock at the Liquor Store. These things are very important to the economy of Saskatchewan, as they are both businesses with a great source of income to the government. I say they are important for more reasons than that too. For everyone who can use these highways, they are a great thing to have, but they do not do much good to a farmer if he is stuck in the mud some place with a big load of wheat. The fact there is a hard surface road through Weyburn, and another one to Rosetown does not help him very much. The farmers are getting wise to things of this nature. They do not think the money is being distributed in the proper manner, when thousands of dollars are spent in certain areas and other areas neglected. I think a good substantial increase in the grants to the municipalities is the answer to main market roads in this country, and you have to have them sometime.

I believe, too, that this government takes credit for the prosperity of the farmers of this province — try to, anyway. I think we all have lived here long enough to know there are only one or two things that make prosperity

in this country to the farmer: one is the rain and the other is the sun, and then, of course, the price. I never heard anyone make the direct claim they were responsible for the rain or the sunshine, and if they are not, I do not think any government can claim the credit for farm prosperity in Saskatchewan. When I was a kid I used to go to Sunday School sometimes — you may not believe that. I used to think my mother was a dictator, maybe she was, and she used to make me go to Sunday School, and I learned a little about the Bible, but not near enough about the greatest book that was ever written. They are certain passages that stick in my memory; one is this: “For he makes his sun to shine upon the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust.” So I don’t think, in the face of that quotation, coming from the Book we all consider the fountain of all truth, that any government could take credit for making it rain, or making the sun shine.

I would like to say a word about the Saskatchewan Hospitalization Plan. I have not very much criticism to offer against this plan. I have been closely connected with it since its formation. I was chairman of the Union Hospital Board several years before this plan came into Saskatchewan, and I have been in very close touch with it since. I think it needs some changes all right, some improvements can be made; but, in the main, I do not wish to criticize the Saskatchewan Hospitalization Plan. In many areas, of course, we had plans, not so broad. We had in our municipality a complete health scheme of hospital and health services since 1934, and it worked out very well. It was not as broad as this plan, of course. It did not take in as many things, but it did not cost anywhere near as much.

The one objection I have is not to the plan, but to the sponsors of the plan calling it “free” hospitalization. It is, of course, in no sense free. It is paid for by the people who buy their hospital cards and the balance is paid from the provincial treasury, to which everyone in this province contributes directly or indirectly. In this main, I would say it is a very good plan. There is this, though, about the plan that I don’t like, and I would like to mention this in particular to the Minister of Public Health, and that is the rules regarding out-patients. In our hospital now we have spent about \$40,000 on the hospital, and we have it up-to-date. We give all the services any hospital can give almost, including X-ray work and things like that. I want to say, too, the rates we receive from the Commission are fair per patient per day, and if your hospital runs anywhere near full you can make both ends meet. If it does not, of course you lose money. The first year we lost over \$7,000 in our business for the year; this year we have done much better because the hospital has been fuller. But the out-patient is the thing I don’t like about it. I know a patient who went in a short time ago and the doctor told her to go and have a check-up by X-ray. She had to go up there and have it done, and it cost her \$56. I don’t say the charges were too high, no higher than a doctor would have charged, and probably not as high. But I am sure, in the light of what I have said, many patients would not go there and have that check-up if they knew it would cost them \$50 because they might not be able to afford to do it. The patient of which I speak might not need to go to the hospital for ten years, maybe never. She is lucky if she does not. But a bed-patient in the hospital would get all those services free along with all the other hospital service. I think the out-patient should be considered. An X-ray examination is a sort of prevention, to find out what is wrong with you and have the thing remedied

before you need to go to the hospital for six months or so. I think that is important, and I think those people should have some consideration.

We have the Health Region too — we have everything up there, the Health Region, the Larger School Unit. We have a lot of things, and a lot of good stuff, too. In that town we have quite a large electric plant, which I think is a very good thing; we have a salt plant; we have gas wells — very important people. And we have the Health Region. All this applies to public health — that is all they have gone into so far. Then they go into complete health services sometime during the year, I don't know, they may do so. I have not much kick about the health services, except the doctors who used to be the health officers throughout the country have no jurisdiction now in that respect. Our health officer in the region is in North Battleford. Of course, there are district health nurses out through the country. They each have a nice car and they drive around to the schools and check up on the kids, and they stop at homes. They may be doing a fair service; I don't know. They are nice little girls anyway, and they have a good time, but they are up against a pretty tough proposition in some places this winter where there are great outbreaks of communicable diseases such as measles, chicken pox, scarlet fever and things like that. These girls are qualified to diagnose these cases and make sure a child has chicken pox, scarlet fever or what is has, and, as I say, the doctors have no jurisdiction and it is creating a bad situation which will no doubt be remedied as time goes on, but that is the way it is now.

The cost of the administration may not be too high; the first six months I believe was something around \$60,000 for that area. That included the cost of several motorcars, office furnishings and the like of that.

We have had, as I mentioned a moment ago, a complete health scheme in our municipality since 1934 — hospitalization, doctor services and everything. Our hospitalization scheme was not as broad as this, and we had to drop it when this plan came in. I am not kicking about that, but I don't think that when this Health Region is completed and they start giving the full services they give anywhere else, they will have as satisfactory a plan as we have right now in that local municipality. I am quite sure of one thing, that the cost will be very much higher, because in a local plan like we have administration of the scheme costs nothing at all. It is administered solely by the municipal council. The councillors get no extra indemnity for the work or the services in that connection, and all you have to do is pay your doctor and that is all. Half our municipality is under contract to the doctors through the town to which that municipality is tributary; and that contract is for a stated amount of course — so much for surgery and so much for medical work. They have never raised the price on us since the inception of the scheme, unless they do it this year. We have figured out many times what the cost was in relation to the prices as laid down by the College of Physicians and Surgeons in Saskatchewan and the highest we ever paid those doctors was 45 percent of the price laid down by them, and down as low as 30 percent. We have saved thousands of dollars for the people of that municipality by the health scheme. I know any municipality in this province could have a similar scheme. Many have. I mention my own municipality because it is typical; no different from any other. A scheme like that could be worked out in any municipality, and you have no administration cost whatever. The scheme has



worked to the complete satisfaction of the people and the doctors and everyone concerned. In the hard times in the thirties we owed the doctors thousands and thousands of dollars. There were two doctors alone we owed over \$10,000 to. They never turned down one of our patients, because they knew when things turned to the better, and they had faith enough in the country to believe that sometime we would get a crop, they would be paid. Of course, they were paid in full when things did turn a little better. We send patients to specialists in Saskatoon, Edmonton, and so on, on the advice of any local doctor, which he could not handle, and we pay 50 percent of the specialist's charges.

**Mr. Kuziak:** — They did not do that in Canora.

**Mr. Horsman:** — That is the way we work it.

That proves again what people can do when they work together, when there is something they are interested in, something in their own hands, not centered in Regina or something like that. I think that proves again that local self-government is the real basis of democracy.

I just want to say a word about natural resources — I will be very brief on this. As I said a moment ago, we have a gas field at Unity, we have salt, and we have potash, a large deposit. The gentlemen on the government side know more about this than I do perhaps; they are very well posted on that. They have built a power plant there, fuelled by natural gas — a very cheap fuel — and I give them credit for doing that. I do not know of any other place in Saskatchewan where power could be developed cheaper than it is there. There are lines running out from their power line, but there is one thing, of course, they did not do. They might have made a start there in rural electrification. I think it would have been a grand place to start it. The reason is this: the towns to which the power lines go, it would not have made any difference to those towns whether the power lines went there or not because they all had plants, and they all had electricity before that, and that would have been a good chance to try out rural electrification.

As I say, we have a gas field. Many of you will be posted and know all about that field. It is a very small field, but comprises some of the best wells, I believe, anywhere in Canada — some of the best producing wells. They are all in an area of about one square mile, down in a little deep valley beside a little lake — Round Lake they call it. What strikes me is that after striking this good little gas field there, why the thing was not extended or why more discovery work is not being done. Last summer there was only one well drilled in that part of the country, and I do not believe it was finished. I think it was stopped in the lime, but I don't know and cannot vouch for that as I was just told that. It seems to me that when there is a gas field like that in that little area, there must be lots of gas in other places. Almost every well that has been drilled in that country has some show of gas or oil or both, besides the salt and the potash which is struck at two different locations. It is rather queer that further development has not taken place. The salt is being developed. A modern plant is being built there and will be in production sometime this spring. They are using natural gas, of course, to fuel their steam boilers and to run the evaporators for the salt. However, they are not going to take electricity from the Saskatchewan Power Commission; they are developing their own electricity plant right in the plant with steam turbines.

They have an up-to-date plant and it will be in operation soon. It seems to me there should have been more development there, more discovery work done, and I think the reason for that is that as long as investors are under the shadow of The Crown Corporations Act, I do not believe they will go far. I do not think sums of money in developing gas or salt or potash — I understand it is going to take millions of dollars to develop the potash — and to do things of that kind, must be assured that after they start and build up a going concern, the government will not come along and say: “All right, boys, we will take over from here.” That is what they are afraid of, Mr. Speaker, I believe. I think that is why the capital is going to Alberta and other places. Oil men believe there is just as good a chance of striking an oil field in Saskatchewan as there is in Alberta. We see no reason why the fourth meridian should be the line over which there is no oil on this side. We know there is quite a development in the Lloydminster area, and I believe if it was not for the terms of this Act we would attract lots of capital to Saskatchewan to develop these resources.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken quite a long time, quite a lot longer than I figured on, and I want to thank the members on both sides of the House for their very kind attention.

I will support the amendment.

**Mr. A.C. Murray (Gull Lake):** — I just want to make a few remarks and then ask leave to adjourn the debate.

I would like to say something about what the previous speaker, Mr. Horsman, had to say of some things this government has done, and some things that have happened in his constituency.

He mentioned that the government should gravel the roads for the municipalities. That would be very nice, but I doubt if it would be feasible as the government first has to build the roads they are responsible for, and after that the gravelling of the roads and the upkeep of them. I think that is all any provincial government can do, without going back into the municipalities. He mentions about being stuck in the mud on the municipal roads with a load of wheat. In our country, where I live, we don't grow so much wheat that we have to haul it when there is mud. We choose a dry day.

Also, the member said this government likes to take credit for the farmers getting good prices the last while. No, Mr. Speaker, we don't want to take credit for that at all. We only want to take credit for a good, efficient government. We have to give credit to the capitalist system for the good prices; they brought on the war we have just gone through.

**An Hon. Member:** — We are not through it yet.

**Mr. Murray:** — I think we will all agree we would not have had the good times of the last few years if it had not been for that war we have gone through. There is no doubt on this side of the House what helped to start that war and who financed the people who started it.

The previous speaker also mentioned they had started a Health Unit up there; their municipal health scheme. He thought the municipal doctor was just as good as the Health Unit. I want to say something later about the Swift Current Health Unit. I have never lived in a municipality that had a municipal health scheme. He mentions that they pay 50 percent for all patients who are referred out of that municipality. Well, in the Swift Current Health Unit if a doctor refers you out, it does not matter where you have to go, the Health Unit pays for your doctor's bill. As I say, I want to say more about the Swift Current Health unit, but with the permission of the House, I would ask you, Sir, to call it six o'clock.

8 o'clock p.m.

**Mr. Murray:** — Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to offer my congratulations to you, Sir, on your appointment as Speaker of this House. We who have had the privilege of sitting in this Chamber for the past four years know that you have always tried to be fair, and I am sure you will be as good in the next four years. You may have your troubles, it is true, with some of the new members until they find out they are not out on the hustings at election time.

I would also like to offer my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the motion. I might say that it is not easy for a new member to get up in this Chamber for the first time, and I think they did a very good job. They not only made the opposition wriggle around in their seats, but they occasionally brought them to their feet. I think, with a little more time, they will be able to make quite a contribution to this Assembly.

I would like to pass a few remarks on what has been said by the opposition in the last day or two. The member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff) had considerable to say about the C.C.F. losing a great number of votes in the Melfort constituency. I don't know whether he took the trouble to figure out the increase in the number of votes the C.C.F. member got, but it was something over 600 more than in 1944. The member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) also had considerable to say about the loss of votes by the C.C.F. candidate. If you look back, I believe you will find that both the candidates in those constituencies gained votes, and, of course, the Liberal members were helped by the joint parties, Liberal and Conservative.

I was very interested in the speech given by the member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. Dundas). I think we all enjoyed his speech. He said he went out and held meetings, and that he could get good meetings — I think possibly he can — and he said: "I sure told the people." I hope he told them the facts. He also said he was able to get a majority vote, I believe, in his home town. That should not be very much of an accomplishment for a Liberal candidate, because the people in the towns as a rule think they are farming the farmer, and they don't possibly belong to the same class of people as the farmer. I might say, if I wanted to give myself any compliments, or the people in the Gull Lake constituency for what they did, I not only got a majority in my home town, but out of the 24 towns I got a majority over the other two candidates in 12 towns,

and a majority over the next candidate in votes next to mine, over four more, and even in one. So it did not leave a very large majority for the other candidates. I will have more to say about the Gull Lake constituency in a few minutes.

It is rather amusing to hear the members of the opposition keep talking about communism; they cannot seem to get their minds off it. I wonder, when they go to bed a night, if they look under the bed to see if there isn't a 'Commie' under the bed. I don't think we in this province need to be very much afraid of communism, especially as long as we can keep the C.C.F. government in power.

In the last provincial election we only had — I believe the Leader of the Opposition mentioned — one Communist candidate in Saskatchewan; and that was in a rural constituency, and that shows they are not very strong in Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Loftson:** — They are all in your party.

**Mr. Murray:** — This candidate ran in the Pelly constituency. When one of the boys called him and asked him if he was satisfied with the result, he said: "Yes, we obtained our objective." Naturally they did, because they don't want to have a party in power such as the C.C.F. In every country they have come into power, they figure on coming in by revolution, and if we make things better for the people they will not have that opportunity.

The member for Turtleford (Mr. Trippe) yesterday, among many things, had considerable to say about Britain. He was belittling Great Britain in the come-back from what they went through after the war. I think . . .

**Mr. Trippe:** — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I was not belittling Great Britain at all. I was belittling the socialist party in Great Britain, not Great Britain.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The point of privilege is not well-taken.

**Mr. Murray:** — The members of the opposition possibly forget, and some of them have forgotten up to now, that we have a recording machine. We can play the records back and tell them what they had to say if their memories are so short they cannot even remember for a day.

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, the member was trying to belittle the recovery that the people of Great Britain are trying to make from what they went through. I think, any member in this House or outside of this House should be ashamed of himself to try to belittle any government that is making such a magnificent job as they are in the 'Old Country', after what they went through. It is pretty hard for us to realize here what those people went through, sacrificing, not just soldiers as we did, but the women and children, while we on the North American continent were making money out of their suffering. The member read an article which appeared in The Leader -Post. Not

long ago The Leader-Post did print a fairly reasonable article or two, but if he wants to get some good information he should go to some other papers to get his information.

**An Hon. Member:** — The Commonwealth?

**Mr. Murray:** — I am personally acquainted with a very fine gentleman who visited all of the British Isles last summer. I had the privilege of talking to him — by the way he belongs to the legal profession and travels in fairly good society. I don't know what his political ideas are, because he does not come out and tell the people what his political affiliations are. However, he said he had the privilege of visiting England in 1929 and again in the thirties, and a couple of times in the twenties. He said: "I have a great many friends over there among the working classes and among the people who don't work. From what I can see, the working class people are much better off than they were in 1939 when I was last there. Naturally a great many of my friends over there don't like things as they are now. They don't like the rationing when they have the money to buy the goods; but under the rationing everybody is treated alike, and there is a certain class of people who don't like that."

I would like to say just a few words about the constituency I have the honour to represent. I always like to talk about the Gull Lake constituency because it has been represented, or parts of it, by one of the first C.C.F. members elected to his Legislature. The Opposition, some of them, have said they wanted to thank their Conservative colleagues for helping elect them. I would like to do the same for my Progressive Conservative friends in the Gull Lake constituency, because I am quite sure I got quite a number of their votes. There is a little story that I would like to relate to this House. In the Gull Lake constituency we had a Conservative and a Liberal nominated. They decided they should run only one candidate so the candidates of the two parties resigned; they called a joint convention, and they sent out calls for this convention. Just about this time I got one of those calls in my mail. It was not sent to me but to one of my good supporters, telling him about this, and that they would be glad to have him at that convention. Possibly they haven't a good list of all the Liberals and Conservatives in that constituency. They called the convention and, naturally, the Liberals got the nomination. I happened to be in the town that day, sitting at a lunch counter, and one of the Liberals I know quite well came in and I said: "Who got the nomination?" He told me. Well, he said: "We sure put it over those so and so Conservatives." They could not even run a convention without trying to plug it, or play fair with the other fellow. You see, a great many Conservatives and some Liberals thought there was some difference between the two parties, but when the heads of the organizations in that constituency decided they would go together, a lot of them just could not take it. Time after time, I had Conservatives come to me and tell me — people I knew; you can pretty well depend on their word — they were not voting Liberal, they were voting for me. So, as I say, I would like to thank those people publicly for any support they gave to me in the election.

In parts of the Gull Lake constituency this past year, and for several years unfortunately, we have not had a very good crop. Being a constituency of 140 miles from north to south, naturally there are parts that have had good crops. This past year, in the extreme south, they had 30 to 40 bushels to the

acre, in a narrow streak. There are some poor streaks and some good ones. Being considerably of a stock country — probably the best in Saskatchewan, with some of the largest ranches, and stock prices being good, the people there have not fared too badly. The past three winters which have been very bad winters, especially for the sheep men — there are a lot of sheep ranches in the Gull Lake constituency — have cost the ranchers considerable money to winter their stock where they had to buy their feed. As most of you know, a sheep rancher figures on grazing his sheep out a good portion of the winter and they have not been able to do that for the past three winters as they usually do.

Unfortunately for the people with rather poor crops, there, they have not been able to accumulate wealth as in other parts of the province. Those who have mortgages — I know of a great many — have not been able to pay off their mortgages as have some people in the province, and they still owe a considerable amount on them. It is just possible, in the future, we may not get the prices we have had in the past.

I mentioned something about the Health Region. All of the Gull Lake constituency is in the Swift Current Health Region. I think most of the people in that Region agree that it is a good thing. Of course, we have some people there who don't like it. I have had men and women say they had never been sick, so why should they pay? But, as I say, the majority believe it is a good thing. You hear, when you go away from where they have had experience with Health Regions, great rumours about what is going on there. But the people there, I think, are well satisfied. It is true it is not free; they have to pay for it, but I know a great many people in the Gull Lake constituency who could not afford the doctor bills they have had if they had to pay them themselves.

As I mentioned, if the doctor refers them out of the Region, they can go any place they are referred to, and the doctor bills are paid. It used to be possible to do that last year without being referred, but that was getting to be too much of a habit, and many of them wanted to come into the city. Well, they would come into the city, and they would go to a doctor here and the doctor would take that bill. I believe it is possible that they have not an agreement with all the doctors outside the Region, as they have in the Swift Current Health Region.

The people in the south part of the Gull Lake constituency appreciate the bus route very much. It runs down as far as Climax. I have been told many times that they really appreciate a bus route down through there, because they are down in the south where the C.P.R. at one time built a railroad in there, and have never seen fit to complete that railroad. Naturally, when they get the business anyway, without completing the railroad, why build the branch line? That is another good example, as I have told many of them down in there, of free enterprise or monopoly enterprise; because they have a monopoly over the railway system all over the south-western part of the province.

We have heard a great deal about the Larger School Units costing considerably more money. Well, there are three Larger School Units in the Gull Lake constituency, or parts of them in the constituency. I, myself, am not in a Larger School Unit. I would be in what is called the Gull Lake Larger School

Unit if I were in the unit. They sent round a petition not to be brought in, and they were not brought in. Possibly that was a good thing, in some people's opinion, and possibly it was not. A gentleman speaking today quoted figures on what it cost in the Unit where he lived, on one quarter-section. I believe he said \$60 for school taxes. Well, Mr. Speaker, he should come up where I live, and I can show him sections that are paying more than that for school taxes, and not in larger units. I can show him schools, running individually, that have up to 24, 26 or 28 mills, and a fairly high assessment; and, also, school districts that have no mills. I know of one school district that had no assessment last year, and I don't believe they will have any assessment this year. What happened? They did not have enough pupils in their district to open the school, so naturally it is closed; but those pupils had to move into town. One moved into town and another moved into an adjoining district; they established residence there, and those districts last year were paying 24 mills, and this year some of them are paying higher, educating children who were born and raised in a district that now does not have to make any assessment. I don't call that fair. I think we should all share in those things. Some people don't agree with that. I know some of the people in that school district who have no assessment, as I just mentioned. They think that is just fine, and a good idea, to let the other fellow pay for educating the children, and they go along without it costing them anything.

What a great many speakers forget is that everything has gone up in price. Of course you can thank the Liberal government at Ottawa for that. It does not matter what you buy, whether you are running a farm or school, or whether you are just buying your groceries, we know it costs at least a third to one-half more than it did a few years ago. So we have to take those things into consideration.

The Department of Highways has built some good roads in the Gull Lake constituency, not as much as we would like. Unfortunately two years ago the Department let a contract in the fall to build some highway, and the contractor never got to the job. Naturally that carried over until last year. Last year there was a contract let — the other contractor did not take up his option — to another contractor to build that highway. On No. 13 highway a contractor had the job to come up through the Swift Current constituency into the Gull Lake constituency, and neither one of those contractors got their work done, so now we have to carry that over. We are not getting as much work done as possibly we would like, but what the department has done in the Gull Lake constituency is to build good roads.

They have built permanent roads, and they have built them right in a straight line, not running into every C.C.F. farmer, or, if a C.C.F.er owned a store, not going in to accommodate his store as was done by the previous administration in building some of their highways. You know, some of the engineers can tell some great stories of what happened under the Liberal administration. All you have to do — I suppose many of you have driven on No. 1 highway from Swift Current to Maple Creek or, a few years ago, to Medicine Hat — is follow that highway and see what kind of a joke they make of building highways. From Swift Current to Maple Creek to just a few miles west of there, I believe there are 11 crossings over the main line of the C.P.R., just to accommodate this town, and then cross the railroad to accommodate another one. In one place they come in to accommodate a town, and half a mile west they go back out again;

they might just as well have stayed on the south side of the railroad tracks. You have to have lived in those districts a few years back to know just what was taking place. As I say, some of the engineers can tell some great stories about what happened; they did not like it. One engineer told me he was surveying No. 1 highway, and the member at that time went along with him. He said: "Now, are you satisfied with that road?" "Yes, that is where it should be." — where it is today — but before the engineer got his report in that member came in to Regina and had it changed. He lived about seven or eight miles away from there and, of course, it had to pass his place, and so he had it changed, and that's where the highway was for quite some time. That has now been changed.

In all surveys — I can only speak for the Gull Lake constituency because I know what goes on there — the engineers follow what they believe is the best route for the people in that constituency, and keep away from railroad crossings, and I think that is how it should be.

I want to say that the air ambulance has been used, and appreciated, a great many times in the Gull Lake constituency. It has made a great number of trips out there, and I know of several people I am acquainted with who would not be alive today if it had not been for that air ambulance. The pilots of those planes deserve great praise for what they have done. I know one gentleman, getting on in years, who was taken in to the hospital. The doctor started to operate on him and found that he could not perform that operation. He had the plane brought in, loaded the patient on, and while they were loading, the pilot went to the doctor and said: "I should not pull out of here tonight. I cannot get back as soon as I should. What do you think about waiting until morning?" The doctor told him: "If you wait until morning the patient will be dead." That patient came in here to Regina, was operated on and was home in about three weeks time, and the last time I saw him he was the same rugged, healthy Scotsman he had always been.

Another thing that has been appreciated a great deal in the Gull Lake constituency is the automobile insurance. I don't know whether the opposition agree with that or not. I mentioned some of the railway crossings on No. 1 highway. Today, I believe, the most money paid out on accidents was paid out in the Gull Lake constituency, where three men were killed in one accident on one of those bad crossings put in by the previous administration. I believe the people appreciate that.

We hear a great deal about the iron curtain in other places; but I don't believe the people know we have an iron curtain around Saskatchewan as far as news, reliable news, getting out of this province to other parts of Canada and the United States is concerned. I was riding on the train last fall, and I fell in with a young fellow from Winnipeg. He did not know I belonged to this Legislature. I never told him, but he knew by our conversation that I lived in Saskatchewan. He started asking me questions. By the way, he was going to British Columbia. He had a job out there — one of these fellows leaving the prairie provinces going to B.C. He was quite inquisitive to find out what was going on in this province, so I started to tell him about the things he wanted to know. He said: "You know that is not the way we hear it in Manitoba. We get altogether a different slant than what you are telling me. They don't seem to tell us the same things as you are telling me."



I was interested in visiting Ontario this last year. Almost everybody I would meet — I have a great many friends and relatives down there — wanted to know what we were going, and what was the difference between their government and our government. When I related some of the things we were doing here, especially the government automobile insurance, they could hardly believe what I was telling them: that we could get insurance for \$6 or \$7, and get the coverage we are getting now. Just why don't the newspapers try to give them a proper picture of what is going on in this province? Possibly if they knew they would ask their government there why they could not do some of the things we are doing here.

There has been a lot of things said, in and out of this Chamber, of how well-to-do the farmers are all over Canada. It is true the farmers have been considerably better off the past few years than they were for a number of years previous to that; but we never, at any time, got our fair share of the national income. Just let me give you a few figures: in 1931, the farming population was 31.7 of the population of the whole dominion, and in 1931 the farmers got 4.5 of the national income; 1932, 4.2; in 1933, 4.1. Somebody will say: "Well, now come along to the later years when the farmers are getting their share." Let me give you the figures: in 1941, we had a farming population comprised of 27.4 of the population of Canada which got 8.3 of the national income; in 1942, 13; in 1947, 11.3. So you can see, we are beginning to slip back down as the farming population. No one need try to tell me that the labourers are getting it because they are not. I have had the privilege of visiting some of the large cities where there are tens of thousands of labourers working, and I know something about what they are getting. Possibly some few skilled labourers are getting good money, but the majority of them are not.

**Mr. J.E. McCormack (Souris-Estevan):** — Come on down to Estevan.

**Premier Douglas:** — Are they getting too much down at Estevan?

**Mr. Murray:** — It is possible the member for Estevan would not like to trade places with the coal miners down there, even with the money they are getting.

Some of the members in the opposition say that we should not mention that a depression might be on the way; they are afraid if you mention it, it might happen. What are the facts? I hope we never see one. About a year ago — I don't think we noticed it here, but I know they did in Ontario. I know a number of people down there had started a small business, and just about a year ago now they did not know whether they were going to be able to carry on or not because things were getting too bad. The young veterans, who had come back from overseas and started up a business, were getting no contracts in the businesses they were in; building had come to a standstill. Of course we were relieved, to a great extent, by the United States bringing in the Marshall Plan which made an outlet for our goods. It is just possible that is not going to help us for very long. We know what has happened to the flax growers. We have a floor price on the price of flax, and the federal government is financing that. The potato growers in the eastern provinces, it is true, are getting \$1 a hundred with the floor — the federal government does not do as well by them as they do just across the line, where they get \$3. We have the fruit growers, where they

are paying them in the east to cut down the trees. Our rye prices went to pieces, so that the man who bought four or five dollar rye seed a year ago, did not receive any \$4 or \$5 a bushel for rye.

I think we have to look at the facts. I wonder just what will happen if the United States declares wheat a surplus commodity as they have some of the other things. I hope they don't, because we know that the countries that want our goods just have not the dollars — and we are tied to dollars here — to buy the things they use.

I am one who started in farming a good many years ago and hit the so-called depression we went through. I feel sorry for some of the boys now who are starting up, the same as we did years ago, buying equipment and land at prices we have to pay now. I don't need to tell the members how prices have gone up; almost any kind of a tractor you buy today, a couple of years ago you might have bought for \$1,000 less, in any of the large sizes, and that holds good with any other machinery of that value. I can remember quite some years ago when you could buy a self-propelled combine for a little over \$2,000; if you want to buy that same combine today it will cost you pretty close to \$4,000. So, as I say, I feel sorry for those boys who are starting up. Under the Veterans' Land Act, a few years ago when that was brought into being it might have looked like a good thing; buy now, with the rising prices, and if the price of farm commodities fall, how much chance are they going to have to pay for the material they have bought?

This is another class I also feel sorry for, and that is the boys who came back after the First World War, and settled under the Soldier Settlement Board scheme. We know there were thousands of those boys who left their land because they could not pay for it, and I believe two or three years ago there were between four and five thousand who had not paid for their land. I believe today there will be some who have not paid for their land yet. But, Mr. Speaker, they have one man they can thank for that, one man in Saskatchewan and possibly all of Canada whom they can thank more than anybody else for still owing that money, and he is the Leader of the Opposition. I don't suppose I have to refresh his memory on what he did in the House of Commons for those fellows. It is true a private member brought in a Bill to cancel all money owing to the Soldier Settlement . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. member would not want to mislead the House. No such Bill was brought into the House of Commons at all. The hon. member should try to confine himself to the truth on such matters.

**Mr. Murray:** — Mr. Speaker, did I understand the hon. gentleman right, when he said no such Bill had ever been brought into the House?

**Mr. Tucker:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I said that and it is true. This is just like something that has been said all over Saskatchewan which has been untrue. No such Bill was brought in by a private member.

**February 22, 1949**

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition could explain to the House that this was a motion brought in . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Some Hon. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — . . . as usual, the opposition don't want the truth or the facts.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! Do I understand that the Leader of the Opposition is challenging the accuracy of the hon. member's statement?

**Mr. Tucker:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member said that a Bill in respect to the Soldier Settlement debt was brought into the House of Commons. To my knowledge, no such Bill was ever brought in, and if the hon. member can present any single Journal of the House of Commons, when I was a member, indicating any such Bill was brought in, then of course he would be in order. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, he cannot produce any such thing.

**Mr. Speaker:** — When any hon. member is speaking he accepts the responsibility, and if he has the document, no doubt he will table it.

**Mr. Murray:** — Mr. Speaker, probably the Leader of the Opposition misunderstood me. I said a private Bill when I should have said a private motion. I don't think I need to relate to this House what happened. I have here the Hansard of 1945 and that motion was brought in by Mr. Fair of Battle River. I will read the latter part of the motion — there is no need to read the first part of it:

Therefore be it resolved that in the opinion of this House the government should take into consideration the advisability of giving clear titles to all soldier settlers who on March 31, 1944 held land under contract with the Soldier Settlement Board.

**Mr. Walker:** — Read what Tucker said.

**Mr. Murray:** — I will just do that. Since the Leader of the Opposition was so kind as to rise to his feet I will just do that. I note here that the Leader of the Opposition took considerable time to stall this motion, not letting it go to a vote before 11 o'clock. I would not like to have the House listen to all of this, but let me just quote parts of what he said. He mentions here about the boys getting P.F.A.A. — they could live on that.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, I did not say they could live on that. If my hon. friend is going to read Hansard, let him read it and not interpolate things I did not say.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I do not think the hon. member who is now reading from Hansard is putting anything in that is not there. If he will just quote the page and the chapter.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I am very sure, Mr. Speaker, I never said they could live under the P.F.A.A.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! I understand the member who is speaking is placing on the record an extract from Hansard, which is the official journal of the House of Commons.

**Mr. Murray:** — I would not like to have to read all of this, but it is very interesting reading. I have read it several times. He did not say they had to live on that, but that it would help them to live and pay their debts.

Further on he said: “I have not mentioned the Family Allowances.” “Mr. Ross: (Souris), This is getting near the end of the debate, five minutes more and you will have talked the farmers out.” “Mr. Tucker: (Mentioning Family Allowances) I wonder how I came to pass over The Family Allowance Act.” Then he goes on talking about how it will help them to live. I note one member here, when he mentions that says: “They will have lots of time to raise a family and collect the Family Allowance.”

**Premier Douglas:** — Didn’t you talk it out?

**Mr. Murray:** — Then they come down to three minutes — an hon. member — one minute, this is Mr. McNichol in talking about Family Allowance: “They will have plenty of time to increase the size of their family and get more allowances.” Then it comes on down to eleven o’clock and the Speaker reminds the gentlemen that it is now eleven o’clock. He talked the Bill out, and those boys . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Again I rise to a question of privilege. It was not a Bill. If this motion had carried . . . This is a substantial question of privilege, and those boys . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! It is perfectly within your rights to rise on a point of privilege, correcting the hon. member that it was not a Bill, but you are not in order in making a speech.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, I wish to state another question of privilege on this. The hon. member said that I was responsible that these debts of the soldier settlers were still in existence. I wish to point out that that statement was incorrect, because if this motion had carried . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — This is not a debate. It is not a question of privilege.

**February 22, 1949**

**Mr. Speaker:** — The speaker who is on his feet knows the rules in the House of Commons, and we follow it here.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, I wish to state . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — That rule is that no member can rise on his feet and make a speech when another member is speaking.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I wish to make a statement on a question of privilege. The hon. member said, in his opening remarks on this subject, that I was responsible for those debts still being owed, and I let him go on and let him lay before your Honour what he wished to do to prove that. Now, he read that this was a resolution that this matter should be taken into consideration. Had that been put to the House it would not have got those debts . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Premier Douglas:** — Why did you talk it out if it would not have done anything?

**Mr. Tucker:** — It could have been brought up again.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! The hon. member will please take his seat.

**Mr. Murray:** — Naturally, if I were in his position, I would be squirming around too.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Again I rise to a question of privilege.

**Mr. Fines:** — Come on, take it like a man.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I am not squirming around. I just want to keep the record straight, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Tucker:** — I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw that statement: I am squirming around.

**Premier Douglas:** — If you are not squirming I never saw anybody squirm.

**Mr. Tucker:** — That is your opinion.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! Order! The hon. gentleman who is speaking is giving his opinion, and an interpretation which members on both sides of the House invariably do.

**Premier Douglas:** — Sure, he knows what the hon. gentleman means by squirming.

**Mr. Murray:** — Mr. Speaker, I said ‘in my opinion’, it is what I would do and what I would feel like. Of course, it is all right if the Leader of the Opposition, while he was in the House of Commons, wanted to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for the Liberal government. That is his business, not mine. I know what I would feel like if I had a chance to support a motion, even a private member’s motion, to cancel those debts for the boys who came back here and bought that equipment for their land — lots of them paid \$400 and \$500 for a team of horses, and over \$100 for a cow. A year from the time they bought it — and I know this from experience — they could not sell a cow for \$20.

Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable said about free enterprise, monopolies, etc. I believe we can get along with free enterprise, but I don’t like monopolies. One member said they were not monopolies because, when they had control of everything that went on, they were still free enterprise. We know a gentleman, speaking in this Chamber not long ago, said a merchant could buy his material from the wholesaler, and could sell it at any price he wanted. That is true; but I would like to take some of the hon. members down to the city of Toronto, say, where there were a great many corner stores run by a man and his family. You know, those stores have been crowded out by a big chain monopoly. This last year they had over 55 stores, just in one chain, in the city of Toronto, and expanding at a great rate. I was at a house in the city of Toronto last fall, and the lady of the house told me that just across the street was a chain store. She said: “I used to buy over on the other corner at the family store for ten years.” The chain store came in and built the building across the street; they cut prices so low that the other fellow could not sell anything. She said: “I would still stay with him, but some of the material he gets — bread and meat — he has to keep it so long it is not good. Naturally, we are all quitting him, and he has to close his store.” That is taking place in a great many corner stores in the city of Toronto, and other places across Canada. That is becoming a monopoly. What has happened there is that they own their own wholesale stores. I have seen, in their retail stores, goods advertised for less than you could buy at wholesale, or a merchant could buy at wholesale. They have control from the wholesale right back to the producer, and they can charge just what they like on the retail market. They can give it away if they like, and they can put the other fellow out of business.

One of the members — I don’t just remember which one it was — when talking about government enterprise, gave an example of the federal government’s Crown Corporation, the C.N.R. He told us that the federal government had to hand-feed them all the time, and he did not tell us they bought over — a lot of the members can remember the time — those old railroads which were bankrupt, but they did not buy them at a bankrupt price. They bought them, I suppose, through some of their political friends, and paid them a good price. It costs us around \$70 or \$80 million a year to pay the interest on what we paid for those railroads. They were never given a chance. That was not because they wanted to run a railroad, it was because they had to see that it ran, and they wanted to save the money for their friends.

There was something said here in this Chamber about the government Crown Corporations laying off a few men. Some of us can remember back, in the city of Regina, when a company came in here and built a factory over on Dewdney Avenue. It just did not have a few men; there was over a thousand men hired. They did not ask anyone if they could lay off those men; they closed the doors and laid them off, and I do not believe the opposition made any big holler in this Chamber about it, or that The Leader-Post made any holler about them leaving the province. Here is the difference. Free enterprise on Dewdney is somewhat different to a Crown Corporation of this government. If we close one of our Crown Corporations, we have not got a federal government to come along and take it off our hands, as they had over on Dewdney.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken longer than I thought I would. This past fall I had the privilege of travelling down through some of the northern states. I have friends and relatives down there and I visited them. In fact, I came across the line just on the Sunday night before the election over there. Of course I have relatives and friends there who are Republicans, and they were really riding high when I left there as they thought Mr. Dewey was going to be elected. I admired some of those boys down there you know, when they throw out their chests and talk about 'our American way of life'. One fellow I remember talking to, a relative of mine, talking about their American way of life — I did not remind him of a few years ago when he had no money and I, myself had to help fill his gas tank so he could get back home — but he has come up in the world now. They have had an administration down there that has done considerable to help the farmers and the working people, far more than they have done here — I mentioned what they are giving in comparison with the East, \$1 and \$3, with a poor market. There was no doubt, when I left there, that they believed Mr. Truman's government was beaten. I noticed a similarity between the election campaign going on there and what we have had here in the past year. The Republicans were hollering 'communism', 'communism'. Truman was a communist, everybody was a communist who was not with you. What was more, you could pick up any paper, and mostly when I picked up a paper I turned to the editorial page to see what they had to say. Practically all of them were talking about the war which they were going to have. In talking to a great many people, they all believed they were going to be at war with Russia in a matter of one, two, up to six months; none of them I talked to believed it would run over six months. As I say, that was brought on, possibly, a great deal during the election. I have no doubt, if they were compelled to go to war with Russia, of what the outcome would be. It would possibly not end as quickly as some of them thought it would be — some of them thought it would be a matter of a month, and they would be back home going to work again.

When we look back over the past, and I think that lots of times history repeats itself, we have gone through a war and we are supplying the nations now that need our supplies. Many of the people in the world are not getting enough to eat. We are not able to supply them because they have not the dollars to buy them. It is true we were able to supply munitions to some countries just previous to the war, and after the war had started, when they did not have the dollars, but they promised to pay. If history repeats itself, under the system we live under, just what will be the outcome? We believe, on this side of the House, that we should — one gentleman said here today — produce for use and not for profit. Of course, his interpretation is that you produce and you don't get anything for it. Well, I quoted figures here of what the farmers are producing

for, and they are not getting what they should out of it. The farmer is entitled to his wages, some interest on his investment, and nothing more, no large sum. We believe that we should feed the poor people of the world. I mentioned about the Marshall Plan. We don't know what will happen to that. It is in the hands of the United States, and I believe it runs for another couple of years. Anything the United States declares surplus, we will not be able to sell to those countries and I hope that they have recovered sufficiently, by the time any of these commodities we have in Saskatchewan are declared surplus by the United States, to be able to buy the goods we are able to supply for them.

I shall support the motion.

## **Second Readings**

### **Bill No. 9 — An Act to amend The Automobile Accident Insurance Act, 1947.**

Hon. Mr. Fines moved second reading of **Bill No. 9 — An Act to amend The Automobile Accident Insurance Act, 1947.**

He said: In moving the second reading of the Bill, I wish to give a short summary of The Automobile Accident Insurance Act since its inception in April, 1946.

The original Act provided a system of compulsory automobile accident insurance whereunder all persons were insured for specific amounts against loss resulting from bodily injuries or death sustained as a result of "driving, riding in or on or operating a moving motor vehicle in Saskatchewan or collision with or being struck down, run down or run over by a moving vehicle in Saskatchewan".

By March 31st, 1947, at the conclusion of one year's operation of the plan, a surplus had been accumulated of \$767,000. At that time it was decided to introduce an additional coverage. Thus, there was added collision insurance to cover the actual damage to the vehicle over \$100.

For the second 12-month period, there was an additional surplus of \$253,000, making in all a total of over \$1 million accumulated surplus.

In the spring of 1948, provision was made for public liability and property damage insurance. It is expected that the total payments made from the fund this year will be approximately equal to the revenues received during the year.

While we have been developing this plan in Saskatchewan, certain of our neighbouring provinces have established plans which require that the drivers of motor vehicles involved in accidents must be able to provide proof of financial responsibility or have their cars impounded. The result has been that the owners of these vehicles have felt it necessary to have their cars insured and were practically compelled to go to private companies where they have had to pay a much greater premium than have the people in Saskatchewan.



Another thing is that these laws have increased the number of motorists insured, and have undoubtedly provided responsibility, yet there is protection only in the case of proven negligence. Not in any other province of Canada, or any state of the Union is there such a thing as universal coverage as we have here. I think, Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan plan owes its success to two main features, as compared with the plans in existence anywhere else. First of all is the universal application. In other words, everybody is insured in Saskatchewan. The result of that is our collection costs are greatly reduced. It costs us less than one percent. Compare that with other companies where the agent who writes it gets a commission of 20 percent; then there is the general agent gets a commission; then the provincial agent gets a commission; then the head office that has to get a profit. All these are expenses that we do not have. In this province every dollar collected goes back to the motorist or to the person who is injured by the motorist.

There is a second advantage, and that is: the law of averages in Saskatchewan, through having such universal coverage, through having some 200,000 persons covered in the province, enables us to provide this insurance at a much lower rate than would otherwise be possible.

One of the chief complaints we had in the past was that we did not have complete coverage, that we did not have fire or theft. The changes proposed will round out the Act, and will enable motorists to have the most complete coverage that has been found in any policy yet instituted. I might state, also, the development of our automobile insurance plan is something which is attracting world-wide interest. I would have liked, if I had time tonight, to read some of the enquiries that have come in from practically every state of the Union, every province of Canada, the Central American States, Porto Rico, and other places that have been studying our plan. I have no doubt, within a very short time, the plan we have instituted in Saskatchewan will be copied by many of the states to the south of us and by all the provinces of Canada.

As a result of our three years experience with the plan to date, we have found there are certain inequities in the rate structure. This has become evident as we have had greater experience. It has been found, for example, that the later model cars, which have nice fancy grills in the front of them and have very expensive headlights built right into the fenders, cost a great deal more for the repairs than for many of the older models. Then, too, now that the price of new vehicles has taken such an upward turn, we find that the old rating, where we had a difference of \$1.50 — that is, the difference from \$4.50 to \$6 — the former motorist was paying entirely too much for his coverage, and the other fellow was paying entirely too little. Let me give you a concrete example. A man with an old 1930 or 1931 model car, valued at approximately \$300, was paying \$4.50 premium, while, for an additional \$1.50 — for \$6 — the owner of a 1947 Buick could be insured to the value of \$3,000 and a 1947 Cadillac to the value of \$4,000, for the same premium. Another reason why an increased premium for the late model cars is justified is the steadily rising cost of replacement parts for these new models.

We have tried to work out a plan whereby the premiums will be more closely related to the value of the cars, and so we have worked out a new rate structure under which there will be four rates in effect. It is proposed, for

example, that private passenger cars will be charged a premium ranging from \$4.50 to \$6 in the second group, \$8 for a third group, and a top grouping of \$10 for the new modern cars. It is proposed that the premium rate for farm trucks, previously ranging from \$5 to \$10, will be changed from \$6 to \$11. This will mean, for an additional \$1 premium, the farmer will now receive complete coverage for fire and theft.

In order that the members may better evaluate the economy of our new Automobile Insurance Act, I would like to give the House a few figures to show what the rates are when purchased from private companies. First of all, I might say, Mr. Speaker, I have taken the very lowest rates that can be found — these are not average rates by any means, you can add considerably to them. These are the farm rates, not the city rates, for the city rates you can add an extra \$4 for a five-point policy.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Are you allowing there for a person only being able to insure during the time in the summer and fall he drives the vehicle, the same as private companies do?

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — On this particular one you cannot expect to get a discount for two or three months in the winter. If my hon. friend wants to get a package policy we will give him the discount there.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Private companies do allow that.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Very little.

Let me give you the figures, Mr. Speaker; public liability, \$5,000 and \$10,000 limits, for a 1932 Ford they charge \$8; for a 1947 Buick Roadmaster they also charge \$8 — that is for public liability and property damage. Collision, with \$100 deductible, they charge \$8 for the Ford, and \$20 for the Buick Roadmaster; fire and theft, without any deductible, they charge \$2.50 for the Ford, \$9 for the Buick. In other words, for the five-point policy, private insurance you pay \$18.50 for a 1932 Ford or \$37 for a 1947 Roadmaster. Now, for \$4.50 to \$10 we give that coverage under our new plan, and, in addition, we will give the accident coverage, something you cannot buy with a private company. For instance, if you buy a five-point policy with an ordinary insurance company, the driver of the automobile has absolutely no protection for himself. If he should fall asleep, for example, and go in the ditch and get killed, his widow receives nothing at all under the ordinary five-point policy with a private company; but with our particular plan, the widow would receive \$3,000, plus \$625 for each dependent child, up to a total of \$10,000, something you do not get with the private companies at all. Yet for what you pay to private companies, either \$18.50 or \$37, will now be available for \$4.50 and \$10 respectively.

I would like to say, this plan has been the subject of a great deal of criticism, a great deal of very unfair criticism, on the part of the insurance companies. I would like to remind the members of the House that the accident feature of our policy is one of the main features, and it is something that has cost us approximately 25 to 30 percent of the total amount of the premiums, so that it is a very important feature. I know that many of the private companies

**February 22, 1949**

try to minimize its value, and try to make out it has no value at all, that it is not part of a standard insurance policy. They are quite right, it is not part of a standard insurance policy, but I would like to say here, it is the finest feature of the whole plan.

Mr. Speaker, I see it is just 11 o'clock. I would, however, before sitting down, pay a tribute to the staff of the insurance office for the way in which they have administered the Act during the past three years. I would like to pay tribute to the former Minister, the former Hon. O.W. Valteau, who has pioneered the way for this plan. I am confident that one day, just as my hon. friend for North Battleford (Mr. Prince) wants to have an irrigation plan to commemorate the name of a man who did a great deal in the north, so, too, our insurance plan some day may be able to do something to commemorate the name of 'Oke' Valteau, the man who did so much to get this on its feet, and get it started.

I know there will be a great many questions, Mr. Speaker, in connection with this, which I think we will have to answer in Committee of the Whole. I leave it to the members of the House with full confidence that it will have the unanimous support as being another of the forward measures introduced by this government.

The Assembly adjourned at 11:00 o'clock p.m.