

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Eleventh Legislature

Tuesday, March 8, 1949

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

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Hon. Mr. Fines:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair.

Mr. J. W. Horsman (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, first I would like to say hello to the members of my constituency, some of whom may be listening on the air today. I hope so anyway. I am in rather a peculiar position up there as my constituency is rather peculiarly located. I am just sitting there like a little island in the midst of the ocean, surrounded on all sides by not exactly hostile camps, but people of different political beliefs at least. I have this distinction though: on the north we are bounded by the constituency of Cutknife, represented here by the Minister of Agriculture; on the east by Biggar, represented by the Minister of Education; to the south-east we have the Rosetown constituency, represented by the Minister of Highways; immediately south by Kerrobert-Kindersley, represented by Mr. Wellbelove. On the west we have the fourth meridian and the Social Credit province of Alberta, so I am pretty surrounded.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that we have a very good constituency there, with very good land, and I am very proud of the people who live there, and I thank them for this opportunity for service that they have given me.

Now, I would like to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer on the very able and eloquent manner in which he presented the budget. I was very much interested in it; in fact I enjoyed it very much; and one reason was I knew that the hon. gentleman was enjoying himself immensely, and I like to see a man enjoy himself. He was just throwing millions around with the carefree abandon, you might say, of a small boy throwing stones at a farmer's cows, or something like that. I enjoyed it very much because I knew he enjoyed it.

The budget is notable, at least, for one thing: that it is the largest ever presented in this Legislature, and it reflects the fact that the heavy spending of the last four years is going to keep right on. We had thought that things might ease off, but instead of that, expenditures will continue to skyrocket.

Hon. Mr. Douglas: — You wanted more service.

Mr. Horsman: — I was rather disappointed in this because I know that under a budget of this size no decrease in taxation is possible, and that the farmers of this province, the working man, people of small income, will continue to be loaded down with this crushing burden of taxation. This, of course, is a time of buoyant revenues, that is in good crop areas, and we hear the expression from the other side of the

House almost every day referring us back to the hard times of the thirties. I would just like to inform the hon. members of this House that there are parts of this province today, if you go there where they have not had a crop for about four years, you will find that conditions are not much different from what they were in the thirties. The people there, in many cases, are depending upon the few gallons of cream they can sell, or a few crates of eggs, on the P.F.A.A. bonus that they receive from the government in the crop failure areas. The high taxation they have to pay cleans the most of it up.

We don't want to see a return of times like the thirties, but I think it would be good business to put something by for a rainy day. It seems to me what would be considered good business for an individual or a private company should also be considered good business for a government. We have heard a good deal from government members, especially from the Premier of this province about the great debt reduction in municipal and farm debts of the province. Well, that is very true. The farmers have paid their debts in the areas where they have had crops, and they have also paid their taxes. Farmers, as a rule, are honest as are business men and so throughout this country. They are honest people and they are anxious and willing to pay their debts if they have anything to pay them with. When the farmers paid up their taxes, and arrears of taxes and so on, that put the municipalities in a position to pay their debts. There is not anything extraordinary about that at all, and nothing that any government can take any credit for either. It is just the times. But there is this: the people in this province have done, wherever they were able to do it in the past four years, besides paying their debts if they had any, they have built up reserves, started bank accounts, and laid something by for hard times when hard times might come again. I would just like to recommend to this government that they follow the good example that has been set them by the farmers and the municipalities and business men in general throughout the province, and try to lay up something for a rainy day.

I have heard, too, and the expression has been made quite often in this House since we have been here, that, according to the opinion of the people on the other side of the House, a good many of them think there is a depression on the way, and before long we will find ourselves in the middle of another depression. I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that these hon. gentlemen are just as wrong in the prophecy as they have been in most of the other prophecies they have made. By the size of the budget that has been presented it could not indicate to any thinking person that anything such as a depression could possibly happen to this country. It does not give you that idea.

There is not much complaint to make about a big budget. In good times a big budget might be all right. It all depends whether the money is sent wisely and well, instead of being wasted in some sort of experiments which are due to failure before they ever start. The hon. Premier of this province, when he addressed this Assembly, to use his own words, he admitted that many of the Crown Corporations established by the government in the last few years, were 'problem children', and that many of the others were still in the experimental stage. It would appear to me that if a government intended to go into business, it would be wise for them to make a thorough investigation of whatever line of business they were going to go into before they started at all, and profit by the experience and what happened to people in those lines of business. It is a very astonishing fact that in view of the fact that this government had hired planners, legal advisers of all kinds brought in from other provinces and

countries to advise them in all their business ventures, and yet at the same time these ventures have failed so miserably. We know that many of these corporations or businesses are losing money. We also know that most of them have been forced to close their doors. This must be a terrible disappointment to these gentlemen opposite. They have my sympathy, and this is a fact. I am very sorry for them. Another thing — it is a very keen disappointment to the people of this province, because after all, it is their money that is involved, and the money that was lost in these ventures belonged to the people of the province and naturally they are disappointed too.

We were told, you will all remember, before these corporations were ever started up, that the profits from government business would pay for social services, and everything else that the people of this province would require. I repeat that it is a great disappointment to the people of this province that such is not the case, and I hope that the government by this time are beginning to realize that any ordinary business is not always a profit business, but that it is also a profit and loss business. It is a very unfortunate circumstance that so many of our government ventures have shown a loss instead of a profit. The government will, somehow, be required now to get along without that great golden stream we have heard so much about which was going to flow into the Treasury of this province, and we would be all sitting pretty, and have no taxes or anything to pay out. Instead of that golden stream flowing into the Treasury, there is a loss that will have to be made up through other sources of revenue. I think, when a government does this kind of business, that there is no hope of any reduction in taxation on the land, or anything else. I see no sign that the members on the government side of the House have any ideas of abandoning any of their socialistic tendencies. They are still ardent socialists and if anyone was to tell any of these hon. gentlemen that you did not think they were socialists, I am sure they would be highly insulted.

Speaking here last evening, the hon. member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. McCormack) quoted a couple of paragraphs from the C.C.F. platform. I think I can repeat that. In speaking of the evils of capitalism, and how you were going to get away from it, here is what they say: "We believe that these evils can be removed only in planned and socialized economy, in which the natural resources and principal means of production and distribution are owned, controlled and operated by the people." The last paragraph — I will quote that again, too: "No C.C.F. government will rest content until it has eradicated capitalism, and placed into operation the full programme of socialized planning which will lead to the establishment in Canada of a co-operative commonwealth." I just want to establish this fact: we have a socialist government, by their own admission. That is all I want to establish here. They condemn capitalism, big business, monopolies and everything like that. I do not blame any government for condemning monopolies. I do not believe in monopolies any more than the C.C.F. government does, but they do not hesitate, Mr. Speaker, to create a government monopoly as soon as the opportunity presents itself. We have a good many businesses in this country, if they are not total monopolies, they are at least partial monopolies. We have the Fish Board, the Timber Board, and the Fur Marketing Service in the north. As far as a good many people in that country are concerned, these things are complete monopolies to them; for those who are forced to sell to those corporations, as far as they are concerned, it is a total monopoly. In spite of that fact, they still lose money. I maintain that a government monopoly can be just as vicious and just as big a detriment to any

March 8, 1949

country as any private monopoly can be. I believe, too, that the government of this province intend to establish another monopoly in the sodium sulphate business.

As I said a moment ago, there is nothing too bad for these gentlemen to say about capitalism and everything connected with it. What they are saying to the people of this province, in effect, is this: these vultures, these corporations, these monopolies have robbed you long enough, now give us a chance. Another remarkable fact is that while our government businesses have turned out so badly, yet in the same period private business has flourished in Saskatchewan. There is not a man in this House who could not tell you of instances where business in these times, during the very same period when our government businesses with all their planners and experts and legal advisers have failed. That is something to think about. It is disappointing, I am sure it must be, especially in times like this because, you know, nothing succeeds like success, and nothing fails like failure.

I think we have established the fact that we have a socialist government, and I want to say that socialism in a place like Saskatchewan must be a gradual process. If this government, when they were elected in 1944, had started right out then and set up a completely socialized economy in Saskatchewan, or tried to do it, there would have been a revolution in Saskatchewan. There is no question about that. They know that in order to put over these socialist practices and work up to a socialized economy, it must be a gradual process. You can see the signs right now by certain amendments to certain Acts, and so on, in the Legislature. A few years ago, when the Accident Insurance Act came into force, people did complain somewhat about it, principally, of course, the compulsory features of the Act; but as time went on people began to accept it very well indeed. They began to realize that some form of insurance was necessary, and unless a good many people were forced into it they would never go into it, and they accepted it. Now the government comes out this year with two new clauses to this Act, covering fire and theft, two things from which there is very little risk. I don't think that the people of this province are going to like that. It would have been all right to put these new clauses in, but they could have been left voluntary for a person to take advantage of if he wanted to, or to refuse if he did not wish to. But that is socialism. It must be forced on you, and you can see the gradual growth of it. Under the amendment to the Town Planning Act, Bill No. 71, which was passed here the other day, under the amendment to that Act more power is placed in the hands of the Minister, taking the local power out of the hands of the people and investing it in Ministers of the Crown and government boards, and the like of that. Mr. Speaker, I don't know that you could use a better word than this; I think it is the best example of the creeping conquest of socialism that you ever had.

I think I should say a few things in defence of our own group. After all, we are in here and we get severely criticized from members on the opposite side of the House; sometimes we may throw a little of it back. They call us reactionary, and they say that reform is something we never think about, the Liberal party. These are extraordinary statements. Anyone who knows the history of politics at all in Canada knows that many, many reforms have come into being here long before the C.C.F. government was ever heard of. We know these things. Just to make a short review back over a few years and mention only a few of the things: I think we have had a social revolution in the last 20 years in Canada

and the United States. Security has been spread through unemployment insurance, health insurance, and community medical schemes.

Premier Douglas: — What health insurance?

Mr. Horsman: — Wealth has been spread through income taxes, bearing heaviest on the wealthy, and exempting those least able to pay.

Premier Douglas: — May I ask my hon. friend where this health insurance comes from?

An Hon. Member: — He's scared to.

Mr. Horsman: — Family allowance . . .

Premier Douglas: — Health insurance.

Mr. Horsman: — Labour unions — we hear a lot about labour unions. Labour unions, Mr. Speaker, have grown to a strength undreamed of, and they have secured for their members the highest real wages in the history of the world.

Mr. Kuziak: — Since when?

Mr. Horsman: — The P.F.A.A. provides security for the farmers in drought-stricken areas. The P.F.R.A. has provided water for irrigation and for the watering of stock. There are many other things such as mothers' allowance, old age pensions and the like. I would just like to say this, too, that security of tenure for the farmers of Saskatchewan was first brought in here and enacted by the Patterson government in 1943, under the terms of The Lands Contract Actions Act. Now, I say these things were done before the time of this government, and I think that the Liberal party has a right to be proud of them. We have no intention of resting on past achievements. If we sat down and said we have done this and that and the other thing, we'll lay off now, we would be just like the duck that always flew backwards instead of forward because he was more interested in where he came from than where he was going.

Premier Douglas: — This duck has sunk.

Mr. Horsman: — That does not apply to us.

Mr. Speaker, the danger I see in the government going into business is not the money they lose, so much, but suppose it became more extensive and they branched out in this, that and the other, and they had thousands of men on the government payroll as they would have, naturally those men could not get out at election time and quarrel with their bread and butter. One cannot do that. They might not all vote for the government, but they could not take an active part against the government because they would be right on the spot — they would lose their job the next day just the same as if they were working for a private employer. If you work for a private employer, you cannot go out and advise the people to put this man out of business, you just cannot do it

March 8, 1949

and hold your job, and that is where I see the danger of this thing. I would like to say this, too: the reason I, myself, and other men like me could get out in the election of last June and oppose this government, and criticize their policies, we could advise the people to vote them out of office, was because we made our living from resources over which this government has no direct control. That is what I think.

I would also like to mention that there are people in this country, and every country for that matter, who would gamble with the nations' solvency and destiny in order to gain political advantage.

I listened to the Minister of Agriculture some time ago, speaking in this Legislature, and he spoke about the fodder policy of the government, how they have people putting up feed bands, and so on. Well, there may be something in that but, in the main, that is not responsible for the fact that we have sufficient feed in the country this year. I come from a part of the country where we grow brome grass extensively. It is not grown for feed, it is grown for seed. In years when feed is scarce, naturally the people save the hay. There are thousands of acres of it grown up there, and that is what relieves the situation in that area. In fact, there is an abundance of feed, and it was not caused by any policy of this government. Farther north, where they grow alfalfa, this same situation applies. They save the hay, but they grow the stuff for seed — that is the main object.

I just want to mention a word about highways. I don't think anybody's address here would be complete without saying something about highways. I live on highway No. 14, west of Saskatoon. It is a main highway right through the province. A good number of years ago they started in to black-top that highway. They had not progressed very far when this government came into office, and we thought, of course, that the black-top would extend right on, and in not too far distant time we would have a hard-surface road through there. But, for some reason, after this government came into office, this hard-surface road took a sudden turn to the south and headed for Rosetown, and here we were sitting there. It was rather disappointing. I think, too, with all defence to the members of the government, I don't think there is a fair distribution of the spoils, if I might use that term, as far as highway construction is concerned. Take my own constituency: since this government came into office they have rebuilt a few miles of highway, and done some gravelling. We have not had one mile of reconstruction. I don't think that is fair, especially when two constituencies here, Rosetown, from April 1, 1947 to January 1, 1948, had \$263,985.63 spent on highways; over the same period, in the Weyburn constituency, there was \$537,181.81 spent. That makes a total of \$801,167.47 spent in two constituencies. As I say, I don't think it is a fair distribution of the money.

Mr. Tucker: — Who represents those two constituencies? The two Douglasses.

Mr. Horsman: — Well, yes. I just wonder about that too. The thought had struck me that Weyburn is represented by the hon. Premier, and Rosetown is represented by the hon. Minister of Highways, both with the name of Douglas, and I just wondered if the name had anything to do with it. I thought it did have, it might be a good

thing for us fellows to all get out and get someone in our places by the name of Douglas. It is a wonderful old Scottish name, and there may something in a name.

Premier Douglas: — You'll never get it.

Mr. Horsman: — I have heard the expression made "a rose by any other name would smell as sweet".

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have not much more to say.

Premier Douglas: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Horsman: — Hear! Hear! I am glad he appreciates the remarks I have made. You have given me a very good hearing.

Mr. Egnatoff: — But they can't take it.

Mr. Horsman: — Oh, I think they do. I hope, anyway, that from the goodness of your hearts and son, you will excuse these few halting remarks from a farmer, and of the few reasons I have mentioned, Mr. Speaker, I will naturally oppose the motion.

Mr. A. W. Loehr (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, I, too, am a farmer and you will also have to bear with me when you have to listen to some halting remarks. I first of all, want to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, for accepting the high honour that has been bestowed upon you, and I want to congratulate you for the able, efficient and fair manner in which you conduct your office. I even want to say that I appreciate the fact that, during the life of the last Legislature, the poor, gallant 'five musketeers' gave you lots of work and you naturally would and could expect more work to keep proper decorum and support in the House during the present session. If, in the heat of debate, even you are perhaps let to make some unparliamentary remarks, I am sure everybody here will overlook it, and we know that in your hands our affairs are in fair hands and that you will do everything you can to give, especially us new members, lots of latitude when we don't stick close enough to the rules of parliamentary debate in this House.

I also want to congratulate the Premier for having led the majority group into this House after the last election. Particularly do I want to congratulate him because I am convinced that this is the last opportunity that anyone will have to congratulate a C.C.F. leader of a majority group in any House, either in Saskatchewan or in any part of the Dominion of Canada.

Premier Douglas: — That is what you said last June.

An Hon. Member: — You got a big scare anyway.

Mr. Loehr: — There is nothing like being optimistic.

I was rather impressed with certain passages in the speech from the throne. We are speaking on the budget at the present time, but the speech from the throne is, after all, the forerunner and reflector of what to expect from the budget. I was particularly impressed by the first part of the first paragraph in the speech from the throne, which reads as follows:

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Might I remind the hon. member that he cannot rehash any debate that took place in this House on the Speech from the throne.

Mr. Loehr: — All right, I will submit to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but the fact remains that previous to 1944 the C.C.F.'ers went up and down the province and told the people that social services were going to be given free to the people. There is no doubt about that. It cannot be denied because I have heard them make those statements by the score — that we would be provided with social services free. We all know now that that was a bubble, something that those who gave the matter any thought at any time knew could not be. The bubble of the idealism of something for nothing has never come to pass, either here or any place in the world, and never will come to pass. Somebody will have to pay.

I want to say a few words in connection with the hospitalization. This is what let me to remark about the offers of something for nothing. I cannot be accused of being against social services of any description, and especially of health services. I have been reeve of a municipality for a period of seven years, right through the hard times of the hungry thirties, as they are called, and during that period of time I was instrumental in inaugurating a municipal health scheme which was second to none in the province. In fact, I have been told repeatedly by those who know — the then Minister of Health and his Deputy — that up in our district we had one of the best functioning health services that could be inaugurated under a plan anywhere in the province.

We had, in that municipality, no municipal doctor until the year 1932. In that year we engaged a municipal doctor, and included in the ordinary functions of a municipal doctor we included surgery. This plan worked very well. The doctors at that time, of course, were practising their profession for very little pay and, in many cases, no pay. There were good doctors in the Humboldt district who gave us good service at a very low rate — there is no need to mention how little, but we know it was far too little for the services rendered. In accordance with the times, we got very good service for the money we gave to them.

In the year 1933 or 1934, the people of that municipality and the neighbouring municipalities decided that they should inaugurate a plan of free hospitalization. I was appointed on a committee; in fact, I was chairman of a committee to make enquiries from the local hospitals on what basis we could inaugurate such a plan. The result of this was we got a contract from the local hospitals to give people of the municipalities — our municipality in particular — hospitalization. It had its limitations in this regard: the hospitalization per person per year was limited to 15 days; after that either the person or the municipality — in the case of indigents — would have to pay. The hospital authorities, after looking over their files, established the fact that in previous years the hospitalization days taken by the people of that

municipality — by the way there were at that time about 3,300 people in the municipality — was approximately 1,100 days, and, based on the \$2.50 rate, or \$2.75; they agreed to give us hospitalization for the round sum of \$2,500 per year on the basis of the 15 day restriction per person.

I am telling you this as preamble to what I am going to tell you about the hospitalization plan of the province today, which is not, in my opinion, functioning as it should. We found at the end of the year that, instead of the people of that municipality taking the ordinary amount of hospitalization days that they had been taking previously, they took a total of 3,400 and some odd hospitalization days, for the simple reason hospitalization was free. The result was that the hospitals realized 61¼ cents per hospitalization — day given to the people of that municipality. In addition to that, of course, they got 50 cents per day grant from the government.

Of course, the next year the hospitals simply could not agree to carry on under that contract so, again, it was left to me to devise some plan that would still give hospitalization and reduce the number of days the people would take in the form of hospitalization. After a long discussion with people directly connected with it — the hospital authorities — we devised a semi-hospitalization scheme whereby the municipality, instead of paying a round sum for complete hospitalization, paid \$1 per day for hospitalization given to the people, and the hospital collected the balance from the patient concerned. The result of that was — and, by the way, the municipality and the neighbouring municipalities from that year on until the day the provincial hospitalization took effect all had that same plan working, and it functioned 100 percent — from that day we, in that municipality, never paid more than \$1,900 for our hospitalization, which means that immediately, when the hospitalization was not entirely free to the people, they reduced the number of hospitalization days taken from 3,400 to as low as 1,725. That is what I am trying to illustrate. When something is entirely free, the responsibility of the individual remove, then a thing like that is, in my opinion, always abused, and not matter what you try to do to circumvent that, it will be abused by the people.

As far as the provincial hospitalization plan is concerned, I have no fault to find with it. I am entirely for it and for health services, but I am not in agreement with the regulations governing it, which leads to just one thing, and that is that our hospitals are overflowing. I am sure that you all agree there are any number of cases that really require hospitalization and have an awful hard time to find space. The hon. Premier, in his throne speech I believe it was, took credit for the government increasing the hospitalization facilities of the province from 3.2 percent per on thousand persons to 6 point something.

Premier Douglas: — Point nine.

Mr. Loehr: — No matter what the decimal point may be, I am afraid you will have to, in order to provide space for hospitalization for the people of the province under this regulation, increases it to nine to ten before you will have sufficient hospitalization space. In connection with that, there are other factors, not only the entirely free phase of hospitalization, that are inducive to the glutting of hospital space. One is, if you go into a hospital — I don't care

which one — and if you watch who is waling up and down the corridors, during the day, with a kimona on, you will find there are ever so many more aged people in there than there were some years ago. Why?

An Hon. Member: — Because there was no place to care for them.

Mr. Loehr: — I believe — and I know, personally, some cases where it applies — the effect of people who are infirm, not particularly sick but infirm and cannot help themselves, the people who ordinarily should be and are responsible for their care simply put them in hospital, and that is where they stay. Another feature is that by your hospitalization regulations you have thrown the responsibility squarely into the laps of the doctors to say, not who should go in, but who should not go into the hospitals. Let me tell you what I mean by that. There are the services to ‘in’ and ‘out’ patients. You know what I mean, of course, or I think you do. If you require x-rays, lab. tests, or if you have slashed yourself or broken a finger requiring you to go into the hospital for maybe an hour or two, your are not an ‘in’ patient. When you go in for a lab. test or a dressing or an x-ray or for a few stitches where you have slashed yourself, you have to pay the hospital. When this hospitalization plan first came into effect, a lot of the people did not know that but they found it out when they ran up against a case where they had to pay for hospitalization. Yet they knew that the people who were in the hospital were getting those services free. The result is that when a patient goes to a doctor and the doctor wants to take him to a hospital to get an x-ray taken, or a lab. test, or something like that, he wants to know what he has to pay for it. If he has to pay for it, he is reluctant to go there, and the result of it is, if the doctor refuses to put him there, the patient the next time is going to go to some other doctor who will take him into the hospital. Under that regulation, doctors — not because they want to, but because they have been put into that position — to get these services free that the ‘in’ patients get free are making provisions to get their patients into hospitals for everything and anything. That, also, is a factor in glutting up the hospitals.

This hospitalization plan is costing, in my opinion, far too much money. The estimate for the year ending in the 1949 period is, I believe, over \$9 million. In the year ending 1948 it was \$8,850,000. The population of the province is 860,000, which means that this hospitalization plan is costing the people of the province the sum of \$10.25 for every man, woman and child in the province and I believe that is entirely too much. While we say, during these buoyant financial times, be able to stand that, the time is not far off, even if only normal times come back, when the people of this province cannot pay that amount of money. I would say that had the government, instead of taking in some economic planners costing some \$30,000 a year to help formulate the hospitalization plan, taken any four or five experienced men in the municipalities, who had actual experience over a long period of years, and asked those four or five men for a few dollars to come in and help draw up a plan, you would have had a plan that would be functioning today far better than your present plan. So much for hospitalization.

There is a plan whereby the government is helping the municipalities insofar as municipal doctor schemes are concerned. In our municipality we still have the municipal doctors, they pay the sum of \$12,000 for surgery and health services of all descriptions with the exception of specialist work. Under this scheme, having such a contract, the government was to reimburse the municipality to the extent of \$1,350 — I believe it was — at the end of the year if they could show that they had given the people of the municipality that service. However, in the fiscal year of 1947 — I don't know what has happened since — the municipality found that they were disqualified from getting that grant, and the reasons given by the Department of Health was that under this contract the municipality had with the doctors, office consultations were eliminated, or at least to the effect that the patient had to pay \$1 and the municipality had to pay the rest. As a result, they said, that was not a health scheme of which the government approved. Their health scheme was more of a preventative nature than a curative nature, and by putting that restriction of \$1 on office calls, the municipality restricted the people and induced them to refrain from consulting doctors. To qualify that statement further, they were told that in order to give real preventative service, every man, woman and child should consult a doctor at least three times a year. If a municipality with a population of 3,300 people would consult a doctor three times a year, it would mean that a doctor would have to serve them for office consultations 9,900 times, and how many doctors would that take? That is utterly ridiculous. It could not be done. And, in other words, if the people would do that, it would mean that the municipality would have to spend \$9,900 more to qualify to receive a grant of \$1,350. The thing is utterly ridiculous.

There is the matter of Crown Corporations. How different is the attitude so far as Crown Corporations are concerned as it affects unemployment. Previous to 1944, before the C.C.F. were elected in this province, they were going up and down the country saying that if elected the socialistic implementation would eliminate unemployment. People would be able to find employment in businesses and factories that would be established. After they were elected in 1944, of course, they started some of these Crown Corporations. You know what happened. Of all the Crown Corporations, those that are still going today and on anywhere near a paying basis are those that were established, some of them at least, previous to the C.C.F. taking over, and were being run by departments under a commission, and now have been turned into Crown Corporations. There is a Power Commission and the Telephone Corporation, those are still functioning and at least making a little money. There is a transportation company which is a Crown Corporation; that made the stupendous amount of \$14.41 profit for the last fiscal year. That is something I cannot understand — and that before paying interest, taxes and setting aside the funds to offset the wear and tear on the property, the sinking fund I you like. Nearly all the other Crown Corporations are a flop. The woollen mill is closed . . .

Premier Douglas: — May I correct the hon. gentleman's statement? The woollen mill is not closed.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — He is trying to pull the wool over your eyes.

Mr. Loehr: — What I want to say in connection with unemployment is that it is very peculiar that the government, through the Crown Corporations, are the first to submit and recognize the old much-lamented cry of supply and demand. Just as soon as there was no more demand they closed their mills and factories, and the employees were let out. There is no other business closed but the Crown Corporations that I know of. The box factory, for instance; it is very questionable whether that can be kept in operation insofar as financing is concerned.

It is very peculiar, because the very man who started the box factory during the period when business was lame in this province during the thirties built up a flourishing business, and immediately after the government took the box factory over they, for instance, raised the price of the slabs that were used for firewood in the city of Prince Albert 100 percent or more, and yet, within a very short time, the employees of that box factory were told that, unless they could show different figures on the right side of the ledger, they would have to close the doors of the box factory. I don't know just why that should be. This business was conducted on a paying basis by the man who had built up the business, and immediately the government took over, it ran into difficulties.

The bus line is another thing. They inaugurated the bus lines, and compared with the hungry thirties, these bus lines are carrying a lot of people. In the thirties you could see the Greyhound Bus Lines, or any of them, running up and down the country empty, and yet they kept things going. Whether they were operating those at a stupendous loss, we don't know, but anyhow they kept on running. The government took over several private bus lines, including one out of St. Walburg operated by a man named Gleason. This man started the bus line system up in that country on a shoestring, and in the course of about ten years built it up into a very fine serviceable bus network in that part of the country. That is why it was appropriated by the Saskatchewan government, and turned into a Crown Corporation. That, together with the choice runs they are operating in the province, leads me to believe there must be something wrong or they should be making more than \$14.41 in a year. If they are not, and things come back to normal, they will, I am sure, have to abandon the bus lines.

The hon. Premier called these secondary businesses, these Crown Corporations, 'problem children'. I don't know whether that is just the right description for them. Here, with your permission, I will recall a joke, one of these stock-in-trade jokes the hon. Premier used in the election campaign, and not doubt some more of the members across the floor of the House have used the same one. This is in connection with the time the hon. Premier went to a house and the lady of the house was very glad to see him. She immediately picked up a pair of twins she had in the cradle and brought them over to him, and told him to hold them, and he, of course, very kindly took the babies in his arms and admired them and congratulated the mother on the nice twins she had, and profusely praised the twins. While he was holding the twins, the mother said: "One of the twins is a C.C.F.'er. I wonder if you can tell me which one it is?" Well, he looked at the twins and handed them back and did not say anything. The lady said: "Can you tell which one it is?" "Oh, he said, this one." "How do you know?" "Well, he said, that is the one that has done something." These Crown Corporations are doing something, and the people are paying for it. They are not 'problem children', the government should have known what they were going into before they undertook those.

Then there is agriculture. I wonder whether this government actually thinks that the people of the province, the farmers of the province, have benefited by the actions of the government during the last four years. I have not seen one thing that has been improved so far as this government is concerned and so far as the farmers of the province are concerned. I don't know of one thing. The only thing I can think of is that, instead of the 21 Agricultural Representatives employed by the previous government, there are now nearly double that number, and the cost is trebled, I think, or somewhere in that neighbourhood; I might say that in spite of the fact that now there are double the number of Agricultural Representatives, and while I was one of the regular representatives prior to 1944 and had a certain territory through Moose Jaw north to the lake and the river, I even now get letters from people in that area who still think I am the Agricultural Representative. I represented that area for two years, while it has been represented by somebody else for four years since.

Another thing that has been done by this government is that the service of the Livestock Commissioner's office has been withdrawn from the Purebred Livestock Association of the province. At least they have been notified to the effect that the service of the Livestock Commissioner's office will no longer be available to them. I don't see where that is going to be of any service to the agricultural element of the province. The Purebred Livestock Association of this province has done a wonderful job, and any government that will refuse to give its services to that body of people is certainly not doing the agricultural element any good. It means this association will have to set up an office and a staff which will cost so much that the association will almost be forced out of business. What is going to be done about it, I don't know, but that is what is happening at the present time.

As far as 'socializing' agriculture is concerned, I wonder if this C.C.F. government of Saskatchewan has any idea that they have now convinced the farmers of Saskatchewan that, if they will get into office in this country, the farmers of Canada and Saskatchewan will be immune from socialization. I don't think they have. I think that when this government thinks about the implements that have been fashioned, which would be at their disposal for the socialization of land if they could get into Ottawa, their tongues must be watering and they must be licking their chops, because all they would have to do, if the C.C.F. government got into power at Ottawa, would be to use the Wheat Board and other similar boards to handle livestock or any other produce that comes off the farm, and do what the socialist governments are doing in New Zealand and Australia: that is, pay the farmer so much and retain the rest for the treasury of the country. They cannot do it in Saskatchewan, of course; but were they in office in Ottawa, the instruments set up for the benefit of the farmer would become the very instruments that would automatically be in the hands of the socialist government to socialize the farming element of the country.

Premier Douglas: — That is what you peddle around the country, eh?

Mr. Loehr: — I would say that, so far as agriculture is concerned in this province, the only assistance this government has given to the farmers is the fact that this government has asked Ottawa for this and the other thing right along, and are continuing to do so. As far as the government of Saskatchewan is concerned, so far at least, it has not given agriculture any assistance in any way, shape or form.

Now, unit schools. I am not going to say very much about the Larger School Unit system, but I want to say that the Larger School Unit, so far as elementary education is concerned, and certainly not so far as secondary education is concerned, has not improved the education system of this province one iota. Not one iota. It has not brought secondary education into the rural areas, and so far, by its functioning, I do not see any hope that it ever will. When they had, for instance, organizations meetings in all the large units in my own little town, there was a speaker from the Department of Education and the school inspector from Humboldt was there. I was there and stayed at the back of the hall as I did not want to be drawn into any discussion, but the school inspector who knows me very well spotted me in the back and asked me to voice my opinion regarding the establishment of a Larger School Unit. I got up and told them, that so far as I was concerned I was convinced that the establishment of the larger School Unit would have one result, and that would be to remove all local interest from the little red schoolhouse which was the community service for all communities all over the country. It would remove control from the hands of the parents as regards the children. But, I said, apart from that, if the inauguration of the Larger School Unit brings secondary education into the country schools, I would not object to it even if it would cost more. As far as costing more is concerned, I told them that, in my opinion, it would cost more. That has been borne out, not to the extent I had in mind which was a few dollars more, but it is costing double what it was costing before, with not added benefits for it. I can tell you this; so far as many Larger School Units are concerned, if they had a vote today it would be thrown out at once.

Automobile insurance: I had a few words on the Bill when it was up the other day. I want to enlarge just a little bit on that. I want to reiterate the fact that his government, through the Automobile Insurance Office, is evading its responsibilities when it uses the methods that it does employ, in some instances at least, to meet its obligations insofar as insurance is concerned. I started to tell you about a case in Humboldt where an adjuster intimidated with the threat of laying a criminal charge against a member of the man's family, intimidated the owner of the car to the extent that he finally signed a release for half the amount of the value of the car when the car was totally destroyed. In addition, I know of a case where a man allowed his hired man, who had been working for him for years and had been driving the car repeatedly, to take his car to an evening's entertainment away from home. While the hired man was away from home he took his girl friend out for a drive. Apparently his girl friend took hold of the wheel and drove the car. The car was totally wrecked and when finally the owner of the car made a claim for the wrecked car, it was discovered that this girl drove the car and this girl had no driver's licence. She had been driving cars before but she had no driver's licence for that year. The result of it was the Crown Corporation refused to pay that man one cent for a new car.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — What would a private company have done?

An Hon. Member: — Humanity first.

Mr. Loehr: — What would a private company have done?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Yes.

Mr. Loehr: — Well, I don't know what they would have done. I never heard of them refusing anything.

Premier Douglas: — Oh, come now. We are not in kindergarten.

Mr. Tucker: — The hon. Premier seems to be an expert on kindergarten.

Premier Douglas: — I have so many pupils opposite.

An Hon. Member: — I would not say that we think that.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Loehr: — I would say, if this government is so anxious to institute a real cheap insurance plan, all they would have to do, if they believe in compulsory insurance and if they want to be friendly to community affairs handled by the people, is to seal the Saskatchewan Mutual Insurance Company or the Wawanesa who are insurance companies who have been operating in this country at cost for years to the farmers and the people of the province. All they would have to do is say, or put through an Act whereby, before you could buy a licence, you have to produce a five-point policy. And you would find that these insurance companies instead of having to insure cars that made 25,000 miles a year or more and card that are driven in the city constantly, subject to being destroyed, if they would find policies on 150,000 cars in the province that are not going to be damaged in a year, they would give the people of this province far cheaper insurance than this government. They would be very pleased to do that I am sure. What is more, I am sure that those people would not have a strike on their hands when they started offices either, because they would pay adequate wages.

Premier Douglas: — The same as they did in the hospitals.

Mr. Loehr: — I have rambled quite a bit. I have the honour to represent Humboldt. Humboldt is situated as an appendix to the great garden of the west, the Carrot River valley which lies to the north. It is peopled by hard-working, agricultural people gathered from all parts of the United States, eastern Canada, the British Isles and continental Europe. We have a cosmopolitan population, all of whom are really true Canadians. The farming in Humboldt constituency consists of ideal farming that is the backbone of Saskatchewan and the Dominion of Canada. There we have a size of farm which is about 2½ quarter sections per farm, and we have less than one-half of one percent of holding farmers. Listening to a number of speakers on the opposite side of the House discussing the election, I came to the conclusion that I must be the one who stands alone. I represent the constituency where there were two-thirds anti-socialist votes, and I represent one of the two-thirds. The total vote there was 7,861 and 5,204 were anti-socialist votes, and the remainder were C.C.F. votes. When I hear charges made by the C.C.F. of collusion between the Liberals and the Social Crediters, I don't know just what to think about that. I cannot help but wonder at the reasoning in their mathematics so far as Humboldt is concerned at least. In that Humboldt constituency, an almost superhuman effort was made to split the anti-socialist vote, and they very nearly succeeded. Now, when it come collusion and charges of collusion, it seems to me if

March 8, 1949

there was any collusion it must have been with the Social Credit and the C.C.F., not between me and the Social Credit; that is a cinch. So far as the C.C.F. were concerned in the Humboldt constituency — and I think I know whereof I speak because I have good friends amongst them — the election, so far as I was concerned had been conceded to me many months before the election. They told me so, and they were convinced that that was a fact. It was not until the Social Credit appeared on the scene and started to make inroads, and tried to convince the people that Social Credit was going to seep the province, and that the only way they, the people, could be sure to get the C.C.F. out was to vote Social Credit that the C.C.F. started to take notice. Just about a month before the election a veteran C.C.F. organizer appeared on the scene. This party is in the civil service.

An Hon. Member: — Oh, no.

Mr. Loehr: — The people of the province paid this C.C.F. organizer somewhere around \$200 to \$250 — I can check up on the days he was there — to organize for the C.C.F. He is some organizer. He was well known in that district. He has lived there for years and his activity during the last Liberals years he was there was solely to organize for the C.C.F. I can assure you that, in the last three or four weeks of the campaign, there was a beehive of activity started by C.C.F. organization, with this man at the head of it. The house-to-house canvass was carried on. I am sure the muddy roads, which were referred to on the other side of the House yesterday, did not stop the C.C.F.'ers going to Wolseley on election day. It never did before. As far as the C.C.F. going to the poll is concerned, I can tell you that in the federal election in 1945, when a real storm struck over the constituency of Humboldt at about half past one at noon, at poll after poll not a single voter came out after the rain, but every C.C.F. voter came out that there was. In one poll over 80 C.C.F. voted, and not one single Liberal voted. I don't think any C.C.F. vote was every stopped by muddy roads.

Premier Douglas: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Loehr: — More power to them, of course.

An Hon. Member: — They expect jobs.

Mr. Loehr: — Both the hon. member for Canora (Mr. Kuziak) and the hon. Premier make fun of what they call attempts on the part of the Liberals and the other political parties who are anti-socialists to scare and intimidate voters into believing that there would be no more elections if the C.C.F. party were elected. Mr. Speaker, I, myself, never heard a Liberals or any other anti-socialist candidate or speaker make that assertion in connection with a provincial election. I have heard it made — and I have made it myself — in the federal campaign. I made the suggestion, and I make it now. It is my belief, my sincere belief, that if the C.C.F. socialist government were elected in the Dominion, where they have control of the British North America Act, which they have told us repeatedly when they get in there they are going to wreck, we will have not further elections, not for a number of years. There is no need of being amused over this because it is happening in other countries and what has happened in other countries will happen here.

Premier Douglas: — Oh nonsense.

Mr. Loehr: — That comes to pass.

Premier Douglas: — That is just used to frighten children.

Mr. Loehr: — There is no doubt about that. It naturally follows that once a socialist government is in at Ottawa there will be no further election. That is what has happened in other countries, and that is what will happen here. There is no doubt about that. I am quoting from a pamphlet that I had personally prepared in the 1945 federal election in the Humboldt constituency.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Did anybody lay a charge of libel against you for it? They should have.

Mr. Loehr: — I said in that pamphlet that we cannot give socialism, with its inevitable dictatorship a trial and then remove it with the stroke of a pencil on a ballot if we don't like it. The socialists themselves are agreed that their plans can only be made to work if the changes are permanent, which means the socialists will have to be permanently in power, which means that opposition cannot be tolerated by word or by ballot. Opposition has been classed as reason by every totalitarian state for the simple reason that a state could not be totalitarian on any other basis. There is no use laughing about it, because it has happened in other places and it would happen here. The first vote we would ever get would be after the country is so socialized that there is no reverting back to any other method.

Premier Douglas: — That is what you said in 1944, and you got one in 1948.

Mr. Loehr: — This government has built up a gigantic stagnation structure, and the climax has still not been reached. We can see that it is still in the ascendancy, and where it will end, if conditions in the country remain buoyant as they are now, is hard to ascertain. We have been talked about as 'do-nothing' Liberals.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. Loehr: — Well, perhaps Liberals in the past have moved just a little bit slowly, but the results have proved that the move was in the right direction.

Premier Douglas: — Consistently back.

Mr. Loehr: — How it is a 'do-something' socialistic age. These socialist experiments are dying off, one by one, and every time one of them drops into an ashcan, so much of the people's revenue goes with it.

I cannot support a budget of this nature. I consider this government must come around and realize there is a limit, and I think it is up to us to see that the government realizes there is a limit. I will not support the motion.

Mr. L. W. Larsen (Shellbrook): — Mr. Speaker, I am glad to chip in a few words on this budget. I am proud of it myself. I think it is a good budget. We have had budgets for years and years. When I go home my wife says she wants more money to balance her budget. But the criticism the opposition has given us simply does not hold water. The main issue they know just as well as I do, which I will come to later. However, to go into a few little details: on Saturday last the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix had some very good comments on the budget, that I am 100 percent in agreement with. Their criticism was that we did not spend enough money in the north, and I am 100 percent in favour of spending more up there. I am sorry to say, a lot of the members down here don't understand the conditions up north. In some ways we are keeping them at the present time but perhaps they will keep us in the future — you never know. So I can agree with the Star Phoenix in those comments.

In other ways the budget looks pretty fair to me. I have heard several criticisms from the speakers but they don't amount to a row of beans. They look at it just as if everything was a loss. They say the Crown Corporations were just loss after loss. Well, I don't know; if these Crown Corporations show a profit of \$3,150,000, which is 8 percent profit on the capital, I don't think it is too bad. Besides, I never saw the Liberals bring in a surplus of \$3 million.

They mention the bus lines. I do know they did a business somewhere close to \$1 million, and I think it went around \$14,000 in the hole. Well after I went up to your City Hall here a week ago last Sunday I did not feel so badly about it. The speaker — I forget his name — spoke on Capitalism, Socialism and Christianity. I think he preferred Christianity, and I had no disagreement with him there either. But, making a few comparisons, he said that when the beautiful street cars and buses burned up in that terrible fire most of the people in Regina felt badly about it; but that street railway was not built for profit. It was built to give the ratepayers of the city a service. There were several years when the street railways in the cities went in the hole, but I never heard any political speeches that they should throw them in the ashcan and discontinue them. Conditions always come back. The street railways are still running. Now, what is the difference? A railway system like the city of Regina has is here to serve the 60,000 people — as a rule I know private enterprise always prefers to take the lines over where the population is dense — and this government trying to give that service to the people who live mile an miles apart; I don't think the bus service was made for any profit they expected from it. They have given a valuable service to these people I don't think we should be too critical. They did go \$14,000 in the hole on a turnover of practically \$1 million, but that might even happen to your street railway in the city of Regina here. It is a service that the people demand, and I think it is good service and they should be entitled to it whenever feasible. I cannot see any criticism there.

I would like to quote a couple of lines from The Leader-Post. According to the critics on the other side, it is the spending of the provincial government that is putting us in a bad financial position, and that we are spending all the money. Prior to the war, the federal government, according to the Leader-Post today, collected 51 percent, roughly speaking, and the provincial government collected 18.8 percent. Now, that is quite a difference, 51 percent

to 18.8 percent. Today, what do we find? The provincial percentage of taxes has come down from 18.8 to 12.5 and the percentage of taxes collected by the federal government has gone up from 51.2 to 76.7. So that shows where the money goes.

There are budgets and budgets, but I say here that the most important budget ever brought in Saskatchewan is always made in Ottawa. There is no question about it. It is Ottawa policies which either makes or breaks us, not the government of Saskatchewan. Because their power is practically unlimited they can put you in the Fritz for a while, and you cannot exist; but, nevertheless, that is where it is made. I do not need to mention the terrible conditions in the lean thirties, which lasted ten years, but neither the federal nor provincial governments had a solution. The only thing that came to the rescue was that horrible war. Is it any wonder, after the suffering of the lean thirties, that such movements as our Grain Growers started and grew, or such movements as the Wheat Pool started, or for that matter, the United Farmers also? Is it any wonder that on such a budget which created these conditions, unemployment grew by leaps and bounds? You know what happened here in Regina, when the authorities of the day pulled these fellows off the trains by force, when they just wanted something to eat. It is no wonder again that our Ottawa budget becomes the most important. Of course, when the war broke out, the capitalistic budgets produced dollars into circulation overnight, just as if by magic. The troubles, for the time being, financially were pretty well rectified, and, again, that refers back to the fact that the most important budget we have in Saskatchewan is still in Ottawa. After that the farmers of Saskatchewan decided to make their own budget, and I am glad to say that these movements I mentioned before grew and grew, and there is no question in my mind, and I am sure there is no question on the opposition side either, that that is the reason we have a C.C.F. government today. These movements were started 20 or 30 years ago to try and make a budget of their own.

We come now to 1942, and I chipped in my two-bits to send down that delegation of 400 to Ottawa because, at that time, even after four years of war, we could not make an existence on the farm. The prices the farmers received were frozen and the other prices were allowed to go up to a large extent. I was glad that the Leader of the Opposition, at that time, spoke so kindly about them when they landed in Ottawa, and told them it was a crime that they should raise that wheat for 70 cents a bushel f.o.b. Fort William, and that it should be immediately raised to \$1.25. I don't need to go into any details; we know that he voted for considerably less when the vote was taken in the House down there.

The Liberals speak so much about free enterprise. It is a fact that they did not believe in free enterprise as far as the labourer and the farmer was concerned during the war, because the labour man's wages were frozen — oh, he got a pitiful little bit of cost of living bonus, but it was of no account as the cost of living had gone up so far and they were finding it hard to balance their budget in those days also. The farmers — why, they were not even in it. The price the farmer got on the 24 cent freight rate in Saskatchewan for No. 3 wheat, which is a good average grade, was 46½ cents, for four years of war, 1939, 1940, 1941 and 1942, and it is no wonder that delegation went down to see if they could not do something about it. We know what happened. It got raised to 20 cents, after all the arguments. What I would like to point out is just what that meant to a little farmer.

March 8, 1949

Let us take a small farmer, for instance with a 3,000 bushel grain production, ten head of cattle per year, and 50 hogs. That is not a very large farm, according to the farms we are used to now. There is no question in my mind that under free enterprise, at least, he was fleeced of \$1 a bushel, but let us be conservative and say 50 cents. Well now, on 3,000 bushels that is \$1,500. Then, if he sold his cattle — there always was a market for his surplus down across the border, which was immediately cut off by our Liberals in Ottawa. I know he was out sometimes \$200 on a steer. I am certain of it because we only need to go back to a year ago last fall, when a good many of our steers were quoted from 30 to 40 cents a pound. But we will say \$50 per head, for I don't want to get into any argument, and that would show an amount of \$500. We do know a lot of farmers raised a considerable number of hogs, so let us just take a small farm again, with 50 hogs. Again, I would say that live sows in the States brought more than our dressed bacon in our market. We know the loss would be \$20 according to the war market under free enterprise, but let us say \$10. Well, that is another \$500. That is not very much, but multiply that by nine years, and that little farm would be out \$22,500, and I have quoted very small figures.

It is no wonder that such a movement as the C.C.F. has grown up, because during the times on which these figures were quoted it was under the Liberal policies in Ottawa. What did surprise me is that we did not have a movement, such as we have today in Saskatchewan, long ago. I know if this farmer had that \$22,500, he could have built a little house, could have got some new machinery and improved things. Instead of that, a lot of these little farms are the same as they were 20 years ago, practically. And that was under the idea of believing in free enterprise for some, but not for others.

Our budget is made on a dollar and cent basis in Ottawa, and I think we should get together on both sides of this House, because if Saskatchewan does not speak up against some of these conditions, who is going to do it? We cannot expect the governments or the people of the other provinces to do so. It amazed me a couple of years ago, when I was out on Vancouver Island, I bought wheat out there, in the spring of 1947, for 90 cents a bushel, and I think I had already received around \$1.30. Now, if I get the next payment — and I still have my certificates — I have an idea that that wheat we were buying for 90 cents will bring me \$1.60, roughly speaking. Now, that was my money. I helped to pay for that. Besides, they had a better price for the hogs out there, and I maintain that the Ottawa government deliberately put a political fence around British Columbia, the Maritimes, Quebec and Ontario, with the farmer's money from Saskatchewan. I cannot see it any other way because under the free freight assistance and 25 cents a bushel off, that is exactly what they paid. I saw the bills out there from the pig raisers. I saw what they got, which was considerably more than here; and they were buying all their grain, roughly speaking, for \$30 a ton. You can figure that out, and 90 cents a bushel would not be far wrong. You can phone up any grain company, or the Pool, and you will see that it is wheat which I will receive \$1.50 for. When I feed hogs, I have to feed them \$1.50 grain, and these other provinces are feeding 90 cent grain, at my expense. That is why I say our budget is made in Ottawa as far as the economy of this province is concerned.

I think our speakers, particularly on the other side, have gone around like a cat around hot porridge, and left the important question alone. I do

know that it is federal policy that either makes or breaks us on the farm. I do not know what the opposition will go to the country on next time when there is an election if this Red scare disappears. I don't think we will need any desks over there at all.

As far as this budget is concerned, I think it is 100 percent, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to support it.

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — I would like to rise at this time and make a few comments on my observations.

I would like to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer on the budget he had brought down. We hear all the time that the budgets are getting bigger and better, and we hear that they are spending far too much money, so I would like to deal with these topics further as I go along. I do believe that the budget is one any Provincial Treasurer can be proud of. There has been no increase in taxes and yet the Provincial Treasurer has been able to see ways and means of increasing services along certain lines in the province for the next fiscal year. If any former government of this province could have had a Provincial Treasurer who could have brought them down a budget as good as the one our Provincial Treasurer is bringing down now, they would have thought they were well off, and I believe they would have been a lot better off than they were. We can go over the back budgets and we do not find anywhere near as good a planning, and they do not show half the capability our Provincial Treasurer shows in preparing his budget. I think there is lots of praise coming to the Provincial Treasurer.

I would just like to say a word or two about the Wadena constituency which I have the honour to represent. Wadena constituency is well known throughout Saskatchewan as one of the vanguard constituencies of the reform movement. The people of the Wadena constituency are not satisfied to just sit back under a laissez-faire attitude, they are always ready to go ahead. The Wadena has not had a Liberal representing that constituency in the provincial House since 1920 or 1921. The election at that time put in a Progressive and the Liberals have fought vainly ever since to try and get a hold in that constituency. In the 1944 election they did not even dare put up a candidate. In the by-election of 1945 they did run a candidate, but they did in some localities give their help and blessing to the Communist who was my only opponent by that time. In 1948 they would not have dared run a candidate if they could not have got the Conservative backing so they could all go together, and then, at the same time, I had the Social Credit for an opponent. The Social Crediter got pretty near the same vote in the last election that the Communist got in the by-election. So we have not much illusion as to where the communist vote is being thrown, by and large.

The member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Culliton) was in my constituency and held a meeting at two or three different points, and I would like him to tell the House, sometime when he is speaking, of his impression of the school at St. Front. St. Front is a large French settlement. It is the largest French settlement in my constituency by quite a bit. In St. Front they have there now a three-room school. They have a workshop in the basement. The work on the school is not yet complete but they are fixing up more facilities in the basement for the workshop. The children of St. Front and district used to attend

school that was really only big enough to hold about 20 pupils at the most, and there were 64 pupils crowded into that school. The plaster was falling off the ceiling down their necks while they were doing their work. The Sisters who taught the school complained that the children had to wear their overcoats and therefore, could not do their work efficiently. That school was a disgrace to any government which was ever in this province, and nothing was done about it. Today St. Front has one of the better schools in this province, and St. Front is in the Wadena Larger School Unit. I have no illusions that had the Wadena unit taken a vote before that Unit came into being, St. Front, pretty near to the last man, would have voted against it, because, Mr. Speaker, they did not have the facts before them of the advantages; but St. Front today has one of the best schools in that unit. They realize now the advantages of the unit. On top of that, St. Front school taxes used to be as high as 35 mills, when they sat in the old school with their overcoats on. They are not paying half of that tax today, and they have a good school. We have heard the criticism of that some other school has to help them pay for it when they are in the unit. That is correct, but St. Front has their school and they are using it. They will help to pay for other schools when other schools are being built. In that way, they have greater strength by more people working together to help to bring better education to the children. I heard the member for Humboldt (Mr. Loehr) saying that the Larger School Unit has not brought any benefit to the people of the rural areas. Well, I don't think he has travelled to the rural areas much because I have travelled in parts of his constituency of Humboldt — his seat happens to be right alongside mine — and I have heard what the people in there have said. Right in the town of Watson the children in that school are getting 50 cents a day for attending school if they have to go over four miles to school. You cannot tell those parents that the Larger School Unit has not benefited them.

At this time, too, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition for being in the House here. He has been the Leader of the Liberal party in this province for over two years, but to a lot of us he was something like a museum piece, something we had often heard about or from, but never saw, so it is a change to see him in here. Some of my neighbours went to the convention in Saskatoon at the time he was elected as their leader. They came back very disappointed, and I said: "what is the matter?" It was your convention and you were there." "Oh, yes, they said, but it was cut and dried ahead of time. The man we have chosen now is not half the man the former leader was." And they were quite sore about it. "Well, I said, maybe Mr. Patterson wants to retire." They said: "that might be so, but if Mr. Patterson wants to retire as the leader, we had another man there who would have made a far better leader than the man we have now." "Oh, I said, who was that?" They said: "The man who used to represent Gravelbourg, Mr. Culliton." I said I did not know either Mr. Culliton or Mr. Tucker. They said there was no comparison between the two. Now, that was not my statement, that was the statement from the Liberals in my own district. I would like to thank the Leader of the Opposition for paying a visit to the town of Wadena a year ago last fall when he held a meeting in that town. You know, Mr. Speaker, I never had a majority — not did any other candidate in the town of Wadena — until this last election, but thanks to the Leader of the Opposition coming there we had a majority in every poll in the town of Wadena. I suppose once they had a chance to see him, they thought they could not better themselves under his promises, and they would sooner go along with the present Premier and help him bring in

security for them. One fellow described it to me and he said: "Well, Mr. Tucker, as a leader is much like the Colonel in an army who lines up his men to go into battle, but instead of being ahead of them he followed at the back of them.: Someone said to him: "Why don't you go ahead when you are leading your army to battle?" he said: "Well, it is this way; when I am at the back I can direct them and see that they all go together. If the battle begins to get tough and we have to retreat, then we need a leader."

We also see in this great united front we have across the aisle of the Liberals, Conservatives and what have you?

An Hon. Member: — Independent.

Mr. Dewhurst: — Yes, and Independent — I am coming to that in a moment.

We see in the Qu'Appelle-Wolseley constituency the great collaboration between Mr. Staines and the present member. It has been said that the member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. Dundas) has put on a good campaign. Well, it looks like he did put on a good campaign in order to take the 'Staines' off Qu'Appelle-Wolseley. Seeing that Qu'Appelle-Wolseley did not want any 'Staines' on their constituency, because after having a member like Warden Burgess for the past four years, they surely did not want any 'Staines' on it, so he went up to Athabaska and

An Hon. Member: — . . . got lost.

Mr. Dewhurst: — He was trying to run there and the former member for Athabaska who had been in this House as a Liberal was ousted without anything to do about it, and there was the 'Staines' on Athabaska. So I guess all is smooth in the Liberal camp. In my opinion, what is going to happen is that we are going to see a steady disintegration of the Liberal party; we are going to see in this country what has happened in the countries across the ocean, the Liberal party is going to become a thing of history only. We have seen in Quebec one of the old traditional seats go to the Conservatives under George Drew. I am not saying for one moment that anybody could be any more reactionary than the Conservative party, but, nevertheless, with the collaboration of the Duplessis the seat elected a follower of George Drew. What will gradually happen, the rightist Liberals will switch over to the Conservatives and the Liberals who have been badly disillusioned all through the years will see fit to give the C.C.F. their support, and we will find in years to come that the Liberals will be not only provincially but nationally a forgotten party like they are in Britain, because we cannot have reaction riding two horses.

I would just like the hon. members across the way to look at the little piece that was in the paper, The Leader Post, a few days ago — I have it in my pocket and can produce it if necessary — where the Minister of Health and Social Welfare in British Columbia was telling he had been a Cabinet Minister since 1933 but he had never been able to do the things he wanted to to help the people. That, Mr. Speaker, was because he was tied to big business. Our old capitalistic decayed system had strings on him and he could not do the things he wanted to, and he advised the coming members in the British Columbia Legislature to stick by their principles and become tied to big business.

Last fall I happened to take part, for a day or two, in the Rosthern by-election. It makes me smile when I hear our friends across the aisle condemning the large budget in Saskatchewan. I happen to have here a whole handful of Liberal literature that was handed around in that campaign. They are always telling about the money that Saskatchewan spends. According to their figures they are spending well over twice as much in one year in the province as what the provincial government is. In 1948 there is a list of eight items on which dominion money was expended in Saskatchewan. Now this was in 1948, according to their literature, and among those eight items there is one for natural resources of \$8 million. Well, every hon. member of this house knows that there was no \$8 million settlement of natural resources in 1948. Another one is provincial debt write-off of \$36.3 million. Well, Mr. Speaker, we are all well aware of the fact that there was no provincial debt write-off in 1948 of \$36.3 million. I just wonder if this will appear on the 1949 or 1950, trying to take credit for the same things. There was no credit whatsoever coming to the federal government for the natural resource settlement or the provincial debt write-off. That was in lieu of agreements signed on taxation agreements. They should give all the facts and not half of them. When I was in the town of Aberdeen one evening, I went down the street and I placed on every telephone poles some of our handbills advertising meetings on behalf of Mr. Makaroff. The next morning — it must have been very windy that night because I tacked the posters on well — there was not one left on there. I think the wind was just as usual, Liberal wind.

Mr. Dundas: — The pole didn't like them and they flew off.

Mr. Dewhurst: — The member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. McCormack) yesterday was speaking in this House and he said he was not concerned with what happened prior to 1944. Evidently his past only goes back four years. Then immediately he began speaking of the Regina Manifesto. Well, that was prior to 1944. Then he talked about his Sunday School days. I wonder if he went to Sunday School since 1944. He was also talking about the young people going to the war; well, that was prior to 1944. He mentioned the sacrifice his parents made in order to give him a decent chance at life and his education and so on. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to belittle any effort of his parents, but I do take objection to the statement when he says he is not concerned with what happened prior to 1944. I am, because I lived prior to 1944; I lived through those years of the thirties, and I know what not only myself but what hundreds of others have to put up with. For any member to say he is not concerned with what happened in the past, I think it shows very poor taste.

We have heard a lot about the freedom being taken away from the people of Saskatchewan; how they are losing their freedom. Sometimes I wonder, when I hear our friends across the aisle talking, whose freedom they are talking about. Lincoln once said there should be government of the people, by the people and for the people, but they seem to believe in government of 94 percent by two percent for the four percent. That totals their 100 percent. We, on this side of the House, believe that the people should have a say in what is the best for the majority of the people, and the majority of the people should share in the benefits of society wherever possible. It is true that within provincial

jurisdiction we do not have the scope to bring as many freedoms to the people as they should have, but we have, in the budget before us, compared with previous years, made a tremendous effort toward helping the sick and the needy in giving them more aid and care. Mr. Speaker, I am not satisfied yet that we have done what should be done for the people of this province. As Churchill said: "Give us the tools and we will finish the job."

Mr. Tucker: — You sure will. You will probably do that next year.

Mr. Dewhurst: — The member for Souris-Estevan was speaking about the miners, and so on, down at Estevan, but I wonder if he was so much perturbed about the freedom of the miners' wives as he was about the mine owners.

We heard the member for Humboldt (Mr. Loehr) say that if the government went into all industries there would be hundreds of men employed and they would not dare protest against their employer because they would be fired and thrown out, and that was their bread and butter. Surely, to any intelligent man or woman, the strike that was at the insurance office last fall, if it did not teach them what it should, it should have taught them one thing, and that was that the employees of any Saskatchewan Crown Corporation were not afraid to meet the government and negotiate with them over their grievances. Those people were not thrown out on their ear and all fired. We have had many instances before when they were, and I would just like to give you one, where a person was fired for political patronage. I asked a question, which was answered today in the House, and the answer will appear in the Journals tomorrow, for the benefit of the rest of the members. I wanted to know who was the Liquor Store vendor in Rosthern on July 19, 1934. I find from the answer that a man by the name of E.F. Hobson was the Liquor Store vendor at that time. I asked if he was a returned soldier, and the answer was yes. I asked then if he was dismissed by the Liquor Board, and the answer was yes. If so, who was appointed in his place, and the answer was a man by the name of G. Ens.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear! One of the finest pioneers this country every had.

Mr. Dewhurst: — I am glad the hon. Leader of the Opposition applauds that because he talks about political patronage, and I think I will show that this was a bit of political patronage. It was a government of which a party is now associated with that was in power at the time the change was made.

Mr. Tucker: — We are proud of George Ens.

Mr. Dewhurst: — I asked if Mr. Ens was a returned soldier. The answer was no. Was he a former Liberal M.L.A., and the answer was yes. Now, pound your desk on that one.

Mr. Tucker: — What is wrong with that. Are you ashamed of being an M.L.A.?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

March 8, 1949

Mr. Dewhurst: — I asked what his age was on the day of his appointment. He was 72 years of age at the time of his appointment. He retired on August 1, 1944 at the age of 81. Now, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Leader of the Opposition is going to talk about party patronage. When he comes in this House and tells us that it was a Liberal government at Ottawa which brought in the old age pensions, when anyone who has read the history of the Parliament of Canada knows how that was brought in by the Liberal government. They would not have done it unless they had to. He told us they brought in the old age pension, but they put a man, who was eligible for the old age pension — which was adequate, according to them — in as Liquor Store vendor at the age of 72. One of the main reasons was that he was an ex-Liberal M.L.A. that is paying off your old debts.

Mr. Tucker: — They would probably give you a job too, if they were in power.

An Hon. Member: — Tim Buck is looking for a job.

Mr. Dewhurst: — Well, Tim Buck may look for a job with us, but he will land up with getting it with the Liberal party.

An Hon. Member: — How about Makaroff?

Mr. Dewhurst: — We have heard a lot about different election promises for so long. I did not hear them in the 1948 election, but in 1944 election it was a common cry to hear our friends across the way running up and down the length and breadth of the province saying: “Oh if you vote for the C.C.F. that terrible bunch of Bolsheviks they will take all your babies away from you and put them in a babies home.” Well, I have not seen any questions on the order paper asking how many babies were taken away. Mr. Speaker, they were just trying to mislead the people on those statements, and, therefore, they put no stock in it themselves.

The Liberal candidate they had in Wadena in the last election, Mr. Halderson . . .

Mr. W.S. Tucker: — Hear! Hear! He had a good war record, too.

Mr. Dewhurst: — He went into the different farm homes, and he would look around and say: “Pretty nice house you have here, eh?” “Oh, not too bad”, the lady of the house would say. “I guess you worked hard for this house?” “Oh, yes, we had to earn our living all the way through in this part of the country.” “You know, he said it would be too bad if you should lose your farm.” “Oh, there is no danger of losing it.” He said: “You will if the C.C.F. get back in again.” This one woman told him in no uncertain terms what she thought of him and that sort of lying.

Mr. Tucker: — Tell us about his war record.

Mr. Dewhurst: — She told him she was not going to support him. It so happens that these people go around there, up and down that constituency, and they do not seem to realize that the people of the Wadena constituency told them 28 years ago that they were through with the Liberals, but they still go back and keep asking for more. They will come back again in 1952 or 1953, as the case may be, and they will get the same answer as they have in the past — that they are not wanted any longer and are wasting their time.

We hear the opposition always talking on the Crown Corporations - how the government has spent so much money in Crown Corporations, and lost so much money. It is quite interesting to note that the Premier made the statement in this House that there was less than five percent of the Crown Corporations, when you figure the dollars invested, that have not made a showing at all. There is only another seven percent that is doing fair to medium. The balance are proving very satisfactory. You see, it just shows how they just want to mention the five percent all the time instead of taking the 88 percent — 88 percent is too large a business for them to look and find any details on it.

We can turn back to what happened to the Power Commission since its inception. The Power Commission was not a success in the first one, two or even three years, Mr. Speaker. The Power Commission — according to the Journal of the 1947 season, an answer shows that the Power Commission was started in 1929. In 1938, after ten years of operation, it had been losing steadily year after year until 1938 when it was over \$326,000 in the red, and it was not until the C.C.F. government came in that it got out of the red and started to make money for the people of this province.

I would like to refer the hon. members across the way to what happened in the Bienfait Briquetting Plant down there some years ago. They are talking about the government losing money, but they have not yet spent half a million dollars in any project, and then sold it for the sum of \$1, which the former governments of this province have done. We don't believe in doing business that way. That is the way they believe in helping people. They spent \$500,000 of their money, provincially here; another quarter of a million federally and a quarter of a million from Manitoba, and let it all go down the drain. One million dollar value was sold for \$1.

We hear also in this House that there has been no grants given to the municipalities to help them out. Now, there are a dozen different examples I could go into in the different ways we have helped them, but I am just going to deal with the grants to the rural municipalities for road purposes. I would just like to give a few figures — I did not choose one of the constituencies belonging to the Douglasses, that we heard about; I took a constituency that has been represented for a number of years and consistently by a Liberal member who still sits in this House. I have the figures on the Arm River constituency from 1940 to 1948 inclusive. I find, in round figures, in the first five years, 1940 to 1945, the amount of grants given to rural municipalities in the Arm River constituency was a little over \$17,000. In the past four years, under a C.C.F. government, it was over \$50,000. So, in five years \$17,000; in four years \$50,000. On the average \$3,500 per year for the entire constituency of

March 8, 1949

Arm River; the last four years, \$12,500 a year grant. And yet we hear the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) rise in his seat and say that the municipalities are not receiving an advantage from this C.C.F. government.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Dewhurst: — If he will take the figures of his own constituency, he will know better than to make those statements.

I had the opportunity last Saturday of visiting the institution at Weyburn. I did not go through it very extensively. I was down there visiting some friends, and I went in into the institution, and the man at the information desk was kind enough to show me part of the institution. We have heard a lot of criticism from the increase of the civil servants in this province. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say here and now that if they do not believe in increasing the civil service to help remedy conditions in those sort of institutions, then there is something wrong with their thinking apparatus. The people who worked in those institutions were on a 12 hour per day shift, working with people who had the misfortune of becoming sick and having to go to those mental hospitals. That is bad enough for those people but to have to have attendants who are tired out on their feet and have to stay there 12 hours a day working with them was asking more than any society has a right to ask of any man or woman employed there as nurses and helpers in those in those institutions. The Premier made the announcement in the House a few days ago that he would arrange for a trip down to Weyburn this coming Saturday for members of both sides of the House to go down there and visit that institution. I hope very member of the opposition goes down to the institution, and I would like them to keep in mind the conditions in those institutions which the young men and women have to work with, as the staff around there, and ask them how they would like to be on a 12-hour shift, which is a thresherman's shift, for all the year round.

Mr. Lopton: — Don't you go down there.

Mr. Dewhurst: — Today they work eight hours a day, six days a week one week, five days a week the next. Therefore, the conditions, they tell me, are far better than they ever had before. I can be sure of the statement, if any government of this province had to try and turn those institutions back to a 12-hour shift, they would have the employees quit en masse. Mr. Speaker, I would not blame them because they are helping the fit ones who are back home, and a lot of those people who are in there may be anybody's husband, anybody's wife, sister, brother or child. Because they have had the misfortune to become injured and sick, should they not have proper care instead of being herded in there like a bunch of cattle? Any member of the province, when he starts criticizing expenditure for health and hospitalization, would do well to visit those institutions first.

Three years ago this coming spring, I had the opportunity to visit the Battleford institution. The same conditions were prevalent there. The eight-hour day was just coming in then for the staff, and they were sure glad of it, because they told me it would help them to be able to get the place cleaned up to a better standard and maintain that efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot that could be said on the record of this government, and what we can look forward to with this budget. A lot has already been said, and a lot more will be said before this debate is over, but I would just like to say that in my estimation any government that looks after the unfortunate people of its land with social services, health, and those sort of things, the people who are least able to help themselves, they are measured in the eyes of society as to whether they are a government fit to keep in office or not. In 1948 the people of this province, despite the numerous misrepresentations that had gone out from time to time over the radio and through the press, returned this government. We are intending to continue to try and help relieve the suffering of the unfortunate citizens among us. If the federal government would come through with their proposals in the Social Security Conference of 1945 . . . it is very funny, Mr. Speaker, every time we mention the federal government the members of the opposition seem to think the federal government is something we should pay taxes to, but we should have no rights to claim benefits from them. When the Leader of the Opposition was a member in the House at Ottawa, why did he not get up on his hind legs and holler for justice for the people of the west? He never did. He just sat down and, consequently, not he hates to stand up. When any member is on his feet talking, he always likes to sit down and talk. If he had been on his feet a little more in Ottawa on behalf of Saskatchewan he would have learned to get on his feet a little better now.

I would like to say in closing that this is a humanitarian budget and any time we can do anything to help the people, by and large, of this province, I am wholeheartedly behind it. I agree there are some departments I would like to see more money available for, and, naturally, it would be quite popular to go around the country saying I am in favour of increased services all along the line, and I am going to fight for the removal of taxation. We cannot have it two ways; we cannot have our cake and eat it too. If we have free services, we have to pay for it. It is not the amount of money we pay that affects us; it is the services we get for the money rendered; and at no time in the history of Saskatchewan has the taxation dollar been as wisely spent as it is now, and has been for the past four years. There are numerous cases which prove it. At no time has there been less political patronage in the province. You can go back to the record, I have in my desk some of the Canada Journals dealing with what happened in the general history of this province back around 1912. Some of the scandals that took place under the Liberal government since the formation of this province. You don't hear a thing mentioned about that. Some of the Liberal members of the House, at that time, were put in jail for fraudulent actions, and yet we hear some members of the opposition now say they are not concerned with what happened prior to 1944. They would like to forget it all right, and they would like the people in the country, the towns, the cities to forget; but you know, Barnum Bailey used to say that you can fool some of the people some of the time but you can't fool all of the people all of the time. For a number of years they fooled the people of this province and they fooled some of them in 1944; they fooled some of them in 1948; but I will wager, Mr. Speaker, that they won't continue to fool them in 1952 or 1953. The people are going to fool them and leave them where they should be.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I heartily support this budget, and I will support any budget, as long as I am a member of this House, which helps to give real security to the people of this province, and I will also support any demand on Ottawa to help get back some of the money they have taken from us in federal taxation.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m.