

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session – Eleventh Legislature

Tuesday, March 22, 1949

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

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

That this Assembly urge upon the Dominion Government the immediate necessity of calling a conference of all Provincial Governments and representatives of the dairy industry with a view to drafting uniform federal legislation and regulations governing the importation, manufacture and sale of margarine, or other butter substitutes, in Canada; and, if necessary, that joint agreement be reached with the provincial governments on any complementary legislation that may be required by the provinces.

Mr. J. Benson (Last Mountain): — Mr. Speaker, I did not understand until about one o'clock that I was to go on the air with this resolution; otherwise I may have prepared my remarks in a slightly different manner. But in order that the radio audience might know what we are talking about I will read the motion as first introduced and the amendment that was suggested by Mr. Danielson. The motion is:

That this Assembly urge upon the Dominion Government the immediate necessity of calling a conference of all Provincial Governments and representatives of the dairy industry with a view to drafting uniform federal legislation and regulations governing the importation, manufacture and sale of margarine, or other butter substitutes, in Canada; and, if necessary, that joint agreement be reached with the provincial governments on any complementary legislation that may be required by the provinces.

The amendment to that resolution is this:

That all the word after the word "that" in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

Until the Privy Council decision is received, in the appeal taken by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, in the opinion of this Assembly, the Government of Saskatchewan, should assume its responsibilities, as determined by the advisory judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada, and prohibit the manufacture, sale and distribution of margarine, or other butter substitutes, within the province, and thus prevent their irreparable dislocation of the dairy industry pending final settlement of the law.

On December 4, 1948, section 5(a) of The Dairy Industries Act was declared ultra vires by the Supreme Court, and I would like to read that section, and I quote:

No person shall manufacture, import into Canada or offer, sell or have in his possession for sale, any oleo-margarine, margarine, butterine or other substitutes for butter manufactured wholly or in part from any fat other than that of milk cream.

The Privy Council has yet to make the final decision on this matter. The amendment to the resolution suggests a method of handling the problem until the final decision is reached, and I believe that this is not an unreasonable request. It only means that we are to have butter for one more year, and I think the people of Saskatchewan will not be put to any hardship if they have to eat our Saskatchewan creamery butter for at least one more year.

Agriculture is our important industry. Without agriculture in Saskatchewan the province could not exist, and I believe that diversified agriculture is our long-term solution to our agricultural products, and dairying is an important branch of our Saskatchewan agriculture. In Saskatchewan in 1948 there was produced 34 million pounds of butter. Saskatchewan consumed in 1948 14 million pounds of butter, which leaves a balance of approximately 20 million pounds for export to other provinces of Canada. Canada produced in 1948 284 million pounds of butter; Canada imported in 1948 from 25 to 30 million pounds of butter. With the manufacture and sale of margarine, the import of butter is bound to cease, and a surplus of butter will naturally follow if present production is maintained. Canada could easily produce its total requirements of butter. In Saskatchewan, production increased during the war years, that is from 1939 to 1944, from 25½ million pounds produced in 1939 to 48½ million pounds produced in 1944. If margarine is allowed to be sold in Saskatchewan uncontrolled and unrestricted, margarine will displace butter from 35 to 50 percent. Such a result would mean disaster for hundreds of small farmers in Saskatchewan, and would wreck our creamery industry. It is estimated that approximately 100,000 farmers market some cream in Saskatchewan. Four million dollars are invested in Saskatchewan creameries; two-thirds of this investment is owned by producer—owned co-ops. In 1948 Saskatchewan's producers received \$27 million for mil and cream; over 70 percent of this was for cream and the balance was for milk.

Dairying requires help; health requires other consumer goods. The creamery butter industry employs 1,500 persons who receive from \$2.5 to \$3 million per year in salaries and wages. Margarine is made from cheap raw products owned and controlled by powerful companies. Butter is made from the products of our own farms, owned and controlled by our own farmers. During the hungry thirties a cream cheque was the only cash hundreds of our farmers received for months at a time. In many cases it was the only means of keeping body and soul together, and today there are still hundreds who could not carry on without the cream cheque. It is a God-send in times of depression, and it is real insurance at all times. What the consumer saves today in buying margarine he may well dearly pay for in the future by the increased price that he will have to pay for milk if our dairy industry is ruined.

The dominion government maintains a floor price for butter of 58 cents per pound and a ceiling price of 69 cents. In 15 days the price of butter dropped ten cents, and in some places it was sold for 11 cents and even 12 cents below the ceiling. That is, from one to two cents below the floor price. The price paid to the producer for cream dropped from 72 to 60 cents, or about 16 percent. Sales of butter in Regina last week dropped 47 percent. Saskatchewan's

production of cream dropped from 30 to 13 percent in January and February. How long will the floor of 58 cents last under the unfair competition of margarine which will result in a large surplus of butter. The stocks on hand at the present time in Saskatchewan would no doubt have to be sold at a great loss which could reach as high as \$150,000 in this province, and two-thirds of that would have to be borne by the producer-owned organizations. What would a 16 percent drop in wages mean to the working man? What would our labour unions do if cheap labour was imported to force down wages? Margarine is a cheap product which is forcing down the income of the farmer. It applied to labour, it would be unfair labour practice and the government would step in. Margarine is unfair labour practice in respect to the farmer, so I would suggest that the government should step in and eliminate this unfair practice or competition which the farmer has to meet.

Insofar as the resolution amendment is concerned, the amendment is a definite proposition. There are two sides to every question, and in this case it is the producer against the consumer. The producer of butter against the producer of butter substitute. Thousands of farmers against a few manufacturers. Butter at a fair price against butter substitute at a low price with the final result a ruined dairy industry. It is a question as to whether or not we are going to support government policy announced by the Minister of Agriculture re diversified agriculture. A long-term solution to our agricultural problem is definitely diversified agriculture, and dairying is an important part of it. The average sized mixed farm occupied and operated by the owner and his family is the fundamental base upon which our province must stand and eventually be built. A short-time, narrow-sighted policy instituted now could easily wreck our whole agricultural structure. The farmer has always been the goat in our whole economy. Is he to be the goat again? During the war the Canadian farmer accepted lower than world prices for wheat; Britain was supplied with cheap wheat, not by the people of Canada but by the farmer of Canada. Wheat and bread consumed in Canada subsidized by the farmers of Canada. The farmer gave the consumer cheap bread. The farmers now ask, in all fairness, that the consuming public aid them to save their industry, and incidentally, to save themselves. The Saskatchewan government has given labour all that they have asked for, and some of us think the government has gone plenty far in this respect but we did not kick. The dairy farmer today has a well-earned right and every reason to expect the government to protect this agricultural industry now. If margarine is to be sold in Canada, it should be sold only on a quota basis. The amount allowed for sale should balance the deficit in butter production, and the price and quality should definitely be controlled for both butter and margarine, and the price should be fair to producer and consumer.

Mr. Speaker, I shall support the amendment.

Hon. I.C. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the motion before the House, I do not care, at this time, to go into all the ramifications of the dairy industry and the importance of the dairy industry in the economy of Saskatchewan and to the economy of Canada as a whole.

In my opinion, it is all a matter of the most practical way in which to deal with this particular situation, and in speaking to the motion, I would

Like to point out to the House first of all that the primary responsibility for this whole matter rests with the dominion government. It was the dominion government that permitted the appeal to be taken to the Supreme Court in the first place, and by virtue of its position before this, in relationship to the banning of oleo-margarine, and, also, in connection with the responsibilities that the dominion government has under The Dairy Industries Act – for these reasons, and because it is only a federal authority that can effectively deal with this problem, I am suggesting that the federal government is the only agency that can deal with a situation such as we have at the present time.

I note that the amendment indicates that the province should assume its responsibility as indicated and determined by the advisory judgment of the Supreme Court. Now, as everyone knows, the advisory judgment of the Supreme Court did not give the provinces power to legislate in banning oleo-margarine. It merely said that the federal government did not have power to ban oleo-margarine, and the whole matter is still up in the air in that regard.

I want to say this, too, that instead of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture being requested to take the appeal to the Privy Council, that again was the responsibility of the dominion government for purposes of clarification if for no other reason. Here they have turned down the expressed wishes of the farm organizations and, in effect, said to them: We are not going to do anything about it. The Supreme Court has made its ruling, and if you want to do something about it, you farmers can take this up with the Privy Council, and in the meantime, they said to the organization farmers, we are going to do absolutely nothing.

Under those circumstances, the original motion before the House, I think was a logical motion and a logical approach to this whole question: to first of all ask the dominion government to accept its responsibility in the matter by calling a conference of all provincial governments in the interests of formulating uniform legislation and regulations right across the Dominion of Canada. That should have been done, Mr. Speaker, but because that has not been done, then the second alternative was for the provinces to get together on this question. Now we tried to do that. As the hon. members know, I have recently made a hurried trip down east to attend such a conference, called at the suggestion of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, and pressed by the affiliated dairy producing organizations that are affiliated with the Canadian Federation of Agriculture. This conference met and suggested certain proposals to the various provincial governments in the interest of uniform regulation. The matter of banning was also discussed at this conference, and everyone was in agreement that unless all the provinces would ban the manufacture and importation of oleo-margarine the whole approach would be impractical and unworkable, as every hon. member knows. For instance, we would ban only the importation and manufacture of oleo-margarine in Saskatchewan, and if similar action was not taken in other provinces, particularly Ontario, it would avail us very little since two-thirds of our butter is marketed in the province of Ontario. The banning proposition depends entirely on having uniformity between all the provinces in the Dominion, and I want to say to the House that there is every indication now that we are not going to have that. There is every indication now that we might not even have the proper kind of regulatory legislation that was suggested at the conference which I attended, so I would think that the reasonable approach, and the more practical approach, would be to again

ask the dominion government to accept its share of the responsibility in the matter and then endeavour to see if the other provinces are willing to take any similar action. As I have just indicated, it looks to me like at this late time it would be impossible to have a further conference in this regard.

If all of those other measures stay, I think that this Legislature should do something about introducing legislation to govern the importation and manufacture of oleo-margarine. I know full well, as the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. Benson) has pointed out, that the dairy industry just cannot face this most unfair competition. It is needless for me to belabour that fact.

I want to say this, in connection with this question of banning: I would hate to go on record as suggesting that the provinces have power and that they should exercise power to ban anything out of a particular province. That would certainly wreck our Confederation. I am not usually influenced by any editorials that appear in *The Leader-Post* or the *Star Phoenix*, or any of that press, but I thought that the *Star Phoenix* had a fairly sensible editorial on this whole matter, and when you analyze it very carefully we could establish, I think very dangerous precedents. Sure enough, it might be done for the interval until we have a ruling from the Privy Council but the dairy industry said, and I think everyone readily accepts, that oleo-margarine is here to stay. Now it is a matter of regulating the manufacture and sale of oleo-margarine in a manner that it will not come into competition with butter on an unfair basis. I believe that that is the realistic approach. The dairy associations of this province have approached us and asked us to introduce that type of legislation, and they recommended to us the various points that they would like to see implemented in any legislation that we might bring down in this House.

Without saying any more on the question, and I do hope that we do not get a complete division in the House on this question, I am just suggesting to the hon. members that we had better take a practical approach. I am sure that hon. members opposite do not place us in the same position that Quebec finds itself in at the present time. I hope that we do not want to see a Balkanization of Canada, or encourage any tendencies in that direction. I think that we should do things that are practical, and even if we do introduce regulatory legislation, granted there may be constitutional questions there, but I believe that eventually that is the way that this problem is going to have to be solved. If the dominion government cannot ban it, well then, why should the provincial government even attempt to do so, even if they did have constitutional power to do so. It would result in all of those adverse effects that I was speaking of. But there is one thing that we can do, and we could certainly do it in common, if necessary, with the Dominion, and that is to bring down legislation to govern the manufacture and sale of oleo-margarine. That can already be done. I am thinking that the dairy people, and the farmers generally, have let the dominion government out of its responsibilities a little too easily. It is another case of buck passing. I want to say to the hon. members opposite that I feel that the dominion government has shirked its responsibilities in this very important matter, when they are going to encourage a condition whereby provincial governments are going to be driven to the position where they are going to have to ban things and have to bring in legislation of a doubtful nature, then I truthfully say that they do not have a proper sense of their responsibilities in this whole matter. We know that if the dominion government want to, they could regulate the manufacture and sale of margarine under

The Food and Drugs Act, and there is another Act, The Trades Standards Commission Act that gives them even broader power to do so. As a matter of fact, at the end of World War I they did all of those things. Why is it that they did not do it on this occasion?

Nevertheless, should all of these things fail, then I think that this Legislature should take action, and, therefore, I would offer an amendment to the amendment as follows:

An Hon. Member: — Buck passing.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member says that it is a case of passing the buck. I can assure the hon. member that we are not going to, and I would not suggest that we do anything that is absolutely unworkable, impossible and impractical. I tried to state that to the hon. members, and again I repeat that if we are going to ban, every province in the Dominion of Canada should ban, if it is going to be effective and you are not going to get that uniformity.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would move that the following words be added to the motion:

And further, the Federal Government should clear any jurisdictional doubt by carrying the decision of the Supreme Court to the Privy Council, and that the Federal Government should act under The Food and Drugs Act and analogous statutes to prescribe standards for margarine to be sold in Canada, and if the Federal Government fails to act and it is found that the province has authority, the Assembly should give consideration to the enactment of suitable legislation fixing standards and prescribing labels for margarine sold in Saskatchewan.

I should say, Mr. Speaker, that when I read the motion it implies the words after the first word “the” in the amendment be struck out and then the following substituted, as I have read them.

Mr. Speaker, I would move this amendment to the amendment, seconded by the hon. member for Kelvington (Mr. Howe).

Mr. W. A. Tucker Rosthern: — Mr. Speaker, if the amendment to the amendment carries, this Assembly would then go on record as follows:

That this Assembly urge upon the Dominion Government the immediate necessity of calling a conference of all Provincial Governments and representatives of the dairy industry with a view to drafting uniform federal legislation and regulations governing the importation, manufacture and sale of margarine, or other butter substitutes, in Canada; and, if necessary, that joint agreement be reached with the provincial governments on any complementary legislation that may be required by the provinces.

And further, the Federal Government should clear any jurisdictional doubt by carrying the decision of the Supreme court to the Privy Council, and that the Federal Government should act under The Food and Drugs Act and analogous statutes to prescribe standards for margarine to be sold in Canada, and if the Federal Government fails to act and it is found that the province has authority, the Assembly should give consideration to the enactment of suitable legislation fixing standards and prescribing labels for margarine sold in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the effect of this amendment to the amendment would practically restore the situation to what it would have been had the amendment not been moved at all. The purpose of the amendment was to face the situation which confronts us today, which this amendment to the amendment does not do. An appeal has already been launched to the Privy Council by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, and so there would be no reason for passing this amendment to the amendment: that the Federal Government should clear any jurisdictional doubt by carrying the decision of the supreme court to the Privy Council . . .". that has already been done. Is this Assembly going to place itself on record as being in favour of doing something that is already being done? That is the first difficulty about the amendment to the amendment.

Then the amendment to the amendment strikes out the very purpose of the amendment. The purpose of the amendment was to deal with the situation which will prevail until the law is settled. We have had a law banning the manufacture and sale and importation of margarine into Canada ever since shortly after the First World War. That was a dominion law, and was enforced by the dominion government for the protection of agriculture. There were many questions raised as to whether the Dominion had the right to pass that law. Finally, to clear up any doubt, it was referred to the Supreme Court of an opinion on the matter. The Supreme Court gave its opinion that the Dominion did not have the power to pass such prohibitory legislation. The Chief Justice, with one other judge agreeing with him, contended that they did have the power, and the other judges said they did not have the power. The majority opinion, of course, prevailed – that the government did not have the power. The basis of the judgment, as I understand it, was that the manufacture and sale of margarine within any province was a matter which came under 'property and civil rights' within the province, and so, under Section 92 of the British North American Act, it was a provincial matter and not a dominion matter.

The Chief Justice apparently was of the opinion that the Dominion had the right to legislate on this matter because it was of such fundamental importance to agriculture, and so that it was a valid law. As the members know, under the British North America Act the right to legislate on agriculture is given to the dominion parliament. It is also given to the provincial Legislatures; but it is provided in case of any conflict in the law in regard to agriculture where they both have legislated that dominion legislation shall prevail. And so the Chief Justice, with another judge, took the attitude that this law was a valid law. The remaining judges, on the other hand, basing themselves on their interpretation of Section 92 and 91 of the British North America Act, said it was not a valid law. They took the attitude that margarine was not an agricultural produce, and, therefore, this legislation really did not come under 'agriculture'.

I do not think the Chief Justice agreed with that view, that because margarine was not an agricultural product, no matter how much it would interfere with the success of agriculture towards prosperity, the legislation having to do with it was not legislation on the question of agriculture. However, it is quite clear that now the law is not settled. We have a law on the Statute Books that bans the manufacture and sale of margarine in Canada. The majority of the Supreme Court says that that law is not a valid law. If they are right, then of course the provinces are the ones who have the right to ban the manufacture and sale of margarine with a province. It is quite clear; there can be no argument about that. I cannot understand the Minister of Agriculture suggesting that if the Dominion really has not the power to ban the sale of margarine, or the manufacture of margarine within a province, it does not follow as a result from that that the only ones who have the power are the provinces. Surely it is a well-understood principle of our law that jurisdiction rests one place or the other and that if the Dominion has not the legislative jurisdiction, then the provinces have it, and so there should be no difference of opinion about that. If the Supreme Court majority decision is right, then the people who have the jurisdiction to pass legislation banning the manufacture and sale of margarine within any province is the province, and only the province.

However, at the present time nobody knows what the law is. The Privy Council might reverse the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada. Some people think that, after all, the opinion of the Chief Justice of this country – one of our most outstanding jurists – that the Dominion has that power, is worthy of a great deal of respect. They feel there is a very good chance that the opinion of the Supreme Court will be overruled and it will be found that the Dominion has the jurisdiction and that this dominion law is valid.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what are we saying in our amendment? I am rather surprised the government does not accede to it. We are saying that until the law is settled, the situation should not be permitted to be changed by the people who wish to introduce the sale and marketing of margarine in our province, that they should not be permitted to take advantage of the uncertainty of the law to come in and introduce the sale of margarine, and by a lot of advertising and so on, do something it may turn out, if the Privy Council overrules the Supreme Court, they had not right to do at all. That is what actually will have happened. If the Privy Council rules that the Dominion law is valid, then, in effect, everybody who has sold margarine in this interval, in Saskatchewan, will have actually broken that law, because it is on the Statute Books today and the only reason it is not in force is because of the advisory opinion of the Supreme Court. We are saying then that until the law is settled, that people in a great industry like the dairy industry, upon which thousands depend for their livelihood, should not have their whole situation put in jeopardy until we are sure where the jurisdiction lies.

See the situation, Mr. Speaker. If a year from now the Privy Council gives its decision and rules that this dominion law is a good law, in the meantime we will have stood by and let people in this province of ours, in effect, flout a valid law. It is still on the Statute Books but the effect will have been that many people engaged in dairying in this province will think it is not a valid law and may decide that perhaps it is unsafe to stay in dairying. They will go out of it, and the whole situation will be disturbed because this government could not bring itself to act to keep the situation as it was until the law was settled.

It is nobody's fault that the law is unsettled. I know my hon. friends will make something of the fact the dominion government referred this dominion law to the Court for an opinion as to whether it was a good law or not. Who referred it is really of no great importance. Anybody could have asked for a ruling on the question. After all, if a dominion law is being questioned as to whether it is valid or not, it is probably not improper for the matter to be referred to Court as to whether it is a good law or not. The fact that it is not a good law, according to the majority opinion of the Supreme Court, is based on an interpretation of our Constitution. It is nothing else than that. The Constitution was passed in 1867 and the Supreme Court have said the Dominion has not the right to pass this law; if it is not a good law, the provinces have the right to pass a law in respect to the manufacture and sale of margarine within a province.

The farmers, through the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, have appealed. My hon. friend has said they let the dominion government out of the situation. I ask the Minister of Agriculture, is he not as interested in the prosperity of agriculture in this province as the dominion government?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — A lot more interested than you.

Mr. Tucker: — Apparently no, because if he is saying the dominion government should show an interest in this appeal, why should not this government show an interest in the appeal? Why should not they have asked that the matter be taken to the Privy Council? No, they sit down and say the dominion government should be doing this, and the Minister of Agriculture say right here from his place this afternoon, that the farmer cannot face this competition. Yet he has, Mr. Speaker, the effrontery, as a responsible Minister in this province having said that, to say: "I have not done anything to find out where the jurisdiction lies; I do not say we should do anything, but the dominion should be doing it." The usual stuff.

Under the British North America Act, jurisdiction is conferred on the province in regard to agricultural matters. It is just as much the obligation of the Minister of Agriculture here to protect the farming industry of this province as it is that of the Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa.

Mr. Erb: — How about The Farm Security Act?

Mr. Tucker: — Well, I know you would like to start something else. I know your conscience must be bothering you on this, but I suggest we keep to this.

I say to the Minister of Agriculture here: it does not lie with him to find fault with the dominion government for not conducting the appeal to the Privy Council. Why does he not take some interest in it? Has he ever told the Canadian Federation of Agriculture that they should go ahead and appeal it to settle the law? Has he said that we will share some of the cost of going and settling this important thing? If he has, I have not heard of it. It is not suggested in the original motion that there is another important consideration. While I am on that point, Mr. Speaker, it is important for other reasons besides the question of margarine and butter that this question of jurisdiction

should be cleared up because if this decision that the dominion government has no power to legislate on this matter is upheld, then the question arises as to what its jurisdiction is in other important matters having to do with agriculture. That is another important thing.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — You bet it is important.

Mr. Tucker: — Has the Minister of Agriculture said anything in this resolution, or to anybody, that this decision of the Supreme Court, which may strike at the very efficient agricultural legislation we have today on the part of the dominion government, should be questioned. Has he said that this appeal should be pressed? Aren't we just as much interested as they are in Ottawa? Why this idea all the time that we should pass the burden of these things on to Ottawa and not take some interest ourselves?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Louder, and funnier.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, this may be funny to the Minister. This thing that he admits himself may strike at the very living of thousands of our farmers, this may be funny to the Minister of Agriculture, but I say it is not funny to the farmers of Saskatchewan. I want to tell the Minister, that if we were in his place we would not have been hanging back, refusing to take any action, and saying that the Dominion should be taking all the action.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Did you get the coarse grains under the Wheat Board?

Mr. Tucker: — We did and will do our best to do so. I have no hesitation in saying that we would have taken a leading part in this matter. Of course, I understand the position of the Minister. His national party, in Winnipeg, came out in favour of the manufacture and sale of margarine in Canada by a Crown Corporation. I do not know that that will help the farmer very much if they have a Crown Corporation, operating tax free, doing all the other things a Crown Corporation does, to handle margarine; it will not help the farmer very much. In view of the fact that the C.C.F. stand for that sort of thing, obviously they have to take the attitude they are today taking. The Minister of Agriculture says that the farmers cannot stand this sort of competition. He has to however, apparently, to bow to the will of his party and let the farmers take the result of this competition he says they cannot stand, and because his party has already spoken. Or course, we know how they will vote on this thing. They have to vote according to what their party has decided on, and vote in favour of the sale and manufacture of margarine in Canada.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — What did you do?

Mr. Tucker: — If the member for Saskatoon (Mr. Sturdy) will just wait he will find out, and if he is able to read, as I think he is, he should know where we stand from the amendment which we moved. The motion, Mr. Speaker, was this:

That we should ask the Dominion Government to call a conference to draft legislation for the purpose of regulating the importation, manufacture and sale of margarine.

In other words, it accepts the idea we are going to have margarine. It accepts the idea that the law now is that the Dominion cannot legislate on the question of margarine. It accepts that situation. We say that we do not think the farmers of this country are wasting their money when they go to the Privy Council. We do not think they are beaten before they get there. We say until we get the law decided and we know who has the jurisdiction that the situation should be preserved as it is, and this important industry should not be faced with this sort of competition which may turn out to have been illegal under the law. That is all. Why will not the government support that reasonable proposition that, until the courts decide this matter as to whether this dominion law is valid or not, no margarine be sold?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Can you get them all to do that?

Mr. Tucker: — As the member for Last Mountain (Mr. Benson) said, the decision may be expected within a year. Surely a law that has been operating in favour of our farmers in this province for the last 25 years, and which may still be a good law, surely this Legislature should be ready to stand behind that law until it is demonstrated whether it is a good law or not. No, apparently they are too anxious to fall in line with the C.C.F. policy of getting margarine introduced into Saskatchewan that they are willing to strike out our amendment that is should be banned until the courts decide, and so let its sale of on as long as possible. Mr. Speaker, I consider it quite within the bounds of possibility that the Chief Justice of this country was right, and that it is illegal to sell margarine in Saskatchewan today under dominion law, and I say to the opposition, to the government rather . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Mr. Tucker: — You will be the opposition soon enough, and if you go on the way you are today it will not be very long. I want to say that, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — You are getting confused all the time.

Mr. Tucker: — It will take me a long time, I think, to get as confused as the hon. member who has just spoken.

It comes down to this when we come to vote on this matter. The amendment to the amendment strikes out the suggestions that until the courts decide, we should not have margarine; that this law the Dominion has passed, which we have been observing for 25 years, shall be made to prevail in this province until the Privy Council decides. The government is so anxious to have margarine introduced in Saskatchewan it will not even support that position.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Oh, nonsense.

Mr. Tucker: — Why do you move to strike it out then? Why did you not support it? I ask the Minister, if he is in favour of what I have just suggested, why does he move to strike out that amendment, because if the Minister had accepted it, the government could have passed the necessary legislation that, until the Privy Council decides, margarine should not be sold in Saskatchewan. Once the matter has been decided by the Privy Council, everybody then can decide what action they are going to take. But I do suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this betrays an anxiety on the part of the government to make sure margarine can be sold in the province.

So to sum up — here is the situation: the dominion law which forbids its sale is temporarily in doubt. We say, forbid its sale until the courts decide, and introduce an amendment to that effect; then the Minister of Agriculture, of all people, gets up and says: “No, we want to strike this out and let margarine be sold to the last possible moment, even if the Privy Council may ultimately find that it is illegal to sell it.” What greater subservience could a man render to that decision of his party, even though, on his own administration, it strikes at the livelihood of thousands of farmers which he, as the Minister of Agriculture, is supposed to uphold?

If we have to face the situation ultimately that the Dominion has not go jurisdiction, well then it will be a matter of great difficulty, but I do suggest that until that question is decided it would not take very strong action on the part of the provincial government of provinces like Saskatchewan to persuade these big interests, who are today trying to popularize and promote the sale of margarine, that they had better wait until the law is clarified. It would not take very much to discourage them. What do we have proposed by the government? The most we have from the government is that we should have some sort of a set-up that recognizes it, but passes some regulations in regard to its sale, and that before we know whether its sale is legal or not. The government is so anxious to have it introduced that it strikes this motion out and adheres to the view that we should let it be sold to the very last moment.

The farmers of this province, if the Privy Council rules — as they may do — that this dominion law is valid, and once more margarine becomes illegal in Saskatchewan, will remember that the government, the C.C.F. government, was so anxious to have it sold here that it would not even prohibit its sale until the matter was settled in the courts; that it took steps to make sure the sale could go on illegally as long as possible. That will be remembered by the farmers, and that it was done in spite of the fact that competition and that it will mean ruin to several thousand farmers. Surely this House should be willing to say, on this important matter, that until the law is decided the whole industry should not be placed in doubt and jeopardy until it knows exactly what the law this Assembly in the predominantly agricultural province of Saskatchewan should at least stand behind a law like this until it is definitely established by the higher court whether the law is valid or not.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, it is always a sure sign, when the Leader of the Opposition begins to shout that he has a very bad case on hand, and he certainly did a lot of shouting today.

March 22, 1949

The spectacle of the margarine controversy across Canada is the result of the federal government's deliberate policy, which they have taken on every other controversial issue, of seeking to throw it into a state of constitutional confusion, in the hope that nobody has a direct responsibility and they, thereby, can evade the responsibility which is properly theirs.

The Leader of the Opposition did not go quite far enough back to give the Assembly the full story on margarine. The federal government has had a national Dairy Act which has given them the authority over the years to state what the standard would be with reference to butter, what the ingredients and composition would be, and so on. The clause in The national Dairy Act banning manufacture and sale of oleo-margarine is about 63 years old, with the exception of a small period, 1919 to 1924, when margarine was sold under federal control. Then there began to be pressure in various parts of Canada due to the butter shortage in the latter part of the war for oleo-margarine to be manufactured and sold in Canada. The Leader of the Opposition has not told us why the federal government took a part of any Act, which had been there for 63 years, and referred it to the courts. They did not need to refer it to the courts. The fact it has been there for over half a century, that no one had taken it to the courts, and it has been accepted by practically all people in Canada, was in itself sufficient to have it continue as part of the law of the land. But they had a federal election coming up, and they were most anxious to get this hot potato out of their hands as quickly as possible . . .

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, Hear!

Premier Douglas: — I know my hon. friends opposite never think of federal elections, but their political counterparts in Ottawa have much more sensitive political antennae than the gentlemen opposite. They became aware of the fact there was a federal election coming up and so they, of their own accord and volition . . .

Mr. Egnatoff: — Do you know any more jokes?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Premier Douglas: — I haven't any more to tell, but I could describe one very adequately, I might tell the member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff).

An Hon. Member: — You are too smart altogether.

Premier Douglas: — . . . they, of their own accord and volition, referred it to the courts and asked the courts for a ruling.

Mr. Tucker: — I know the hon. Premier wants to be correct in this, perhaps he does not figure the Senate amounts to anything, but they . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Are you speaking on a point of privilege?

Mr. Tucker: — Yes. The hon. Premier said it was on their own volition, without any reasons for doing so. Well, the Senate passed a resolution. I know he may not regard that as important.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, in the first place, a resolution from the Senate is not binding on the government. It is a recommendation. That is the first thing. Secondly, it is a Liberal Senate that passed the resolution.

Mr. Tucker: — They must have read your resolution in Winnipeg.

Premier Douglas: — The federal government had the sanction to leave the legislation on the Statute Books, and they could have left it so any body of manufacturers or any group of people in Canada who wanted to challenge the constitutionality of that resolution would have taken it to the courts. They could have left it up to the other people to take it to the courts, but they did not. They referred it to the courts because now the hot potato was out of their hands.

More amazing still, Mr. Speaker, when the court brought down an advisory decision, saying by majority that in their opinion the federal government had not the power to ban the manufacture and sale of oleo-margarine, the federal government, who referred it to the courts and whose bounden duty it was to take it on to the Privy Council to get a final decision for clarification, what did they do? They said: “Oh, it is out of our hands now. There is them take it to the courts.” My friend stands up here in his place today and says: “Does the provincial government offer the farmers help to finance this before the courts?”

Mr. Tucker: — Did you?

Premier Douglas: — Why should the provincial government offer to finance something before the courts that we did not refer to them in the first place? We have plenty to do financing the stops we have to take to protect our own legislation. Why would we step in to take something to the courts that the federal government had already referred to the courts? They referred it to the courts and it would never have been in the courts if they had not referred it to the courts; but after they have referred it to the courts, they want to drop it into somebody else’s lap.

The Leader of the Opposition says there is an interim period between the decision handed down by the Supreme Court of Canada and the final clarification by the Privy Council. He says that during the interim period the provincial government should step in. I will deal with what the provincial government ought to do in a moment. Let me say to him that his party, the federal government at Ottawa, has the power to deal with that interim period right in the palm of their hands. If they wanted to prevent the sale of oleo-margarine in Canada pending a final decision by the Privy Council, all they had to do was to ban the importation of the ingredients for making oleo, from Canada. That is

all they need to do. Had they prevented the importation of those ingredients, there would be sufficient time then to see what the position was with respect to the constitutionality of Section V of The National Dairy Act. They did not do that. They did not ban it, and they did not take it to the courts. They simply tossed it out in the air, with what result? With the result that nobody today, certainly not the best legal advice we could get anywhere, is clear as to what the responsibility is.

The Leader of the Opposition stands up and says to the Minister of Agriculture here that, because it was decided by a majority of the Supreme Court, they did not have the authority, and therefore the provincial government must have authority. It does not necessarily follow. My hon. friend is a lawyer and he will remember very well that when Mr. Bennett's Natural Products Marketing Act was taken to the Supreme Court and later to the Privy Council, the Privy Council threw it out. On the basis of that decision, the province of British Columbia said if the Dominion Government has not the authority to pass a Natural Products Marketing Act, then the provinces must have the authority, and they proceeded to pass a provincial Natural Products Act which the same court then proceeded to throw out. For a time it was decided that neither the federal government nor the provincial government had the authority to pass a Natural Products Marketing Act. It was only lately that it was found that, by dove-tailing and separating certain powers, they could each have certain marketing features. It does not automatically follow.

Mr. Tucker: — It does in this case.

Premier Douglas: — As a matter of fact, my hon. friend ought to know that the whole question of inter-provincial trade is a very real part of the Constitution of Canada, and to what extent the province has a right to ban good coming in from another province, to prevent something made in Winnipeg from being sent into Saskatchewan, or being shipped through Saskatchewan, is a very real problem, and even more serious is the problem of controlling standards. I am quite convinced that if oleo-margarine is going to be sold in Canada it certainly ought to be made to comply with very right standards; but what power has a provincial government to deal with standards? The federal government has assumed, under the Food and Drugs Act particularly, that they have exclusive jurisdiction in the field of setting standards for foodstuffs, drugs, etc. The Department of Public Health, with which I am associated, has no power to go into a packing house and investigate what is being put into boloney or sausages. We can go in and make sure the premises are sanitary, but what is put into the sausages, what is put into the containers, what is put into cans, those things lie entirely with the jurisdiction of the federal government.

It is all right for the Leader of the Opposition to get up here and say the provincial government has the right to do this, and the power to do that, but no one has yet been able to demonstrate that we have the right either to ban or regulate or to control.

Mr. Tucker: — Quebec has passed that legislation.

Premier Douglas: — My friend says Quebec has passed it. Quebec has already done it in part, and part has been rescinded, as I understand it. I will deal with what the other provinces are doing in just a moment if you will kindly wait.

The situation at the present moment is completely chaotic from the standpoint of any clear enunciation of where responsibility lies. The member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) in his amendment said that the government of Saskatchewan would assume its responsibilities. He did not outline what those responsibilities were, or what the powers were, and there are very serious doubts as to what our powers are. If it is true we can step in and ban the sale of a thing like liquor on the grounds that it would be harmful, or excessive use of it may be harmful, to the public; but whether or not we can turn around and ban something which is food, and which is nutritious, or that we can ban something in order to build a protective fence around a particular industry, that is a constitutional question on the whole matter of inter-provincial trade which has to be very seriously gone into.

Had the federal government been anxious to get a solution to this, rather than to get rid of a very awkward child that was squalling on its lap and was in a very unsanitary condition, had they been anxious to solve the problem, they would simply have called the provinces in and told them there was some doubt about the question: "We are prepared, between us, by complementary legislation, to deal with the question of the sale of oleo-margarine until such time as the whole matter is clarified." Or they could have said: "We are prepared to stop the importation of the ingredients until this matter is clarified." But the federal government has refused to enter into any such arrangement. The provinces have been left with the responsibility of trying to get together, and what is the situation today? My friends across the way, today they know where they stand. I would like to know where the Liberal party stands. At Ottawa, where does the Liberal party stand? They are doing nothing, and, worse than doing nothing, they tossed this thing when it was on the Statute Books and was working satisfactorily, into the courts and then left it there and refused to do anything about it.

Where is the Liberal party standing in Manitoba? What are they doing about it? What is the Liberal party doing about it in the province of British Columbia?

Mr. Decayed: — What are you doing about it?

Premier Douglas: — If I may judge by the press reports, the Premier of the province of British Columbia, where they had a ban which was many years old on the Statute Books, has promised the Legislature he will bring down legislation to repeal that ban. Where does the Liberal party stand?

Mr. Tucker: — You know where they stand in Saskatchewan anyway.

Premier Douglas: — We know where they stand in Saskatchewan. Exactly. That is the point I am coming to.

Mr. Tucker: — We are dealing with Saskatchewan.

Premier Douglas: — In the big urban centres they are for oleo, and out in the country they are for butter. That has been the Liberal policy for years. All things to all men; that is their policy.

March 22, 1949

Mr. Tucker: — You are describing yourselves.

Premier Douglas: — They are on both sides of every fence on every issue.

Mr. Danielson: — You will find out where we stand, right here.

Premier Douglas: — Most of the provinces started out with the idea of being able to ban oleo, and gradually had to give way to the realities of their constitutional position. Some of the provinces who talked about banning oleo, after examining their constitutional position, doubted if they have the power to ban it. I see that in some of the other provinces. I have seen the draft of some Bills they were preparing, and after looking over those Bills and going into them with their law officers, they had to modify them because they started out with the assumption they had powers that they began, upon investigation, to find they did not have.

Mr. Tucker: — What province was that?

Premier Douglas: — I can demonstrate to my hon. friend. Will he tell me which of the provinces banned it, apart from Prince Edward Island and Quebec — and Quebec has already retracted part of its programme. Did my hon. friend take the trouble to look at the legislation passed by Alberta the other day? That legislation, which was going to be banning, took out the banning clause and took out the question of colouring, and it is simply restricted now to say that oleo-margarine cannot have more than 16 percent water, cannot be mixed with butterfat, and it must have 80 percent of certain fats and oils, and it must be clearly marked on the package that it is oleo-margarine. That was not the original idea. It has gone a long way because these provinces are faced with exactly the same problem we are facing, and that is: what are the constitutional powers which the provinces enjoy, and can they take action which will prove later to be beyond their jurisdiction?

The Leader of the Opposition portrays the situation that will occur if oleo-margarine is sold and later on the Privy Council rules that Section V of the National Dairy Act is *intra vires*; then all the people who have sold oleo-margarine have been breaking the law. As I say, that could have been obviated very easily by the federal government by having prevented the ingredients from coming in, or having taken some action in conjunction with the provincial governments. I put to him: what would be this Legislature's position if we passed legislation banning the sale of oleo-margarine in this province, and then find out that we have not the power to ban it? What is our position? Our position is ridiculous. Our position is that we have stopped the sale of something without knowing that we have the power, and we seriously doubt as to whether or not we have the power. Furthermore, a ban in the province of Saskatchewan would not meet the problem which we really have to face, as the Minister of Agriculture has pointed out. Two-thirds of our butter is sold primarily in Ontario and British Columbia. Some is sold in the two provinces on either side of us, but the major portions of our export butter go to the provinces of Ontario and British Columbia. There is every indication that in

at least one of those provinces there is going to be no ban, and we do not know whether or not there is going to be a ban in the other province, but the probabilities are there will not be a ban in Ontario.

The dairy industry is not going to be saved just by doing something in Saskatchewan which we are not sure we have the constitutional power to do. The dairy industry, as far as Saskatchewan is concerned, can only be saved if some action can be taken right across Canada, because we are concerned not only with the sale of butter; we are concerned even more with the sale of butter in the provinces of British Columbia and Ontario. In the province of British Columbia, at least, where a Liberal-Conservative government is in power, predominantly Liberal with a Liberal Premier, they do not seem to be doing anything to help our dairy industry. I would suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that part of the steam and energy he has generated, this afternoon, could be used to very good account if he could persuade the governments of British Columbia and some of these other provinces that have Liberal Conservative governments, along with the federal government and ourselves, to get down and work out some policy that will assist the dairy industry, not in one corner where we sell very little butter, but over the whole of Canada where the dairy industry is vitally concerned.

Mr. Tucker: — If I could get you to do something I would be well please.

Premier Douglas: — Well, Mr. Speaker, we have done a great deal more than my hon. friend knows anything about as far as this problem is concerned, and had we been able to get anything like the co-operation from the federal government we would have been able to get something done with reference to dealing with the dairy industry. My hon. friend knows that the federal government's action on this, as on everything else, has been to do absolutely nothing, and the hope that, in the general fracas as to who is responsible, they will somehow or other slip out the back door. What the Liberal government in Ottawa is going to do is just what my friend has tried to do this afternoon: go out through the great cities of eastern Canada and say: "We gave you oleo", and then send my hon. friend out to the rural section to say: "We did our best to stop it."

Mr. Tucker: — You are doing nothing for the farmers at any time.

Premier Douglas: — It is the magnificent Liberal tactics. As a matter of fact, of course, it will take some great expense for the Leader of the Opposition, who for years has talked about no restraint of trade, the great principles of Liberalism; in two elections he talked about nation unity, keeping the parts of Canada together as one great nation, and now he is turning around and saying it is up to each province to put a little fence around itself to deal with these problems individually. The federal government is the sovereign state in Canada. We on this side have never taken the position, as some, that there are nine sovereign states. The provinces have a limited jurisdiction. The federal government has a responsibility, and it has the power to act as a sovereign state.

March 22, 1949

Mr. Tucker: — Not in certain spheres.

Premier Douglas: — When people refuse to exercise their powers to govern, they have given up their right to govern, Mr. Speaker, and they have given up the right of the respect of the people who elected them to government.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. Premier knows very well, under our constitution . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! Does the hon. member rise to a point of privilege?

Mr. Tucker: — Yes. I am raising the question that the hon. member is mis-stating the constitutional position in Canada.

Mr. Speaker: — That is not a point of privilege. It is an argument.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I am not mis-stating the constitutional position. I pointed out, very clearly, that the federal government had the power, which it exercised for 63 years. I pointed out that when they thought oleo should be sold in this country from 1919 to 1924, they passed federal legislation to provide for its sale. I pointed out that under The Food and Drug Act they have complete power to regulate and control the sale of oleo, and that with all these powers in their hands, they are now washing their hands of the whole issue because they think it will make some political capital for them in some parts of Canada, and sitting back, leaving the matter to the provinces, knowing perfectly well that the provinces have not the jurisdictional power and exercised it, what you would have across Canada would be a patchwork quilt of nine, very soon ten, different provinces dealing with the problem in different ways. What would that benefit Saskatchewan? In our own province, for the better consumed in our province, we could get one price, but for the butter which had to go to Manitoba, Alberta, British Columbia, Ontario, it would be in competition with oleo-margarine. That, Mr. Speaker, is the worst of protection put up by gentlemen who for 30 years professed to be free-traders.

Mr. G. H. Danielson (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, it is amusing to watch the antics of the gentlemen opposite.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear! They took up all the radio time today.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, of course, that was all fixed up, but that is all right. The fact remains that we are in the position now which no words can very well challenge. The people and the dairy farmers of the province of Saskatchewan and of the Dominion of Canada face a situation at the present time which is real. It is not politics. It is not a flow of words, and arguing points here and there. It is the fact that they in their daily lives are up against a problem which must be taken care of.

I had a letter from the Palm Dairy Association yesterday. This Association represents 265 creameries of Ontario, marketing the cream of 68,000 cream producers. It is the only specific Association of primary producers in Canada. This letter reads, in part:

It is our conviction that on economic grounds butter substitutes should not be legalized in Canada, and we respectfully solicit your support to continue the prohibition of such substitutes. The creamery butter producers have been accused of failing to produce sufficient butter for the Canadian needs. The fact is, of course, that we have been prevented from doing so by the system of controls applied to restrict our production. It is claimed by critics that butter is too dear, yet it is relatively cheaper than all the dairy products. It was stated in the propaganda for butter substitutes that they would provide a market for other fats and oils from Canadian farms. We now find it is made from cheap imported oils, produced by cheap, low-economy labour in certain southern countries. In the current week, the cream producers of Ontario are losing a lump sum of \$175,000 to \$250,000 through the depressed market, as a result of the competition of butter substitutes. The cheap labour of southern countries profit by it.

I leave that to the consideration of my labour friends over there on the other side of the House.

The Minister of Agriculture has done all he could of course – but a very poor job he made of it – trying to convince us that this province has no right to power and that no one has said we have the power. Well, I have a statement here on this question from one of the best legal minds in the province of Saskatchewan, a man who has devoted his life for the last 25 years to acting for producers' organization, and who is now engaged to take this case to the Privy Council. He said – this is Mr. Milliken, December, 1948:

Special legislation would have to be passed by the provincial governments if the manufacture and sale of margarine is to be prohibited in Saskatchewan. Mr. Milliken, counsel for the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, made that statement following the handing down of the judgment itself. He points out it meant that the dominion Act prohibiting the manufacture and sale of margarine in Canada was invalid. Unless provincial legislation is brought in to prevent its manufacture and sale, margarine can be made and sold in Saskatchewan.

I do not think there is anybody who has taken issue with that statement, and I have every faith in Mr. Milliken and his reliability was a legal mind, and he stated the case very clearly and very much to the point. There is no question about this in spite of the Minister of Agriculture, and the Premier himself who tried to leave the impression with the House that there has been no one with authority to speak on this question, with any knowledge on the subject. Mr. Speaker, that is now all wiped away because it is not true.

I am sorry that the Minister of Agriculture is not in his seat now because he made quite a statement, and quite a splash over the radio, of the

fact that they have tried, and consulted with other provinces, to set up rules and regulations to regulate the sale of margarine in Canada. I would like to ask him and the hon. Premier: has he, acting for this government, ever consulted with the other provinces to enact legislation of a general nature instrumenting all the provincial governments in adopting a law in Canada to prohibit the sale and manufacture of margarine in the nine provinces? Has he done that? He went out and tried to get regulations set up to permit the manufacture and sale of margarine in Saskatchewan. Would it not have been just as easy for this gentleman to go to work and say to the other provincial governments, let us pass a law which will prohibit margarine and save the dairy industry for one year until this thing is finally settled? Has he done that? Nothing of the sort, Mr. Speaker.

Premier Douglas: — Does he know of any Liberal provincial government that has done that?

Mr. Danielson: — There is no Liberal government in this province. You are on the spot now, and you are going to stay there. We on this side of the House speak for the Liberal party in the province of Saskatchewan: I am a farmer, and there will never come the day when I am going to sell the farmer down the river in this province for any price. I am not tied to any labour union; I am not tied to any industrial organization which is running the Liberal party in this province, because if that day comes, Mr. Speaker, then I am not a Liberal. I am not like the C.C.F. who are tied hand and foot to the industrial labour unions of Canada, and they are the ones who dictate the policies of the government. At their convention in August they endorsed this, and that is why their hands are tied today. They cannot do any other thing, even if they wanted to. I know there are farmers sitting on the other side of the House who think otherwise. We have heard one this afternoon, and I will give all credit to the member for Last Mountain (Mr. Benson) that he has shown he is perfectly willing to stand up and speak for the people who sent him here, the people of his constituency. That is what we are doing.

Mr. Tucker: — He is the only one.

Mr. Danielson: — He is the only one so far as I know.

Premier Douglas: — I represent more departments than the hon. gentlemen, and . . .

Mr. Tucker: — You never grew a bushel of wheat.

Mr. Danielson: — I want to tell the hon. gentleman that he doesn't need to worry about me because all I need to get elected again is to get you to make a speech or two in my constituency.

Premier Douglas: — Only by getting the Tories to support you.

Mr. Danielson: — That is all right. That is a deliberate falsehood, Mr. Speaker. I am going to charge the hon. gentleman with telling a falsehood when he made that statement.

Premier Douglas: — All you need is Diefenbaker to make a . . .

Mr. Danielson: — It is not true, Mr. Speaker. It is a falsehood.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Danielson: — He is just throwing mud. He is an artist at that.

This is not a subject for politics, Mr. Speaker. He is the gentleman that told the United Farmers of Canada a few months ago in Saskatoon, it would mean the financial ruin of 60,000 farmers in the province of Saskatchewan. That is what he said. I want to ask the Minister of Agriculture now: was it not easy for this gentleman to go out to the provinces and consult them to set up rules and regulations for the sale and manufacture of margarine? Would it not have been just as easy to consult with these governments, and try to effect an agreement whereby uniform legislation could have been enacted which would have prohibited the sale and manufacture of margarine until the decision of the Privy Council had been brought down? I want to ask him that question.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I am very glad to answer that question. That is exactly what we did, Mr. Speaker, in the interest of uniform legislation, and if you would keep your ears open, I also said we discussed this question of banning and we concluded it would be impractical to ban it unless all the provinces did. I would be very glad to go along with that if you could get them all to do it.

Premier Douglas: — There are too many Liberals down there.

Mr. Danielson: — What about the Municipal Convention, Mr. Speaker? It was held here a few days ago, and it was unanimous vote among the 1,200 men who were there. I do not think more than 800 of them had a vote, but there were only four votes in opposition to the very thing we have here, to cut this off until the Privy Council decision is handed down whether we can do this and we know where the responsibility lies, and whether it is with the Dominion or this government here. We know where it is now and that is right here for the time being, and this government is not going to shirk its responsibility, Mr. Speaker, insofar as this question is concerned. They are going to have to stand up and be counted this time.

An Hon. Member: — So will you.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Counted out too.

Mr. Danielson: — The Premier said something about inter-provincial trade. That is just one of the reasons, Mr. Speaker. He cannot deny the fact that this thing is in his own lap now. He cannot get away from that. He may tell stories and all that, but as far as inter-provincial trade is concerned, he mentioned something which is a very serious matter and opens up a larger question.

That is all the more reason why this thing should be stopped where it is right now. In effect, what the government here could do is to take the place of the dominion government, when they were told by the courts they did not have the power. According to one of the best legal minds in the province of Saskatchewan and everybody else, it cannot be possibly any other place because either the dominion government or the provincial government have the right. It is not use squirming about it, like the hon. gentleman did over here.

I am not going to say anything about this matter. I think the member for Last Mountain made a wonderful presentation of the subject, much better than I am able to do. But I just want to say that it is time this government shook itself loose from the shackles of domination by the labour unions in eastern and western Canada, and ceases to be a labour government and begins to be a farmers' government, or at least one that will give some consideration to the farmers' interest. Until they do that they cannot do anything other than they are doing right now.

The Amendment to the Amendment was carried on the following division:

YEAS 28

Douglas (Weyburn)	Thair	Heming
Wellbelove	Darling	Dewhurst
McIntosh	Nollet	Stone
Brockelbank	Howe	Erb
Fines	Douglas (Rosetown)	Kuziak
Corman	Sturdy	Denike
Lloyd	Williams	Swallow
Brown	Gibbs	Willis
Gibson		Buchanan
Murray		Larson

NAYS — 22

Benson	Dundas	Banks
Tucker	Danielson	Horsman
Marion	Woods	McDonald
Loptson	Trippe	Deshaye
Prince	Egnatoff	McCormack
Culliton	Korchinski	Blanchard
Patterson	Cameron	Lofts
	Leohr	

The Amendment as amended was carried on the following division:

YEAS — 28

Douglas (Weyburn)	Murray	Dewhurst
Wellbelove	Thair	Stone
McIntosh	Darling	Erb
Brockelbank	Nollet	Kuziak
Fines	Howe	Denike
Corman	Douglas (Rosetown)	Swallow
Lloyd	Sturdy	Willis
Brown	Williams	Buchanan
Gibson	Gibbs	Larsen
	Heming	

NAYS — 22

Benson	Danielson	Banks
Tucker	Dundas	Horsman
Marion	Woods	McDonald
Loptson	Trippe	Deshaye
Prince	Egnatoff	McCormack
Culliton	Korchinski	Blanchard
Patterson	Cameron	Lofts
	Loehr	

The motion as amended was carried on the following division:

YEAS — 28

Douglas (Weyburn)	Murray	Dewhurst
Wellbelove	Thair	Stone
McIntosh	Darling	Erb
Brockelbank	Nollet	Kuziak
Fines	Howe	Denike
Corman	Douglas (Rosetown)	Swallow
Lloyd	Sturdy	Willis
Brown	Williams	Buchanan
Gibson	Heming	Larsen
	Gibbs	

NAYS — 22

Benson	Danielson	Banks
Tucker	Dundas	Horsman
Marion	Woods	McDonald
Loptson	Trippe	Deshaye
Prince	Egnatoff	McCormack
Culliton	Korchinski	Blanchard
Patterson	Cameron	Lofts
	Loehr	

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

That this Assembly respectfully urge the Federal Government to revise the present tariff structure and trade policy in such a way as to facilitate the interchange of good and services between Canada and Great Britain, in order to enable the latter to take our surpluses of agricultural products.

Mr. V.P. Deshaye (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, I have heard so much about margarine that I do not know whether I can talk on anything else but margarine now. However, the hon. member for Milestone (Mr. Erb) has proposed a resolution:

That this Assembly respectfully urge the Federal Government to revise the present tariff structure and trade policy in such a way as to facilitate the interchange of good and services between Canada and Great Britain, in order to enable the latter to take our surpluses of agricultural products.

Mr. Speaker, I think that, like the resolution that was much debated here, this afternoon, this is another piece of window dressing by the government. I have repeatedly stated to the people of the Melville constituency when I spoke to them that if at any time the C.C.F. proposed any legislation that I thought was good for the people of Saskatchewan as a whole, I would stand behind it; but when I made that statement I had no intention of standing behind any legislation or resolutions that were merely window dressing and were put there to fool the public and pull the wool over their eyes. The government seems to be very good at pulling the wool over the people's eyes, and, in fact, it has been so good that they opened a woollen mill so that they would have more wool to do it with.

I am glad indeed that the hon. member for Milestone realizes the importance of world trade, and the prosperity that world trade means to this nation of ours. This is certainly a change of policy, if it is the present policy of the C.C.F., from the policy that the C.C.F. adhered to in the past. For years they have advocated that we could get along without world trade, and that world trade was only secondary. Now a member comes forward and brings out this resolution.

It has always been a Liberal policy to encourage world trade, and the proof of this is in the record. In 1911 Sir Wilfred Laurier fought an election on reciprocity; in 1930 another election was fought on the Dunning budget which was advocating free trade; and in 1946 Canada took an active part at the Geneva conference endorsing free trade. As I said, the Liberal party has always been recognized as a party of free trade, and as a result prosperity and security for our country would develop.

The resolution seems to advocate bilateral agreements. It is understood, at least by any student of economics, that no country can deal alone with bilateral agreements. These agreements are trilateral or quadrilateral; they have to go through many countries in order that eventually we will get the good that we require, and the other countries will have the good that they require. As a result this leads to the dollar problem which is the problem that is affecting Britain today. Britain is very, very short of dollars and we all recognize this fact. That shortage of dollars has been brought out by the government of that country today. We have no doubt, and there is no doubt about the ability of Britain to produce goods if it has the proper government under which to do so. This was exemplified during the war when Britain probably produced more goods under the circumstances that it had to face than any other country, under the Churchill government. Today, with peace restored in that country, everything seems to be stagnant; production is stifled because that great country has a socialistic government which restricted all production. The members across the House do not like that, but they must still face the fact regardless of whether they like it or not.

In England today there is a Labour government which is accepted as a socialistic government. Any capitalist who wants to invest in their own country has been driven away, and the people in England are afraid to invest in their own country for that reason because they say if they make a success of their enterprises the government will take it over, everybody saes: "Well, let George do it", and George says the same thing, "Let the other fellows do it".

We do not have to go very far to find an example of that stifling of production. We have it here in Saskatchewan under the same form of government as Britain has. Anybody that has the money to invest, doesn't invest it in Saskatchewan. They go off to some other province. We have the example of how this affects a province when we see the abundant prosperity that is in Alberta today where all the capital that is to be invested is going. None of it is coming into our province, and regardless of what they saw across the way, the fact remains that all the capital that is to be invested goes to Alberta - even our own money.

The problem of trade is not a problem that we can remedy. It is a problem faced by a dollar shortage in Britain, and to help alleviate that shortage, the government of Canada, along with the United States government, have tried to propose certain remedies to this terrific situation. The United States, after much study, have proposed the Marshall Plan. We, in Canada have enacted The Export Credits Insurance Act, in 1944. The Act, similar to the Marshall Plan, has given Britain a great amount of credit and where those goods which we ship over there, that cannot be paid in good returned to us by Britain, are paid for in the credit extended under The Export Credits Insurance Act.

If we were to follow the wording of the resolution, in effect we would be going backwards: we would be exporting less agricultural goods than we are today. Therefore, the resolution is of no practical effect. It does not solve anything. In fact, it goes backwards, and for that reason the member that proposed it did not have a clear picture of the situation that exists. Also, there seems to be a failure of understanding as to what has been done by the federal Minister of Agriculture in Britain in the last few months. The federal Minister of Agriculture went to Britain intending to make arrangements whereby much of our agricultural products could be exported. When he got to Britain he learned, to our misfortune, that Britain could not pay for the goods, even with the large amount of credits that were extended to her, that she wished to buy. The reason for that was that her production has been reduced considerably under her present form of government. Mr. Gardiner reported extensively on this. He told us that much of our agricultural products exported there now were being paid by credit and that these credits had reached their limit, and for that reason our agricultural programme of exporting agricultural products to Britain could not be further expanded.

It is an accepted fact by all the political parties that the Rt. Hon. J. G. Gardiner did all that he could in Britain when he was there to facilitate these trade agreements, and I am sure that the resolution that has been submitted does not help that situation at all. However, there is no harm that I can see in supporting the resolution. The spirit of it is a Liberal spirit. It is exactly what Liberal governments have advocated since reciprocity in this country. We have always advocated free trade and the encouragement of trade, and the reduction of tariff barriers, and for that reason I do not see any harm in supporting the resolution although, I say again, that it is of no effect.

Mr. J. W. Erb (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the member for Melville for at least crediting the resolution with doing no harm, but I wash to differ with him as to his statement about it being of no great consequence.

I do not think that I would have taken it upon me to bring a motion into this House if I did not conscientiously believe that my motion was going to be of benefit to our western agriculture economy. I think the member — I may have misunderstood him — talked about window dressing. If he thinks that this was window dressing, I wish to assure him that it was far from anything like that in my mind. The conditions which prompt a motion like this are all too obvious today. As I pointed out in my motion, in bringing in the resolution that was passed in 1946, showing that the House then already was alarmed over the anticipated agriculture surpluses that would undoubtedly accumulate after the World War II, that they went about to present a submission to the federal government.

All this works into the once picture, and that is to make every effort on the part of the governments of the three prairie provinces to bring about a condition of trade between the United Kingdom and Canada that would relieve us of our agriculture surpluses.

The member for Melville mentioned that the Liberal were for world trade. It certainly is not in evidence by the fact that our surpluses are

already beginning to mount. As I pointed out in speaking on my motion, we already noted that last year we sold four percent less wheat to the United Kingdom than we did in 1947. Certainly the federal government is not encouraging or making a definite effort to make available to the United Kingdom dollars with which she is going to be able to buy our surplus agricultural production.

The member for Melville also mentioned that my resolution was favourable to bilateral trade, or advised bilateral trade – I did not quite get the full text of that. Under the conditions we have in the world today, bilateral trade very often seems to be an effort to provide trade in the first instance. Multilateral trade, as I pointed out while speaking on my motion, was not functioning smoothly during the post-war years, and that is because the various countries of Europe, devastated by war, their economy disrupted and dislocated, are unable to earn credits for themselves. Therefore, they are functioning today by the aid of Marshall dollars. Consequently, our multilateral trade has not functioned smoothly; you cannot get multilateral trade functioning smoothly when you have one predominant nation handing out credits. Therefore, bilateral trade certainly should be accepted if it is going to remedy, at least in part, the deficit that is created by multilateral trade.

The hon. member also stated that Britain brought about her own dollar shortage, with which I very, very heartily disagree. I think we are doing the British people and the British government a great injustice in saying that she brought about her own dollar problem. By saying that you might also infer that Britain brought about the war, which she certainly did not. Britain's dollar problem came about because she was our first line of defence in stopping . . .

Mr. Deshaye: — I did not say that Britain brought about her own dollar problem. I said that the socialistic government of Britain did it, and that does not mean the British people.

Mr. Erb: — The member for Melville (Mr. Deshaye) says that the dollar problem was brought about by the socialist government, he overlooks the fact that Great Britain fought a war. In other words, in his thinking, England did not go through the rigours of a war, and all the economic dislocations that followed in its wake.

Mr. Deshaye: — There are a lot of your ideas in there.

Mr. Erb: — As I pointed out, speaking on my motion, Britain's dollar problem was brought about by her vast investments in this country and in the United States for war materials through which she liquidated her foreign assets, through which she lost through sinkings of submarines her Merchant Marine, which all brought sizeable revenue into her Treasury. Today those things are gone and Britain has been forced to pull herself up by her own boot straps. Britain's foreign investments in this country and in the United States contributed \$81 million per year to make up her balance in trade, together with her vast resources in shipping, finance, and so on. That all tended to make up her deficit in trade. I think the member is very, very unfair, even to the socialist government in England, with whom he doesn't agree, in saying that they brought about the dollar problem. Nothing can be farther from the truth.

He goes on to say that as a result of the socialist government in England, stagnation was brought about. In other words, he means to say that a system of stagnation exists in Great Britain today. I would suggest that the hon. member go to Britain and take a look for himself to see what the British people have done in rebuilding their industrial empire. England, today is exporting more products than she exported in the 1938 level. Speaking about rural electrification, you go in through northern England today and Scotland where they are harnessing about 30 lakes and building a hydro-electric power that will electrify Scotland and northern England; where they are decentralizing the factories from the large cities and bringing them out to the towns. They have done things that the hon. member for Melville has never dreamed of, and he is merely talking about something of which he does not know anything. His remarks are purely motivated by prejudice.

The Conservatives in England go about telling the people of all of these things that my hon. friend suggest, but you ask the Conservatives in England, who haven't regained a single seat in the by-elections, if they would give the mines back to private enterprise, and they would say: "Oh, no." You ask them if they would again put the banks back where they were and they would say: "Oh, no." So they are not prepared to go back.

Mr. Deshaye: — That is what you say.

Mr. Erb: — It is obvious that they are not prepared to go back. They are giving credit where credit is due.

He mentioned, too, that our capital goes to the other places instead of coming to Saskatchewan for development. I do not see where he draws the analogy between speaking on my motion and Britain. He seemed to walk all over the place; but in any case he says that our capital is going into Alberta to develop Alberta's oil fields. We have been hearing a lot of that lately. Well, it is admitted that Alberta has realized considerable revenue from her oil wells, but I also maintain that if you have a table with a lot of bread on it, there is certain to be a lot of crumbs, and that is just what the people of Alberta are getting. They are not getting their fair share of the deal. We, in Saskatchewan, as we had pointed out the other day, in the leases that have been let, ultimately we are going to realize the greatest benefit from our potential oil wells. We certainly do not mean to operate them on a proposition where we are giving our natural resources away which belong to the people, and that is precisely the same stand that the labour government in England is taking. They are going to reserve their natural resources and co-ordinate them for the benefit of all.

The hon. member also went on to say that we cannot remedy the dollar problem. That is certainly taking an attitude of defeatism. I certainly think that we can remedy the dollar problem. Certainly, if we do not do anything about it, we are not going to remedy it very much. I suggested, in speaking on my motion, how we are going to remedy the dollar problem, and that is by encouraging trade with Great Britain and making every effort on our part to make dollars available to Great Britain. He talked about the Marshall Plan. Well, England is not going to have a Santa Clause all of the time; neither are the countries of Europe. The Marshall Plan runs out in 1952; and the object of

the Marshall Plan was to tide Britain over until she had developed her industrial might to the extent that she is going to be able to get along on her own power. England is in the position today where she has to export in order to import. She no longer, as I pointed out before, is able to draw on her foreign investments which have been liquidated through the war pressure.

We certainly can do something about this dollar problem. 1952 will see the end of Marshall aid, and by that time Britain is going to have to be able to pull herself up by her own efforts.

There are certain things that are becoming very, very evident today, and I think something which the member for Melville (Mr. Deshayé) completely overlooked: England today is developing her trade very favourably in the sterling areas. She has to pay a higher price for many of the commodities that she buys in the sterling areas, and she does that because in this way she can conserve her American and Canadian dollars. Where does this leave us? Already there are indications that because she is expanding her trade in this favourable sterling area that repercussions are already being felt upon our export of wheat and certainly upon our export of hogs and dairy products as a whole. We have to make every effort in order to retain our market in England, and the only way we can do that is to make available to Britain the dollars with which she is going to be able to buy the things that we have in surplus. That is just simple arithmetic.

The hon. member also suggested that my motion would restrict agricultural in this province. I see nothing so far from the truth; it is simply inconceivable that this motion could restrict agricultural in this province. The purpose of my motion was to encourage trade with Great Britain. Let me just read this motion again:

That this Assembly respectfully urge the federal government to revise the present tariff structure and trade policy in such a way as to facilitate the interchange of goods and services between Canada and Great Britain, in order to enable the latter to take our surpluses of agricultural products.

That is just what I meant, and I certainly did not mean that this resolution should ever, in any sense, restrict agriculture. I do not think that I have to spend a great deal of time on that because it is obvious that wherever we want to encourage trade, and wherever any effort is made to encourage world trade, you are certainly not trying to restrict it. I am trying to propose here to remove the restrictive trade policy that we now have in order that our surpluses may move freely from this country, and that imports from England, which is the only way that she is going to be able to buy our surpluses, might move freely into this country.

The hon. member said the motion does not harm, but that I have no clear picture of the situation. Well, Mr. Speaker, the facts that I got in the material that I used when speaking on my resolution were not something of my imagination. I gathered that material from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and from Foreign Trade – publications by the federal government. I certainly do not believe that the Dominion Bureau of Statistics would give us a fuzzy and

hazy picture of world trade. All the figures that I presented while speaking on my motion were facts out of Foreign Trade, the Canada Year Book and the United Kingdom Bulletin on Trade. The hon. member certainly has no clear picture of what he is talking about. He simply went around in circles.

Mr. Gibbs: — He was reading the wrong motion.

Mr. Erb: — He is taking to task publications and doubting the veracity of publications that are published by his own government, and I am afraid that he might be reprimanded for that.

He mentioned about Mr. Gardiner being over in England. I do not know whether or not Mr. Gardiner went over to England to actually effect a wheat agreement, or whether he went over for a holiday. Certainly what he produced out of that trip to England was not more than he would have had he gone on a holiday.

Mr. Dundas: — They should have sent you over.

Mr. Erb: — Well, I am sure it might have been a little more productive than what Mr. Gardiner has done.

When hon. members begin talking about a resolution I hope they make a better job than the member for Melville (Mr. Deshaye). I think the resolution that I have here has sufficient sense in it to be criticized sensibly. The hon. member for Melville did not even use good judgment or even good sense, and I think that it pretty well establishes the type of criterion that we can expect. It was a perfectly good motion which was intended to develop and increase our trade, and if that is all the opposition has to offer, it certainly shows poor judgment or simply trying to evade the issue.

Premier Douglas: — The Liberal tariff policy.

Mr. Erb: — That is all that I have to say in this regard. I am sure that I have given the hon. member a clear picture this time, if he did not hear it the first time, why this motion was brought in.

The motion was carried.

RESOLUTION RE SUBSIDIZED HOUSING

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

That this Assembly urge that the Dominion Government, in co-operation with provincial and municipal governments, take immediate steps to devise and institute a large-scale programme of subsidized housing, whereby citizens in low income groups might purchase homes on a thirty-year repayment basis at low rates of interest, or lease housing accommodation at rentals within their means.

Mr. A. C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, When I asked to adjourn the debate on this resolution, I did so for two reasons: first, because the wording of the resolution would leave the impression that nothing whatever has been done by Ottawa to meet this problem because it asks that the Ottawa government devise and institute a plan for large-scale housing. An interpretation of those words indirectly imply that as yet we haven't made a start in that regard. Secondly, because of the futility of this and other resolutions of which the net result, as I see it, is to take up the time of this House and to prevent us from giving attention and study to the main work of the Legislature.

The motion reads:

That this Assembly urge that the Dominion Government, in co-operation with provincial and municipal governments, take immediate steps to devise and institute a large-scale programme of subsidized housing, whereby citizens in low income groups might purchase homes on a thirty-year repayment basis at low rates of interest, or lease housing accommodation at rentals within their means.

It would appear that our hon. friends are just about four years behind the times. Just such a programme as this was devised and was instituted by the dominion government some four years ago. I am not going to begin to argue the merits nor the demerits of the federal plan; I am merely going to place before the Legislature the accomplishments of the dominion government along the very lines that we are urging them to take action in now.

Ottawa has some five or six plans under which it serves to meet the problem of housing. These plans cover army personnel, rural citizens and urban dwellers. I think, perhaps, the more important of these Acts is The National Housing Act, administered by the Central Mortgage Corporation. This particular branch constructs and rents houses in the urban centres of 5,000 of a population or more. Then under this particular phase of their housing programme, we find that they first built basementless houses in an attempt to meet the urgency of the situation. A two-bedroom house was rented at approximately \$22 per month; a three-bedroom house at approximately \$27.50 per month; and a four bed-room house at \$30 per month. This was an attempt to make houses available to the low-income group in that situation.

Arrangements were also made whereby the tenant of the house, if he so wished, may purchase the house; and if it was about to be purchased, arrangement was made whereby a basement and a permanent chimney would be constructed first. In the terms of these agreements, it was arranged that the purchaser was to put down, I think, ten percent of the price. He was to receive his interest at 4½ percent, and the balance of his payments were to be spread over a period of 12 to 30 years, and in some instances as high as 50 years. Payments were amortized over this period of years in order to take care of the principal, the interest, the taxes and the insurance so that they would be worked out on a payment over a number of years so that his monthly payment would not be more than what he was originally paying in monthly rents. This very movement here would appear to be in conformity with the resolution asking for subsidized housing over a period of years at a low price of interest.

Our primary concern, of course, is Saskatchewan. We might reasonably ask: "Well, how have we fared in Saskatchewan under these federal plans?" I might point out that at the end of December, 1948, we had 2,276 of these homes occupied. During 1948, 810 such units were completed in Saskatchewan. At the end of 1948, 547 such homes were under construction. The costs of units under construction and completed in 1948 involved an expenditure, within the province, of \$4,778,000. What is the picture in the Dominion as a whole in regards to this national housing problem?

When the Dominion undertook to assist in solving the housing shortage four years ago, they found that they would be confronted with many problems, and the greatest problem, of course, confronting them at that time, was the shortage of trained men in the building industry. Our first necessity was to overcome the material shortage, and, secondly, to overcome the labour shortages of trained men in that particular industry. Steps were immediately taken to accelerate the production materials. Production has been stepped until we find, for instance, cement production increased in 1948 by 50 percent. Wall board increased in its production by 85 percent; solid pipe, as another example, increased by 90 percent. I mention only a few of course, but this increase in production in the building industry took place all along the line, and by 1948 the building industry in the Dominion was spending three times the amount on plant expansion as it did in 1945. The labour force in the building industry now exceeds the 100,000 mark. You can understand that the bottlenecks have been, to a great extent, overcome in the building industry. We find that as a result of this in the last four years 275,000 homes were built in Canada. We get some conception of this when we think perhaps that 275,000 homes is a larger number of homes than in the whole city of Calgary.

My friend, the member for Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs), who so lovingly speaks of the British Labour party, boasted with pride, and I say he should boast with pride, that the British government has built a million homes. When we look at the condition in Britain, we find that those homes were ravished by war beyond the conception of most of us here in this country. We find that they indeed should be concerned in trying to remedy the situation in regard to the housing that existed after the war. I would like to point out that the housing situation, and the responsibility of supplying houses within Canada, is, firstly, the responsibility of the municipalities and the provinces, and, eventually the dominion government. The dominion government, realizing that housing was a national situation undertook to evolve these plans and to assist the municipal and provincial governments in undertaking this problem of great importance. What has been the net result of this? It has been simply this: these 275,000 homes, built by the dominion government, in a population of 13 million in the Dominion of Canada, compared to a million homes built in Great Britain with a population of four to five times as great as that of Canada. It points out that we, in Canada, have done equally as well, and have far exceeded the effort of Great Britain in relationship to our population.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I am sure that the hon. member would not wish to misinform the House. The 275,000 homes in Canada in relationship to our population, and the number of homes built by the British government in consideration of their population, we need not hide our heads in shame at the effort that we put forth.

Mr. Cameron: — Then we find that during the past war, and during the past four and five years, not only have we made great strides in meeting our national housing problems, but we have matched the efforts of other nation in the whole industrial development programme. We find that we are not only doing as well as Britain, but we are expanding our capital structure at an even more rapid rate than is the United States. We are doing ten percent better than the United States in overall terms, and we are doing 20 percent better than the United States in investment and manufacture. I said, Mr. Speaker, the responsibility of providing the homes is that of the municipalities and the provinces before it becomes that of Ottawa.

Let us examine what we have done in Saskatchewan in response to assuming our responsibilities. We find, in 1945 when the government of Ottawa was busy devising and instituting a large-scale housing project, the government in Saskatchewan was talking about the problem also, which was reasonable. I think I have a few press clippings that will bear out, perhaps more fully, what I intend to say. We come to August 31, 1945: that is when the housing situation was receiving its greatest attention, and we find a heading from The Leader-Post: Government ready to help the housing. “The Saskatchewan government, in order to ease the existing housing shortage in congested areas is prepared to take over any suitable building, convert it into temporary, satisfactory living quarters that could be removed as soon as the housing emergency ceases to exist, Reconstruction Minister J. H. Sturdy said Thursday. The Minister pointed out the projects launched by the Saskatchewan government in Regina, Saskatoon; as examples of what the provincial government could do toward meeting the housing situation.” So we were aware of the situation at that time.

Then we come on a few weeks later to September 25, 1945. We find the heading: Promise of province limits help in housing. “The decision of the Saskatchewan government to limit this housing programme to the reconversion of suitable building, particularly military building, was announced Monday by Reconstruction Minister J.H. Sturdy.”

Then we come on to 1946 – they talked of it for over a year – and we find on April 3, 1946, large headlines in The Leader-Post, with a picture of a lovely little cottage. The headline says: The province may launch big housing programme. So at least we talked of it in 1945 and 1946; we talked of it to the extent that a Bill was introduced into this Legislature.

The Saskatchewan government may undertake a provincial housing scheme costing millions of dollars, with a view to establishment of permanent, modern homes in selected areas, with parks and shopping centres, Reconstruction Minister J. H. Sturdy gave the House this information Tuesday. A Bill to amend The Housing Act was considered in the Committee of the Whole. The government hopes to finance the project through incorporated Crown companies which it could set up under the amendment to The Housing Act, Mr. Sturdy said. Companies would be constituted so they could apply to limited dividend or institutional housing corporations for loans and other privileges under The National Housing Act. The Minister was not prepared to say, however, how much might be expended, but conceded it would run into millions of dollars. The homes would be erected in areas where housing needs were greatest.

March 22, 1949

This was in 1946.

I am surprised, Mr. Speaker, to find that in 1948 we are still taking up the time of this Legislature in resolutions asking that Ottawa undertake to devise and institute a large-scale housing programme. I think from my experience in the Legislature that all too much time of this session has been taken up in just such resolutions. I do not know how many we have, but there must be a host of resolutions to Ottawa for this and that, and the other thing. Some of them are within the proper right of discussion within the Legislature – such as the question that was voted on this afternoon, margarine, and one or two of the others, but by far and large we have contributed many precious hours in debating and counter-debating resolutions which within themselves are merely a means of bringing the attention of the government at Ottawa to something which has long since been looked into. We get this all the way through. The other morning in committee we spent hours discussing one displaced person: whether or not the druggist should be compelled to find some means whereby this man could practise his profession.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Cameron: — Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — You had better confine yourself to the resolution.

Mr. Cameron: — I am through with that. I merely mentioned it to bring out my whole field of discussion in leading up to what I was going to say next. However, I will leave it at that, and I will say that, much as we may be concerned with particular things under discussion, I would like to point out that a week or ten days ago 1,200 people that likewise had problems met in the city of Regina for a whole week to assess and consider and to work upon the problems facing them. There were 1,200 municipal men whose responsibility in their field of government is equally as great as ours here, and who find problems facing them that appear to them beyond their ability to solve. They, too, have asked of this Legislature, through certain resolution, for guidance and assistance in helping them to meet their problems. I am sorry to state that, to date, Mr. Speaker, with the exception of one on the government side, not one member has stood up and mentioned anything in support of the problems of the municipal men at their convention.

Last week we had a thousand school trustees that were here for a week assessing and going over the problems particular to their administration. We find, too, that they are facing serious problems; problems which should be the concern of this particular Legislature. We find, too, not one man has stood up on the government side of this House and brought to the attention of this House the problems which the school trustees were asking us to assist them with at their convention.

Mr. Gibson: — Has this anything to do whatever with the motion under discussion?

Mr. Cameron: — I could answer that in this way: in that I mentioned that the motion was merely a basis that was causing this House to spend too much time on idle talk, and taking it from the exact things that should be the concern of this Legislature. That is what I am attempting to do here, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — The hon. member says that housing is frivolous.

Mr. Cameron: — I am not even going to consider that remark, Mr. Speaker, because there are more important things to consider in this House. But I notice that these particular problems of the people of this government get a screaming headline in the press, but hidden on the back page in the smallest of print that a socialist government in Britain has won some new by-election . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The debate on the budget and the speech from the throne are over. We are discussing a resolution, so let's get at it.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member will have to confine himself more closely to the resolution.

Mr. Cameron: — In closing, I want to say that I think I want to be brief on this resolution. I want to say in all sincerity to the House: in the resolutions that are about to be presented to us, let us be brief in our discussion of them; let us rush them through if need be in order that we can spend the dying days of this Legislature to bring toward this House things of greater import, things of more concern and immediate concern to the members of this Legislature in order that we may go back to our constituencies and be able to say, at least to the municipal men: "Your problem was brought up", and to the school trustees: "Your problem was considered." Are we to go back to our particular constituencies and say we have dealt with resolutions, such as we are dealing with here? I only want to say in closing, let us be brief with our resolutions and let us get down to the business of these parts that so concern the particular constituencies of the province.

The motion was carried.

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