

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Eleventh Legislature
16th Day

Thursday, March 9, 1950.

The House met at 3 o'clock p.m.

HULL INSURANCE VIA HUDSON BAY ROUTE

The House resumed, from Tuesday, March 7, 1950, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Howe seeking reduction of Hull Insurance Rates via the Hudson Bay Route.

Mr. J. W. Horsman (Wilkie): — In rising to speak on this Motion, I may say that I can agree with most of the things that were said by former speakers; that I agree with the fact, for instance, that the Hudson Bay Route is a very important route, and that it is not being used anywhere near to the extent that it should be. I also agree with the other speakers that hull insurance rates into that port are out of all proportion, I think, to the risk involved.

The subject of the Hudson Bay Route or the Hudson Bay Railway is not a new thing to us here in the west; it is something that has been before us for many many years. No doubt many of you will recall the old Progressive Party in this west, formed many years ago in the early 1920s. There were three things that brought that party into existence in this country: one, and perhaps the principal, was the demand for the Hudson Bay railway; another was the demand for lower tariffs; and the last, but by no means the least, was the restoration of the Crow's Nest Pass rates which had been suspended some years earlier during World War I.

It seems an extraordinary thing, Mr. Speaker, that thirty years later we are confronted with almost identical questions. True, the Crow's Nest rates have not been abolished or suspended, but we know there is a movement on foot to have those rates abolished, and we have the Hudson Bay railway. We know, however, and we all agree on this question I think, that it is not being used to anything like the extent that it should be used, and that most of the benefits we might receive from this route are taken away from us by high insurance rates.

You may also remember that the terminus of that railway, in the first place, was supposed to be Port Nelson and it was a poor port, and that, chiefly through the efforts of the late W. R. Motherwell, the terminus was changed to Port Churchill which is a much better port.

Now I say I agree with the other speakers that the hull insurance rates into Hudson Bay via that route are out of all proportion to the element of risk involved. I suppose there is more risk on that route than there is by the St. Lawrence route, but we do not believe that it should be five and one-half times higher than the rates by the eastern route.

The ocean route into Hudson Bay is another thing that is not

March 9, 1950

new; not by any means. The earliest traders who ever traded into this country brought all their trade goods and everything in by way of Hudson Bay. That was the old Hudson's Bay Company or "Gentlemen Adventurers" as they used to call them in those days. I have read a good many things about navigation in those waters in the early times, and I cannot recall, at any time, that the route was considered extremely dangerous. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that, if those old navigators with their old wooden sailing ships could negotiate those waters at all, it should be a much easier and safer thing today with the modern ships that they have now. The old sailing ships have been done away with long since; they use steel in the construction of ships now instead of wood; they will stand much heavier seas and everything of that nature.

Then, too, we have all sorts of modern helps to navigation – trade for one. We have weather stations established throughout the country that give storm warnings, and many other things of that nature. These things, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, should all help to reduce the risk of shipping through the Hudson Bay route.

The advantages of this route are many, the principal of which, of course, is that it is a much shorter route by rail from most parts of western Canada. Another thing with which I think every member of this House will agree, is that our trade with Britain and European countries should be increased, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that if this route were used to the fullest possible extent, it would become a great stimulus to trade with Europe. True, the season up there is much shorter than by way of the eastern route, but that is no good reason why this route should not be used to the fullest possible extent. In order to make this route successful, I believe we would have to have carloads coming in as well as going out; we would have to load ships both ways. We are carrying on, at the present time, quite a large, flourishing trade with Britain and other European countries, but principally Britain, and we all agree that that trade should be stepped up. I know that the hon. gentlemen in this House will agree that at least one of the greatest barriers to increased trade with Britain and the rest of Europe is hull insurance rates to Hudson Bay.

However, there are many things manufactured in Britain that we could use and use much more than we do now. It was mentioned in this House a few days ago that through the efforts of, I believe, the Minister of Agriculture one of those field Marshal tractors (which they call them) – an English tractor – was brought over to Canada and tried out on one of our Experimental Farms. I saw one of those tractors a few weeks ago. They are a big, heavy, solid-built machine, one of the heaviest types of farm tractor. They are a full diesel, one cylinder, tractor, and they will haul as heavy a load as almost any of the large farm tractors that we have today, and they are guaranteed to run under full load at about one gallon of diesel fuel per hour, which are much cheaper than any other tractor of that horsepower that we have here made in Canada, or which we get from the States. And, there are other tractors. The Ford Company of England make a tractor, and they are sending out another tractor – a three to four plow tractor – and much cheaper than anything of that size that is manufactured here. There are many other articles that we could use more than we do now, and I think if we had trade going through Hudson Bay that we could increase our trade with Britain very much indeed.

I believe, though, that what the hon. member from Kelvington

said was right when he said that farm products should be based on Hudson Bay prices, but there is another matter that works against us on Hudson Bay prices, which most of you know about, and that is the diversion charge that is paid to grain elevator companies who ship grain by way of Hudson Bay. Now these diversion charges are something which I think are a great injustice to the people of the west, and the grain growers of the west. I have here a small newspaper clipping dealing with this matter which I will read to you, and I think it will explain this thing better than I can.

This was published in the 'Saskatoon Star' on November 8, 1949. Here is what it says:

"It is about time that the Canadian Wheat Board explains to the farmers of Western Canada why they make an outright gift of 1½ cents to elevator companies and the Wheat Pool on every bushel of wheat shipped from Churchill instead of the Lakehead. Figures contained in a recent return in the House of Commons show that, in the crop years from 1939 to 1948, shipping out twelve million bushels via Churchill cost the Wheat Board \$36,198 more than had the wheat been shipped via the eastern route.

On the face of it, this figure makes the Hudson Bay route look like an uneconomical operation, but a closer examination shows this figure is misleading in the extreme. Actually in these ten years, the Board saved itself \$137,084 on freight charges by shipping through Churchill. This works out at about 1 cent per bushel. But having saved itself this not inconsiderable sum, made during years when the Port was working at far from its potential capacity, the Board turned around and gave the \$137,084 away and another \$36,198 besides. It gave \$137,282 to elevator companies, including Pools, in the form of diversion charges.

The question may well be asked – why should the Board pay the elevators this money? The elevators do nothing to earn it.

It is, in effect, a sum to compensate the Companies for the fact that at Churchill the wheat goes through a Government elevator and not through Company elevators at the Lakehead.

There seems to be no logical reason why this money should be paid out. If wheat can be shipped more cheaply through Churchill then that is the way it should be shipped, without reference to the fact that the elevator companies might lose a little business. As the 'Saskatoon Star' pointed out – no other commercial company

March 9, 1950

which finds the business undercut by more economical processes can run to the Government and claim a diversion charge. Why should the elevators? A direct question to elevator companies or Pool officials for an explanation, will get the questioner nowhere. There never has been a satisfactory explanation given as to what diversion charges are paid. Before the Wheat Board issues any more statements claiming it loses money by the Hudson Bay route it might explain why this is true.”

Here is another short comment on the same thing on the same report made by Frank Eliason, secretary of the Hudson Bay Association.

“Commenting on the report tabled in the House of Commons at Ottawa, early last week, which showed Wheat Pool losses on shipping wheat by Churchill, the secretary of the Hudson Bay Association declared that the port of Churchill if operated on a fair competitive basis could show a saving to both producer and buyer. Mr. Eliason said the conversion charge is from 1 cent to 1½ cents per bushel and that eight elevator companies were paid in lieu of their terminal earnings. In other words, they were paid for a service they did not render. On that basis, Mr. Eliason commented, for all wheat shipped via Churchill the Wheat Board should subsidize the railways and lake shipowners of wheat they did not ship. ‘Has the terminal the divine right to handle all grain, or is this a competitive system we are operating under?’ he asks. If it is the latter then Churchill can stand on its own feet. Mr. Eliason suggested that a Royal Commission should investigate the operation of the Hudson Bay Railway and the port of Churchill in relation to other routes.”

Now, I think, Mr. Speaker, that is a grave injustice. I don’t see why these elevator companies should be paid diversion charges for service that they don’t render at all, taken out of the profits that we might otherwise make. It is just another knock against the Hudson Bay route. Of course, I don’t know that it would be wise to store up a whole lot of wheat in Churchill early in the season. A situation might arise whereby that wheat might be sold and would have to be shipped then. If wheat could be stored in many country elevators in the northern part of this province and shipped out to that port perhaps somewhere near the time when that route would be expected to be open, that would do away with any possibility of having to ship wheat through Churchill back through the Eastern route. And that is another argument that has been used at times against the Hudson Bay route.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us turn to the matter of Hull insurance. It would appear that the very high rates now charged by the insurance companies to protect shipping through the Hudson Bay Route are charges that the hon. members in this House believe to be exorbitant, and we also believe that these

insurance companies are making huge profits to which they are not entitled and are taking these huge profits mainly out of the people of the West, farmers in particular. It is our opinion that this practice should be stopped – should be done away with permanently. In view of these facts, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the following amendment to the motion:

“That the motion be amended by striking out all the words after the word “Assembly” in the first line down to and including the word “Rates” in the third line, and substituting the following therefor:

“Request the Government of Saskatchewan to consider the extension of its insurance activities through the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office by supplying coverage on Hull insurance.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Insurance Act was amended in 1947. Subsection (1) of Section 3 was amended by adding to paragraph 1 two clauses covering marine insurance and aviation insurance. Now, it seems to me, in view of the facts mentioned, and I think facts that we pretty all well agree with – that this should be a good opportunity for our Government to branch out in their insurance business. We know they have a prosperous insurance business here; perceive the reports tabled. There is no reason to doubt but what it is a good insurance business, and this looks to me like a good opportunity for them to step out and do something that would be of real benefit to the farmers of this country.

I think the Federal Government, too, should be urged to do everything they can to promote business via that route, but the Federal Government are not in the insurance business. Our Government is in the insurance business – that’s where I see the difference. Suppose, Mr. Speaker, that our Government could go into that business and reduce rates; suppose they could cut them in half from what they are now – 5½ times higher than the rates by the Eastern route. Suppose they could cut them to 2½ times higher – that would still leaves a large margin over what is paid in the Eastern route, and it should leave a large margin for profit. When rates go down to where the thing started to get risky, there would not be anything to stop them from pulling out. I don’t think either, that the Government of Canada can force any insurance company to insure cargo going into the Hudson Bay at any set rate. All the company would have to do would be to refuse the business. I do not think they could force the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office to insure cargoes going in and out of Hudson Bay. I think that they would just have to refuse the business. But this looks to me like a golden opportunity when we are all established here in the insurance business and marine insurance is covered under the Act and everything is all ready to go ahead, and I would advise members of this House to consider this matter very carefully. I take great pleasure in moving this amendment, seconded by Mr. Wood.

Mr. Speaker: — It has been moved by Mr. Horsman, seconded by Mr. Woods – That the motion be amended by striking out all the words after the word “Assembly” in the first line down to and including the word “Rates” in the third line, and substituting the following: “Request the Government of Saskatchewan to consider the extension of its insurance activities through the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office by supplying coverage on Hull rate and then it will go on “via the Hudson Bay route and place this route on a fair competitive basis with the St. Lawrence route”. The debate is now on the amendment.

March 9, 1950

Hon. C. M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. gentleman for the very great tribute which he has just paid to the operations of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office. I think that this is one of the finest tributes that has ever been paid in the history of Crown Corporations in Saskatchewan — that one of the members of the Opposition would get up and suggest that we extend our activities to the insuring of these various hulls coming into the port of Churchill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the hon. gentleman is asking us to give consideration to something to which we have already given a great deal of consideration. We have been studying this question of insurance insofar as the vessels coming into the Hudson Bay are concerned over a period of years, and I want to say, very frankly, that we have already done a great deal towards assisting in this work. For example, I have here in my hands the rates which were formerly charged by private companies, and one of the amazing things is that the insurance rates for the vessels and cargo coming into Churchill are just double those for vessels coming into the Eastern Canadian ports. We have been able to reduce these rates very considerably. We have been able to cut the rates on cargoes coming into the port of Churchill, but we have been unable to insure the hulls.

There is a very good reason for it. First of all, the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office has tried to follow very sound insurance principles. We have adopted the policy of reinsuring our large risks so that, today, nowhere have we a risk over a certain amount, depending, of course, upon the type of building and the purpose for which that building is used. At the present stage of our financial development, we do not feel that we should carry any limit beyond say \$50,000 or \$75,000. That is as much as we think that it would be safe for us to handle. Yet, to insure one of these large boats would require several million dollars. Now frankly, we are not in the position to do it unless we can do as we have done with other large buildings, for example, or groups of buildings which we have insured. If the London Marine Insurance market would follow us with our reduced rates, then, of course, we would be in a position where we would be able to go out on the market, go to Lloyds or someplace and buy the reinsurance which would be necessary for it to be a sound business operation. But, of course, if we deviate even in the slightest degree from the rates which have been set by the Imperial Shipping Committee, which control these rates, then, of course, we are unable to get any reinsurance whatsoever, so that it would mean that we would be left holding a risk of two or three million dollars, or five million dollars, depending upon the type of vessel which came into Churchill, and if anything happened to that boat it would take all the assets that we have.

Mr. Speaker, I think that you will agree that we cannot be expected to place the whole of the assets of the insurance office in jeopardy in this way. We are prepared to do it tomorrow, if the other companies will join with us, in getting these rates reduced.

I might say that even at this very moment we are busy exploring the possibility of organizing a Western Canadian Marine Insurance Pool, which is hoped will be made up of the various companies doing business in Western Canada, including our own insurance office. Now this Pool would place the resources of the various insurers, such as ourselves, in a position to insure a much large proportion of the import cargo which is coming into Churchill

at the present time. We have discussed this matter with Mr. Dalgleish, the head of the Dalgleish Shipping Company and other people, and are just as anxious as any other member to get into this business as quickly as we can. But we cannot at this time do this.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have no particular objection to the amendment, except that it takes the very heart out of the resolution. I think it completely destroys the resolution. I am not sure that it is, strictly speaking, an amendment to the motion at all, I am not sure that it is actually in order, because it is destroying the motion, not amending it. The original motion asks the Assembly to urge the Government of Canada to do all in its power to reduce hull insurance rates via the Hudson Bay route, and the motion is striking that out and asking the Government of Saskatchewan to consider the extension of its insurance activities through the Government Insurance Office by supplying coverage on hull insurance.

Now, as I have indicated, we have already given study to that. We are giving study to it, and I would like to see us given a chance to vote on the original resolution, so that we would get the wider resources of the Dominion, get the Insurance Underwriters of Canada, for example. If my hon. friend had included the Insurance Underwriters of Canada, then I think we would be in a position to really talk turkey. As I say, we have already reduced the rate on the cargoes very considerably and have made very substantial savings to those people who have brought cargoes in. But I feel that the passing of this amendment will not do any good in view of the explanations that I have just given. I am going to ask my hon. friend to withdraw the resolution in view of the explanation I have given, if he would like to do that. If not, I would like to ask the House to turn it down.

The question being put on the amendment moved by Mr. Horsman, the amendment was negatived, on division, by 29 votes against 19.

The question then being put on Mr. Howe's original Motion, it was agreed to unanimously.

AGRICULTURAL PRICES SUPPORT

The House resumed, from Tuesday, March 7, 1950, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Gibson respecting Agricultural Prices Support.

Mr. G. H. Danielson (Arm River): — In rising to speak on this Motion, I might say that this is very important to people of Western Canada and indeed to all of Canada, but particularly to the farmers on the Prairies. They have asked for support prices for all of our agricultural products, of which we have had, of course, the guarantee up-to-date, although the need of putting it into effect has not been very much apparent up to the present time. I think the principle of this resolution is one every man in this House to agree to. We are simply asking the taxpayers of Canada to give us some support and stability during the reconstruction period that is now coming on.

I think I am safe in saying, Mr. Speaker, that that has been the policy of the Government of Canada for the last eight or ten years. I

March 9, 1950

think that has been the line of policy of the Government at Ottawa ever since the early days of the war. I just want to review. On December 4, 1943, W. L. MacKenzie King in a radio broadcast delivered said:

“I wish tonight to thank the farmers of Canada for the magnificent contribution to the battle of production. I wish again to appeal to them to continue to help hold the front line against inflation by continuing to support the price ceiling. If to help win the war, the farmers are asked to accept the ceiling on prices, we believe that they are entitled to a floor price in the prices to insure them against agricultural depression after the war. It is an essential part of our post war policy. The Government intends at the next session of Parliament to place a floor price on the farm products”

Now, that was in 1943. Again in 1944, the Agricultural Prices Support Act set out the function of the Board in the preamble to the Act as follows:

“Endeavour to assure adequate and stable returns for agriculture, and that it should endeavour to secure a fair relationship between the returns from agriculture and those from other occupations.”

That was in 1944. We now come to 1950, Mr. Speaker. The Speech from the Throne which opened the House, in Ottawa, a few days ago – I think on the same day that we opened here in Saskatchewan – had this to say:

“Circumstances outside Canada have been responsible for the downward adjustment in the price of farm products. Measures have already been taken to reduce the impact of these adjustments. In order to provide authority to continue price supports to that end of the primary products of our farms and fisheries, you will be asked to amend the Agricultural Products Act and the Fisheries Price Support Act.”

This sets a programme for this Session. I understand that the Act lapses on March 31st and that a new Bill will be introduced to continue the principle of this Act. So I do not think that there is any difference in opinion so far as the fundamentals of this thing are concerned. The responsibility has been accepted by the Government of Canada and I think, perhaps, if anyone is entitled to consideration in this respect it is the farmers of Canada who have, during the war years, accepted prices for products which have been below the actual prices we could have had in the markets of the world during that period. I do not think there is anyone who particularly has been putting in any strong complaints regarding that policy. It was accepted. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers accepted that policy part of the time, but not all of the time. Part of the time, that policy was also applied to the salary and wage-earning classes in our Dominion. Their wages and income was frozen and, for that reasons, we had no kick as producers of farm products or any reasons to kick with regard to that policy. When the war was over, the releases of ceilings on salaries and wages were

made (and I think it was necessary); but most of the things that we were held down on had price ceilings that remained in effect for some considerable time, and for that reason we have, as wheat producers in this Dominion, made by far the biggest sacrifice of any class in our Dominion of Canada.

Now then, what did we do before we had this support? We did just as other producing classes in the Dominion had done for many years. We asked for protective tariffs to guard against cut-rate prices in order to pay certain wages and be able to operate. Now whether the request has been justified at all times, I am not going to discuss at the present time; but that is what we are doing and we as farmers should not forget that when we abandon that free sort of policy which, I think, most of the farmers of Canada have always adhered to, then we also will abandon something which places us in a position where we cannot very strongly complain about some of the others, who are also asking for something from the Government to which we in the past have very strongly objected.

I would like to say that support prices by Government can only be used and should only be used for the purpose of stabilizing, or 'cushioning' the shock in adjustment periods like the one which we are going through at the present time. I know that there is no exporting country in the world that has been able or will be able to ask the taxpayers, the people at large, to pay any particular part of the economy, or any producing class in that economy, certain fixed prices – more than the world's prices will earn. If you ask the Government to guarantee you certain prices for any length of time that Government sooner or later will be forced into a position to say to me as a producer and my friend here, who is another producer, "You shall produce so much and no more, because we can only dispose of that quantity, and we cannot (no nation could) stand the burden of building products which are not useable or saleable." They may be useful in some parts of the world but that has no effect on us if that part of the world is unable to give us the prices which it cost us to produce these goods.

I think we should never forget that. The United States, of course, a wealthy nation, did go farther along the line of protecting the producer than any other nation, and even they are getting into very deep water at the present time. It is estimated that, at the end of this fiscal year, over \$4 billion of the United States tax money is sunk and tied up in commodities which are not useable and some of which are absolutely impossible to dispose of. They had 465 million bushels of wheat of a value of \$996,719,000, they had corn holdings of 510 million bushels at a value of \$713,128,000, they have a 6,035,000 bales of cotton at value of \$965 million and they have a smaller part of other commodities like flax seed, butter, dried eggs and all that sort of thing, running up to four billion of dollars. Then it is estimated that the \$4 billion will even be exceeded at the end of this fiscal year.

There is a nation, Mr. Speaker, which can go to the farmer in the spring of the year and say, "We will guarantee you a certain price for your products." Great Britain can do that without any fear of consequences because there is hardly a commodity that I know of produced in the British Isles which is not in short supply. They must import products. Well, if we were in that position, Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Government could say, "Here, we will give you so much for bushels of wheat and so much for your hogs and eggs and everything else," because all they would have to do would be to set the price for the public who have to consume the products, and the

March 9, 1950

money would come right back to them. But we know that with a nation that exports, particularly a nation like Canada who will export at least 80 per cent of our products, it cannot be done. We are asking the Government, nevertheless, and I think justly to come forward and carry out and expand the policy which we have already had implemented, to some extent, in the past year or two.

This motion, Mr. Speaker, is of the gravest importance, and I am going to move an amendment to this resolution. In order to be able to discuss this problem fully and freely, I am going to move the amendment now, and my remarks from now on will be chiefly direct towards and in support of this amendment. I have already supplied the Mover of the resolution with the amendment, and I would like to read the amendment now to the House:

That all the words after the word "Assembly" in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"urge the Federal Government to co-operate with the Provincial Government in giving every possible assistance to producers in organizing provincial marketing boards, and that the Government of Canada be requested to render all possible assistance and if necessary financial aid in setting up a National Marketing Agency under the control of the producers through their provincial marketing boards, and that floor prices be continued and extended for all farm commodities which will assure the producers a price commensurate with the cost of production and an adequate standard of living."

Mr. Speaker, I said a little while ago that this is the time of adjustment and that, as farmers of Canada we face this period. I do not think it makes any difference how much we prove this, and how much we try to blame the Government for what is taking place. I think we are just as helpless as anyone could be in preventing that re-adjustment, because we have reached the point now where not only agricultural products but other products, manufactured products (and there are signs to that effect) are also adjusting themselves to a lower price level. I am not so sure that would be a bad thing. I think this eternal race – wages up, prices up, wages up, prices up – reaches a peak when something is going to happen and if we can control and check ourselves and have an orderly re-adjustment to a middle price level, then I think the economy of our country and all those individuals will be far better taken care of than they will be if a non-controlled spiral continues until the top blows off like it did back in 1929.

Someone said that there has been a certain amount of criticism of Great Britain. I am not criticizing Great Britain at all. Great Britain is a purchaser, a buyer, and Great Britain is just like any other government, whether it is Socialist or Liberal or Conservative or Capitalists or whatever they are; they are not going to pay any more for the necessities of life than they need to, to carry on. If we in Canada, or the North American continent, place ourselves through our own actions in a position where we have priced ourselves out of the world's economy, then, Mr. Speaker, painful as it may be, there is no other course for us, if we are going to live and trade with the nations of the world, than to bring prices down where we can do so. And that re-adjustment period is here now. We do not like it. I know some people would say I am a pessimist. No, I am not a pessimist.

I am an optimists, Mr. Speaker, for the future; but nevertheless it is an inescapable fact that you cannot talk away, you cannot get rid of by criticizing governments or boards or wheat pools or anything else; it cannot be done.

I have here an article that was written by one of the outstanding agriculturalists in the province of Saskatchewan, and I do not think anyone here will say that I am not right. This article, Mr. Speaker, was written by Mr. Hedley Auld, and he deals with the Canadian picture. He touches on the United States picture and then about Great Britain in connection with the purchase of farm commodities and the foodstuffs that they need. And he says:

“The statements given to the Agricultural Production Conference held in Ottawa in mid-December showed that the United Kingdom can buy bacon from Ireland, Denmark and Poland for a fraction less than 31 cents per lb. and the price to Canada is 36 cents per lb. Cheese is available in New Zealand for less than 22 cents per lb., in Australia for 19.2 cents per lb. compared with 30 cents in Canada. These countries also have butter at 34.7 cents per lb. and 34.5 cents per lb. respectively, whereas our price is 58 cents per lb. Denmark eggs are priced at 30.8 cents per dozen and egg prices in the United States and Australia were quoted under 35 cents per dozen. In Canada, the price of eggs at that time was 52.5 cents per dozen.

Then we have other products and, in every case, there are prices far below the market price at which the market has been held in Canada for the same products. He then speaks about the United States:

“Hog markets in the United States in the next twelve months 15 per cent over the previous twelve months. That is the expectation of what is going to happen in the United States. Prices have been down close to support prices for weeks, and they stayed below fluctuating guide price for months in seven selective markets. The guide price for December is \$14.75 per hundredweight. This is equivalent to about \$19.41.”

You know what the present prices are in Canada. The price on the second day of this month, Mr. Speaker, in Winnipeg was \$26.75 to \$27.00 a hundredweight and in the United States a carcass of that weight was \$19.41 approximately, very little lower than that.

Now what is the difference in the prices? We get down to the bacon agreement. We see there in spite of the fact that there is a bacon agreement (not a big one) for the coming year, the price they are paying to Canada, this year, is considerably more than what they might pay for that particular product in some other markets; and Great Britain started, not at this time but a year ago, to place orders with Poland for all kinds of farm products at much lower prices than they are paying us in Canada. So we

March 9, 1950

can expect that the laws of economics rule all the actions of the Government in Great Britain. We will have to accept, if we are going to say in that market, a price which will induce the British people to buy in Canadian markets.

The next criticism, Mr. Speaker, that has been leveled at the Government in Ottawa has been the fact that some of the contracts could not be renewed with Great Britain, and that the failure to do so is the fault of the Federal Government. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any sense in that argument at all. I think it is absolutely wrong, because over a year ago, we were told that there was very little hope of getting another egg contract with Great Britain, and I know that some time in September we were told quite frankly that there was no hope of getting an egg contract with Great Britain, and that other contracts would be drastically reduced. So that it is no new thing to us. We knew what was coming, and there is no person in this country can show to me or anyone else that the Dominion Government ever made the promise, during the last ten years at any time at the end of these contract periods, that they were ready as a Federal Government to go into the business of marketing bacon, eggs, cheese and all these things that are now for sale in Canada. There never has been a statement to that effect, Mr. Speaker.

Now, then. Before the war, Mr. Speaker, we had in Saskatchewan and I think that a fraction of the statement that no one is able to take care of this problem except the Dominion Government, is a reflection on the initiative and ability of the farmers and producers in general. I think it is a reflection on them, because we find ourselves having been able as farmers in Saskatchewan to build up the greatest grain marketing organization in the world today. We did it, too, without any help from anybody else. We organized and we built that organization ourselves. Before the war, Mr. Speaker, you had the Poultry Pool here. You shipped millions of dozens of eggs all over Canada. The excess eggs that were produced during the war, they stored them under proper conditions, and they sold them when the markets were available. This organization was controlled by the farm women in Saskatchewan. So the people of this province and of other provinces, too, can take care of this problem themselves if given the opportunity. It is up to the Government to find facilities for the operation of these organizations. It is nothing new: Manitoba has them; Ontario has them now, at least for the last few years. And now is the time to go back and reorganize these marketing organizations on a bigger and firmer foundation than before the future benefit of the producers of this province and that's what the farmer, Mr. Speaker, is trying to do.

I was rather surprised that the Government, particularly the Minister of Agriculture, have taken the attitude they have in this matter, because I put it to you, Mr. Speaker, their attitude has been absolutely negative in this matter. They have done nothing to assist in the operation of the agricultural marketing organizations and the Act which was placed on the statute books here, in 1945. Nothing at all. As a matter of fact, they have done nothing but offer criticism on every suggestion that has been made whereby this Act may be now at least, after all these years, of some service and some benefit to the people of the province of Saskatchewan. This Act was passed by this Government – and, by the way, this Act was so inclusive, Mr. Speaker, that it takes every imaginable thing that is produced on a farm except wheat. There was no provision in the Act for asking the producer whether he wants it or not. It was only on the insistence of a member of the

Opposition that they brought in an amendment to the Act which provided for a vote being taken and 51 per cent would be the vote required.

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — Mr. Speaker, a correction, if I may. Provisions were made for taking a vote of the producers, but on a suggestion from your side of the House we fixed a figure of 51 per cent in favour.

Mr. Danielson: — I remember the occasion very well, and it practically left the whole thing in the hands of the Minister and the Government. It does not mean anything. They fixed the vote at 51 per cent — they could not make it any less, of course. But, that's a fact. This Act has been on the Statute books and I am not criticizing the Government for not putting it into effect, because I don't think there has been any need of it. But the Minister himself, I think you find, was absolutely honest in what he intended to try and do. I think he intended to put that Act into operation the first year but, for some reason (he admitted that himself), he did not get the co-operation of the producers or the co-operative organizations, and for that reason he did not try to push it into operation. Now that was to be understood. I am not criticizing him for that; but now, when it can be put into operation and he does not do it, we are asking that the C.C.F. Government do everything in their power to assist the producers, to help them out with suggestions, expert advice in every way possible, to get these organizations set up. Then we ask again that the Dominion Government come forward with their advice, and that the machinery that they already have be set up to assist the Province, and the Provincial Board in organizing and building up a national marketing board, owned and controlled by the provincial boards and, if need be, they would finance the setting up of such an organization. It is the practical thing. It does not make any difference whether you would like it or not. We move that the producers through the provincial organizations take care of the management of this problem. That we have to ensure for the next year or two at least, and I think you will see it for a number of years, for the simple reason that there will be production, and, properly functioning, they should be protected against losses up to a certain floor price; that is, by the money that will be voted by the Dominion Government, which has been voted for the last two years to the extent of \$200,000,000 — and there is no doubt that that amount will be continued and probably increased. So that makes an excellent opportunity now, the greatest opportunity there has ever been in this country for the producers themselves to get right down to business, and I think all the Governments, not only Provincial but Federal (I should probably put it the other way, Mr. Speaker, but we'll let it go at that) are all willing and anxious now to get this thing organized, and get it off their hands themselves. I don't think this Government is anxious to set up a government board. I think the feeling of this Government, like everybody else, is let the people that produce the goods — let the Wheat Pool attend to the wheat grower; let them organize themselves into a body that will do for themselves what nobody else can do for them.

Premier Douglas: — I have followed the hon. member up to the question of the provincial marketing board and producers' organization. When he gets to the matter of the National marketing agency, has my friend in mind that the producers would actually do the overseas marketing or that the Federal Government would do the overseas marketing as it does now through the Wheat Board?

Mr. Danielson: — The Minister should know that there is no hope of the Federal

March 9, 1950

Government setting up any National marketing board as a Government body. The Government in the past has operated under the War Measures Act. I am not dealing with wheat now, I am dealing with other products; and even there, they have not set up an emergency board for bacon or anything else. They have seen to it that the required amount of products to fill the contract have been secured by the Board, and then shipped overseas to Great Britain and their effected the floor price that stabilized the price all over Canada to the consumer in Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, arrangements are being made whereby the producers in Canada through their organizations are going to have a conference with the Government. That conference is going to be called very shortly. The main purpose of it is simply, in conjunction with the Federal Department of Agriculture, to put into operation and build up the structure necessary to put this national marketing board into operation. It says here:

“The conference is being called on the initiative of the Federation of Agriculture, after an exchange of communications with Federal Agricultural Minister James G. Gardiner. The time and place have not yet been set.

The situation is that most provinces have marketing acts giving more or less authority to provincial boards to regulate the sale of specified commodities within their own borders. Last year, Ottawa enacted Bill No. 82, the Agricultural Products Marketing Act, which gave authority to such boards to carry their operations into the field of Federal jurisdiction, interprovincial and export trade. The proposed conference will discuss the co-ordination of the activities of the provincial boards so as to have them work on a national scale. Eggs and poultry are an example of proposed nation-wide control over farm commodities.

It will consider uniformity of provincial legislation towards this end. At present there is a considerable variation between one province and another. Some require a vote of the producers before any commodity board is authorized. Some confine the board's powers to that of negotiating a marketing scheme with the trade and do not give it full authority to control the product.

The coming conference will also discuss the methods under which any provincial or inter-provincial marketing set-up can take advantage of the Federal Government's price support policy.”

Now, this is all in the cards at the present time.

“The sequence of events as explained by the C.F.A. (Canadian Federation of Agriculture) is that

in 1938 the producers asked for a Dominion Marketing Act, but they did not get it, and the following year they offered a compromise in the form of a draft Bill, stating that if Ottawa would give to the provincial boards marketing in the matter of inter-provincial and export trade that would be adequate for the purpose. The matter was left in abeyance during the war. The Federation renewed its request in 1946, 1947 and in 1948 and finally saw it granted in 1949. The federal Legislation followed very closely the C.F.A. draft Bill of ten years earlier.”

Let me repeat, the Act passed in Parliament, last spring, was almost exactly along the lines of a draft Bill offered by the organization for the producers themselves.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask who wrote this?

Mr. Danielson: — I can tell you. It was Mr. Hugh Boyd from Ottawa, and I do not think there is a man in Ottawa today who is more qualified and more genuinely interested in the farmers’ problems than Mr. High Boyd. Prior to his present duties, he was employed by the Wheat Pool.

Now then, any criticism on the Act of Parliament, Mr. Speaker, I think is out of place, because what has been passed is what the producers asked for.

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — Mr. Speaker, what is the date line of that newspaper article?

Mr. Danielson: — February 27th, 1950 – not so many weeks ago. I got this out of the “Western Producer” and, as a matter of fact, I have it out of the “Western Producer” and the Regina “Leader-Post” both. The Regina “Leader-Post” is a little more elaborate – it explains the thing a little more fully. The article which I read is out of the Regina “Leader-Post”, but I have it here from the “Western Producer” as well. There is no argument about this, Mr. Speaker, for, after all, the Provincial Government has a part to play in this matter. And another thing, the poultrymen will be meeting here very shortly and that is up-to-date, as it is dated February 28, 1950:

“The Saskatchewan Poultry Association meeting with other groups here, Saturday, (that’s in Saskatchewan) approved in principle a scheme submitted by the president for the establishment of a Provincial Poultry Marketing Board. Represented at the meeting were the Saskatchewan Co-operative Creamery, Dairy and Poultry Pool, Wheat Pool and the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture. Others were Prof. Wade, head of the Poultry Department of the University of Saskatchewan; C.W. Wood, Poultry Commissioner; G. Hoffman, Poultry Production Inspector for the Dominion Government. A poultry marketing programme for eggs and poultry was a prerequisite to achieve their objective.”

March 9, 1950

And then it speaks about Manitoba. The same thing is taking place down there. The Saskatchewan Board would be free to work with similar boards in Manitoba and Alberta, to form a central board or marketing agency to act for inter-provincial and export trade.

The whole thing is necessary for the producer, Mr. Speaker. We ask that the Dominion Government come forward now to assist these provincial boards and the producers and that they co-ordinate and organize this thing in the proper way; and they have to come back again and support prices for these products, just like they did with butter. We bought butter at 58 cents per lb a year or two ago. There never was a shortage of butter in this country, and then this margarine came in and took about 70 to 80 million pounds of the butter market away from the farmers. Now there is a surplus of butter, and the Government is heavily involved in the Prices Support Act, and it may be there will be a loss yet – no one knows – because the Government has held this butter. And, so we see the same thing here. We say that eggs will be 32 cents per dozen to the farmer. Mr. Speaker, I have been here for over 45 years now and if we, as farmers could receive 30 cents per dozen for our eggs for 12 months of the year, we would have many hundreds of thousand dollars more than we have now.

I spoke to a group of farmers in my district a few days ago, I just happened to walk in when they were talking in a business place, and this thing came up and I said, “Well, I don’t know much about the poultry business; we never went into it very heavy.” “Well,” he said, “if you’ll give me that for 12 months a year, I am not kicking at all, because 80 per cent of the eggs are produced in the spring and summer months in this country and these men who are engaged in the poultry business producing eggs are not going to quit production.” There is no doubt there are greater investments, Mr. Speaker. There is no doubt in my mind that for fresh eggs in the wintertime, we don’t need to look for a market. The market is always there at a good deal more than 30 or 35 cents a dozen, so there is nothing to be afraid of. I say that, when the poultry pools and egg pools commence to operate with a basic floor price of 32 cents, the interest of the poultry and egg producers of Canada is fairly well looked after. It may be, as I have said, where an adjustment period is necessary; and I know the farmers are the first ones that will take it – they usually are. There are also other classes of world society that don’t altogether escape the readjustment that is coming, I could mention a few things in regard to business which are also taking a great big loss in order to place themselves on a footing where it is possible to move out into consumption and they can go ahead and do business. That is the situation.

There are many many more things that I could speak of, Mr. Speaker, but insofar as the Marketing Act in this province is concerned it was placed on the statute books for a purpose. I am not criticizing the purpose. All we did at that time was decide that it was going to be a good thing. There should have been a bigger majority in favour of it than 51 per cent. I said so at the time, but that is not so important. What we want to do is to use that Act now. It must have been placed there for such a purpose and if it was not placed there for that purpose, Mr. Speaker, then it must have been placed there for some other purpose. We can draw our own conclusions in regard to that. So I would say, Mr. Speaker, that after all, it proves what a price adjustment, what a price recession that has taken place in the agricultural province up-to-date, and anyone that goes out and thinks that he is going to make big capital out of these little adjustments taking

place at the present time, is absolutely making himself silly, that is all, because the farmers of this province know that they have to take these adjustments and they are expecting them. It is up to the producers themselves and the Governments, both Provincial and Federal, to see to it that this adjustment will be as painless as possible.

There was something said when this Resolution was introduced, Mr. Speaker, in regard to farm income. Well, you can get most any statistics to prove so and so and so and so; but I think when you consider that type of comparison, that it depends a whole lot from what angle you approach the matter. I think when you come to figure farm income, and you can take the farm income of Saskatchewan for 1948 as compared with 1949. You may get an entirely wrong picture of the farm prices structure as a whole, and why do you do this? Well, Mr. Speaker, and I don't think there is any man in this House who quoted these figures who does not know that himself, the main income in this province is wheat production; there is no question about that. We have had a certain amount of this calamity hitting us for the last few years, but, last year, if you look at the map, conditions are almost as bad as they would have been if that plan of bonuses had been in operation in 1937; there is far more than half of this province that had practically no crop so far as farm income is concerned. Three, four, five and six bushel to the acre is not farm income, because it does not pay the cost of production and taxes, etc. That is what we find when we compare the farm income of this province of Saskatchewan from 1948 to 1949 without taking these conditions into account, Mr. Speaker. We get an entirely false picture about what the condition really is, because there are people in the province of Saskatchewan that had a crop in 1949 and 1948, and I would say that there is a very small reduction in farm income between the two years.

I have some statistics here: "Canadian farm prices were down in 1949, the first decline in ten years." That picture is all over Canada; it is not in one province in particular. However, the general average still remains more than two and on-half times higher than it was during the 1935-39 period. We were down so low that it should not fairly be called a comparison; that was my only objection to it. Well, I will go on and try to prove what I am saying.

The Bureau of Statistics reported that farm prices of Canadian agricultural products dropped 1.3 per cent from the 1948 record of 252.6, to 251.3; that is the drop all over Canada. In 1935, taking the basic period which I mentioned, the income of Canadian farms was based at 80; 1936 – 96.3; 1937 – 119.7; 1938 – 105; there you have your average of 100. In 1940, it had gone up 96.8; 1941 – 110.2; 1942 – 133.1; 1943 – 157.8; 1944 – 172.4; 1945 – 182.2; 1946 – 208; 1947 – 212.5; 1948 – 252.6. That 1948 figure was an all-time high; that was the peak of farm income in Canada. In 1949, it was 251.3 as I already stated. But in 1945 (and when you mention this thing to some farmer, they thought that 1945 was a very good year, a very satisfactory farm income), we find that in 1945 the average was 182.2; it was 67½ per cent higher in 1948. Now that is the position, Mr. Speaker, for Canada as a whole. If we take out the drought area which was a calamity, I am sure there will be very little difference found between 1948 and 1949.

I want to say another thing or two in regard to this price structure. There is another consideration which is much more fair, in comparing prices as between the agricultural income and other incomes in Canada,

March 9, 1950

than to try to compare them as part of the national income. There are so many of a farm population in Canada and taking the national income on the basis of the population, some say the national income should be divided on a per capita basis – so and so and so and so. I do not think you will ever arrive at a complete of a fair basis on that division; I don't think it can be done. I have a table here – I think a much more fair basis, Mr. Speaker. What relationship is there between manufactured commodities, merchandise, machinery of every kind that the farmer buys heavily and the price of the product which he produces? I think that is the relationship which counts for the farmer. That has been my own experience, and I have farmed for some few years myself; but I have a table here and it commences in the year 1913. I am not going to read it to you, but even at the bottom of the period of the 1930s, you will find in 1933, 1935, 1936 and so on that there was prosperity then but nothing to the extent that some people would be lead to believe; but we get down to the last few years, and in 1946 the farm income and the price levels for farm products sold at 124.6. I want to point out to the House that these figures are not based on 1936-39 or from 1933-40 or something like that. They are based on the years 1913 to 1948, and that is a long time, taking in the 'thirties and the good years, and I think 1929 was one of the most prosperous years that Canada has enjoyed as far as agricultural products are concerned. In 1946, for farm products the price level was 124.4 and of various manufactured products it was 98.8. Then we get to 1947 with a price level of 132.9 for agriculture and 96 for manufactured products. Now that, I think, is a good indication that, when it comes to receiving something for our goods, we have had at least a fair break the last few years. I think I am safe in saying this.

I just want to say one more word in regard to Great Britain and I say again that I am not criticizing Great Britain. But I am not the only one that realizes that Great Britain does what every other individual and country has to do when it comes to a battle for survival, Mr. Speaker. This was not realized in 1949 or 1948, but it was realized in 1947 when some of our farm leaders were told that in 1947. I have here a dispatch dated May 17, 1947, from the big farm conference, the International Farm Conference. Mr. Wesson, President of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, was speaking and that was in a closed session, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Wesson, speaking before the policy committee of the International Federation of Agricultural Producers at a closed session, said:

“The United Kingdom refuses to accept the agreement.”

That was the International Wheat Agreement which was drawn up at that time. We know that it wasn't adhered to or accepted. We had one in 1948 which was quite satisfactory, I think, to the farmers as a whole and the fellows are responsible to farmers. Mr. Wesson was speaking at that meeting and he said this:

“The United Kingdom refused to accept the agreement, because of the belief that the British economy must depend on expanded exports of industrial goods, and the corollary to that policy must mean importing cheap foods. It is obvious that if the United Kingdom wishes to import 50 per cent wheat, or at six pence or 10 cents a lb., they can only export the equivalent

in volume of industrial goods, and it settles conclusively that if this situation arises, the United Kingdom's export of industrial goods must be reduced either in volume or price or both."

Now that is Mr. Wesson speaking, and I think he realizes very well, and I do not expect anyone was particularly surprised who has been in contact with these things for the past five or ten years. We all know that something is taking place today, that is absolutely an inevitable thing that had to happen.

It has come to mind, here, there was something said about the wheat agreement, the International wheat agreement. Well, Mr. Speaker, the International wheat agreement is working very nicely but the Minister of Agriculture has great concern over the stability of this agreement, and that this agreement was not going to be carried out, it was no guarantee, as a matter of fact I am sure he meant that many of these countries have not ratified this agreement. There is the statute, and since the start the agreement is working very satisfactorily, and up to date there are 36 countries operating under that agreement. And just today I got the information that out of the 42 countries, that means importers and exporters, 37 have ratified that agreement. That means they have not only signed it, but the Governments on the whole have ratified it, Mr. Speaker. So it is very very satisfactory indeed for us to know that for at least a couple or three years more, we will have some stability in the matter of marketing our wheat crops.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that the House will take all this amendment as read; I move the amendment, seconded by Mr. McCarthy.

Mr. Speaker: — The debate is now on the amendment.

Mr. R. A. Walker (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to take part in this debate this afternoon, but after having listened to the remarks of my hon. friend from Arm River (Mr. Danielson), I feel impelled to say something about this matter of agricultural prices. I am sorry he was not in his seat, last Monday, when I made my contribution to the Throne Speech debate. I dealt at some length with the problem at that time; however, the hon. member from Arm River has raised some points today, which I think it would not be amiss to deal with at this time. On reading the Amendment, I find that the hon. member for Arm River is proposing practically the same policy, as near as I can see, as that which the Federal Minister of Agriculture presented to the Agricultural Conference in the east, in February, at which he got such a cool reception.

I do not expect, Mr. Speaker, to take as long in this debate as did the hon. member from Arm River, but, after all, he has a pretty tough job to defend that agricultural policy in a House consisting of so many farm representatives. The hon. member for Arm River had the difficult job of not only defending the present status quo, insofar as agricultural marketing is concerned, but he also had to mention the fact that agricultural prices are no declining in this country, and rather than gloss over the thing and try to suggest there was no decline in agricultural prices, he came up with the rather startling statement that a little deflation is a good thing. Now, Mr. Speaker, I can't remember when we ever had a little deflation without having a lot of it. I think it was the late Leon Henderson who said, "Deflation is like pregnancy; you can't just have a little of it."

If you review the economic cycle for the last hundred or hundred and fifty years, you find that our price level never does remain constant – it never does remain stationary. It is always either advancing

March 9, 1950

or going down, and the moment our agricultural price level falls you have a shrinkage in farm purchasing power. If you have a shrinkage in farm purchasing power, you have shrinkage in the effective demand for our national products, and with that you have the beginning of a vicious spiral of deflation. It has never failed in the past. There is no evidence that the national government has done anything to see that it will not happen again.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that whatever we may think of the present agricultural price level, even if we think that all prices are a bit too high, I think we must now stabilize those prices at that level, because the first signs of falling off of farm prices, the first signs of a shrinkage in consumer purchasing power will, under our present economic set-up, have the inevitable result of discouraging further capital investment for new production. After all, under a system of so-called 'free enterprise', you cannot expect perspective investors to invest in new productive plants so long as the prospects for the sale of our goods is becoming restricted. So I think that, when the member for Arm River suggests that a little deflation is a good thing in farm prices, he is taking a bad state of affairs and trying to convince this House that it is a good thing. I would suggest that he do not go out to his constituents and tell those who are selling eggs at ten or fifteen cents a dozen less than they were selling them for, last fall, that a little deflation is a good thing. I do not think he would convince them that we must have a falling-off in farm prices, because, we must not forget, Mr. Speaker, that when we have a decline in the price of primary produce, we have an economic recession. It has always happened in the past: there is no indication that it won't happen again.

The hon. member from Arm River proposes to deal with that problem by precisely the present agricultural policy of the Federal Government. As every member of this House knows, this policy is not working now, and there is no reason to assume that it will work after the hon. member from Arm River gets his amendment approved by this House. So, if we are going to stabilize our economy, we must fix the farm prices at a level commensurate with the cost of production. That is precisely what was asked for in the motion of the hon. member for Morse (Mr. Gibson) – "Commensurate with the cost of production." How are you going to do that? Well, the member from Arm River says that you can't peg farm prices without having large farm produce surpluses, and then he came out with the astonishing remark that Britain is in the fortunate position that she has a shortage of all agricultural products and can, therefore, peg farm prices!

Mr. Speaker, such thinking is surely not conducive to a solution to this problem of farm surpluses. The idea that 'a surplus of goods is a calamity', and 'a deficiency or shortage of goods is a streak of good fortune' is a perversion of the facts. To say that if we were in that position – that is, if we had less farm production – we would be in a fortunate position because then we could provide a guaranteed price to the farmer, is to misstate the case. I submit that that kind of thinking is the kind of thinking that got the world into a long series of depressions, wars and booms. That is the kind of thinking that we must seek to remedy. Thinking people all over the world recognize that that kind of thinking, based upon the desire for scarcity, is the kind of thinking that produces these repetitious disasters.

Mr. Speaker, what this Government asks for in the Speech from the Throne is a national marketing board, and by a national marketing board

I do not mean the kind of a board that the hon. member for Arm River means. I mean a board that is constituted in a manner similar to the Wheat Board. The hon. member for Arm River says that is out of the question. I don't know if my hon. friend is a constitutional lawyer, but I say to him that the National Government can establish such a board providing it has the enabling legislation passed by the provinces beforehand. That is the solution, Mr. Speaker, to which we must look. We must expect National Boards to market our farm produce at guaranteed minimum prices.

Then our hon. friend says, "What about the surpluses?" Well, to a hidebound capitalist reactionary like my hon. friend, I am sure that these surpluses will be a source of embarrassment; but to people who believe in prosperity, in abundance, surpluses are a blessing and a boon. What Canada can do with those surpluses is to exchange them on the markets of the world for the surpluses of other nations. You know, when you get a depression, the first thing that happens is that every economic group in the nation seeks to fence in, to corral its own little preserve, to try to erect trade barriers, embargoes and quotas against other nations who seek an export market. We have had that experience. We have had it many times, and I submit that the answer to that is to export our exportable surpluses in exchange for other goods.

My hon. friend will ask, "What will happen if we import, or if we accept, the surpluses of other nations in exchange for our surpluses at a time of depression?" He will say, "That will create a surplus of all goods on the Canadian market; that will create unemployment and all the rest of it." Well, I say, Mr. Speaker, that the answer to that situation is that we must so expand our purchasing power in this country, that we can afford to absorb and to assume surpluses from other parts of the world in exchange for other goods which we seek to dispose of.

We talk about expanding purchasing power. A moment ago, the hon. member was talking about restricting and curtailing the purchasing power of Canada. He said it would be a good thing. Well, I tell him that if this is allowed to continue, this disastrous decline in the farm prices, it will commence a vicious spiral of deflation. It will discourage the construction of new industries and, before long, you will have a cry in Canada to protect Canadian industry from the invasion of cheap foreign goods. Then I say that you are at the bottom – I say that you are then in the midst of a depression. The remedy is to remove the restrictions of financial domination over the exchange of our surpluses in foreign markets.

My hon. friend talks about the prosperity that we have today. He says, "The farmer is doing very well." I say to him that no farmer is doing well, and no farmer is pleased and happy with the state of the world so long as he is producing surpluses which he cannot sell and so long as there are millions of hungry mouths that cannot be fed. We must look to the solution for this problem not in some method of curtailing production, or in the depressing of farm prices. We must look for a solution by placing food in the breadbaskets of the world. The only way that we can do that is to be prepared to assume and accept the surpluses of other nations. I know that the Liberal Party has been elected and re-elected many times in this country, by going out and advocating low tariffs.: Why," they say, "that's just the thing that will do it." Well, the record shows that the Liberal Party has never, in office, done anything substantial by way of lowering

March 9, 1950

tariffs and encouraging imports. They protect their friends, just as the Tory Party did. They must do that under a private enterprise system for the simple reason that the volume of purchasing power available to purchase goods in Canada does not depend upon the volume of production at all. It depends upon wages and farm prices; but it also depends upon the willingness of capitalist investors to invest. When capitalists refuse to invest, or are reluctant to invest, you have that deficiency which creates unsaleable surpluses on the Canadian market. And so you get the demand for protection from Canadian industry. I say to my hon. friend that he is pursuing the course of a dry river. He does not know where he is going unless he advocates a broad, general solution to this problem based upon the export of Canadian surpluses and the exchange of them for foreign surpluses.

We must welcome goods into this country; the people who are opposed to lower industrial prices are opposed to that because lower prices mean lower profits. The people create scarcities because scarcities mean high profits.

Let us accept the philosophy that there is no solution to our economic problem of trade and agricultural surpluses except the solution of expanded consumption, that can be accomplished only by planning and regulating the volume of money that goes into investment.

You have in Canada, today, under the Canadian Bank Act, the power to discourage or restrict the investment of capital by advancing the re-discount rate. But you have no corresponding power in the Canadian Parliament to encourage and develop public investment except to do it directly. The Canadian Government can do that only by borrowing money and spending it on public works projects. That is the only way you have of inducing capital investment. That is the only way you have of encouraging the flow of investment, other than by war.

My hon. friend will have to look a little deeper than Mr. Gardiner's solution to this problem. He will have to look to this problem of deficient purchasing power in Canada. He will have to look to the problem of accepting foreign goods on equal terms with the markets that we seek for our goods. And so I suggest to them that we had better give a little more thought to the means of developing our purchasing power in this country.

We have the co-operative movement here which is an excellent example of the way to expand consumer purchasing power. The co-operative institutions of this province annually pay back hundreds of thousands of dollars in patronage dividends, money which would not be available to the consumer if he was buying from a private enterprise. That is one of the ways in which consumer purchasing power can be expanded, namely, by low cost production. My hon. friend knows this story. It is the story of the Co-operative Commonwealth. For the story of low cost government production, I cite to him the Government Insurance Office. No doubt, we will have a little more to say about that when the budget debate comes along.

There are all kinds of ways to expand consumer purchasing power if you are willing to sacrifice the vested rights of the profiteers. There are all kinds of ways of guiding and developing public investment, of stimulating greater consumption in Canada, so that we can take the imports that we will have to take to get rid of these exports. We must adopt a policy of national marketing boards – not these sterile eunuchs that the hon. member is talking about. We must adopt national marketing boards which will have

the power to guarantee fixed prices to advance for the primary producer. Those marketing boards must have the authority to go into the export market and make direct deals with foreign customers. They must have the power to come back to the Canadian Government and say, "We can sell so many millions of dollars worth of Canadian farm produce providing you will agree to remove your embargoes, remove your restrictions and allow a corresponding value of foreign products to come into this country." Then I say that, if there is any deficiency or any shortage in the price that is realized on the freight market for these surpluses, the Canadian Government will have to subsidize that deficiency. I say that it is only fair and only right that the Canadian Government should recognize that agriculture is the basis of our prosperity, that without a prosperous agriculture you cannot have economic prosperity. We must recognize that that means a whole lot more than Mr. Gardiner's Agricultural Prices Support Act or the hon. member's Agricultural Prices Support Act. It does not mean pegging the price of eggs at thirty-eight cents to the wholesaler and the jobber; it means pegging the price to the primary producer. It does not mean to say, as Mr. Gardiner said here in Regina not so long ago: "I am not going to spend that two hundred million dollars supporting eggs, butter, cheese and other farm produce," and he said, "if I went back to the Canadian Parliament and reported to them that I have used up this two hundred million dollars, I wouldn't get another nickel." That is not the kind of prices support that the farmers of this country need, and the hon. member for Arm River knows it. I suggest that he get hold of the Regina Manifesto and do a little bit of reading, and he will find out what the answer to this problem really is.

Mr. A. L. S. Brown (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, I cannot suggest that we were particularly surprised at the amendment which the hon. member for Arm River moved, for I think that those of us who have sat in the House for any considerable length of time expected that this would be done; for this amendment to the Motion was, in my opinion, for effect. First, it affects the question which was risen in the original Motion. In the original Motion my seatmate here started off on a discussion as to the principles of prices support and their applications as they affect our agricultural economy. The amendment entirely ignores the principles of the prices support and, secondly, as is often the case in this House, the Opposition refuses to accept the experience that we have had in the past few years and apply it to the future. They refuse to accept the fact that, during the war period, and in the period immediately following the war, we did have a degree of stabilization in our agricultural economy, because during that period, not because of choice but because of necessity, the Federal Government had accepted some of its responsibility; and thirdly, this amendment, as many other amendments introduced by the Opposition to Motions which we have put before this House, has attempted to remove the responsibility from the Federal Government.

My hon. friend from Arm River has suggested that the Federal Government was no longer prepared to set up a central marketing board, and, if I am misquoting him in this respect I hope he corrects me; but I understood him to state that there was no hope for the central government setting up national marketing boards. I presume that he is suggesting that on good authority, and I am glad to see that he is prepared to put the Liberal Party on official record as to their marketing proposals. Yet, during the war years, we did, in respect to many of our agricultural products have National Marketing Boards to the extent that they were operating.

March 9, 1950

He suggested, in reference to the original Motion, that the Prices Support Act could only be implemented as a stabilization factor during a transitional period; but if, all the Prices Support Act can effect is during transitional periods from war into peacetime and if in peacetime we cannot expect the same amount of stabilization as we have during war, then I suggest that something is wrong with our economy here in Canada; and I suggest that every Government, whether it be provincial or whether it be Federal, has a responsibility to formulate the type of economy which we need. We suggest, on this side of the House, that the type of economy which we had a dream of during the war period, that type of stabilization, is the type of economy that our agricultural industry needs and for which we should be working.

He suggested in his amendment that this responsibility of marketing our agricultural products should be placed upon the producers and not necessarily upon the Federal Government. He suggests that, through the medium of a National Products Marketing Act, or that is, the Provincial Act the producers through the medium of that Act set up provincial Marketing Boards and in addition to that there would be set up National Marketing Agencies under the control of the producers. Well, once again, history has taught us a few things in this respect, and I agree with the hon. member for Arm River when he suggested that we had here, in Western Canada, a great farm organization. Indeed, we did, and during the early period of that farm organization, the proposals which the hon. member is suggesting at this time did receive serious consideration and, indeed, were put into application. We all remember the time when the Wheat Pool set up its central selling agencies throughout the markets of the world, and you all realize the calamity that fell upon that great organization, compelling them to close their central selling agencies. In the different parts of the world. I suggest that, if we are to consider what history has taught we can only expect that, if we go into a period again such as we had in the late 1920s, history will repeat itself and that, if we did set up national marketing agencies under control of the producers alone in which the producer took full and entire responsibility for them, what happened in 1929 is certain and bound to happen again.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that what we have seen happen to eggs can very well happen to our other agricultural products. It has been suggested that it will happen to hogs in June, and unquestionably it will, because there is one basic scientific fact that I can remember from my days at school and that is; putting the same thing under the same conditions you are bound to obtain the same results. And we are bound to obtain the same results, as far as bacon is concerned, as happened to our eggs when the contract with Great Britain expired and was not renewed under the basis of a guaranteed price to the producer, and I suggest that if my hon. friend has introduced in his resolution in regard to floor prices is to be considered in the light of the type of floor price which was placed under eggs, the resolution, as far as floor prices is concerned is entirely meaningless. We are giving producers absolutely no guaranteed price whatever as far as eggs are concerned. The only assurance that we have is that the man who has eggs at the end of the year will be guaranteed that he will not lose upon them. The same could be applied to other agricultural products as well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take up any more time at this particular time in discussing this resolution, so I ask leave of the Assembly to adjourn the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

AGRICULTURAL RECLAMATION AND CONSERVATION

The House resumed, from Tuesday, March 7, 1950, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Buchanan with reference to P.F.R.A. activities.

Mr. A. G. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on Motion 5 moved by the hon. member for Notekeu-Willowbunch, I would like to say before proceeding that when I saw the Motion appear on the Order Paper it rather appealed to me in that we were urging that the Prairie Farm Assistance Act would be incorporated into a more comprehensive agricultural reclamation and conservation service. I think we can agree with that. Be advised, rather, that the resolution asked that the Dominion Government give grants to the provinces to use under their own Acts along the same lines.

I asked to adjourn the debate not because I am going to raise any objections to the motion, but rather because, in the introduction of the motion, the member from Notekeu-Willowbunch made it the occasion for a bitter attack upon the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act and it creates the impression throughout the province and the Dominion that the P.F.R.A. has completely failed in its task and that this is brought about through gross inefficiency and political corruption. Mr. Speaker, I could not let such statements go unchallenged. My appeal has often been that further co-operation between the two governments would have speeded up activity to overcome the very serious situation that I am facing in my particular constituency and that the member from Notekeu-Willowbunch and the member from Bengough face in their particular constituencies. I was amazed that members of this Legislature, particularly two members from a drought area, would be so politically biased as to make such sweeping charges against the P.F.R.A.

I want to take a few moments, Mr. Speaker, not to refute those charges (because they will be accepted for what they are worth), but to place before this Legislature something of the accomplishments of the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act so far to date. The member from Notekeu-Willowbunch stated, in discussing the Val Marie project, that the project cost \$70 per acre; I am not sure whether it did or didn't. But what bothers me is that they went on to use it as an example of inefficiency of P.F.R.A., and said it was almost a complete failure due to the salt itself coming to the surface.

Mr. Buchanan: — Mr. Speaker, I did not say that it was a complete failure due to the salt. I said that due to the salts that further expensive undertakings had to be made to bring it under satisfactory cultivation or words to that effect.

Mr. Cameron: — In discussing this, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, in the first place, that the hon. member should know that the Val Marie project was not constructed under the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act. It was built under a special vote of Parliament by the Dominion Government of 1935, and it was concurred in at the time by the farmers. This money was voted under the Supplementary Relief Re-Construction Act and I say Eastend was done in the same manner. And of the \$270,000 that the Val Marie project cost, in 1938 alone, the revenue from it to the Dominion Government was over \$100,000. The crop that year was taken off by the Saskatchewan Government — a crop of oats and coarse grain at 30 cents per bushel, and that crop was distributed

March 9, 1950

to the surrounding farmers in that particular drought area. In addition, when the project started, in 1935, the farmers had been forced to sell their cattle, and there were only about 300 head of cattle in the whole area. But, today, over 3,000 head of cattle are there as a result of this project.

He spoke of the Maple Creek project, and I happen to be particularly interested in that particular project. This project cost \$70 per acre he claimed . . .

Mr. Buchanan: — Correction, Mr. Speaker, I claimed it cost \$60 per acre.

Mr. Cameron: — I am not disputing the cost in any of these cases. He used it as an example to show lack of forethought due to the fact that we had sufficient water to irrigate only 4,000 acres when we had a potential 10,000 acres in that area. Now, the fact in connection with the Maple Creek project is that, when it was built by P.F.R.A. it was told by the Water Rights Branch of this Government, that, in some years, there would not be sufficient water in the reservoir due to lack of spring rains. But out of the 10 years, there were only two years (and that was the last two years) that there was not sufficient water. After further exploration in that particular area, last summer, they were fortunate in drilling, testing, that they came across a heavy underground flow of water. Some referred to it as an underground river. The P.F.R.A. will be able to assess the storage of further water in that particular area. The total storage capacity today at Maple Creek is 23,260 acre-feet; 130 farmers are on irrigated land, while thousands of tons of fodder have been raised for the stock in this particular area.

Then we come to the Swift Current project, which the hon. member is familiar with. It was built in 1940, and this project will ultimately irrigate approximately 25,000 acres. The Duncairn dam out there – that reservoir holds approximately 90,000 acre-feet of water, or enough to irrigate 90,000 acres to a depth of one foot. From the Duncairn dam to the Rush Lake the farmers are served in rows as this water comes. The reservoirs and the whole connecting canal system within this connection was built by the P.F.R.A. And then we joined it up to the Rush Lake area and in the Rush Lake section there is approximately 7,000 acres here to be developed. This area is developed entirely by the P.F.R.A. and as the hon. member should know that by an agreement with the Province in 1946 and 1947 the P.F.R.A. undertook to develop all the land and if and when the Province wishes then they may take over the project.

There are approximately 120 farmers who have parcels of land in this particular area, and I want to deal for a moment with the Herbert Section of the whole Swift Current project. This was done through negotiating with the Provincial Government. The P.F.R.A. built the connecting canal to the Herbert Section and they paid for that, and the province undertook the distribution system; the P.F.R.A. undertook to deliver the water to the distributing system. This project will irrigate approximately 89,000 acres. Further in regard to the Herbert Project, the storage is there to take the water further on down to Hodgeville, where it is badly needed. In this connection the P.F.R.A. has positively made it known, in their co-operation with the Provincial Government, that they are willing at any time to listen to and co-operate with them in any proposal concerning the Water Users' Associations or any other proposals the Provincial Government may care to enter into.

I could go on, placing facts before you about what has been done in the province. I think that I have given sufficient to drive home this one particular point, and in every instance in which the P.F.R.A. has entered into the Province of Saskatchewan, it has consistently pursued its long-term policy of building irrigation projects and dams and dugouts in line with its programme of reclamation of those areas. There are hundreds of thousand of acre-feet of water in storage in that area. Mr. Speaker, it is remaining there because the Province has not accepted its responsibility to construct the laterals to get this water out to the land.

I was interested in a Press report that the province, in 1949, had irrigated 15,315 acres and underneath the Press report, that the Province had accomplished more in one year than the P.F.R.A. had done in ten years. I want to go into that for a moment.

It is true. There were 15,315 acres put under the ditch in 1949, and I want to tell this House how it was put there: 1,615 acres are with the departmental feed projects; 13,700 acres are with water users' associations – and water users' associations mean, Mr. Speaker, that, in this connection – the P.F.R.A. built the reservoir and the dams, they built the canals, and the adjacent farms formed themselves into water users' associations under an Act passed by the Province in order to take from the P.F.R.A. dams this water distributed over their territory. In that manner, 13,000 acres was put under irrigation, and I say, Mr. Speaker, that a Government to get into that is pulling it quite a bit to claim some second or third or thirtieth cousin-relationship to that. In 1937, the southwest part of this province had 450,000 head of cows sold at from ½ to 1 cent per lb. because there was not the pastures to feed them on. However, because of the policy of re-grassing, started in 1935 and carried out since, and re-grassing in the most scientific manner, in 1949, when we had the worst drought that we have had since 1937, there was not the forced marketing of one head of stock in that area.

In the matter of individual farms, the P.F.R.A. has worked with individual farmers under what they term 'self-help plans' where the P.F.R.A. supplies the planning and the engineering service for the farmer together with financial assistance in the building of his projects. The P.F.R.A. to any farmer will pay one-third of the cost of any dugout up to a maximum of \$150 and the P.F.R.A. will pay one-third of the cost of stock watering dams up to a maximum of \$150. The P.F.R.A. will pay one-third of the cost of small irrigation projects up to the maximum of \$350. Under this self-help plan, 42,000 of these projects have been completed in the prairie provinces; 4,085 were building in Saskatchewan alone, in 1949, and in addition to all that I have mentioned, Mr. Speaker, there are a million and a half acres in community pastures, and 72,000 head of livestock being pastured on these pastures. They have seeded over one half million acres of abandoned farm land with crested wheat grass and brought it back into production. The carrying capacity of the grazing lands in 1938 in that area required approximately 58.7 acres to feed on head of cattle. In 1948, that had been reduced until it required approximately 20.1 acres to feed one head of cattle; or, in other words, under the re-grassing programme the production of that area has been trebled in taking care of livestock.

The member from Notukeu-Willowbunch said only \$3,000,000 was allotted to P.F.R.A. in 1949. That is correct, Mr. Speaker, as far as he went, but he did not see fit to tell this House that in addition to that,

March 9, 1950

\$3,000,000 was allotted for small projects and in addition to that there was \$7,500,000 brought in for special projects such as the Bow River and the St. Mary's projects, and \$1,250,000 for reclamation in British Columbia; \$250,000 for protection of new lands, making a total of \$12,000,000 allotted in 1949.

The biggest problem we have to face in our agricultural economy has always been soil drifting and erosion, and I lived in that area and I can recall the present director of the P.F.R.A. coming out to meetings in all those towns, with individual farmers and small groups of farmers and asking what we are going to do to stop soil blowing. I can remember 2,500 acres around Tompkins where they came out from the Experimental Farm and said "In an effort to try to assist you, we will do this. We will take the Listers and we will list that mass of prairies, and they did." Shortly after, the high winds came and filled it in. The director said, we will list it against. They did. They continued until they got a rain that stopped the drifting and netted on an average of some twelve to fifteen bushels an acre in that area.

In regard to the prevention of soil drifting and of erosion, leading scientists in their reports will state frankly that Canada has the greatest programme for weeds and erosion of any nation in the world, and, in behind us and the United States that he talks about, is ten years behind us. The problem of stabilizing the economy of the southwest is of such tremendous scope that it requires the co-operation of the Province and the Dominion and all agencies in the country. When we hear charges leveled against the 'senior partner' in this undertaking, such as was leveled, yesterday, by the Mover and Seconder of this resolution, I can accept no other explanation than that it was done for cheap political purposes. And I think, Mr. Speaker, in all fairness to the people in my constituency. . .

Premier Douglas: — On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. It is against the rules of the House to impute motives, and I know that the hon. member is a new member, and I think that should be drawn to his attention. It is against the rules of the House to impute motives as to why a member made a speech or why he made a statement.

Mr. Cameron: — I had thought that this was a general attack on the P.F.R.A. and I am so concerned with the whole drought area in this whole province that I think the attack that was made in this House will have a detrimental effect not only in the province but across the whole Dominion. It will lead to the fact that some of our members of Parliament will take the attitude that if conditions are as stated in the Legislature in the Province of Saskatchewan, why should we continue to vote money for doing this work out there? I say this in fairness to my people and in fairness to the people in those members' constituencies. I would suggest to the Government that we invite the Director of the P.F.R.A. in this province to come and sit before the Agricultural Committee and the member from Notukeu-Willowbunch and the member from Bengough, spoke so highly of this individual that there is one thing we are all sure of, that if he came before this committee he would present the facts of what has been done in a manner straightforward and to the point without any political bias.

Now in regard to the motion itself, I would just like to say

that, in my opinion, while we urge the Dominion Government to put up the capital, we are asking at the same time that they make another series of grants to the Provinces in order to assist them with this particular work. Now the net result, the net gain, is the same, only, I think we may possibly run into this particular danger in that we are dealing with the P.F.R.A., or when we are dealing direct with the Dominion Government, and they have spent the allotment and are informed of the conditions, they have a direct appeal to the Government for additional funds, and by distributing those funds to different agencies, we may possibly weaken our demands on the Dominion Government for additional grants. That is the only thing I see against it. And I might suggest that as far as I see it personally, it might be a little wiser approach for the individual Provinces to set aside what they think they can set aside for that purpose in order to get the programmes they now have formulated under active participation. Then, when we have accomplished that, and when we have cleared the air of all these political implications and shown a genuine desire to put into the background everything pertaining to politics in the P.F.R.A. and when we have the interests of the province, of the west, at heart, then I think you will find then that this co-operation will grow and with our joint efforts we can rally speed up the programme on a much larger scale.

Hon. I. C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Before the question is put, and I assume it will be very shortly, I want to make a few observations on this matter. First of all, I want to advise the hon. member from Maple Creek that if he is going to carry on some political criticism of the Provincial Government's discharge of its responsibilities in regard to irrigation and other developments in Saskatchewan, he can expect to have criticism back. He is just getting paid for the kind of procedure that he set in this House, when dealing with this all-important problem.

Everyone recognizes, Mr. Speaker, that a whole lot of the irrigation projects that have been brought into existence are not a success. There were a whole lot of problems that were not anticipated — as was mentioned, the fact that the salts came to the top — and a whole lot of more expensive work is going to have to be done before those irrigation projects become feasible to any degree.

I would like to advise the hon. member again. For a man who is so interested in conservational developments, he ought to get his facts a little bit more straight and get a bit more information on the subject before he pretends to stand forth as an authority on this particular matter. He was out on a good many scores.

Again, Mr. Speaker, he left the impression with this House that the Conservation and Development Branch of the Department of Agriculture had little to do with the 15,000 acres that were brought under the ditch, this year. I want to advise the hon. member that water users' associations, as such don't provide themselves with plane-tabling, engineering services, and all of those responsibilities that have now been placed on the doorstep of the Provincial Government for the first time by the Dominion Government, I might mention that previously the Provincial Government here never took a bit of responsibility for either irrigation or any other constructive programme or to bring about a degree of agricultural stability particularly to the southwest. Former provincial administrations never did a single thing in that regard. It was only under this administration that we are asked to assume

March 9, 1950

responsibility, and I want to tell the House that the cost of that responsibility in the construction of laterals, plane-tabling, the engineering services is approximately half the overall cost of the entire project, so you have some idea of what irrigation costs are going to mean to the Provincial Government in Saskatchewan.

The projects that the hon. member referred to – Val Marie, Maple Creek and Eastend – were projects that were developed entirely by P.F.R.A. and the province claimed no part or had any responsibility in those projects at all. Perhaps that is one of the reasons they have not been a success entirely; because members ought to understand that all matters pertaining to the origination of irrigation districts comes under Provincial statutes. The P.F.R.A., as Dominion, did not have the legal authority to set up proper functioning irrigation associations or irrigation districts, which definitely comes under Provincial Legislation.

I don't want to say a single disparaging word for the works done by the P.F.R.A., but, like many other people, I think it has not been extensive enough, and I realize that some mistakes have been made. I do know, however, that we do need to get on with the job a whole lot faster than we are getting on with it at the present time. I want to say to the hon. members, speaking specifically on the Rush Lake project itself, that was a very simple and easy project to develop. The farmer administration had carried on some negotiations with the P.F.R.A. whereby that particular development has become the entire responsibility of P.F.R.A. That was one of the last agreements that we completed and negotiated with P.F.R.A., and sometimes I find it very difficult, Mr. Speaker, to follow the thinking of the Federal Minister of Agriculture. When it comes to other projects that have not such good prospects immediately, he wants them all on a fifty-fifty basis, with the Province carrying 50 per cent of the cost. But in the case of Rush Lake, he said, "We'll do the whole thing ourselves." It was a simple project, and they did it, Mr. Speaker. And I want to tell the hon. member, if some of the people in the P.F.R.A. would quit some of their window-dressing and hot-air shooting, it would be a whole lot better for all of us. They develop this project, Mr. Speaker, and then they stick up a sign along the highway "P.F.R.A. Irrigation Project 1 Mile North; 3000 acres under the ditch", when there are only 7,000 acres in the project and there are not 30,000 acres in the entire project. It does not go for good working relationships between the staff of the two administrations, and I quite agree with the hon. member that the type of criticism that will lead to the general public belief that money is being extended foolishly will have a retarding effect.

Now to stick specifically to this resolution, Mr. Speaker, the thought behind this resolution, I believe, is that, in addition to all of the other development work that takes place on large irrigation projects, stock-watering dugouts, individual irrigation projects, and stock-watering projects thereto, if we are going to overcome some of our basic agricultural problems in the southwest, can remove the risks imposed by the hazards of nature, we are going to have to follow the type of agricultural practice dictated by nature as far as the individual farmer is concerned. It is all right to stand up in the House and try to tell us how many more head of livestock we have now against the 'thirties. This is not altogether correct. We have had just a big a livestock population down there as we have at the present time. All of these things, while they were good and meritorious, however, are not striking at the farmer's individual farm practice.

The hon. member accused me of suggesting that we are going to move a whole lot of people out of the southwest. Well, P.F.R.A. realizes that. No one realizes it better than the Director of P.F.R.A. that there is going to have to be some thinning out of population, some readjustments in the pattern of farm occupancy, in the areas from which the settlers are moved in order to enlarge the size of your farm units, and above all else, after that is done, to get into the right type of agriculture practice. Even though a man with an exceedingly large unit in the southwest can, under certain soil conditions, continue operating for straight wheat, he is going to get into difficulties; he is bound to; and he is going to come to the Provincial Government for relief seed. We have had enough of that experience, and it has been the policy of this administration now to endeavour to invest money in overcoming some of these basic difficulties. We can play our part there.

The suggestion has made to me that we should not have any resettlement at all but perhaps we ought to pay those farmers more for their bushel of wheat. Well, I agree. If it is the national interest that our farmers in the southwest should engage in straight wheat-farming, then we ought to pay them twice as much as farmers receive elsewhere because of the risk that they have to take, and because of the (I suppose we could argue) higher protein value of their wheat. Now that would be one way of doing the job if we want them to raise wheat; but if we think it is not logical and sound to raise wheat, then what other alternatives have we? The only other alternatives are two: either to increase their P.F.A.A. payments, which does not cure the problem at all, or else to go on to a constructive programme in which it is anticipated, I think in this resolution, that we would set up conservation areas preferably on a municipal basis similar to the conservation district set up in the United States to the south of us. My friend does not know his facts. I don't know what authority he was quoting from when he said that the United States was ten years behind Canada in conservation. Does the hon. member not know that Canada has not got any conservation policy whatever for the Dominion, we never did have one?

Mr. Cameron: — I did not wish to interrupt the hon. Minister, but I did not say on conservation development; I said on the development of re-grassing and of stopping the soil erosion. It was with soil grassing and soil erosion that they were 10 years ahead of United States; nothing to do with conservation as a whole. I just wanted to keep the records straight.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is trying to beg the question. Doesn't he know that re-grassing and soil conservation are all a part of over-all conservation work and the right type of farm practice that is followed in the conservation areas? Here is what happens, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member should take a trip just south of us here, and take a look around once; get out of Maple Creek for a change and see what people are doing elsewhere, and he'll see strip farming down there, contour framing, and he'll see re-grassing on a grand scale and some of the best grassland practice that I have seen anywhere. He will see corn crops produced; he will see all kinds of crops produced that are adaptable to a particular climate and soil. We have to do exactly the same thing in the southwest and our thought here was that if we could set up these conservation areas under statute and then, instead of a continuing expenditure on relief or under P.F.A.A. — which is a palliative — we ought to think seriously of correcting the problem. For instance, the thing we have in mind, when you do move settlers out of the too thickly settled area in the southwest, what are you going to do with the balance? Are you, as I say, going to leave them carry on just as they have been? It is

March 9, 1950

my thinking then that area should be set up as a conservation area, and a stated farm practice and land use policy followed in co-operation with the local farmers. Once you have decided on the type of agriculture best suited for that particular area, then I think payments should be made to the individual farmer to get into that type of practice. It could take many forms, including all of the protective measures necessary to prevent soil erosion by wind or water, shelter-belting, getting into other crop varieties, getting into a position, as I said at the beginning, where we could farm in accord with the dictates of nature. Now, if we follow that we are going to have some agricultural stability in the southwest.

I might suggest that I am a little bit alarmed at tendencies towards every broadening P.F.A.A. I know that it is needed as emergency temporary assistance, but we ought to get on with the job of a long-term solution. In other words, pay people, and pay them well, for overcoming the basic problem. That is the purpose of this resolution. It is represented as a supplement the work already done by P.F.R.A. and by the Provincial Government on an individual farm basis.

I would be remiss in my responsibilities, Mr. Speaker, in view of what is said, unless I said something in tribute to the work already done by the new Director of P.F.R.A. He certainly is conscious of the need for conservation in all its phases and activity, and I think he is one man who, being a member of the Agrologist Institute of Canada, has been urging the Dominion Government repeatedly to adopt a conservation policy for the entire Dominion of Canada similar to the conservation services in the United States. I am certain that under the dynamic leadership and direction of Mr. Thompson, P.F.R.A. is going to take a real jump ahead in the province of Saskatchewan. I want to state, too, and make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that we have had the most happy working arrangements with the P.F.R.A., I think, that we have ever had in the province. We have worked together very closely. We have had certain administrative problems that we meet on from time to time and find a solution for, and I think that nothing should be done to drive any wedges or create any antagonisms in this very important field of activity. This is one place, I think, where we ought to lay aside some of our partisan political feelings. That is not saying, Mr. Speaker, that constructive criticism isn't in order. It is in order – and I could stand up, Mr. Speaker, and criticize a whole lot of projects that have been under development; but we have to also recognize the fact that a lot of this work was done at an initial stage before full information on irrigation was available. It is easy to criticize, but it is pretty difficult to implement constructive programme. It is might easy to hand out relief; but it is might difficult to get people activated on a constructive course.

With these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you I will support the Motion.

Mr. Niles L. Buchanan (Notukeu-Willowbunch): — Mr. Speaker, what I have to say won't take very long. At the outset, in reply to the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. A. C. Cameron), I want to show that his suggestions concerning my talk as being a political diatribe against the P.F.R.A. are entirely false, and I want to repeat from my speech. First, I want to quote from the speech I made when I had the occasion to second the motion for the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I quote, Mr. Speaker:

“Valmarie is in the centre of a large ranching district and, through the spirit of determination and their own thrift, they have been able to sustain themselves.”

Mr. G. H. Danielson (Arm River): — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member is quoting from a speech made in a previous debate at this Session.

Mr. Buchanan: — Well, I previously pointed out in this House, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Valmarie, working in close co-operation with the Provincial Government and the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act, have built themselves a stable economy, and in the speech which I made when I moved this motion I pointed out the happy working arrangements which existed between the head of the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act in this province and this Government.

I also stated in that speech:

“Since the inception of the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act, we have had a new man appointed to head it. His office is in Regina; his name is L. B. Thompson, and, fortunately, in L. B. Thompson we have a man who is anxious to do a job without fear or favour. He works in close co-operation with our Department of Agriculture. All he needs is the money to go ahead and do a real job of irrigation and land conservation and development.”

What I did point in my speech, however, Mr. Speaker, was that, at the time of the inception of the P.F.R.A. it appeared to be used more for immediate political gain rather than for future benefits, and I can tell you and tell this House that is exactly what it was used for. I travelled through the Valmarie district during the time that the P.F.R.A. Act was working in that particular area, and I can tell you that no person got a job unless he was vouched for by the local Liberal committee. That’s the truth, and the people there will bear it out. It was not only used in P.F.R.A., it was used in every spending department of the Provincial and Federal Governments during the 1930’s. People were hungry in those years, Mr. Speaker. They didn’t have enough clothes; they didn’t have enough food; they weren’t able to repair their houses. The relief officer came around and he had little money to give them . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Will the hon. member please confine himself to replying to points raised in the debate?

Mr. Buchanan: — Mr. Speaker, I am replying to charges made against me by the member from Maple Creek, and I am once again stating that the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act at first was used for political gain more than it was for any immediate future benefit. The proof of the pudding is in the eating because, in this past year, we have suffered another drought in a large part of the area in which these P.F.R.A. projects that

March 9, 1950

I mentioned and the hon. member mentioned are situated. There we have once again repeated practically the same conditions that existed in the 1930's – people not able to sustain themselves. Almost every mail, I am receiving letters from people in my constituency, in that drought-stricken area, asking what can be done to help them. Now, if there had been a comprehensive scheme of Prairie Farm Rehabilitation in effect during the past 15 years during which this Act has been in force, we would not have these conditions repeated. It is true they are not as bad as they were before. To say that the P.F.R.A. has done nothing would be false. It has; and more and more under the leadership of L. B. Thompson it is achieving the goal for which it was originally designed and for which the people of Canada supported it. And because of that, their conditions have not been quite as bad.

I might also give some credit for lessening the conditions of the 1930's to our present Minister of Agriculture who, through his land conservation and development plan and his feed banks, has provided some stability. The two of them working together gave those people more stability. However, the Act, as I said, has not been given enough money to carry on, and it was without any intention of political gain, political opportunities of any sort, that I introduced this Motion into this House. It was the member himself who, in my opinion, misrepresenting the things that I stated, brought up the political picture of it during these recent years. I want to state again that since L. B. Thompson has been at the head we have every confidence in it. All we are asking for is that he be given more money and a green light to go ahead.

(The question being put, the Resolution moved by Mr. Buchanan, was carried unanimously.)

SECOND READINGS

RENT CONTROL BILL

The Honourable J. W. Corman (Attorney General) moved Second Reading of

Bill No. 13 – An Act to regulate Leasehold Rights and Obligations.

Hon. Mr. Corman: — I am grateful for the applause, I know it would not have come after you hear me. I appreciate the courtesy of the House and the Provincial Treasurer in allowing me to go along with this Bill dealing with leasehold regulations. Under our undertaking with Mr. Abbott, we must have it passed here and assented to by April 1st which means that it is necessary to know the shape and the form in which it is going through the House as early as we can, and for that reason I am anxious to have it given second reading this week.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I understand that, in view of the public interest in this matter and in view of, I think, a lot of public misunderstanding of and about rent controls, it was thought that possibly something should be said from this House over the air about it, and I prepared what I thought was, for me, a pretty good speech, Mr. Speaker. Well the airtime is gone. I have no doubt that, tomorrow, it will be taken up to good

advantage. We haven't a full House – we probably have three acres here. I don't know – the Press Gallery is pretty well shot. We have the best part of it here and I know, tired as they are, or at least having listened to weighty speeches this afternoon (they were good speeches), no one is going to pay any attention to what I say anyway, Mr. Speaker. For that reason I am going to try and make it as brief as I can.

The Bill is introducing an Act to regulate leasehold rates and obligations, and the short title is “The Leasehold Regulation Act, 1950”, which, getting away from high-sounding words, means that we are introducing a Bill dealing with rent control. I don't think to those of this House who are going to listen, that I need to explain that the obligations and rights of landlords and tenants is normally a matter for the Province. It comes under the ‘property and civil rights’ section of the B.N.A. Act, and I think everyone knows how the Dominion got in. They got in by reason of a war emergency, and I think everyone knows that the Canadian people accepted their entry into the rent control field as into other fields of control; not only accepted it, but approved it. I think we all know too, that following the war for a number of years, the Dominion Government remained in the field on the basis of a continuing emergency. I believe the justification, in the minds of most people, for that was the housing shortage, and I think people believed the Federal Government was responsible for the housing shortage. There may be a difference of opinion about that, and I am certainly not going to elaborate on the way I feel; but I believe that it cannot be effectively argued that the housing shortage, which now makes necessary rent control, was not a Federal responsibility and is not a Federal responsibility. I am not going to say anything that will provoke anybody myself, but I can refer to what other people say, and it has been suggested that during the ‘thirties, with plenty of labour and plenty of material available, there was a neglect on the part of the authorities at Ottawa in not seeing that we got houses built. I am not going to say anything more about that, Mr. Speaker, however.

I would say that the Government of Saskatchewan accepted Federal controls, up until a time I will mention later, not as being perfect, not as being satisfactory, but as being better than to have nine different Acts dealing with rent control; but I might say that the Saskatchewan Government was never satisfied with the speed with which the Dominion Government was relaxing rent controls. Now that brings us up to the reason why the Saskatchewan Government feels that it is compelled to go into this field, and I may say it all arises out of an announcement made by Mr. Abbott in the House of Commons, in the fall of 1949, that rents, increases in rents, were being authorized, amounting (as he put it) to 25 per cent for unheated accommodation and 20 per cent for heated accommodation. Now it is true there was such a wave of protest at that time that when the formal order was drawn up on November 10th – I believe his announcement was made about the last of October – it pared the figures down to 18 per cent and 22 per cent, but the figures of 20 per and 25 per cent still stand based on the rents that were fixed originally by the Dominion Government, as of the rents prevailing, I believe, in 1941. So it does not make much difference whether we call it 20 and 25 per cent or 18 and 22 per cent; it all depends upon how it is computed.

I might say that, in the fall of 1948, with respect, Mr. Speaker, I believe, that Mr. Abbott was under pressure from the big property owners in the East, including the big mortgage and trust companies, to get out of

March 9, 1950

this field of control as the Dominion Government had pretty well gotten out of other fields. In any event, in 1948 Mr. Abbott held out invitations to the Provinces to take over rent control. I might say that not one of the Provinces accepted his offer. He even added to the bait the promise to pay the costs of rent control to any Province that would relieve the Federal Government of the responsibility and the work, and I may say that he has renewed that offer now to any Province that will go in, and that offer, while it has not been put in definite form between myself and Mr. Abbott, is still being made to Saskatchewan – that at least part of the cost of rent control in this province will be paid by the Federal Government. But I might say that no Province accepted his offer in 1948. They all felt that only a central government could control rent so as to have any uniformity about it, and that it should be the central government that controlled rents because the central government should be saddled with the responsibility of seeing that there were houses, the lack of which made rent control necessary.

Now, I do not need to go into the correspondence that passed between our Government and Mr. Abbott. We first protested, as did many organizations across the Dominion, including all the Servicemen's organizations; we protested at the sharp increases without regard to the requirements of individual cases. Our protests were summarily rejected as were the protests of other groups. Faced with that situation, we made this offer to Mr. Abbott. We offered to recommend to this House a rent control Bill to take effect on April 1st, if the Dominion Government would, as far as Saskatchewan was concerned, rescind or suspend the order of November 10th increasing rents by 18 and 22 per cent. Mr. Abbott accepted our offer and that is why I am here tonight. We have been undertaking to bring to this House a Bill which will put Saskatchewan in the rent control field as of April 1st, and because of our undertaking to bring this Bill here, Saskatchewan is the only province that has not felt the effects of what I suggest nine out of every ten citizens of this Dominion think was a severe and an unjust order.

Now, I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I always try to protect myself in the clinches. I want to make my declaration – and the Minister of Social Welfare isn't here. Mine is not a similar declaration, but I want to make my declaration now that I am not simple enough (and I can be very simple, Mr. Speaker) to think that we are going to any picnic when we get into rent control. I had looked forward to a pleasant 1950. My hopes in that respect are shot. Rent control is something that will drive man to his grave quicker than anything I know of, and I want this House to know that we are not going into it unaware of the difficulties, unaware of the fact that we may not please either the landlord or the tenant; we are not going into it unaware of the fact that we are going to displease individuals, many of them in each group. We know all about that. So six months from now when you find me, as the Leader-Post said, holding something by the tail, I want you to know that I know tonight that I will have it by the tail.

Now, not wanting the job and knowing the embarrassment that is going to follow, it is important that this House – both sides of this House and the public – realize why the Provincial Government is going into this field, and the best way, I think, that I can convince this House of the inequity of that Order-in-Council permitting, just before Christmas rent increase of, as Mr. Abbott put it, 20 per cent and 25 per cent; I think the best way I can convince members of this House, all of whom I know have an open mind on this subject, is not to give my own opinion but to quote from newspapers what organizations across Canada have said about that order. The point I am trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is this. Our only

justifications in taking this responsibility off the shoulders of the Federal Government is that order of November 10th. If it was a proper order, we should not be in the field. If it was an order that those self-respecting Provincial Governments would stomach (to use the words of one Editor), then we are compelled to go in the field, regardless of what may lie ahead.

Now if I had the 'mike' in front of me you would get all of this, but you are going to be spared a lot of that tonight. What I am trying to prove is – I am going to read to this House what I think is convincing proof – that the great majority of the newspapers, the community originations, servicemen's groups, labour organizations, consumer groups, welfare groups across Canada, and we of the Saskatchewan Government, considered that as an order that no one would take lying down if there is anything they can do about it.

First, the 'Star-Phoenix' – I am not going to read all of these, "Prince Albert City Council, Monday, passed a resolution protesting the excessive increases."

Mr. Coldwell: now nobody across the House is going to pay much attention to this, but I may say that for once he is in strange company, because I am going to quote you a lot of Liberal newspapers before I get through and I believe I am going to quote the Leader of the Opposition. "Mr. M. J. Coldwell, National C.C.F. Leader said Friday, "He could not too strongly condemn the Government's action. He said the move showed an entire disregard for the interest and welfare of the great mass of the people." He said a lot more but that will be enough of that. He did point out – he said: "With the Government housing programme since the war failing to provide houses to care for even newly-married couples, much less meet the needs imposed by immigration and the backlog of demands that has existed so long, and considering the soaring cost of living, the Government's policy in allowing such drastic increases will work untold hardship on hundreds of thousands of Canadians" – and I may tell you that is mild to what some other people, not associated with the C.C.F., say about it.

The Toronto 'Telegram' said that "rents in Toronto's 80,000 rented living quarters will increase almost \$800,000 a month."

Quoting from the Canadian Press: "The Canadian Legion, next week, is expected to protest to the Federal Government against the changes in rent controls. A Legion spokesman said Friday, the increases are contrary to our wishes."

George MacLean, president of the Canadian Federation of Mayors, expressed keen disappointment at the news. He said, "The increases will be hitting people who can't afford to pay very heavy rents."

The President of the Montreal Tenants' Association said: "It is believable the Government would boost rent prices to such an extent at this time. This (he said) is a terrific blow to the working class and makes rents 40 per cent above what they were two years ago for heated homes and 30 per cent above the 1947 level for unheated homes." He added, "This does not include a vast list of hidden increases." He continues: "It is obvious the Government doesn't intend waiting for the situation to right itself before adding burdens for a vast number of the country's working population."

March 9, 1950

The Winnipeg 'Tribunal', of November 16th: "The Winnipeg City Council has added its collective voice to the growing protest against the Dominion Government's sanction of higher domestic rents. There is still another possibility that similar action may be taken by the Canadian Federation of Mayors and municipalities."

The Vancouver 'Daily Province': "Budgets of thousands of families living in rented quarters will be badly dented by the lifting of rent control ceilings. It is going to mean a sharp increase in the cost of living for many Canadians." And from the same paper: "Looking to the future there will be a time when the landlord will find himself facing a buyer's market. He will have to meet competitive prices in the housing field; maybe he would be wise to think of future relations with his tenants when he revises his rents schedules."

Now I have read that to say that the Bill which is before you provides for a board field in which landlords and tenants may negotiate, and I hope and believe I know the majority of landlords will do this; that landlords will realize what was said in this editorial in this Vancouver paper "that a little tolerance now may pay dividends in the future."

The Toronto 'Star': "If rent controls were suddenly to cease many families would suddenly be confronted by the danger of eviction or the necessity of finding other accommodation."

Canadian Congress of Labor: "The housing shortage has grown so acute that it now has become an extraordinary peril and a menace to the national life of Canada; an emergency so serious and pressing is utterly beyond the control of any province. It has attained such dimensions as to affect the body politic of the Dominion and to justify the Dominion Parliament in passing laws for its regulation or abolition." That is for the abolition of the housing shortage, I presume.

The 'Star-Phoenix': "The immediate need in rent control is for a greater degree of flexibility." That means a greater degree of flexibility than was permitted by Federal regulations and that was embodied in that order of November 10th.

Here is something interesting. I might point out here, Mr. Speaker, that in the minds of a lot of people (I can't say whether it is correct or not) the Dominion Government would have welcomed, at least at one time, a decision from the Supreme Court that they had no jurisdiction to stay in the field. That cannot be proven one way or the other; but it is extraordinary that, in making the reference to the Supreme Court, they served notice on the Property Owners' Association but they served no notice on the tenants or anyone to represent the tenants – and someone could have been found. I may say – this is the Canadian Press reporting the first hearing: "Surprise was expressed by the Chief Justice when he noticed that there was no counsel present to represent Canadian tenants at the Court hearing, this morning. He said he had been delayed in arriving at the hearing because of a parade of lessees which blocked traffic for twenty minutes. The parade was held by 200 members of the Montreal Tenants' Association who will confer with Mr. Abbott in the morning. Now counsel for the tenants will be appointed by the Court, said the Chief Justice, and he expected . . . (that word 'expect' – I can hear the Chief Justice saying it; it was meant that they were going to pay the costs of counsel employed to represent the tenants) that the Government would pay the expenses involved in retaining counsel for the tenants."

“Mr. McLeod said (just what the Leader of the Opposition said) that he could not see what useful purpose could be served by appointing counsel for the tenants since the stand the tenants would take would be the same as the Government.” And he does not say it with sarcasm, but most of us know. “Are you suggesting that the Government will represent the tenants?” the Chief Justice said. Mr. McLeod said that he did not, and he said he would inform the Chief Justice whether the Government would agree to pay the expense or not. Well, in any event, by reason of the intervention of the Chief Justice, the tenants had counsel at the hearing and were prepared to argue; but if it had not been for the intervention of the Supreme Court they would not have had. I don’t know whether that proves anything or not. To some people it proves that probably Mr. Abbott would not have been heartbroken if the Supreme Court had said, “No, you can’t stay in the field, the Provinces all have to take it over.”

An editorial, in part, from the ‘Leader-Post’: “There are persons in Saskatchewan on whom the new rental increases will work a real hardship. Any further boosts in their costs will aggravate their situation. These people should be protected.” That is an editorial written after this order, and, I submit, is putting the ‘Leader-Post’ on record as being, with the Saskatchewan Government, of the opinion that that was an improper order.

I am going to quote myself here pretty soon because it is the first time I ever was able to put myself in the same group as the ‘Star-Phoenix’, the ‘Leader-Post’; and I am going to submit some statements made by the Leader of the Opposition, and I can’t resist the opportunity. Here is what he said as reported in the Regina ‘Leader-Post’:

“The Provincial Government was condemned for its hesitation in entering the rent control field in a radio speech by Walter Tucker, provincial Liberal Leader. Accusing the Government of attempting to divert attention from their own inaction by loud outcries against Ottawa, the Liberal Leader maintained there was no doubt that rents came within Provincial jurisdiction in peacetime, since they were a matter concerning property and civil rights.”

The hon. Leader of the Opposition was kind enough to mention me. He says: “The exercise of jurisdiction in this field does not depend on any grant from the Dominion Government, as Attorney General J. W. Corman, pretends. I suggest (I believe this radio address was made during the Cannington by-election) that on sober reflection (and I use that word in its nicest sense, and in the only sense it should be applied to the Leader of the Opposition); I suggest that he would not make that statement, today, because it is beyond peradventure that the Province can get in now only by a grant, a transfer, a delegation or something from the Federal Government. So in this particular case, I believe most people will agree that the Attorney General happened to be right and the Leader of the Opposition wrong. That doesn’t prove very much.

Here is another public man saying: “If the Government had announced prior to the last general election that it planned to authorize such increases it would not have had such a large following at the polls.” That is one complaint that is made – that no intimation of this was given before the election. Another complaint that is made, Mr. Speaker, is that this drastic Order-in-Council while Parliament was sitting. As one speaker said – it was very similar to the way the Cominform was ruling Czechoslovakia.

March 9, 1950

And the Winnipeg 'Free Press' – I have them on my side to some extent; and here is the 'Regina Leader' again, and here I have the Leader of the Opposition again – it says, November 8th: "A demand that the Saskatchewan Liberal Leader at a meeting, Monday night, speaking on behalf of the Liberal candidate for Cannington, Ross McCarthy" . . . and you must have been very convincing, Sir, . . ." Mr. Tucker said the Government's reaction to the question of rent control was typical. 'It is the usual trick of trying to shift the responsibility to Ottawa;' he said."

I may say there that the Supreme Court does not agree with that statement either, because the Supreme Court held not only that it was the right of the Dominion Government to remain in the field longer, but that it is the duty of the Dominion Government to remain in the field.

Going on, from the staff correspondent of the 'Regina Leader': "Mr. Tucker said control of rents was a Provincial matter in peacetime and the Saskatchewan Government had full power to give protection to people faced with unduly high rents in areas where housing was scarce." Remember, this statement was made on November 8th, within a week of the time that this drastic order was made at Ottawa, and it must have had reference to Ottawa. Then the Leader of the Opposition says – (and I am afraid that we agree with him): "I feel the Provincial Government should accept this responsibility and provide this protection wherever there should happen to be a housing scarcity."

Now, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that in the minds of those people, that will be taken as a condemnation of the Federal order.

I may say that there are pages and pages of this from newspapers across Canada, from groups of different kinds.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I was wondering if the Attorney General could quote a good Conservative authority or two, so we would be sure of having the support of the member from Arm River, and the member from Moosomin.

Hon. Mr. Corman: — Just the way I feel now I am not going to tilt lances with the member for Moosomin; there are enough people here who can say things about him. I guess his politics is his own business for tonight, until somebody else starts.

I did make this statement, the next day after the order came out, and it was carried in the Press. I am reading it, not because it adds anything to what these wider people have said, but I do want for once as I say, to associate myself with these Liberal newspapers and with the Leader of the Opposition:

"The action is unforgivable coming from a Government that stood idly by and allowed the cost of living to soar to an all-time high. It is unforgivable coming from a Government that must accept responsibility for the acute housing shortage that exists in Canada, chiefly caused by an adamant refusal to provide subsidies for low-rental houses while at the same time finding money to subsidize the big steel and gold mining industries."

I said a lot more really good stuff here, but I am not going to read it now. In the Canadian Press, October 23rd: “Consumers, civil servants and war veterans, Friday night, were not in favour of Finance Minister Abbott’s announcement easing rent controls. The President of the Ottawa Consumers’ Associations aid, ‘We are opposed to easing rent controls in any way; this is a responsibility of the Federal Government and not of the Provinces.’ The secretary of the Dominion Command Civil Service War Veterans’ Associations aid, “There is no doubt this rent increase will react on the rising cost of living, it will make imperative immediate action by the Government for a cost-of-living bonus to civil servants.’ Officials of the Canadian Legion, Dominion Command said, ‘Provincial Commands will appeal to the Provincial Governments to enter the field and hold rents at current ceilings’.”

I am reading these things to show that this Government is not alone in feeling that that order which forces us into the field is considered by these organizations and these newspapers as being an unjust and unfair order.

The Montreal Standard: “Instead of getting better, the situation is getting worse. There is more than a political reason for keeping the rent lids on”; and they go on to quote some figures and show how many people – they say 800,000 families already are doubling up.

The Canadian Press, November 8th: “The boost in rental ceilings which comes into effect ten days before Christmas, may hit some four million Canadians living in rented rooms, suites and houses.”

It was estimated by the ‘Financial Times’ that the total dollar amount involved in the new rent increases would come to about \$65 million or \$70 million a year. This represents a transfer of money from one group to another, and they point out that while that money may be transferred to the landlords they don’t spend it as the tenants do. The tenants who are called upon to pay this additional money to their landlords will undoubtedly have to curtail their spending in other ways.

‘Financial Post’, Toronto, November 19th: “On sober reflection fairminded people must agree that there was substantial justification for the rent increase authorized by Ottawa last week. They will also agree that this increase should pave the way for the prompt lifting of all remaining wartime controls in this field. The existing situation was unfair and unsatisfactory” – and before I comment on that, I have a quotation here from Mr. Abbott’s speech in the House and he is quoted: “Finance Minister Douglas Abbott told the House of Commons – it was perfectly clear the existing structure of the frozen rentals was unfair to them majority of the landlords receiving them”; and he went on to say, that in his opinion, he did not think it would increase the cost of living. The reason I have grouped them is that, in all this mass of quotations, you have Mr. Abbott and the Financial Post of Toronto as the only ones who try to support the order of the Federal Government.

I don’t think I will read any more. I suggest that what I have read and what you people have read yourselves before I started this talk of mine, must have convinced you that there is general disapproval across Canada of that order, therefore, that we are justified in taking on this job.

From the quotations I have read, you have lined up against that order the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities, many

March 9, 1950

representative newspapers across Canada including the Winnipeg 'Tribune', the Toronto 'Star', the Regina 'Leader-Post', the Saskatoon 'Star-Phoenix', the Vancouver 'Daily Province', the Montreal 'Standard', the Montreal 'Star' and the Edmonton 'Journal'; many municipal councils, the Canadian Legion, the Army, Navy and Air Force Veterans' Association, the Canadian Welfare Council, the Canadian Congress of Labour and the Trades and Labour Council, Consumer Associations across Canada and the Dominion Command Civil Service War Veterans' Association, and, supporting the order or defending it as being a just order, you have the Hon. Douglas Abbott and the Toronto 'Financial Post'.

These people, among other things, said this: "The Order shows an utter disregard for the interest and welfare of the great mass of the Canadian people. It is contrary to the wishes of veterans; will work hardship on hundreds of thousands of Canadians; unbelievable the Government would boost rent prices to such an extent at this time; a terrific boost for the working class; it means a sharp increase in the cost of living for many Canadians; a menace to the national life of Canada; deplorable, a pay-off for services rendered in aiding the Liberals back to power; cannot too strongly condemn the Government's action; disgraceful, a crime; the result of strong lobbying at Ottawa; a threat to Veterans; we deplore the ill-timed announcement of rental increases; and another – the inevitable rise in the cost of living could be disastrous; the Order-in-Council, while Parliament was sitting is similar to the way the Cominform is running Czechoslovakia by decree; without justification, wicked and unforgivable."

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if I have not convinced the members of this House that that was an order that we could not take, then I will never be able to convince them of anything. Now, probably some of you would be more interested in knowing what we are going to do about it. I first want to say that in bringing in a Bill to control rents because we think we are forced to do it, we are not taking sides for or against any group. Some rents now are too high, some rents are too low. We are dealing, not with groups, not with landlords or tenants as groups; but we are dealing with a situation, and the situation is that there is admittedly a housing shortage not only in Canada but there is a housing shortage in Saskatchewan; that the demand for housing accommodation, admittedly, exceeds the supply and, in the opinion of the Saskatchewan Government, the time has not yet come when the obtaining of housing accommodation and keeping a roof over one's head can be left to the exigencies or the caprices of the open market or free enterprise.

The Saskatchewan Government realizes that the legislation is temporary legislation to meet an emergency situation, and it is not intended to be permanent. For that reason it provides for the greatest possible measure of voluntary negotiation between landlord and tenant compatible with the maintenance of a necessary degree of uniformity and avoidance of inequities and inequalities. I might say when the Bill is being considered in Committee, that most of the provisions respecting definitions, penalties and powers of enforcement officers have been taken from the Federal regulations. If they were found unsuited to Saskatchewan and it is necessary, a year from now, to renew this Bill in its present form or in an amended form, experience will have taught us what changes should be made in that respect; but we are going into a new field and we had, to some extent, to depend on a precedent from someplace, so that, as far as penalties, definitions and many other of the formal things, they have been taken from the Federal regulations. I may say this Act, from the very nature of things, can be considered an Act for once year, because it is certain that it will be before this House for review a year hence.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the following features of the Bill (and I am speaking only of housing accommodation, not commercial or business accommodation), and in speaking of housing accommodation, I want to make it clear that this does not include farm houses, does not include room and board, does not include any room in a hotel, in a clubhouse which is defined in the Act, or in a tourist cabin, and, by a House amendment which will be brought in and which was an omission in drafting the Bill in the first place, it will not include any room in a religious or educational institution, and there are four or five other kinds of institutions that go with them taken from the Federal Act or regulations, but of the same nature. It does not include rooms in such places as the Y.M.C.A. or a college or anything of that kind.

Now, the next thing the Act does is to fix maximum rentals of all housing accommodation. I believe it is obvious and apparent to every member of this House that the maximum rentals cannot be fixed by an individual appraisal of every suite, of every room, and of every house in Saskatchewan by the Mediation Board who will administer this Act. There has to be a starting point. The Dominion Government started, I believe, in some month in 1944. We have fixed the rents in existence as of April 1st of housing accommodations as the maximum rents for those premises until or unless varied by the Mediation Board. That means that the only housing accommodation affected by this Act before the House are houses, suites, and rooms under a lease on April 1st, whether it is new construction or whether it is old construction that becomes for the first time available for tenants after April 1st. What I mean by that is, that the owner of the house, finding it too large for himself, if he decides after April 1st to throw it open, to rent it, the Act as drawn does not exercise any controls over him or over the rents he can charge.

I may say it is hoped that, by the provision keeping our hands off of new construction and new accommodation, we will encourage the owners of large houses to throw them open and take in tenants, which will relieve congestion some other place, and will help in the leveling-off process that we all hope for in the interests of both landlords and tenants.

We hope it will give the incentive to people who are contemplating building, especially apartment blocks, to go ahead and do it. I have been told (I might not believe this) – but I have a lot of friends among free enterprise contractors and property owners in this province, and I have been told that they are just holding back to find out what this Government was going to do. I was told by one person in Moose Jaw that he is going to build a big apartment house; he wants to know whether we are going to give him a chance to operate without too many controls. Well, you can tell any of your friends that we are not controlling, in any way, new constructions. I only hope that they were not kidding me, that they will go ahead and that we will find lots of these houses and apartment houses built.

It was realized, in fixing the rentals at the rates prevailing on April 1st, that some rents would be too high, some would be too low, and to meet this situation power has been given the Mediation Board to vary (that means, to increase or decrease) rents of all premises leased on April 1st. Now these rents may be increased or decreased on application by the landlord or by the tenant, or it may done of the Board's own initiative. And I may say that when the new rent is fixed by the Board it becomes the maximum rent then until again varied by the Board.

March 9, 1950

It is also realized that, even up to this point, the Board is not going to be able to deal expeditiously with all the applications that will come to it if we tie the hands of landlords and tenants completely, and for that reason there is a provision in the Act that landlords and tenants of these controlled premises (that is, of these premises under lease of April 1st) may make their own agreements as far as rentals are concerned, but that those rentals as fixed by agreement shall not be collected or paid until the agreement has been approved by the Mediation Board. We hope that that will work out satisfactorily. Only time will tell.

It is also provided in the Act, that, unless a permit has been obtained from the Board, no person shall discontinue or lessen any heating or lighting. Those are matters that can be dealt with in Committee, of course.

The Board has been given permission to exclude from the operation of the Act any class of accommodation and power to exclude districts in the province or parts of the province. If they should find that it is the wish of some of the towns or villages that there be no rent control, if it is considered in the public interest they have the power to exclude them.

Now, that is housing accommodation. I might say that there are a number of House amendments that are being brought in to make it abundantly clear that we are not exercising any control over any housing accommodation except such as in under lease. It was drawn to us that it might give the impression that, as the Act is read, we were taking the right, for instance, to go into a new apartment house and check over the landlord's books. The House amendment makes it clear that we are not taking that power, and those amendments will come before you when we go into Committee.

As far as commercial rents are concerned, we are not fixing commercial rents. But realizing that there is some dissatisfaction, realizing that some adjustments probably should be made, we are giving either the landlord or the tenant the right to come to the Mediation Board and apply for a variation in the rental, and giving the Mediation Board the power to grant it. But we are not fixing commercial rents.

It must be obvious to everyone that the power to control rentals cannot be effectively exercised by the Board unless they have the power to control evictions. The Act gives the Mediation Board power to control evictions, but only to these premises that were under lease on April 1st.

In drawing to a close, might I say this. I said before that we are legislating for or against any group. Landlords who don't play the game will find that the Act is designed to force them to conform to a course of conduct in the public interest; and to tenants (and there are 'black sheep' in every group, except probably this House) concerning this right to prevent evictions, I would like to serve warning now, that tenants who attempt to take advantage of the protection given them will find that they are out of luck, because neither this Government nor the Board intends to guarantee permanency of occupation or possession to tenants who become objectionable or a nuisance either to the landlord, or to other tenants if it happens to be an apartment block.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I may say that to get any place at all with the administration of this Act, it can be done only with the

co-operation of landlords and tenants. Without that co-operation the Mediation Board will find it very difficult to administer the Act, and as Attorney General, for what it is worth, I do appeal to both groups to use a little tolerance and to give the Board their co-operation. I move the second reading of the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, from what I have heard of the Attorney General in his series “The Attorney General Speaks”, and the fact that Saskatchewan will not be deprived of the joy of hearing some of these very sweeping arguments which he seemed to worry about not getting a chance to deliver. I expect to hear them myself of course when I next hear his radio speech.

Now, in regard to the length of time that he devoted to condemning the Federal Government, it was just because of that very attitude on the part of the Attorney General and the Premier when this step was taken by the Federal Government, that I said that, if they felt that this order left the field open for useful action on the part of the Provincial Government, which had ample power to enter the field, then it seemed to me that they should take action instead of doing, as they have done in some many other cases, crying out against Ottawa. I am glad that they have decided to take action in this case because whether the members opposite agree with it or not, it was the policy of the Federal Government to gradually decontrol; the avowed policy so far as the Federal Government is concerned to gradually get out of the field of controls which they entered into in wartime. That was endorsed, surely it cannot be denied, by the overwhelming majority of the Canadian people. That was a fixed programme of the Federal Government laid before the people last year, and I do not think it can be denied that they got quite a satisfactory endorsement.

Now, my attitude in regard to this particular matter was that rent control was one thing in which the Federal Government had not yet got out of the field, and they had indicated that if the Courts upheld their right to stay in the field for another year, they would stay in the field of rent controls. But I gathered that it was only for one more year, and that, in the meantime, they felt that there were cases where landlords were entitled to some increased rents and so they raised the level under which landlords could operate. That permission was not a blanket raising of rents as was represented by so many people seeking to make political capital out of it; it was purely permissive. It said that rents could be raised by agreement up to that amount. That was the effect of that Order-in-Council. It was a step towards decontrol. The Federal Government has made no secret of the fact that it did intend to get out of this field within a year from now, the fact that it did intend to get out of this field within a year from now, even if the Supreme Court upheld its right to remain in the field, because it felt that, and the Courts have upheld this viewpoint, the only reason why the Federal Government has a right to remain in this field is because the Federal Parliament have said by their legislation that this emergency due to war had not yet passed. The Court takes the attitude, as I understand the judgment, that if Parliament makes that decision and unless they have very ready reasons to find otherwise, they will accept the decision of Parliament. So the only reason why the Supreme Court upheld the view that the Federal Government has a right to remain in this field is because Parliament has said that this emergency still continues.

The Federal Government sent its lawyers into the Supreme Court to point out that the Federal Government had so decided, and on that basis the Court should uphold their right to remain in the field. Now to say, to

March 9, 1950

argue from that, that the Federal Government wanted the Supreme Court to rule that they had no right to remain in the field when it passed legislation that the emergency still existed on the basis of which previous Supreme Courts had ruled that they would not interfere unless there was overwhelming evidence to the contrary; to argue from that, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Government was hoping that the Supreme Court would say that they had no jurisdiction, would require a far more suspicious mind than I thought the Attorney General had.

Hon. Mr. Corman: — That was not my statement.

Mr. Tucker: — Well I'm glad he does not take any responsibility for it himself, because, surely, when a Parliament, with a majority such as there is in that Parliament, finds that there is an emergency and the Government agrees and then sends its counsel into Court to argue before that court, and to point out, "Here is what they passed by legislation, that the emergency still exists, and we want you to find that it does exist and that we still have power"; when they do this you can hardly say that they are trying to do the opposite.

Now, that is a simple record, Mr. Speaker, of what the Federal Government did, and to suggest, as the Attorney General has done, that they were trying to do the opposite to what they were actually doing is, I do not think really fitting for the Attorney General of any province. It is throwing doubt on the good faith of all, or at least most, of our fellow legislators in Parliament who legislated that this emergency still exists. It is throwing doubt on the good faith of the lawyers who went there to argue that it still existed, and it is throwing doubt on the good faith of the Government who instructed them to go there and argue that it still existed. However, if the Attorney General gets some pleasure out of arguing that in his usual jovial way, I suppose we should not find fault with it.

All I need to say about this question is that there is no doubt that we are coming to the period when the Federal Government cannot any longer say that we are in the emergency due to war. Even if they do say it, the war is over now five years, and the Courts do hold the right to question even the decision of Parliament. Otherwise, of course, Parliament, by saying that the emergency existed indefinitely, could take powers to do away with our entire constitution. So the Supreme Court has reserved that right and Parliament, I think, realizes that it is coming to the time when it cannot any longer insist upon remaining within fields of Provincial jurisdiction on the ground that the emergency has not yet passed away. So it is a matter, so far as I can see, of whether we would enter the field now or enter the field in some respect a year from now.

Now then, my own attitude, Mr. Speaker, was that as we appear near the end of decontrol, I may say, I upheld the Federal Government's control policies during the war because I felt that, during the war, everything had to be subordinated to the necessity to win the war, and people's ordinary rights and liberties that they hold dear in peace-time, it is not too much to put them into the common pool of rights. When others were risking everything they had, including their lives, there should be no hesitation about putting everything in pawn in order to win the war. But once the war is over and the emergency due to the war is past, then I think nearly everybody thinks that the constitution, which our forefathers laid down for the government of this country should come into force and effect and that no pretense that an emergency exists when it no longer exists, should be used as an excuse to flout the constitution. I for one agree

with that view because whether or not we agree with the division of jurisdiction between the Provinces and the Dominion, it is our constitution, and it is the foundation for rights which most of us, at least many of us, value quite highly.

We respect the work done by the Fathers of Confederation, and I think most of us appreciate it – I don't know whether in the House we all do. So my argument was that once the Federal Government vacates this field, then it is open for the Province to legislate and it does not depend upon any grant from the Federal Government. It stems from the constitution itself, Mr. Speaker. They have vacated it quite clearly or indicated their intention to vacate if the Province would enter the field. And so perhaps the Attorney General – maybe we were misunderstanding the effect of what each other was saying, but all I was indicating was that we would be operating under our basic constitutional rights and that we would not have to depend on any grants from the Federal Government once they had vacated the field. That is all I meant by it, and I think the Attorney General will agree with that view of the matter. In fact with his statement the law on the matter, I think that there could be no fault found.

Now, there is nothing in this legislation to indicate that it is temporary legislation. I was glad that the Attorney General indicated that legislation like this might have a bad effect on the provision of housing and that, of course, is one of the reasons why the Federal Government has intended to get out of this field, and the fact that it indicated that it was going to get out of this field has meant that we have had more success in constructing new housing accommodation than any other country in the whole world. Other countries have indicated their intention of controlling the rentals on housing accommodations indefinitely, and the result is that people have put their money into other lines of investments. But because it has been very clear in Canada that there was no intention to stay indefinitely in this field, private capital has not been so late to go into the field of investment in housing. The result is, Mr. Speaker, that, I believe, the figures are that in the past year the number of new houses completed approached the hundred-thousand mark, and I saw the figures given by a reputable Minister of the Crown at Ottawa, that Canada had built more units of housing per head of population than any other country in the world. Now then, that surely must indicate what must after all be the ultimate solution of this problem: not legislation. Legislation which keeps people out of the field of investing in housing does not provide homes for people.

We all are a little familiar with what has happened in that regard in France where they continued to maintain a rigid control over rentals ever since the first World War. The result is that there practically have been no new houses built in cities like Paris and many people are living in the most terrible accommodations that one can imagine in the city of Paris. Now that gives us an idea of the utter and complete breakdown and failure of too much rigid control, because you can pass laws, but that does not build houses and that does not provide people with homes.

I gather that the Attorney General agreed with that viewpoint, for he emphasized that there was no intention of interfering with new housing. The Federal Government indicated some time ago that it would not interfere with new housing, but now we enter the field it appears that we do interfere with a great deal of that new housing that was not under control by the laws that existed up to this time. If people are going to be under the threat that they are always going to be faced with some change in the law whereby,

March 9, 1950

even if invest money in housing, that housing may be brought under control by changing the law later on, as we are doing right now, they will be reluctant to invest in housing. By that action, of course, we bring the whole set-up under the very threat that will prevent the necessary investment in housing to cure this situation. I am not finding fault with the Bill as a whole, but what I do say is that in regard to this situation, any legislation like this has somewhat of a dampening effect upon the willingness of people to invest in this particular line, because they know if they go into any other line of activity there is no thought of controlling. There is no thought of controlling people who invest, for example, in oil wells or anything like that. So the tendency is fostered of investing in many other lines of activity where they are sure there will be no interference with them. But in this thing, we are indicating there will be some interference. Now that will have the effect of hindering some investment in housing. I am not saying it should not be done for that reason; what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that there should be, what the Bill itself indicates there will be – the maximum amount of room for arrangement between landlord and tenant. I take it that it is not the intention to interfere unless it is felt by the Mediation Board that there is some injustice being perpetrated. That is exactly the line that I suggested in my speeches. For many years now it has been the policy of Government in Saskatchewan under the Mediation Board, that if any person under adverse conditions economically was not able to protect himself the Government would interfere to give him protection. Now that has been the fixed policy of the Government of Saskatchewan, and the fact that it should be applied in the realm of housing to protect a tenant is only carrying out the policy which we had in effect, particularly in regard to farmers for, I suppose, the past 25 years at least. So there is nothing unusual about it, nothing that needs to cause anybody too much alarm or anything like that, as long as it is understood that that is the intention. And the Attorney General indicated that that was, as I understand it, the attitude that was going to be taken towards the administration of this Act: that it was to protect people from being pressed in any way unfairly.

If that is so, the only question then that arises is this: Does the Bill carry out the intention of the Attorney General in that regard? If it does not carry out his intention, then it would be too bad, because there is nothing so unsatisfactory as good intentions not properly carried out and which cause the damage that the good intentions sought to avoid causing. The Attorney General said this is clearly a temporary Bill. Well, there is nothing in the Bill itself that indicates that it is a temporary Bill. Now, I can understand the reason that perhaps the Attorney General had in his mind in not putting in a clause to the effect that this Bill shall expire on the first of April, 1951. To do so might cause a great deal of apprehension towards the end of that period. In case the housing shortage has not been completely remedied then it might cause some unnecessary apprehension. So the question is that somehow or another you have to find a way between those two difficulties: on the one hand to make it clear that you are not going to be continually and indefinitely interfering in this field beyond what you are doing in other fields; that you are only doing it while the housing shortage exists, and making it plain that that is your sole intention; but on the other hand, not causing undue alarm that you are going to terminate the thing before the housing shortage is over.

Now, my own suggestion to hon. members is that I think that we should give some thought to introducing something in this Bill that tries to meet those two requirements: one, so that people should not be alarmed that the protection will be withdrawn before the housing shortage is over,

and the other, giving assurance to people who might go into this field and do something so that the housing shortage may be brought to an end as quickly as possible by the building of new houses. We should see that they are not deterred by the thought that they are going to be met with indefinite interference and controls beyond what is supplied in other fields of investments. Now with that, Mr. Speaker, I say that we support this Bill. It carries out what I have believed in for some time. I felt that now that we are five years away from the war, the provinces can handle this matter much more effectively than it can be handled from Ottawa. I was in Ottawa, when, a couple of years after the war, I became very much aware that conditions which the rental control administrators were trying to deal with in their regulations, in the congested areas of Montreal and Toronto were entirely different from the conditions prevailing in the Prairie West. The result was that rules and regulations were being made to meet those conditions in those congested areas of Eastern Canada which were not applicable out here. And speaking for myself, I felt that we, knowing our own conditions here in Saskatchewan, could pass laws and make regulations that would be much more applicable to our needs than they ever possibly could in Ottawa when they had to pass regulations to try to meet the needs of some of the heavily populated areas of this country. So, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, I welcome this legislation on the basis that the Attorney General has placed it: that it is temporary legislation designed to meet the situation that exists due to housing shortage.

I feel that he need have no apprehension if he approaches the administration of this Act in the spirit which he has indicated. It seems to me that if the Dominion could do as well as it did dealing with the varied conditions as they exist from one end of Canada to the other, Canada as compared with the great metropolis of Montreal. If they could do as well as they did, it seems to me that the Minister should have no apprehension about handling the situation in our province of Saskatchewan from our capital city of Regina. He should be able to give a great measure of relief from apprehension on the part of tenants and a great measure of fairness in considering the just claims of landlords. So far as we are concerned, we intend to support this Bill, and we intend to assist in any way to make it a Bill that will be as workable as possible; and we certainly extend to the Attorney General our best wishes, and I say that in all sincerity, in its administration.

Hon. Mr. Corman (Closing): — The point raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition was given a lot of consideration. We realize the force of the arguments for and against putting in any such provision as that “This Act shall expire on the first of April of next year.” It would create unnecessary and unfounded fears. There are advantages, as were pointed out. We decided against putting it in. But I can give the House the assurance that, if I am still occupying this seat next year, this Act will be brought before the House next year for the attention of the House as to necessary amendments, as to whether it should be continued and, if so, to what extent it should be continued. I can give that undertaking to the public.

The motion was agreed to unanimously, and Bill No. 13 read the second time.

The Assembly adjourned at 11 o'clock p.m. without question put.