

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session — Eleventh Legislature
24th Day

Tuesday, March 21, 1950.

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

The House resumed from Monday, March 20, 1950, the adjourned debate on the Motion of Hon. C.M. Fines: That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair. (The Assembly to go into Committee of Supply)

Mr. G. Danielson (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, to begin with, I want to congratulate the hon. member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Culliton) for the very fine speech he made in criticizing the budget. His speech was very fine indeed.

Hon. members opposite have been attacking the Wheat Board for incurring an overdraft of \$23,000,000. All large business operates on a line of credit. This is far different from borrowing in the normal sense of the term. I don't think any business can avoid doing that occasionally. Operating on a line of credit is far different from borrowing. Even the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool has borrowed up to \$238,000,000 from the Bank of Montreal for current financing. You cannot operate in a large business like wheat marketing without an occasional overdraft.

I have been closely associated with a Co-op. store in my home town. We do a very large retail business, and sometimes operate on an overdraft.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Do you borrow to pay dividends?

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, possibly even for that. But we don't call it borrowing. It is operating on a line of credit, and quite legitimate. Members opposite know that this is a common business practice, and they are being very unfair when they criticize the Wheat Board in this manner.

Hon. members opposite try to blame the Liberals for the low teachers' salaries in the 'thirties. No one denies that teachers' salaries were terrible in the 'thirties. The hon. member for Elrose (Mr. Willis) was very critical of the Liberal Government of those days for the salaries that were being paid to school teachers; but I know of one C.C.F. chairman of a school board who was instrumental in reducing salaries not to \$400 per year, but to \$350. I say to hon. members opposite, and particularly to the member for Elrose, they are the last ones that should speak about teachers' salaries — and to some more of the C.C.F. members the same statement can probably be applied.

I have here an editorial and also a record that, in 1944, the average of teachers' salaries in the province of Saskatchewan — and this is dated January 25, 1945, with reference to the 1944 salary situation, and it says this:

“On Thursday, January 11, the Department released figures showing a steady rise in teacher' salaries and revealing that the average salary in 1944 was in excess of \$1100.”

March 21, 1950

Now that is the Department's own report for 1944. That doesn't correspond with the statement made by the hon. member for Elrose, yesterday; so that statement is all washed up. I would just like to call the attention of the House to the statement that the Minister of Education made, and, if I am not quoting him correctly I stand to be corrected. When he commenced his speech on March 10th, just before adjournment he made a statement to the effect that the Liberal Party reminded him of a circus, they charge you a very small price to get into the first tent, he said, but when they get you inside, they commence to charge you more and more and more until finally they pick your pockets.

Well I have been waiting for years to conjure up in my mind, Mr. Speaker . . . (interruption) . . . I repeat that, if my statement is not correct, I want the hon. gentleman to correct me; but I want to tell him that I could never find anything better or anything more fitting to apply to the Department that he represents over on the other side of the House.

In 1944, before the election, Mr. Speaker, everything was 'free'. The Leader of that Party, who had been the member for the constituency of Weyburn in the Federal House, was the circus car at that time, and he reminds me of the gentleman who stood outside the tent of a circus in the old days, with the blacktop boots, shiny boots, and a stovepipe hat with a little whip or a stick in his hand, calling the 'suckers' to come along — that he was going to take them into the tent to show them the bearded lady and all that sort of thing. That is exactly what these gentlemen did. They said to the people of Saskatchewan: "You elect us, and we are going to give you free health services without money and without cost" — and there is no use in them coming, today, Mr. Speaker, and saying that they didn't say so, because the Premier of the province predicted that, and he went so far as to tell them where he was going to get the money. He said he was going to abolish the Education Tax because he knew where to get the money. That is a fact.

Now then, what has happened? Well, the people believed him — I am sorry to say they did — and they kicked us out and they put this circus in, and they took the people into their fold, and they have been taking their taxes ever since, Mr. Speaker. Yes sir, there isn't a tax or a permit or a lease or a licence in the province of Saskatchewan that has not been doubled and trebled in many cases, except the Public Revenue Tax and that stands. Now that is a fact. That is what this Government has done — and who is paying the shot? Well, I know who is paying for hospitalization — I didn't expect anything else but there are thousands of people in the province who believed this circus ballyhoo when they were going around the province, in 1944, telling them that they wouldn't have to pay anything for this heavenly service, that it was going to be heaven on earth in this province, without money and without price. I can hear the mealy-mouthed Premier now as he told that story many times. Well, Mr. Speaker, here is what I would like to say — I am not believing other things that my friends say, particularly the Minister of Education, who was brought into the circus from the province of Ontario and they were brought from all over Canada, and here is one of them who said in Moose Jaw — "election gripes are bad enough at any time, but when they can't get anyplace any other way, they are insulting". I recommend that model to my friends over there now, because that is what he said then; and they offered anything to the people of Saskatchewan to put them into power, and that is the group that sits on the other side of the House today, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to talk to the Minister of Highways for a few moments. Oh no, I am going to let him off! I am going to speak about the Power Commission, Mr. Speaker — I'll get to the Minister of Highways before I get through. Time and time again in this House these men here, who don't know anything about the background of this province because they were playing on the street corners and they were also on the farms snaring gophers in those days when we were battling to keep this province going and bring it through the hard old times — you know about those times, Mr. Speaker; they tell us now that the Power Commission has never been any good, it has always lost money, and that it is just since this group came in that they have made such a wonderful success. Why have they made a success? They have not given more power to the people of the province of Saskatchewan, and they have reduced the charges slightly; but do not let us forget that the reduction has worked this way: that before, in my home town, there was \$1,176 taxes paid to the Dominion Electric at that town, since they took it over there has never been one nickel paid, but the town has levied a 5 per cent tax on every light bill that I pay or that anybody else pays in that town since that time. That is the way we pay the taxes now. Now that is the story that is true and more than true and the Minister knows it, and that is the system of the whole province, Mr. Speaker, and he knows it.

What is the situation in regard to the Power Commission? Well, Mr. Speaker, the Power Commission was started in 1930; they paid everything and established a surplus of \$600,000; twenty years after that the total capital invested in the Power Commission was \$8.3 million; there was \$440,000 depreciation reserve set up, and there was a sinking fund of \$1,746,000, or a total of \$2,200,000, or nearly 15 per cent on the capital invested. Then let us go to December 1944. The capital invested was \$9.4 million; reserve was \$2,270,000, making a total of \$3,320,000, or nearly 34 per cent of the capital investment. I want my friend here, who thinks he knows all about the background of this Corporation, to note that particular fact.

Then we come to December 1947 — I have no later statement than that. We had an investment of \$21.5 million, because you would have bought out some companies. Then we had a reserve depreciation of \$2,450,000; the sinking fund was \$3,300,000 which make a total of \$5,750,000 or 27 per cent to which the capital of the reserve to the amount of capital invested, Mr. Speaker. Against that is 34 per cent in 1944. That does not bear out the tales and sob stories that have been told by the members opposite.

I ask them to go back on the files and the Journals in this House and find out what the relief situation was, the debt adjustment and the protection for debtors in the years gone by and see what was done in this province before they came in to this House, and not utter such nonsense as they have done here in the last few days.

Mr. Danielson: — Now then, let us talk about highways. I see the Minister is still here. I have a copy of the statement that the member for Last Mountain had the other night. It was the most interesting thing I have ever seen, and it was a clear picture to anyone that studies it and knows anything about the background of what has been done in this province under this 'non-political' administration of the Highways department of the last few years. Far be it from me, Mr. Speaker, to attribute any political activities to the hon. Minister of the Highways Department. The total expenditures here is on the capital and revenue account for four years, and I would be glad, today, if I had the last year, 1948-1949; but I have not been able to get that because the Return which I asked for has not been brought down.

March 21, 1950

It was \$15,924,000 in round figures. There were five Liberal seats in the province the last five years, and in this period practically every bit of it was during that five-year period in which there were only five Liberal members in the House. Now then, Arm River, the total is practically blank — \$51,310; Cannington, did a little better, they had \$60,535. Then we come to Hanley — somewhat better than the first two years. Last Mountain, which was spoken of by the member for Last Mountain, I gather that he is practically in the same position. Well, then we come to Moosomin. Again, Mr. Speaker, \$20,257 for four years and then to Rosthern it is just a blank all the way. I should not forget my friend from Athabaska, he has \$200 there — it is not on the sheet, but I remember it being mentioned the other day by the member from Last Mountain.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how does that work out? I said the capital revenue expended was \$15,924,000; one per cent of this amount is \$159,000. Five Liberal seats in four years got \$132,304. We got just a little less than $\frac{3}{4}$ of one per cent of the money spent, and we had 11 per cent of the seats in the whole province. Then this gentleman over here has the nerve to come in and tell this House that he is not playing politics with the Highways Department! There has never been anything but political patronage and skulduggery in handling that department. Now then, $\frac{3}{4}$ of one per cent for 11 per cent of the seats in this province in the last four years, and if we had the figures up to date, Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely sure that the picture would look far worse than it does now. I am sure it would. There was not a cent spent in my seat and in any of these other seats in the last year on capital or revenue account. That is the situation. Bring down the Return and show me where you spent anything on highways in my seat, on capital or revenue account for construction, re-construction, or surfacing; that is what these figures cover. You have a reason to be ashamed.

Each year in these five seats, Mr. Speaker, the total expended was \$26,500 in five seats or \$5,300 in each seat for four years. That is the situation. We have the highest here, which is \$1,089,000, in Milestone, and \$746,000 in Biggar, \$217,000 in Bengough, and all the way through; \$998,000 in Souris-Estevan and so on. And that shows that there is no politics in the Highways Department, Mr. Speaker. He feels quite offended when anybody suggests it. I am not wasting time on this because I think I have proven my case, and it is up to him to disprove it now.

There is another thing. In regard to hospital grants the member opposite has taken great pains to prove to the people of this province and to the members of this House that we have never paid hospital grants. All right, but the Premier of this province, speaking in our town in 1948, said that they had given to the municipalities to build new hospitals and to extend existing institutions over one million dollars. That was on June 18, 1948. And that dates, particularly, Mr. Speaker, to the end of the 1947-48 fiscal year. They had to pay \$526,000 to the end of 1948-49 fiscal year. That's \$769,000. Now it is all of two years since the Premier made that statement, but the members have been sitting here and saying these things about these grants in silent approval that there was nothing done before. Since 1912 in the province of Saskatchewan, the previous government paid a grant of 50 cents per day for every day a patient was in the hospital; that amount, along with approximately half a million dollars a year previous to the time that this Government came into power. Now that has not been paid in the last three or four years. There is a reason for it.

Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — We have the hospitalization scheme now.

Mr. Danielson: — Have you paid the grant of 50 cents per day? No. You just sit down and listen to me and I'll clear this matter up. I think that the hospital tax that was paid per patient to each hospital amounts to pretty much half the grants that this Government has handed out — and it was not ear-marked for anything except to help the hospital get on. They could spend it for anything they liked. Now then, let us go back to what the Provincial Treasurer has in mind and I now what he has in mind, and that is we have the hospitalization Act. Well, who pays for that? But it isn't free. I pay it, Mr. Speaker, and everybody else pays it and what we don't pay out of our pocket as a private tax we pay through the public revenue or the general revenue of this province. But have you ever heard one of these men come up and say, for instance, that there should be at least a reduction in the amount distributed about the country when the people want to send it. This was previously paid as a hospital grant but they won't admit there was anything there before. They do everything new. And that is the position. There is no use for these fellows sitting here and trying to put that stuff over, because it is not true. We would tell these members, "You go down to the city hall and look back on the records. In 1942, including returns from the city hall and look back on the records. In 1942, including returns from medical and health services in this province of Saskatchewan, we were the second highest per capita in the Dominion of Canada. Then it sets out that for medical and health hospitalization, we in Saskatchewan were the highest per capita. What do you know about that? It is just a waste of time trying to tell these gentlemen any of this because they don't admit it. But it is the situation.

Let us talk a bit about Social Service. Well, Mr. Speaker, as we go along and dig into the Public Accounts in some of these mysteries of this Government, we find here and there, from scraps that accidentally slip around, there is something to the effect that we are getting some money from the Dominion Government. But did you ever hear one of them admit that? So, digging in the Public Accounts we run across something like this. This Government spent \$840,000 for hospitals, small hospitals and so on in different centres in the province of Saskatchewan. I commend them for it. But did they ever tell you that the Dominion Government had any part of that? I don't know, I don't know. But we find that the Dominion Government gave you \$239,000 of that \$840,000. So that's the truth, Mr. Speaker. Lucky for us it has been found out. Did they tell you about it? Oh, no! And it is the same through the whole setup and functions of the different departments of this Government.

Here's what I want to draw your attention to. We hear a great deal about the tremendous amount of money that the Dominion Government takes out of the province of Saskatchewan, but here's what happened in 1948. The pamphlet which was used by the C.C.F. in telling the people of Saskatchewan . . . Let me tell you this . . . This year the people of Saskatchewan are paying taxes to the Liberal Government of Canada, and they mention retail tax, income tax, corporation income tax, \$133,000,000. And they say the Federal Government should be ashamed to return to the people of the province in subsidy, in old age pensions, etc., \$20,000,000. All we get back in Saskatchewan is \$20,000,000, it says. Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is the C.C.F. view. They have a new dictionary, he says. And they are clever with words and they build up a sort of a (I forget what Mr. Churchill called them, but he had some expression and I wish I could remember and let you have it, but I haven't got it and I can't remember what it was). He was referring to the Labour Government in Great Britain — the C.C.F. Government or the Socialistic Government over there — and said they wanted to tell the various people that they had to take less wages. He said, "We must be satisfied with less income."

March 21, 1950

Not less wages, but less income. And it is something of that same thing here. After all, we went to some trouble to find out something about what the Dominion Government actually takes out of this province and what they pay into this province, Mr. Speaker, from year to year, according to the needs of the people of this province and the crop conditions and so on. Now, I think a year ago they only paid \$12,000,000 into this province as P.F.A. bonuses — twelve million some hundred thousand dollars. This year they have already paid over \$15,000,000 and I am informed that the payment will be nearly \$60,000,000 in the province of Saskatchewan before this whole payment is completed. It is for the general welfare and the carrying on of the general functions of this government of Canada. The taxpayers and citizens of Canada have made their contribution as well. So that these are correct figures; more correct than I think anyone in this House can produce at the present time.

We hear there were no health services in the province of Saskatchewan. I just want to mention that, in 1944, there were 86 rural municipalities that paid for medical care and medical doctors out of the general revenue of the municipalities of this province. There were 102 municipalities that paid for hospitalization, and there were about 70 municipalities that paid for both doctors and hospitalization, Mr. Speaker. So that is just the situation. And anyone that can say that at that time, after coming through the hard times that we had during the previous 10 or 12 years, must admit that there was a wonderful improvement in the province of Saskatchewan to complete health services in this province. I am saying that, if this Government had not come in with their tyrannizing and their socialistic ideas, with ideas that everything was going to be run from the top and not from the bottom or let the people themselves run their business, there would not have been the amount of money that has been spent in the province of Saskatchewan, the last few years, for this business of hospitalization, medical units and health service in the province of Saskatchewan.

I tell you there is no excuse or reason why the tremendous cost of the organization that has been built up by this Government to operate and run this hospitalization scheme would be carried by the taxpayers of this province. It is an unnecessary burden upon the people of this province. One of the members opposite said a few days ago in this debate, that they had spent \$76,000,000 in the province of Saskatchewan for relief in the last 40 years. Now, Mr. Speaker, that's less than \$20,000 a year. Furthermore, he mentioned it was assisting the dried-out areas in Saskatchewan. Now, then, in one year, Mr. Speaker, in 1936-37 the former Government spent \$56,000,000 in the province of Saskatchewan for all services in connection with the public relief, feed and fodder, not seed grain. In one year, we spent \$23,121,000 for social relief.

Mr. J. Gibson (Morse): — Did you pay it or charge it up?

Mr. Danielson: — I can tell my hon. friend, Mr. Speaker, that we paid over \$10,000,000 a year — that's more than he'll do — when the revenue of this province was from \$15,000,000 to \$20,000,000 a year during these years. Let's ask him how much he has paid.

Mr. Gibson: — We paid that.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, this Government has never paid one dollar of that relief that was cancelled. They haven't cancelled one penny of relief in this province. And I'm going to say this, Mr. Speaker, they haven't cancelled one penny of seed grain in the province of Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Oh, oh!

Mr. Danielson: — Just a moment, you go to your dictionary and look up the word “cancellation” and see what it means. But, Mr. Speaker, it took the help of the seed grain in 1938 when this government got all the people of this province to pay, but they did not cancel one penny of it. We, the people did that. They are proud men who have come on there and settled on these quarter-sections and half-sections, in helping to pay for this. Dispute my statement, if you will. And every dollar that was cancelled on anything else was cancelled by the Dominion Government, not by this Government.

Mr. Kuziak (Canora): — Who paid for that?

Mr. Danielson: — The people of Canada as a whole. You didn't cancel one penny of it. You just left it to the department to pay it. Our friends across the way are smiling. I would like them to try and disprove to me that that statement is not correct.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — It is too silly to reply to.

Mr. Danielson: — You would reply to it if you could, my friend. I'm going to tell them another thing. Now this is the situation. In 1942, we had about the biggest crop that this province has ever produced. In 1944, we had a fair crop and in 1945 a good one, and in 1946 we had a good crop. In 1947, we had one of the biggest crops over Saskatchewan that has ever been produced. We were at the peak of prosperity at that time. The income tax department of the Dominion of Canada made a ruling in February, 1944 that in the drouth area of the three prairie provinces, every farmer that owed a dollar's worth of relief, seed, seeding supplies, gas and oil and everything else up to the end of 1944, to a provincial or municipal government could write off the whole thing in his 1944 income tax return. But this government has not cancelled of that 1938 seed with the result that millions of dollars that they wrote off, we are paying it now — all of us; girls who work in restaurants, a man who draws \$50,000 a year if there is anybody, except probably some of these fellows over here, a man that works on a farm, a returned man that is trying to make a living for himself and his family. They're paying it. I say that more than half of the money of that 50 per cent of the cancellation of the relief seed of 1938 could have been written off against the farmer's income tax in that year. But it wasn't. So that proves conclusively, Mr. Speaker, that with caution and business judgment to govern their action, that money could have been saved. There is no question about that. Then I challenge my friend, the Provincial Treasurer, to contradict that statement and he can't do it.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Am I to understand that my hon. friend was opposed to the Government cancelling the 1938 seed grain? Is that what he is trying to tell us?

Mr. Danielson: — I am not opposed to him cancelling any seed grain, if he did cancel it; but he didn't cancel it. He passed it on to the other people to do. And I am opposed to his cancelling seed grain and putting it on the public debt of this province and to the taxing of the same when it could have been written off against the individual's income tax which he then had to pay to the Dominion Government. Thousands of farmers sit here and pay hundreds and hundreds of dollars of income tax to the Dominion Government, and at the same time they pay 50 per cent of the seed grain cancelled

March 21, 1950

by the Provincial Government. That was the situation, Mr. Speaker, and they did not need to do that because the whole thing, interest and principal, was deducted against the income of 1944.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — May I ask my hon. friend if that is the official policy of the Liberal Party?

Mr. Danielson: — Well, Mr. Speaker, that is not a question at all, but I don't mind answering. I am going to tell him that it is the Liberal policy to exercise due caution, the party's best judgment, the very best of business judgment, and do what is best for the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

I am going to tell him that hundreds of thousands of dollars have gone to pay some men that they brought in here to take the place of the elected representatives of the people of this province, planners to take the place of this Legislature. You know they have them over here from England — Mr. George Cadbury for instance. You know I heard from a woman in my town of the women talking amongst themselves and some English ladies were present who had come out here because they had friends over here. And some friend of theirs, very much known to Mr. Cadbury, was telling them, "Why, think about George. He's got a job over there, and a good one too. He's getting money for it!"

There is one thing, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to draw to your attention and it is that this is a Socialist government. They never mention that except when they are put on the spot and they have to — except perhaps the Minister of Agriculture. I was talking to him, Mr. Speaker, and, you know, I have been reading for years to get this point clear in my mind. He said, "The difference between you and me is that you are co-operator and I am Socialist." I heard a member of the House telling you several times in the last few years, that he could never understand, Mr. Speaker, how the member for Arm River could have been co-operator without first being Socialist. The point is very clear to all of you — and you'll know where I am pretty soon.

This Government cover up their activities on the socialistic line. They speak of social services, social services, social services, and they try to tell the people and want the people to believe that that is Socialism. Well, Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no connection between the two. There isn't any more connection between social services and Socialism than there is between a toadstool and a mushroom. One is good healthy food and the other one is poison. That's what it is, and the best proof of it is that this has been a socialist government. Go over all of Canada, every province and Federal Government in the years gone by; they said, "Let's revise it bit by bit; more and more social services." We look over the ten provinces, today, and we find that there are other provinces that do more social services than this Government in this province, and they never heard of a Socialist government. Social Services and Socialism are two different things entirely.

Mr. Speaker, in all of Canada we have the right to have legislation in regard to social services. And ever since the beginning there have been certain Acts and amendments passed by the different governments and the total is 34! Thirty-four important social measures for the benefit of the people that have been passed by the provinces and the Dominion of Canada, and Liberal Governments in the provinces and in the Dominion have passed

24 of these; the conservatives passed 5 of these policies; the Union Nationale of Quebec, passed two; the United Farmers of Alberta, one. The United Farmers in the province of Ontario, one; the Social Credit government, one; the C.C.F. none. That is your record. That is the record and it stands, too.

I have something here that might be of interest to some of them. In the 1947-48 fiscal year, the Federal Government collected \$84,000,000 in taxes from this province, and they spent \$128,000,000 in Saskatchewan. Of all the money spent in the Dominion of Canada on social services, Mr. Speaker, 80 per cent of it is supplied by the Dominion Government; and in Saskatchewan they amount to 82 per cent because of the most peculiar situation as far as crop conditions are concerned. The P.F.A.A. are responsible largely for that extra. These are the things here, and I challenge my friend here to deny that statement. Yes, it is social services, and many other things are social services, and if you could take credit for that you would never stop talking about it. Your publications and your broadcasting schedule would be going all the time. You would hire more paid broadcasters to talk about it. These are facts.

Now then, what services have we got to brag about. All they are doing in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, is expand services that were here before . . . (interruption) . . . They have not done a solitary thing that was not here before. They are only expanded by the fact that the revenues of the province of Saskatchewan have increased two or three times. Any kind of a fellow can spend money. It is no credit to anyone for being able to spend money when it comes in as fast as they need it.

What about the family allowances? \$19,000,000 is paid per year into this province for family allowances. Last Year, the payment was \$1,587,842 for the month of August alone. When you have not got a problem in the province of Saskatchewan today, why is that? After six years of crop failures in over half of this province, why is not that a problem? Lord help the people of the province who have to depend on you.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is more than one reason for it. One is that the Dominion Government payment was \$19,000,000 a year into this province in family allowances. The other one is millions of dollars every year in P.F.A.A. payments. Another is Unemployment Insurance some of which is contributed by the Dominion Government. The other one is the payment that comes back to us from the operation of the Wheat Board. These are the principal reasons why they do not have a big problem in the province of Saskatchewan today, and there is no one on that side of the House who can claim credit for that situation.

Again, I want to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that social services are one thing, Socialism is an entirely different thing and there is no connection between the two. I want to say a few words in regard to the budget. I am not going to say very much because the Provincial Treasurer said too much already. This terrible thing, the Education Tax, has got to be quite respectable lately. It was "abominable," it did not "smell very good" either, a few years ago; but somehow or another the Provincial Treasurer came into this House a few years ago and said, "Why, this thing is all right." He said, "We should try to popularize it." He wanted us to help him popularize the Education Tax and now he comes in and says, "Well, after all, this is not as bad as I thought it was, and we will just make it more respectable." But do not forget this, Mr. Speaker. After the election in

March 21, 1950

1944, there were thousands of people who entered the stores throughout the province of Saskatchewan and told the storekeepers and clerks that they had no business charging Education Tax any more, because the C.C.F. was elected and they had taken it off. He does not deny that, Mr. Speaker. He said in his 1945-46 Budget Address:

“We hope before another session, to bring in certain recommendations which will remove the nuisance features of the tax. We also hope to remove the more regressive features of the tax through its progressive removal from all commodities that are recognized as necessities. At the same time, we hope to convert the tax into what would be in effect, a selective excise tax on luxuries and non-essentials. Such a programme involves the ultimate removal of the tax from foodstuffs, clothing, hardware, lumber and materials of production.”

Well, he just did one thing and he still left it on everything else, so that it is still a regressive tax because it is still on at least three of these goods which are mentioned here. The only thing he has removed is the tax on foods which to a large extent were not taxable before.

He fixed up the tax on fertilizer, too, because he did not change this tax until most farmers had paid for their fertilizer. I just wonder what he is going to do with fertilizer attachments which he added to the list last year, which to my mind, is absolutely contrary to the law. If he can convince me that a tax on seed fertilizer on the farm — if the seed drill is not a farm implement, I would like to know what he calls it. He added a tax to it, last year.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, I did not get the point. Would my hon. friend explain what he means there?

Mr. Danielson: — Your Department sent out a letter to all dealers telling them that fertilizer attachments must pay Education Tax. I read the letter to you here two or three weeks ago. He did not deny it. Now then, Mr. Speaker, someone says, well where would you save any money?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, I do not want to leave a wrong impression. In my Budget Address, on page 21, he will notice that I stated there that by amending the regulations, we will include hay balers, swath turners, fertilizer feeders, grasshopper bait spreaders, etc. so that they will be and are, on the first of April, exempt from the tax.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, I said just what he said now. That he did not change the tax on any of these things until the farmers had paid for their fertilizers for this year. They would all have their fertilizers on their farms by the first of April. What I said was that, last summer, your Department sent out a letter to every machine and implement dealer in the province of Saskatchewan and it first of all went to the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company who manufactures the fertilizers exempt the fertilizer attachment. I had the letter here the other day and read it. They were the instructions from his department that they had to go back and collect the Education Tax on all fertilizer equipment back to the first of January, 1949. That is the statement and that stands true.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend objects, why did not he have his government remove it?

Mr. Danielson: — Here is the situation Mr. Speaker, I said a little while ago, and I say again, that according to my estimations, under the Education Tax which was put into effect by the Liberal government, fertilizer attachments are farm implements and as such were exempt, and that is what he should have done too.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, there is a statement that is wrong and I am going to correct it. I have in my hand a copy of all the farm implements that were exempted under the previous Liberal administration. I just want to say that it is not on that list. Here they are, you can have them if you want them.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, I am going to say this again. According to my information, fertilizer attachments are a farm implement — and I have two on my farm, one for a one-way seed drill and the other for my 28-foot drill, and I never paid Education Tax on them before.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — What date is that? I would like to check up on that. I would like to get that tax.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, if he would go back to the beginning of 1948, in his Treasury files, he will find a copy of the letter which he sent to the dealers, saying they had to go back to the first of January, 1949 to collect the Education Tax on these attachments. That is all I have to say. He cannot disprove that statement either. All of you fellows listening know about this thing; the budget is more than you can take.

Mr. Speaker, we have what we call Crown Corporations here, and it seems to me that someone said something about them before. There was almost half a million dollars of the taxpayers' money sunk into that hole in the last four years, and all that is left of the Fish Board now is about \$41,000, and if that outstanding account is not worth \$41,000 then nothing is. Not one dollar in interest was charged against that money. I say, and everybody else says, that it must cost this Government at least four per cent. They are charging the fellows who are building houses 5½ per cent interest on the money, but on the millions of dollars which are tied up in the Crown Corporations, not one penny was charged in interest. They have not even charged up the auditing expenses or, for that matter, anything else. Now I say to him, he should just give them away or lock them up like he did the shoe factory and the tannery; they have disappeared, and nobody knows what happened to them except the Minister of Public Works. They started another corporation or another trading company, and everything has disappeared. So I would say to him, stop throwing money into these Crown Corporations because that is losing money, because that money is paid by the taxpayers. By so doing he can save hundreds of thousands of dollars a year.

I want to say something else in regard to these Crown Corporations. This is a problem. Already millions of dollars have been lost. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that, in the next ten years, if they advance into these Crown Corporations (and I do not include the Power Corporation or the Telephone system or the Printing plant, which he is feeding all the time himself), you will find that they will be a loss to the people of this province to the extent of \$12,000,000. This Government can cut down the Civil Service, and sell all the jeeps and trucks and all that sort of thing which

March 21, 1950

they do not need. They could cut down the overhead of this Government by \$5,000,000 a year in cars and gas and repairs and tires and salaries to servants that they do not need. It would be a simple thing to take this organization all the way through. The Provincial Treasurer says that the more civil servants you hire, the less taxes you pay, and it must be that he raised the taxes because he has not hired enough civil servants. That must be the reason, because he said, last summer, that the more civil servants you had the more work you had for them to do, the more efficiency you got and the people would benefit so they would pay less taxes in the process.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, might I correct the statement made by the hon. gentleman; I am sure he does not want to leave it that way. The statement that I made, last summer, was to the effect that an increased number of civil servants did not necessarily mean an increase in cost to the government. For example, when the Power Corporation had 400 employees they were losing money, and now, when they have 1200, three times as many, they are making money.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, I can very well agree with what the hon. gentleman says. He tells me that utility is paying its way; but that does not cover it. As a matter of fact, I am not so sure that the Power corporation employees come under the Civil Service Commission; I do not think they do, if I remember correctly. So his statement is out of line.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — It does not come under the Public Service Commission, but it does come in the statement which he and the members of his party make when they refer to the greatly increased number of civil servants.

Mr. Danielson: — Now, Mr. Speaker, these are things that I am not going to argue with him. He intimates that a government which employs a larger number of civil servants is an indication that business is booming and that they were rendering a service which would reduce the taxes of the people, and, therefore, they would pay less taxes. There can be no other interpretation of that statement. Now, when he had to increase this Education Tax by 50 per cent, Mr. Speaker, it is apparent to anyone that he has not hired enough civil servants, if the problem is as simple as that. I am sure he would not mind increasing the civil servants, because he would have more political workers when the next election comes along — and sometimes they come in handy, even if they do nothing else than go out onto the streets in Regina. He admits they do nothing else than to go out on the streets of Regina and sell membership cards in the C.C.F. Party.

I want to deal for a few moments with old age pensions, Mr. Speaker. I listened to the Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. J.H. Sturdy) here, a few days ago, and he told us quite frankly that the reason the old people of Saskatchewan were not receiving, and could not receive, more money was on account of the Federal Government. Of course, we know how handy it is to have that particular Government to blame for everything — everything that has happened in the province of Saskatchewan is the fault of the Federal Government. Well now, in June of 1944, the average old age pension paid in this province was \$23.08 a month. On June 30, 1945, it was \$24.63, or had increased \$1.55 a month. On December 31, 1949, (and I got this information a few days ago), it was \$35.89. Now that is an increase from 1944 of \$12.81 per month. Well, the Minister is not in his seat at the present time but he seems to think that \$35.89 is more in bread and butter, clothing, fuel and all the necessities of life than was \$23.08 was in 1944. I don't think

myself that it will buy any more of the things that the old people need to get along, so I don't think there is any great credit or blame either. What I object to is the tremendous capital that they are trying to make out of this fact that this Government, having more than double the revenue that we had to go on, has increased the old age pension by \$12.81 a month. Well, they come along and they say here — "oh, but look at our hospitalization!" Yes, Mr. Speaker, I know the hospitalization is there, but the old age pensioners got hospitalization in the old days too; probably not quite as frequently as they do today, but they got it in my district, and I know something about it because I was in municipal work for many years. And I am sure that, in your district, Mr. Speaker, the people were not going to sit back and see any old people, or anyone who needed medical attention or hospital attention, go without the services that they had to have.

Now then, so far as hospitalization is concerned, the Government of Saskatchewan pays the old age pensioner's hospitalization fee. There is nothing wrong with that, and that must be counted as a benefit to the old age pensioners. That is \$10.00 per person now that is all you can figure that this Government is contributing to the old age pensioners, because when we recognize the fact, Mr. Speaker, that 25 per cent (I think it is) of all the hospitalization costs is taken out of the general revenue of the Province, I think it is unfair to try to come forward with a statement that the Government of Saskatchewan is paying all the costs for the old age pensioners at the going hospital daily rate. I think it is wrong, because I, myself, after having paid \$10.00 a year, have to go to hospital and I am there a month, six weeks or whatever time it may be, my \$10.00 does not pay the cost by any means. It pays just a small part of it and the rest comes out of the public treasury of this Province, and I say that the old age pensioner is entitled to the same consideration or is entitled to be placed in the same position as far as relationship to that hospitalization plan is concerned as I am or you are or anybody else.

There is another thing I want to mention here and that is this. If an old age pensioner is in the hospital more than sixty days, the old age pension stops — except \$5.00 a month. If he was getting \$40 a month, he gets \$5.00 and the government keeps back \$35. If he is getting \$35 a month, he gets \$5 and the Government keeps back the other \$30. I don't know but I would say offhand that that money alone that is saved on the actual basic pension goes a long way towards paying the Government the \$10 a month which they are paying as hospitalization tax for the old age pensioners in these cases. Now then, let us get everything in its proper proportion here, and let us deal with the old age pensioners in the same status in this public health scheme that you and I and everybody else, Mr. Speaker, are dealt.

Then there is medical attention, of course. The Government pays that. I give them credit for paying that. There is some dental work to be done — they pay that; and I give them credit for doing that, too. But I say this: this thing has been mentioned and talked about and boosted and boosted until the people of the province of Saskatchewan think that this Government is spending millions and millions of dollars for these services — which it is not doing. Today the basic pension is \$40 and the Province pays \$10 of the \$40. That is exactly the same amount of money in dollars and cents — that "inflated" money, as we have been told by our friends over here — that the province of Saskatchewan paid from 1927 to 1931 when the revenue of this Province was from twelve to eighteen or twenty-two million dollars a year — nothing more.

March 21, 1950

Up to April, 1947, this Government had paid a cost-of-living bonus of \$3 per month for the old age pensioners in this province. That, I think, was started in the spring of 1945, and paid from then on, until the beginning of the fiscal year, 1947-48, when the bonus was increased to \$5 per month. The Government paid \$5 for exactly one month, and that was for the month of April. From then on till the end of the fiscal year, they paid 25 per cent of the basic pension and they paid no bonus. In spite of what was supposed to be paid to the old age pensioners, they paid no bonus. That gave the province \$614,000 that year — you can't deny that either. Now then, things got pretty warm for this Government in 1948, for the balance of that fiscal year. That was all right — I would say it was right, and I was satisfied and so were the old age pensioners. But again the old people of Saskatchewan were reckoning with the C.C.F. Government, and what do we find? We find that, on March 9, 1948, before the beginning of the fiscal year and just about the same week that this money was voted to be paid to them, an Order-in-Council No. 404, dated March, 1948, was passed by this Government — and what was that Order-in-Council? Mr. Speaker, the Order-in-Council was nothing else but that they were putting on the means test, which they have condemned from the Pacific to the Atlantic, from the United States border and as far as they can go to the north. They condemned the Federal Government for it, and promised the people that they were doing and have done everything in their power to abolish it; but here is how this Order-in-Council reads — Paragraph 8:

“the maximum supplementary allowance payable in the case of a married couple living together and where both are in receipt of an old age pension under the Old Age Pension Act of Canada, shall be \$5.00 per month each or such portion thereof so that the joint income of such pensioner, including pension payment and supplementary allowance payment, shall not exceed \$1080.00 in any one calendar year.”

This \$1080, Mr. Speaker, is a full basic pension, and that means that any people who got this full basic pension could not possibly get any supplementary allowance, and, of course, in accordance with the regulations under the Dominion legislation, that basic pension was also subject to all the rules and regulations with regard to other income which the pensioner might have.

That is the situation, and this is the Party that has been moving resolutions and amendments to the Budget Motion in the House of Commons, to the Speech from the Throne, and everywhere else, and damning the Federal Government for having still the means test on the old age pension. Here in Saskatchewan we have this Socialistic Government, the only one in Canada, and which claimed to be “humanity first”, taking this shelter to back up a means test of \$5 a month! There are other provinces that have voted to pay supplementary allowances to pensioners and these are capitalistic governments, Mr. Speaker. Not a solitary one of them has ever applied the means test to these supplementary pensions — not a one of them.

Mr. A.L.S. Brown (Bengough): — Why did not the Federal Government raise the allowable income so that there would be no excuse for the province of Saskatchewan, or any other province, applying the means test?

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, his question is absolutely off the point entirely. There is no means test applied by the Dominion Government to the supplementary pension. In the beginning of 1947 it was clearly understood (and I have Mr. Martin's statement right here) that there was no limit to the supplementary pension that any province could pay its old age pensioners.

Mr. Brown: — Mr. Speaker, could I have that clarified? That is not an answer to my question.

Mr. Danielson: — He spoke about the income allowances. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I said on a previous occasion in this House that I regretted that the income allowance was not raised in proportion to the increase in pension. I said that and I am honest about it; and I say, today, that I think it should have been raised. But that is no excuse for this Government that pretends to do a thing, and then does not do it. There is something that is said about not letting your right hand know what your left hand is doing; that is exactly the case right here. This would come as near to being called a 'pickpocket' scheme as anything I have ever seen.

Mr. Speaker, here is the situation. Any married couple that gets its full pension gets \$1080 a year, if they have no income; that means if they have no deductions for having their own houses, or any income whatever of their own, they get \$1080 a year, and a single man gets \$600 a year. It is right here. Then under this Order-in-Council it says it shall not be paid if they have \$1080 a year, or if a single person gets \$600 a year income. Now that is the situation. They apply the means test before they ever start to pay it; in fact before it was ever voted in this House, this Order-in-Council in March, 1948, was put on the statute books by this Government and then they pretended to vote this money to be paid to the old age pensioner, and then they said, "No, we are not going to pay it!" What happens now? When the pension was increased, last Spring, to \$40 per month, this Government then takes half the \$5 and makes up \$2.50 of the \$10 deficit in the increase by the Dominion Government, which is 25 per cent of the \$10. That leaves only \$2.50 of the supplementary pension — only \$2.50, and this means test, Mr. Speaker, is still on the \$2.50.

I would say to my friends over here who are so proud of this Government in social services and all they have done for humanity and how much they have cried and wept over the old age pensioners, I think it is a shame, Mr. Speaker. Today this Government here are pretending to be "humanity first", but yet they apply a means test on a measly \$2.50 a month for the old age pensioners. That is the situation and it cannot be denied. It is there, and this thing has been going on for over two years since the order-in-council was passed. You didn't tell them that when you went out in the by-elections did you? You didn't tell them that when you were down in Cannington, or up in The Battlefords, and even in Gull Lake?

Mr. H. Gibbs: — Do you think it should be necessary for a Province to pay a supplementary allowance?

Mr. Danielson: — That is just a matter of opinion. You must have thought so when you voted the money for it, and then stuck it in your pocket. I can tell you something more, Mr. Speaker, that there are provinces in Canada that have treated the old age pensioner better. At least they haven't said "We'll give you this", and then haven't given it to them, or pulled it back with the other hand after handing it to them. No, Mr. Speaker,

March 21, 1950

there are provinces in Canada who have played the game with the old age pensioners.

On a previous occasion the Minister of Social Welfare got up on his feet and was going to give me some information. I found he was more wrong than I was at that time. I wasn't right either, but he was more wrong than I was. I thought Alberta was paying \$5 supplementary, when, in fact, they were paying \$7.50 at that time but he denied that they were paying anything. Here is the situation. Today, Alberta pays \$7.50 and here in the news: "The Premier said that the old age pension will be increased \$2.50 a month, giving the old age pensioner a maximum of \$50 a month in this province, and the Federal Government share a part of the pension". That is March 4, 1950, in Alberta — \$50, \$10 supplementary in Alberta without a means test; \$10 supplementary in British Columbia without a means test; I am sure Manitoba pays \$5, and Ontario, I have been told by people who should know, is paying \$10 a month supplementary pension without a means test; and here we have a Government who pride themselves, and they point their finger at us and all that sort of thing. Why, if there is anybody who should hang their head in shame, it is this group across the House, Mr. Speaker.

Now then, in view of these things and in view of the things that I have said, of which not one solitary statement has been disputed by the group across the House, I am going to move, Mr. Speaker, that the Motion be amended by striking out all the words after "That" and substituting the following:

"This Assembly regrets the failure by the Government to give due consideration to payments by the province of the supplementary old age pension allowance without a means test."

That is moved by myself, and seconded by Mr. Tucker.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, in view of what I have said, I don't think I need to tell you that I am not going to support the Motion. I shall vote against the budget, and I hope that everyone that voted against the Bill, last night, will vote against the budget when it is presented in this House. I can say that, so far as I am concerned, I am not against larger School Units or the Old Age Pensioner, or anything like that. I have worked for that purpose all my life, and there is no man in this House that is going to smear me with that kind of talk, and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that anything that this Government will do that will bring more comfort to the lives of the old age pensioners of this province, I am all in favour of it and I shall support it. I shall not support the Motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — We have an Amendment to the Motion "that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair":

Moved by Mr. Danielson, seconded by Mr. Tucker:

"That the motion be amended by striking out all the words after "That" and substituting the following:

'This Assembly regrets the failure by the Government to give due consideration to payment by the Province

of the supplementary Old Age Pension Allowance without a means test’.”

The debate is now on the amendment.

Mr. J. Benson (Last Mountain): — Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the Amendment, but I have a pretty good idea what it is from what the member who has just spoken has read. While I have not had any time at all to prepare anything in regard to it, it meets with my approval, and I think that every member in the House should support the amendment.

The old people in this province, or the old people in Canada as a whole, in my opinion, are not yet getting what we might consider as a square deal. I read a statement of the Attorney General, the other day, outlining what had been done at Ottawa and that a similar amendment had been moved to the Speech from the Throne by C.C.F. members in the House of Commons, and the stand of our C.C.F. Federal members apparently is that the old age pension in its entirety should be paid without the means test. I think that, when we find it necessary to add a supplementary allowance to the old age pension in this province, it is our duty to support that supplementary allowance without a means test, and I am going to support the amendment.

Mr. H. Gibbs (Swift Current): — Mr. Speaker, as you know, last evening I voted against the Education and Hospitalization Bill. Now, that to my mind, Mr. Speaker, was the only bad feature in the budget. I thought it was a pretty good budget brought down as I was going to say, on Friday next, when I speak on the budget; and that was the reason why I did not like the Education tax and the Hospitalization tax, that reason being the increase. As you know, and as I said last night, I have found that now for several years; but it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, when a Bill like that is in the Budget Debate, about the only chance you have is to come into the House and speak your mind, and either vote for it or vote against it; but it was never my intention to vote wholly and solely on the Budget. My only contention was the taxation Bill and, as far as the old age pension goes, I have always been of the opinion that the means test should be eradicated. But I think that since this Government has been in office, they have done a very good job in aiding and abetting to get better pensions for the old age people of our province. And furthermore, the C.C.F. members in the Federal House have always advocated a better pension and the doing away with the means test.

I think I spoke some years ago about that, as it applied in the old country. I don't see any reason why the same thing should not apply here in the province of Saskatchewan, and, as a matter of fact, in the Dominion of Canada, because I know that over in the old country it does not matter if you are a millionaire or a pauper, when you become of age you receive the old age pension — and it is not handed out as a charity; it is handed out more or less as for services rendered to the country in which you lived, in which you worked, and when you become too old for it you become the recipient of this pension. But for the world, Mr. Speaker, I could not go against the budget as a whole. I gave you my views, last night, why I go against the budget as a whole. I gave you my views, last night, why I opposed to the increased taxation and that is, in my estimation, the only bad feature in the whole Budget. So, Mr. Speaker, I shall support the Budget.

March 21, 1950

Mr. W.A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition): — As it was pointed out by the hon. Member from Last Mountain, the C.C.F. members in the House of Commons with one exception laid it down as the policy of their party that the means test should not apply to old age pension payments. They have preached that all over this country; they went on record on the floor of the House as against the means test being applied to old age pensions.

Well, now, Mr. Speaker, the C.C.F. members of this Legislature are going to have a chance to say whether or not they agree with their colleagues in Ottawa. They are going to have a chance to say yes or no. Is it one thing in Ottawa and another thing here? Apparently it is, for if the C.C.F. in this House get up and vote against the removal of the means test in regard to this \$2.50, they show that they do not believe in the statement when it comes down to actual administration. They will show that it is just a matter of winning votes in the country. Now they have the chance to show, when it is a matter of actual administration, whether they believe in this or not. This is the time for them to show whether they believe in it or not, not when it doesn't cost them a cent, not when it is just a matter of propaganda or making speeches. The C.C.F. Party is here now to show whether they believe in this principle or not. They furnished \$2.50 to old age pensioners' money but it is eliminated by the means test applied by this Government to the \$2.50 paid out in supplementary allowance.

If two married old age pensioners have an income of over \$1080 they do not get this \$2.50 supplementary allowance. I have seen letters sent out by this Government to that effect. They apply the means test to this \$2.50. By Dominion regulation, any supplementary payment paid by the Province is not income within the meaning of that ceiling of \$1080, and it is happening. For example, in Alberta, today, two pensioners together can draw \$1200 a year. That is \$50 a month each, regardless of that means test as applied in Ottawa, because the Ottawa means test specifically states it does not apply to any provincial supplementary payment.

Now, if the C.C.F. believe in what they say they believe in at Ottawa and what they have been telling the whole country they believe in, let them take the means test off their own supplementary payment. Let them do that. Let them all stand up and show that when it comes down to administration, they believe in what they talk about at Ottawa and throughout the country.

I am rather amazed at the hon. member for Swift Current, yesterday saying that he was going to stand by what he said before, and then on this amendment saying he does not believe in the application of the means test and when we say that within our jurisdiction here the means test should not be applied; I would think that the hon. member for Swift Current would say, "yes, I support that," just as the hon. member for Last Mountain said.

Mr. Gibbs: — Just to clarify this whole thing. The Opposition is bringing in an amendment to defeat the whole budget. Isn't that the idea? You are bringing in an amendment to absolutely defeat the budget. Now, I made my stand clear, I am not going to defeat this budget.

Mr. Tucker: — As a matter of fact the stories we have heard from Ottawa from C.C.F. members in this — and I have heard it about Tucker, for example: he voted against this and he voted against that (and these are

exactly similar circumstances) and that when I was voting to keep the Government in office, I was accused of voting against the principle of the amendments. Now then, the C.C.F. members got up before the House at Ottawa and they challenged and taunted every Liberal member from Saskatchewan for voting under exactly similar circumstances to sustain the Government, and they pretended that they were voting against the taking off of the means test. What's sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. If all the members in Ottawa were guilty of all the C.C.F. members down there said they were guilty of, if they would vote . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Speak up, we can't hear it.

Mr. Tucker: — That's all very well. I know you dislike hearing this. I know that the hon. Provincial Treasurer hates to hear this because they are afraid of being exposed. That's what it is.

If you read any of the speeches, in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, you will see that the C.C.F. members down there accuse the Liberal members from Saskatchewan of opposing the means test because they would not vote for an amendment of exactly a similar nature as this is. The Liberals voted to sustain the Government, and they did not act the hypocrite about it. They said we are voting to sustain the Government, but the C.C.F. got up and said they were voting against the means test. If the C.C.F. are right down at Ottawa, let the members now stand up and vote for this amendment which their members at Ottawa said everybody should have supported who believed in the elimination of the means test. Let them get up and vote for it. I am suggesting that if you people mean what you say in Ottawa, if you mean what you say throughout the country, get up and vote for this amendment.

Hon. T.J. Bentley (Minister of Public Health): — I am not going to make any major speech. I just want to point out to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, who just took his seat with all his fire and fury, that the C.C.F. policy has been consistent right through. It has never changed and its policy has been old age pensions without a means test payable by the Federal Government 100 per cent and we will vote for that any time it comes up. They are very funny people over there. If I were a cartoonist, I could make a real good one right now of the expression on their faces. They know what I have said is true, Mr. Speaker. They know that policy has been so. They know themselves we have consistently supported in Ottawa that policy I have just stated. We have done it at the Dominion-Provincial conferences, and we'll do so again. Now those gentlemen over there ask us to deviate from that policy just to suit their convenience.

We on this side of the House consistently support the stand, I just announced, and it is a fair stand. The reason we have taken that stand is that we recognize that in Canada, according to the geographical boundaries that have been drawn to divide provinces one from another, there are some areas which enjoy much more wealth than others. Saskatchewan is one of those that heretofore has not enjoyed the immense wealth of some of the other provinces that have been mentioned here, and are able to pay these higher supplementary allowances. Because we believe that an old person in Prince Edward Island or Saskatchewan or Ontario or British Columbia requires the same kind of treatment, we have said consistently that the old age pensions are the responsibility of the Federal Government and should be paid without a means test. And no man on this side of the House is inconsistent with C.C.F. policy who votes against the amendment which, in effect, is a vote or rather asking for a vote against the whole budget presented by the hon. Provincial Treasurer on the day he made his speech.

March 21, 1950

Mr. J. Gibson (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition said that this was an opportunity for us to say whether or not we backed our colleagues in Ottawa. Well, unquestionably I do, Mr. Speaker; but I am certainly going to vote against this motion and I have several, I think, very good reasons for it.

In the first place I must have missed it if our hon. friends across the way pointed out the fact that there is a means test imposed by the Federal Government. It is quite true (at least I have been told that it is true) that if by an Order in Council any provincial government wishes to pay a supplementary allowance this need not be counted in as income. But it is very obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the reason for this is because the Federal Government does not wish to involve itself in further expenditures on old age pensions, for it would be a very simple matter to raise the allowable income, and the province of Saskatchewan or no other province could then apply a means test to a supplementary payment. I don't think it should be necessary for a provincial government to pay a supplementary payment on old age pension. Surely the minimum that the old age pensioner should receive today, is \$50 a month, and in order to be consistent with C.C.F. policy this Government is now paying its share of a \$50.00 pension, other than in a few instances. That the Leader of the Opposition has shed a lot of crocodile tears, did not move me a great deal because, as I say, he knows of a way that this can be quickly overcome: just by merely raising the allowable income.

Speaking about supplementary allowances, since this Government took office I think that, if we take into consideration the revenues available to this province, we can indeed be proud of the Government's record in old age pensions. We have consistently led the Federal Government in old age pensions since we took office, with one exception: for a nine-month period, we were only paying our share; for the rest of the time we have paid from \$5.00 to \$15.00 over our share. That is, if the Federal Government had been paying their share on the basis of the agreement, 25 per cent to 75 per cent, the old age pensioner would have been getting from \$5.00 to \$15.00 a month more. Our hon. friends over the way are shedding crocodile tears and feeling very sorry for the old age pensioner because of the fact that a few of them are deprived of this \$2.50 supplementary payment owing to this means test that they say that we are imposing. At the same time, they have forgotten that every time an old age pensioner gets his old age pension cheque, it is \$7.50 a month short of the payment that they should be getting if the Federal Government were paying their full share.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to make a long speech, and I wanted to make it clear that I am certainly going to vote against this amendment.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I just don't think I could let this opportunity go by. My hon. friend from Arm River, Mr. Danielson, can't even multiply. He stated that a married couple who were receiving the old age pension of \$40.00 apiece would be getting \$1080. That is the amount they would receive in pension plus the miserable little amount that the Federal Government regulations will allow them to earn on their own for that couple: \$80 times 12 is \$960 and \$120 is all they are allowed to earn before their pension is reduced. That's what it is.

We have heard a great deal during the last few days about playing politics. I never saw a better raid on the electorate attempted than has been attempted, this afternoon, by the member for Arm River and the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition used the word "hypocrisy". I never saw a better exhibition of hypocrisy than the Leader of the Opposition put on when he was making that speech, this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard hours and hours of talk from the other side of the House. We have heard the Leader of the Opposition in this House say that it is time we call a halt to expenditure; and it has gone all around. I want to know which they believe. Do they really want to call a halt? I don't think so. I think they are more interested in getting votes than they are in either calling a halt for the sake of the province of getting more money for the old age pensioners. You just can't be on both sides like this, all the time. And I want to ask my hon. friend from Last Mountain (Mr. Benson), does he believe in calling a halt or does he believe in spending more money in the province of Saskatchewan? That is one of the questions that he will have to decide, too.

To these beautifully impractical people who think that they can give things away without getting them, I want to say that you just can't do that. We never thought that my hon. friends have been trying to cheat the people of Saskatchewan and of Canada, ever since I can remember, with this story about 'pie in the sky, and some day they'd be all right.'

Let us go back a little into the history of the old age pension, if my hon. friends want to discuss it. I remember the day, Mr. Speaker, when the maximum old age pension was \$20 per month, and I remember that, in that day, when an old married couple lived together who were both getting the pension, not because of the means test applied by the Federal Government but because of a rule subscribed to by my hon. friend from Arm River and my hon. friend from Gravelbourg; probably my hon. friend from Saltcoats was there at that time, too. This rule said that if two old people lived together, just because they live together they can't get the full old age pension; and they cut them down to \$15 apiece instead of \$20 apiece. Of that \$10 they cut off, the province had \$2.50 to pay and the Federal Government would have paid the other \$7.50. For \$2.50, they reduced the incomes of old people, an old couple, by \$10 a month. These are the people that get up here now, when we are willing and ready to pay our share of a \$50 a month pension; but when the Federal Government won't come across with their share, they don't say anything about that.

My hon. friend talks about the \$2.50, and he is one of the members that does this talking about not spending so much money; but he is always willing to talk about a whole lot more things to spend and none of them point out where any waste is. They don't do that; they can't do it. It won't stand up when you look at it, when we look back over history, and when we remember that, in the history of the old age pension, the Liberal Government in this province gyped the old people of this province out of \$10 a month for the sake of saving \$2.50. There were many, many cases in this province where the means test was so applied, that there was a great deal of hardship. I could go over a whole lot of other things. I have taken up a whole lot of these cases, and I was here and I knew about them at that time; but the most ridiculous thing that I have come across in a long time,

March 21, 1950

Mr. Speaker, is when the member for Arm River moves an amendment like this, moved purely, not for the sake of the old age pensioners, but for the sake of unseating the Government (if that is possible to do), and supported by the Leader of the Opposition who, in Ottawa, took quite a different stand. I shall oppose the Amendment.

Mr. W.C. Woods (Kinistino): — Mr. Speaker, I won't take very many minutes; but I just want to point out one or two things in connection with the old age pension at the present time, that my friend the Minister of Natural Resources criticized from that side of the House.

I know an old couple who were getting an old age pension, both members of the family living together as he says. They never received the old age pension, and never got the old age pension until after this Government were in power. They never received the full old age pension until January of this year. The husband died in December, and the January cheque for the wife was raised to the full amount in January. Now, there is something we are criticizing this Government for.

Then another thing. I had an old age pensioner come to my place, last summer, and complain about the amount of the pension he was getting. I was coming down to Regina a few days later, and I brought the particulars of the case down with me to find out why he was not getting more. When I visited the office, they looked over the papers and started to explain why he was not getting more. One reason was that, when they took his application he was living with a son and his wife and family, and while his son was a working man not able to support his father, rather than see him put out on the street he had to maintain him until he was old enough to get his old age pension — the old man was unable to work. Now, they charged that man for the time — I don't know just how long before he got the old pension; but I know they charged that old man \$15 a month, saying that his son was keeping him. Well, I got that fixed up. I told them, of course, that the old man was unable to work, and so they admitted that the pension should be increased that amount, the amount that that would allow.

Just a few days before I came down here, this time, another case of exactly the same nature came to my attention. It was the case of an old lady applying for the old age pension, who was living with a nephew, and they were charging her \$15 a month because the family were keeping her. They were calling that \$15 a month income.

Do you mean to tell me whether it is Federal or Provincial? When I brought this first case into the office and took it up with them, it was increased; so apparently it is left to the provincial authorities to say. I can bring you all the documents in connection with it, if you want to see them and if you don't believe what I am telling you is the truth.

The question being put, the amendment moved by Mr. Danielson was rejected, on division, by 25 to 22 votes.

Mr. Speaker: — The debate is now on the main motion.

Mr. N.L. Buchanan (Notukeu-Willowbunch): — I did not know whether I was going to get an opportunity this afternoon to speak or not. I spoke to our friend, the Whip, before coming into the House, this afternoon, and he assured me that I could have all the radio time after the member for Arm River got through speaking. Well, the radio time was slipping away and I happened to hear our radio men up above say that this ends today's broadcasting; so I gave up any hope of any radio time in this speech of mine. Then this little skirmish that happened has delayed me a little bit more and, after the excitement and so on of this mild filibuster that we had, I am afraid that my contribution to the debate on this Motion that you do now leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, won't be quite as interesting as it could have been otherwise.

At the outset, I want to say that I am not particularly worried about a large budget, and I do not think that the people of Saskatchewan are, in the main, worried about a large budget. What they are chiefly concerned with and what I am, as a representative of a seat in this province, chiefly concerned with, is how the money is gathered in the first place, and distributed or spent in the second place, by the Government which has brought in this budget. We have seen, during the post-war years, a period of rapidly rising budgets, not only on the provincial level, not only in this province, but in all the provinces, in the Dominion, on the municipal level and on the school district level. Budgets have continued to rise, and that has not only been true of Saskatchewan and the Dominion Government; it has been equally true of practically every country in the world. And there are reasons for this, understandable reasons.

The most important reason as far as we are concerned here in this province is that since the war has ended, we have gone into a period of rising prices, of inflation. This inflationary spiral, as the Provincial Treasurer pointed out, has meant that our \$55 million budget of today is only the equivalent of what a \$33 million budget would have been in 1944. In other words, we are losing the use of \$22,000,000. Now that cannot be placed at the door of this Government. That is entirely due to decontrols, to the allowance of the friends of the Federal Government at Ottawa to get in first on the accumulated savings of veterans and citizens of this country. And so we had a seller's market, and this accumulated purchasing power has rapidly disappeared in buying the things that the people were doing without, in

March 21, 1950

buying those things at enhanced prices. That has affected our budget as it has affected our municipal budgets and as it is affecting our Federal Budget; and so our budget today is \$22 million more than it would have had to have been had we had the same price levels as we had in 1944.

There are other reasons for increased budgets and, in my opinion, good reasons and one is the increased demands that people are placing on their representative bodies for services which those bodies are intended to give. People all over the democratic world are continually insisting that their governments do more and more to recognize the responsibility of the fortunate to those who are less fortunate. People are more and more demanding services from their various governing bodies, which they are unable to provide individually.

On the municipal level people are demanding more and better roads, because of changing agricultural conditions. They are demanding bridges. They are demanding hospitals and they are assuming the responsibility of paying for those things. Then in the cities and towns, in the urban municipalities, people there are asking for better streets, sidewalks, water systems, sewage disposal and so on. When we come to the provincial level, we are asking for better social services, and we are asking for more educational facilities. And this is as it should be. After all, the reason why we have governments, the reason why we have developed as I have stated, various governmental bodies in our democracies, is for the purpose of making it possible to do those things on a community basis which we are not able to do individually. We have read at various times in history about frontiers where they had no governing bodies in which the good things of those communities went to those who were strong enough to hold them and the weaker individuals went without. And eventually, governments and law were brought into those frontier districts, and so we have governments for the purpose of regulating our community life, for the purpose of distributing benefits to those who need them and for giving services which we as individuals are unable to provide for ourselves.

There are a few basic factors that we might use in determining what constitutes a good government and what constitutes a poor or a bad government. A good government, briefly, is a government which seeks to provide the services required by the people it governs; a bad government is a government which does not seek to provide these services. A good government seeks to distribute the burden of taxation fairly according to ability to pay, and a poor government distributes the burden of taxation in such a way that it will not hurt its friends. So we have the two basic principles which we may use when deciding whether a government is a good one or a bad one. In my opinion, this Government, through its budget, is trying to distribute the services that the people require in this province, and through its taxation policies contained in the budget, through the increase in this sales tax, we are distributing the burden of taxation in the most fair manner possible.

I had intended to say a bit about the sales tax, but the thing has been threshed back and forth for the last half-hour or so, and so I am just going to dwell quite briefly on it. In my opinion, the budget which we have before us, today, once again carried out those principles which the Provincial Treasurer enunciated on the presentation of his first budget in

this House and that is, that it is a humanitarian budget designed for the purpose of giving goods and services to the people who need them. None of us like increased taxes; but I believe that we should realize that if we are going to have increased services, we must have increased revenues. After all, the Government isn't in the money-issuing business. The Government does not make money. The Government merely distributes the taxpayers' money which they receive from the taxpayer to those places which are rightly government activity. I do not like the increase in the sales tax any more than any other hon. member of this House. However, we find that we have not raised sufficient funds under The Hospitalization Act that is charged the individual upon registering, to meet the deficit which occurs each year, and so we found it necessary to find some new source of revenue.

There were other alternatives that we had besides increasing the sales tax. We could have done away with the hospitalization plan, thrown it back upon the shoulders of the rural and urban municipalities to assume the responsibility for hospitalization in any way that they might see fit. I do not think members on either side of the House would advocate that this be done. It is not desirable. Another thing we could have done was to curtail the services. We could have limited the period of time a person might be allowed in a hospital and receive payment. Or we might have cut out some of the hospital services that are being paid for under this scheme. We could have charged an admissions fee to people going into the hospitals. Well, that would have done away with the idea, the humanitarian idea, that underlies the principles of this Act. That would have kept out of the hospitals, poorer people who were in need of hospitalization, and so that was not desirable. Well then, we could have increased the hospitalization tax itself. Had we increased the hospitalization tax — the registry fee is what I am referring to; had we increased that fee to the amount that is now being charged in British Columbia, I am advised that we would have been able to take in sufficient to meet the deficit, but that would have fallen heaviest on those people least able to pay, and so as an alternative plan, an increase in the sales tax was brought in.

Spread over our population, the amount of some \$3½ million to \$4 million that this increased sales tax is going to bring in, will amount to roughly \$3.50 per head of our Saskatchewan population; but each person is not going to be paying that \$3.50. The Provincial Treasurer has pointed out time after time that those who are in the more fortunate income brackets will be paying a greater share of this \$3.50, while those in a more unfortunate position will be paying a lesser share. So, in my opinion, this is the fairest possible tax that we could have increased. I do not like the tax, and I think that it is unfortunate that C.C.F. people, not C.C.F. leadership and recognized speakers, but C.C.F. supporters in the country, went out before 1944, and made all kinds of promises about the removal of this tax. We stated then, and I stated then, officially, that we would repeal the tax as soon as other sources of revenue became available, and I expect to be sitting in my seat on the day when a C.C.F. government does repeal this tax, not because it is an unjust tax, but because as our hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. H. Gibbs) says, it is a "damn nuisance", especially for the small businessman — and I am one of them — who has to make up the returns every three months and keep track of every package of cigarettes he sells and all the rest of it. It is a nuisance. So as I said before, I expect to be

March 21, 1950

seated in my place here, some day, when a C.C.F. government does remove this tax.

I notice, on further perusal of the budget, that it maintains the same fair relationship between the various departments of the government; that a larger portion of it is going to social welfare and education. Highways occupy a very great share of the budget and, in a province such as ours, that is as it should be, because we are a province of sparsely-settled inhabitants, our population is scattered, a large area of the province is settled, and so we have great distances to go in the course of our ordinary business and pleasure in this province. So, as a natural result of these things, we need a very extensive system of highways, and I was pleased to note in this budget that a large share of it is being devoted to the construction and maintenance of highways.

What particularly pleases me most however, is the emphasis, the recurrent emphasis, which this budget and other budgets brought in by the Provincial Treasurer, have placed on agriculture. Agriculture — and it does not require any great mind to make this statement — is our basic industry. That is acknowledged by all, and upon the success or failure of agriculture in this province depends the success or failure of everybody in any other walk of life, no matter whether they are engaged directly in agriculture or not. When the farmer gets a fair reward for his toils, everyone else is able to live in prosperity in this province. And so, if we are really going to make it possible for the people of Saskatchewan to be prosperous we have got to give first consideration to our basic industry, agriculture. Agricultural stability is the main thing that we have to deal with.

Now, within the limited jurisdiction of a province, it is impossible to give stability to markets for agriculture. We have no authority when it comes to setting prices for the things that a farmer sells, nor for the things that the farmer has to buy. That is within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, and it is the one that makes it possible for the farmer to get a decent price for his product and to pay a reasonable price for the things that he needs. We are not in a position to stabilize markets, and the financial resources of any government in this province are limited, and so it is difficult for us to undertake any comprehensive scheme of placing stability under his production. However, I am pleased to note that this budget has, for the last number of years, placed more and more stress upon remedial measures towards stabilizing a farmer's production.

I have here a table of amounts spent, voted to the Department of Agriculture and spent by the Department of Agriculture during the past ten years, since 1940 to 1951. In 1940, the Department of Agriculture spent \$406,000; in 1941, \$707,000; 1942, \$430,000 and in the last year of Liberal administration the Department of Agriculture spent \$744,000. Last year, our Department of Agriculture spent \$2,368,000, and, this year, \$2,800,000. Now you will notice, Mr. Speaker, if you compare these figures, that in the last five years of Liberal administration, the Department of Agriculture spent \$2,781,000. In the last five years of the C.C.F. administration, the Department of Agriculture spent \$7,897,000, or, in other words, three times as much as was spent in the last five years of a Liberal administration. In the last year of Liberal administration, they spent \$744,000; this year, we are

appropriating for agriculture \$2,800,000. In other words, four times as much is intended to be spent for agriculture, this year, as was spent in the last year of Liberal administration.

You will notice if you study the history of the Department of Agriculture that, during the C.C.F. term of office, a new approach has been given to the whole problem of agricultural stability in this province. Previous departments of agriculture, under Liberal administration, only believed in superficial policies such as herd inspection (it is all right as far as it goes, but it doesn't go far enough); grants to livestock societies — that is all right too, but it doesn't place any stability under production; livestock improvement, weed control, and they did have an insignificant Ag-Rep service. I did not even know that they had an Ag-Rep service during those years until I went into the department and I found out there that they did have it. But any farmer in Saskatchewan, today, knows that we have an Ag-Rep service. You know that the Minister of Agriculture here, a little while back, was referred to as the "Minister of Ag-Rep Services", and it was not intended to be a compliment. But, Mr. Speaker, I can think of no greater epitaph to place on the Hon. Minister's grave when he has gone to his reward, than to say that he built the Ag-Rep service in Saskatchewan.

Since the C.C.F. came into office in Saskatchewan, the Department of Agriculture has concerned itself mainly with the basic problems; the emphasis has been placed on cures instead of palliatives. We have an extensive land use and water use and reclamation branch of the Department, and our Ag-Rep service has been increased until now the farmers of Saskatchewan know that there is an Ag-Rep service. Incidentally, today, Mr. Speaker, I went down while the Ag-Rep broadcast was being given in one of the rooms of the Department of Agriculture. It was an interesting thing to see, and it was interesting to listen to, and it has become on the preferred list of people's listening on the radios in this province.

The first problem then was scientific land use in this province. Years ago when Saskatchewan was settled — and I am not blaming any particular group or individual; when this province was settled some years ago, there was no scientific approach whatsoever towards settlement. People just came west and grabbed land. If they were lucky, they got good land; if they were not lucky, they got poor land. Eventually, those on good land became prosperous farmers and those on the poor sub-marginal land became poor farmers, and during the 'thirties some feeble attempts were made to move them north, but again insufficient study was given to this problem.

I was up north at the time these people came there, and I saw many of them settled up there on jackpine ridges and tamarack swamps, given a team of oxen, a sleigh and a little bit of household furniture, and told to go to work — God bless you — and possibly the Almighty did bless them; but they were blessed with very little else that they needed in this world's goods. So these people continued to barely hang on there. This Government has gone in there and today in the north they are making available, through breaking and clearing, a large amount of land for the purposes of re-settlement of people from these sub-marginal areas. Over a hundred thousand dollars is being spent in the north, this year, to break up and clear lands. The Minister of Social Welfare is spending some \$140,000 on veterans that he

March 21, 1950

is settling in the north for the purpose of clearing land, and breaking it, bringing it under cultivation, and making it possible for these people to get a start so that a burden of debt will not continue to hang around their necks for years and years to come. The Department of Municipal Affairs is advancing \$200,000 to the people that went north in the 'thirties to make it possible for them to each get at least 100 acres broken up so that they will not be a charge on the public treasury, both municipal and Provincial

In spite of this there is still the necessity to do some scientific study in use of the land down in the south — the sub-marginal land — and to bring it into production again. So we have some \$175,000 allocated for the purpose of forming the developing twenty-four community pastures in the province, this year. We have twelve reclamation projects, including almost 14,000 acres of dry land; there are 2,726 acres of irrigatable land developed by the Branch of this Department and there are 320 acres of forestation land. We have had irrigation and fodder projects launched so that we won't have repeated the thing that happened here a few years ago, when people didn't have sufficient fodder of their own and neglected to order fodder until the blizzards and storms extended in the Spring and the Department of Agriculture had no available surplus of feed to shoot into these deficiency areas. Today that won't happen because the new branch of this Department has set up these feed banks, these irrigation and fodder programmes that I mentioned. Some \$375,000 is being allocated for this work. It is going to be used on sixteen projects.

Now this irrigation and reclamation has not only been applied to large projects. Through the Ag-Rep service, individuals and small groups of farmers are advised what they can do to develop a project for their own use in their own district, or even on their own farms, and these are organized as self-help programmes. Some \$150,000 has been allocated to this purpose.

A total of over a million dollars has been allocated for the purpose of remedial programmes to put a stable base under the production of agriculture in this province. Now, that is not enough — that can only scratch the surface. However, it is a beginning. It is a recognition that something has to be done, and had we had a million dollars spent each year since this province was first formed, or even a portion of a million dollars, directed towards a programme of this kind, we could have had something today of which we could feel justly proud in this province. Alberta spent some \$25,000,000 on irrigation since that province was formed, but even they don't have a programme developed for the express purpose of putting stability under agricultural production in that province. In my own constituency alone, last year, over \$30,000 was spent by this Department in self-help programmes through municipalities and local organizations. Instead of relief these people received payments for work which would bring sub-marginal land under cultivation.

In comparing the budget of Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan, we find that, in comparing the total budgets from 1944 to 1950 (that is during the last five years), the Department of Agriculture in Manitoba spent a total of \$3,635,730; Alberta spent a total of \$5,602,161; Saskatchewan spent \$9,136,678. You will notice that that is as much as the total amounts spent by both Alberta and Manitoba on their Departments of Agriculture during the last five years. Saskatchewan has devoted one-quarter of its agricultural

budget for remedial measures; Alberta and Manitoba simply concentrate on superficial treatment.

However, I had intended to compare the spending of the different agricultural budgets in Alberta and Saskatchewan. Taking the total agricultural budgets for these three provinces, Manitoba, as I stated before, spent \$3,635,000; Alberta, \$5,000,000; Saskatchewan, \$9,000,000. Further examination of these budgets shows that, during these five years, Manitoba spent 31.2 per cent of its total budget on general assistance, that one-third of its budget went on superficial treatment; Alberta spent 16.2 per cent, while Saskatchewan only spent 8.5 per cent on superficial treatments. Now I am not denying or belittling these services. As stated before, they are important but the agricultural budget for this province, as I am pointing out, is laying the main stress on remedial measures, and I believe that is as it should be. Alberta spent 2.7 per cent of its budget on remedial measures; Manitoba spent 8.9 per cent of its budget on remedial measures; Saskatchewan has spent, as I stated before, 25.4 per cent, or one-quarter, of its budget on remedial measures in an endeavour to place stability under the economic base of our agricultural production.

I can go further speaking on this budget and pointing out benefits that people are going to receive in this province. However, I have concerned myself mainly with the Department of Agriculture, because I represent an agricultural seat. The things that the Department of Agriculture is doing are of importance to the people I represent, and they are concerned with the problems the Department of Agriculture is concerning itself with.

This Budget also shows other things that the Government is doing to assist agriculture, either directly or indirectly. Increased school grants are of direct benefit to agriculture in this province; increased school grants, and increased road grants. I have here a table setting out the amount of money that the Department of Highways has made available to municipalities whose boundaries are either wholly or in part within the boundaries of Notukeu-Willowbunch, and these grants have one list showing the grants paid from 1945 to 1950 inclusive, showing the grants paid during the last six years of C.C.F. administration. It makes very interesting reading, Mr. Speaker. I find here the R.M. of Willowbunch No. 42. In 1938, they received \$1,251.51 of a grant (You will remember there was an election that year), and, in 1939-40, they received nothing. In 1940-41, they received \$232; in 1941-42, they got nothing; in 1942-43, they got \$750; in 1943-44, \$500, and then in 1944 they got \$2,000. For a group that likes to accuse this side of the House of partisan politics in administration, this should make very illuminating reading to say the least.

This political picture goes all down the line here. I can, even at a glance, pick out the municipalities with C.C.F. reeves and the municipalities with Liberal reeves and the municipalities with Conservative reeves, and I don't even have to know their names. I can tell just by looking at the grants that were paid these municipalities in the 1930's to 1944. In those six years, in my own constituency, municipalities received from the Liberals \$17,774.

Mr. F.M. Dundas (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Too much!

March 21, 1950

Mr. Buchanan: — An hon. member of the Opposition says it is too much. Well, how little could the municipalities receive and still be called too much!

Then turning to 1945 to 1950, including the proposed grants to municipalities — the same group of municipalities — I find that there is a consistent rise from 1945 to 1950. I find only two exceptions, and that is in a municipality that didn't get a grant in any one particular year. I find that, while the Liberal total for their last six years of office was \$17,000, our total is \$54,000, or more than three times as much.

Now I could go on down the line, mentioning school grants in school districts. I have here answers to some questions that I asked, the year before last in the House, about the amount of the grants paid to hospitals in my own constituency. I find that, in that year, there was some \$15,500 paid in grants and \$7,000 in loans, making a total of \$22,500 available for hospital construction within the boundaries of Notukeu-Willowbunch. In examining the Public Accounts for the next year, I find that there was \$4,000 additional grant given to a hospital in Mankota.

I could go on quoting from these and other documents that I have on my desk, showing that the things that this Government has done has made it possible for taxes on individual farmers to be kept down in this province, while municipal taxes in other provinces have risen beyond the real ability of people to pay. We had a comparison the other day of taxes being paid in our sister provinces, Alberta and Manitoba. We found that their taxes are higher than ours. We found that, right across the board, their school taxes were higher, their ordinary municipal taxes were higher, and the reason for that is that those Provincial Governments haven't done the things to assist agriculture and rural municipalities that our Government has done in this province.

I have sat in the Legislature now, on the Government side of the House, for some six years, and I have sat across here listening to the Opposition criticize the Government. It is the duty of His Majesty's Loyal Opposition to criticize the Government; that is their function. It is also their duty, as His Majesty's Loyal Opposition, to offer an alternative to that Government. Now, I have been sitting here, Mr. Speaker, for some six years and, to date, I don't know what the alternative is that the Liberals across the way have to offer. I don't know what their policy is, and I doubt if anyone in Saskatchewan knows. I would like to know it. On the one hand, they are in favour of increased services, and on the other hand they are in favour of decreased revenues. Now, how are you going to do these two things? Anybody knows that if you are going to weight one side of a balance a little more, you have to put a little bit more on the other side to counterbalance that weight.

I have also found that, no matter what the Government on this side of the House brings forward, no matter whether it is good or whether it might be bad — although I have yet to find out anything bad that they have brought forward; but even though they must acknowledge in their own private thoughts that it is a good thing, for the sake of political expediency they will do

whatever they possibly can to damn those good things that are being attempted in all sincerity by this Government.

Mr. Speaker: — May I remind the hon. member that it is just on six o'clock?

Mr. Buchanan: — I shall finish, Mr. Speaker. The attitude of the Opposition to the activity of this Government reminds me of a poem — I had intended to develop this thought a bit more, but I think the hon. members will go along with me — it reminds me considerably of Kipling's "IF":

If you can dream — and not make dreams your master;
If you can think — and not make thoughts your aim,
If you can meet with Triumph and Disaster
And treat those two impostors just the same;
If you can bear to hear the truth you've spoken
Twisted by knaves to make a trap for fools,
If you can keep your head when all about you
Are losing theirs and blaming it on you,
Or watch the things you gave your life to, broken,
And stoop and build 'em up with worn-out tools:
Yours is the Earth and everything that's in it,
And — which is more — you'll be a Man, my son!

Hon. C.C. Williams (Regina City): — Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the debate, I would just like to make one observation, and it is that I sympathize with the member from Notekeu-Willowbunch as to what happened to his radio time today. I recall that two years ago, I split a period with two other members — twenty-five minutes each — and agreed to go on third. That was a tragic mistake. I ended up with seven minutes by the clock, and I think the clock was a little slow: I was on less than five minutes. I don't remember who spoke first, but the member who spoke second has just taken his seat. I beg leave to adjourn the debate Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

THIRD READING

Education and Hospitalization Tax Act

Moved by The Hon. Mr. Fines:

That Bill No. 39 — An act for the Imposition and Collection of Taxes on Consumers and Users of Tangible Personal Property in order to raise Moneys for Educational and Hospitalization Purposes — be now read the third time.

The question being put, it was agreed to, on division by 23 votes to 17.

The said Bill No. 39 was accordingly read the third time and passed.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:30 o'clock p.m.