

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN  
Third Session — Eleventh Legislature  
4th Day

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

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

**DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY**

The House resumed, from Monday, February 5, 1951, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Howe for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

**Mr. W. A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, my first task this afternoon, is to congratulate the mover and seconder of this motion. It is easier for me to do this because of the very fine way in which they moved and seconded the motion, we want to compliment them most sincerely on the content of their respective speeches, also on the spirit of those speeches. I thought that they were both very moderate and, on the whole, very reasonable. I particularly want to congratulate the member for Elrose (Mr. Willis) for his remarks in regard to the present international situation. It helped to make up a bit for the way in which it was treated in the speech of His Honour.

I, perhaps, should make reference to the absence from the Chamber of a colleague — the member for Kinistino (Mr. Woods). As probably most of the members know he has suffered ever since the first war from a disability which he contracted during the war, and the specialists advised that he should be moved to Sunnybrook Hospital to get the advice of some of the specialists down there; but I was assured by his medical advisers that there was nothing to be unduly alarmed about and that, if things went as well as they expected, he might be expected to take his seat in the Legislature before the Session is over.

I also should make some reference to the vacant seat beside me, formerly occupied by the member for Gravelbourg — now Mr. Justice Culliton of the Appeal Court of this Province. I, of course, probably will miss him more than any other member of the House, because he was such a very able member of this House. He acted as our Whip, and he had had experience in the Cabinet; he left that position in order to enter the service of his country in the second Great War, showing his devotion to public service. I never experienced anything at his hands but the greatest amount of co-operation and loyalty, and I will miss him very much from my side here in the Legislature; we will miss him from the councils of our Party, and we will miss him from the work of the Party in the country. But when high preferment comes to somebody who is as worthy of it as Mr. Justice Culliton, and when the chance comes to serve in another sphere for which he is so well fitted, one cannot feel too badly about it no matter how much one, personally, may miss him. I am sure that all members of his Legislature will join me in hoping that Mr. Justice Culliton will be spared many years in health and strength to serve his country in the high position to which he has been called.

**February 6, 1951**

I would like, too, before I embark on the main part of my address this afternoon, to extend greetings to the young people who are here representing the University Forum of the University of Saskatchewan. It has been a very pleasant privilege to attend that Forum each year since I was honoured with the leadership of our Party, and I must say that the students have taken interest in public affairs sufficient to conduct a campaign in which the issues which face our people today are discussed and then voted on. They have made a splendid job of handling that campaign. The debates in the University Forum have been of such a high order that I think everyone who was able to attend them felt very proud of the work that was being done there, and felt that if the young people attending our University are willing to take such an interest in public affairs — such an intelligent interest — we can feel that good work is being done in regard to teaching interest in public affairs in our high schools and universities. We may feel too that the future of all our Parties is in good hands. I think it was a very fine idea of the Minister of Social Welfare (whom I do not see in his seat, and whom I believe is ill), and I'm sure we all hope he will soon recover his health and strength and be back in his seat. But I am sure it was a very happy thought of his to invite the members who took an active part in the University Forum to attend two of the meetings of this Legislative Assembly. I would like to extend our welcome to the young people and to voice the hope they are enjoying their trip down here and we'll get some real benefit out of it.

I do not intend to refer to any length to the remarks of the hon. gentleman who moved this motion, but there was one thing that he did refer to that I felt I should say a word about, at the outset. I did not take his exact words down, but there was a reference therein to the payment to be made in respect to the wheat delivered to the five-year pool, and I understood him to suggest that payment should have been made before this date, and I understood him to express wonderment that payment has not been made. Now, the hon. member is a farmer and naturally takes a real interest in these matters and I was rather amazed. He is a man, generally, so far as I know, who sticks very closely to what he believes to be right, so I cannot think that he was deliberately raising any question or trying to create any false impression. But he must know, Mr. Speaker, that under the present circumstances, if a payment were made (and, as he says, all that wheat is sold), that the payment would only amount to the balance on hand in the hands of the Wheat Board, and that the amount is somewhere — it is not hard to calculate it — between four and five cents per bushel. Now if the hon. member is satisfied to get four or five cents as a balance on that five-year pool, I would be surprised, because most of us in Western Canada are hoping to get more than five cents.

Now we might say, "Well, why shouldn't more be paid?" What answers this question is that the only way that more than what is on hand can be paid is if the British Government decides to pay something under the "have regard" clause, and that is now under active negotiations with the British Government, and so the amount is not set. It is not even known if the British Government will recognize any obligation in the matter, and so obviously nothing could be added to the amount on hand from that source.

The hon. gentleman had in mind that money should be added from the public treasury of the country, well, then of course, that cannot be paid either, because the hon. member, as an old member of this Legislature, knows that money cannot be paid out without being appropriated by Parliament.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, when it was suggested, last fall, that payment may be made before Christmas, I took it upon myself to urge — knowing, if that were made that it would only be the amount that was on hand — that the payment not be made until we got some settlement with the British Government, until we got some allowance, if possible, from the Dominion Government, which could only be made when Parliament met.

**Mr. Howe:** — On the point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I being the only farmer who spoke yesterday, I take it he is referring to my remarks. I want to inform the hon. Leader of the Opposition that I did not refer, in my speech yesterday, to the final payment on the five-year pool. I never referred to it at all.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I should have said the gentleman who seconded the motion, and perhaps he can be excused since he is a schoolteacher, the implication being that he would not know any better. As far as our schoolteachers on this side are concerned, they are just as familiar with farming matters as the members who are farmers.

In any event, the fact remains that it costs about half a million dollars to make a payment on the five-year pool and I think it is the consensus of opinion of farmers that this last payment should be held up until it would include all that was going to be paid, so that I think that is the reason why nothing has been paid to date. I'm sincerely hoping that the obligation of the "have regard" clause will be recognized by the British Government, and I am also hoping that something will be recognized in the way of something being paid during the time that wheat was taken for domestic consumption at a \$1.25 when the British price was a \$1.55, thereby subsidizing people who use bread, all over Canada. I am hoping that something will be paid to recognize that out of the Treasury of the country. Certainly as far as the Liberal Party in this province is concerned, they have spared no effort in making representations to that end to the Federal Government. It should be understood that the money is not now in the hands of the Wheat Board, but that only the money that could be paid out is from the wheat that has been sold. If that money only is paid out, it will be only somewhere between four cents and five cents, and anything further that is to be paid will have to be contributed either under the "have-regard" clause by the British Government, or by the Government of Canada paying something in to the Wheat Board.

Now, in regard to the Speech from the Throne. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that an attempt was made in the Speech to put political propaganda into the mouth of His Honour. One item of the Speech reads like this:

"The actual delegation sought to discuss the implementation of Social Security and economic proposals advanced by the Federal Government at the conference on reconstruction held in 1945. Unfortunately the conference was restricted to matters relating to Federal-Provincial fiscal relations and old age security."?

Now that is the statement that was put into the mouth of His Honour, and I submit it was just propaganda. It is certainly not correct. If you

**February 6, 1951**

look at page 4 of the conference proceedings, you will find that the Prime Minister there said in opening the conference, and I quote his words:

“Most of the Provincial Governments have also indicated a desire to discuss Social Security, particularly old age security. For that reason in my most recent letter, I advanced the view that we might concentrate our attention primarily on these two matters.”

You will notice he said ‘Social Security’, and he goes on to say:

“This view seemed to be generally acceptable to the Provincial Governments, though it was recognized, of course . . .”

And I wish you to note this Mr. Speaker,

“that the conference would be free to enlarge the scope of its deliberation to other subjects of common concern.”

Why should the Lieutenant Governor be made to say something which quite obviously, on the face of the conference proceedings, was not strictly correct? The Prime Minister goes on and said this:

“In 1945 when the hoped for and planned for a long period of peaceful development of our own country, the Federal Government laid before the Provincial Governments a comprehensive, integrated series of proposals. We do not feel that this would be an appropriate course in 1950, when we are faced with an entirely different perspective. It is our view that on this occasion the conference is likely to achieve more if we proceed step by step discussing the more urgent problems first and endeavouring to work out suitable understandings or arrangements as we go on.”

I am still quoting from the Prime Minister:

“It may be that the Canadian people will also be prepared to make financial contributions over and above any national security taxes to pay for further Social Security or other services which we may agree at this conference are desirable.”

What becomes of this suggestion then that the whole thing was restricted? He goes on to say:

“What I wish to emphasize is the necessity of considering all such proposals, in the light of these and other urgent demands upon the same body of taxpayers.”

Mr. St. Laurent then went on himself to discuss the question of health, and what was being done in regard to health. The Hon. Paul Martin,

Minister of Health, filed and circulated a report on the national health programme at the conference. It appears in the appendix in the report of the conference. The Premier of Saskatchewan spoke about health as much as he wished. There was nothing done to prevent him from speaking about health or any other matter. No restriction, as alleged was even sought to be imposed.

Another example of the attempt to have the office of the Lieutenant Governor in giving the Speech from the Throne used to put out political propaganda, was this statement in the Speech from the Throne:

“The Government of Saskatchewan is still of the opinion that the Government of Canada should provide a monthly cash pension of \$50 without a means test to all Canadians citizens 55 years of age and over.”

The C.C.F. members of the House of Commons agreed to the very suggestion that is now being made. The hon. member has to try to make it out that he is more anxious about the old people than even the members of his own party and the House of Commons. Now, the Hon. Premier was impressed himself with the view that we have to take into account that we may have to spend over \$1,500 million in national defence this year, because as I read in the report of the proceedings the Hon. Premier said it might be impossible to carry out this suggestion. This is found on page 51 of the report. I will just read it so there will be no doubt about it. At page 51 of the report of the proceedings here is what the Premier said in that regard:

“I recognize it in the light of the international situation may not be possible to do that instantly, but it ought to be one of the objectives of this conference and something toward which we move.”

Now he admits that it might not be possible to go ahead with this instantly. His own members in Parliament agreed to this other programme, and yet he has put in here and His Honour the Lieutenant Governor’s mouth that we would like to do more. Well, all of us would like to do more; but surely in laying down the programme of the Government it should not be made an occasion to put out political propaganda.

Finally — and I’m not going to give the quotation but it is right there in the Speech from the Throne; the Lieutenant Governor has words put in his mouth suggesting that His Majesty in the right of Canada through the Government of Canada has broken a Federal Act of Parliament. I do not think that is a proper use of the Speech from the Throne. I suggest that at this stage, and I hope that this will not create a precedent. I even could visualize — there is so much propaganda in that Speech, that I am almost expecting some of the members opposite to run around the country and begin to say on a certain day Dr. Uhrich said this, and said this, and said this”. I do not know whether the hon. Premier was laying the foundation for that or not.

There was another aspect of the Speech which struck me and that was an obvious attempt to make political capital out of this position of

**February 6, 1951**

the Federal Government, with the tremendous responsibility it has, facing the present difficult international situation and the necessity of \$1½ billion on national defence this year; it was very anxious to make it plain that it sought discussion and implementation of the proposals of 1945.

That was the attitude taken in the Speech from the Throne. No attempt made to take account of the changed conditions since 1945, and nothing in it to take account of the fact that what the Government professes that would like the Dominion Government could do would cost \$550 million to carry out — what His Honour was made to say they would like to see done. And this at a time when the Federal Government is proposing to carry out unanimous requests of the committee that considered that matter in the House of Commons and Senate, which is which was agreed to by the members of the C.C.F. Party on that committee. And yet there is an attempt made to make out that C.C.F. Government of this province is more anxious about this thing than even the members of the C.C.F. down in Ottawa. When one thinks of the record of this Government and the way they have treated old age pensioners at times, well, I do not think anyone is very much impressed.

The Prime Minister referred to that situation and, I think, at a time like this, we have got to take some of these things into consideration and not pretend that we are in exactly the same position that we were in back in 1945, no matter how much we would like to see some of the social security measures put through. I do not think there is anyone more anxious than I am in that regard. I took that attitude all the time I was a member of the House of Commons. Here's what the Prime Minister said, speaking about this:

“I do not need to tell you that our fiscal position is very different from what we hoped it might be at this time. When we undertook in 1946 to hold this Conference it is unfortunately very different from what we still hoped it might be when the Conference was proposed, last December. When the post-war conference met in Ottawa in August 1945, we were on the point of emerging from a war which had not yet been won. We were facing the tremendous task of converting a wartime economy to a peacetime basis. We had high hopes that the foundations were being laid for a secure and lasting peace and we were thinking primarily, not in terms of national security, but in terms of maintaining employment, posterity and social security in our country. We all know, indeed we were all resolved to avoid if at all possible the economic social frustration and disappointment which had followed the first World War and which made the decade of the '30s such a grim memory for so many people. Unhappily today our main preoccupation is not and cannot be with the maintenance and expansion of prosperity and security within our own country. Though these continue to be our constant objectives, our main preoccupation is for the security of our country and its people, and our only real hope of that security lies in the prevention of another world war. We have been driven inexorably to the conclusion that the only way those who wish to prevent war can prevent it by preparing to resist aggression and

preparing to resist it successfully. Now it is evident that the more of our resources we are obliged to devote to these precautions designed to prevent war the less there will be available for other purposes which, though more desirable, are less urgent.”

The Prime Minister said, it will be noted, that these objectives are more desirable, but, of course, under present international circumstances, less urgent. Now, these words were uttered by the Prime Minister in the presence of the Hon. Premier, and the truth of what he said then is clearer today than it was two months ago — the terrible state we are in, we, of what is left of the free world. I would have thought, Mr. Speaker, that in preparing the speech for His Honour, some consideration might well have been given to that situation.

Another thought occurred to me, Mr. Speaker. Here is the Government ready to spend very freely \$550 million of Federal money in spite of the fact that the Federal Government is facing a tremendously increased burden of providing medical services for those aged 65 to 69, it certainly pats itself on the back because of its great generosity. It finds fault with the Federal Government because it is going to spend \$250 million more, but takes five or six bows because it is going to spend \$3 million more. If that is not trying to make use of the Speech from the Throne in putting out propaganda, and I do not know propaganda when I see it, and I'd have had to look at a lot since the C.C.F. came into office.

It makes so much of spending \$3 million dollars. And here the Dominion Government is offering at the same time a new financial agreement under which it will get \$22 million next year, if things keep going the way they are at the present time, and that is four and one-quarter million dollars, more than it got last year. Anyone reading the Speech from the Throne certainly would not get that impression.

I would like now to say something about external affairs. I wish to go into that shortly because it affects not only what has to be done in Ottawa, but it should affect our approach to things here in Saskatchewan. After all, we are all Canadians and we certainly have got to be ready to do our part in any way possible as Canadians, and there is no doubt that the present international situation is just about as serious, no matter how you look at it, so far as the preservation of freedom is concerned, as it has been any time during the last fifty years, perhaps longer. Nobody knows when the Soviet Union will strike again at some other spot. Nobody can be sure; and that is the situation we face today. We also face the situation where overwhelming military superiority lies on the side of the Soviet Union and while we are weak like that it is a lasting temptation to the Soviet Union to move before we get stronger. So the situation is fraught with danger.

Another thing that might prevent the Soviet Union from feeling that they can successfully move is that they should feel that they are confronted by absolute unity in the free world. If it appears that the free world is not united, that anything in the way of regret that anything in the way of aggression takes place there will be disunity in meeting that aggression, that the members of the Western world

will not stand together, as they agreed to do, for example, in the Atlantic Security Pact, that very thing might be the factor that might tip the balance when the Lords of the Kremlin are trying to decide whether they will move in the direction of peace or war. Anything that arouses any thought or doubt about the unity of the free world is doing a real disservice to mankind, doing a real disservice to the preservation of peace, which, of course, we all realize is so very important. So, I regret very much the resolution passed by the C.C.F. Party of the province at their convention. I have the resolution here. I got it out of the “Commonwealth”, so there would be no doubt about it (I am glad there is only one person applauds that paper). I am not surprised, though, because it is purely a propaganda sheet from start to finish. Here’s the Resolution passed by the C.C.F. convention:

“Be it resolved that the Provincial and National leadership of the Party should continue to search out all possibilities for an effective Third Force which will offer an alternative to the conflicting policies now pursued by the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union.”

**Government Member:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Tucker:** — My hon. friends say, “hear, hear!” We have got a Treaty with the United States — the Atlantic Security Pact — under which we agree to stand with them in the defence of freedom, and here the C.C.F. Party puts the policies of the United States on the same grounds, on the same level as the policies of the Soviet Union, and says that we should try to take a middle course between them. Now, Mr. Speaker, what does that mean? It means pulling out from the side of the United States and joining some sort of a Third Force. Can anything be imagined that would be more encouraging to the leaders of the Soviet Union, if it was felt that this represented the real thought of a good part of the Western world that the United States should be left alone? Why, great leaders like Eisenhower has said over and over again that the United States cannot stand successfully alone, and neither can the rest of the free world stand successfully alone.

It is unfortunate that the C.C.F. which forms the government of this province, should have passed a resolution like that of which so much use can be made by the people who put out propaganda for the Soviet, that this Government on the American continent is ready to pull away from its present allies. I know my friend was worried about some soldiers of the United States in North Battleford. Well, after all, when one thinks of his remarks as to that, I would think that he would not interject himself into this debate. I am referring to the Minister of Agriculture. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the hope of the world today is that there should be the greatest possible amount of unity amongst the members who signed the Atlantic Security Pact and amongst the rest of the free world, and that the Communists today are, in certain countries, fostering that Third Force movement, because they know it breaks up that unity.

What do we find just recently to be the attitude of the C.C.F. in this most important matter, because this problem of the preservation of peace is more important than any other single thing? What is their attitude there? We have the people’s government of China engaged in aggression in Korea. It is brought before the United Nations, and the United Nations



finally pass a resolution supported by 44 nations and opposed by only the Soviet bloc and India and Burma. The purpose of that resolution is to recognize that China committed aggression, and at no time was there any idea, Mr. Speaker, and it was made plainer and plainer as the days went on, there was no thought of closing the door on negotiations or working for peace in any way, shape or form. Certainly though, it was also realized that if the United Nations, which had not hesitated to brand the North Koreans as aggressors had hesitated to do in the case of a larger country it would have lost its moral authority — that it should say “Here is what we recognize about this aggression, but in no way do we close the door towards an attempt by honourable means to effect a settlement.” The C.C.F. Party in the Federal House moved an amendment criticizing the Federal Government for its stand in that matter at the United Nations. Here’s the exact amendment, Mr. Speaker:

“We further regret that while your Excellency’s advisers have generally followed a constructive course in relation to the Korean dispute, they have in relation to the resolution granting China as an aggressor supported a course which is premature and unwise at this particular moment and what should not have been pursued until the methods of peaceful negotiations had been completely exhausted.”

They were, Mr. Speaker, dealing with an absolutely concrete situation. Our Canadian Government had lined up with 43 other countries including the United Kingdom, France, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, practically the whole free world, in this action, and our Government, our Canadian Government, is to be condemned and forced out of office. Why? Because, Mr. Speaker, it did not line up instead with the Soviet bloc and India and Burma. There is the Third Force. The Soviet bloc was not the Third Force. Burma and India and the C.C.F. Party — apparently that is the Third Force. That is all that is left of it.

Now then, that is a remarkable situation. I can just imagine if the C.C.F. had the way down there and we had lined up with the Soviet bloc against practically all of the free world, excepting India and Burma, supposing they had succeeded in this vote of lack of confidence in our Canadian Government, wouldn’t that be a real triumph for the Soviet Union? Couldn’t it be made use of? But even although our country is lined up with these other 43 countries that we condemn it: one wonders if they do not appreciate just what has happened in the last year or so with regard to the rest of the free world trying to get together. I repeat again, Mr. Speaker, the hope of peace is not, in the face of the Soviet Union, to appear weak and disunited. That is the very thing that may cause them to feel they can safely move. The hope of peace, Mr. Speaker, is for the free world stand together, ready to brand aggression as aggression, ready to stand together as united people against aggression, but at no time in any way threatening the existence of Soviet Union or any of its friends, or at any time in any way being unwilling to negotiate in order to preserve peace; approaching the situation in all humility, that no time ever giving the impression that they can move aggressively without meeting united opposition.

Now, there is the situation with regard to external affairs in which the C.C.F. find themselves. One wonders why they take these attitudes.

**February 6, 1951**

One wonders why there are all these debates whenever the Atlantic Security Act has come up, or the Marshall Plan. I do not blame the Premier personally, because I believe that in many cases he has tried to take a proper stand in this matter; but apparently there is such a big group in the C.C.F. Party that are moved by these ideas that when it gets to a showdown the leadership has to go where they point, and not where they know in their own hearts they should go.

Mr. Speaker, I wish now to say a few words about the Dominion-Provincial Conference. I was glad to see that so much harmony prevailed at that conference and, knowing the tremendous burden the Federal Government faced in regard to increased costs of rearmament, which I knew would amount to about a billion dollars (we might now find it will amount to about a billion and a half dollars, this year), I knew that some people were saying we should not even go ahead with the Old Age Security proposal. As far as I was concerned, I hoped they would go ahead at least with those proposals, but to do so meant the expenditure of another two hundred and fifty million dollars. I realize that this meant more taxes. If it were borrowed or done by inflationary means it would lead to further inflation. So it seems that every cent of this would have to be raised by taxation of the people, and when they were having to bear all of these other burdens I know it must give great cause for concern whether this extra two hundred and fifty million dollars should be placed on upon the backs of our people. But, personally, I was glad to see it because I felt there were so many people between 65 and 69 who were having difficulty getting along and I felt they had to be looked after anyway, and so it was a very good move to provide, in the case of these people, a basic pension. I was very pleased to see there was apparently so much unanimity in that regard. I realize, and do not take any issue with the attitude of the Government, that that that will cost this Province something over three million dollars more in order to provide medical services to people from 65 to 69, but I do think, when we are getting this better financial agreement (and I do submit it is better than it was before, and we can hope to get it under over four million dollars in the first year of that agreement than we got last year), it is only right that part of that money we are getting should be passed on in this better Old Age Pension scheme, and so I feel that what was done deserves commendation.

One of the things that I would just like to emphasize in passing is that some people have an idea that we are renting to the Dominion the right to levy corporation and personal income taxes and estate duties, and, of course, that leads sometimes to misunderstanding. As Mr. St. Laurent pointed out — I will not take time to quote in full; but he said:

“It must be remembered that the Dominion Government has the right to enter those fields. It doesn’t need to get any rights from the Provinces at all. All we are renting from Provinces is the exclusive right to enter those fields.”

I think that that should not be forgotten. But one thing I do take issue with is the attitude of my hon. friend, the Provincial Treasurer towards these agreements. However, he never suggested he would not sign him; he is too good a business man to ever hint at that. He knows how important they are to the future stability of this province. But when we are getting an agreement that does put us in a much better position than we

would be without it, I did not think that he should profess such grievance and distaste for these agreements, especially bearing in mind the burden that the Federal Government is bearing in national defence, which we are interested in just as much as they are.

Under the present agreement, the minimum that we are entitled to, whether in good times or bad, is \$15,200,000. Now that is raised under the new agreement to \$19,800,000 — raised over \$4½ million — that is sure of, in good times or bad, and the Provincial Treasurer, Mr. Speaker, says that is meaningless. He has got in the state of mind now of throwing millions of dollars around, and \$4½ million does not matter to him. Well, that is one of the things that is bothering the people of Saskatchewan — that he has got into that state of mind. It should be borne in mind that this minimum that he says is “meaningless”, is more than the total receipts of the Saskatchewan Government in all but two years of the '30s. In 1931 and 1932 total revenues did not reach \$12 million, and here we are today, Mr. Speaker, guaranteed by the Federal Government over \$19½ million — a matter of \$8 million more than our total revenues in 1931 and 1932 — and the Provincial Treasurer says that is meaningless. And if things go on the way they are today, we will be getting \$22 million — \$10 million more than our total revenues in 1931-32. The Prime Minister pointed out the reason why there is this guaranteed minimum. He said that while no one anticipates any substantial decline in the gross national product in the next few years, this proposed changed minimum will provide an additional measure of insurance to the treasuries of those provinces which have tax agreements with the Federal Government.

I am sure that, in his own heart, Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Treasurer does feel that this guaranteed minimum of nearly \$20 million from the Federal Government does mean something. I should not give him any comfort, but perhaps when he says it is meaningless, he is looking forward to two years from now when it may be meaningless to him, I never thought of that possibility until just this present moment — maybe that is what he had in mind.

There was one matter on which I think we are all in agreement in this House and that is that at the earliest possible date there is one group of people that we would like to see something done about, and those are the totally disabled. I feel, myself, that something should be done about them as soon as is reasonably possible, something on the same basis as the help to those who get blind pensions, because the totally disabled man sometimes needs help much more than even a blind man. Now that is an extension which I hope will not be lost sight of whenever there is any further advance to be made in that regard.

I want to say a word or so about the proposed constitutional amendment. The Premier pointed out that he had advocated that five years ago, and he said at the conference (he was very frank about it) that it would certainly facilitate the collection of such a tax by those provinces which have to resort to that means of raising revenue, because of the particular problems they have to grapple with. In other words, he said it would facilitate the collection of this tax if they could only put it on in an indirect way, so that they could put it on the storekeeper and then say, “You can collect it or not, if you wish; pass it on or not as you want.” It becomes an indirect

tax then. Then, of course, people would not know they were paying the three per cent. He said that quite frankly. The Provincial Treasurer went on to indicate in a recent statement he gave to the press, that there was no intention to use this in addition to the present Education and Hospitalization tax, but that it is only a way to enable them, if this is used, to put this Education and Hospitalization tax underground. That is as I understand Provincial Treasurer. He promised to do away with the Education Tax, and when they cannot do away with that they want to hide it as deeply as possible; put it underground. Well, one thing I must say is they had been very frank about it.

I doubt very much if the association of ideas about it is correct — the idea in the public mind that this amendment is somehow necessary in order for us to go ahead with our part of the improved old age pension scheme. I do not think that if it is put underground there will be any more got out of it than before; the only thing is maybe they would be able to go around and say, “Well, we promised to do away with the Education Tax, and now we have done so”; but the result of it will be that, in some cases, the consumer will pay even more than he does today — the mark-up will be placed on the tax. Then, other people who live on the borders of the province will not be paying the tax at all, so it will be most unfair to the storekeeper is living on the border.

When we have got an Education and Hospitalization Tax to pay which the Provincial Treasurer has defended with such eloquence over and over again, I do not know why he wants to get the right to impose a tax which he has condemned over and over again, namely, an indirect sales tax. I suppose it is due to the fact that they are always bothered in their minds about their promise to take the Education Tax off when other revenues were available to take its place, and they feel that is one promise, amongst many others, that they have broken. We well remember that they admit they said they would take it off when they had other revenues to take its place, and at the time they promised to take it off it yielded about \$4,228,000; today at three per cent it yields over \$9 million. At the same time they promised to take it off when they had other revenues to take its place, the revenues were less than \$32 million; today they are a matter of \$55 million. In other words, they are getting today about \$23 million more than they got when they promised to take the tax off, if they had revenue to take its place, and all the revenue they had to get to keep that promise was a matter of less than \$5 million. They are today getting over \$20 million, and what did they do, Mr. Speaker? Instead of taking it off they increased it by 50 per cent, and now the Premier says it he took the lead in trying, away back in 1945 to get power to put it underground. Is that the way this Government intends to carry out this important promise? Well, from the way they have dealt with other promises, no one should be surprised. Everyone will be watching to see what is done in this particular matter.

A very important question has been before us, and it was important enough that the Government appointed three very capable men to look into it. I do not think they could have appointed any men who were better qualified to look into the question, namely the question of the fiscal relationship between the Province and the Municipalities. They set up that committee, called — with their not unexpected modesty none of them would take the chair mentioned above apparently; they are all equal — “Britnell-Cronkite-Jacobs Committee”. They were set up in 1948 and we have been anxiously awaiting

their report. These gentlemen reported last July. They recommended measures to relieve the present situation that the municipalities find themselves in; and they made their recommendations very definite. Their chief recommendation was that the Public Revenues Tax of two mills, which must be imposed by the municipalities and the money sent in to this Government thereby adding to the burden upon the land and to the inflated revenues of this Government — taken right out of the homeowner and the farmer; this outstanding Committee recommended that this tax be discontinued. Here is what they said:

“Despite the fact that we have been unable to find the real burden of the real estate tax has been increased in recent years . . .”

The “real burden”, — they say the “real burden” because they claim that the receipts of the farmers have gone up as his taxes have gone up. They do not deny that the actual taxes have gone up, but they say the “real burden” of the real estate tax has not gone up in recent years.

They go on to say:

“. . . we are definitely of the opinion that the time has come for the abolition of the Public Revenue Tax.”

They say, “We are definitely of the opinion” (and this is a unanimous report) “that the time has come for the abolition of this tax.” They feel that the municipalities need this million and three-quarter dollars more than does the Government, whose revenues are now swollen up to more than \$55 million, and who, today, will get in the coming year almost \$20 million in grant from the Federal Government; and it must be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that the \$20 million takes the place of the statutory subsidy of \$2 million — a little over \$2 million — and it takes the place of our right to impose taxes out of which we never get more than, roughly \$2,600,000. Assuming that we could have got twice as much out of those taxes as we ever got, bring it up to \$5 million, add the \$2 million subsidy to it and that makes \$7 million, and under the financial agreement which the Provincial Treasury was so grudging about, we stand to receive in the first year of the agreement about \$22 million in place of this \$7 million that we might have hoped to get ourselves — \$22 million instead of \$7 million. Yet this Government hangs on to that Public Revenue Tax, makes the secretary-treasurers of the municipalities take it out of the people in taxes on their homes and on their land, in order to add another million and three-quarter dollars to their swollen revenues.

No wonder the Britnell-Cronkite-Jacobs Report said the time has come to stop. No wonder they did! I suggest that we did not set up that Committee; we did not have anything to do with that report. When it was brought out the Minister of Municipal Affairs went up and down this province defending the report, leading people to believe that its recommendations would be carried out. Well — somebody said “hear, hear!” over there; I do not think it was the Minister though — he did not say “hear, hear!” Now then, here is what the Committee said. Among the reasons given was that it would put the municipalities in a better position to cope with the demand for increased services, particularly in the construction and maintenance of highways. Surely the Minister of Highways will agree on that necessity; this is

**February 6, 1951**

most important if we are to keep our farmers from moving off the farms in ever-increasing numbers. Surely the Minister of Agriculture will agree with that: he has been talking about that as much as anybody. We all agree with that. Why aren't we getting action then? And it is highly desirable that the municipalities should have one field they could call their own. This would lead to more responsible municipal government, and I think we all agree with that. Then they go on, and I quote again from the Committee's report:

"The present is a reasonably opportune time . . ."

(just note this)

". . . for securing this field to the municipalities. Provincial revenues are comparatively buoyant . . ."

This is the finding of the committee:

". . . and the adjustments could be made with much less shock than in a period of depression."

In other words, they say they have lots of money, now is the time to do it. The Provincial Treasurer, having got his hands on this one million and three-quarters, apparently it is hard to pry it out of them.

Now as I read Speech from the Throne, this considered recommendation of a Committee set up by the government itself has been ignored, and the Minister of Municipal Affairs went up and down urging people to support it. The municipalities must continue to raise this money and send into this Government an amount of at least a million and three-quarter dollars.

Then the Committee went on to make a further recommendation, and I quote:

"In the opinion of your Committee the exemption of Crown property of a commercial nature from municipal taxation is indefensible. This observation applies to property owned in the right of Canada as well as property owned in the right of Saskatchewan."

I say, hear, hear! to that. Ever since I had the honour to be elected leader of the Liberal Party in the Province I have taken the attitude that while Crown Corporations are engaged in commercial enterprise, they should pay taxation. It is not right or fair to the local taxpayers for government to take over property and take it off the tax roll and compete with people who are paying taxes. This means that the people who are paying taxes have to pay still more. And the Committee says that "this policy is indefensible". This Committee, appointed by the Government, says it is indefensible; but there's no suggestion that the practice is going to be given up. I am again quoting from this Committee's report:

"In many cases a governmental agency acquires property and that property is simply taken off the tax rolls to the detriment of the local body."

Well, surely we have said over and over again, and surely we are glad to have the support of people of the eminence of Dr. Britnell, Professor Cronkite and Mr. Jacobs in that stand. But when the Government profess to be so much in favour of this report we would have liked to see some action — and they recommended this action be taken and no such legislation is forecast in the Speech from the Throne.

There was some suggestion, perhaps, that the municipalities do not need this help. Now I cannot take time to give any figures on the matter, but I was very struck with a couple of items which seemed to me to indicate that the municipalities are needing this help. In 1944, the rural municipalities had \$14½ million arrears of taxes coming to them; now they have collected a large part of those arrears of taxes, and they spent them until, in 1948 (which are the last figures I have), four years later, they had collected and spent, roughly, \$7 million of those arrears in taxes, and they now, in 1948, have arrears of taxes of \$7½ million, roughly, instead of \$14½ million.

Another significant thing, I think, it seems to me to indicate that the municipalities, most of which handle their finances very carefully — in fact I have often thought if the Provincial Treasurer would take a lesson from some of the municipalities of the rural districts we would not have this inflated budget we have today — is the fact that these municipalities are under such pressure to build up market roads so people can get to town in the winter time. We are all in favour of that. We want to see the people stay on the land and farm the land. If we do not do that in Saskatchewan there will be there will not be much left of this province, because agriculture is, and will remain, the basis of our provincial life; and unless we take steps to keep the farmers happy on the land, give them a chance to have rural electrification, a chance to be able to get to town, there is a tendency for them to move into town in the wintertime and quit raising stock and so on. Well, the rural municipalities went into debt. In 1946, they had a debt of \$3,900,000; three years later that debt had gone up to \$6,000,000.

How can it be said that, Mr. Speaker, that the municipalities, having spent these arrears of taxes, and having gone into debt so fast as that, and having increased taxes as they have had to do — how can it be said that they do not need this help more than the Provincial Government, with its increased revenues, particularly from the Federal Government.

The Provincial Government is prepared to raise its grant for T. B. treatment, and I am very glad that provision is being made to increase those grants. This increase is overdue, of course, but at any rate it is better late than never. The Premier, speaking about this question, sought to make out a tremendously greater amount of help was being given to municipalities than was given when they came into office, which was the very height of the war. Later in his speech, and trying to justify his budget, he spoke about the lesser purchasing power of the dollar. Now, of course, that works both ways, and if you take, for example, the \$440,000 now given for T. B. control, if you apply the Premier's reasoning to the value of the dollar, it brings the \$440,000 down to \$264,000, which is less than the \$273,000 being paid by the Liberals in the last year they were in office. Here is the way they have been treating this important question of T. B. grants, up until now. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly time and more than time that something was done about that.

These are some figures the Premier gave as to help given the municipalities. He pointed out that the Liberals spent on these items — T. B. control, municipal bridges, market roads, secondary highways, etc. — \$683,000 the last year they were in office. He took great credit to himself because they had increased that from \$683,000 to \$1,335,000. My hon. friend there, the member for Canora, is always enthusiastic to applaud anything — no matter how detrimental to his own Party. I would point out that, if you take it on the basis of the decreased value of the dollar, there is practically no change, and if you consider that they have increased these grants by around \$600,000 at the same time they are getting from the Federal Government not \$8,000,000, but they will get, this year that we are coming into now, \$19 million — \$11 million more. Think of the generosity, Mr. Speaker! They are giving about \$600,000 more to the municipalities!

We heard a great deal in the days when the C.C.F. were seeking office, about how they were going to recognize education as a provincial responsibility and all that sort of thing — none of this pussyfooting around any more. This obligation of looking after education was put upon the Provinces by the Constitution, and the Premier, for one, was not going to avoid any obligation or responsibility. Well, what is the situation, after this brave new party got elected, they have been in office now for six years? I cannot take the time to give more than a few figures, but I got this from the Britnell-Cronkite-Jacobs Report, Table 8. They point out that the Province is paying about \$3,800,000 more on local education than it did in 1944 — from \$4 million up to \$7.8 million; but the municipalities, who have not had these increased grants and increased liquor profits and all these inflated revenues to operate with, but have had to get their money out of the taxation on the homes and farms of the people, they did not have to increase their expenditure on education by only \$3.8 million, they had to increase their expenditure by nearly \$5½ million.

Where is the situation now? Well, the situation now is that this Province that was going to recognize education as a provincial responsibility, today, according to the Britnell-Cronkite-Jacobs report, is paying as its share of educational costs — it refers to it as local educational expenditures, as a percentage of the combined total — in 1948-49, 33.8 per cent of the cost — just about one-third, and the municipalities are spending 66.2 per cent — just about two-thirds. If you compare that with Ontario or B. C. you will find that their provincial governments are paying a very much greater proportion than ours. So far as Alberta and Manitoba are concerned, they are paying about the same proportion as we are paying. But it must be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that this Government promised it was going to do much better; it was going to really do something about the problem. Well, there is the record. Anyone can look at it, and the more you look at it in the light of the promises made, the worse it really appears.

In view of the attitude of absolute callousness towards our municipalities and the burden that they are having to carry, and the considered recommendation of this Committee they set up themselves, that this Public Revenue Tax should be abolished, that the municipalities should have that money and that taxation should be paid by Crown Corporations engaged in commercial enterprise; in view of the fact there is no provision made for that in the Speech from the Throne, I intend to move, at the conclusion of my remarks this afternoon, the following amendment to the motion, seconded by Mr.



Danielson. I will move it before I conclude, but I will read it to the House now:

“That the following words be added to the Address: ‘but regrets that the measures proposed to assist municipalities are inadequate in that they do not propose abolition of the Public Revenue Tax or taxation of Crown Corporation engaged in Commercial enterprise.’”

Now Mr. Speaker, the next matter that I want to deal with is the question of agriculture. We will have a chance later to deal with this question; but one of the remarks I want to make at this particular stage is that the Minister was good enough to put out a release from his Department sometime in June, in which he said there was somewhere around a million acres (I think it was) of good land that still, by drainage and by clearing, could be brought under cultivation. He went on to say that this acreage would only be made available under 33-year lease.

Mr. Speaker, how did it come about that we got these prairies settled by the type of good, hardworking citizen that we have here? It certainly was not by saying to the people who came to this country from Great Britain and various other parts of Europe, and whose descendants have made such fine citizens, that they would get only a lease of land. The idea was held out to them that they could get a bit of land they could call their own. Now then, when the C.C.F. Party started up in its early days it was going to have this leasing system of land tenure, or “use-lease”. Well, that did not go over very well with the people who came out here and endured hardships in order to get a piece of land of their own, nor did it go over with their sons and daughters; so the C.C.F. dropped back from their provincial platform. If they have genuinely dropped that idea, why do they not have some sort of a system whereby the land that is still available for settlement can be bought on reasonable terms at a price to pay for the cost of clearing it, and so on? I am not going to go into the terms that might be entered into, but if they do not believe in socialization of the land that they do not believe in socialization of land, why is it that they will not let people get title to the land that is still to be settled?

We are told by people in the north that while you have that system of refusing to give people title to the land, you will have no real development. And I can well believe it, because we would never have got this western country settled if we had that system. It’s holding up the development of the north, this crazy Socialist policy. I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this whole thing be reviewed, and that they bring this land settlement policy into line with what they profess is their policy in regard to the tenure of the land throughout the province — land to be held under title.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I pass on to the price of wheat, and this is an important matter to everybody in Saskatchewan. The Premier, in a radio speech of October 6, 1950, implied that our farmers have lost millions of dollars under the British Wheat Agreement. Well, that is what the Grain Exchange is saying, exactly what they are saying. It is that sort of thing that made the President of the Wheat Pool speak out so strongly at their last delegates’ meeting, that if we are going to keep the system of handling our wheat through the Wheat Board, we had to quit undermining and attacking it. Does anybody think

that if the farmers of this province could be persuaded that they lost hundreds of millions of dollars under the British Wheat Agreement, they are not going to turn against that system of marketing their wheat?

**Mr. Danielson:** — They won't believe it.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, As my hon. friend said, they won't believe it; but I think we have a right to expect more from the Premier of this province than to put out that suggestion.

Then the Premier went on to speak about the initial price of the 1950 crop, and here's what he said, and he spoke with all the authority of being Premier of the province. I am quoting his exact words:

"The fact remains that one hundred million dollars which the farmers are losing by reduction in the price of the would pay all the provincial, municipal and school taxes for the entire province for one year."

**Premier Douglas:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Tucker:** — He says "Hear, hear," now. Think of it, Mr. Speaker, pretending that they are losing a hundred million dollars because the initial price was \$1.40: not the suggestion that they are not getting that amount at once but that they are losing it, Mr. Speaker. Does anybody think, for a single minute, that if the people of this province believe that they were actually losing a hundred million dollars by the system of handling our wheat, they would adhere to that system very long? And yet the Premier pretends to be in favour of the system.

It has been recognized by those who know anything about co-operation (I am sure the Minister of Agriculture will not disagree with that, judging by his past speeches) if you are paid in your initial payment 70 per cent of what you ultimately expect to get for your wheat, that is a reasonable initial payment. I see the Minister of Public Health looking up here, and I am sure he will not disagree with that either, because he was associated with the Pool for quite a long time. Now, what was the situation? We have an International Wheat Agreement under which the price in American funds would be \$1.80 per bushel. At that time our money was set at a discount of 10 per cent, which brought the money we might get for wheat up to about \$1.98, at the very highest; and so the Government said 70 per cent of \$2.00 would be \$1.40, and they set that as an initial payment. Yet the Premier goes out and says there was a loss to the farmers of one hundred million dollars! Well, the Premier knows that \$1.40 was not the price at which our wheat was being sold. He knew it was just the initial payment. If he did not know that, every farmer knows it anyway, and it is the system which farmers have been asking for for the last twenty or thirty years. It will behoves the Premier of the province to line up with the Grain Exchange and try to undermine belief in it. They, like the Premier, attacked the initial payment. They also sought to arouse antagonism over the spread — oh yes, that was a great thing! Here the farmers were disappointed because their wheat had been frozen in such quantities and because the spreads in price for lower grades were set fairly wide. The Premier did not miss a chance to arouse animosity either. He said, and here are his exact words:

“This year much of our wheat will be in the lower grades. For some reason which it is difficult to understand . . .”

He does not understand people pay less for frozen wheat for No. 1 Northern wheat. Well, he goes on to say:

“For some reason which it is difficult to understand . . .”

And he said it in that mellifluous voice of his; you know it. Why, I was just carried away myself almost — but not quite.

**Premier Douglas:** — Quite a carrying job I would say!

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well it was — if you had managed it, but you did not quite manage it; and it is a bigger load to carry the province along with that nonsense, as you will find out. Here again are his words:

“For some reason which it is difficult to understand, the Federal Government has decided to reduce the price of the lower grades much more than they lowered the price of No. 1 Northern.”

That was in his speech, and you will note he says, “the Federal Government did this.” Well, of course, it was not the Federal Government; it was the Wheat Board. The hon. Premier did not know that either, apparently.

When the further interim payment of 20 cents was announced, the President of the Wheat Pool said, “Well, I am surprised they are able to pay 20 cents (or something to that effect) on the lower grades, but after all if they can figure they can pay it, that is their business.” Now that was the comment of everybody who knows anything about this, Mr. Speaker; but the Premier (he had a lot to say about that too), wanted to know where the other 15 cents were. Well, as a matter of fact, more than half this wheat that the Wheat Board have had to take is of lower grades than the usual grade used for milling purposes, and I fancy that it will take two or three years to get rid of some of his feed wheat. They will have to work it off on the market very carefully so as not to break the price. Nobody knows what this feed wheat is going to fetch and every farmer is glad that it is being handled by the Wheat Board, because he knows if he had to sell it on the open market, he would probably have got less than the initial payment for it. Now he has got 20 cents more on top of that initial payment; and still the Premier tries to shake confidence in this pooling system of handling grain by pretending that the Wheat Board still has money it should pay out. He may think he can put anything across on the radio, but I assure him that that has not gone over with the farmers, they know their own business too well.

Furthermore, it is well understood by the farmers that these grains are kept in separate pools; that every cent the respective grades sell for will go to the farmers when it is sold. That is a great deal different, Mr. Speaker, than in times past when feed wheat was dumped on the market and sank down to almost nothing in value, because people were afraid to buy it in case it would spoil, and they did not know when they would get rid of it.

**February 6, 1951**

Let me read what the President of the Wheat Pool, John H. Wesson, had to say about this sort of business, which he was good enough to direct at the attacks of Stanley Jones, the president of the Grain Exchange; but I suppose his remarks apply equally to other people who are talking the same way, and even worse if they had less reason to talk the same way than Stanley Jones. Here is what Mr. John H. Wesson, who has been President of the Wheat Pool for so many years, had to say about this sort of thing:

“Let me come back to this famous address again” — that is to the address by the head of the Grain Exchange. “He now takes the view that, because of the statements of the two educational farm organizations in Alberta and Saskatchewan, they are now siding with the Winnipeg Grain Exchange in its criticism, because they are saying the losses sustained under the contract are \$630 million — they are not far out because the final figure is \$680 million.”

And here is what Mr. Wesson goes on to say:

“There used to be a saying when I was a boy — ‘ Oh Lord deliver us from our friends’ . . .”

And he goes on to say; almost pleading with people to quit attacking and undermining the system:

“There is not much we can do about it. There is not much we can do about trying to save the things we have fought for during these years, if certain statements continue to be made by farm organizations.”

I do not know how many of you read the open “Farm and Ranch Review,” but there was a very frank editorial published not so many weeks ago in which they dealt with these policies of criticism, and asked how much longer the Wheat Board could stand criticism from their friends, who, to all intents and purposes, are agreeing with the arguments of the very people who want to see the Wheat Board destroyed, with what the President of the Grain Exchange had to say about this system.

You will remember the prediction of the Minister of Agriculture last Fall, speaking about the spreads. He thought that we had got such a good payment on our feed wheat, that he said: “When you’ve got that initial payment, you’ve had it.” Now we have got \$.20 on top of that; that is how much the Minister of Agriculture knew about it. It is a wonder he does not keep quiet in the house, having made that prediction; and if he is right that that initial price was all we could expect on our feed wheat, and how wrong is the Premier. When we have already got \$.20 more and he thought we would not get anything— -and he is the Minister of Agriculture!

Now then, here is what Mr. Wesson said about the spreads:

“I think, under the circumstances . . .”

This is the thing that the Premier could not understand — why there was such a difference between the price of feed wheat and No. 1 wheat. Here

It's what Jack Wesson sat in that connection:

"I think, under these circumstances, had I been consulted, officially, on the basis of our experience in 1928, I, personally, could not criticize those spreads."

I am sure the hon. member for Kindersley will agree with what I am saying. When we get into difficulty like that, the thing is not to raise all the trouble you can; but if you have a good system, let us all stand united leave behind it. And that is what Jack Wesson said. He is not afraid to come out and say: "Had I been consulted, I would have approved of this."

He goes on to say, and I cite this for the Minister of Natural Resources who pooh-poohed the idea that it was the Wheat Board that did this and not the Government — and apparently he does not know as much about this as I thought he did. Here's what Jack Wesson says:

"The Wheat Board carried the responsibility for us."

That is what the President of the Wheat Pool said. He went on:

"I just want to raise two more questions. I would like you to ask yourselves this question. In view of the spreads which did obtain in 1927 and 1928 and compared with the present crop, which is worse, with almost a half, or almost 160 million bushels in a low grade of 5, 6 and feed, ask yourselves what the price of wheat would be today, had we no Wheat Board, had we no International Wheat Agreement, with price ranges. What do you think the price of feed wheat and low grades of wheat would be today if we had to depend on the purchasing power which must absorb the hedges put out by all elevator companies when they take delivery of the grain at the country elevator under the open market system?"

Mr. Wesson then in effect said to the delegates, "What do you think you would have got for your wheat under the open market?" And he goes on to say:

"My opinion, based on all these years of experience, is that we should not have expected more than 40 cents a bushel at the country elevator for feed wheat. The old-timers will remember, in the earlier days when we had lots of feed wheat, we sold it for even less than 25 cents per bushel — 19 cents the chairman says."

What are we getting for feed wheat today, Mr. Speaker? The man who delivers feed wheat to the elevators around Regina — the President of the Pool says if we had had the open market we would probably have got 40 cents. And what are we getting today with the 20 cents added — and the Premier says they are keeping 15 cents they should not keep. We are getting \$1.03½ per

bushel; that is what we are getting. And that is the kind of system that he goes around making speeches about, shaking confidence in it. Well, it is for the members of this House and later on, the voters throughout this country to say just whether they approve that sort of thing, because the system was not built up in a night. It was built up by the combined work of many men who settled on these plains before the Premier ever laid eyes on them, who worked together in co-operation and harmony to try to bring about more security here; and I do not think that the Premier of this province should be undermining that sort of thing.

Mr. Wesson goes on to say, and I commend this to be Premier:

“Two years ago I think I said the time would soon come when we would have to fight to retain that we had achieved. That time is here now. And while there has been a closeness of association between the three Pools for 26 years, I have never seen a time when it is so necessary to close ranks and fight with a united front.”

I would like to say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the country, that in that fight to preserve what we have got, the Liberal Party will stand four-square behind the people of this province.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Like they always have!

**Mr. Tucker:** — Now I come to the question of education. I want to complement the Minister of Education. I understand that he is taking the “World of Today” as an official and compulsory textbook out of the curriculum; it will still be a reference book, I suppose, to be a reference for what not to believe about the Soviet Union, not what students should believe. But in any event, it has been taken out. It has been taken out, I understand, as an official compulsory textbook and I want to say that I am glad he did it. I hope they have also discarded Mr. Dyson Carter’s book, “Atomic Future”, that they paid so much of our good money for to educate the people of our province along the Communist line. Dyson Carter, today, is one of the main writers for the Communist paper of this country. He was employed by the Minister of Education, to write “Atomic Future”. I hope that it is I hope that it’s not still being put out by the Adult Education branch. He saw fit to defend it when it was attacked in this House, and he will have a chance, this Session I hope, to say whether it is still being put out.

I would like to say just a word about the question of school grants, and let there be no mistake about our position in this matter. The people who want to have their children educated under the larger school unit system, our attitude is that we will co-operate with them in every way we can, in office, if we get there, out of office if we do not.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — A big “If”.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, it may be a big “If,” but we are always ready to bow to the will of the people. We are not sure about what is going to happen, and neither is my hon. friend if he would speak what is in his own heart. I would like to say that whether we are out of office or in office we will take the attitude that if the people want that system, we will do our best to co-operate with them and do anything we can in consultation

with them to improve it. We also take the attitude that is, exercising their democratic rights, they prefer to stay out of large school unit, they are entitled to the same help from the provincial government in providing education for their children as those who see fit to stay in the largest unit, and that there is no justification whatever for discrimination between the people who stay in a larger and those who choose to stay out. That sort of bludgeoning, of trying to force people to obey your will, and certainly not in accordance with Liberal policy anyway.

I bring to the Minister's attention the last statement of grants in regard to the schools in the larger school units and those outside. Building repairs are at the discretion of the Minister. What do we find? Surely people outside the larger school units need to have schools just as much as those inside! This then is the discretion of the Minister. What do we find? This is taken from the Annual Report of the Department of Education, 1948-49. We find this: the average grant for building repairs for districts paid in large units is \$36.42, and \$26.49 to those outside larger units — \$10 more on the average throughout the province. Special building grants, again at the discretion of the Minister. What do you find there? Exercise of discretion so that the larger school units on the average got \$136, those outside the larger unit got, on the average, not \$136, but \$47. I protest, Mr. Speaker, against that unfair treatment of those who are exercising their democratic privileges. The equalization grant is so granted that the result is to treat people outside the larger units much more unfairly than those inside. The average paid to districts inside the larger school units is \$486, those outside \$155 — \$155 against \$486.

I know my hon. friend may think, "Well, the majority are in, so what do I care?" I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this province have a sense of justice and fair play and when they exercise their rights not to go into the larger unit for the time being, they are entitled to the same help from the Public Treasury as if they decide to go into the larger unit. Knowing the difficulty that some of the school districts are having in districts around my own home — the Warman District, the Osler District; knowing the difficulty they are having in keeping their schools going and the treatment they are getting, I will not cease to protest, Mr. Speaker, against that discrimination against those people.

In regard to highways, we were told recently in Rosthern by a man who had been a candidate for the C.C.F. Party that we could not expect to get highways to Rosthern because we have not voted right. I just wonder if that is the policy of the Government. That is what their own candidate said. And I want to say to the Government, if it is their policy to discriminate against people on account of the way they vote, that is just exactly the way they act in Eastern Europe. They may be able to stay in office despite this in Europe, but the people will know how to deal with them in Saskatchewan when they get a chance, if that is their policy. They are not here by Divine Right. They are there by the vote of the people, and if, because they think that they occupy the seats of power they can punish people for the way they vote, Mr. Speaker, they will find out in due course.

In regard to the completion of the Trans-Canada Highway, I would like to say a good word of the Minister in regard to that. He took the attitude here that I would like to have seen him take — that the completion of that Trans-Canada Highway is important, more important now than at any

other time. I read his speeches to the Highway organization of which he is the President, and I thought that he said exactly what was right in that regard. It is much easier by bomb attack or sabotage to knock out a railroad and highway, and I hope he will press ahead the completion of the Trans-Canada Highway in Saskatchewan without any delay of any sort.

I was a little bit apprehensive that the Federal Government, with its increased burden of defence, might be inclined to want to curtail that programme. I was assured that it would be left to the province, so there is no reason why that work cannot be proceeded with, so far as I know. I hope that the Minister will use his position as President of that association, to urge that I highway be put through the mountains as quickly as possible, which again will serve in case we get into trouble from hostile action against Canada; also that the highway be completed connecting us with Ontario. I think that in that sort of thing we should work together in complete harmony regardless of the party, and surely I hope that the Trans-Canada Highway will be pressed through so it is complete from coast to coast at the earliest possible date.

In regard to Hospitalization, I do not want to say very much except that we took the attitude that this scheme could be administered much more economically if there was less centralization, that if the money being spent on it were made available to local people that they could get far more out of that money than could possibly be got by any central government. Because we took that attitude we were accused of not being favourable to the Hospitalization scheme. It was under other than C.C.F. administrations that different hospitalization schemes controlled on more of a municipal basis came into existence in at least one-third of this province, and with rising revenues it was only right that we should go ahead. Saskatchewan had pioneered the way in free treatment to the individual of T. B., and we would not have been fair to the history of our own province if, the moment we were able to do it, we had not gone ahead with more advanced plans in regard to health.

We have said that this scheme could be operated so that there would not be the same loss, and the money that was thereby saved could be used for other useful purposes. Nothing is gained by talking about the expenditure of large sums of money that you do not have to spend to achieve the same objective, because if you spend them on that you have not got them to spend on something equally important. The soundness of our attitude on that, Mr. Speaker, was borne out by one of the authorities in regard to public health in this province, Dr. Mott. Here is what he said as reported in the "Star-Phoenix", October 13, last. I want to read his exact words:

"Widespread abuse of benefits available under the Saskatchewan Hospitalization plan was common knowledge."

These are not my words; they are Dr. Mott's words. He went on:

"We all know the plan is becoming abused and very widely so. It is very widespread. Everybody knows it and the doctors tell us about. Quite a portion of this hospitalization could be described as unessential."

Exactly what we predicted is thus confirmed by a man of Dr. Mott's position. So far as we are concerned our stand in this thing has been quite



clear from the start. A Government of our Party inaugurated help under the Municipal Doctor Scheme. Under it we were the first province to inaugurate free T. B. treatment. We have no fault to find with anything that will advance the public health of our people; but we certainly are not in favour of squandering money by undue centralization. I will be very interested to see what the Minister of Public Health has to say about those charges made. I believe this gentleman is even the Acting Deputy Minister on his own Department, so he should know what he is talking about.

I want to say a word or so now about industrial development. We claim that it is being retarded because we have had a government in this province that allows Socialism as its ultimate objective, and there should be no surprise that it should have been retarded. In the Natural Resources Report of 1945, issued by the responsible C.C.F. Minister, Mr. Speaker, here is what was said:

“While it is hoped that private enterprise would risk its capital in the development of Saskatchewan’s natural resources, eventually it is hoped to establish complete social ownership and management of industries in the development of our resources.”

That is from the Department of Natural Resources Report by a responsible Minister of the Crown. That is the attitude with which they approach this situation after their election to office. Does anybody think people are going to risk millions of dollars when that is the official attitude of the Government?

The Government has made much of the fact that it will carry out the decisions of Party conventions from time to time. Well, here is what its conventions decided. In 1945, their provincial convention decided this:

“The Saskatchewan Government will give consideration to early development under public ownership of gas, minerals and oil development.”

And they profess to be bound by such decisions! Can people be blamed for fearing they mean what they say? What did they pass in 1946:

“Whereas the existence of natural gas and oil in commercial quantities in the Province of Saskatchewan has been proven conclusively, and whereas the C.C.F. Party as a Socialist Party believes in and advocates the public ownership of the natural resources of this province . . .”

“Believes in and advocates.” This is what the C.C.F. Party said in 1946, two years after they were elected:

“... and whereas a resolution was passed at the 1945 convention pledging the Government of Saskatchewan to undertake the development and distribution of natural gas and oil in this province,

“Be it therefore resolved that we urge our Government

to take steps towards the implementation of the C.C.F. policy for the development and distribution of natural gas and oil under public ownership and control and for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan.”

Those good people believed that when this Government was elected, it meant what it said. They were calling on it to carry it out. That is what they passed in 1945, and that is what they passed in 1946. Then in 1947, there were questions as to why the Government was not carrying out the instructions of the convention. The Premier had to quiet the insurrection being led, I believe, by the present head of the Labour Relations Board, Mr. Makaroff. I do not know whether or not there is any connection between these facts, but at any rate the Premier, with his usual ability to quiet things down more or less . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — I have never had any success with you.

**Mr. Tucker:** — No, and you never will. And it may be that you have not quieted your own people as much as you think. Perhaps they have kept quiet finally, but perhaps they also believe you should carry out what you said you would carry out when you were elected. Perhaps they believe that. Perhaps they are sincere in that. Here’s what they said in 1947, at Saskatoon, anyway, in spite of the powers of the Premier. This is a report in the June 14, 1947 issue of the “Star-Phoenix”, (Canadian Press.)

“Policies of the C.C.F. Saskatchewan Government were condemned on two counts by the annual C.C.F. convention, Saskatoon constituency convention, here Friday night. The meeting passed a resolution viewing with disfavour resolution passed at the last Session of the Legislature providing public funds to private enterprise. They said it was incompatible with the principles of Socialism and contrary to the C.C.F. programme as laid down at annual conventions.”

I am sure the members from Saskatoon will not say that the C.C.F. members of the Party in Saskatoon, when they said this was the policy of the Party, did not know what they were talking about. Another motion deplored the failure of the Provincial Government to place the oil resources of the province under social ownership to be developed in the interests of the people.

Then you come to the national C.C.F. convention in 1948. Here is a resolution passed there:

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

That was passed by the C.C.F. national convention, in 1948. Is it surprising that we did not have people flooding into this province risking their money to develop our resources? I know the Minister of Natural Resources tried to blame it on the Liberals. He said it was their propaganda. Right in the face of these resolutions passed by their own convention,

it is very interesting, Mr. Speaker, the Premier said that development was not hampered in this province. The suggestion of the Minister Natural Resources was that the Liberals were responsible because they made speeches. Well, of course, one or the other must be wrong. As a matter of fact, I think in that regard the Minister of Natural Resources is half right. The development of natural resources has been hampered, but certainly by the avowed policies of the Party which is in power today. It could not be otherwise.

Then, of course, the Premier has to make speeches now and again. He went to Montreal, he told the Rotary Club that they really loved private enterprise. I am told that he had some of those bankers down there just convinced that he was really safer than the Liberal Party in regard to protecting private enterprise. But then he comes out and speaks to the Forum here in Regina, and here is what he has to say in the Forum, on January 10, 1949 — and, of course, the people thinking of investing money in this province they do not know; they think perhaps he might be telling what he really believes at home, not when he is down at the Rotary Club in Montreal. It is hard to know which he does mean. But here is what he said at the Forum here in Regina when he is right on his own doorstep. Then he was really ‘going to town’ about this capitalistic system:

“Our capitalist system is through. The time has come to move out into new waters, to build ourselves a new form of society.”

Well, he cannot be right then and right in Montréal. The Premier went on:

“The existing system has produced great wealth for a few, and unemployment, poverty, misery and hell for the many.”

There in the quotation marks is what the Premier said. There is a statement that he made in 1949. Is it any wonder then that the people are afraid to risk their money in this province?

Geologists claim that Saskatchewan has a potentially better oil area than Alberta, far better than Manitoba. We know what happened in Alberta. They have even found oil in Manitoba in the little part they figured they could produce oil there. Surely, Mr. Speaker, we are bound to find oil here in Saskatchewan soon, in spite of the present Government; but it is nothing like what we could have expected had not been all these resolutions passed, and all the speech-making.

I wish to deal with that for a moment or so. The propaganda sheet, the “Saskatchewan News”, says that seven million dollars will be spent this year in oil development. I wonder if that is quite a bit in comparison with what is spent in the other parts of Canada. In view of the fact that we have about 40 per cent of the potential oil resources of Western Canada, I suppose we should therefore expect about 40 per cent of the expenditure. I was amazed to find that the total expenditure in Western Canada on hunting for oil and oil development, last year, was \$150 million, of which about seven million dollars (over which the Minister of Resources goes into such ecstasy) was spent in Saskatchewan. Seven million out of one hundred and fifty million!

And here is the situation with regard to exploration. The oil industry completed 529 oil wells in Western Canada. How many in Saskatchewan? In September 1950, 127 drilling rigs at work, 114 of these in Alberta. With as much in the way of potential oil resources in Saskatchewan as in Alberta, we had ten drilling rigs at work compared to 114 in Alberta. That is what the propaganda sheet goes into ecstasy over. During the first nine months of 1950 there were 144 dry holes; the cost of these was from \$20 million to \$22 million. The Premier, when trying to persuade his own people not to pass these resolutions any more — things they believed so much in before — tells them about the dry holes, and that you cannot risk public money in hunting for oil. He did not tell them that when he was seeking office. Well you know, Mr. Speaker, the set-up of that.

Let us now see the number of geophysical parties in Western Canada in September 1950. We hear a lot from the Minister of Natural Resources about the geophysical parties, and we find that in September 1950, there were 106 out in Alberta and 12 out in Saskatchewan; Manitoba had two, or a total of 120, of which we had 12. Now Imperial Oil had its first production in Leduc in 1947; three years after this Government came into office. This company made this great development in Alberta and also is, I believe, responsible for the discovery in Manitoba and the governments of these provinces, I guess, are protecting their citizens — at least the Alberta people seem to be satisfied with their Government. We are told that company is of such a character that the Minister of Natural Resources says he will not even deal with it. Yet this is what they have done in the other two provinces. And, what has it meant to Alberta?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — He'd better get his facts straight.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, I looked it up just a couple of days ago, and I heard with my own ears the Minister say he was not going to deal with that kind of a company. That is what he said, and there is no use him trying to tell us anything different. Now then what has happened in Alberta? Alberta will receive \$55 million in the current fiscal year, from oil. If the Provincial Treasurer got his hands on that much money — sixty-five million! And then, they have reduced their debt by \$56 million already through revenue from oil. My considered opinion, Mr. Speaker, is that if this Government had not been elected we would have had the same oil development and development work in Saskatchewan.

The Premier, speaking the other day, said our potential resources were equal in regard to oil of Alberta. He said he expected to find oil ultimately and that oil would be found, oil of light quality, and he was so enthusiastic he said it might enable him to take off the Education Tax. The discovery of oil will remove it apparently. But, Mr. Speaker, if he expects that in the future, why couldn't we have had it now, and wouldn't we have had it if they had not frightened these companies out of the province? This company managed to go to Alberta and find oil. Now then, why could we not have had this development just the same as they? My hon. friend is asking, "Why couldn't we have done it?" We were in a war for six years. My hon. friend says 1905. I wonder if there was any drilling in Alberta or Manitoba in 1905! What I am speaking about is what has happened in the neighbouring provinces since the war. There is no reason why we should not have had this development, if it had not been for the fact that a Socialist Government was elected in 1944. This province has paid a very dear price for having the

C.C.F. Government in office during the last six years.

Now, it may very well be, that people are coming in and doing a bit of work in searching for oil and so on. We are glad to see it. We certainly hope that oil will be found; but there is nothing like the search going on here that there is in Alberta. Why? Because they know this — they know if oil is discovered it is the fixed policy of the C.C.F. Party to follow the will of their conventions; and it is to be expected, Mr. Speaker, that any person who supported Socialism back in 1944 had changed his mind entirely and abandoned his principles, that they will not decide if oil is discovered that they will follow the national policy of the C.C.F. and take over the oil wells should they be discovered? No matter what the Premier may say, while we have a C.C.F. Socialist Government in office in this province, nobody can be sure what is going to happen. That is the price we pay for having the present Government in office. The sooner they go to the country and give the people a chance to throw them out the better for the Province, Mr. Speaker.

We are told a great deal about the industrial development which is taking place. What do we find? We find that (and I could not get any figures except of a general nature, subsequent to 1948) there has been money invested in Canada in capital expansion at a greater rate per capita than in any other country of the world. We know that Canadians themselves are investing, because the proportion of investments by non-resident-owned capital investment in Canada went down from 38 per cent of the total in 1939 to 32 per cent in 1948, which is a good sign. Canadians are investing in the development of their own country, yes, and even people from outside are coming in.

In 1945 Saskatchewan had 926 manufacturing establishments. Well, after all the talk, and every time there is a speech made in this house by a C.C.F. member we hear of someone opening up another company, or they have heard of somebody incorporating a company or something of the sort. I was very interested, yesterday, at the reasoning of one of the gentlemen who spoke as he appeared to think that because companies were incorporated to the amount of several million dollars that meant that much money had been invested in the province. But some of the people they had entrusted with some of their licences and so on with regard to oil, etc., and mineral resources were incorporated for very large numbers of money with only a hundred dollars or so in the bank, and the fact that they incorporate for very large sums of money does not mean they have invested that much money.

Now, I would like to go on with these figures. We would have thought there had been a great increase in manufacturing establishments in Saskatchewan from 1945 to 1948, but, according to the figures brought out by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, the figures are exactly the same in each year, namely, 926. The only difference was they were employing 667 less people in those establishments three years later, and all the time we had to sit here and listen to all the beating of drums about the new businesses which were being started up in the province. Apparently when one started up another closed up. Not surprising. You start a Crown Corporation up and it frightens other people out as they think they cannot face competition from the Government which they cannot possibly meet. So it is not surprising.

In Manitoba, I saw a recent newspaper report showing 36 new manufacturing establishments in 1950, but in the same years, 1945 to 1948, there was an increase from 1,302 manufacturing establishments to 1,400,

nearly one hundred of an increase, while Saskatchewan stayed absolutely still. The went up from 1,157 establishments to 1,568 with a tremendous increase in the number of employees— over 4,000.

There, Mr. Speaker, is the situation with regard to industrial developments. Canada has been going ahead faster than at any time in her whole history but, because we had a C.C.F. Government here with its Crown Corporation legislation and its other confiscatory powers, and its avowedly Socialist policy endorsed by the Premier whenever he talks to a Forum or something like that, we are almost standing still. The great development is passing us by. I know that the Premier recently made a speech that we are now “on the verge” of some great development. Well, I look back on his speeches and see we have been on the verge of development here, the version of development there for the past three years. We have been missing these things by being “on the verge” for quite a while. What the people of the province would like would be some real development and not just be always “on the verge.”

We have heard about our great improvement with regard to the production of oil and mineral resources, and we are glad that we got up to one million barrels of heavy oil in this province. In Alberta, in the production of light oil (and after all they just discovered these new fields in 1947), they have 22 million barrels and, of course, this was not the limit of their development because until they finished the pipeline they had to hold their production down. Now, of course, I feel that members opposite may have no great faith in our development of our natural resources, but I feel that if we had had the same money and the same energy put into the hunting for oil in this province, we could have had this development, rather than Alberta.

In regard to the mineral development, what is the situation? Well, the situation is this, and this is very significant; the Premier made a great deal of this mineral development. From 1945 to 1950, the value of mineral development increased in Saskatchewan by 62 per cent — I am glad of that; but in Manitoba increased by 127 per cent, or twice as much, and in Alberta by 160 per cent, though we have more basic potential minerals than either Alberta or Manitoba, if you take everything into consideration. Why didn't we get the development? Because we have got a Government which avows these Socialist policies. Now, those are the facts Mr. Speaker, in regard to industrial development.

I would like to say a word about Crown Corporations. I do not want to say too much now, but we keep hearing about the tremendous profits that are being made by the Crown Corporations. Now, in regard to the Telephone System, it was established and a going concern in this Government came into office, having been established in 1908. It was established on the basis: not to make a profit, but to give a service to our people, and the rates were so set as to carry the cost of the system and enable it to make expansion as necessary. There was no idea at any time, Mr. Speaker, that it should make a profit. It was recognized that being in the nature of a monopoly, if it made a profit it just meant that you were charging rates higher than you should charge. This would constitute a system of secret taxation. Why call that a profit? A system of secret taxation, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Walker:** — What about Massey-Harris?

**Mr. Tucker:** — Oh, I know, you are supposed to be a lawyer; let's keep to the point. I know that this bothers you but you should take a leaf out of the book of your leader and let on it does not bother you. After all, it might be worth your while to watch sometimes.

The Power Commission was set up in 1928. This was followed shortly after by the depression, followed thereafter by the war. There was never any real chance to develop it, and no great development took place in Alberta or Manitoba during this time. This Government came into office in 1944, and what is the situation? They lump in together the Power Corporation and the Telephone System with their Crown Corporations. Why? It only can confuse the issue when you are going to talk about profits, for the Power System, like the Telephone System, is in the nature of the monopoly. By charging higher rates than you should you can show a so-called profit. If you do so it is just a form of secret taxation. The Corporations that should have been kept separate are the Corporations taken over and set up by this Government with the avowed objective of making profits and using those profits to help finance the expansion of social services. That is the thing that you have got a right to look at. And what is their record? Well the record is this. First, we heard the claim made in the 'propaganda sheet' that there were net profits of \$5,200,000 at the end of 1947. Then the claim was made of profits at the end of 1948 of \$3,152,000; and at the end of 1949, another \$3,284,000. That totals over \$11½ million supposed to be profits.

Look at all the profits, Mr. Speaker. Why don't they appear in the Public Accounts? Where is this \$11½ million of alleged profits? Not in the Public Accounts. And why they are not in the Public Accounts, Mr. Speaker, is that if you add together the profits up to that date, as I say, they amount allegedly to \$11,674,000; but \$10,317,000 is accounted for by interest payments and profits of the Telephone System and Power Corporation, which, as I suggest, are not real profits at all. That leaves the C.C.F. Crown Corporation, for all that period of time with an alleged profit of \$1,330,000. If you take out interest on money invested of \$887,000, municipal taxes that they should have paid of \$160,000, Planning Board salaries and the loss on the Fish Board and the Leather Products and Tannery, last year, of \$190,000, that amounts to \$1,437,000, \$157,000 more than their alleged profit. What would you think, Mr. Speaker, of a man who had to borrow money to put it into a business and then tried to tell his shareholders that he had net profits without first deducting the cost of doing business? Surely what he had to pay in the interest on the money he borrowed to put into that business is as much an expenditure at the wages he paid. If a private company called a thing like that "net profits" before they took off their cost of paying interest on money borrowed, and tried to sell shares by making such a claim they would be put in gaol for it. Well, that is the sort of thing that has been going on.

The Premier, before we get the Crown Corporations' Reports or a chance whatever to examine them, goes on the radio and makes a claim about profits for 1950. Well, they may be different. I would not be a bit surprised though if they are made up in the same way. Take for instance, their alleged profits in 1949. The profits claimed were \$3,284,000. Take off the Telephone and Power Corporation share and you reduce them to \$433,000. Take off \$190,584, the losses of the Fish Board, and the Leather Products and Tannery,

and you reduce it to \$242,000. The interest at 3½ per cent (and I venture to say the average cost of money to us during 1949 was more than 3½ per cent) which amounts to \$308,000, so that last year, without counting anything for taxes and charging nothing for audit costs, we had a net loss of \$65,000. Yet it was put all over this country that you had had a profit on these Crown Corporations. Well, that is the sort of thing we pay for in the 'propaganda sheet open', Mr. Speaker, to put this alleged information out all over this country.

I wish to say a word or so about rural electrification, and I won't say everything that I intended to say about this as I have been longer than I expected. But I would like merely to sketch the picture. I find at the end of 1944 there were about 500 farmers connected in Manitoba, and Manitoba in the meantime had set up a Commission to look into it. The Commission reported this. They examined what happened in Europe, they examined what happened in other parts of Canada, and they came to the conclusion that you cannot have a successful system of farm electrification unless you subsidize it at least to the extent of one-half. They amply justified that, Mr. Speaker. They said first of all that the very basis of our economy in Western Canada is the farmer, and unless you keep the farmer on the land you cut away the very foundation of your whole society in Western Canada. They maintained they were justified in spending money in striving to keep the population on the farms. Then, they took the attitude that if a man is willing to live on a farm, working the longer hours he must work on a farm, sometimes work seven days a week not five, then at any rate he should have for himself and his family the same amenities of life that they could have if they moved into the city. And that is only fair again, too, with a province that is so dependent upon the farming industry. In fairness to them everything possible should be done to take to them the same amenities of life as people in the city enjoy. We could not exist without our farm population, and they should have those amenities in places that are settled thickly enough to permit it at all. So Manitoba recommended that the State should assume half the capital costs of farm electrification scheme, and that they should take electricity rates in the farmer's door, and all he had to do was wire his buildings and provide the fixtures to use electricity. They came to that conclusion after examining the situation not only here but in Europe, and they went ahead with that plan.

I want to point out that when they started in 1945, they had only 500 farmers connected up. And what do we find is their situation today? Well, their scheme is working. Manitoba has 22,000 farmers connected now, an increase from 500 to 22,000. She now has got 40 per cent of her farmers connected. In our province also action was taken to look into the matter. The Saskatchewan Reconstruction Council was asked to study this problem, and they reported as follows:

"As agriculture is the principal industry of Saskatchewan and the population is predominantly agricultural, even more so than Manitoba, it is more important for us, not only in fairness to the farmers, but in the best interest of the province and the future, that everything be done to make living conditions on the farm attractive; the wide use of electricity and labour saving devices, increased efficiency of electric electrical appliances, new uses for electric power in farming and household



operations, emphasized the responsibility of the Government to provide this service for our farmers in connection with their work and in their homes.”

Now, that that report was before this government when it came into office. At the beginning of 1945, there were 137 farmers connected: 500 in Manitoba, and 137 in Saskatchewan connected with electricity. What do we find? We find here that this government did not do anything for years, then it began to take some interest in this important matter. It passed an Act under which the farmer must pay approximately two-thirds of the cost of being connected with the high-line. It is realized now that that is holding the whole thing up, so now they are going to loan money to the farmer to help them pay that cost — lure him into debt, while in Manitoba he has got to pay none of it. And we in Saskatchewan have rates based on the idea that the system, so important to our farmers, must be entirely self-supporting. Of course, that is reflected in the rates. Here’s the situation. We, starting with 137 farmers have approximately 5,000 connected . . .

**Hon. Mr. McIntosh:** — That’s after 25 years.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Yes, after 25 years in Manitoba too. I am glad to see the Minister of Municipal Affairs has managed to stay awake this long listening to me.

**Premier Douglas:** — It’s harder than you think.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, I think that is quite a compliment and I realize that, and I am very much encouraged when the Minister of Municipal affairs is listening. What is the situation? The situation is that we have four per cent of our farmers connected and Manitoba 40 per cent of hers, starting with very little difference in the number connected to begin with, in 1944. Alberta had only a few farmers connected before World War 2, and about 12,000 have now been connected; 13 per cent of her farmers. So there is quite a difference. Here is this Government wasting its energies and money in Socialist schemes. It has got four per cent of the farmers connected, Alberta 13 per cent and Manitoba 40 per cent.

What are the farmers having to pay? Well, the farmers are having to pay per 100 kilowatt hours, in Manitoba \$4.50 and in Saskatchewan \$8.10. Our farmers have to pay large sums of money to get connected up that they do not have to pay in Manitoba. Then when they get electricity, they have got to pay almost twice as much per month for the first hundred kilowatts.

**Mr. Kuziak:** — What about 1943?

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, you can ask your own Minister that. But in 1943 there were only a little over a hundred connected and 500 in Manitoba, so your question is just as much to the point as your questions usually are.

I know that it is sometimes said that after all we have not got so much water power. But I ask you to look at the cost of generating electricity in Saskatoon, where they have got to haul coal all the way to Saskatoon, and after you provide for all costs, including the cost of the money, the interest on the money invested there, and fair depreciation, provide for everything, the last figures I saw for generating electricity

there was approximately .9 cents — less than one cent a kilowatt. That is little more than one-half cent more per kilowatt in the cost of hydro-electric power, the cheapest of it being generated in Manitoba. I am quite sure that when you can generate your electricity right at the head of the mine as you can at Estevan, that you can cut that cost down so that there will not be very much difference between the cost of generating by hydro-electric developments, than by generating by using the coal rate at the pit mouth.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — How about transmission?

**Mr. Tucker:** — Transmission, it does not cost any more to transmit electricity in Saskatchewan than it does in Manitoba for the same distance, and after all if there is a slight difference in the density of population between the part of our province that you could electrify and the part you can electrify in Manitoba (they cannot electrify all of Manitoba either), there is all the more reason then for the State giving at least as much help to the farmers as there is given in Manitoba. Well, there is situation. It is not for lack of revenue we have so little done. Manitoba's revenues in 1950-51 were \$39½ million; we have got revenues of \$55 million. Why is that we cannot do as much for our farmers as the Government of Manitoba? Well, let the Government try to answer that.

I want to say a word about redistribution and then I am through. I understand that a Redistribution Bill is to be introduced. All I want to say about it is that I think that this province will expect a Bill whereby all parts of the province will be treated fairly. It has always been recognized that for the country districts to have equal say in the government of our province, they should have more members proportionately than the cities, because if the same number are in the city as the country the city will have influence on the government out of proportion. In the cities you have got your newspapers that circulate all over the whole problem; you have got your trade unions which are able to meet together, and you have got your boards of trade which are able to meet together; you have got your citizens who are able to meet together more easily. They can meet and pass resolutions much easier than they can in the country and thereby influence public opinion. In the legislatures you can redress the balance to some extent by giving somewhat more representation to the rural areas, so that each part of the country will have a fair share in the government of the province. This principle has always been recognized throughout Canada and I am hoping it will be recognized in the Redistribution Bill this Government is going to bring in.

**Mr. Walker:** — It's all settled, Walter!

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, my learned friend across here says it is all settled. I suppose he is speaking for the Government again. But I would suggest to him that when his leader in here, the Premier, the Attorney-General and the other experienced members of the House here, members of the Government it would probably be at a good thing for him not to undertake to speak for the Government. He may have such a low opinion of them that he thinks they need to be spoken for, but after all, I do not think they share that opinion with him.

All I will say further about redistribution is that we will await that Bill with interest. If it is based upon a fair appreciation of the

situation and fairness to all parts of the province, then, of course, we will not have much difficulty in supporting it; but I would like to say, though, that if it shows the attitude of unfairness toward towards the rural areas in the province, we will oppose it with all the strength we can bring to bear.

We are waiting also with suitable interest the Election Act to see if the C.C.F. Party is going to carry out its policies in regard to a certain promise that I will not take time to mention now, or whether that is going to be another promise that is going to be forgotten.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before resuming my seat I move, seconded by Mr. Danielson, that the following words be added to the Address:

“but regrets that the measures proposed to assist municipalities are inadequate in that they do not propose abolition of the Public Revenues Tax or Taxation of Crown Corporations engaged in Commercial enterprise.”

I move that motion.

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

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I should like to extend my congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne and congratulate the member from Kelvington (Mr. Howe), who is now one of the oldest and most experienced members on this side of the House, who I am sure, conducted himself yesterday in a manner that not only made us that sit with him feel proud of him, but I am sure brought honour to the people whom he represents in this Legislative Assembly.

I would also like to extend my congratulations to the member for Elrose (Mr. Willis) for the very fine speech he made yesterday. I hope his sensitive feelings have not been touched by the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition that being a teacher, he does not know anything about farm problems. I do not think that was very nice thing for the Leader of the Opposition to say, when they took a teacher from Lemberg, Saskatchewan, and made him Federal Minister of Agriculture. Now, I'll promise the Leader of the Opposition not to tell the Federal Minister of Agriculture what he said, and hope that it will not be noticed.

I should like to extend my thanks to the Leader of the Opposition for the very kind words he said yesterday, with reference to Frank Jaenicke, and thank him for the expression of sympathy which he extended to those of us who were associated politically with Frank Jaenicke and those of us who were privileged to be his friend. I am sure that all members of this House will join in extending to Mrs. Jaenicke our deepest sympathy at this very sad loss.

I should also like to join with the Leader of the Opposition, and others who have spoken, and say how much we regret the fact that the member from Kinistino (Mr. Woods) is not with us in the opening days of the Session, and to hope that he will soon speed we recover and be able to take his place

in our midst again. The same also is true for the Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Sturdy) who has had a recurrence of the trouble which put him in hospital a short time ago. We are hoping it is not too serious, and that he may be back in the House in the course of a few days.

I should also like to extend to you, Sir, my congratulations on the trip which you made to New Zealand and Australia, representing this Legislative Assembly, and I am hoping that sometime during the Session it will be possible for us to have some sort of an informal meeting at which you can tell us of your trip, or how you conducted yourself at the Conference — Conference proper — and it may be that the Clerk of the House can get some information as to how you conducted yourself away from the Conference which we could pass on to the members, which I am sure would be of interest.

I am sure, also, that all the members will join with what the Leader of the Opposition has said with reference to the member for Gravelbourg. I say the member for Gravelbourg — I am not sure whether his resignation has come in or not, but either the member or former member for Gravelbourg. The Leader of the Opposition has been very confident today about what is going to happen at the next election. The member for Gravelbourg did not share that confidence and decided to go to a safer and more permanent position.

**Mr. Dundas:**— You'd better get ready.

**Premier Douglas:** — I would like to say, however, that I'm sure all of us who had the privilege of working with him, both in the Assembly and in the Committee of this House, enjoyed his jovial wit, were deeply conscious of the fine contribution he made as a member of the Assembly, and that we congratulate him on the promotion which has come to him.

Also, I would like to extend a welcome to the members of the University Forum who are privileged to be with us here today. I am sure it has been a unique experience for them. I am sure they have learned something here today that will help them in their University Form work. I am sure they will have learned one lesson and that is that the length of the speech is always in inverse proportion to the quality of the material, and I am sure that from that they will have learned to cut down the material so as to make their speeches as effective as possible when they go back to take part in the debates in the University.

Now, Mr. Speaker having made those few remarks, and noticing these young people are getting extremely hungry, having already been made extremely bored, I should like to beg leave to move the adjournment of the Debate.

The Assembly adjourned at 5.40 o'clock p.m.