

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN  
Third Session — Eleventh Legislature  
6th Day

Thursday, February 8, 1951

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

**DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY**

The House resumed, from Wednesday, February 7, 1951, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Howe for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Tucker.

**Mr. J.W. Horsman (Wilkie):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in this debate, I would like first to congratulate those members who have already taken part in the debate, especially our leader, Mr. Tucker, and the Premier and others who have preceded me. I represent a constituency, as I suppose you all know, in the west central part of the province. It is a very good constituency, but I am sorry to state that I cannot boast, as many other members, especially those on the Government side do boast about the wonderful things that the Government has done in their constituencies since it came to office in 1944. There is one thing we need more than anything else, perhaps, and that is roads. During all these years, Mr. Speaker, we have never had one mile of new construction on highways. A few miles have been rebuilt and a few miles gravelled; but we have never had any new construction, although millions of dollars, we all know, have been spent on highways.

I am rather proud of our constituency up there. It is good land, almost all of it under cultivation; the land is of good quality. Some of it is the same kind of soil that you have around Regina, and it is classified for assessment purposes as Regina heavy clay. In any year that we have a little rain up in that country, I do not think that I am making an overstatement when I say that we can grow more grain there than the average constituency in Saskatchewan, and have. Unity and Wilkie also are at the centre of the brome-grass area of Saskatchewan; I believe the centre of the brome-grass area of Canada. I do not know of any other place where brome-grass is grown on such a scale for seed as it is there. We do not grow brome up there by the hundreds of pounds or by the thousands of pounds. We grow it by the millions of pounds. I know one farmer there who has 1,000 acres sown to brome-grass, and many others have up to 500 acres. The Federal Grain Company have a plant in Unity for cleaning the brome-grass seed. This plant runs almost the entire year on a 24-hour basis. They handle several million pounds a year and I know they do not handle half the brome-grass that is grown in that country.

Then we have a gas field at Unity and we have a power plant operated by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. That gas is supplied to the plant to fuel their engine — they have a dry gas engine plant. Power lines are built out from the town and run right south to Kindersley and all over the country. That is the cheapest power in Saskatchewan, with probably the exception of Estevan. We have also a salt plant there, built a few years ago at a cost of about \$2 1/2 million. It also operates on a 24-hour basis, employing quite a few people.

**February 8, 1951**

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers in that country buy gasoline, they buy motor licenses and all that sort of thing and there is great income comes from that constituency into the Government's coffers. No doubt the Government gets a royalty on the gas in that gas field, and I suppose they get a royalty from the salt, and they must make a profit from the power plant up there. All these things added together, Mr. Speaker, must make considerable revenue coming from that part of the country to the Provincial Treasury here in Regina. Yet, in spite of all these things, as I have said before, we have not had one dollar spent on new construction of highways for almost 20 years, none at all since this Government came into power.

I am sandwiched in there between three or four constituencies represented by members on the Government side of the House. I have the distinction, though, of having very eminent gentlemen for my neighbours there, in surrounding constituencies. On the north I have a Cabinet Minister, the Hon. I. C. Nollet, on the east the Hon. Woodrow Lloyd, the Minister of Education from Biggar, and on the south-east just in the corner of my constituency, the Hon. J.T Douglas, Minister of Highways, and on the south, Mr. John Wellbelove, the member for Kerrobert-Kindersley, not a Cabinet Minister but he is almost as good as a Cabinet Minister because he is Deputy Speaker of the House. Now, I feel kind of proud of having such very distinguished neighbours there, but there is just this to kick about — they get all the money and I get none, and that is what I mean about highways. I have a report here just to show you . . .

**Government Member:** — Could we have it tabled?

**Mr. Horsman:** — The report is tabled in the House here. It will show you the difference between the money that has been spent in my constituency and what has been spent in the surrounding constituencies. This is a report of 1947 and 1948. It is a year or two old, but there is no change in the condition since, no change at all, we have not had any money spent since that. Here is the Biggar constituency: On earth construction and reconstruction in that year, \$122,415.58; on gravelling and surfacing roads, \$128,418.22, which with maintenance and other items, makes a total of \$313,965.63. Now here is Cut Knife just to the north: on construction, \$36,768.72; surfacing \$7,905.30, with a total of \$98,424.29. Now, wait till I find Kerrobert-Kindersley, it is here somewhere. That same year, on construction and reconstruction \$117,036.35, surfacing \$61,780.39, total, when you include maintenance and so on, \$245,108.50. That is a lot of money in anybody's language, and here is another report for another year to show you that that was not only in one year. Oh, but I forgot Wilkie. I forgot the important constituency up there. I forgot to tell you how much they spent in Wilkie that year. Well, I said we had nothing spent on construction. I said not one mile of construction; I did not overstate it. On construction and reconstruction (there was a wash-out on the road someplace), they spent \$291.14; nothing at all on surfacing; total of all items, \$25,123.08.

Now here is the other report for the year ending December 31, 1948. Biggar — construction \$25,481.08, surfacing (that is levelling and blacktop), \$158,078.29; a total of \$228,939.21. Cut Knife — construction \$120,276.68; gravelling \$65,468.54; a total of \$257,913.64. Kerrobert-Kindersley — construction \$135,950.54; surfacing \$75,495.09; a total of \$272,214.78. Wilkie — construction and reconstruction zero; surfacing zero; total for all items \$26,936.21. I am just quoting these figures to show you the difference.

Now I do not know if that is proper treatment or not. I do not know what to think about it; but as I have pointed out to you, I think the revenue from that constituency is as great as, and probably greater than that

from the average constituency in this province. When so much money is being spent in surrounding constituencies you would naturally suppose that we would get some consideration. I would hate, Mr. Speaker, to be brought to the conclusion that discrimination would have anything to do with that; that the mere fact that Wilkie happens to be represented by a Liberal member might be one of the reasons why there has been no money spent there on road surfacing. I would hate to be brought to that conclusion, Mr. Speaker.

As I said, I congratulate those who have spoken, now I will take issue with a few things that have been said by former speakers. The hon. member for Kelvington (Mr. Howe) in moving the Address in Reply to the Throne Speech made a very good speech. I will admit that; but I can not say that I agree with everything he said. Of course, he started out early in his speech with the same old time-worn theory about the hard times in the 1930's, and tried to draw comparisons between that time and the period between 1944 and the present. Of course there is no need of comparison there at all; it is not fair comparison. It is ridiculous, and I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that it is just as ridiculous to blame the hard times of the '30's on the Government of that day as it would be to blame the present Government for the fact that we had a disastrous frost last summer, and very bad harvest weather last fall. There is not any difference; just as ridiculous. He pointed out that the reason the Liberals were kicked out of office in 1944 was not because of what they did because they did not do anything. That may be true. There must have been some very good reason because they certainly got kicked out; there is no question about that. But, I would like to point out to hon. members of this House that there has been quite a change in public opinion since 1944. We have had two good examples of it. We had the Provincial election of 1948 and even a better example of it was the Federal election of 1949. I would just like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I think the writing is on the wall. I do not think it is hard to read. I do not believe we need a Prophet Daniel to read it for us. It is too plain for that.

The hon. gentleman also had quite a bit to say about farm prices, the prices of grain. He quoted the price of the initial payment of wheat at \$1.40. I think the gentleman made a mistake there; anyone might make a mistake. He no doubt has not been aware that before he spoke the initial price had been raised by 20 cents and stood at \$1.00. The price of coarse grains had also been raised and I do not think there is much difference in the initial price of coarse grains and what there was last year. I believe it was about the same. Well, there was an increase in the initial payment of 20 cents all across the board. I think that came as a surprise to a good many people. I do not think that even many farmers expected 20 cents more on seed wheat. I know one farmer that did not. That was our Minister of Agriculture when he made the statement in Saskatoon (I think it was) that anyone who had received an initial payment on seed wheat had all they were going to get. So you can see how wrong we can be in these prophecies of disaster and things like that.

Surely this criticism of the wheat marketing policy, or the grain marketing policy, can not be meant to try to undermine the policies, that the farmers of this country have strived for for so long. For many years they sought some system of marketing to get away from the speculative markets that we always had to contend with. Any such criticism of the Wheat Board just stirs up dissatisfaction among the farmers, and must have a detrimental effect on that, and might, in time, have a tendency to upset our plans in that regard.

February 8, 1951

The reduction in the purchasing power of the farmer is a thing that you hear a lot about. The hon. member from Kelvington mentioned that too. I just want to state, Mr. Speaker, that the purchasing power of the farmers, this fall, is down, I suppose, if you take the province only. But the reason is not so much prices as it was the disastrous frost we had last summer, and the lack of harvest weather that we had last fall, and on that account, in many areas half of the crop is under the snow. In my own district, at least half of the crop is out under the snow. Well, if your crop is out under the snow, naturally your purchasing power is going to be down. There is not any question about that. He also mentioned (and it was mentioned in the Cronkite-Jacobs report) that farm taxation was not too high in relation to farm income. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that that statement, or that clause, is only half correct. That is correct in areas where crops have been good, but it is not correct, Mr. Speaker, in areas where crops have been poor. I can take you into many parts of this province — every hon. gentleman in this House knows it, too — where there has been no crop and you will find that taxes are plenty high enough. They are just high enough that people can not pay them, and they are piling up in arrears in many places; but I do believe that where the crops are good, taxes are not too high.

Price controls and other things were mentioned. That is a very difficult proposition. The hon. member for Kelvington did not mention, however, that when we have to resort to price controls in Canada, sometime in the not very distant future perhaps, in order to control prices, wages would likely have to be controlled as well. I do not think it is even reasonable, Mr. Speaker, to say that you can clamp the lid on tight and not have some control over wages. Now, no one likes to see labouring men paid well any better than I do. I have done lots of work for wages myself, sometimes very low wages. I have every sympathy for the working man; but at the same time, you can take any product you like to mention — take lumber. I used to work in the lumber camps at one time for about \$35 a month. Go into the lumber camps today, and see what those men are paid: \$5 to \$10 and more than that a day. All the way down the line it is the same thing — mills, and freight and everything else is up, and principally on account, of wages. And when the finished product comes and you buy it to build a house, then it is wages again. I do not see how you can control these prices, Mr. Speaker, unless you can control wages as well.

The hon. member thought, too, that prices should be rolled back. I do not suppose he meant farm prices. I wonder if the hon. gentleman would go back to his constituency and tell the farmers there that prices of beef should be rolled back. There is not any question, Mr. Speaker, that beef is at an all-time high. It is selling at a price on the hoof that no farmer ever dreamed of getting for beef in this country; no, never dreamed of it. Now, I would not go back to my constituency, I would not dare go back and tell them that I would advocate rolling back prices on beef. If you start rolling prices back, they will be rolled back wherever they are too high. There is not any question about that.

The hon. gentleman also mentioned the Union hospitals, how they have been built and extended in recent years. Very true. One of the reasons was because it has been a time of high income, high revenue; there has been money in the country. Coupled with that, we have had grants from the Dominion Government which we did not have many years ago, which helps in that direction. And that is why the Provincial Government could spend it. But there is one thing I would like to mention about Union hospitals, while I am on my feet.

I have had a little to do with it. When the Union hospital is built there is an area mapped out, and that area is responsible for the capital cost of the hospital. In our case we have one complete municipality, half of another one and three townships each of three others, which form the area. But the people outside the hospital area use the hospital just as much as those inside and pay no taxes, unless it is very recently that they have. I do not remember any amendment along that line, and I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Public Health to that fact. I think that areas outside Municipal Hospital Districts should pay some tax to help with the burden of running those hospitals.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I had a report, and I think every member has, which has been presented to the Government by the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union. There are a great many recommendations in that report. I do not agree with them all; but it does mention in that report a good deal about farm insulation, rural isolation. That is a very real thing in many parts of the country in the winter months. That is one of the reasons why people move to town in the winter. That is one of the reasons why there is not more mixed farming, that there is not more livestock in the country; because, sooner than live on the farms in the winter, many of them do move to town.

Some of their ideas regarding that question, I do not agree with, but there are a couple of pretty good suggestions. One was better roads, more all weather roads. Another, of course, was farm electrification. I think those two things would help more than anything else, perhaps, to keep the people on the farms during the winter months. I know, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Highways, can not build good roads or highways to everyone's door. That is impossible. I do believe, however, that an arrangement could be entered into with the rural municipalities so that main market roads could be built to many parts of the rural municipality. It has always been my contention that if a municipality has good machinery (and most of them have nowadays) and would build a road up to a certain standard, a pretty good road, the Government should put gravel on that road, a few miles a year, say 10 or 15 miles a year. Then in 10 years we would have a system of roads through the province that you can get anywhere on. Surely, the people pay enough for these roads. We do not mind building hard-surface highways in many parts of the province. We have a highway from the border running north expected to be built up to the northern lakes, Waskesiu, Prince Albert, and all up that way, and the main excuse for spending all that money on that highway is to encourage tourists from the United States to come in here and fish in the summer or come in the fall and shoot a few deer and a few things like that. I am not trying to minimize the good effect of the tourist trade in Canada; but I do say that, compared to agriculture, the tourist trade in Saskatchewan does not amount to anything at all. I think money could be far better spent in the best interest of this province if some of that money was scattered out to areas like my own constituency where they need roads very badly.

I just want to say a word about natural resources. One thing I would like to say before I forget is this. I believe that, on land where oil is struck and on which the landowner does not hold the oil rights or the mineral rights, in many cases a small royalty should be paid to those people who own the land, All they get out of it is surface damage, and you can go and drill as many as four wells on a quarter-section of land. Now, I think everyone in this House knows what it would be like trying to farm a quarter-section of land with four oil wells on it. I do not think it would be worth farming, and I

February 8, 1951

believe that in cases where oil is struck on land on which the owners have no oil rights, some small part of the royalty paid to the Government should be paid to the land owner. I think there is quite an agitation through the country for that, too.

Mention was made in the Throne Speech that oil has been struck this summer at Heart's Hill. That oil well is just a few miles outside of my constituency. We have not struck any oil in my constituency, this year, although there is quite a lot of work going on. We also have up in that country deposits of potash, which everyone knows about, possibly the greatest deposits of potash known anywhere; but no development, although I understand when I read the 'Saskatchewan News' that the Government was willing to give leases or concessions or whatever was necessary towards the development of that potash. So far, however, there has been no development. I sometimes wonder why it is that a product that is not manufactured or mined anywhere in Canada remains undeveloped. It seems to me that it should be a good money-making proposition if anyone wanted to take it up.

Then there are the natural resources in the north country. Northern Saskatchewan is no doubt a very rich land — we all believe that to be the case — not in oil, but in mineral. Many important strikes have been made there according to a publication of the Natural Resources Department. So far there has been no development, or very little, except the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company which has been working up there for years and years. I just read these things, and I wonder why it is that down in Quebec now, millions and millions of dollars are being poured into Northern Quebec to develop the mineral resources of that province. There seems to be something wrong. I wonder if the investing public has lost confidence, or if the Government has lost the confidence of the investing public, and feel that it is not safe for some reason to invest money in Saskatchewan. It is a well-known fact, of course, that every Socialist will tell you that they believe all these resources should be owned, controlled and operated by the State. And when you consider the legislation that is on the statute books of Saskatchewan (I do not need to mention what it is), there is some excuse, perhaps, for investors being a little bit leery of investing their money here, regardless of all the assurances that the Government may give.

I would just like to say a word or two about the international situation. I think the 'free' world of today is in greater danger than we have ever experienced. I do believe that; I think everyone does. Unless the free nations of the world stand together they will no doubt fall separately if things keep on the way they are now. We are faced with dangers not only from without, but from within. We have had that experience here before. You remember the 'spy ring' in Ottawa, a few years ago? There were men brought up and questioned on the witness stand there and they said that they had a higher loyalty than their loyalty to Canada. That is the great danger that we face.

I mentioned, last year, the threat of Communism across Europe. I said that it could only be stopped by armed force, and I was accused of being a war-monger, Mr. Speaker. But we well know how those things happen. We know about Czechoslovakia. We do not need to go back into its history; only mention it. Assaults from without and treason from within is the way those countries have been taken over.

The Premier went into this matter very thoroughly, and he criticized the nations for signing a pact that branded Communist China as an aggressor. Well, of course, I think everything was done that could have been done to try to settle that dispute by peaceful negotiation. China refused, as I understand, unless everything was handed to her that she wanted before a cease-fire order would be allowed. But I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that, as far as the admission of China into the United Nations goes, there is any reason why she should not have been admitted, and I think that had she stayed out of Korea she would have been admitted into the United Nations. I am quite sure of that. But I do not think that China had a right to go out and try to shoot her way into the United Nations. I do not think they have that right, and when there are a couple of hundred thousand Chinese fighting in Korea and the Chinese Government make such a ridiculous statement as to say that those men had just volunteered, that it was no responsibility of the Government, then I do not know what could be done about it. We know well enough that a Communist Government is a dictator government, a slave government according to our standards, and we do not want any of that stuff with us. I maintain that unless the free nations of the world stand together, they were never in such great danger as they are now. We want peace; everyone does. It makes us shudder to think that we might be engaged in another war. But then we must make some policy, then follow that policy and stick together on it, if our representatives had not voted for that motion in the United Nations Assembly, there was no option except to vote for the Communist bloc. I do not think we wanted them to do that. I think all members of this House would agree that we want to preserve our way of life.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to quote a word or two from something that Mr. Pearson said when he was speaking in the House of Commons, a few days ago. He said this:

"There are qualities in the minds, the souls and the hearts of free men which can never be matched by slavery."

Mr. Speaker, I will not support the motion.

**Mr. J.G. Egnatoff (Melfort):** — Mr. Speaker, I wish, first of all, to tender my sincere congratulations to both the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. In particular, I wish to commend the hon. member for Elrose (Mr. Willis) and I wish to commend him because of the stand which he took approving the Canadian policy taken at the United Nations. In my opinion, it is unfortunate that the hon. Premier of this Socialist Government of Saskatchewan, in his address yesterday, did not share the very sensible views of the hon. member for Elrose in this regard.

Before commenting on the Premier's address of yesterday, I wish to say that the people of Melfort and I, myself, are very happy about at least one paragraph in the Speech from the Throne, and that is the paragraph that forecasts the construction of the Melfort Home for the Aged to begin during the coming year. Now, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, I do not care whether the construction work will commence just before an election or not, as long as the construction work does commence; and I have every confidence in the Government's intention to definitely fulfil this promise, even though it has been talking about fulfilling it for years, and later than the original promise which was made. I do want to assure the Government of this province that in the mayor and the councillors of the town of Melfort they will find a very co-operative group of men. They will co-operate with the Government as much as is humanly

**February 8, 1951**

possible to see that the construction of that home is commenced and that it will be concluded.

I wish to deal, Mr. Speaker, for a few minutes with two major aspects of the hon. Premier's address of yesterday, namely, his remarks in connection with the foreign policy of the C.C.F. Party, and secondly, with his rather scathing and unwarranted attack on the Canadian Wheat Board.

With parts of the Premier's remarks when he enunciated and elucidated so eloquently the foreign policy of the national-socialist party of Canada, I think all of us can agree. There are, however, some statements that were made by the Premier with which I feel that every hon. member of this House ought to take issue; and, as a matter of fact, I was very pleased to note the expression of disapproval on several of the members on the Government side as the Premier was talking yesterday. I have wondered where the hon. Premier stood with regard to the Chinese aggression in Korea, and he is entitled to his opinion in that regard. He revealed it to this House very clearly in justifying the action of his national-socialist leader in the House of Commons.

The very definite and serious implication of the speech of the hon. Premier, yesterday, was that perhaps the Chinese were justified in the action they took in Korea. He seemed to regard the thought that the 44 nations who condemned Chinese aggression in Korea, while at the same time making it plain that they were ready at any time to negotiate with the people's government in China in an endeavour to arrive at a peaceful settlement "might be actually bolstering up discredited governments and endeavouring to reimpose them upon people who did not want them". Now that is a very serious attitude to take and an extremely dangerous one to take.

In view of the fact that the United Nations voted unanimously, except for the Soviet Union, to oppose aggression in Korea, and called on all countries to assist in opposing that aggression when the North Korean government only was involved, if they had not at least gone so far as to brand the action of the Chinese people's republic as aggression, the United Nations would have lost all its moral authority. Surely it would have been said then that the United Nations did not hesitate to brand North Korea, a small country, when it committed an act of aggression, but did not have the moral fibre to brand a larger country like Communist China when it committed a very similar act of aggression. If they had not been able to come out definitely and label that Chinese act as an aggressive act, it would have been the downfall of the United Nations. Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness I think every member of this House should realize that the Governments of the United Kingdom, of France, Belgium, Holland, New Zealand, Australia and in the remaining 44 countries which voted for the resolution naming China as an aggressor, and at the same time setting up a 'good offices' committee to endeavour to arrange a peaceful settlement, were just as concerned about the preservation and maintenance of peace as the socialist Premier of Saskatchewan.

While the Premier was speaking, yesterday, I could not help but wonder, had he been the Secretary of State for External Affairs for Canada, attending the United Nations as our Canadian delegate, which way he would have voted on that resolution. I could not help but feel, in view of what he said yesterday, that he would have, under all the circumstances which he stated, voted with India, Burma and the Soviet Bloc. Now when all countries, with the exception of Burma, India and the Soviet Bloc voted for that resolution, I think



their leaders, together with the peace-loving representatives of the United States in the United Nations, were very much concerned about the satisfaction which the Soviet Union would have received had that Chinese act of aggression not been labelled as such. As a matter of fact, had the 44 nations not stood together it would have indicated to the Soviet Union that there was disunity, disunity of purpose, among the so called freedom-loving nations.

And, Mr. Speaker, what would have been our position? We are regarded as the good neighbour of the United States. The Soviet Union would have felt that we could not be relied upon to go along with the powers that had signed the North Atlantic Security Pact as well. I am sure that the Soviet Union would have regarded this as a sign that if they moved in Europe to take over the rest of Western Europe, they could rely on real disunity among the free nations of the world. Surely Canada should not take the lead in giving this feeling to the Soviet Union.

Hon. members know that it has been demonstrated time and time again that the only way to preserve peace is for the freedom- and peace-loving nations to demonstrate, beyond any shadow of doubt, to countries which have dictators, like the Soviet Union, that the free nations are prepared to stand together. It is necessary to convince aggressor nations that aggression will not pay, and that aggression will inevitably lead to failure.

Now to me, Mr. Speaker, it is a very sad thing to know that, while we have asked young Canadians to go to Korea to fight against aggression there, and while young Americans are fighting aggression there, we have in this province a Premier who suggests that perhaps China has some right to be doing what she is doing — namely, committing an act of aggression instead of referring her grievances to peaceful discussions as she has been repeatedly invited to do. I think, for the Premier to have taken the attitude that he did take, yesterday, was to throw a considerable shadow of doubt on the justice of our action in Korea. Surely, Mr. Speaker, it should be clear by this time that the only way we can secure peace is for the freedom-loving nations to make up their minds that they will stand together in opposing aggression.

There is no hope, in my opinion, for successfully opposing aggression if the United States is to be abandoned by the other western nations by their attempting to set up a so-called third force. The third force, it has become very apparent now, consists, at the present time, of Burma, India and the Soviet Bloc, and it is with that group that the Premier would have had the Canadian delegate at the United Nations vote. If this were to become the policy of Canada and other western nations, the Soviet Union would feel that she would not meet strong opposition if she attempted to carry out aggression in the Middle East, or in Europe generally. And again, it seems to me that the Premier's words, yesterday, constituted a criticism not only of our own Canadian policy, but also a criticism of the other 43 nations that voted in favour of that resolution. As for myself, Mr. Speaker, I would rather rely on the leaders of the 44 countries for their sound judgment and for their sincere desire for peace than on the foreign policy that was enunciated and elucidated here yesterday by the Premier.

Strangely enough, in the discussion of his foreign policy, at no time yesterday did the Premier come out and say, "We stand behind the United Nations". That was something that he hedged about. The only conclusion that I could arrive at was when Nelson Clark, leader of the Labour-Progressive party in Saskatchewan,

**February 8, 1951**

would hear the words that were quoted by the Premier, he would be very happy indeed. As a matter of fact, what the Premier of this province says is quoted far and wide, not only in Canada but throughout the world, and I can just imagine the Kremlin propaganda agency making use of good portions of it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words concerning what the hon. Premier said, yesterday, about the policies of the Canadian Wheat Board. The Leader of the Opposition had quoted the opinions of outstanding farm leaders like Mr. Wesson, who are defending the Wheat Board, who are anxious that the Wheat Board be continued because they regard it as the best method of marketing grain; and when the hon. Leader of the Opposition was quoting the opinions of these men, the Premier thought that was trying to blackmail him. Nobody is trying to blackmail the hon. Premier. He is entitled to his opinion. If he wants to line up with the Winnipeg Grain Exchange in trying to undermine the Canadian Wheat Board, that is his right and his privilege. Some hon. members opposite laugh; but that is understandable. When the Premier was speaking with regard to the initial payment, which was increased, from \$1.40 to \$1.60 per bushel for No. 1 Northern f.o.b. Fort William, he said something to this effect: "This time they" (and I presume he was referring to the Wheat Board) "are holding back about 28 cents per bushel and will hold that back for a political pork-barrel". Now I went to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that anyone who accuses the Canadian Wheat Board of such a policy is doing nothing less than undermining the Canadian Wheat Board. Again, strangely enough . . .

(interruption by Premier Douglas)

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — You don't understand logic, or recognize it when you hear it.

Mr. Speaker, strangely enough I do not recall the Premier at any time during his address yesterday, coming out and saying, "I and the C.C.F. Government of Saskatchewan support the Canadian Wheat Board".

**Premier Douglas:** — I was fighting for the Wheat Board when you were in swaddling clothes.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Did you change your mind?

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — If the hon. Premier was fighting for the Wheat Board when I was in swaddling clothes, he is a much older man than I think he is, and if he was fighting for the Wheat Board I wish he would stop his flamboyant addresses over the radio, and even in this House, trying, either deliberately or unwittingly, to undermine that great institution which the farmers of Canada have fought for and which they want. I have no hesitation in saying, Mr. Speaker, that as far as the members of this side of the House are concerned, we are 100 per cent behind the Wheat Board. We are behind the Wheat Board because we believe that that is the system of marketing grain which the farmers have wanted and which they still want, and you may rest assured, Mr. Speaker, that we are not going to run around the country or make radio addresses which may undermine the Wheat Board, which may be leading to its downfall and to a reversion of the old speculative system of handling grain.

That that has been our attitude is indicated by the resolution which was passed at the Liberal convention in Saskatoon, last fall. I wish to read that resolution at this time, because it indicates the attitude of the members on this side of the House towards the Anglo-Canadian Wheat Agreement and the five-year pool. I am reading the resolution that was passed at that time:

"RESOLVED that the Federal Government be asked to re-open negotiations with the British Government in regard to obtaining a fair settlement under the 'have-regard' clause under the Canada-United Kingdom Wheat Agreement, in respect of the 600 million bushels of wheat supplied under that agreement;

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that if the British Government maintains its refusal to admit further liability, or a fair liability, in the matter, that the Canadian Government be asked to accept full responsibility for the obligation implied in this clause, and that such be paid as a cash settlement to the Wheat Board in order that it may include it in the settlement of the five-year pool;

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Canadian Government be asked to make a substantial payment to the Wheat Board to compensate for the wheat taken from the Wheat Board for domestic consumption, between March 1, 1945, and February 17, 1947, at \$1.25 per bushel, which price was much below the market value during this period;

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the money paid to the Wheat Board, under clauses 2 and 3 of this resolution, be added to the money now on hand to make a final settlement for wheat, in the five-year pool, substantially larger than the amount possible from the amount now on hand, and that said final settlement be paid as soon as possible."

There is evidence that the action which the Liberal Party of this province has taken is bearing fruit. It is now a well-known fact that the Prime Minister of Canada himself re-opened the matter of the 'have-regard-to' clause in the Anglo-Canadian Wheat Agreement with the British Government, and he has been assured that the British Government will give it consideration. Now, for one, I am confident that a satisfactory solution will be found because I have faith in the British sense of fair play.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words about agricultural income. To have heard the Premier and the mover and seconder of the Reply to the Speech from the Throne, you would think that policies followed by the Federal Government at Ottawa with regard to agriculture were not in the best interests of the farmers of Canada. I would like to refer to a table showing the composite index numbers of commodities and services used by farmers of Western Canada, those showing farm living costs of Western Canada, farm prices of agricultural products for Saskatchewan, and I would also like to refer to a table of estimated cash farm income in this province.

It does not matter what period you take, you get a very favourable picture. Let us take the years 1939 to 1949 — a ten-year period. We find that the cash income for Saskatchewan farmers has increased from \$159.75 million to \$570 million. Now it is true that the cost of farm machinery has gone up. It is true that taxes on farm lands have gone up, very substantially, due to the policies followed by the C.C.F. Government here; and I think it is interesting to compare these indexes. In 1939, the composite index of commodities and services used by western farmers, which does include a general school and public revenue tax, was 99.7. That was raised to 191.0. During the same period, the farm prices of agricultural products have risen from 79.9 to 239.3. That is to say, the cost of commodities and services rose by 91.3 points during this period,

**February 8, 1951**

but the index on farm prices of agricultural products in Saskatchewan rose by 151.4 points.

I think this is an excellent picture, especially in view of the fact that the land policies followed by the C.C.F. Government here have increased taxes on real property very substantially. As a matter of fact, the general, school and public revenue levies in Saskatchewan have increased from \$10.3 million in 1939 to \$18.2 million in 1948. It is true that this very great increase in taxation on farm property has a disastrous effect in many parts of the province, which have not been favoured by good crops. All in all, in examining these tables, one cannot help but come to the conclusion that, due to agricultural policies pursued by Liberal Governments at Ottawa and due to the marketing of grain by the Canadian Wheat Board, the farmers of Saskatchewan are in a better position today than they ever were in the history of this province. Now that does not for a moment say that they are in the position in which they should be. Certainly there is room for a great deal of improvement.

The people in northern Saskatchewan are interested in the Provincial Government's policy regarding the allocation of northern lands. I wish to commend the 'Minister of pigs' — the Minister of Agriculture. I do not know why I associate pigs with the Minister of Agriculture, unless it is due to exchanges of opinions between him and the Federal Minister of Agriculture. But I do want to commend the Minister of Agriculture for putting out the very fine pamphlet, dated June 12, 1950, in which he gave a statement of policy regarding the allocation of northern lands. I think this pamphlet has some very commendable features. For instance, it states very clearly the land resources in this province are limited, and that the development of land will, of necessity, be confined to the fringe settlement area and possibly to the Carrot River triangle. I also think that it is very commendable to have this pamphlet come out in a very concise manner, informing the people that there is a very definite need for the development of additional land in this province.

I wish the hon. members of this House could and would take a trip to the Carrot River triangle. It is located northeast of the town of Carrot River between the Saskatchewan river and the Carrot river, and runs from Carrot River itself right to the Manitoba border. Although it may be necessary to re-channel the Saskatchewan river to make this land useful for agricultural purposes, there seems to be a very definite opinion that the land has very great possibilities. Some people feel that somewhere in the neighbourhood of 1,250,000 acres could be used. Others think there may be more than that. Others again think the acreage that would be suitable for agricultural practices is somewhere between 600,000 and 800,000 acres. At any rate, it is a fairly sizable parcel of land.

I do wish to commend the Minister of Agriculture for stating clearly the policy with regard to the allocation of this land, and I wish to quote, Mr. Speaker, from this pamphlet put out by the Department of Agriculture:

"All land will be leased. All land will be allocated on the 33-year lease basis. The primary purpose of this lease is the well-being and security of the lessees. It permits the efficient development and utilization of Crown lands and resources."

I am very glad to have that definite statement of policy from the Department of Agriculture. Hon. members on the Government side of this House talk a great deal about security — security, security, security! Mr. Speaker, what greater security can any man have than to own his own land? It is true that a

man's home is his castle; a farmer's domain is his own piece of land. I wonder if the hon. members on your right, Mr. Speaker, actually realize that it is the policy of their Government not to sell Crown land to farmers, but only to lease it on a 33-year lease basis. Does the hon. Minister of Natural Resources, who represents a northern constituency, approve of this policy? If he does, I want to assure him that he will not be re-elected whenever his Government goes to the people in that part of the province.

I happened to take a short trip across that Tisdale constituency and have talked to a fair number of farmers to find out what they thought of this land-lease policy. They are against it. They are definitely against it. I want to assure the hon. Minister of Agriculture that, whenever the C.C.F. Government decides to go to the people, on this one issue alone they would be defeated. I want to ask the hon. member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Wellbelove) who is a very fair-minded gentleman, this question: Having acquired some of your own land, are you now going to deny the right of other people to acquire their own land, or are you going to insist that if they are to accept Crown land it must be only on the 33-year lease basis? I want to ask that same question of the hon. member for Kelvington and the hon. member for Torch River. Personally, Mr. Speaker, I believe in private ownership of land. I believe that private ownership of land is essential to achieve maximum farm production, and I do want to urge the Government to change its policy in this regard at the earliest possible date. And if you are not prepared to change it (the Premier seemed to be quite anxious to be prepared to go to the country on certain issues), go to the country on this issue, Mr. Premier, any time you wish!

There is another bit of information for which I am grateful to the Minister of Agriculture, and that is the monthly letter of the Dairy Branch of his Department. I think it is a very excellent letter and I do wish to thank him for it, very sincerely. Now the January issue, 1951, reveals a rather startling fact. The production of creamery butter, in this province, during 1950, was over 22 million pounds less than it was in 1949. That marked a decline in the production of creamery butter in this province, of 8.7 per cent. Mr. Speaker, I want to submit that one of the reasons for the decline in the production of butter has been the policy adopted by the C.C.F. Government with regard to the sale of margarine. I am not saying it is the only factor involved; but it is certainly a very appreciable factor.

A great deal is said by the members on your right, Mr. Speaker, about price controls. I would just like to say a few words about that. What about the price of milk? Milk is regarded as an essential food. The consumption of milk per capita declines as the price of milk goes up. We have a Provincial Milk Board. Why doesn't the Provincial Milk Board really control the price of milk? Why doesn't this C.C.F. Government of Saskatchewan, which talks so much about price controls, pay a subsidy to the milk producers of this province and really show the people that they mean what they talk about? The Provincial Government could quite easily give a subsidy of two cents on milk. The Provincial Treasurer, last year alone, Mr. Speaker, took in \$8,300,000 in liquor profits — \$8,300,000 taken in in liquor profits. Why doesn't this 'humanitarian government' take a small portion of that at least, and subsidize the milk producer and keep down the price of milk to the consumer? I am sure that you would satisfy the producers. You would certainly satisfy the consumers, and you would have healthier people all the way around.

**February 8, 1951**

Considerable has been said about rural electrification, and I do wish to commend the Minister of Public Works for this programme that has been carried out in the Melfort area. I think that the Power Corporation, under his jurisdiction, does not indulge in discriminatory actions such as the Department of Highways. I want to assure the hon. member for Wilkie of that. There is a very welcome reference in the Throne Speech to making loans to farmers who are unable to pay their share of the construction costs. It would appear to me that the Minister of Public Works is beginning to move a little closer to some of the policies that have been advocated with regard to farm electrification by this side of the House. You see the way it stands now, Mr. Speaker, there are too many farmers who cannot afford to be hooked up. Ever in our wealthier part of the province I have had farmer after farmer say to me, "The power line is going by, but I can not afford to get hooked up. It is just more than I feel I can safely invest".

I wonder if these loans will be made interest free, as loans are made by the Government Finance Office to the various Crown corporations. I think if these loans will be made interest free it will be a considerable help. However, there will still be too many farmers, and particularly younger farmers, who will not be able to afford to go into debt to the extent that it will be necessary to have the farm electrified. This province should profit by the experience of other areas, not only in Canada but in the United States and in Europe, proving that rural and farm electrification programmers have not really been successful elsewhere until very substantially subsidized by the central government. That, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, is the position that we will have to reach sooner or later in this province.

I know the Premier does not like comparisons with Manitoba. He does not seem to like comparisons that place his Government in an unfavourable light, and that is quite understandable. However, it is very significant that in Manitoba, in 1945; there were 500 farmers connected, while in Saskatchewan there were 137. In 1950, there were 22,000 farmers connected in Manitoba, compared with 5,000 in Saskatchewan. Now I am not suggesting, for a moment, that we have not made some very fine progress in rural and farm electrification. We have made some fine progress; but is that the best we can do? Is that the best we could have done and would have done had the Government of Saskatchewan adopted the policy of taking the power right to the centre of the farm unit? All the farmer should have to do would be to pay his deposit, wire his house and farm buildings, and purchase the electrical equipment. I think if we had done that, Mr. Speaker, we would have embarked, in this province, on a very sound and progressive farm and rural electrification programme, and, sooner or later, it seems to me, we will have to come to that.

I would like to say a few words about highways. I want to commend the Minister here. I do not know why I happen to be commending so many cabinet ministers in one afternoon, but I do want to commend the hon. Minister in charge of highways for a certain amount of blacktop that is being done on No. 6 Highway leading from Regina, north. It is quite a change to get on that portion of the highway when one travels into Regina or out of Regina. I would like to submit for his consideration, however, that in 1951 or 1952, preferably 1951, blacktopping could be commenced on that highway from Melfort south to meet the blacktop somewhere in between. There is a great deal of traffic in and out of Melfort. It so happens that we have two schools right on the highway. The dust that comes off the gravelled road as people are travelling through is almost unbelievable. I sometimes shudder to think that, as a result of that dust on the

highway which passes the school, we may have casualties, and it is for that very good reason that I want to urge the Minister of Highways to give consideration to the blacktopping of No. 6 from Melfort south.

I would also like to see some consideration given to the completion of No. 6 from Gronlid to link up with No. 35. Then, in north-eastern Saskatchewan, there is need for another new highway to be constructed, and that is a highway, which some of the Boards of Trade are proposing, between Carrot River and The Pas. I understand there is a fair road up to the Co-op farms, although when I visited the Co-op farms at Carrot River a few years ago, the road was still pretty rough; but by constructing not necessarily an expensive but a good all-weather road to link up Carrot River and The Pas, we would be opening up a very fine agricultural area.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say anything today about Education, but I do wish to say a few words about the desirability of abolishing the Public Revenue Tax. It is quite true that this tax was imposed by a Liberal Government in 1916, I believe; but it was introduced, Mr. Speaker, not as a public revenue tax, but as a Patriotic Revenue Tax, and at that time it was just one mill. Out of that patriotic revenue tax grants were paid to the Red Cross for their essential services. This was increased to two mills in 1918. Then in 1927 there was a great deal of agitation for the abolition of the tax and a progressive step was taken by reducing the tax from two mills to 1 1/2. Later, (I believe it was in 1932) the tax was again increased to two mills.

It is possible that this tax was justifiable in the early days of this province. It may even have been justifiable during the depression. I am not prepared to concede that point, however. I do feel, however, that in times of very buoyant provincial revenues, there is absolutely no justification for the province to retain that tax. I believe that a normal year will yield to the Provincial Treasurer approximately \$1 3/4 million. Of that \$1 1/4 million comes from rural municipalities. It is true, as the Premier pointed out yesterday, that a recommendation for the removal of this tax was made by the Jacoby Commission, appointed by a Liberal Government — it is very true; and he rather chided the Leader of the Opposition for not having read from the Jacoby Commission. Well, we have no hesitation in doing that. With regard to the recommendations by the Jacoby Commission there was this recommendation for the repeal of the Public Revenue Tax:

"The Commission recommends the abolition of the Public Revenue Tax principally for the following reasons . . .

I will not read all of the reasons but I would like to read a couple of them:

"It represents an invasion, by the Provincial Government, of the only important sphere of taxation that the municipalities can effectively administer;

"The facts show that property owners as a class have been called upon to support burdens of government in general, far in excess of any benefits to property, as such;

"The Commission considers that this condition would remain true, even without the levy of the Public Revenue Tax, by the province, and that such a levy enlarges the inequity."

**February 8, 1951**

Then quoting further from the Britnell report, we have this argument advanced:

"On principle it would appear that the strongest argument for abolition is that, respecting the encroachment of the Provincial Government into the traditional field of municipal revenue sources."

I think all hon. members of this House recognize that municipal government is the very foundation of democratic government. Municipalities have their own responsibilities. To carry out those responsibilities there ought to be sources of raising revenue that would meet the increasing demand for services from the municipalities themselves; and unless the Provincial Government does make this adjustment, I think there is only one alternative for municipalities and that is to continue to press for ever-increasing grants from the provincial treasury. In my opinion, it would be far sounder to repeal the Public Revenues Tax and to give the municipalities a field of taxation which they can rightfully call their own. I do not know what the Committee which prepared this report had in mind with regard to the time when this Public Revenues Tax should be repealed. They do suggest that the implementation of their recommendations could be put into effect over a three-year period; but with regard to the repeal of this tax they have this to say:

"We are definitely of the opinion that the time has come for the abolition of the Public Revenues Tax."

And then they summarize the reasons for it. The time is not coming within a three-year period, that's not what they say. They say, "the time has come for the abolition of this tax". So let us not take the three years to repeal it.

There is another alternative which municipalities will have, unless the Public Revenues Tax is repealed, and that will be to increase property taxation. The Premier, and other members of the Government side of this House, very frequently talk about the people who have not large means. They are concerned about old age pensioners. They are concerned about people on small incomes, and all that sort of thing. I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that any further increase in property tax could hit those very people very, very badly. Every hon. member can pick out old age pensioners who live in villages or small towns, and who have, as their only source of income, the old age pension. Some of those people own their own homes. Every time you increase the property tax you are putting the 'squeeze' on these people whom the Government pretends to champion.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I wish to say that I do believe that with our present buoyant revenues in this province, the Government of Saskatchewan is in a position to abolish the Public Revenue Tax. Secondly, now is the time to have the Crown Corporations, which are engaged in business enterprise, pay taxes to the municipal authorities. Thirdly, if this Government is genuinely sincere in what it says about price controls, why does it not pay a subsidy to the milk producers and in that way keep the price of milk down? The few things that I am advocating here, this afternoon, will not cost the Government great sums of money. These are sums of money which the Government could easily save by doing away with some of its wasteful expenditures.

I will support the amendment.



**Mr. Allan L.S. Brown (Bengough):** — Mr. Speaker, in striving to take part in this debate on The Address, I will attempt to follow the precedent which has been set by the speakers who have preceded me with the exception of one in making my remarks this afternoon at least relatively brief.

I wish to join with those who preceded me in congratulating the mover and seconder of this Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I do so with particular reference to the mover. He is one of the elders, at least in years of service in this Legislature, and one of the elders in years of service to the people of the province of Saskatchewan in his own community, and it is indeed gratifying to see that, after the years of service which he has given to this Legislature and to his fellow beings, the vision which he has and which he no doubt had when he started out, remains intact with him, that the heartbreak and the bitterness which is oftentimes associated with public life has not deviated him from his desire to serve his people to the best of his ability.

I think also, Mr. Speaker, it is significant that when this debate opened we had a farmer and a teacher and this afternoon we have, coming from the Opposition, the remarks of a farmer and a teacher. But I think it is also significant Mr. Speaker to note the difference between the two. On this side we see the farmer and the teacher appealing to the unselfishness in the human being, and on the other side we have seen, time and time again, appealing to the selfish individualistic feelings which do dominate in some people. I could refer for instance to the suggestion made by the member from Melfort in his remarks here this afternoon when he lauded the Minister of Highways for the fact that they were getting some road work in that particular constituency, and yet the member from Wilkie suggests that the highway programme is bad because it does not apply to his particular constituency. It illustrates in my opinion very clearly that if you get it coming to you it is just, but if it is going to your fellow mankind it's not necessarily so good. I also wondered, when I heard the member from Melfort make reference to the Old Folks' Home which this Government proposes to establish in that town, if he would be so keenly interested in the promotion of that Old Folks' Home if it were to be established for instance in the town of Assiniboia.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would.

**Mr. Brown:** — The advocations one which he has made is that it shall be established in the town of Melfort.

The remarks which I make here, this afternoon, I will attempt to confine at the outset to replying to some of the suggestions and the criticisms which have been made here particularly this afternoon. Both members who have spoken here this afternoon, have made reference to the international situation, particularly as it affects the Far East. I think yesterday the Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan and our leader put the stand of the C.C.F. clearly on record, a stand on which there is no question of division upon this side of the House. We unanimously support and endorse the stand which he took at that time, and I wish to add simply to it, after listening to the remarks which were made here this afternoon, that as you look and approach a local problem so do you approach a problem on a wider field, and it has been indicated very clearly to me this afternoon that as the Liberal Party has no suggestions and no alternative for the situation which we here in Canada find ourselves in at the present time, they are equally lacking in any constructive alternative for the present situation in international affairs. They are prepared to use force to maintain the status

**February 8, 1951**

quo in the international field exactly as they are, I presume, if necessary prepared to use force to maintain the status quo within our own Canadian province.

This afternoon we would raise the question once again of the Canadian Wheat Board and the stand which we here on the C.C.F. have always taken in connection with their work. The member from Melfort suggested that yesterday when the Premier was criticizing the Federal policy as it effects the marketing of wheat he was criticizing the policies of the Canadian Wheat Board. Nothing can be further from the truth. The hon. member asked and stated that the Premier yesterday did not stand up and state that he supported the Canadian Wheat Board and its policy, and where the C.C.F. stood in relationship to the Canadian Wheat Board. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that the C.C.F. Party is the only political party in Canada which in season and out of season has consistently advocated the system of socialised marketing of wheat. Not only have we advocated socialised marketing of wheat, but we have advocated that that same principle should be applied to ether agricultural products. We have gone even further than that. In this House and outside of this House, time and time again have we advocated that we should establish national importing boards and national exporting boards.

My friend suggests that they have been on the side of the Canadian Wheat Board. If they were on the side of the Canadian Wheat Board, where were they in 1935 when the Rt. Hon. R.B. Bennett introduced the Canadian Wheat Board measure into the House of Commons? It was they who pulled the teeth out of the marketing Act at that particular time, and it is they who, given the opportunity and feeling that they can get any support whatsoever, will be prepared to revert back to that stage where they were in 1935 and where they were in 1936, when they put the Canadian Wheat Board on drydock. I would also like to ask them which political party is it today that is keeping the Winnipeg Grain Exchange open by allowing the Canadian Wheat Board to use the Winnipeg Exchange and the speculative market for the marketing of our course grains? If they are sincere and consistent in their advocacy and their support of the Canadian Wheat Board, then let them make the Canadian Wheat Board, or a similar marketing agency, the sole marketing agency for all our grain. It is they, not we, who stand to be condemned for their failure to implement their suggested support of the Canadian Wheat Board.

I was also interested (deviating for a moment from the question of wheat which I will return to in a moment or two) in the relationships to the remarks made here the other day by the Leader of the Opposition. I wish to turn a moment, and only for a moment, to the question raised by the member from Melfort on the question of the private ownership of land in the province of Saskatchewan. Where were they in standing out for private ownership of land when your farm, Mr. Speaker, and my farm was mortgaged, as it was mortgaged during the 'thirties? They were not then to expound as they are today of the private ownership of wealth, and yet they take the opportunity of this Throne Speech debate to criticize the thirty-three year lease programme which has been put into effect by this Government and carried on through the Minister of Agriculture. I ask them to take the opportunity of going to the Marievale Ranch, and ask those veterans of the last war what they think of the question of a thirty-three year lease, and I am satisfied that the opinion expressed by those experienced farmers, who are actually working and living under a thirty-three year lease, will be considerably different from the opinions expressed by the hon. member for Melfort.

I suggested a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, that I would come back to the question of wheat. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition raised it in his remarks here as did the hon. member from Melfort in his opening remarks and that was in connection with the payment due the farmers of Saskatchewan and of Western Canada under the five-year pool, and I suggest that it is important and that it should

be discussed in this House. I doubt if there is one single issue in Western Canada that is as more prominent in the minds not only of the farmers but of all the people of Western Canada than is this question of what settlement will be taken in connection with that 5-year pool, and Mr. Speaker, it is important to this extent that there is somewhere between nothing and \$300 million involved in the decision which will be arrived at by the Federal Government. That amounts to somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$400 for every man, woman, and child, in the province of Saskatchewan.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition takes great credit to himself and the Liberal Party for the fact that the Federal Government is making a grant to the province of Saskatchewan in lieu of certain taxations which we have given up to them, of some \$20 million or in that neighbourhood and yet at the same time, he supports a government that may very well deny the province of Saskatchewan some \$300 million, or an amount equal to 15 times that which we get under the tax agreement. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, when we have been talking to this, that I certainly do not want to be misinterpreted, as the Opposition attempted to misinterpret the Premier yesterday, as being critical of the Canadian Wheat Board. We are criticizing the policies of the Federal Government as administered by the Canadian Wheat Board. I suggest that there is not only an implied and stated responsibility on the Federal Government to come through with a substantial payment promised on that 5-year pool, but that there is also a moral responsibility on the part of the Federal Government to see that those of us who are engaged in production of wheat and in the production of any other agricultural commodities, should receive in return for our labour a fair price.

When the question of the pooling of our wheat over a 5-year period was before the House in Ottawa and consideration and discussion was taking place in relation thereto, it was suggested at that time and agreed to by the Minister of Agriculture that a parity price for wheat was somewhere between \$1.50 and \$1.55. Due to the rising cost of living which has taken place since 1946, and due to the increased cost of production of agricultural commodities, it is not beyond consideration that, if \$1.50 to \$1.55 was parity then, parity today is at least \$2.00 a bushel. If it is right that \$2.00 is parity as it is applied to the five years over which this 5-year pool is based then that means that we are entitled, under the Federal precedent, of at least 25 cents a bushel for the 5-year pool.

Reference was made here this afternoon to the Anglo-Canadian Wheat Agreement. I suggest that all of us have supported the principle involved in the Anglo-Canadian Wheat Agreement, and that it was a good agreement in principle in so far as it is one government here dealing directly with another government, in that case the British Government. The fact that it did not work out so advantageously to Canada was not the fault of the Anglo-Canadian Wheat Agreement, it was not the fault of the British Government, but it was rather the fault of the policy of our Federal Government which denied the opportunity of importing goods in exchange for the wheat which we sold under that peak. We went even further than that, Mr. Speaker. Through the medium of the duty upon goods coming in from the sterling countries, they are making it even more impossible for agreements, such as the Anglo-Canadian Wheat Agreement, to be entered into and to work satisfactorily. And I doubt that if that resolution which the hon. member from Melfort read out in here this afternoon, in which he suggests that the Federal Government should go back to the British Government and ask that reconsideration be given under the 'have-regard-to' clause, has much value. If the Canadian Government in that period during which the Anglo-Canadian Wheat Agreement was in effect, had been interested in putting into effect the "having-regard-to" clause, they could have done it by taking either British goods in

**February 8, 1951**

return for our wheat or taking sterling funds in return for our wheat, so that we could have used those funds within the sterling bloc. They could have taken advantage of that "have-regard-to" clause. The "have-regard-to" clause is not particularly applicable between the British Government and the Canadian Government, but it is applicable between the Canadian Government and the farmers of Western Canada who delivered our wheat during that period, delivered it in good faith in support of stabilized marketing and orderly marketing within the confines of that particular commodity.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, I was not sure of what he was endeavouring to convey there. Is he suggesting that the British Government had no obligation under this "have-regard" clause? Is he indicating that the discharge of the obligation of the "have-regard" clause is more a matter between the Canadian Government and the Canadian farmer than a matter between the British Government and anyone else? I just wondered if he is taking the attitude that the British Government had no obligation in this matter.

**Mr. Brown:** — The British Government has always taken the attitude and they take it today that the British Government has no obligations to the farmers of Western Canada in connection with the "have-regard-to" clause. It may be, and no doubt should be, in the hope that we can get similar treaties and agreements in the future between the Canadian Government and the British Government, that they can take into consideration that "have-regard-to" clause, but I suggest that as far as we are concerned the "have-regard-to" clause is not between the farmers of Western Canada and the British Government but is between the farmers of Western Canada and the Federal Government of Canada who signed the agreement on behalf of Canada.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, I still do not understand the answer. If the British Government did not pay anything to the Canadian Government under that agreement — I am just asking a general question. I am trying to ask him to clear up this point and I want to know what his position is. If the British Government does not pay anything to the Canadian Government under this "have-regard" clause then they won't have the money to turn it over to the Canadian farmer. I was wondering if he was suggesting that the British Government did not owe anything to the Canadian Government under the "have-regard" clause?

**Mr. Brown:** — That is strictly up to the Canadian Government and has no relationship to the farmers here in Western Canada. In 1946, I will point out to my hon. friend, the then Minister of Agriculture made a definite commitment to the farmers of Western Canada on the Prices Support Act in which, through the House of Commons, he assured the farmers of Western Canada that if there was an increase in the cost of production of grain to western farmers, they would be reimbursed under the Agricultural Prices Support Act for that increase in cost of production. That was the commitment which was made to the farmers, and that is the commitment with which I am interested. That is the commitment in which the farmers of Western Canada, I feel, are interested.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker I want to direct a question to the hon. member.

**Premier Douglas:** — This is not an interrogation. It is an address.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The member has signified his willingness to answer questions. Might I point out to the Leader of the Opposition that when you ask a question, you do not direct what he is saying.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, the reason I brought up the question is that this matter is one which is under negotiation with the British Government, and I did not want any misunderstanding that a person of this Assembly was of the impression that the British Government should not pay anything under this clause. If he has that impression, of course, he is entitled to it; but I did not want a wrong impression to go out if he did not intend to convey it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Might I point out to the hon. member that when anyone is speaking in this Chamber he has the responsibility, and if we allow someone to get up and argue that they are wrong, well we won't have very much order in the Chamber to speak of.

**Mr. Tucker:** — If the hon. gentleman had objected, I would not have pressed my question.

**Mr. Speaker:** — He answered your question.

**Mr. Brown:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition in his speech the other day raised rather serious objections to the fact and suggested that this Government was putting words into His Honour's mouth. Well, even though I am no lawyer, I am not going to allow the hon. Leader of the Opposition to put words in my mouth and suggest that I have made statements or implied other than that which I hold firm convictions on.

I think possibly sufficient has been said in regard to the stand which we have taken in connection with the settlement of the five-year pool. The stand of the C.C.F. as a political party has been made abundantly clear in connection with the principles of socialized marketing of wheat.

Just for a moment I wish to refer to a few remarks which were made by the Leader of the Opposition, here the other day, in connection with the Dominion-Provincial Conference. I would point out Mr. Speaker that in his remarks he made reference to the Dominion-Provincial Conference and he also made reference to the Britnell-Cronkite report. It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that he was very critical of the fact that in the first Speech from the Throne since that report was tabled there a not a clear indication that all of the recommendations contained in it would be immediately implemented, and yet he was not particularly concerned with the fact that after the Dominion-Provincial Conference on reconstruction which was held in 1945 and certain proposals were made by the Federal Government representing the same political stripe as my opponent, these proposals have not yet been implemented. It is bad if this Government takes one year to implement some recommendations or proposals made by a Committee appointed by it.

I would point out that this question of Municipal-Provincial relationships is indeed important in this province, it is indeed important anywhere in Canada, and it is important to the extent that, before we can have the proper type of economy, the proper type of social welfare and social security within the confines of the municipality, within the confines of the province, and within the confines of a country, we must have some co-ordination between different governing bodies. We have a responsibility to those municipalities because they are creatures of this Legislature. It is our duty to see that they work in the best interests of the people of their community, and that, through collective actions, the municipalities by working together can create a more stable economy not only within their own municipalities but make their contribution to the stability of the economy of the whole of the province.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that in this report it is suggested that its recommendations are, to a degree at least, contingent upon the Federal Government assuming its rightful share of the responsibilities in connection with certain social welfare and social security maintenance. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in implementing the recommendations of that report, in the implementing of anything as it affects local governing bodies, serious consideration must be given to them. So, if we were to support the amendment moved by my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition, and if we here as a province immediately withdrew as a province from the field of taxation and at the same time threw back upon the municipalities certain social security measures which this Government now pays for, a lot of municipalities would immediately find themselves in a bankrupt position. If we want to work this out in a manner and a means by which we can assure that we will have a better type of local governing body in our municipalities that is better able to fulfil and take its place, then you can rest assured that this Government is prepared to implement the recommendations of the Britnell report, or to implement anything which will place these bodies in a better economic position to carry on the work which we, as ratepayers and citizens of those municipalities, expect.

There was reference made in the amendment to the question of taxation of Crown Corporations, and the Leader of the Opposition left the impression that Crown Corporations do not pay taxes. All Crown Corporations pay taxes. They pay taxes insofar as the revenues and returns from those Crown Corporations come into the treasuries of some governing body. It is not a question of whether they should be taxed; it is strictly a question of where that taxation money should go. My hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition suggested, in support of my contention, that Crown Corporations today are taxed insofar as the revenues come into the Provincial Government; he suggested that a Corporation such as the Power Corporation, by increasing its rates or having too high a rate, was a means of hidden taxation. Well, if they are a means of hidden taxation today, what were they back in 1934 when the rates of the Power Corporation were considerably higher than they are today? I think that argument can be advanced, very strongly, for the proposals submitted by the Britnell-Cronkite-Jacobs report. I think they have arguments which deserve very curious consideration. Put once again, just to give municipalities (and I point out that it would apply only to certain municipalities) the right of taxation of Crown Corporations, you are not by that sole thing solving any great or general problem. I was going to suggest that by carrying out the proposals made the Leader of the Opposition in his amendment, as supported by the two members, that what we are doing is strictly a negative approach to the problem, and that it is no constructive alternative to the proposals submitted in the Speech from the Throne.

I would also like to refer for a moment to the question of rural electrification which has been raised, I believe, by every speaker of the Opposition who has spoken so far this afternoon. I would like to take them down into my country, if I may, and show them what we had previous to 1944. South of the main line in the province of Saskatchewan, we had one power plant owned by the Power Commission, and that was in the town of Willowbunch, and today, starting from that small nucleus in 1944, there is rural electric lines being built into the rural areas in the Bengough constituency. The stand that we have taken in connection with a utility such as the marketing of wheat, we take equally as sincere and solid a stand in connection with a utility such as power, and the first step which had to be taken was the socialization of power and bringing it under public ownership so it could be administered as a public utility. It is because of the policies which were advocated in the Speech from the Throne back in 1945 and again in 1946, which were opposed by the Liberals of that day, that we have a Power Corporation which has enabled us to undertake

rural electrification. It was my friends in the Opposition of that day who consistently fought against the establishing of a public utility such as the Power Corporation, and they must accept their responsibility, even since 1944, if the rural electrification programme has not gone even further ahead. They fought against it tooth and nail before we got into a position where we could have some form of rural electrification in Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that I am going to oppose the amendment and support the main motion. I think I have given my reasons why I oppose the amendment. I am going to support the motion because, through it, we continue here in Saskatchewan to build a firmer foundation which we tried to lay back in 1944, and we are, through the implementation of the proposals in the Speech from the Throne, making provisions for the municipalities to better be able to carry out the work which we have asked and expected them to do. Through the medium of the Speech from the Throne and the implementation of the proposals therein, we are creating greater economic and social security within Saskatchewan. Further, Mr. Speaker, I realize that the implementation of the proposals in the Speech from the Throne do not complete the job. I realize that we must go on and work towards the end when we shall establish here in Saskatchewan and in Canada a Co-operative Commonwealth Federation.

**Mr. R. A. Walker (Hanley):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to oppose the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition and to support the statements enunciated in the Speech from the Throne, I want to extend my congratulations, along with those who have preceded me in this debate to the mover of the Address in Reply, the hon. member for Kelvington, and the seconder, the hon. member for Elrose.

As I look across the Chamber, Mr. Speaker, I see a vacant chair. I have been in this House for only two Sessions previous to this year, and I remember at the time of the first Session, we had it on this side of the House through the 'grapevine', that the Leader of the Opposition was about to lose the distinguished rapport that he had on his left hand. Then last year, it came to pass. And again, last year, we had the rumour that the Leader of the Opposition was about to lose the support that he had upon his right hand, and that too came to pass. I do not suppose that I would surprise the Leader of the Opposition if I tell him the "grapevine" now has it that lightning is going to strike right in the middle. Oh, I sympathize with the Leader of the Opposition. He likes to be where he is now, and I may say on behalf of every member on this side of the House, we are going to do everything we can to keep him there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in beginning my remarks I would like to comment briefly on some of the statements that have been made by some of the members opposite. We have had a good deal said about wheat. I know I have not grown my wheat for quite a long time, and I know that some of the other members that spoke with such great authority in this Chamber have not grown any wheat either.

**Mr. F.H. Dundas:** — You wouldn't know the difference between wheat and barley.

**Mr. Walker:** — I may not know as much about rye as the hon. member, but I think I know the difference between wheat and barley. So, Mr. Speaker, I venture to offer some comments of my own on this matter of wheat and wheat marketing.

**February 8, 1951**

The Leader of the Opposition has gone a long way out of his way to try to hoodwink the people of Saskatchewan into thinking that the C.C.F. is opposed to the Board system of marketing wheat. I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition must think the majority of the voters of Saskatchewan were just born yesterday. The fact of the matter is that if the Leader of the Opposition takes his mind back a few years over the Liberal history of Wheat Board activities, he will remember that shortly after the end of the first great war the Federal Government set up a Wheat Board in this country. The Wheat Board at that time was designed to and did secure the farmers a stable price for wheat below the world market and below spiralling costs of production. Then he will remember that in 1934, the then Tory Government of Canada introduced Wheat Board legislation. I had something to do with the growing of wheat at that time. I remember well that the price of wheat was higher than the world price in the year of the Tory Wheat Board, 1935. As a matter of fact the Wheat Board was used as an instrument to subsidize production of the wheat farmer in this part of the country. And then in the fall of 1935, the Liberals were elected to power at Ottawa. You remember then that the Wheat Board was put up on the pantry shelf for four or five years by Order-in-Council of the Liberal Government. You remember, too, that, in the years under review, the last five years, it was a Wheat Board constituted and controlled by a Liberal Government that saw to it that the farmers get less for their wheat than the wheat would have fetched upon the world market. Now, I say this just to review for this House the history of the Liberal Party in connection with Wheat Board operations.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the members of this House and the people in the country know very well that the Leader of the Opposition is trying to drum up a false issue when he says that we on this side are trying to kick the Wheat Board around. I think the people of this country know, Mr. Speaker, that the criticisms levelled by members of this side of the House are not levelled against the Wheat Board as a marketing agency for wheat, but that are levelled against the political manipulations of the Wheat Board for the partisan interests of the Liberal Government. Nothing that the members on this side of the House can do can destroy the Canadian Wheat Board. There is only one government and only one party in Canada who can take away the Wheat Board, even such as it now is, and that party, that government is the Liberal Government at Ottawa. As a matter of fact, any kicking that we have done in connection with the Liberal Party has been the kicking we have been doing while standing behind the Liberal Party. That is the only way we have been able to get a Wheat Board here in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I do not pose as an expert on wheat marketing and I do not propose to talk any further about it than what the layman would know from ordinary reading, and what I have heard.

We have had some suggestions, Mr. Speaker, from the hon. member for Melfort, who, I am sorry to say, is not in his seat at the moment. The hon. member, besides having tried to join in with the diatribe of the Liberal leader against this party and its wheat policy, has also something to say about milk production. In Hanley constituency, as hon. members know, there is a fairly well-established dairy industry. As a matter of fact, the dairy industry in Hanley constituency is the centre of the dairy industry in the province of Saskatchewan. The Saskatoon milk shed, extending northward through Rosthern to Prince Albert, is the only milk shed in Saskatchewan which is normally a surplus area for milk.



I was very much interested in the suggestion made by the member for Melfort. "Why", he says, "the C.C.F. Government in Saskatchewan professes to believe in holding down prices." He says milk is one of the things where the price is controlled by a provincial board. Well, Mr. Speaker, he suggests that possibly we should have something to say about holding down the price of milk.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that we have made it abundantly clear on this side of the House that we believe in equality and fair play as between one group of primary producers and another. We know that those people who are the consumers of milk in the cities are primary producers of one sort and those who produce milk in the milk areas and milk dairy farms in Saskatchewan are primary producers of another sort, and nobody on this side of the House has ever said that there ought to be unfairness as between one group of primary producers and another. But, we object, we have always objected to and will continue to object to a condition where a tightly controlled monopoly owned and controlled by a small handful of people exploit the primary producers who work for them on the one hand and exploit the other producers who buy their product on the other.

The hon. member even made a suggestion as to what might be done about maintaining a low price for milk in Saskatchewan. He came up with a suggestion that we should spend some provincial money subsidizing the production of milk. I think he will know, as all hon. members will know, that milk and milk products are to a considerable extent products of inter-provincial trade. I think he will know, too, that the imposition of a subsidy on products of inter-provincial trade is not a very efficient way of controlling such a situation. If we are going to have any kind of an effective subsidy on the production or on the consumption of milk, it ought, in all common sense, to be applied on a national level.

Mr. Speaker, up until 1948 we did have a subsidy on the production of milk in this country. As a matter of fact, milk subsidy was supported by the majority of the members of the Canadian House of Commons. As a matter of fact, they voted upon it and they voted to retain that subsidy. Some months after the House of Commons prorogued that year and went home, the Federal Government suspended payment of the subsidy on milk.

I suggest that the Liberal party's right hand does not know what its left hand is doing. I suggest that the hon. members opposite had better get together with their colleagues at Ottawa and have a heart-to-heart talk about this Wheat Board situation, reassure themselves that the Liberal Government at Ottawa does not really intend to kick out the Wheat Board, and reassure themselves about this matter of subsidies on milk. I agree with what the member for Melfort says, milk is a product which ought, in the national interest, in the public interest, to be subsidized unless some other means could be found of guaranteeing an adequate supply for the consumer.

The member for Wilkie came up with, I think, the first proposal we have had from that side of the House — a proposal for new taxes. He pointed out that a large area in the province of Saskatchewan was not included in any union hospital district and was not, therefore, paying taxes for the upkeep and maintenance of hospitals, and he said, "I think people outside union hospital districts should pay some tax". Well, that is interesting. I suppose probably the Provincial Treasurer will make a note of that. I hope that any of his constituents, who are outside of union hospital districts, will applaud him in his suggestion.

February 8, 1951

He also made the suggestion that you can not have price control without wage control. Well, of course, Mr. Speaker, that is a matter of Federal issue and I do not propose to waste too much time talking about Federal issues. I think, however, that since he brought the question up that something should be said about it. On this side of the House, we believe that price control is an effective way of maintaining protection for the consumer from high costs arising through monopoly profits. It may be that, ultimately, you will have to have some kind of wage control. If, when you put on price control at the retail level you suddenly say, "Now what is the price of wheat; what is the price of milk on the farm; what are wages", and put a ceiling on them, you have accomplished precisely nothing to rectify the situation that has grown up as a result of the inflationary trends of the last few years. It may be all right to put a firm ceiling upon prices at the retail level and then set up arbitration boards, representative of wage earners, primary producers and consumers, to arrive at what is fair prices to the wage earners and primary producer. It may be that it would be advisable and desirable to set up machinery which would enable wage earners to bargain on boards, where the government is represented and where the public is represented, for equitable increases in wages. But let us not fool ourselves by saying that we accomplish anything by imposing over-all price control, and then, on the other hand, imposing absolute airtight wage control, and control over the prices of farm products.

If you do that, what have you accomplished? Everybody knows that the sale price of any product is divided into two accounts — part of it goes to pay for wages in producing the goods, the rest of it goes in profits. Now, of course, somebody will say, some of it goes for raw materials; but raw materials, in the final analysis, are just wages and profits. So if you put an airtight control over prices and then put an airtight control over wages, you might just as well, in the first place, have put a floor under profits, because that is all you have accomplished. I do not think that the Liberal Party gets very far by trying to represent to people that if you want price controls you had better start thinking in terms of wage levels as they were in depression times. I think that that sort of thing is only an attempt to confuse the issue, Mr. Speaker.

Now I want to say something more relevant to the actual content of His Honour's Speech delivered to us last Thursday.

The Speech of His Honour provides us with an opportunity, on this side of the House, to amplify and develop and express the policies that are pursued by this Government; and it is an opportunity for the Opposition party to provide some constructive criticism of those policies. As a matter of fact, under our British parliamentary system, the members sitting to your left, Mr. Speaker, are reputed to be a possible alternative to the Government. As I look across to the other side at the hon. gentlemen, I am a little skeptical about whether theory is always sound practice. When I listen to the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, Mr. Speaker, I am more dubious than ever, because when I listen to them I do not hear very much in the way of a sound alternative policy to be laid before the people of Saskatchewan. The people of Saskatchewan will look in vain, Mr. Speaker, if they look for the real policies of the Liberal Party in the utterances of their leaders here in this House.

We have the kind of thing we heard from the Leader of the Opposition when he was making his marathon oration the other day. I like to stand around sometimes, on the fairground, and just see what fools we mortals be, and how sometimes we get sucked in by the 'con' man. Well I could not help thinking about that as I listened to the Leader of the Opposition with his 'rubber'

statistics, the other day. He was saying, "Why, what has this Government done for municipalities? You have to deduct 40 cents on every dollar that they are spending to assist municipalities, because it is a depreciated dollar". Then he says this Government is now getting \$19 million from the Federal Government. If he applied the same formula to that \$19 million that he applied to the expenditures, and deducted 40 per cent, well then he would be down around \$11 million and he would have to admit it was a decrease instead of an increase.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, in dealing with rubber statistics. I think if you are going to talk about a 1951 dollar when you are dealing with income, you should deal with a 1951 dollar when you are dealing with expenditures. I do not think it gets you anywhere to talk about a 1945 dollar when you are talking about income and a 1951 dollar when you are talking about expenses. You only tend to confuse people. Of course, if that is what you are trying to do then you are succeeding.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to note, in the Speech from the Throne that the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company had now completed the project which they commenced last year up in north-eastern Saskatchewan. I can not help remembering that in the last Speech from the Throne it was said by His Honour that the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company proposed to build a new \$9,000,000 extension to their facilities for recovering base metals from Saskatchewan ore. Well, that is just another of those things predicted a year ago, which has now come to pass: Nine million dollars, spent on industrial expansion by a firm which has some experience in Saskatchewan, has some experience dealing with this Government, a firm which is paying largely increased royalties. As a matter of fact, when the matter was discussed in the House on March 23, 1950, the hon. member for Saltcoats was a little worried. He said, "I think you are being a little too hard on those boys. After all they are local boys trying to make good, and you are going to be charging yourself out of the market". Well, the fact of the matter is — and he pointed out that we had increased the rate of the royalties on the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company's production in this province by some five or six times — they are going ahead and developing their industry in this province, and they are satisfied, Mr. Speaker. They would rather pay \$11 million to a C.C.F. Government which will do something to develop Northern Saskatchewan than pay one-half million or a quarter million to a Liberal Government. The very fact that you have development by that company in that area is proof of that fact.

The Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company, I dare say, are just as astute as the Leader of the Opposition. He talks about expropriation. Well, there is a good Grit Government in Manitoba that gave away a dam-site some years ago, and now they have expropriated it, as reported in the 'Leader-Post' of February 7th. Maybe the Opposition would like to have it read to them; I do not mind reading it to them. Expropriation is a word which applies not only in Saskatchewan, as the Leader of the Opposition knows.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not personally familiar with the northern areas of this province. I have done some reading about the work which this Government is doing to develop and protect our northern resources. This Government initiated a successful fire prevention campaign in Northern Saskatchewan. Much can be said to prove that that fire prevention campaign has saved a good many million feet of good lumber in northern Saskatchewan. The Leader of the Opposition, two years ago, alleged that the C.C.F. claimed to have had God on their side, when we pointed out that forest fires had been checked. Well, the fact of it is, Mr. Speaker,

**February 8, 1951**

on this side of the House we do not believe that we should just sit and wait to see if God is on our side — we should go out and save our resources!

I want to congratulate the Minister of Natural Resources and the former Minister of Natural Resources, on the progress that was made by that Department in an overall programme of timber conservation. It is not very easy to get excited about the word 'conservation'. We think of conservation as something we ought to be interested in and that we ought to approve of, in a general sort of a way, but that it is not something with any particular romantic connotations attached to it. But when we stop to consider that the resources available to us here now, in a large part, are not expendable — they cannot be used up and recovered — we should approach our natural resources potential as custodians of a trust to future generations. We should always regard our timber resources on the basis that we should use only the increment, that we should preserve the 'capital' of those resources for future generations.

I can think of no better example than that of our great neighbour to the south. They have undoubtedly wasted many, many millions of tons of the iron ore which they fell heir to when they settled that vast half-continent. The same applies to petroleum; they burned it off when it was not a commercial class of petroleum, they burned it off. Well, Mr. Speaker, down there they are beginning to be alarmed about the fact that their iron ore resources have fallen below their normal industrial requirements. Those facts give any serious minded person cause to pause and think and ask himself, "Are we fulfilling the trust that is imposed upon us for the care of our natural resources?"

Northern Saskatchewan, prior to this Government coming into office, had its timber resources being sold at public auction. Large areas were sold to promoters, to people who came in and were interested in only one thing — getting back more than they paid, and getting out. You had no control, no quota. You had no over-all system of conservation. It did not matter whether those people went in and just slashed everything in front of them or whether they picked only the ripe or mature timber. As a result, you had timber cuts in this province, amounting, even in the early '40's to well over 100 million board feet; in 1939 — 120 million; in 1940 — 133 million; 1941 — 154 million; 1945 — 131 million.

First of all, the C.C.F. had a survey made to find out what was the maximum sustained yield of production of our timber resources. It was found to be something less than 50 million feet board measure, so we instituted a progressive reduction in the quota. In addition to that, we had officials of the Department of Natural Resources go and say to the timber operators, "These are the trees which are now mature and ready to be cut". The small brush and the small seedlings were protected, so that they would grow, and replenish the forest.

If those cuts of timber which were taken out of our forests prior to 1946 had been allowed to continue, in view of the high prices that were asked for merchantable lumber in the last five years, it is safe to say that irreparable damage would have been done to our timber resources in this province.

So, Mr. Speaker, where they say this Government is "doing nothing to develop a diverse economy in Saskatchewan," I say that the policies of the previous Government would, by this time, have completely destroyed the timber industry in northern Saskatchewan.

I have heard the Leader of the Opposition, as has every member of House, rise in his place in this House and in committees, and on the radio, through the press and public platform complain that this Government is oppressing the producers of lumber in Saskatchewan. Well, Mr. Speaker, the producer of lumber in Saskatchewan is the owner of the lumber on the Crown Reserves. The people who own the Crown Reserves are the people of Saskatchewan, and it is the policy of this Government to see that the people of Saskatchewan will always own that lumber and that it will always be used and marketed and sold for their benefit.

Now, why is it that the Leader of the Opposition says that the "producers" are being oppressed? Who does he mean by the producers? Does he mean the men who go in and cut the timber that stands in the forest? Does he mean the Department of Natural Resources' employee who goes in and marks the merchantable timber? Does he mean this people who work in the saw mill? Does he mean the clerks and the typists who do the invoices? Does he mean the people who work for the railroad and bring the timber to market, or does he mean the people who work in the retail establishment? As far as I can see, Mr. Speaker, they have all made a contribution to producing lumber out of our natural resources. No group of them should be singled out as "producers." But, you know, when you have had a little association with the Liberal Party, you can see what sort of thing they are trying to do. They are trying to build up an idea in the minds of that little group of contractors, "You boys can have hopes that if we ever get elected, the door will be wide open. We will throw it open to you. All you need to do is bid a little bit, chip in a little bit to the Party kitty, and you can have it all. The people of Saskatchewan be damned! Give it away!"

The Liberal Party does not say that that is what it is going to do, but when you get to know their conduct and their tactics you understand well enough to read between the lines.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

The Assembly adjourned at 6.00 p.m.