

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Eleventh Legislature
25th Day

Wednesday, March 7, 1951

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

BUDGET DEBATE

Mr. Jacob Benson (Last Mountain): — Mr. Speaker, we have learned, this Session, that another civil servant was retiring. I am referring to Mrs. Bothwell, our Provincial Librarian. Mrs. Bothwell has given long and faithful service to this province. No professor of politeness was needed to teach her manners; she is the soul of courtesy and charm, untiring in her efforts to serve. She did her job well. I appreciate the help she has always freely given me. We will miss Mrs. Bothwell around the Library. In her retirement I wish her many years of happiness. I can truthfully say, "Well done, true and faithful servant." My wish is that she will spend in her retirement, many years of happiness. My life has been enriched by having known Mrs. Bothwell.

The Premier, the other day, praised the "third force" in regard to the United Nations, the "third force" led by Nehru. He inferred it was right and proper. I would suggest that if a "third force" is necessary in the United Nations, then perhaps, if the Premier is logical, he will agree that a "third force" is necessary in this Legislature. Peter McLintock, our genial representative of the 'Leader Post', who writes that column "On the Banks of the Wascana," has created for us a "third force" in this Legislature, and he indicated in his column that no doubt in the near future my good friend Louis Larsen would soon be joining my ranks. He also indicted that perhaps my good friend from Athabasca (Mr. Marion) would be the second convert. Now, at the present time I am alone — the head, body and soul of the "third force" in this Legislature. I am right at the bottom; there is no other way to go but up. And I want to say to every member of the Legislature that I am looking for recruits, and I give you all, each one of you, a cordial invitation to join the "third force" in Saskatchewan.

I remember when I first came into this House, I came in here with a small group known as the Progressives, and at that time the Government of the day was defeated. The Government at that time pleaded for the support of that small group in order to keep it in power. Since I have been in this Legislature, I have seen three Governments on their knees, pleading for support. Before long, I shall see a fourth Government on its knees, pleading, pleading for support. I shall take my time to answer.

I want to say, in regard to the budget, a few words to the Provincial Treasurer. I want to congratulate him, as I always do, on the manner in which he delivered his budget speech. I also want to congratulate the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) on the manner in which he delivered the chief criticism of the Opposition for the Opposition. The provincial Treasurer did a good job. I always admire him for his ability. But I wondered this time, when he was delivering his speech, why he should have given it to the press before he delivered it to this Legislature. I remember

March 7, 1951

what happened to the Hon. Hugh Dalton in the British House of Commons when he merely gave a hint to some reporter as to what was in that particular budget. While I know quite well that the budgets delivered in this House are not as important as the ones delivered in the parliament at Ottawa or in the parliament of Great Britain, still, to the people of Saskatchewan, to the members of this Legislature, that is the most important document. And I regard it as just a little bit of a slight to the people's representatives when the public press was presented with that document before it was presented to this House.

A few years ago the Provincial Treasurer prophesied that he would be delivering a \$60 million budget in this Legislature. His prophecy has come true. He is a regular magician with figures. He can make them do anything. I remember last fall seeing a young chap in Semans handling cards. You would think you had one set of cards in your hand and give them a flip and you had something else. The Provincial Treasurer told us of the reduction in the public debt. We all know, and he knows, that a lot of that reduction came by cancellation of debts by the Dominion Government and repayment of guarantees by the Wheat Pool and other organizations. But the Provincial Treasurer knows his job, and I am going to give him credit for knowing it. And I believe that if he did not have so many spendthrift Ministers behind him, he could really do a good job of financing this province. He has no confidence in the Ministers of this Government, and to prove that, he has set up a Budget Bureau in this province which gives him complete control over each Department, and I would suggest that the Minister in charge of each Department, and his deputy, should be the Budget Bureau for that particular Department, and that we do not need this extra Budget Bureau. I wonder sometimes, especially when we have 12 Ministers in the Cabinet, why we need this extra Budget Bureau. I would believe that the Provincial Treasurer finds these Ministers in the way. We notice often times, when he is in Public Accounts Committee, for instance, or the Committee on Crown Corporations, when the Ministers get stuck he is always able to answer, and I admire him for his ability and his knowledge of the affairs of the Government and this province. I think perhaps we might crown him King Clarence the First of Saskatchewan, and he could then send all the Ministers home and also the members of the Legislature. We would not be necessary here, only once a year or so when he wants a little more money.

My conclusion in regard to the debate that is being carried on here so far, is: when I listen to the Liberal speakers, they tell us that the Government and its works are no good; and when I listen to the Government speakers, they tell me that the Liberal Government at Ottawa and all its works are no good. Now I believe that every member in the House is a truthful person, so I rather believe them both. Our Liberal friends tell us that they are going to vote against the budget and they give us the reasons why. They say they are going to vote against it, not because it is too big — with one exception; last night, the member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) said it was too high. The rest of the members' criticism of the budget is not that it is too high but the money is not well and properly spent.

So far as I am concerned, I believe the budget is too big. It is out of line with the economy of Saskatchewan, and there are too many extravagant expenditures. The Minister of Social Welfare, the other day, in Public Accounts Committee, told us that he had visions about what he might do in the way of co-operative farms. I think he has had too many visions about other things as well.

Now, the budget — or rather, the over-expenditure last year, was balanced by bring in supplementary estimates which we still have to pass. When I read the budget speech, I found that the farm income for Saskatchewan for 1950 was estimated at \$405 million. The farm income for last year (1949) was over \$525 million; I think it was around \$535 million. The Provincial Treasurer, though, has done the arithmetic for me and he estimates that the farm income for this past year is down 27 per cent. Now, in my opinion the farm income of this province must be the guide to the Provincial Treasurer in bringing down any budget, and I would ask if that reduction in the farm income of this province is any guide to the Provincial Treasurer? Does it mean anything?

I would like to read the figures that were referred to, last night, by the member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski), from the appendix to the Provincial Treasurer's budget speech. Estimated production and value of the provincial crops of this province: wheat down from last year; oat production down; barley production down; rye is up a little flax production is up a little. Then we come to the livestock — these are numbers, not values: all cattle down; sheep and lambs up a little; swine down; poultry down; turkeys down; geese down; ducks down. The whole Saskatchewan agricultural economy for last year is going down. Still our budget is going up.

I read an article in one of the financial journals, this last fall, and that article obtained its information from all the financial institutions of this country and it declared that there was more money out on loan today in the Dominion of Canada than at any other time in the history of Canada. Mr. Graham Towers once said (I believe it is in one of the reports he made), that a country is only prosperous when it is borrowing money. That is something that we should think about, because if you look back over the history of this province, you will find that we experienced prosperity only when Saskatchewan was borrowing money. But there is a payday coming, and I believe that we are near the peak of borrowing in this province, and near the peak in the Dominion of Canada. The only thing, in my opinion, that can change that trend will be if we have another war, and I hope we do not.

From all reports today there is a very high percentage of all goods sold on credit. I am given to understand that the country implement dealers in Saskatchewan at the present time are feeling the pinch. I have been told that 40 per cent of the implement dealers in this province are today on a C.O.D. basis, and the stores are carrying large unpaid accounts. These facts should be a warning. Machinery sales, according to the budget speech, were \$50 million in Saskatchewan for the last year. I believe that about 50 per cent of that amount would be still unpaid.

Now, we have a resolution on the Order Paper in regard to price control. We are asking the Dominion Government to establish price controls in Canada to stop inflation, and we are doing everything in this Provincial budget to increase inflation. I think that we should begin to practice what we preach. I see only one way out of the future difficulty that this province is bound to face. It is bound to face a difficulty, because we have established services in Saskatchewan on a basis of peak production in Saskatchewan, and when the net revenue of this province starts to fall, then these services cannot be maintained and there is only one way, as I see it, out of the difficulty, and that will be development of our natural resources so as to obtain more revenue from oil, minerals or any other undeveloped resources.

March 7, 1951

We have been treated to comparisons in the Legislature during this past couple of weeks — comparisons of what the Liberals did when they were in power and what the Government is doing at the present time. Figures for 1929 up to 1944 were taken, then from 1944 to the present time. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that those two periods are no basis of comparison whatever. I am not interested today in what the Liberals did or did not do. What I am interested in today is what the Government of the day is doing, and I think we just waste a lot of time when we beat and flail the Liberals over there. We are just bringing them to the attention of the public and creating sympathy for them. I think my advice to the Government would be: attend to your own knitting and let the Liberals attend to theirs.

You know, when you listen to these parties you come to a wrong conclusion. I know when the Liberals were in power here they went around the country telling the people how much the Liberal Party had done for the people; now the C.C.F. here is telling us how much the C.C.F. has done for the people. I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal Party or the C.C.F. Party has not done one thing for the people. All they have done is what they have been paid to do, and they have used the people's money to do it. Now, I could do a lot for the people. I could do a lot for the members of this Legislature. I could buy them each a new car tomorrow, if they will let me put my hand into their pockets and take out the price of it — plus a little bit for administration expense.

I said the budget was too big for the present economy of Saskatchewan, and the Government intends to spend it all. I could support the budget, even if it were as big as it is, if the Government was setting something aside out of it for a rainy day. We have cycles of weather and crops in this province; we have cycles of prices, up and down. Those who ignore the lessons of the past cannot be wise in looking into the future, and I think we should take notice, and take it now, of the lessons we have experience in this province in the past. I shudder to think of the conditions that we went through in the 1930s. When I first came into the Legislature here it was when the depression hit, and I know what the Government of that day was up against. When the C.C.F. came in, they came in under the best conditions that ever existed in the province of Saskatchewan and they have had a wonderful opportunity. But the Government, in my opinion, has adopted the Indian philosophy, "Eat everything today, tomorrow we may be dead."

Before I vote for the budget I want to know where the money is going to be spent and how it is going to be spent, and I am willing to make a bargain with the Government. If the Government will tell me in the House how and where this money is to be spent, tell the House where the road programme is to be, where the roads are to be built and surfaced, I will vote for the budget. That is all I ask. I ask for full information as to where this money is going to be spent. I maintain it is the right of every member of this Legislature to know, before he votes on this budget, where every nickel of it is going to be spent. That is what we are here for. No member should be expected to vote any money if he does not know where and how it is to be spent. In the past we have voted millions for highways and we did not know where one nickel of it was to be spent. We had a general idea; but we did not know what the road programme was to be. We have never been told that since this Government came into power. We always get it in the press some time later. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, this state of affairs should end.

I want to discuss briefly, a few departments of the Government, and I will start first of all with Highways. Last Session, I gave some figures in regard to highways. This year I want give you the figures for 1949 and 1950; I just took some of the main ones. I have here the figures for the constituencies that received \$100,000 or over on construction, reconstruction and surfacing of highways, 1949-50. That will be up to March 31, 1950; we have not the figures yet for the past summer; Cutknife, \$289,000 (I will just give you the round figures); Humboldt, \$115,000; Morse, \$317,948; Prince Albert, \$234,000; Rosetown, \$104,000; Tisdale, \$206,000; Wadena, \$154,000; Yorkton, \$386,000; Milestone, \$322,968; Lumsden, \$812,000. Now I will give you Last Mountain - \$77,000.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I know very well that you cannot spend the same amount of money in every constituency. I know, and I am not criticizing a bit, the expenditure in the Lumsden constituency is high because that expenditure is made on the highway leading in to one of the main centres of the province. I have no criticism whatever for that. I think that that is the proper way to handle the situation; build out from the centres and keep going. But I complained last year, and I am not complaining this year, so much in regard to the Minister of Highways. Out of the budget last year, I was to get about 7.9 miles gravelled, but the roads became so bad, No. 6 became so bad in the constituency of Last Mountain last summer, that even they had to have a caterpillar tractor pull the buses out of the holes. Now that is one of the heavily travelled roads of this province, and within 50 miles of Regina they were pulling the buses out of the holes on No. 6 with a caterpillar tractor. The road got so bad that it was impossible to maintain it, and the Minister received some extra money from some place and decided to start work on No. 6. There were not very many miles done on No. 6 in Last Mountain this last year, but he did blacktop it from No. 11 up to the valley, and did the preliminary work from the valley up to No. 22. And I want to sincerely thank the Minister of Highways. I am going to tell him that if he will continue that programme up No. 6, even though he does not do very many miles each year, I will give him all the support that he wants.

I want to point out to him, too, that so far as the constituency of Last Mountain is concerned, I have had better treatment from the Minister of Highways this past year than I have ever had before. The Minister wrote in the spring and told me that I was entitled to a bridge in the constituency. A bridge was built in that constituency the year before, and I had heard nothing whatever from the Department about it — and incidentally they put it in the wrong place. This year, however, the Minister wrote and told me I was entitled to a bridge, and I appreciated that. So I immediately drove around the constituency and, myself, inspected all the bridges to see which one, in my opinion, should be built. The Minister also told me in his letter to get in touch with his engineer or the Bridge Department. I did that and the engineer then came out with me. I took him to a few of the worst bridges, and he sent in his report. The bridge was built, and another one on the same road was repaired. I want to thank the Minister on behalf of the people in that district for having fixed up those bridges.

Now, I received a letter just yesterday from Nokomis, reminding me that the highway from Nokomis (that is No. 15, west) was in a deplorable condition. In fact, some parts of this particular highway have never been built, and it is impossible to go over it when the road is wet. The people from Nokomis (a lot of them) and from Nokomis east, go to Watrous over the week-end, and if there happens to be a rain they get started down that road

March 7, 1951

and they cannot get through. It is an alkali flat, and it is very slippery and very bad. I want to suggest to the Minister, too, that No. 14 from Dafoe to Guernsey is also in bad condition. No. 20, as he knows well, from four miles east of Strasbourg, north to Nokomis, is in bad condition, and I hope that this year he will do some work on that road. I would ask him to build it from a point east four miles of Strasbourg and take it up as far as Duval this year, and I will be satisfied. If he will do that, and continue on No. 6, then he will have all the support that he wants from me in regard to that particular work. I would suggest to him that the people from Raymore north, the people who use this new No. 6 Highway, are very grateful and appreciative of the fact that that highway has been built. It is really a treat to come off old No. 6 at the end of that new highway, and then drive on the blacktop into Regina. We appreciate what he has done there.

I want to say a few words in regard to the Department of Public Health. I want to congratulate the Minister of Public Health. He, the other day, indicated to us that he had done a lot of work in finding out and learning about this Department, and he did a good here in explaining what was taking place in the Department of Public Health. If he had left that chip off his shoulder, and had not set up so many straw men to knock down, I would have said he had done an excellent job.

There is nobody in Saskatchewan that I know of, who is opposed to the hospitalization scheme. We know it is in bad shape; we know that the privileges there have been abused. The Deputy Minister told the world that from Saskatoon, and I want to say to the Minister that I do not think anybody who ever took a cabinet post in province had a tougher job than he did when he went into that Department of Health. I myself think the Department was in a little bit of a mess. He has had to work hard, and I will back him up, to get it into shape. Some day he is going to have to tell the public some cold facts that they are going to have to face in regard to this hospital scheme, and if he has the courage to go through with it he will have my support.

My relationship with the Minister has been very good, and I am not complaining in the least about him. I like him, and he has always treated me as I think a member should be treated. Now, I think the reason the hospitalization programme and the hospital programme got in a mess in Saskatchewan was because we had too many outside planners handling it. We did not have enough of the local people who had some experience in hospitalization here consulted in instituting that plan. They will have to consult them yet before they get a solution to the problem. The member for Humboldt (Mr. Loehr) made some suggestions the other day in regard to how he thought some abuses might be corrected, and I think his suggestion is worth considering. A problem exists in regard to the hospitalization plan, a problem exists in regard to hospitals, and a solution or solutions must be found. I often think, when we consider the construction of these union hospitals, because of the fact that everybody now is paying hospitalization fees, and because everybody has the right to demand hospitalization when they are sick, that everybody in Saskatchewan should make a contribution towards the upkeep and the building of those hospitals, and they are not doing this at the present time. I think the Minister mentioned something about that the other day. I live in a district that makes no contribution at the present time to a hospital. They are trying to organize one in that district, but I think when this plan was put into effect there should have been a levy made over the whole of the province for hospitalization, because it is a provincial issue, and everybody is benefiting and everybody should contribute. We cannot have privileges without responsibilities, and the same thing goes for Education.

The Minister brought in a Bill, when he first became Minister, to set up larger school units. One of his main arguments was that it would equalize cost, and I agreed with him. But I also suggested at that time that he should institute a tax over the whole province on an equalized basis, for education purposes, and he then would have real equalized cost in the province of Saskatchewan. The same thing should be worked out some way or other in regard to hospitalization.

I want to say a few words in regard to the Department of Natural Resources. I want to congratulate the Minister for what he has done in the North. Credit is due him in some respects, and I am going to give him all the credit I can. He said the other day that criticism is a part of democracy. If I have some criticism to make it is not personal, and I hope that the criticism will be taken in the spirit in which it is given. He criticized me, the other day, because I introduced into the Legislature many years ago a resolution asking for the institution of a use-lease system in the province. It is quite true. I did, and I was the only one who voted for it. I have voted alone in this House on several occasions because I thought I was right.

The use-lease system that I was asking for then was on the basis of 99-year lease, such as is established in Great Britain and has been established there for many years. I want to say to you that I have no objection to a use-lease. If any person in Saskatchewan wants to go on a use-lease basis on a piece of land or anything else, then I say it is his privilege; but I do not see why one person should be compelled to take a use-lease if he wants a piece of land now, while we others are permitted to enjoy our titles. I have no apology for introducing that resolution back in 1933 or 1934; but it was submitted to the people of this province and they turned it down flat. They did not want it.

Now, I come to the time when the C.C.F. was in Opposition in this House. There are still in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, the member for Kelvington (Mr. Howe), the member for Tisdale (Hon. J. H. Brockelbank) and myself, who were in the Opposition then. When we were on the other side of the House, one of the problems that we used to discuss was the problem of the natural resources, the disposition of the natural resources of this province. I remember that we used to rail loud and long in regard to the manner in which the Liberal Party, which was in power at that time, had handled the natural resources of this province. 'Joe' Phelps, I remember, when he was in here, was going to take over the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company and nobody was going to be allowed to develop anything in Saskatchewan — only the people of Saskatchewan, and they were to be developed for the people of Saskatchewan. The Minister of Natural Resources at the present time was one of those fellows who was criticizing the Government of the day for the manner in which it was handling the natural resources. The C.C.F. advocated the policy of the development of these natural resources in the interests of the people of this province, and I wonder what made the Minister of Natural Resources change his mind!

We had, the other day, a speech made by the hon. member for Maple Creed (Mr. Cameron), and he pointed out (I have some of the notes I took which he was speaking) that certain interests in this province had obtained large concessions in regard to our northern mineral rights. He pointed out that when the matter was up before the Committee of the House, last Session, the Minister of Natural Resources told us that a person named Rhubbra, who was supported by Harry Bronfman, had obtained permits on 9 million acres in the

March 7, 1951

province of Saskatchewan. We also learned at that time that this Rhubbra-Bronfman outfit were acting as promoters, they did not intend to develop it at all, and that a few days later they had turned it over to some other company and, for their interest, they had received an undisclosed cash payment and an over-riding royalty of 2 1/2 per cent on all they held.

We had some experience in Saskatchewan back in 1932 or 1933 with this fellow called Bronfman. It was thought at that time that he had been carrying on some rum-running business in the province of Saskatchewan. The Attorney-General of the day laid some charges against him, but the charges fell through. Mr. Harry Bronfman was too strong a man in Canada for the Provincial Government of Saskatchewan. And I want to warn this Government that they are getting mixed up with a pretty dangerous individual, in my opinion. Now, he controls, I understand from the reports I have read, practically all the liquor distilling plants in Canada and the United States. When I was out trying to defeat this Liberal Party, I used to tell the people that when I wanted to sell a load of hay, or my neighbours wanted to sell any hay, to the Government of Saskatchewan, we could not sell any hay to the Government of Saskatchewan, we had to sell it to a company in our district called the Saskatchewan Hay Company. It was a 'go-between', between the farmer and the Government, and the Government bought it from the Saskatchewan Hay Company. Look up the records. You will find them in the Department of Agriculture. I condemned that practice.

That was not the only practice they carried on; but I condemned that practice on the part of the Liberal Government in this province, and condemn the same practice on the part of the C.C.F. Government in this province. If a concern like this Rhubbra, Gulf Securities, can obtain concessions over nine million acres of the oil rights in this province in order that they might turn it over to somebody else, then I say the Liberals of their day were 'babes-in-the-woods'. I believe that when we are dealing with the natural resources of this province, when a lease is to be given or a permit is to be given, those leases and those permits should be made direct to the parties who are going to develop them, and not to promoters. That is my stand in regard to that.

The Premier said the other day when the member for Maple Creek was talking "Why don't you get up and make a charge?" . . . "Or if any member makes a charge we will have it properly investigated." I am not going to make a charge. I am stating my opinion in regard to these affairs, and I say it is absolutely contrary to the policy that the C.C.F. adopted before it got into power. I am not blaming the Minister of Natural Resources alone; I blame the Government. He did not do it alone. I have been told that he had nothing to do with it, that it was forced on him. I hope that is not right.

I also read, this summer, in fact I have here, a prospectus of the American-Canadian Company, and it was sent to me by a member of the C.C.F. It was sent because he believed there was something wrong, and this American-Canadian Company (also mentioned by the member for Maple Creek) is a company that was investigated by the Attorney-General of New York because they had purchased 83 per cent of the stock of the company; that is, the insiders had purchased 83 per cent of the stock of the company for \$90,000 and then they were trying to sell 17 per cent of it for \$1,750,000 to the public. The Attorney-General down there called a halt.

Now, I want to say a few words (I am sorry I am going over my time) in regard to the Industrial School. We were told the other day that the Industrial School cost \$340,000. In 1949-50 there was an average attendance of 28 boys. The admissions for the year were 74. At the present time there are 30 boys, and the staff at present is 18. Now I think, Mr. Speaker, that the cost of that institution in order to take care of the number of delinquent boys that we have in this province is altogether out of line. That means an expenditure along of \$11,000 per boy, and I am going to ask you how many families of five in the province of Saskatchewan live in a home that cost \$11,000. There is something out of line here. I believe that I was born 45 years too soon, because I know if I was a boy now, I would be trying to get in there, because it is a wonderful place in which to live.

I want to say just a few words in regard to Crown Corporations. I think it is generally admitted now in Saskatchewan by everybody — by the C.C.F. and the Liberal Party — that we have three types of Crown Corporations; public corporations, the co-operatives and the private institutions. The member for Battleford (Mr. Maher) made a slip the other day when he said he would throw some of them out of the windows. I am afraid that, from now on, as long as he is in the public life of Saskatchewan, he will be known as the ‘out-of-the-window’ member from North Battleford.

You all know my stand in regard to Crown Corporations; I do not have to repeat it again. I want to say a word to the Minister of Public Works (Hon. J. A. Darling), however. I think that he is an ideal Cabinet Minister; he is my ideal anyway. I told him yesterday, when he went out of the House, that he had made the only speech in this Legislature that had given us any real information as to what he did last year, as to what he is going to do with the money we are voting for him this next year, and his plans for the future. He told us that he was advocating the policy of plowing all the profits of this corporation back into the corporation, to extend the plant and to reduce the charges to the public, and I think that is a perfect set-up for that particular corporation. I agree with him, and I will support him a hundred per cent. I want to say to him that I congratulate him most sincerely, and if I ever go up into his constituency to hold a meeting I will tell them to send him back to the Legislature of Saskatchewan. If we could carry on this budget debate in the manner in which the Minister of Public Works started out: he is the only one that got up here, of all the Cabinet Ministers, who did not have a chip on his shoulder. He told us from beginning to end what he was doing and trying to do. There was not one word of party politics in his whole address. Even when he got up to answer some criticism that had been levelled the day before, he answered it in a perfectly gentlemanly manner, without any hint whatever of trying to get any political advantage out of it. I think that he deserves credit; and I would be glad to welcome him into my room. He is the type of cabinet minister that I want to see installed in the province of Saskatchewan.

I am through now, I would like to say something about some other departments, but I do not want to take up any more time; there will be other occasions. I have offered some criticism and I have made some suggestions. My group of friends around me here have been at me every day to tell them what my programme was, so I am going to tell them now. I believe in unity, security and freedom, and a society where man is supreme. I shall criticize with malice toward none, with charity towards all and firm in the faith that is in me. I believe in reform and I would reform our political institutions; first, our electoral system; second, our parliamentary system, and third, our administrative system. Right here I want to read a little bit to the

March 7, 1951

House from a book I have here. I want to read it, and I want every member of the House to take notice of this. I want, especially, the Liberal members to take notice of it, because it is taken out of the report of the National Liberal Convention, and I do not mind telling you that I asked the Leader of the Opposition for this book so that I could read it. In this book, on page 202, is one of the finest speeches that I have ever read, and I commend that particular speech especially to the members of the Liberal Party. If they will carry out the ideas expressed in that speech, then they stand to go a long way in the province of Saskatchewan. I said I would reform our electoral system, our parliamentary system and our administrative system. I want to read from Mr. Powers' speech:

“Parliament itself must be reformed and it must shake off the appearance which it presently has, of being a mere debating society and a theatre for platitudes and repetitious speeches. Committees of parliament must be made to function, not merely for the purpose of stifling criticism of the government, but for the purpose of laying bare every important detail of its departmental administration, and of submitting to the control of the people of bureaucratic decisions of boards, bureaus and commissions. When we have accomplished some of these things, we will be entitled to say that we have restored responsible government to Canada. We will be entitled, also, to say to the followers of other ideologies and -isms that democracy does work and can be of benefit to the people without the intervention of either crypto-communism or neo-fascism.”

I would commend that speech for “must” reading to every member of the Legislature. I would suggest that the members of the Liberal Party read it twenty times.

Now, I would amend The Election Act to provide for majority representation by use of the single, transferable ballot and proportional representation, where applicable. And as soon as possible I would provide for an election of one-third of the members of the Legislature every two years. This would provide a representative, stable government which would not be subject to violent change. It would also end partisan government, which has served its purpose, no doubt, but in my opinion stands in the way of true democracy. Second, I would reform the parliamentary system by having the Cabinet re-elected every two years by the elected members of the Legislature. The Cabinet then would be directly responsible to the member of the Legislature. This would put the Legislature and Cabinet right side up; it is upside down now. Third, every part of the administration, whether department, Crown corporation or other public service, should be directly responsible to a Minister and, through him, to the Legislature. This would end all forms of irresponsible commissions and bureaucracies. Insofar as the present administration is concerned I would first re-organize the Government and cut the portfolios to ten. I would place Agriculture and Co-operation together, and I would perhaps place Municipal Affairs and Labour together. I would place all “splinter” branches under proper departments.

What I mean by “splinter” branches is well known to the members of the Legislature. For instance, we have four Departments of this Government doing exactly the same type of work. I refer to land clearance, done by the Department of Social Welfare, by the Department of Agriculture, by the Department of Municipal Affairs and by the Department of Natural Resources. The Minister of Social Welfare tells us, in committee the other day, that he is running his branch very efficiently. In fact, when we had the Minister of Agriculture in there we wanted to know how efficiently he was running his, because, after all, we want the most efficient man in the Department of Agriculture and we will perhaps have to move the Minister of Social Welfare to the Department of Agriculture.

Agriculture should be given its proper recognition in the Cabinet. In a Cabinet that I would have anything to do with, there would be no two Cabinet Ministers from the same city or the same seat. I would change the government advisers; all imported theorists and experts would be advised that their visit to Saskatchewan was over. I have great faith in the people of Saskatchewan. I believe the people of Saskatchewan understand their own province, and I believe that they can solve their own problems better than anyone else. I believe in the people of Saskatchewan; they are supreme. We do not need anybody from New York or Chicago or Toronto or London or Vancouver or Calgary to tell us how to run our province. I would make the members of the Legislature the real advisers to the Government. If they are not fit to advise the Government that is in power, then they should not be elected as members of the Legislature.

All forms of bureaucracy should be abolished, delegations that come in to see the Cabinet or any Minister should always be accompanied by the member of the constituency from which they come. All members of the Legislature should be the true representatives of their constituency, no matter to what party they belong. I wonder today if, in any matters of local concern, the Government asks for the advice of the member concerned opposite. I know that when the Liberal Party was in power they never asked me anything about the Constituency of Last Mountain. I know that when they were in power and when I was elected, they had a road-gang working on No. 22 Highway near Earl Grey, a few days after the election the machinery went away and left three miles uncompleted. And I want to thank the Minister of Highways here for completing that for me after he became Minister.

All legislation and all programmes should be initiated by resolution of the Legislature. That would be a change. The Legislature should direct the Government, rather than the Government direct the Legislature.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I have already stated, if the Government tells this Legislature how and where this \$58 million is to be spent, I will vote for the budget. If we are not given full information, I shall vote against the budget. We are the elected representatives of the people. We must be given full information.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! It is my duty to inform the House that the mover of the Motion is about to exercise his privilege of closing the debate. Anyone wishing to speak may do so now.

Hon. C. M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, two weeks ago I had the privilege of introducing the budget, and for two weeks now we have taken up a great deal of the time of

March 7, 1951

this House listening to various speakers, either speaking for the budget, speaking against the budget or, as in many cases, speaking on something not related to the budget at all. This afternoon, we have listened to a speech from the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. J. Benson) in which he has dealt with a great many of the matters contained in the budget, and some of them outside. I would like to deal with one or two of those first.

The member criticized me because I gave a copy of the budget address to the press before it was given to the Legislature. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that the practice we followed this year is the practice that was followed in Saskatchewan always until about three years ago. It is a practice which has been followed with respect to budgets given at Ottawa. Year after year the budget address is given at Ottawa at three o'clock in the afternoon, and we read it in our papers that same afternoon. In Ontario, for example, where the time is two hours faster, it appears on the street before the budget address is completed in the House. The budget address is sent out from Ottawa 24 or 48 hours ahead of the time it is actually delivered, keeping out any secrets, anything that may give information which could be of benefit to the people. I want say very frankly that I have no objection to giving my address to the press with the understanding that that address will not appear on the street until such time as it has been given to the members of this House. That is the understanding I had with the press. They agreed that they would keep their papers back, and would not let them out until after four o'clock that afternoon.

Now the hon. member made some reference to the fact that the Provincial Treasurer feels that he is paying the public debt out of his own pocket. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have tried year after year to give credit to the people of Saskatchewan, and have on more than one occasion stated that the buoyant revenue conditions of the province were largely responsible for our ability to reduce the debt as much as we have. I want to come back to that question of debt, later, in connection with some remarks made by the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson).

I resent, Mr. Speaker, the proposal that was made this afternoon by the member for Last Mountain, that I find the other Ministers in the Cabinet in the way and that they are a bunch of spendthrift Ministers. I want to tell you, today, that you will look the length and breadth of this province before you will find a more loyal and co-operative group of people than my colleagues in this Cabinet, and I want to say to you today, too, that the task we had this year was an almost superhuman task of preparing a budget on figures comparable to those of the past year, considering the greatly increased cost of living that has taken place. As a matter of fact, this budget, while it may appear to be \$3,000,000 higher, if you take the cost-of-living index of January, 1950, the budget is actually a million dollars less than it was last year. Now, Mr. Speaker, you could not get that kind of a condition if I were working with a bunch of spendthrift ministers. I want to say that I have every confidence in my colleagues. The hon. member for Last Mountain may have no confidence in them — that is his privilege — but I have. And if his suggestions in his nice remarks were directed to me as a possible recruit for his 'third force', I would like to say that they have fallen upon deaf ears. I have no intention of becoming a member of that 'third force' to be lead by the hon. member for Last Mountain.

The hon. member said that we did not need the Budget Bureau; cast some remarks about it. I want to say to you today that the Budget Bureau

was never intended to take the place of the Cabinet. The Budget Bureau is simply a group of advisers, a group of technical people, everyone of them university graduates, every one of them especially trained and skilled. I am sure that if the members could see the type of work they are doing they would be much more appreciative. For instance, I have here in my hand a copy of a report dated March 2nd, which has just been handed to me. This report is a survey of Government vehicles. The survey was undertaken at our request, for the purpose of obtaining more efficient utilization of the existing fleet of automobiles. Now, Mr. Speaker, someone mentioned in the debate, last night, that there were far too many automobiles. Very well, perhaps there are too many automobiles. I do not know; but I am going to find out, and I have got information in this report that is going to help me in finding out. I am sure that if the hon. members saw the type of work that is done and read this report, they would find that this one report alone will probably pay for the entire cost of the Budget Bureau for the next year.

Mr. Tucker: — Is it available to the members?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — No, this is a document which is made out to myself. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the hon. member for Last Mountain should be one of the last to complain about the Budget Bureau, because he is one that has made suggestions from time to time about the condition of public accounts and about the condition of the estimates. The greatly improved condition of these is due in no small measure to the part that has been played by the Budget Bureau in their preparation. Today, for example, our public accounts are prepared in such a form that they tell you practically anything you want to know without asking questions. The information is right there, except, of course, on matters of policy which the Opposition try to get out of Public Accounts Committee.

I am not going to deal with the question that the budget is too big. I am going to come back to that later; also the too many extravagant ideas. I did, I might say, leave a space on the first page of my notes for suggestions from the hon. members as to how the budget might be cut, but the page is blank.

I think the highlight of the afternoon's address is when the hon. member said that the budget has been balanced by bringing in supplementary estimates which we still have to pass. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is a new way of balancing a budget. Supplementary estimates, if anything, should help to throw the budget more out of balance because supplementary estimates are increased expenditures. Supplementary estimates have nothing to do with revenue. Yet we are told this afternoon, that the budget has only been balanced by bringing in supplementary estimates which we still have to pass.

Then I was asked the question if I believed in using cash income as a guide for determining the budget, and the hon. member quoted from something in my address. This was also quoted, last night, by the hon. member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski). I want, to say, Mr. Speaker, that I resent very much the way in which the hon. member for Redberry twisted the remark completely out of the context. As a matter of fact, I doubt if he has read the address. Certainly his statement last night did not give any indication that he had. If he had read it, he would have been able to understand what he was trying to read. But he takes the first line of the paragraph and the last line of the paragraph and leaves out what comes in between. Yes, the hon. gentleman said the preliminary estimate of cash income of Saskatchewan

March 7, 1951

farmers for 1950 is now placed at \$405,000,000, a drop of about 27 per cent below the previous year. And then he skips and reads, "However, a rough estimate of the gross value by agricultural output in the 1950-51 crop year, which takes into account the additional income yet to be received, approximates \$690,000,000, possibly an all-time high." And then, the hon. gentleman says that those two statements are contradictory.

If he had read the address he would have seen what I pointed out was that Saskatchewan farmers increased the province's physical output of grains of all kinds by 120 million bushels, but that their cash receipts for the calendar year have been far below those of 1949. Then I set out the reasons for it. Now, Mr. Speaker, what it means in simple English, which I am sure the hon. member for Redberry can follow — if he can't he should not have a certificate for teaching in one of our schools; what it means is that we have reduced more in greater volume goods in 1950 than in many years, but, because of the Federal Government's policy of paying only \$1.40 a bushel instead of \$1.75 as was paid previously, the income for the crop will not be received in the year 1950, but will come into this year's income.

I would like to tell the hon. member for Last Mountain that I have not let the members of this Legislature down very badly yet. I have never at any time had to bring in any budget which did not balance. I have never at any time in the last seven years had a deficit, and I want to say here very frankly that nothing short of a major catastrophe could ever make this budget turn into a deficit either. I have every confidence, Mr. Minister, that next year at this time I shall be able to tell the hon. members of this House that there is a very substantial surplus again.

I noticed the hon. Leader of the Opposition applauded the statement that was made by the member for Last Mountain when he said that we were doing everything we could in this provincial budget to increase inflation. And the hon. member for Melford (Mr. J. C. Egnatoff) is shaking his head, as though he agrees. Now, Mr. Speaker, do the hon. gentlemen believe that putting money out into the hands of old-age pensioners, putting money out into the schools to enable our schools to be operated, putting money into the hands of people who require health services, putting money into our hospitals to enable the hospitals to operate — do they believe that that is inflation? Do they believe that spending money in developing our natural resources, do they believe that money spent in developing the agricultural industry in this province, do they believe that money spent in trying to develop co-operative that these things cause inflation? As I pointed out to you before, we are actually asking the members of this Legislature for less money than we did a year ago, in terms of real value of the dollar. And yet they say we are increasing inflation by this — a million dollars less!

I was very interested in the statement that we should not refer to what was done by the Liberal Party; that it was not fair; the hon. member was not interested. Really, I was expecting any time that he was going to pull out of his pocket a letter from Mr. Gardiner, announcing that Mr. Gardiner (that is 'Wilf' Gardiner) was withdrawing from Last Mountain and was going to support the hon. member for Last Mountain. Actually, what are we here for, Mr. Speaker? What are we here for if we are not going to make these comparisons? How can we ever determine whether this Government is carrying out its responsibilities and its duties if we cannot make comparisons

with previous governments? What other way is there? Are we supposed to make comparisons with other provinces? Is that the way to do it? Well, I shall have something to say about that later on.

Then the hon. gentleman said that he could support the budget if we were setting aside something for a rainy day. Then, in the very next breath he went on to tell the Minister of Highways that he wanted a lot of work done: about Highway No. 14 being in bad condition, Highway No. 15 being in bad condition. But he wants the money put in the bank. Now, how in the world are you going to do these things and put aside this money for a rainy day? Now, Mr. Speaker, we could quite easily do that. As I have told you before, I consider that the best nestegg that this province can possibly have is to build up the credit of the province, to get the debt paid off to enable us to go out and borrow money cheaply. That, to me, is one of the best ways that we can possibly set money aside for a rainy day. I might also say that to me, keeping healthy, giving people education, giving people services to enable them to live a more abundant life, is putting money in the bank. Anything that adds to the happiness and the wellbeing of the people and helps those people to serve their country more fully in future years, that, to me, is putting money in the bank.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was surprised to learn this afternoon that the Premier had left the hospital programme in such a mess when the Minister of Public Health took it over. I was also surprised to learn that one of the chief reasons that the hon. gentleman thought it was in a mess was that we did not consult the local people enough. Well, that is not the criticism that we had from the opposite side, or the criticism, I believe, that the hon. gentleman himself made a few years ago. At that time the criticism was that we were consulting too many people. You will remember the statement, Mr. Speaker. You were in the House when the hon. members opposite said that we had a committee of advisers to advise the advisers to advise the advisers. In other words, we had a committee made up of common people, like the hon. member for Arm River — Well, I withdraw that, Mr. Speaker, that implication is unfair to the other people; a committee made up of a number of common, ordinary people. We had 30 to 35 of them on that advisory committee. We called them all in, they had many, many meetings to discuss this whole program. At that time, they were the ones who advised the Government as to the policy that should be followed. If our plan is in a mess, what about British Columbia where we have a Conservative-Liberal Coalition government operating it? They are millions and millions of dollars in the hole, and yet they are charging fees of \$21 for a single person, \$33 for a family — yes, and they introduced a three per cent sales tax in order to provide extra money for the hospital plan.

The hon. gentleman also came up with a new suggestion this afternoon, that we should have a tax on all the people of the province, whether they are in a hospital district or not, so that they would contribute to the cost of hospitals. Well, I want to say that we have looked at that and we spent a lot of time studying it. I am sure the member for Humboldt (Mr. Loehr) would be very interested in the suggestion. I am sure that he would be one of the first to point out how unfair that would be to his people in Humboldt, where, for example, they have a hospital operated by the Sisters of Charity who have contributed, not through taxes, but dollar contributions made by the people throughout that locality, and then, in many cases, grants from the municipality, and then to come along and suggest that those people should have to pay an additional tax. There is the problem. If it were not for these private hospitals I think we could work out some such plan as was suggested by the hon. member for Arm River.

March 7, 1951

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word about the Natural Resources. The hon. gentleman objects to Mr. Rhubbra getting permits to transfer to someone else, and pointed out that we should only grant permits directly to the persons who develop it. In other words, he would not allow an assignment to anyone. I noticed the Leader of the Opposition applauded the statement that he would not allow any assignment to anyone . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, excuse me, the reason I applauded that statement was that it should not be given to speculators and gangsters.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Well, Mr. Speaker, how in the world can anybody get a permit and then turn around and assign it to somebody else without being a speculator? You cannot have it both ways. You are either for it or against it. And I wish the Opposition Leader would tell us whether or not he is in favour of these permits being allowed to be assigned or not.

Mr. Tucker: — I am certainly not in favour of one group of people getting control of over 10 million acres out of which they can make possibly millions of dollars at the expense of the people of this province.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Well, Mr. Speaker, that still does not answer the question. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has, as quite frequently, skated around without giving us a definite answer as to whether or not he is in favour of the assignment of these leases. The hon. Minister of Natural Resources, the other day, pointed out that recently we had given a lease for potash development, yet here we find already that the organization, the Bata Petroleum Company, to which this was given, have come along and wanted us to assign the lease to somebody else who has the capital to develop it — and this within a period of a month. Now, if my hon. friend had his way there would be no assignment allowed. In other words, Bata Petroleums would either have to develop that themselves, or else they would not be able to go ahead with it. They would not get the lease. Well, now, that just is not the way these things are done any place in the world, Mr. Speaker.

This afternoon, a statement was made about the Industrial School to the effect that the cost of the Institution was out of line in that it had a staff of 18 with only 28 boys. Well, I think it has been pointed out on more than one occasion, Mr. Speaker, that this staff of 18 do things other than look after the boys in the Industrial School. This staff have a certain responsibility in connection with the entire administration of these young lads who get into trouble. Many of them who go before police magistrates, probably are out on probation. The staff of the Industrial School visit these boys, give them guidance, give them advice, give them help. In other words, the big majority of the time of some of them is not devoted at all to the work in the Industrial School but to work that is done outside. It is most unfair to say that there are 28 boys that cost so much to operate the Institution and, therefore, it should be all charged against that. I would point out, too, that that school is designed for 100 boys and, while it is true that during the past year there were only 28, there are more than that today and undoubtedly there will be more in future.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to say much more about the speech from the hon. member for Last Mountain. I want to congratulate him on his very fine programme of unity, security, freedom. Those are all splendid words, we are all for them. There is nobody at all in this room who does not believe in unity of the people. We all believe in that. Security?

Why, certainly! Security, yes. We believe not only in the security of the nation, but we believe in the security of the individual. It is very important. Economic security is very important. Freedom — we all believe in freedom. I must say, however, that with regard to some of these theories of government, which were proposed this afternoon, I think the hon. gentleman should think them over very carefully before we put them into effect. You know, this old British Empire, the British Commonwealth of Nations, is getting pretty old now. It has been going for many hundreds of years. These institutions that we have in this country have been built up over a long period of time. If the proposals of our hon. friend are good, I am sure that there are bright men in many parts of the British Commonwealth who would have seized upon them long ago. I am sure, too, that there are people who have copied the British system, such as the United States, who would have picked these theories. The Legislature should direct the government: yes, we are willing, and anxious, for direction. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman how many resolutions he has introduced in this House in the last seven years, recommending certain policies to be considered by the Government? I have not any recollection of any. I have not any recollection of any coming from the Opposition in seven years. We have had no guidance from them, and I do not think we should be too ready to criticize, when we have shirked our responsibility. If we feel it as keenly as the hon. member for Last Mountain evidently does, then he should have given some practical demonstration of his desire to direct the Government by having given us resolutions asking us to consider things, from time to time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of things that I had prepared to say this afternoon, but, in view of the fact that we have had an hour and twenty minutes, I think possibly the members would appreciate dealing with something else. So, with the consent to the House, I should like to adjourn the debate at this time.

Mr. Speaker: — Is it agreed that we adjourn the debate?

Debate adjourned.

Hon. W. A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition): — On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. If we had known this debate was going to be adjourned today, other speakers from this side would have taken part. We consented to the arrangement whereby the vote would be concluded today, in order to facilitate the other business of the House. The arrangement was definitely made, as I understand it, between the two Whips that this debate would be concluded today, and that is why certain people, on this side, did not take part in it, Mr. Speaker. I do not know what we are going to do if arrangements definitely made, on which people do rely, are going to be so lightly broken. It is most unfortunate, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me that if we are going to try to handle this business on a basis of good faith between the different parties, then these arrangements have to be lived up to. I am sure the Provincial Treasurer and premier, if they made this motion to adjourn this debate, made it without any knowledge between the Whips, which I can hardly believe. Knowing the efficient nature of the Whip on the other side of the House, I certainly would expect that he would communicate the arrangements. Arrangements were made whereby we did not put on all our speakers so as to have the vote today, and in order to facilitate the business of the House; but here we have the debate adjourned

March 7, 1951

at around half-past four in the afternoon. I cannot help but think that when we wanted to have an adjournment, and where there was not any breach of arrangement or anything like that, it was voted down on the demand of the Premier. Now, here we have a definite breach of arrangement, without any consultation, and it leaves us in a position where the Provincial Treasurer is able to have a chance to make a further speech tomorrow, and whereby we gave up a right we might have had to take part in the debate today.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I accept full responsibility for any change in the plans that had been made. May I point out that we had to change the plans a number of times because of the gentlemen opposite. We hoped to take a vote on Friday, but the hon. members opposite wanted to put on speakers, which was, of course, their privilege. As far as taking speakers off is concerned, the vote does not compel them to take speakers off. There was one speaker here, last night, who was ready to go on but stood down in order that we might bring this matter to a close as quickly as possible. Now it was planned, today, that the Provincial Treasurer would get a chance to wind up the debate; but he only got on the air about 4.10; whereas it had been planned that he would probably get on about 3.45. It was nobody's fault. I suggested to him and to the Whip that it seemed to me the only fair thing to do, if he was going to make a proper summary of the debate (which has been considerably prolonged) was to give him leave to adjourn the debate and an opportunity of discussing it later.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! As far as the Speaker is concerned, the request was made to adjourn the debate. I took it the majority voted and the vote was taken and accepted, and there is nothing can be done about it unless someone moves this question.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, the matter has been raised on a Point of Order, or a question of privilege, on the proceedings of the House and I think, by unanimous consent, there would be no objection to our simply clarifying the point.

As I say, I felt, and so suggested to the Whip, that the Provincial Treasurer should adjourn the debate and proceed with it later. It will not hold up any of the business of the House as we can have second readings here, and there is plenty of work for the Committee of the Whole. We can take the vote later. But I think, in view of the lateness with which he got on, he should, at least, be allowed a reasonable amount of time to discuss and summarize the debate, on the radio. It is not going to inconvenience the House. There is plenty of work on the Order Paper here to keep us busy and to carry on with until the budget debate is complete.

Mr. Benson: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege: I think perhaps I am the culprit in regard to the upset arrangements. I am sorry that I took longer than I intended, but unless you write out your speech and read it over and time it, it is impossible to tell how long you are going to be. I was longer than I should have been, and I have to apologize to the House for that.

Mr. Speaker: — I think the whole thing is out of order.

Mr. J. E. McCormack: — Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House, I would like to say a few words. On this point, and speaking

for this side, I understood that the Provincial Treasurer was going to wind up the debate this afternoon, and that a vote would be taken. I would suggest to the Premier and to the Whip on the other side that, under the circumstances, they might have notified me of any change. We could, possibly, have arranged for other speakers to fill up the time, and the Provincial Treasurer could have wound up the debate tomorrow, if he found that he did not have sufficient time today. Last evening, we had much the same trouble. I must say that the Government Whip and I have had most cordial relations, but it was a little difficult sometimes. Last night we had much the same thing — one of our speakers stood down, due to much the same problem. He curtailed his speech to about five minutes and discontinued, in order to give the member for Last Mountain the airtime today, as was arranged. I think, under the circumstances, it leaves me in a very embarrassing position. I think I am entitled to be notified at least; other speakers could have been called on, and the Provincial Treasurer could have taken the airtime tomorrow.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. member. We probably should have done that; but there was not much time before the Provincial Treasurer got up, and we thought that if he got on by even 4.00 o'clock, or five minutes to 4.00, he would have had adequate time. But time kept going on, and probably a note should have been sent across to my hon. friend. I do not feel, however, that any time will be lost. There is enough work to keep the House going this afternoon, and to keep us busy, and we can wind it up either tomorrow; or, if some of the private members want to go on tomorrow, we can wind it up on Friday, whichever the Whips agree on.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! I do not think that this debate should go on. As far as I am concerned, as far as the conduct of this House is concerned, the thing is finished, unless you want to rescind what you have done. As far as the conduct of the House is concerned, I have no cognizance of what arrangements you have made or anything of that kind, and I do not think it has any control of the action that has been taken. When the hon. member asked for permission to adjourn the debate, it was granted. We then went to the next item of business, and there is only one thing that can be done. That is, if you wish to rescind what you have done; it is up to the House itself.

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, sitting here as a private member of this House, I think it comes as a shock to all the members here. We did not know what was happening. We hardly knew he had adjourned. We looked at each other, and there it was. There was no member on this side of the House had any idea of what was going on, and, I am sure, if we had known, the routine of this House, or the speeches, would have been timed a little differently. I think it is a most peculiar thing — at times we have been asking for certain things and they have been refused to us. The Whips had made an agreement that this debate was going to be wound up this afternoon, and we fully relied on that agreement. As far as the members of the House are concerned, this thing was slipped over so quickly, because we did not know even what the Provincial Treasurer said . . .

Mr. Speaker: — What arrangements the Whips have made does not control the procedure in this House. If the Whips made arrangements

March 7, 1951

for a certain number of speakers and the speakers took a lot longer than they were supposed to take, you can throw all the thing out; but as far as any arrangement made by the Whips, I have no cognizance of it. I conduct this Chamber according to the rules that are set up.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I would just like to point out to Your Honour that I was prepared to . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! There is nothing before the House to debate. You are out of order.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Well, what sorry state of affairs!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

The Assembly adjourned at 6.00 o'clock p.m.