

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session — Eleventh Legislature**  
**43rd Day**

**Tuesday, April 3, 1951**

The House met at eleven o'clock a.m.

Moved by Mr. A. Loptson (Saltcoats), seconded by Mr. A.W. Loehr (Humboldt):

“THAT this Assembly urges the Federal Government to give consideration to exempting from Income Tax levies annual income up to six hundred dollars derived from dairy and poultry production on farms the main income of which is derived from other products; such sum to be considered as non-taxable income of the wife of the farmer operating the farm if she resides on the farm with him.”

**Mr. Loptson:** — Mr. Speaker, I had intended to give you a pretty fair picture of the importance of the work that women are doing on the farms, and their children as well; not only in the amount of produce that they produce in overtime work, often early in the morning and late at night; but in view of the fact that we want to expedite the work of this Assembly, I am going to make it very short.

A great many of the members in this House have lived on farms and know what the women do, particularly on mixed farms, and I hardly think it is necessary to illustrate to them. The others, I think, will realize the value of increased production that is brought about by their work, and in many instances, the hardship they go through.

I think you will agree with me, Mr. Speaker, too, that we, as men, do not always appreciate the work that our women do, and it is high time that we should recognize that, even in this small way; to earmark the earnings from that particular work they do so much to produce, or the revenue they do so much to produce, by asking the Government to exempt them to this small amount from income tax levies, and especially so that they would have at least that much independent interest in the investment itself.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I am going to move the foregoing motion.

**Mr. V.P. Deshaye (Melville):** — Mr. Speaker my remarks will be even shorter than those of the hon. member from Saltcoats.

Speaking in support of the resolution, I would like to point this feature out — that, it seems to me, there should be some additional exemptions for farm wives, because those of us who happen to live in towns or cities know that our wives are not entailed in adding to the income of the particular occupation in which we happen to be, as our wives pretty well stay home and occupy themselves in other ways. I admit that the wives of

**April 3, 1951**

people in towns and cities play an important part in the society that we have, in different types of work; but the wife on the farm plays an additional part in that she helps to milk the cows and feed the chickens, and helps in creating the revenue that the farmer has to declare on his Income Tax returns. She cooks for a threshing gang, possibly, or for the different people who work on the farm, and her load is a little heavier, and as a result of her efforts the income of that farmer is increased, and still the farmer has to pay income tax on that total income. Therefore, I wish to support the motion to that extent, that I feel there should be this exemption which is asked for in this motion so that there will be a greater exemption to the farmer on the income that he has to declare to his Income Tax office, because, as stated, the wife has a great deal to do with increasing that income, and, therefore, the couple should be entitled to a larger exemption for that reason.

The question being put, and motion was agreed to unanimously.

## **HOUSING**

The House resumed from Tuesday, March 20, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Heming:

“THAT this Assembly, recognizing the serious lack of housing not only for veterans’ families but for the civilian population as well, and recognizing also that the provision of decent hygienic and comfortable homes within the reach of all is a primary condition of the democratic way of life, urges upon the Government of Canada that it either assume full responsibility for the provision of adequate housing, or make it possible for the Municipalities and Province to collaborate fully with the Federal Government in the public housing programme provided for under the National Housing Act by completing the necessary agreements and assuring adequate building supplies, materials and equipment.”

**Mr. Gibbs:** — Mr. Speaker, it looks as though we started out pretty well this morning. We broke a few records already, and I can assure the House that, in this debate, I will probably be in line with our hon. friend from Saltcoats. I am not going to take very long, because, I think, Mr. Speaker, that every member in this House knows the serious situation — the housing problem of Saskatchewan. There is no doubt about that at all, and after we heard the hon. member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Heming), last week, and also the hon. member from Saskatoon (Mr. Stone), I think they gave us quite a very good outline of the actual conditions of the housing situation in this province.

Therefore, I can concur with everything they said, and at this time I would just like to bring to your attention the plight of my own city of Swift Current with regard to the housing problem. I received a letter from

the Swift Current Council the other day. In part it says:

“We have 130 applications for housing accommodation.”

Mr. R.H. McLellan, representing the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation has a waiting list of 171, who would like to obtain one of the homes erected under their last scheme.

There may be some duplication on these lists. The housing situation is somewhat desperate. People are living in homes that are not at all sanitary, and the Medical Health Officer recently condemned a house in which there are five families living. There is no foundation, and the sills have rotted so that the house has sunk and the floor has heaved.

There are people living in garages and other buildings, which is a disgrace to any community, and I quite agree with that, Mr. Speaker.

The rents they are charging in some places are out of reason. One party is paying \$70 per month for a small suite in a building which was erected for a bus depot. We have three families living in a tin shed that was used for a warehouse, right in the centre of town, with no modern facilities. There are a number of men working in Swift Current who cannot find any accommodation whatsoever, and are separated from their families. If accommodation was available for them here, it would relieve the situation at some other point.

So there you are, Mr. Speaker. That just about sums up the situation in Swift Current, and I think I can say, possibly without contradiction, that the same thing applies to most towns and cities of our province.

Now we have heard, from the floor of this House, about the shortage of building materials on account of the defence situation that is being set up; but we heard the member — I think it was the member from Saskatoon who quoted that probably there are lots of materials available yet for building. There is no doubt about it, we have to have homes. We have to have suitable dwellings in order to keep up the morale of our citizens and give them everything that is going.

I would like at this time just to pass on the compliments, that over in Swift Current there, prior to the abandonment of the Airport housing about five miles east of the city, through our Provincial Government we housed for a number of years hundreds and hundreds of families, which did relieve the situation somewhat. Had it not been for the Provincial Government and the Airport houses they had out there, I do not know just what would have happened, because these people at least had a roof over their heads; they had modern facilities. I tell you it was a great acquisition to Swift Current. So, without further ado, Mr. Speaker, I think, and I feel pretty certain, that every member in this House is going to support this housing motion. With that, I take pleasure in seconding the resolution.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Mr. Speaker, I cannot hope to be as brief as the other speakers this morning, but I promise you that I will not take as much time as the gentlemen opposite have taken in this Legislature;  
on

**April 3, 1951**

various other occasions. Believe me, this is a most important subject, and I intend to deal with it, I trust, adequately.

Mr. Speaker, the chapter of Canadian history dealing with housing since World War II could be summarized in one word, and that word is "failure." The situation, since the end of the war, right across the Dominion of Canada, has become progressively worse until today, not only have we failed to provide housing for veterans, but I venture to say that a million homes are required in this relatively sparsely populated country of Canada, to adequately house the people here.

The only concern of this Government, since taking office in 1944, has been to assist the senior Government, and the responsible Government, in every way possible to provide adequate housing in this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in order to keep the record straight, I intend to deal, as briefly as possible, with the history of housing insofar as this Government is concerned since 1944. Let it not be forgotten that in all progressive countries in the world, housing is a national responsibility. It is so in New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Britain and so on. Nevertheless, this Provincial Government has, at all times, co-operated with the Federal Government, and has endeavoured to persuade the Federal Government to permit us to participate more accurately in housing.

Go back to August 5, 1945, when the National Housing Act was amended at Ottawa. Mr. Ilsley, speaking on the amendment at that time, has this to say:

"The National Housing Act provides that a low-dividend housing corporation, or life insurance company, may undertake the housing project, and if it does it may do so under the terms set out in the Bill. If it is a limited dividend corporation, the Dominion Government will lend 9 per cent of the cost of the project at 3 per cent on certain conditions."

I wrote to the Hon. Mr. Ilsley and to the Hon. Mr. Howe, who was in charge of housing, and this is an extract from my letter:

"I have mentioned before that the Saskatchewan Government has established the Saskatchewan Reconstruction Housing Corporation which has assisted materially in meeting the housing emergency. We are extremely anxious to extend the activities of this Housing Corporation in order that more people in Saskatchewan may be provided with comfortable low rental homes.

"We therefore request that you consider the Saskatchewan Reconstruction Housing Corporation as a limited dividend housing corporation for the purpose of developing low-rental housing projects.

"The Saskatchewan Government further requests that a loan be made to the Saskatchewan Reconstruction Housing Corporation under the same terms and conditions

as are given to other limited housing corporations already engaged in projects of this nature.”

The reply I received from Mr. Howe was very much to the point as negotiations always are with Mr. Howe. He says this, (in part):

“We are grateful for the activities of your Government in assisting the Dominion to meet the current national housing emergency.”

What he referred to were the 700 emergency housing units that this Provincial Government set up in some 15 municipalities across the province of Saskatchewan; something that had not been done by any other provincial government in the Dominion of Canada. That is what he is referring to. Mr. Howe goes on to state:

“There are, as you know, good reasons why the Dominion, at this time, finds it difficult to make a loan under Section 9 to a province or a municipality. Past experience with loans of this type do not lend much encouragement. Facilities for such loans would have to be extended to all provinces and municipalities. Materials are in very short supply for even our current housing programme. Loans to provincial or municipal housing authorities would merely develop a transfer of housing from one type to another, rather than add to our new supply. All of these reasons lead me to believe that it is not a propitious moment to enter into this new field of financing.”

And so we were refused. The Saskatchewan Reconstruction Housing Corporation was not accepted as a low-dividend housing corporation, and we were refused that loan. We were prepared to enter into a large-scale housing programme, back as far as 1945. When we could not do so, we did the next best thing. We went into emergency housing, and, as I have explained, we did provide over 700 of these units in some 15 municipalities in the province.

In 1949, Mr. Speaker, just prior to the election, we find promises made on the hustings by practically all Liberal speakers, and I am quoting from a speech made by the Prime Minister, and this is what he said, prior to the 1949 election:

“It is up to the provincial and municipal authorities to decide what public housing projects are desirable. Any provincial government that really means business will find no difficulty in securing co-operation from the Government at Ottawa. Our Government will not be satisfied until there is a decent home for every Canadian family.”

This is representative of Liberal election promises. It is propaganda of the very worst kind, appealing as it does to people who were desperately in need of housing. And certainly, in the light of performance, that is the worst type of promise to be made to an expectant Canadian electorate. If every Canadian

**April 3, 1951**

would take as his political watchword, "I shall not be influenced by the propaganda of words but by the propaganda of performance of action", then we would get homes in this country, and we would get health services too, and old-age pensions without a means test, and many other things.

Section 35 of the National Housing Act was amended in November, 1949, and as soon as it was humanly possible we passed the necessary complementary legislation in this Legislature in March, 1950, and we set aside \$2 million for our share in the housing programme. We entered into negotiations with municipalities and with Ottawa. I have found, frankly, that these negotiations were not as satisfactory as I would wish. I tried to get from Ottawa a statement of the regulations under this amendment to the National Housing Act, in which they agreed to pay 75 per cent of any housing projects, the provinces and municipalities to pay the remaining 25 per cent, but I could not get those regulations. I wrote, in June, 1950, to Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, and this is the reply:

"Sufficient progress in the working out of Dominion-Provincial arrangements under Section 35 of the National Housing Act has not been made for any firm set of rules to be established, as preparation of administrative instructions relative to this section of the act is still under study. As you know, Section 35 of the Act, being enabling in character, was so worded that it covered in a broad way almost any type of project which a province might wish to put forth. For the very reason that it is so general in character, it is difficult to frame guiding regulations."

Nevertheless, we went ahead with our negotiations with Ottawa. We went ahead with our negotiations with the municipalities and, as I have mentioned in this House, some 15 municipalities have their housing-project negotiations and investigations in various degrees of completion. I merely mention this, because in the press and in the letter I have received from Mr. Winters, under date of March 21, there is an intimation that this amendment to Section 35 had been on the statute books for 15 months before the provinces or the municipalities took advantage of it. Now I wish to state categorically that the municipalities have co-operated 100 per cent, and this Provincial Government has co-operated 100 per cent, in trying to get these negotiations through, and they would have been through and housing projects entered into commencing this spring. So in spite of the difficulties, in spite of the increased cost of building materials of all kinds and in spite of the fact that regulations had not been established under Section 35 of the National Housing Act, the municipalities of this province and the Provincial Government did everything possible to consummate these agreements and to get on with the job of providing houses for Saskatchewan people.

Well, as you know, Mr. Speaker, it has been pleaded that the national emergency prevents our proceeding with housing, and we have so been informed by the responsible Minister, Mr. Winters. But I want to state that there is evidence of availability of building supplies enough to provide a minimum of 2,000 houses in the province of Saskatchewan, and unless those supplies are deliberately diverted to other housing projects elsewhere in the Dominion, they should be available to the people here in Saskatchewan.

With regard to the situation in the United States, in "Time", March 19, 1951, I find this statement:

"Building was nearly 25 per cent above February 1950 figures."

That is, home-building in the United States, in February of this year, was 25 per cent above what it was in the corresponding month, last year. The United States industry was expanding so fast, and material cutbacks had worked so well, that the national production authority was changing its mind about the extent of controls needed with respect to building supplies. These shortages, it states, are so terrible — one man writes: "I will soon have to rent another warehouse to store my goods". Well, I am wondering if there are not building supplies in the Dominion of Canada, as there are in the United States, to enable us to go ahead with the housing programme in this province. And if there are not supplies, it is due to the ineptitude of the Ottawa Government that we have not got such supplies. In a country with all the building materials and resources of Canada, to be in short supply five years after the last war, is very remarkable indeed.

They complain of shortages in steel: 2½ tons of steel is required for each home. Well, Mr. Speaker, if there was ever need for the nationalization of the steel industry in this Dominion, it is certainly now. One can scarcely blame Britain for nationalizing the steel industry there, in order to increase supplies to enable them to take care of their defence programme, as well as to provide for housing in that country, as they are doing today . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Ask the Provincial Treasurer about that.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — A facetious remark of that kind is scarcely worthy of the Leader of the Opposition. He evidently is not aware of the seriousness of the housing situation in this province, or he does not care.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to elaborate on the seriousness of the housing situation here, but a report from the Regina Veterans' Housing Association alone, of which there are approximately 500 members, states that there is a minimum of 1,500 veterans' families in the city of Regina that are inadequately housed.

Maybe you would like the report of some of the conditions under which these veterans are living. Here is a wife and one child, another expected in June, living in a 3-roomed house, non-modern, no basement, very small, cold and dirty. They applied for a C.M.H.C. house as far back as July, 1948. A wife and three children, including a 10-months-old baby and week-old twins, three rooms in house not fit for human habitation; bathroom shared with 15 other people. Army veteran and wife, with two children, had a Wartime house, joined the army for Korea, moved out of the house to Eastern Canada, discharged from army and came back to Regina, and is left without any home and is presently living with his neighbours. I could go on for page after page, outlining the conditions under which veterans' families are living in the capital city in this province.

**April 3, 1951**

There is need for housing, too, and we possibly were making a good start, in the smaller communities in this province. They serve the farming area, contiguous area. Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation had refused to go in and give them housing of any kind; and many of these, including towns represented by members opposite had hoped to get housing under this plan.

I would point out, too, that volumes had been written regarding the morale and moral effect of inadequate housing or slum dwelling; the unhygienic housing; the insecurity that is developed in those children. Broken homes are the result, very often, of inadequate housing, leading to divorces, to desertion, to delinquency, to maladjustments. Those are the moral effects of inadequate housing. And as far as the morale on our people is concerned I know of nothing that so undermines the morale of a man or a family as inadequate, improper housing. "A man's home is his castle" certainly does not apply to thousands of Saskatchewan people, or to hundreds of thousands of Canadian people, because these people have not homes. They have not homes — they may have rooms, basement suites, hovels, shacks, shared accommodation, slums; but by no stretch of the imagination have these people homes. And that is scarcely good enough in a country that boasts of being in the forefront of the democratic nations of the world.

We should take this warning that we cannot spend billions of dollars on armament and let our veterans go unhoused or insecure. I predict, Mr. Speaker, that nothing less than conscription will raise Canada's overseas army to a single division, and a part of this is brought about by the insecure conditions under which many of the three-quarters of a million veterans of the past war are living. Hundreds of thousands of them are living in Canada at the present time under deplorable conditions; make no mistake about that.

Mr. Speaker, the day will come when a decent, hygienic comfortable home will be the birthright of every Canadian citizen. Undoubtedly we shall have to wait, it would appear, for a Socialist government to be established in Ottawa before this is to be. You, yourself, Mr. Speaker, have been recently in New Zealand where, under a Socialist government, adequate housing for the entire population has been accomplished. And adequate housing has been accomplished in the Socialist countries of Norway and Sweden and Denmark, and in Britain in spite of the tremendous handicap of over a million homes destroyed, and a nation that went broke defending democracy. Britain has done infinitely more in housing than has this country which has been blessed with abundant resources of building material and building supplies of every kind.

You know, Mr. Speaker, that the blessing of health, education and culture are lost to people who have to eke out a sordid existence in some of the hovels we call homes in this province and in this Dominion. Now, naturally, I shall look forward to everyone in the House supporting this motion, but do not be satisfied with merely supporting it. Write to the Federal members who are representing Saskatchewan and see if we cannot get something done. I have already been informed, at least indirectly



through a press despatch issued by Mr. Winters, that if we could establish the needs for housing to assist the defence effort in Saskatchewan, then we might have housing in those particular areas. Well, R.C.A.F. schools have been established in Moose Jaw and Saskatoon and both of those cities are desperately in need of housing. Maybe we can get a start on housing made in those two cities. I hope so, and I hope that supplies building supplies, of which this country should be capable of providing all the needs of defence and housing, will be rapidly taken care of so that we can go ahead with a decent housing programme in the province.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to take any part in this debate because I think that everybody was quite prepared to give unanimous support in this House to this resolution. But I do not feel that the cause of unanimous support of this resolution was advanced by the attempt to inject politics into the matter, as was done by the Minister who has just taken his seat, or the attempt to make out that Socialism is the cure. Now, if Socialism is the cure, why is it that we have the Provincial Treasurer going out and indicating that that is not the case in this province any more. I would commend to the Minister who has just taken his seat a recent speech of the Provincial Treasurer, where he indicated that while, the Regina Manifesto might have been consistent with the needs of the occasion back in the days of the depression and the 'thirties, those days are now far in the past and those things should be forgotten, and the implication was that Socialism was certainly not the answer.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I want to make it clear to the hon. member that at this meeting referred to — and there were some others in this group that were at that meeting — I made it abundantly clear that I was standing behind the Regina Manifesto, that I would not rest content until I had eradicated capitalism, and I called upon my friends at that meeting to join with me in it.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, in regard to the suggestion that Socialism is the answer, this is in quotation marks from the Provincial Treasurer's speech of March 30th last. He said: — "Mr. Fines said critics of the Government so often reminded him of the Regina Manifesto and the promise to eradicate capitalism," and in quotation marks:

"I still believe that in terms of the society we knew in the 1930's, I still believe that those days are gone and should be forgotten."

So he still believes in the Regina Manifesto in terms of the 1930's, but he said those days are gone, so there is the implication that he does not believe in it anymore. I commend this to the Minister of Social Welfare in regard to a suggestion that the only answer is nationalization and so on. This is the Provincial Treasurer. He says:

"The demands of the people included more social services and power for rural areas. Saskatchewan is now a place where every individual can use his enterprise to build up a fair and good return on his investment."

**April 3, 1951**

Now, then, there is the endorsement, certainly, of free enterprise, and if the Provincial Treasurer is going to eradicate capitalism, what becomes of this business about this “being a place where every individual can use his enterprise to build up a fair and good return on his investment”? And the Provincial Treasurer says that he looked forward, if we worked together — this is a very fine sentence — he saw no conflict of interest between industry and government:

“If we work together we can make Saskatchewan the greatest province in the Dominion.”

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Leader of the Opposition wanders all over the world on this housing debate. I just want to put in my word that I want to do a little wandering on the same motion, too. He is no more talking about housing now than he is flying out the skylight. I am willing to debate that question with him anytime.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. The hon. Minister of Social Welfare advocated the socialization of the steel industry in this country and I am dealing with the question whether that would be a good thing or not, and I am citing to him the Provincial Treasurer’s attitude that the answer is free enterprise. I am just answering the argument of the Minister who just took his seat. Surely I am entitled to do that. I don’t see . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — You don’t have to spend so much time . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — I will get to that in a minute, but I wanted to read what the Provincial Treasurer said because I think it is worthy of note and I simply brought it to the attention . . . Well, if you had not interjected politics into this thing, we would have had this thing carried unanimously and with a great deal of good will and good feeling. But you saw fit to inject a political note into it — well, then it is only fair that it should be dealt with.

“If we work together we can make Saskatchewan one of the greatest provinces in the Dominion. We will no longer be the poor relation.”

I say ‘hear, hear’ to that! The Provincial Treasurer said he looked upon this as a partnership of industry willing to invest its resources to develop the minerals, and the Government with the interest of the people at heart. This partnership is the very thing that we have been advocating for the last six years and I am glad to see the Provincial Treasurer has joined us in that attitude now:

“With such a partnership the province will be richer and greater and industry will get a fair return for the money, interest and talents invested.”

Now then, I am so pleased that the Provincial Treasurer (who I take it is speaking for the government in this matter), has taken the attitude as follows:

“I am absolutely opposed to the government of the province ever taking public funds and trying to develop the natural resources of this province.”

That, of course, is so contrary to . . .

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Mr. Speaker, I am enjoying this immensely. I hate to get up; but I must confess that in this particular case the reporter did slightly wander. What I talked about was that I was opposed to the Government going out to drill oil wells in this province. My friends will agree with me that that is what I said: that I was opposed to the Government going out exploring for oil. Thank you for giving me the opportunity . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, if the Provincial Treasurer has now come that far in regard to oil, I do not think it will be long until he has gone the rest of the way. Of course we are just wondering where we are going to place the Provincial Treasurer when he comes across here, because . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — On a point of order. This may be the Liberal policy in regard to building houses, but it is not staying with the resolution.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, it is just answering the Minister. He says the answer to this thing is socialization, or nationalization, and I am pointing out that instead of that being the trend of the present Government, he is out of step entirely, because the Provincial Treasurer says that the other way is the way to go. He goes on and says:

“In this field the Government of Saskatchewan believes there is a place for people who sincerely believe in private enterprise. There is a place for Government, co-operative, and private ownership and no one can do the job by itself. Each needs the other’s help. In working together co-operatively nothing can beat us.”

Now, then, I doubt very much . . .

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Mr. Speaker, may I have the job of writing the hon. member’s speeches. He seems to like my speeches.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I must say that when the Provincial Treasurer now, apparently speaking on behalf of the Government, adopts our policy so completely, I feel I should not let the occasion pass with commending him for it and saying that I am glad that they are beginning to see the light. I would suggest that he get talking to the Minister of Social Welfare, Mr. Speaker, because he has not caught up with the procession yet, apparently. He is still living in the days of the ‘thirties and in the days of the Regina Manifesto and in the days of Socialism, which of course, my hon. friends opposite have thrown out the window. But the hon. senior member for Saskatoon, (Hon. Mr. Sturdy) has not caught up with the procession yet, so I would suggest that he do so.

**April 3, 1951**

I am very much interested in this great retreat from Socialism. Mr. Black, who is an employee of this Government, dealt with this question of whether industry run by the Government can do things so much better. I take it that he was speaking on behalf of the Government, because he is head of the Provincial Government Industrial Board — he was speaking in Yorkton this month, March 8th. He spoke about this Government Industry business. He went on to speak of some of the Crown Corporations; mentioned the shoe factory and tannery. According to him, these were started as pump-primers more than anything else. The same is true of the woollen mills. Although these have closed he would be glad if they would open again. He said:

“It should be remembered that these represent highly competitive business.”

This is what we have been saying . . .

“It is true that they can be operated more efficiently under private enterprise.”

The Government knows that. Now, then, here is a man who is speaking on behalf of the Government . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — May I ask a question? Will he inform me of the relationship between raising sheep and the steel industry in the Dominion of Canada?

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, the Minister said the one way to solve this was to nationalize the steel industry and that is surely a highly competitive industry, and I am citing from this Government employee who went down there — I presume he is in conference with the Government he works right under the Premier — and said:

“These are highly competitive industries. We know they can’t operate as efficiently under Government control. The Government knows that.”

I figure he is an honourable man, telling the truth. Well, if you know that these highly competitive industries cannot possibly operate as efficiently under Government ownership as under private enterprise, why does the Minister get up and advocate it? Now, that is what I would like him to answer if he can.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — May I ask the hon. member a question? Is steel in Canada a highly competitive industry? I wish to assure him it is not a highly competitive industry here in Canada, and if he says it is, he does not know what he is talking about.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I understand the Minister was getting up to ask a question, but he is so confused, apparently, he does not know the difference between a question and a speech. Now, then as the answer to the question, ‘Is steel a highly competitive industry?’, I would say this: under the arrangement which prevails between the different steel-producing companies in the United States and Canada, it is a highly competitive industry. I do

suggest and commend to him this speech of Mr. Black's and I read it — and at some time I would like to know if this civil servant going down there at public expense was authorized to make this statement of policy, because he said:

“These represent highly competitive businesses. It is true they can be operated more efficiently under private enterprise. The Government knows that.”

Do they know it? We have been trying to suggest that to them as we have met in the Crown Corporations Committee, but that view has been repudiated over and over again. There is, of course, in the course, of the speech a very exhaustive defence of the C.C.F. Party, done at public expense — but I won't go into that now. The part that I wanted to deal with was another evidence of the 'great retreat'. Here a Government employee goes down there and tells the people the Government knows Socialism is not efficient; they know that private enterprise is much better in competitive business. Now, then, if the Government knows that, why does the Provincial Treasurer get up today and say that he still believes in the Regina Manifesto? Where in the world do they stand in this thing? One minute they say they believe in complete eradication of capitalism and the next . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Why don't you stick to housing?

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, I know the Premier would like to get away from this thing because I am sure he does not really know where he stands himself. I think that is . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — We know where you stand on housing. Like everything else you have done nothing.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, on housing, as I said I am in favour of this resolution.

**Premier Douglas:** — But you will do nothing about it — except talk.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I will do all I can. Just let me deal with it. Here are the people who made promises — and what have they done but talk? Just let me read some of the promises made upon which the hon. member was elected to office. I ask him what he has done? If there has been a complete failure in building houses in this province, as the Minister says, this Government has been in office over six years. Now, then, here is what they promised the people . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — And provided more houses than any Liberal Government in Canada.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Here is the C.C.F. programme for Saskatchewan published in the Saskatchewan 'Commonwealth' "Know what you are voting for", May 24, 1944, nearly 7 long years ago since the province entrusted this Government on the basis of these promises. And here is what they said, and I quote:

“Housing to the thousands of families that are now living in slum areas and in crowded tenements in our cities.”

**April 3, 1951**

That is what the Minister was just speaking about, a few minutes ago. "This programme also includes the re-housing of our citizens in the rural areas . . ." Not only in the cities, but in the rural area . . . "And that our natural resources be developed to the fullest extent to bring this about." There the C.C.F. made this promise nearly seven years ago, talking about slums just as the Minister did today, promising to deal with the matter, and now he gets up to say it is all a matter to blame Ottawa for.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — On a point of privilege. Evidently the hon. member was not listening to my address, because I proved conclusively that we were prohibited by Ottawa from entering the housing field.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Now then, the Minister may say that, Mr. Speaker, but nobody is going to take it very seriously. Nobody has prohibited this Provincial Government from carrying out its programme during the last six and a half years. Why, such a statement as that is just sheer, utter nonsense, Mr. Speaker, and the Minister knows it. But let me read it again —

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, may I table this correspondence for the information of the hon. members opposite?

**Mr. Tucker:** — I am just pointing out, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister spoke about slums and so on, and there they were talking about slums seven years ago, and saying that they would do something about it if the people elected them as the Provincial Government. Then he gets up today and speaks about the conditions — and as I heard them, Mr. Speaker, they seem to be worse today than they were then — after this Government has been in office over six years. Well, I cannot imagine a worse condemnation that any Minister ever made of his own Government than the Minister made this morning, in the light of the promises he made, because, after all, the C.C.F. programme for Saskatchewan had the support of the Minister.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Who controlled building supplies in 1945 and 1946, and who controls building supplies in Canada today?

**Hon. Member:** — He wants to find a scapegoat.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I cannot help but think of the attitude taken by the Government in regard to timber produced in this province. It is not just for the people here; it is shipped out if any money can be made out of it — And then they condemn private enterprise — if they can get a few cents more out of it. In fact we had a case of a man in this province buying two carloads of timber — just two carloads of lumber — and just by re-routing it, making almost a thousand dollars on those two carloads. They took control of the timber resources of the province in a large measure, and then permit it to be shipped out like that, and they do not even make sure that the profit goes to the province. Talk about gambling on the Grain Exchange! Anybody who can just re-route two carloads of lumber bought from the Timber Board and make nearly a thousand dollars out of it, well that is really something, Mr. Speaker. And they talk about not having lumber. Why didn't they keep the lumber in the province if they are short of lumber?

And here is another quotation. This is “Better Homes in Saskatchewan.” This is also in the Saskatchewan “Commonwealth” of May 26th. This was in 1943. This is the C.C.F. when they were appealing for votes, nearly eight years ago:

“The machinery of government will be in the hands of those who form our first C.C.F. Legislature.” . . . (How true!) “The Housing Commission must study the situation in both rural and urban areas . . .” (Where is the Commission?) . . . “make an estimate of the needs . . .” (We were in the middle of the war then, I remind the Minister, when these promises were being made) . . . “and offer a solution for such.”

And here we have the Minister getting up today, and his solution is to attack the Federal Government. But here, eight years ago, they were going to set up a Housing Commission and offer a solution. Could you ever have a worse condemnation of the policy on which they were elected than the Minister’s speech this morning? I think it would have been much better for him if he had not made the political speech he made this morning. Here is what they went on to get votes on:

“We could work on an individual basis somewhat similar to our recent National Housing Scheme . . .”

“We”, that is the Provincial Government —

“. . . with Government long-term loans at a very low rate of interest paying most of the way.”

Where are the Provincial Government long-term loans paying most of the way? That is on what you got elected. Then you talk about promises made by the Prime Minister of this Country! And you said nothing could be worse than to make promises about such an important matter. Well, I commend to you the promises on which you got elected, Mr. Minister. You go on to say:

“In this way, a considerable number would some day have decent homes, and they would own them. In giving ownership, a stimulus would be given then to remodel, renovate and make their homes more comfortable as the years went by.”

These were the promises that the C.C.F. Party made when they were seeking office, eight years ago. And then the Minister gets up and says, “Look at the situation today!” Promising to look after it if they get elected to office; in office nearly seven years; and the Minister gets up and says of the situation, in effect, “I think it is much worse than it was then”. And yet they were going to remedy it. I recall that they said, “We won’t promise anything that we cannot do provincially.” Now, on the backs of the alleged complete failure, there is . . .

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — On a point of privilege. Is the hon. member not aware that we could not get any building supplies whatsoever. If the National Government requires those building supplies, they have control of

**April 3, 1951**

them. We have been so informed by correspondence that housing, as far as the Provincial Government is concerned, is entirely beyond our jurisdiction.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Now, I would point out, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister that when the Party made those promises there was much more rigid control in 1943 and 1944 than in 1946, 1947, 1948, 1949 and 1950. If the Minister thinks that that is the way out, why, of course, I remind him of that.

Now, I am not going to take any more time on this matter except to answer the suggestion that the situation has been a complete failure in Canada. In view of the great record of our country in playing such a great part alongside the United States in helping out Europe, and particularly the Socialist countries of Europe, I hate to see these attacks made upon our own country, and I just want to give some figures to show that housing has not been such a complete and utter failure as the Minister said. Now I have Hansard here, of February 5, 1951. Hon. Mr. Winters said:

“Through private endeavour, but also in a large part owing to the assistance afforded by the Government under the National Housing Act, house construction in Canada since the War has proceeded at an unprecedented rate.”

If it has not done that in Saskatchewan, I wonder if the Government is to blame. The only difference between the province and all the other provinces in Canada is that this is the only province in Canada that has a C.C.F. Government.

**Premier Douglas:** — Does my hon. friend mean by that the Federal Government discriminated against Saskatchewan because they had a C.C.F. Government?

**Mr. Tucker:** — No, I think that the situation is this . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — That is exactly what you meant.

**Mr. Tucker:** — No, no! because I do not think that is the case at all. My experience with regard to this Government and the way they made property available to this Government under the Reconstruction Corporation and so on, was that there was the greatest amount of co-operation with this Government, and I think the Minister will have to admit that. Anything that they wanted from the Federal Government they got.

**Premier Douglas:** — Why didn't they build houses here then?

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, as a matter of fact, this is the answer — it says:

“Through private enterprise, but also in a large part owing to the assistance afforded by the Government under the National Housing Act.”

I am quite satisfied that if this Government had been on its toes it would have got the same consideration as other Governments got. I have no doubt about it. And here is what happened — and this is, in a large part,



private enterprise. And, as the Provincial Treasurer intimated in his recent speech, if you are going to have private enterprise operate, you have got to assure them that they are not going to be socialized. Well, that was the implication; that is why the Provincial Treasurer went down and made that speech. He said: "Regardless of the Regina Manifesto, you are not going to be interfered with." Now then, why did he have to make that, and why is it that we have everything handicapped in this province? It is because people are afraid we have a Socialist Government in power; that is why we have not got the development, and everybody knows that. And that is why the Government is beginning to make its retreat and creep out of that position as best it can. But every time it is caught, it gets up and says: "Hurrah for the Regina Manifesto!" again. But still, it is creeping out as far as it dares.

**Hon. Member:** — Just like you are creeping out.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, I could not creep the way you people have; that is really an example of creeping. Why, if people who are fighting today could really emulate the C.C.F. in the way it creeps out of positions and at the same time maintain, "We are still where we were before," we could almost write a new chapter in the annals of tactics of war.

**Premier Douglas:** — It is a little muddled analogy, but it is all right.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, it may be a muddled analogy, but the way you people are muddling around in regard to that matter puts it to shame entirely.

Now, here is what the Minister says:

"In 1947, the number of houses constructed was 79,359; in 1948 the number rose to 81,243; in 1949 the number of houses built was 91,000. In 1950 there was an unprecedented volume of loans under the National Housing Act and a record number of housing starts. During the year, approximately 80,000 housing units were completed, but by the end of 1950 there were about 66,000 houses incomplete, which was approximately 8,000 more than were incomplete at the end of 1949."

Now, when the Minister talks about complete failure, and so on, if one reads what is happening in Socialist England, where the building of houses is not nearly as difficult as it is in Canada on account of the weather not being such as to require such a great deal of insulation and so on, you cannot say that our record here is such a failure.

**Hon. Member:** — I do say so.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, you can say so. But if there is a failure in this particular province, in the light of the specific promises of this Government in seeking office, it should accept, certainly, a great share of the blame.

**April 3, 1951**

That is all I suggest, Mr. Speaker, and I reiterate again that in regard to the Federal Government assisting in this programme, I have always been in favour of it since it has been announced. I have been in favour of the Government here taking full advantage of it, and I am certainly wholly in favour of this resolution. There are other excerpts I could give in making comparisons with Great Britain and other countries, but I do not feel like taking the time. I am almost tempted to though because of the Minister's attack upon our own country, saying that we have made a complete failure. I do not think that our country, in any of these things, in the magnitude of its recovery since the war, in the magnitude of its contribution in regard to the whole field of reconstruction and development; I do not think that any country has surpassed our country. I do not think that they have even come up to it.

I regret these attacks upon our country and I am satisfied that, in regard to housing, we should have full co-operation, and I am ready to support it in getting it in every way, shape or form that I can. I am ready to join in making representations, through this Legislature and any other way I can, asking the Federal Government to co-operate. I assure the Government of that. But I do regret, in things like this, that the Minister of Social Welfare should seek to try to make political capital out of it in view of their own vulnerable record. And I hope that now that is drawn to his attention, we can support this resolution and all of us do what we can to solve this question to the best possible advantage.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I shall not detain the House more than a few minutes, but it is interesting that patriotism is always the last refuge of a beleaguered politician. The hon. member is decrying any attacks on our country. Of course, it is our country as much as my hon. friend's, and the Minister whom he is attempting to refute has done as much for that country and as much to help defend that country as any member of this House. But nobody is criticizing this country. We are criticizing a Government which has been much more concerned about the property interests of this country than the human interest of this country; been much more concerned about seeing that certain big concerns make a lot of money than they have been about seeing that the ordinary people get a decent house in which to live. That is what we have been criticizing.

Now, I am not going to wander as far afield as the Leader of the Opposition did, but I would like to say a word about this constant talk about the 'great retreat' of the C.C.F. programme. The gentlemen opposite, of course, not having had any policy of their own, seem to spend most of their time trying to work-over our policy and help us to correct it and to improve it and to make modifications in it. Of course, if you have not got a programme of your own and if you did nothing for the 35 years you were in office, naturally you must have a certain morbid curiosity about people who have a programme and who have been doing something while they are in office. But, Mr. Speaker, there has been no mystery about the C.C.F.'s stand with reference to the Regina Manifesto. The very first speech which I made in this Legislature, in the fall of 1944, was a clear-cut statement. We knew perfectly well that you could not build an island of Socialism in a sea of Capitalism, and our task here was to build a three-fold relationship

of public ownership, co-operative ownership and private ownership working side by side in a partnership. That statement was made now nearly some six and a half years ago, and it is still the stand of the Government and the stand from which we have not departed in a single particular.

Now, with reference to this matter of housing, let me just say these two or three words about it. There are three facts that cannot be gainsaid. The first is that, following the war, when the Federal Government passed this National Housing Act, this was the only Provincial Government in Canada — and that covers a lot of Provincial Liberal Governments; the only Provincial Government in Canada which said to the Federal Government and its National Housing Administration, “We are prepared to come in under that legislation and prepared to build houses.” We passed the necessary legislation and prepared to provide the necessary funds to build houses under the National Housing Act. What was the answer? The answer was “No.” Mortgage companies, lending institutions, private companies, could come under the National Housing Act and get all the benefits of the National Housing Act, but a Government representing nearly a million people was denied the right to have the benefits provided under the National Housing Act. Why? The Leader of the Opposition said, “if we had been on our toes.” We were the only Provincial Government in Canada that was on its toes; the rest of them were on their seats. And we said to Ottawa, “We will build houses, we will provide the funds; you give us the same benefits under the National Housing Act that you give to lending institutions and to private companies who want to make money.” We want to make houses; they want to make money. No, we were denied it. Why? The Leader of the Opposition never told us why. The Liberal Government never told us why. No, we were just refused.

Secondly, when that was denied us, we turned to emergency housing and provided, as the Minister said, over 700 units in addition to providing accommodation for veterans going to University. And that cost the people of this province some money. We did provide them housing: the only Provincial Government in Canada that went out and provided emergency housing for its people. The Liberal Governments I have mentioned, in other provinces, made no such endeavours. Only this Province accepted some responsibility in the matter of providing housing for returning veterans.

The third fact that cannot be gainsaid is that, under the present legislation, emanating from the promise which was made by the Prime Minister prior to the last Federal election, legislation was set up which does allow the provinces and the Municipalities to come in; at long last, Mr. Speaker, five or six years after the war is over, we finally got legislation to allow the provinces and municipalities to participate. Why? Because free enterprise has failed, that is why. After five years, free enterprise has miserably failed by the Federal Government’s own decision to allow the provinces and municipalities to participate. Now, if they had allowed the provinces and municipalities to participate in 1945, under the National Housing Act, we would have got houses. But they were clinging to good old free enterprise; they were going to let the profiteers make houses, and after five years they themselves tacitly acknowledge that their plan had failed and that they now had to allow provinces and municipalities to participate and set up housing authorities.

**April 3, 1951**

The Minister of Social Welfare, I think, deserves a lot of credit. There is not any man in Canada, in any provincial legislature or provincial cabinet, who has worked harder on this question of housing than has the Minister of Social Welfare in this province. The moment it was possible for us to participate in a housing programme of the Federal Government, he went to work to get housing authorities set up. Fifteen of them, in this province, are now prepared to proceed. What happens? We are now told by Mr. Winters that, in the light of the national emergency, we cannot get supplies and the scheme is called off.

I think we all recognize, Mr. Speaker, that if war actually breaks out and all the resources of this country are required to fight a war, housing will have to go by the board. But we are not yet at war; we are not yet in the position where all the resources of this country have to go into the war effort. There is still a lot of luxury industries going on; we are still spending millions of dollars on luxury goods all over this country. Why, right in the present time, the shortage of houses in most of the large centres of Canada is one of the things that makes it almost impossible to set up new factories or to set up any war industries. And I want to express the hope that the gentlemen opposite, instead of seeking to condone and to excuse the Federal Government for its failure to deal more adequately with this housing situation, will use what influence they have with Ottawa to rescind this decision to discontinue housing. If they want to have a cut-off date and say, "Well, from now on we will not agree to setting up any more housing authorities," that is their business; but surely these fifteen municipalities in Saskatchewan, and whatever municipalities in other provinces have proceeded with their plans and are ready now to begin building houses, surely, Mr. Speaker, ways can be found to get supplies, even if we have to stop a lot of unnecessary building, luxury building, to devote those supplies to providing decent homes. The Leader of the Opposition knows, as I know, that back in 1937 a report was presented in the House of Commons in Ottawa showing that at that time there were a million houses needed in Canada. The population has grown since then. It is true there has been some building, but new building has not kept pace with obsolescence. There is a tremendous need for housing right across this country.

I want to express the hope that everyone will use whatever personal influence we have, whatever political influence we have with the parties we represent, and will use the influence of this Legislature as a whole, to try to persuade this Federal Government to rescind this decision they have made and to allow the municipalities who have now established their housing associations to proceed with building houses in the various communities of this province. If we do not, and then we do get into a state of war and there is a long period of no building, the situation at the end of that war will be one that is almost too horrible to contemplate. I would say that next to the actual factories and airports and barracks, and next to the means of transportation and communication, the most essential thing for a country, whether it is at war or in a state of possible war, is to have decent housing conditions for its people.

**Mr. J.E. McCormack (Souris-Estevan):** — Mr. Speaker, I am sorry indeed that the political aspect was interjected into this debate. This is a motion that I can agree with wholeheartedly. The Town of Estevan, I think the Minister will agree, was the first town to make an application when the Housing Act was brought in last year. At that time I pointed out to the Minister that I wanted to be very sure that the municipalities, particularly the town that I have the honour to come from, had the authority to go ahead and raise the 12½ per cent which they are required to raise; and at that time I was assured by the Minister that there was no obstacle that could stand in its way. However, during this Session of the legislature, we have had to pass two amendments to Acts to give the towns the power to go ahead and raise this 12½ per cent of moneys which they were required to do under this scheme. Under this scheme, as you know, Mr. Speaker, the Dominion Government puts up 75 per cent, the Provincial Government 12½ per cent and the Municipal Government 12½ per cent, and I think that is something that should be borne in mind.

Even, the municipalities, as I understand — and I know particularly one has gone ahead with a survey and they have set aside certain lands, but they had no actual authority to raise one five-cent piece until this legislation was put through this year. They had to have the approval of the Local Government Board, and the Local Government Board could not give them that approval because there was not legislation on the Statute Books to do that.

**Premier Douglas:** — May I ask my hon. friend a question? Does he think that they were held up in any particular because of the lack of what he considers to have been legislative authority?

**Mr. McCormack:** — In our particular instance, yes, I believe so.

**Premier Douglas:** — Does my hon. friend suggest they could have proceeded, last summer, if they had had that authority?

**Mr. McCormack:** — They could have proceeded, last fall.

**Premier Douglas:** — I happen to know that their plans were not ready that they could have proceeded last fall. My hon. friend is trying to draw a red herring across the trail now.

**Mr. McCormack:** — I am not. They laid the sewers and they had everything ready to go last year, and they could have, quite easily. I know that. I think the sewer was laid for that block of twenty houses either at the end of June or the middle of July last year, and construction could have been started.

Now, we heard something about materials and the availability of them. I would suggest to the Government that if there are materials available and the Government wants to get into the housing business, they should hold on to some of the materials they have got. Lumber is one of the important things in building houses. We had a Return asked for in the Crown Corporations Committee, and this was the question: “For each of the years 1948, 1949 and 1950, how many carloads of planed lumber and unplaned lumber was shipped by the Saskatchewan Timber Board to points in Saskatchewan, other parts of

**April 3, 1951**

Canada and to the United States?" Now, planed lumber, in 1949 . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — The shortage is not lumber. My hon. friend knows the shortage is not lumber, the shortage is other building materials.

**Mr. McCormack:** — There is a shortage of lumber; that is one of the things that they are short of.

**Premier Douglas:** — No, steel and wiring, plumbing and such things.

**Mr. McCormack:** — "And points in Saskatchewan in 1948, 599 car lots; 161 car lots shipped to other parts of Canada; 214 to the United States.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I wonder if he would accept the word of the Hon. Mr. Winters with respect to shortages. In his letter to me of March 21, 1951, he states this:

"The main reason for this . . ." (that is, the discontinuance of the project) . . . "is that there is a real shortage of building materials, chiefly products of steel."

**Mr. McCormack:** — Well, I will finish up with lumber here anyway.

**Premier Douglas:** — Yes, sure, you have the speech ready on lumber.

**Mr. McCormack:** — We have not nationalized the steel in this province yet.

**Premier Douglas:** — You want to build shacks with some lumber.

**Mr. McCormack:** — In 1949, there was 397 car lots of planed lumber shipped to points in Saskatchewan, 212 to other parts of Canada, and 165 to the United States. In 1950; 328 car lots to points in Saskatchewan, 194 to other parts of Canada and 270 to points in the United States. I just thought I would point that out, Mr. Speaker.

**Premier Douglas:** — Yes, it has nothing to do with it; he would just like to point it out.

**Mr. McCormack:** — It has been suggested, I think, by the Minister of Social Welfare and by the Premier, that one reason for the shortage of material was that concerns were putting it into other places because they wanted to make money, and I think that probably the same thing follows in respect to the Timber Board.

Now, there is the question of costs. I think that the gentlemen opposite will agree that their Crown Corporations have taken advantage of the rise in prices as well as any other business has, and I know from our own experience in Estevan with respect to the brick yard, that they have taken advantage of every increase that the market would bear, exactly as good business practice. And common brick, for example, at the end of 1948, sold for \$22.50 a thousand; at the end of 1950 it was up to \$25.50 a thousand, an increase of 12½ per cent; and certainly it is a substantial increase, at \$25.50 a thousand today over what it was in 1944. I think

common brick at that time was selling somewhere around \$11 a thousand. So I think they have taken . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Could I ask my hon. friend a question? Does he want Mr. Winters to proceed with the building of houses in Estevan? Let us get to the point.

**Mr. McCormack:** — I think I have answered that, certainly I do, I am all in favour of that. If the material is available, I certainly think they should go ahead with the building of houses.

Now, one of the things that was brought out here today was that the Provincial Government made available these 700 housing units in the province of Saskatchewan through these airport apartments and through Army and Air Force buildings. They bought those buildings for 8½ per cent of their original cost, if I understand correctly.

**Hon. Member:** — Private contractors got them in other provinces.

**Mr. McCormack:** — Yes. But they got them for 8½ per cent, and that is the only thing that this Provincial Government has done with respect to housing. They got those buildings for 8½ per cent of cost, then they rented them out and fixed them into suites.

**Premier Douglas:** — That is one more thing than the Liberals did.

**Mr. McCormack:** — And there was not one other step taken by this Government for housing until the Dominion Government came along and said, “We will supply 75 per cent of the cost.”

**Premier Douglas:** — My hon. friend just heard me say that in 1945 we passed the Housing Act and applied to come in under the National Housing Act. Will he now tell the House why the Liberal Government refused to allow us to come into the National Housing Act?

**Mr. McCormack:** — I do not know whether they did . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — No, you do not know. Everybody else knows though.

**Mr. McCormack:** — Well, you can explain it to the House then.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Why did not you carry out your own programme as you promised?

**Mr. McCormack:** — But, in any event, there is nothing to stop the Provincial Government of the province of Saskatchewan today going into this housing scheme, nothing to stop them whatsoever.

**Premier Douglas:** — May I ask my hon. friend a question? Would you get us the supplies, will you arrange with the controller at Ottawa to get us the supplies if we go into the housing scheme?

**Mr. McCormack:** — Well, I would refer the Premier to the list of available supplies that was read to us by the Minister of Social Welfare, the day that he spoke on the Orders of the Day, and when he received

**April 3, 1951**

the letter from Mr. Winters. And if all the material is available that he read out that day, I am sure you will have no difficulty in building any houses.

**Premier Douglas:** — Have you heard of the Steel Controller in Ottawa? I have had contractors in my office, steadily, who now find that they cannot put up anything unless they get a “D.O.” (Defence Order), before they can get one pound of steel. And some of them are having to buy steel from Great Britain and buy German steel and American steel because all Canadian steel has been taken over by the Steel Controller, and steel from outside Canada now is coming under the Steel Controller. Will my hon. friend undertake to see that we can get steel?

**Mr. McCormack:** — If that is the case, how can any government go ahead and build houses then, Mr. Speaker?

**Premier Douglas:** — The Federal Government can, by allocating steel to us, that is all.

**Mr. McCormack:** — Well, they must have some reason for allocating steel to some other thing. Would you suggest they take all the steel to build houses and let the defence projects lapse?

**Premier Douglas:** — No, we could get a priority.

**Mr. McCormack:** — Well, I agree very much with this resolution and, as I said before, I am very sorry that the Minister of Social Welfare saw fit to interject the remark that nothing less than Conscription will raise Canada's Overseas Army more than what it is. I think that comes very ill from the Hon. Minister. I do not think the veterans of this country are going to let this country suffer militarily because of the fact that they have not got houses. It may be a factor — but that is exactly what you said, and I do not think that statement is worthy of you, Sir.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I am prepared to let events decide.

**Mr. McCormack:** — I think this country is worth fighting for, even if we do have to live in shacks.

**Premier Douglas:** — I am sure you do not have to.

**Mr. McCormack:** — Well, I was born in one, and I feel rather proud of it, too. It was good enough to fight for in 1917, when I was born in one, and I still think it is good enough, even if I had to live in it again. I would be quite content.

**Premier Douglas:** — Quite content to let a lot of other people live in them, too.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I think it should be pointed out, because the hon. member from Souris-Estevan seems to be under a misapprehension here. When the Housing Act was introduced several years ago — I have before me the Town Act of 1947 — there



was complementary legislation set up for amendments made to The Town Act, and this is what Section 263 of The Town Act stated:

“A council may enter into an agreement or agreements with Wartime Housing Limited, or Saskatchewan Reconstruction Housing Corporation, for the erection and equipping by the Corporation, of houses within the town, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon. The agreement may provide that the town may, with the approval of the Local Government Board, expand in any year, such funds,” and so on.

But, Estevan, I do not know whether the Local Government Board turned down their application to refer the amount required to a money by-law. I do not know whether that happened or not; but Estevan, and any other town or city in the province could enter into an agreement under this 12½ – 12½ proposition, they had to place it before burgesses. We have now amended the Act so that it will be voted on by the voters. That is the difference. But I am sure that the legislation was there to enable Estevan — now it is true that the financial position of Estevan may be such that the Local Government Board refused to permit them to refer the money by-law to the burgesses, because they . . .

**Mr. McCormack:** — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I can say this. I was speaking to the chairman of the Local Government Board, I think it was last Friday, with particular reference to this. The representatives of the Council of the Town of Estevan were told by the Local Government Board that they could not appropriate any money for this purpose until there was legislation brought into this House.

**Premier Douglas:** — Until there was a vote of the burgesses.

**Mr. McCormack:** — No, they could not proceed any further, because they had been ready to go.

**Premier Douglas:** — They have been ready to go, but they have been wanting to go without a vote of the burgesses; that is the real reason.

**Mr. McCormack:** — Well, I am going by what the chairman of the Local Government Board told me.

**Mr. V.P. Deshaye (Melville):** — Mr. Speaker, circumstances at present have made it so that the construction programmes that were anticipated cannot be carried out, and I certainly will support the resolution regardless of any other opinions. I sometimes feel that possibly the regulations requiring the type of houses to be built may be a little bit too stringent at the present time. If we are so short of steel, it might be that these homes could be built without plumbing facilities for the time being, because I know, out our way we have people who are living in basement suites which are very unsanitary and they have no plumbing facilities there. I am sure that if these people had homes, even

**April 3, 1951**

if they did not have some plumbing facilities, they would be much better off than where they are now. There is plenty of lumber in Saskatchewan. We know that. We have heard figures this morning, and we know that there is ample lumber in Saskatchewan to build many good homes, and it is regrettable to me that the programme of building houses for the people who need them so badly cannot be proceeded with. I wish just to add that I am wholeheartedly behind the resolution, and I hope that it receives unanimous support.

The question being put, the motion was agreed to unanimously.

The House resumed from Thursday, March 22, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Danielson:

“THAT this Assembly requests the Federal Government to take action to re-negotiate the International Wheat Agreement, with a view to having an additional term added to the said Agreement providing for an annual conference between the parties thereto, such conference to have power to increase the minimum and maximum price each year, so that such prices may be set at an amount which would give the same purchasing power as the said prices did when the Agreement was signed.”

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, I want, first of all to state that the members on this side of the House have supported and will continue wholeheartedly to support the principle of international agreements and long-term bulk sales of agricultural commodities. This method of international trade, in my opinion, is here to stay, regardless what anyone might say on the subject. We have had ample proof that the old speculative system and the private graintrade system of marketing grain, in the face of present world circumstances, has fallen down conclusively. That was very amply proven during the 1930's when, for a 12-year period of time, from 1930 to 1942, the farmers of Saskatchewan received an average price of 50 cents a bushel.

I think everyone appreciates and realizes that no private organization can adequately deal with international problems where currency and other complicated problems are involved, other than on a government-to-government basis. As a result of that, Mr. Speaker, there finally came into being what is known as the International Wheat Agreement, consisting, I believe, of some six exporting countries and 31 importing countries. Under the terms of the Agreement, there was a maximum and minimum price set, and somewhere between that maximum and minimum a provision was made under which the price for any year would be negotiated; but I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that under the provisions of the Agreement, the importing countries are only required to take the quota of wheat contracted for at the minimum price.

I think we can all agree with the principle of the resolution, insofar as this resolution recognized that the purchasing power of the wheat

farmer has diminished in Canada, due largely to the inflationary tendency in farm production costs. This, of course, Mr. Speaker, is a matter that comes completely under the jurisdiction of the Dominion Government, and I do not think it is realistic for us to suggest that we now go back to the importing countries and say to them that our cost of production has gone up tremendously, in Canada, therefore, we would like you to reconsider raising the minimum and maximum prices to make up for that deficiency. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the importing countries would look too kindly on that particular type of suggestion that we would export our domestic responsibilities with our wheat, and ask the importing countries to make up for the loss of purchasing power occasioned by the fact that the Canadian Government, in their de-control policies, permitted the cost of all of those things that enter into a farmer's production costs to rise to unprecedented levels. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that once agreements are negotiated, the Government has some responsibility for seeing to it that, at least, the production costs of the farmer are maintained at a level that will guarantee to him somewhere near parity prices.

I was somewhat interested in the observations made by the hon. member for Cannington, when he suggested that the farmer should be prepared to make some sacrifice in favour of what he termed, 'long-term stability'. Now, it is physically impossible for a farmer to produce below the cost of production; he simply cannot remain in business. I imagine that the farmers in the Cannington area would be quite interested in that observation. I believe that the Dominion Government or any government that has the responsibility for fiscal policy in these modern circumstances, has an obligation to see to it that the national income is spread fairly throughout the entire country, and that the farmers receive their just share of that national income. If that principle is accepted, I am certain that the farmers and the general public will wholeheartedly support the principle of bulk purchase agreements, and it is only because of a lack of recognition of those principles that we are asked to break the confidence, particularly of the public, in bulk trade agreements.

At the present time, Mr. Speaker, when farm income is supposed to be at a comparatively high level, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics indicates that the farmers, while representing 42 per cent of the population of Canada, only receive 13 per cent of the national income. May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, if any government continues to ignore the fact that we should take care of our whole market by providing the necessary purchasing power, particularly to rural areas, that government is delinquent in its responsibility, and must face the consequence not only of agricultural collapse, but a general economic collapse for the whole nation. It is principally on that basis, Mr. Speaker, that I feel it will argue that the Dominion Government should share the responsibility with importing countries for any difference in prices. There is a limit to what we can ask our customers to bear.

I therefore feel, Mr. Speaker, that this particular resolution, with some practical amendment, would be more acceptable to the rural areas and would more adequately take care of those things that I am mentioning, and quite naturally, Mr. Speaker, the Government at home must be prepared to assume some responsibility in this matter.

**April 3, 1951**

For instance, in the United Kingdom Food Agreements, when we wish to renegotiate prices at higher levels because of our increased production costs at home, this good customer told us that they were controlling prices in the U.K., and that we were at liberty to do so at home. Now, because we did not do so, our food contracts with Great Britain diminished year by year; and as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, because of the disparity of prices between farm products, our production in certain categories like hogs and dairy production fell very drastically — fell so rapidly in fact, Mr. Speaker, that we were unable to fulfil even the diminished contracts with Great Britain, particularly with reference to bacon. As a matter of fact, we had to swap wheat for cheese on one occasion, in order to get a contract with Britain at all.

In addition to maintaining production costs at a reasonable level at home, I believe it is also the responsibility of the Dominion Government — and I hope they will not make the same mistake again that they did under the five-year pool, when they asked the farmers to sell their wheat that went into domestic consumption far below the contract prices, and far below world prices. At least the Federal Government should see to it that the farmer gets a parity price for the wheat consumed within Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have endeavoured to be very meek and very mild in speaking to this particular resolution. I have done this in order to facilitate business, Mr. Speaker, in this House. The suggestion has been made, this morning that politics should not be dragged into some of these discussions. Well, Mr. Speaker, when you get a hard-pressed Liberal Party, with all of their political future at stake, it is only poets who dream about people not interjecting politics into either provincial affairs or national affairs. It is just a poet's dream. At any rate, Mr. Speaker, I have endeavoured to indicate, very briefly, and not very extensively and perhaps not too adequately, some of the reasons why I feel that the resolution as presented is not practical and is not adequate to meet the situation. I think, too, that some clear-cut criticism is due the Federal Government for not having kept the cost of production down at home. For instance, Mr. Speaker. I might just quote to the House some of the increases that have taken place, and I am quoting from the Economic Analysis which gives the wholesale prices of farm commodities and living costs. Taking the year 1935 to 1939 as representing 100.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, in 1949, in the column devoted to field crops, I note that the figure stands at 184.9 for the farm plant products, but the combined commodities and services used by farmers stood at 201.8. Some difference, Mr. Speaker.

But, when you get to 1950 and you take the new crop year for August, the price index on field crops products was down to 160.2; and the cost of commodities and services required by the farmer had gone up to 215.4 — a complete disparity, so I . . .

**Mr. McCormack:** — Do those price indexes include the payments that have been made on the wheat since that time — the 20 cents?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — No, I am quoting figures from August, and that is good enough. It shows a very drastic drop, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that there isn't any talk about giving a similar low initial payment

in the next crop year coming up, in view of these increased costs, Mr. Speaker. It certainly indicates that costs have gone up at home, and I think we would be remiss in our duties, Mr. Speaker, if we did not bring some of these factors to the attention of the Dominion Government, when presenting a resolution from this House.

I would therefore, move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the hon. member from Lumsden (Mr. Thair) . . .

**Mr. Dewhurst:** — Do you think the 1935-39 basis of 100 was really parity between production and returns?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — I certainly do not, Mr. Speaker. I would move in amendment, seconded by Mr. Thair:

THAT all the words after the word “Assembly” be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

“approves the principle of International Wheat Agreements for the marketing of wheat, but regrets that the Government of Canada allowed costs of production to increase thus destroying the proper relationship between farmers’ costs of production and selling prices; and further, that this Assembly requests the Government of Canada to endeavour to secure recognition by importing countries of the necessity for an escalator clause in this and future agreements, and that the Federal Government support the price of wheat at a parity level to the Canadian farmer.”

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

**Mr. Tucker:** — This resolution is based on the existing situation that prices have gone up, due to many different reasons, not only because of the fact that prices have not been controlled, but also due to the prices rising in other countries and many other factors. It accepts that situation that prices have risen, and based upon that fact a certain proposal is made.

Now then, the amendment seeks to introduce a new feature into the situation in regard to intimating, as I understand it (I have not yet got a copy of it), that in some way, something should be done or some action taken by us in regard to the rise in prices, which, of course, is the very basis for the amendment, and it is based upon that viewpoint. Then it approves the principle of International Wheat Agreements for the marketing of wheat. That part of it of course, would be consistent with the motion — “but regrets that the Government of Canada allowed costs of production to increase thus destroying the proper relationship between farmers’ costs of production and selling prices; and further, that this Assembly requests the Government of Canada to endeavour to secure recognition by importing countries of the necessity for an escalator clause . . .”

It introduces this question of regretting the fact that the Government of Canada have allowed costs of production to increase.

**April 3, 1951**

Now, of course, there might be a great difference of opinion as to whether the Federal Government is entitled to the entire blame for that, and that introduces, certainly, a new question altogether regretting the action of the Federal Government in regard to the increased costs of production. I submit to Your Honour that a definite motion in regard to the rise in the cost of living, or something like that, asking the Assembly to take any view on the matter, should only be made after proper notice. An amendment must not raise any question which, by the rules of the House, can only be raised by a distinct motion after notice.

Now obviously, this is a new point which is sought to be presented to Your Honour. The original motion accepts the position that the cost of living has risen; this amendment expresses the opinion that that is due to the Federal Government's action, and I submit that it is a new question altogether. Now then, I refer you to Beauchesne, page 127, rule number 397:

“An amendment must not raise any question which, by the rules of the House, can only be raised by a distinct motion after notice.”

I submit that this new element sought to be introduced into this resolution should only be introduced after notice. There is a reason for that, Mr. Speaker. People coming to speak on this debate would come prepared to speak on the basis that costs of living have risen, and therefore, there should be an escalator clause or some provision for an annual conference to raise the amount allowed under the International Wheat Agreement. Nobody would think that, on that resolution, you would start going into the question of what caused the prices to rise, and condemning some particular body for that rise, because the whole purpose of the motion is to say that in view of the fact that costs have risen, certain action should be taken.

Then there are other citations which I could give you, much along the same line:

“Every amendment must be relative to the question on which the amendment is proposed.”

The question proposed here is what should be done in regard to the International Wheat Agreement. This seeks to condemn the Government of Canada for allowing the costs of increase, and that is, I submit, a new question altogether, and:

“The law on the relevancy of amendments is that it be on the same subject matter as the original motion there admissible, but not when foreign thereto. The exceptions to this rule are amendments on the question of going into Supply or Ways and Means.”

In other words, it must be relevant to this question of what should be done in regard to the International Wheat Agreement. That is the question before the Assembly, and not the question of who is to blame for the rise in the cost of production of the farmers.

Now, I do submit to Your Honour that when this new element is introduced, I cannot imagine that anybody who did not know what motion was going to be introduced by the Minister of Agriculture could possibly be prepared to debate it, and that is why there is this rule that resolutions must have two-days' notice so people can be prepared. Now we are in the position that we cannot be prepared to debate that, because there was no reason to expect this would be raised, and so I submit that this amendment is out of order, except where it brings in this one question. I would not question the remaining part of it — “approves the principle of International Wheat Agreements for the marketing of wheat” and “this Assembly requests the Government of Canada to endeavour to secure recognition by importing countries of the necessity for an escalator clause in this and future agreements”. That is relevant to the motion — it is just a different way of putting it. “And that the Federal Government support the price of wheat at a parity level to the Canadian farmer.” That introduces, also, the question of parity prices and what constitutes parity. That is again another question.

We are quite prepared to debate those questions, but I submit that they should be debated after we have had due notice. I would say to Your Honour that I would have liked to have seen this resolution disposed of, but if Your Honour rules it in order, it seems to me that we would have to ask for an adjournment to prepare ourselves to properly go into the debate.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, on the point of order which the hon. Leader of the Opposition has raised. He has raised the question as to whether or not the amendment is relevant and whether or not it is out of order by virtue of the fact that, in his opinion, it introduces a new subject.

It is difficult for me to see how the matter of the rising costs of production can be a new subject matter when the entire motion is based on the assumption that rising costs of production have made it necessary to change the terms of the International Wheat Agreement. The whole case of arguing for making the ceiling prices under the International Wheat Agreement flexible, is because there has been an increase in the cost of production; therefore, it seems to me that the matter of the cost of production is certainly most properly before the House, and it is because there has been an increase in the cost of production that the House is now asked to agree to the principle of an escalator clause in the International Wheat Agreement. After all, the resolution or motion, introduced by the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) is asking that the International Wheat Agreement should have an escalator clause or at least that a ceiling price should be flexible to meet increased cost of living on the part of those who produce wheat. Now it seems to me that the amendment simply suggests that this problem must not only be tackled by having the International Wheat Agreement altered to provide for an escalator clause, but it should also be tackled on the domestic front by trying to do something about these increases in cost of production. Therefore, it seems to me that both points are perfectly relevant, but I do not think, Mr. Speaker, — you may not want to make a ruling offhand and I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that it may be something that should be discussed; you might want to take the matter under consideration. Some member, in the meantime, could adjourn the debate and allow the Speaker to look over the motion and see what he thinks about it, and he may study the various authorities, and we could proceed with the business of the House.

**April 3, 1951**

**Mr. Speaker:** — With regard to the Leader of the Opposition's point of order as to whether the amendment is in order, I would prefer to bring down my ruling a little later.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, just to give you a chance to do that, Mr. Speaker, I would move the adjournment of the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

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