

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

Tuesday, February 12, 1952

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

On the Orders of the Day

Hon. J.H. Sturdy (Minister of Social Welfare): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to exercise my yearly privilege in welcoming, on behalf of the Assembly, certain distinguished guests from Saskatchewan's outstanding and most beautiful city.

It is of greatly added interest that these guests of ours are members of the University's parliamentary forum. They are from all constituencies in the province; they are accustomed to a very high level of debate, and I trust they will not be disappointed, this afternoon.

DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The House resumed, from Monday, February 11, 1952, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Erb for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. W.A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to join with the Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Sturdy) in welcoming our friends from the University of Saskatchewan. I was rather surprised that he was under the impression that the only people who were here from the University came from Saskatoon. I think that there are many other points of the province represented besides the very fine city of Saskatoon. I certainly want to join with him in welcoming them here and to express to them my appreciation for being invited every year to attend their debates, and I must say that I have enjoyed them very much. I want to commend them very much on the wonderful work they are doing in promoting an interest in public affairs by the way in which they are carrying on that forum. Probably the members know, an election is held and the various viewpoints of the different political parties are put before the students on the University campus, and then an election is held and a government is formed, according to the voting and the members elected. I am glad that for some years now — I believe it is 3 years — as might be expected in such a highly intelligent electorate, the Liberals have elected the largest number of members. Of course that, Mr. Speaker, is just a foreshadow of what will happen when the rest of the province gets the same chance. They have had a chance to do this for 3 years now, and the rest of the people of the province have not had the same chance.

Certainly, they do carry on their affairs in a most able manner, and it is really a pleasure to have them here with us, today. There will be another group here tomorrow to visit with us and it is an indication of how anxious we are that the young people of our province should take a real interest in public affairs and in making our democracy a good one.

February 12, 1952

I intend, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, to deal, almost exclusively with provincial matters. We elect members to the Federal House of Commons from Saskatchewan, and my impression is that they are very able to put forth the Saskatchewan view in regard to Federal matters down there. We are elected to look after provincial matters and I think if we do that we will be fully occupied; and an attempt to interfere in other people's business is probably not desirable.

We have the question, of course, of dealing with agriculture, and the big problem of the large amount of grain that is damp and will heat if the weather gets warm, unless it is dried; and also, of course, the problem of the unharvested crop. I saw, in a recent Bureau of Statistics report, that there were still 6½ million acres of wheat yet unthreshed in western Canada, and it is estimated the yield from that will be about 150 million bushels, and there are 3½ million bushels of oats and barley unthreshed — a total of 10 million acres of grain yet unthreshed, to be added to the tremendous amount of grain yet on hand. That does place a tremendous problem on the hands of our elevator companies and our railway companies. From anything I have seen there has been a very real effort made on the part of the elevator companies — all of them — and on the part of the railway companies, to cope as best they can with that tremendous problem.

I mentioned, yesterday, that the members of the Federal Government, with whom I have discussed the matter, had assured me that they were doing everything they could to deal with the very great problem of damp grain. I understand that they are ready to permit grain to go to the United States to be dried wherever there are drying facilities there, and to permit drying machines which will dry the wheat without harming it to cross our border and be used here in somewhat the same way as combines went back and forth across the border in years past. I repeat what I said yesterday — that we have a well-staffed agricultural department in the Province, and I am hoping that they will do something really substantial to meet that great problem to which our attention was drawn, yesterday.

With regard to the Speech from the Throne, I have looked it over very carefully and I was surprised about particularly one thing. Considering the fact that almost any time in the evening when you turn the radio on you can get some broadcast paid for at public expense, being put over by the Bureau of Publications, or some broadcast being put over on behalf of the Crown Corporations — again at public expense — most of it sheer propaganda; and the fact of the vast amount of money being spent on the 'Saskatchewan News' which is sent, not only around Saskatchewan, but all over Canada — again at public expense — I would have thought that perhaps this Session might have been spared the spectacle of having His Honour made a vehicle for C.C.F. propaganda. But, on the contrary, this year, by putting words into His Honour's mouth in the Speech from the Throne, that method of putting out C.C.F. propaganda was made use of in an even greater degree than at any time in the past.

Of the approximately 212 lines in the Speech from the Throne over half was given, either in an attempt to glorify the present Government, or to make covert attacks on the Federal Government; and I was thinking, as I read the covert attacks on the Federal Government, and when I read Monday's paper, I ran across a speech by the Premier and it made me think — after all, the Federal Government should not feel too badly, because, while we are a Legislative Assembly, engaged in provincial politics, the Premier ventures

into affairs having to do with the Federal Government and its shortcomings and what it should do; and into the United Nations and its shortcomings and so on; but I have not noticed him until recently, undertaking to attack the British Government. I was quite surprised, Mr. Speaker, therefore, to find that now he is undertaking to advise the British people in regard to the shortcomings of their Government.

Certainly we have a versatile Premier! If he would stay at home and look after Saskatchewan we probably would not have such a dismal failure in this province as far as this Government is concerned.

Mr. Churchill, I think, is regarded as one of the great statesmen of this generation. Somebody has said that he is the greatest Englishman since Shakespeare. But that does not prevent the Premier of this province undertaking to intervene in British affairs. Here is what he is supposed to have said to a meeting in Regina here, referring to the recent changes of government in Britain:

“Under the Labour Government, the austerity programme affected everybody. Now with the return of the Churchill Government, not only has the austerity become more severe but there has been a cut in health services, letting the sick and the poor suffer.”

And that was coupled with the suggestion that the reactionaries were gaining control in the various English-speaking countries throughout the world!

Now isn't it really something, Mr. Speaker, that when one considers what the British people have been going through in the last several years, and as they struggle with that programme, that a Premier of this province, with problems that are not to be mentioned in the same breath as those of the British government, that he takes it upon himself to criticize what they are finding it necessary to do. I say again, that if one looks at the record of failure of this government to meet the problems that face the people of Saskatchewan, one would think that he might be better employed in looking after our Saskatchewan provincial problems.

We well remember the hopes that were held out when the C.C.F. were seeking office in the 1944 campaign, and again the hopes held out in the 1948 campaign. There was the honest hope held out of expansion of our economy, and that things would be much better if the C.C.F. got into office in many different ways. It was pointed out at that time by people who did not believe in socialism as a solution to problems such as faced us, especially in new countries where development is so important, that the election of a government which had as its ultimate objective the socialization of natural resources and the means of wealth production would ultimately have a deterring effect upon the development of the province. Of course, there is no way of proving it except to try it. And now, of course, we have the record before us as to whether all these great hopes have been realized. I think that we should, today, examine the record in that regard, but before I come to that perhaps I should make a few more references to the Speech from the Throne.

February 12, 1952

I have already said that about half of the Speech from the Throne is devoted to propaganda, and the meagreness of the programme of the government is shown by the fact that of the over 200 lines in it, only 42 lines deal with actual programme — that is one-fifth of the Speech from the Throne.

One of the things that struck me in this programme, as outlined in the speech of His Honour, was this sentence: he said that the Government was going to set up a plan for highway construction, and in quotations:

“ . . . that would greatly exceed anything heretofore attempted in this province.”

Well, we have had some great plans in this province, and now we are going to get a plan that will exceed anything they have ever attempted before — it is going to be some plan! But I think what we would like to have is something done, rather than great plans, and of course that is all that is promised in the Speech from the Throne — they are going to have a plan in regard to highway construction.

In regard to another thing — I well remember when we used to hear facts upon the setting up of commissions and so on — well, we are going to have a municipal advisory committee. I will admit that it was suggested by the committee set up to deal with municipal problems, but that was only one of the suggestions. The biggest suggestion of all was the one doing away with the public revenue tax. The government has been strangely silent about that. That is the main suggestion this committee, set up by the Government themselves, made, but they are ready to set up this municipal advisory commission — another commission to have around to advise them.

One of the most remarkable parts of the Speech from the Throne is that it shows the feeling they had to make as brave a show as they could, with very little to put before the people. Here we are told that we are going to have a celebration of our Golden Jubilee in 1955, Mr. Speaker, - three years from now — and they are going to provide, at this session, for a committee to arrange for that jubilee. Well, perhaps the people may have something to say as to who is going to be the government of this province before ever that jubilee takes place, and perhaps it was thought that the government had better act now or it would never have a chance. But just think of putting that in the Speech from the Throne, in regard to arranging for a celebration in 1955!

It provides that there will be legislation to ratify the new taxation agreement. Of course we are glad about that, because if it were not for the money that is being derived from those taxation agreements from the Federal Government I do not know what would have happened to this government before this.

Then we have the provision that this government, after nearly eight years in office, is going to set up a Commission, and I quote: “to investigate the problems that have arisen in our agricultural economy.” We have heard from time to time about the great experts that the government has surrounded itself with — the economic Planning and Advisory Board — the Budget Bureau — all these numerous experts that we have had around. We have been told that we have one of the finest staffs in the Department of

Agriculture, and, certainly, the largest staff we have had in all its history; and of course there has been more money spent on civil servants than ever before in our history. And the government has pretended that it is very conscious of the needs of agriculture. And here now we have this ruse adopted because they do not know what to do, consistent with their socialist programme, to help agriculture in this province. Somehow or another the problem has to be put off, so what better way to adopt than to refer it to a Commission? Isn't that really something! We have a government here that has been a government of an agricultural province for nearly eight years, and they have to set up a commission to tell us what our agricultural problems are. Of course, while that Commission is hearing evidence, while it is making its report I suppose the government has a good excuse for inaction, but I hope that situation will be brought to a sudden end, Mr. Speaker, by the holding of an election in the not too distant future when a government will be put into office that will know what the farmers of this province do need to deal with their problems, and we will not have to wait a year or so for the report of some Commission.

The actual legislative programme is provided for in about thirty lines of the Speech — 30 lines out of about 200! We are to have provision for the proper conservation of our oil and gas resources. Surely this will be welcome. My desk mate says it is about time. Here the province, and the people that are interested in oil developments, do not know what the programme of the government is; they do not know what they are going to have to meet if they invest money here, and the government is sitting there apparently unable to make up its mind. I hope there is something in the legislation that will prevent such a deal being made as the notorious Rhubbra deal, where an interest in a tremendous block of our oil in the province was dealt out to a group of individuals — to Rhubbra and other unknown people — we still do not know who got it. I hope there will be something in the legislation preventing a thing like that happening again.

There is provision made for increase in Mothers' Allowances, which is certainly welcomed, due to the increased cost of living and the increased revenue of the government.

In regard to teachers — the circumstances of whom I will refer to later — one might have expected something more from the Speech from the Throne than is there. The provision for conciliation and in regard to an amendment to the Superannuation Act. Well, I think that everybody, teachers and the people that are today moving off the farms because they have not got adequate staff in their schools and so on, would be much happier if there had been some provision to assist municipalities and school districts so that they could pay better salaries to retain our teachers, without having to raise taxes still higher beyond their present high level. But there is nothing worthwhile in the Speech from the Throne in that regard. But there is something there, something that is thrown out to sort of try to make out that something is being done for that important branch of our province, the teachers.

The provision for payment in lieu of taxes on commercial government property is something, Mr. Speaker, that we have advocated for many years as only fair. It did not seem fair at all that the government could engage in commercial enterprise and that right away it sees that the

February 12, 1952

property used for that purpose should cease to bear taxes and the people competing in that very enterprise would have to pay higher taxes because the government had gone into the business. This proposal was recommended over a year and a half ago by the Britnell committee, and at last the government is reluctantly doing something about it. But again I point out that this is a very small relief compared to the other suggestion of the elimination of the public revenue tax.

The legislation in regard to preventing economic discrimination against female workers is a desirable objective, but one thinks, in that regard, of the futility of legislation if you have not got an expanding economy — a healthy economy — of trying to make conditions of people better by legislation alone. I will deal, before I am through, with the effect of this government's legislation upon the working people of this province, and this legislation which is so much talked about has actually rebounded to their disadvantage, instead of to their advantage. The two should go together, desirable legislation and a policy which would lead to economic expansion providing plenty of jobs; and if that happens, later — by its ability to organize and so on — it can go a long way to protect itself; and legislation will not take the place of that.

I was glad that, at last, our suggestion that something should be done to protect the subjects against the government is going to be done, and it is proposed to do away with the necessity of having to obtain permission of the government before action can be launched against the government.

The scandalous case of Ivanchuk shows up the necessity of that. The Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank) laughs at that! I am sure the people, (he is laughing at my bringing the case up, he says — well, at me, then, for bringing the case up) would like to know just what was involved in that case. Officials of his department go and seize a man's means of livelihood, retain it for over a month, at a time when he should be earning a living, and then, without in any way proving that he had broken the law in any way, shape or form, they give him his means of livelihood back again. An absolute interference with a man's livelihood, against the very basic ideas of the Magna Carta, because it says in Magna Carta:

“Against no man shall we go, except by due process of law.”

Where was the due process of law there, except the will of the Minister and his servant, and having interfered with this man, the man could not have any recourse against the government, against their own consent. So there is a situation! Talk about condemning a man by executive action, without any chance of defending himself in court! It was done there, and I understand that other cases have occurred in the Lac la Ronge area — that a meeting of fishermen protesting against that sort of high-handed action is now taking place.

I would say to people engaged in the farming industry — I wonder if they would think it a laughing matter if an official of the department of agriculture were to come and seize their binder or their combine — just during harvesting time, and hold it for over a month; and then, without

giving them a chance to clear themselves or do anything, come back and give it to him, and say: "All right, take it. What can you do? We are supreme."

And the Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank) laughs at that, Mr. Speaker. Well, after all, he will find out that there is a power greater than he is in the electors of this country; and they will know whether that sort of high-handed action should be laughed at!

Now we have promise of further amendments to the Legislative Assembly Act. I hope that they provide for some repeal of some of the provisions they put through the last session. You will recall, last year, Mr. Speaker, that these amendments to the Legislative Assembly Act were repeatedly voted against in this House by the Liberal party, and supported unanimously by the C.C.F. party. One of the most amazing provisions of that amendment is the provision that the Department of Natural Resources can, by agreement, give to somebody an interest in oil and minerals which he can hold for a member of this legislature, including a member of the Government — a secret interest — and if it is found out afterwards that there has been that sort of dealing in the natural resources of this province, nothing can be done to unseat that member. And that was not enough, Mr. Speaker! It was made retroactive. Apparently it was being made as necessary to protect somebody from such an arrangement as that, but the sooner we clear the good name of this legislature and get that notorious legislation off the statute books, the better.

I understand the excuse is made that there is a similarity here to the Manitoba legislation. Now I have carefully examined the Manitoba legislation, and there is no such provision, I assure you, Mr. Speaker, of the government of the day being able to give a secret interest in oil and mineral rights to a member of the legislature or government, without it vacating his seat; and there is no such indication that there is anything like that provided for in Manitoba legislation. The only thing provided for there is where a man takes an interest in an oil lease or something like that openly, so the people of the province know about it, and then his seat is not vacated, but there is not this provision that he may hold this right through a trustee, secretly. Well, Mr. Speaker, we would be very interested to see what is in those amendments to the Legislative Assembly Act, and we will expect that that sort of thing which lends itself to the possibility of dealing secretly in the vast and valuable resources of our country and our province shall be wiped off our statute books.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that anyone who examines the Speech from the Throne will say that it does set a record in regard to the meagreness of its programme to meet our problems, and the magnitude of the propaganda involved and contained in it.

I said that the hopes of the people of this province, and the honest hopes of many people, had been dashed by the record of this government; and I think that the best proof of that is the population statistics. Now this is a good change for socialism to show what it can do! In fact, they more or less took that attitude at the time they were asking the electors for support, in 1944. They said: "Elect us and we will show you what we can do; we are going to cause the province of Saskatchewan to

February 12, 1952

forge ahead.” Now what is the record? Well, the record is this: In the first place, for all of Canada we only have the figures for '41 to '51, but during the seven years of that time this government was in office — seven years out of the ten; and during the first three years of that period we were engaged in war, and of course there was nothing in the way of recovery possible during that time. But the period from 1944 until 1951 was a period when other provinces were experiencing real recovery, and the province of Saskatchewan was the only province with the very doubtful privilege of having a socialist government in Canada, and it is very unfortunate for the people who try to pretend that socialism is the answer, to have this situation, that of all the provinces in Canada, this is the only one which has had a decrease in population, and every other province in Canada has increased. This is the only province with a socialist government in office.

Now then, we are told that perhaps it is the climate. Well, when this province was growing, and when, in 1921, we had 920,000 of a population, and looking forward to going over a million, we still had the same climate. People were coming here then because there were more opportunities here, and they are now leaving here because they are finding better opportunities elsewhere. Some people say, “well, it may be the fact that the number of people engaged in agriculture is dropping off.” To some extent that is true, but there are other agricultural provinces besides Saskatchewan. What about Prince Edward Island? What about Nova Scotia — agriculture and fishing? New Brunswick? What about the greater part of Quebec and Ontario — agricultural? What about Alberta and Manitoba? They are up against the same sort of thing but that did not prevent them from gaining in population.

I would like to give you, Mr. Speaker, the figures in regard to the situation. It is a sad picture: Alberta increased, during the period of ten years, by 18 per cent — 143,000. Manitoba increased by 6.41 per cent — 46,000; and we decreased by 7 per cent — 64,000.

During that time, Canada, as a whole, increased by over 20 per cent. The period from 1946 to 1951, as I have said, is a little more significant, probably, than the whole period from 1941 to 1951. During that entire period the C.C.F. were in power. During that period Manitoba's population increased by 49,618 — nearly 50,000 — our neighbouring province to the east. Alberta's population increased by 136,000; and this province has had the benefit of a socialist government, with all the stagnating effects that that government has had upon our development. We actually lost population during that period, by around 1,000 people, a net loss. But the situation is that at the start of the '41 period, Saskatchewan was third in population in Canada. Today, she is sixth; and if this trend keeps up of losing population while others gain, we are then, of course, going to also sink below Manitoba, if something is not done to stop it.

There is another feature of this business, (the Premier smiles over this thing — he is apparently very pleased about it) but it is a most terrible thing that this new province of ours should have had a net loss in five years of 1,000 when the rest of the country is going ahead by leaps and bounds. Our natural increase, during that time, has been nearly 78,000 — the surplus of births over deaths — so that we have actually lost, Mr. Speaker, during that period of five years while this government has been in power; we have had a total loss of people that were in this province when

they were elected, and allowing for the surplus of births over deaths, we have had a total loss of over 79,000 people for five years. Could there be any more convincing demonstration of the blighting effects of any government on the economy of a province than in those figures? That is at the rate of over 15,000 people a year! Well, there is a demonstration of the complete failure and breakdown of this government and its policies.

Now then, what was the cause of this unfortunate event in our province? It was not the lack of plans; it was not the lack of promises; goodness knows we were always on the verge of great things — we were going to have this and were going to have that; and we were going to have this development and we were going to have that development. We were going to have great developments! The foundation of it all had just been laid. But here, when we finally get the figures, we are still going backwards. That five years cannot be blamed on any previous government — it is right on the doorstep of this government — that demonstration of failure. Now, one reason for it is quite clear, and students of the situation do not have to have a Royal Commission to tell them it is necessary to take steps to fight against farm depopulation.

I remember one of the first speeches I made on the floor of this House. I said that subsidization of farm electrification was one of the methods adopted by all the countries of Europe, except Great Britain, whose population is very densely settled — but adopted by Nova Scotia, Ontario and Manitoba — that is, helping the country as a whole, and bringing electricity to farms was one of the measures necessary to fight against the depopulation of the farms. Well, Mr. Speaker, that fell on deaf ears so far as this government is concerned. They were much more concerned in making profits out of the Power Corporation than in getting electricity to farmers at low cost as was being done for the farmers in Manitoba. They were anxious to throw the receipts from the Crown Corporations of power and telephones in with the Crown Corporations they had set up, and of course if they charged rates high enough they can pretend they have had great profits. Well, the situation is this, Mr. Speaker — in that regard, if the people are going to have the benefit of electricity — if they are going to have the benefit of telephones — they are going to have to pay whatever the Government sees fit to charge.

That is not a real profit. It is a means of secretly taxing the people. The Premier said over the radio, recently, that our profits were about \$4 million, last year, actually \$3,800,000. The basis on which they figure the profits, before they allow for interest, shows that of that \$3,800,000 — \$3,300,00 came out of the Telephones and the Power — which meant that these things that should be, in our scattered province, brought to the people at cost, were being mixed up with other Crown Corporation receipts, which makes a good story for Crown Corporation profits.

Just compare that with Manitoba, which pays half the cost of farm electrification. It takes the electricity right to the farm home without any cost to the farmer at all; and then, as I shall show later, the rates — in spite of the fact that the Saskatchewan farmer has to pay an average of from \$600 to \$700 to get the electricity to his buildings — our rates are still higher than those in Manitoba. But also, a number of people who have enough cash on hand to become connected to the electricity,

but cannot do so, then a lot of them feel that they would rather live in urban centres and get the benefit of the electricity. So they move off the farms, and they stop producing milk, meat and so on. The result is, that once they have moved off the farm, the next step is, perhaps, to move out of the province altogether. And so this Government has sat in office and has seen other provinces fight against farm depopulation, and it has taken measures, that instead of trying to fight against it, they have actually encouraged it.

Now then, I said that it led to people moving off the farms, and I thought that there should be some figures, (if one could not get the actual farm population) then the up-to-date figures in regard to the people who are still living on the farms, compared with 1941 or 1946. So I thought the value of products produced on the farm (not wheat, because that can be produced in mass production by machinery), but such products as meat and butter — that it would show just what is happening in Saskatchewan compared to Manitoba and Alberta.

Here are the figures in regard to meat production, Mr. Speaker. In 1944, in Manitoba, the value of meat production was \$49½ million; in 1950 it was \$64.2 million — an increase in the value of meat production in Manitoba of \$14.7 million. In Alberta there was an increase of \$28.1 million in the value of meat production. That is an increase in Manitoba of \$14 million, and an increase in Alberta of \$28 million — and what is the picture in Saskatchewan, in regard to the value of meat production? In spite of increased prices, mind you, the situation in Saskatchewan was that there was a decrease in the value of meat production, between 1944 and 1950, of \$5.1 million. Well, that shows that the farmers have been moving off the land in Saskatchewan, and this trend has not been going on in Alberta and Manitoba to the same extent.

Butter is probably another indicator. In Manitoba, the value of butter production, in 1944, as compared with 1950, shows an increase of \$2 million. In Alberta there was an increase of \$4.6 million. In Saskatchewan there is a decrease of almost half a million dollars. Why is it? Our farmers are exactly the same kind of people that we find in Alberta and Manitoba — so why is it that these things arise? Values are going down in Saskatchewan and are rising in our neighbouring provinces. These have to do with the same kind of people.

Take, for example, its effect upon our representation in parliament. It will affect the subsidy which we get under the financial agreements with the Federal Government. I would just like to run over how it has affected the various provinces in regard to representation in the House of Commons, taking the population of the various constituencies in Canada.

In Newfoundland — six of their constituencies increased in population, and one decreased. Prince Edward Island — (if ever there was a farming province without anything like the natural resources which we have, it is Prince Edward Island) and three of their constituencies gained population, while only one lost. Nova Scotia — (an agricultural and fishing province) 12 of their constituencies increased, and only one lost. New Brunswick — (an agricultural and forestry province) and what

was the situation there? They did not have a Timber Board, of course, driving the timber people out of the province! So what was the situation? Every single one of their 10 seats increased in population, in New Brunswick. Ontario, as everyone knows, is an agricultural province to some extent; and the situation there is that 70 of their seats increased in population, and 13 decreased. But it is an interesting thing, that out of the 13 seats in Ontario which decreased in population, 8 of those 13 were city seats, which indicates that the farming areas in Ontario were not decreased to the same extent. They were being held in the small villages, perhaps, and towns, by the virtue of having cheap electricity to start small industries, and so on. That is also happening in Manitoba — but here, they are trying to make money out of electricity, instead of providing it at least at cost, and to the farmers at less than cost.

In Manitoba, 8 constituencies increased and 8 decreased. One of the 8 that decreased in Manitoba was a city seat. And then we come to Saskatchewan — and here only 3 of our seats increased in population — 2 city seats and one rural seat, by a very small margin. Every single one of the other seats — 17 of them, all predominantly rural — went down in population.

In Alberta, 10 constituencies went up in population, and 7 went down. In British Columbia, which to some extent is an agricultural province, 17 increased in population, and one went down. It is a peculiar thing that, in British Columbia, the one which decreased in population was a city seat.

I think those figures, Mr. Speaker, demonstrate the fact that we have not had development under this Government. They can argue around that all they want, but if population is going down it is a sign that there is a falling off of economic activities. People leave the places they do not like just the same as they frantically try to get out from being behind the iron curtain, today, to get to free countries. And so we have the same thing happening in Saskatchewan — people leaving this province and going to other provinces.

My hon. friends can laugh, but it is the truth, and they cannot deny it. If people can laugh about that, well then it is certainly time for an election.

The development of our oil and mineral industries has been hampered by the policy of the present Government, and it is to be noted, Mr. Speaker, that there was hunting for oil going on in Saskatchewan before this present government was elected. It came into office with an avowed policy of socializing the oil industry. This was set out in the Regina manifesto which this Government voted support of no later than a couple of years ago. It was set out in their national conventions, set out from time to time in speeches, by their own Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank) and so on; and by the Premier. The Regina manifesto set out that they believed the evils of our present system could only be cured by our natural resources, and the means of production and distribution, being owned, controlled and operated by the people. They wound this manifesto up (which is supposed to be the greatest political document of our time, according to the Premier) by saying that “no C.C.F. Government would rest content until it had eradicated capitalism.”

February 12, 1952

Now there is the story! And we were supposed to have people come in and risk their money, based on the strength of that prospect. We had provisions made by amendments to the Act — the Mineral Resources Act, for example — that said, regardless of any contract that might be made in regard to our mineral resources, that it should be deemed that the royalty payable should be whatever was set out by order-in-council under regulations, or by regulations under order-in-council. As I pointed out in this House, that meant that none of these agreements were worth the paper they were written on — that this Government, by order-in-council — could change the terms of any of those contracts, at a meeting, in 5 minutes. How in the world — in view of the way they, for example, tore up the rights of the people interested in the sodium sulphate industry and immediately raised the royalties, in some cases, 1000 per cent — can they expect people to come in here to develop the resources of this province? It is not surprising, and yet it is thought that this whole thing can be quietened down by speeches by some of the Ministers!

Just recently, within the last few days, the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) went to Calgary. I would like to read you, Mr. Speaker, what he said. He said:

“Oil companies have nothing to fear in Saskatchewan. Any contract Saskatchewan made with the companies would be lived up to, 100 per cent, and would be diligently honoured.”

What right has the Provincial Treasurer got to say that? With legislation on the statute books and a Mineral Resources Act that enables a government to absolutely cancel that contract and change it — as they have done with contracts, already? How can he say that his own party has totally, and for all time, while these contracts may be in existence, abandoned the principles by which they were elected — the Regina manifesto? How can he guarantee that, when the Regina manifesto envisaged the social ownership of the means of wealth production? Has he got any right to give that guarantee? They say that they must do what their convention decides, and from the murmurings I hear from their conventions about finding fault with them for not living up to the Regina manifesto, nobody knows when one of these conventions is going to say, “Now let us live up to our own principles.”

And then, of course, the Provincial Treasurer will be told politely to ‘get out’. Of course I do not suppose he worries very much about that, but the fact remains that people thinking of investing money in this province realize that. They know they have no security, and so you have only a certain amount of development by companies to try and retain an interest in the tremendous resources we have. We have always said we think we have potentially more resources in the way of oil and gas than Alberta. We say that we have 90,000 square miles of the pre-cambrian shield formation in which there is the great mineral development of Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec. Very little of that shield is in Alberta. We have potash deposit and salt deposits and coal deposits; I think we have much greater resources than any other western province. What is the situation? There is great rejoicing because there is a little bit of development going on, but nothing like that of Alberta. Why shouldn't we be getting the same development as Alberta? Because the Companies that were working in Saskatchewan were chased out of this province when this government was elected! The Minister of

Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank) said, "Oh, I would not even deal with the Imperial Oil Company." That was beneath his dignity! I heard him on the floor of this House, myself, Mr. Speaker . . .

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural Resources): — On a point of privilege, I would like the hon. Leader of the Opposition to withdraw that statement. I did not make that statement.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I heard him make it myself, and I am entitled to say that he did make it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, that is not a withdrawal.

Mr. Tucker: — I do not intend it to be a withdrawal. I heard the member make it myself, and so did the other members on this side of the House. He is not going to force me to say something different than what I know.

Mr. Speaker: — Since the hon. member, on his own responsibility, says that he did not make that statement, I think the hon. member who is speaking must withdraw it, unless he is prepared to bring forward documentary proof.

Mr. Tucker: — I heard him say it myself, Mr. Speaker . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — That is no proof.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Tucker: — — I say, on my responsibility, that he did make it, and my word is as good as that of the Minister of Natural Resources.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. leader of the Opposition knows as much of parliamentary procedure as I do, or maybe more, and he knows that it is obligatory, on the part of any member who makes a statement that is categorically denied by the person to whom the statement applies, he must withdraw it or else substantiate it in another manner than by his own personal word; otherwise we would get nowhere.

Mr. Tucker: — I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that I heard the hon. Minister say that, and I venture to say the records of the House will substantiate it. I have no intention of withdrawing. I said, on my own word, that I heard the Minister say that; and several members on this side also heard it, and I am not going to be forced, in this Legislature, to say that I did not hear something that I did hear. The Minister can say that he did not intend to make the statement; he can say anything he wishes; but I also have the right to say that I heard him make it, according to my hearing.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! The hon. member knows that if that rule applies, any member in this House can persist in saying something that may not be supported by fact; and if that is allowed we will have no statement in the House that could be relied upon . . .

Mr. Tucker: — But supposing it is supported by fact?

February 12, 1952

Mr. Speaker: — It is generally accepted in parliamentary rules that when a statement is applied to another member, if that member gets up and, on his own personal responsibility, says that he did not make that statement, then it is the duty of the member to withdraw. He can bring the matter up in some other manner.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, I say again that I heard the Minister say that he was not going to deal with the Imperial Oil Company, and the other members heard this. I am not going to be bulldozed in this Legislature to take back something that I heard myself. That is all there is to it.

Mr. Speaker: — No that is not all there is to it.

Mr. Tucker: — All right, do as you please. Do as you please, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member knows that the rules of this Chamber are pretty clearly set out, and unless those rules are observed, either from one side or the other, you would have nothing else but a complete controversy between two individual members; and I think the hon. member will find all kinds of precedents for the statement that when a Minister, or even a private member, is charged with something by another member, if he denies it then that member who is making the statement should withdraw it.

Mr. Tucker: — Well, Mr. Speaker, when what is averred and what is denied is equally within the knowledge of both sides, both members, one man's word is as good as another, and I do not have to take second place to any other member in this Legislature, even if he is a Minister of the Crown. This rule only applies where something is said of which the member speaking has no personal knowledge, and then, of course, the word of the other member must be accepted; but where both have equal knowledge of what happened, the word of one does not prevail over the word of the other, Mr. Speaker.

Now then, if I may continue my speech — I think the wording of the parliamentary rules would bear me out, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — All right, I will revoke my decision on that, but I think that it must be generally understood, when one member applies a specific statement to another member, he must have proof, other than his own personal word, to substantiate it.

Mr. Tucker: — I repeat, the hon. Minister said he was not prepared to deal with the Imperial Oil Company, and yet what does he do? He enters into a deal with a man by the name of Rhubbra and some of his associates, to hand over 10 million acres — an interest in those, and then he, (Rhubbra) turns over those rights to 12 other companies that haven't got the same standing in this province as the Imperial Oil! What kind of a business is that, Mr. Speaker?

Now that is the sort of thing we have had to listen to, and I do suggest to you, Minister, that these continual affirmations on the part of the Government, that they believe in ultimate socialization; that they, at their national conventions, come out for socialization of natural resources, oil and gas, and so on, only makes us realize that; and we cannot hope to have the development we should have of our natural resources.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, there is another feature — and perhaps I should give some figures on that. I have already referred to the population as one proof, but I would like to give some figures in regard to this question of oil and gas production. In 1944, the value of oil production, in Saskatchewan, was \$46,000; in 1950, \$1,200,000; in 1951, \$1,600,000 — an increase of \$400,000. In Alberta, the figures are: in 1944, \$20 million, largely in the Turner Valley, and there has been no increased value there to any extent; the big increase has been in the new fields found in the north; and, in 1950, the value in Alberta was \$85 million. In one year — last year — that went up to \$131 million, an increase in those two years of \$36 million; and in Saskatchewan we had an increase of \$400,000, and with probably greater oil resources.

And then in regard to the search for oil that is being made. We are told that \$200 million was being spent in the search for oil in western Canada, last year. About \$20 million, or 1/10 of that was spent in Saskatchewan, and we with greater oil resources — 40 per cent of all the oil resources in western Canada — and 1/10 of the money spent! Why? Because investors are afraid that this Government might mean to carry out, sometime, the policy by which it was elected. They believe that, perhaps, these people are sincere that belong to the C.C.F. party. Perhaps they are — but are people going to risk their money on the basis that they are not sincere, and will not, ultimately, carry out the programme for which they were elected? It is too big a risk, and that is the attitude of the people hunting for oil.

In Alberta, there were 127 drilling rigs operating in 1950 — that has increased to 195 in the last year — an increase of 68. In Saskatchewan, there were 8 in 1950 and 26 in 1951. 26 in Saskatchewan as compared to 195 in Alberta. That is the picture, Mr. Speaker.

There is a great deal often made by the Premier of the value of mineral production in Saskatchewan. Well what is that picture, Mr. Speaker? The only real mineral production, in Saskatchewan, outside of coal, in any quantity to affect this situation, is the development taking place on the Manitoba-Saskatchewan border, and that was done by the Hudson Bay Mining & Smelting company, which was put in there by virtue of arrangements made with the Manitoba Government. They extended their operations to the Saskatchewan side, where the mineral bed was; and of course we are credited with that production because the minerals at that point are on the Saskatchewan side — but we have no great right to take credit for that. It is Manitoba that caused that establishment to start there. The other place where development is taking place is in the northern part of the province — the northwestern part — where the Dominion Government is conducting work in connection with uranium.

Those are the facts in regard to mineral production.

In regard to oil wells. In Alberta, last year — I will change that and say, in the last 25 days, in Alberta — 47 oil wells were brought in, and 3 potential gas wells. In 1951, in Alberta, 35 oil strikes and 63 gas discoveries. Now then, the output, of course, tells a similar story. We went up, in output, about 200,000 barrels; Alberta went up about 19 million barrels. I give these figures, not because I like to give them, but I give them because they show the picture, and the sooner the Province realizes how

February 12, 1952

we are not getting the development here that we should have, the sooner we will get a Government in that people will not be afraid of and who will spend money in here to develop those resources. Naturally, we will tax them just the same as they are taxed in other provinces; but we would get the development, Mr. Speaker, and I do not think we would make deals such as were made with Rhubbra and his friends.

In regard to manufacturing industries, there is the same picture. There is an increase in manufacturing industries, in Manitoba, in the 5 years after 1944, of from 1290 to 1510; in Alberta, from 1165 to 1685 — that is in manufacturing industries. Saskatchewan had a decrease, from 1944, manufacturing industries have decreased from 1054 to 962.

The number of people employed in such industries, were increased, in Manitoba, by over 1,000. There was an increase, in Alberta, of over 4,000. And a decrease, in Saskatchewan, of 1,500.

Is that good for labour? That there should be 1,500 people less being able to make their living in the manufacturing industries in Saskatchewan? You can pass all the beneficial labour laws you want, and it is a good thing to pass laws that assist labour, but if you have a contracting economy like that, and people have to leave home and go elsewhere to get work, such laws are not helping them very much.

I could deal with what happened in forestry. We were told that socialization of the forestry industry was going to be a great thing. Well, what does the record show? Once the socialists got in charge of the forestry industry, and began to exploit the people interested in it? Those people in the North were exploited in a shameful way and began to move out of this province. The figures show the picture of operations in the woods, the value of such operations went up \$2 million from 1944 to 1949 in Manitoba; up \$400,000 in Saskatchewan; up in Alberta by nearly \$5 million — that is the value of operations in the woods.

Let me deal with sawmill operations and pulp and paper mills. We have heard a great deal about the Big River project. Well there is always the possibility, when government enters the field, with its power to draw on the public purse, its exemption from taxation, that it frightens more people out than it does good. That appears to be the situation in this field, because the value of sawmill operations and pulp and paper mills is this: In Manitoba, from 1944 to 1949, it went up over \$6 million; in Alberta, it went up about \$8 million; and in Saskatchewan, it went down \$2 million. There is the record. That sort of thing is why we are decreasing in population — the interference of imported planners and socialists, running around the north interfering with the timber industry of the north, until people pulled out by the dozens.

When we told the members of the Government about that, they laughed! They cannot laugh at these figures, Mr. Speaker. Of course, some people can laugh at anything. The Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) is laughing now. He is pleased, apparently. He is pleased, I guess, at the success of his socialism in the north. Well the people will know how to deal with him, in the north, whenever they get a chance, in the next election.

Now what is the situation with regard to agriculture? No provision to eliminate public revenue tax, in spite of the fact that the Government's own committee, almost two years ago, said it should be eliminated. That money raised by taxation, on the land and homes of the people, should be left with them to carry their school and municipal problems; but this Government still hangs on to that \$1,600,000 a year that is taken out of the taxation of farms and homes, in order to swell its already swollen revenues. It means that municipalities who pay a \$4 million assessment have to collect \$8,000 taxes from the people, on their land and homes, and send it in to this Government.

There is no provision for repeal of the mineral tax of 3 cents per acre. Yes, they imposed that on farmers, and on the basis of it, took title away from the farmers to their mineral rights, because they did not pay that tax; and there is no suggestion made that that tax is going to be repealed.

We are told that the Government is studying methods whereby the farmers who own mineral rights would be able to benefit when oil is produced from their lands. That is going to put a lot of money in the hands of the farmers — the fact that they are studying it! They have been studying this problem of farm needs for eight years, and now they set up a Royal Commission to find out what really is the truth! How long are they going to study this thing?

Continuing in regard to farmers, they are promised a committee to investigate farm implement prices; a commission on provincial-municipal relations; a commission to investigate agricultural problems; a study by the Government of methods whereby farmers will get something out of their mineral rights; a promise of accelerated rural electrification. But where it is a matter of doing something worthwhile for the farmers, nothing is done to speak of. But they are supposed to be satisfied with two commissions, one committee, one study and one plan — greater than anything that has ever been seen before! Well, that really is something — that is the Speech from The Throne.

Now in regard to our own policy. Farmers themselves have evolved our policy. For one thing, we say we should have a rural electrification programme more like that of Manitoba, to bring electricity to the farmers cheaper than the bare cost of bringing it. We say that the public revenue tax should be abolished so that municipalities can build up roads and farmers will not be isolated so much and will be able to get to the towns and cities to do their business. If this is done they will not be moving off the farms to such an extent. We say there should be more help in school grants, so that, without raising taxes, it will be possible to pay teachers higher salaries, and we will not have over 500 people in our rural schools who are teaching there without qualification to do so; and as a result, people, in order to get education for their children are moving off the farms.

These are some of the things that we say should be done in regard to helping our farmers. We say that something should be done really worthwhile, instead of spending money, competing with private enterprise. Something could be done to open up the north by roads and so on, such as opening up the Carrot River triangle, opening that land up there — another road into the North would be an investment, not money poured down the drain

February 12, 1952

such as the money poured into tanneries and shoe factories and all that sort of thing. That would be something worthwhile.

And we would certainly abolish the land tenancy policy of the C.C.F., which prevents a man from getting title to his own land, but makes him a permanent tenant of the Government. We certainly would do away with that. We would take steps to see that the farmers do benefit, to a reasonable extent, when oil is found on their land. We would not have to study it for seven or eight years; we would do something about it. We certainly agree with the Farmers Union, where they advocate that money this province has to invest should not be put out in large sums, to help people in the entertainment business. If the Province has money to invest, let them invest it in helping young farmers get started on the land — not in helping our friends of the Government in regard to getting started in the entertainment business — perhaps not getting them started, but helping out in some way in the entertainment business.

We have urged the abolition of the education and hospital tax on farm fuels. It is not paid in other provinces, and it is a most unjust tax to levy upon production. It should have been abolished long ago. This Government was elected on a programme to abolish the entire education tax when it had revenues to take its place — and that happened long ago. At least it could have carried out that promise in regard to taxes on farm fuels, but it did not do so.

I have said that the moment we are elected we will abolish the public revenue tax, because we think that the burden of looking after schools, and looking after municipal obligations — that that field of taxation should be left with the municipalities, as recommended by the Commission the Government set up itself.

The present C.C.F. Government is, as I have already pointed out, taxing farmers, where they own the minerals, 3 cents an acre. We would do away with that tax. They have confiscated land where the farmers did not pay the tax. That land would be returned, and those mineral rights would be returned to the farmers from whom it was taken.

Immediately upon election we will move towards a policy of cheaper farm electrification. There is a great deal of misunderstanding about farm electrification. There is some idea that there was a great farm electrification programme in existence, in Manitoba, at the end of the second war. In 1944, there were only 500 farms with farm electrification, in Manitoba; and in Saskatchewan there were 137. Not much difference between them. In 1944, a C.C.F. Government was elected in this Province, and what was the situation? Well, there have been about 7,500 farmers connected in Saskatchewan. We have twice the number of farmers in Saskatchewan that they have in Manitoba; but, in Manitoba, with half the number of farmers, they have connected 46 per cent of their farms with electricity. This Government has connected 6 per cent. In Manitoba, 26,435 farmers have been connected; and, in Saskatchewan, about 7,400. Of course it is understandable why that should be so. Manitoba takes the electricity right to the farmer's buildings, pays for the transformer, the meter, etc., and all the farmer has to do is wire his own building. Here it costs the farmer from \$600 to \$700 to get the electricity, on the average, to his buildings. Then, having got it here, what is the situation, in regard to charges made? There

are continual little adjustments being made in charges made by our Power Commission.

Here is the situation in regard to what is charged the farmers. In Manitoba, the net bill for 50 kilowatt hours consumed is \$3.60; in Saskatchewan, under the new reduced rates, it is \$5.00, or \$1.40 more. If the farmer uses 500 kilowatts, the net bill, in Manitoba, is \$8.55. In Saskatchewan, it is \$15.05. If he uses 1,000 kilowatts, as he would if he really began to use electricity the way he would ultimately do so to take full advantage of it, the net bill, in Manitoba, is \$13.05; and in Saskatchewan, \$25.00 — almost twice as much. In spite of him having to pay from \$600 to \$700 to get connected in the first place.

That is one reason why there is less farm depopulation in Manitoba than in Saskatchewan. Because, if you have to lay out, on top of the cost of wiring your building and buying your fixtures, from \$600 to \$700 in cash, it is much harder to get a scheme going; and the result is, in Manitoba, where you just have to sign up and say you will take the electricity, it is much easier to get the scheme going than in Saskatchewan where you have to pay this money out.

The next matter I wish to deal with, Mr. Speaker — I have dealt, to some extent, with the lack of consideration by this Government for the farmer in Saskatchewan; and the next thing that I wish to just say a word about is the position of labour. This Government has held itself out, continually, as a great and good friend of labour. They have advocated an idea that has been opposed by the great labour leaders of the United States for many years. Those leaders have taken the attitude that socialization was a bad thing for labour; they have opposed the idea of labour getting actively involved in supporting one political party. Labour, in Canada, has gone in the other direction. It has supported the idea of socialization, in spite of the advice of these great labour leaders in the United States.

Well, we have had one test here in Saskatchewan, and all that I want to say about that is to just ask, “what are the results?” According to ‘Labour Gazette’ of November, 1951, the average wages and salary, as at August 1, 1951, in manufacturing was: In Quebec, \$47.99 per week; in Ontario, \$52.30 per week; in Manitoba, \$49.23; in Alberta, \$50.60; in British Columbia, \$52.53; and Saskatchewan is the lowest, at \$47.28 per week. It is about \$5.00 under Ontario; it is lower than Quebec; more than \$5.00 under British Columbia; and more than \$3.00 under Alberta. The greatest proof of these things is, how do they work out? You can pass the most beneficial labour legislation you want, and if, at the same time, you have a programme which stunts development and makes less jobs available, it weakens the bargaining power of labour, and, as a result, the laws you pass do not result in benefiting labour. There is the situation in regard to our labour! Those figures are put out by the ‘Labour Gazette’.

The next thing that I wish to deal with — and I should say, at this time, that I think I have left you in no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that I think the policies of this Government have been most harmful to our Province. I think they have stultified its development; I think if we had had a government in office that was not devoted, as its ultimate objective, to socialization, no matter what may be said from time to time by the Ministers — they cannot deny that that is their ultimate objective — if we had not had

February 12, 1952

in office a government who had that as their objective; if they had not carried out legislation as indicated and not wanted to move in that direction, I think that we would have had the oil discoveries that Alberta has, today. I think the oil development Alberta is getting would have been ours. I was glad to hear the announcement, this afternoon, that there has been another discovery. It is only proving that we have great potential oil reserves and gas reserves, but that makes it all the more important that we get the real benefit from them.

If we cannot get oil and gas development — supposing we do find them — isn't this going to be the situation — that private risk capital is going to be afraid to come and build industries based on those resources? Aren't they going to be hesitant, aren't they going to think it would be better to build in neighbouring provinces where they haven't got a government that believes in socialization as its ultimate objective?

Then what happened? Supposing we get these great reserves of gas, on the basis of which we should get some great industries built up in Saskatchewan? We are told of the great industries that are being built in Texas on the basis of the natural gas resources there. Suppose we have a government in office yet — which God forbid — that believes in ultimate socialization, when these great discoveries are made? Then, of course, there will be those resources standing unused, and the question will arise as to where they will be used, and we will be told: "Well, you are Canadians. You cannot use it yourself, you are not using it, so you had better export what cannot be used." And the pressure will grow and grow, and if we do not get the industries and use the gas and oil, ultimately there will be the feeling that we should export it; that some other Canadians may as well benefit by such resource if we cannot. As a result these industries will be built up outside our borders. Our young people will go there to staff them. The pipelines will go out of this province, taking the gas from under the ground, and the oil. (The Minister of Social Welfare laughed with joy at that. I will venture to say his own city of Saskatoon does not laugh at that prospect.)

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that now it is more important than ever that we get a government in that private enterprise is not afraid of. In order to get these industries built up on a basis of those natural resources, built up in this province and not elsewhere, and not have to see that gas and oil pipeline going out of our province and seeing other provinces going ahead, and all we would get out of it would be the sale of gas or the royalties from it.

So I intend, Mr. Speaker, before I am through, to move an amendment that this Government has lost the confidence of the people of this Province. I will move it at the close of my speech, because in the little inter-change that you and I had, Mr. Speaker, quite a bit of my time was used up, and so I will not take time, at the moment, to have you put the question. I will move it at the end of my remarks.

Now in regard to education. I would just like to look at that question for a minute. Education is a most important thing to us all. The training of our children, and I think that one of the reasons that farmers have tended to move off the farms has been the fact that it has been so difficult to get qualified teachers in the rural schools. The reason for

that has been that this Government has not carried a fair share of the cost of primary and secondary education. It has not stepped up its assistance, for example, as British Columbia has. I understand they carry around 50 per cent of the cost. Here the figures are: In 1944, the rural municipalities levied, in school taxes, \$5,600,000. That has risen, six years later, to over \$10 million. That was the burden the farm people had to carry in the municipalities in respect to schools. An increase, in those six years, of 82 per cent. Now then, that meant that the average tax per quarter-section went up from \$39.75, in 1944, to \$61.40, in 1950 — or an increase of \$21.80 per quarter-section, an increase of 55 per cent. The expenditure per capita on education by rural municipalities out of their local taxes rose from \$10.95 in 1944 to \$22.29 in 1950 — over 100 per cent.

That is the situation. The present Government should have given more help to the municipalities to carry that rising burden of education. The subsidy which is given to the Provincial Government to assist them to discharge their constitutional obligations was, in 1944, \$8,390,000. That includes the subsidy and the constitutional payment we are entitled to. That was up to \$17,180,000, in 1949-50, or an increase of \$8,790,000. The education tax went up by \$3,372,000. It is true the school grants increased during the same period from 1944 to 1950. We hear a lot about the way the school grants increased, but they actually increased by \$2,475,000. In other words, Mr. Speaker, that was less than the increase in the receipts from the education tax by almost \$1 million. And there the C.C.F. left the municipalities struggling with this school problem, left them unable to pay salaries to keep teachers in the Province. They did not even pass on the increase in education tax, in spite of the fact that, during that period, receipts from the Federal Government more than doubled — went up by more than \$8 million. And then they think that they are entitled to some support from the people who are struggling with educational problems in this province.

Let us look at it another way. The expenditures on education, as set out in the estimates, in 1950-51, that is the total expenditures on education, in those estimates, were \$9,437,000. Let us look at the way that money was obtained. Interest on investments and education fund, \$82,500; interest on invested school land fund, \$647,000; receipts in regard to school land funds, other than interest, \$500,000; two-thirds of the education and hospitalization tax, which goes from the people directly to carry education, \$6,500,000; examination fees, \$235,000; paid by the Federal Government, or paid out of school land investments, \$8,198,000. That means that this Province, this Provincial Government — in 1950-51, proposed to spend from its own funds \$1,200,000 or \$1,238,000 to be exact. The rest of the money spent on education is taken out of the interest on invested school funds, the education tax, payments by the Federal Government directly towards education.

I ask you to bear that figure in mind, Mr. Speaker, - \$1,200,000 — and carrying that small load, they left municipalities which did not have mounting revenues, and which had to take it out of taxation on the lands and homes, they left them to carry the burden. That burden on rural municipalities alone, that has gone up to \$10 million — an increase of over \$4 million in the period from 1944 on.

No wonder the Cronkite-Britnell-Jacobs report said that the Provincial Government should help the municipalities, out of their large revenues, by transferring the public revenue tax to them. But still there is no provision made for cancelling the public revenue tax. We hear a great deal from the C.C.F. speakers — propaganda — and from people who run around doing the work of the C.C.F. party — a lot of them on the Government pay-roll. We hear from them of the great increase in grants to rural municipalities. Well, the grants, in 1944, were \$288,000. They were increased, in 1949-50, by \$437,000. Just think, Mr. Speaker, — here is this Government with all these increased revenues, expending \$1,200,000 from its own money towards education, getting these increased grants from the Federal Government, and yet has increased the help to the municipalities by less than half a million dollars! Is it any wonder the teachers are leaving this province? Is it any wonder that less and less teachers are going to the normal schools, and to the University College of Education?

In the official publication, the 'Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation', Mr. Trout, one of their officials, points out that, a year ago, there were 502 study supervisors in Saskatchewan; that is people with no training as teachers whosoever, and now the figure has gone up to 543, this year.

What about C.C.F. talk that they were going to treat the people in the rural areas as well as the people in the urban areas? Where are all those study supervisors teaching? Is it any wonder that people who wish to have their children receive the proper education are moving into the towns and villages? Mr. Trout points out that 291 teachers left the Province this year, and 339 left the year before, and added to that, 150 less teachers in the Normal schools and College of Education this year than last year — a drop from approximately 900 to 750. There it is! An approaching breakdown in our whole educational set-up, because if you are so treating your teachers that they refuse to go in for training as teachers, and if they are leaving the Province at that rate, well, of course you are going to have more and more of your schools staffed with untrained people. Well, can anyone be satisfied with that?

In regard to this situation, it is not surprising that people are not going in to training as teachers, because Mr. Trout gives some figures there that indicate something. He takes these from the 'Labour Gazette', and he shows the average teacher's salary for 1950-51 was \$37.14 a week — the average salary in the forestry industry was just \$10.00 a week more — \$47.15. Mining was \$60.71 a week; manufacturing, \$51.70; operation of public utilities, \$56.20 a week. Well, if that is the scale in which this Government values the teaching of our children, that they are willing to pay such a comparatively niggardly grant, that without imposing impossible local taxation, teachers have to receive these salaries as compared with what other workers in other industries are getting, is it any wonder that our whole educational system is in danger?

It is something for us to think about, and it is pretty near time that something is done to help the municipalities carry this load, instead of spending these vastly increased revenues on the schemes of the Government — from about \$28 million to \$58 million, in a matter of six years.

A great deal is said, from time to time, by C.C.F. speakers and apologists about what is spent on the Social Welfare and Health Department. Here are some figures I would like to give, Mr. Speaker, that are very interesting. A total expenditure in these two departments, in the 1951-52 estimates — estimates that were tabled last year — were \$29,257,000. One-third of the receipts from the hospitalization and educational tax, the revenue from health services, social welfare services, the revenues paid directly by the people, and other revenues, amount to \$4,177,000. The Federal Government's payments in respect to cancer, V.D. control, old age pensions, and blind pension payments, health regulation contributions, amounts to \$6,886,000. The two together amount to \$11 million, paid for by the contributions of other people, or by the people directly (I refer to the hospitalization and education tax). Now, if you take that off the total expenditure of these two departments, you get this Government paying out of its own funds towards running these departments, \$18,192,000.

Now then, in that year the Federal subsidy was \$19,948,000. That means that the subsidy more than covers the total cost to the Government out of its own cash revenue, outside of what is paid directly by the people, of \$1¾ million. That is more than enough — half a million dollars more than enough — to pay what it is paying in regard to education; because you will remember, Mr. Speaker, I said it was spending — net — on education, \$1,200,000.

So here is the situation. This Government, out of its own revenues, outside of the direct taxation and hospitalization tax, is actually financing public health, the Public Health department, the Social Welfare department, and the balance it is paying for education, out of the Federal grant, and it still has something left over. Then it leaves the municipalities' taxes on lands and homes to rise the way it has — leaves them struggling on the admission of the Minister himself, (I have a clipping of a recent speech he made on that) with a problem, which, as he says, they are finding great difficulty in meeting. I think he said tax revenues were not adequate to meet expenditures because councils were faced with persistent demands for the needs and services to be supplied. (I refer to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. McIntosh). He realized they were up against an almost impossible proposition, and the C.C.F. Government prefers to spend its own money on their own socialist schemes and ideas, rather than helping in regard to this great education problem, and in regard to the municipalities, struggling with the building of roads, bridges, etc.

In regard to highways. We are promised a great plan that will exceed all previous plans! They have been in office nearly eight years, and have let this problem get worse, worse and worse; and now we are told we get a greater plan than has ever been seen before! Well, that is very interesting. It is interesting to see. Yes — plans! We have heard a lot of plans in other places. Perhaps they are beginning to catch up, even in that regard. But in any event, we hear a lot about highways, and I think, when I deal with that I will conclude, because I think that is a good note on which to conclude.

February 12, 1952

We are told that, in Saskatchewan, we have a bigger problem than in Manitoba or Alberta, and I agree with that. But it is amazing when you look at what is being done, that Saskatchewan is doing, proportionately, so much less.

Here are some figures from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, and I want to give them to you, Mr. Speaker. The total expenditure on transportation, roads and communication, in Manitoba (for fiscal year ending March 31, 1951) was \$10.1 million. In Saskatchewan, \$10.6 million. In Alberta, \$22.3 million. Now then, the total budget expenditure, in Manitoba, exclusive of debt entirely, was \$38 million (\$38.12); in Saskatchewan, \$65.3 million; and, in Alberta, \$75.2 million, so that Manitoba spent 26.4 per cent of her budget expenditure in regard to her highways; Alberta spent 29.78, or almost 30 per cent; Saskatchewan spent 16.2 per cent of her expenditure. In other words, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan spent 10 per cent less than Manitoba — 16 per cent as compared with 26 per cent in Manitoba, and 29 per cent, in Alberta. Well, I think the reason for that is this: That in our province, since the C.C.F. came into office, we have been trying to handle this road problem as a political matter — to get political advantage. In those other provinces there is the tendency to build roads to open up the north country, both in Alberta and Manitoba, but here, our Government does not care about important things like that, even when it is a question of our minerals being taken to be dealt with in another province. The Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank) made the remark (of course he can contradict me if he wants to, because I did not hear him, but it was reported) that he did not care if they took them to Timbuctoo.

Some Hon. Member: — No denial of that!

Mr. Tucker: — No denial of that. Well, he could have denied it and I would have had to accept it, Mr. Speaker, because I did not hear it, but the fact remains that this Government has been trying to use the highways building programme to get votes, instead of figuring that it should build roads up into the North to open up our north country, and that would have been a real investment. How else can you explain Manitoba spending 26 per cent of her total budget; Alberta spending 29 per cent; and us spending 16 per cent? When I said that they have tried to use this for political purposes, I think the figures will bear me out. The total expenditure, in this Province, on construction, reconstruction and surfacing of highways, in the years 1944-51 — that is five years — was \$20 million. Do you know how much was spent in Rosthern during that time, out of the \$20 million? \$738 in the last year of that period, and not a cent in the previous four years — situated right on the road from Saskatoon to Prince Albert, and we were told of their attitude by a man who, today, is a candidate of the C.C.F. party. He said, “while you vote Liberal, you do not need to expect anything spent in the way of highways.” That is what he said, but fortunately I have told this story around the Province, about how they are playing politics, punishing people for how they vote. That is all it amounts to — the Soviet system — that is what it is. I told them what was going on, and I venture to say that some decent C.C.F.ers said to their Government, “surely what Tucker says is not so; surely you had better do something, so that he will not be able to say that any more”, so now they are beginning to do some highway building in Rosthern constituency. And how are they doing it? Well

they go ahead of where the highway is going to go. They say, “now if we get enough memberships . . .” For example, they went to Rosthern, last summer, and said, “we will take the highway as far as Rosthern this fall.” But whether they get the highway there depends upon how many C.C.F. memberships they get!

I was very interested in a report of a recent meeting at Alvena — the C.C.F. candidate went there. The people there were wanting to get connected up with hydro and wanted some road-building done. The president of the C.C.F. in that constituency got up and said: “Boys, I have got a black book, and in it is written the names of the people who are supporting our party. I do not see many people in here from Alvena supporting the C.C.F. party. You know, you have to take that into consideration.” I was glad when somebody from Alvena got up and said: “Well, we have done without hydro here since we settled in this country, and if we have to submit to a political party that we do not believe in, and support it in order to get hydro, we will do without all the rest of our lives.”

There they are! This is the story of how they are using their power to punish and reward people, considering how they vote. That seems to please them, Mr. Speaker. Well believe me, it does not please the people of this Province. That is just the way the communists do it, exactly. Believe me. Isn't that so? Do they not undertake, (the Government, that is) to punish people and reward them in respect of how they vote? This is public money. It should be distributed in some fair way. For example, can anyone say that a highway running through an area of this Province, situated right between two of the large cities of this Province, Saskatoon and Prince Albert, travelled over as much, I believe, as any in this Province, and no work has been done on that highway from 1929 up to last year, up until it was desired to get some votes there, or something, or to stop my talking. For five years practically nothing was done, and during that time \$20 million was spent in the Province. Well, I figured it out, that in each of the five years, \$123 a year, on the average, in Rosthern, while \$20 million was spent on the rest of the Province. And why? Well, the C.C.F. candidate put it in words, and he is now their candidate in Kinistino. He would not make it in Rosthern, so the C.C.F., in the redistribution, cut a chunk off Rosthern, and threw it into Kinistino so he could run there. He must be a very highly valued candidate, and he said: “While you vote Liberal you do not need to expect anything.”

Well, that is the way they have been playing politics in highways. I have dealt, Mr. Speaker, with their record in regard to preventing this Province from going ahead the way it should with its great resources. I have dealt with their failure to, in any way, meet the problems of agriculture. I have dealt with the lack of hope for this Province in getting the development it should, if we do not get rid of this Government; and in the earnest hope that this will be accepted as a sign that we would like to have an election just as soon as it can possibly be held, I would move this motion for lack of confidence in this present Government.

I move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by Mr. McCormack (Souris-Estevan):

February 12, 1952

THAT the following words be added to the Address:

“We respectfully submit to Your Honour that Your Honour’s present advisers do not possess the confidence of the citizens of Saskatchewan.”

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

Hon. T.C. Douglas (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I should first like to join with others who have spoken, this afternoon, in extending a word of welcome to the students from the University of Saskatchewan, and the members of the Parliamentary Forum. We are delighted to have them here this afternoon, and delighted that this has become an annual occasion for them to come and see parliament in action. We hope that they and their successors in the Parliamentary Forum will continue to come each year to the opening of the Legislature.

I cannot share with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) in feeling so happy about the political complexion of the Student Parliament, but I am sure that you will feel as I do, that if all students could come and see the opening of the House and hear the Leader of the Opposition, that there would be a very substantial change in the political complexion of the Parliamentary group in Saskatoon. I am sure if they had to listen to the senseless arguments and the very faulty and false conclusion that have been drawn here this afternoon, that would convince them that the Liberal party is not deserving of the support of young people, let alone of intelligent people.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) expressed the hope that the Parliamentary elections in the University would be a forecast of what happens in the province. He said, “if the people of the Province get a chance to vote.” Several times he kept saying “if they get a chance to vote.” Mr. Speaker, the people of this Province have never had any difficulty in getting a chance to vote as long as this Government was in office. The only time the people of this Province ever lost their democratic rights was under a Liberal Government, which ought to have gone to the country in 1943, because its term of office was up — the five years that was prescribed in the Legislative Assembly Act — their term was ended, and instead of that, by their own motion, they perpetuated their own lives, their own political lives, for one year and forced their administration for another year upon a long-suffering public. So do not let the gentlemen opposite ever worry about whether or not the people will get a chance to vote. The people of this Province will get a chance to vote, and they will get it long before the gentlemen opposite want them to have it.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) said he felt sure, of course, that this would — (just control yourself, gentlemen. I would like to say to the member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski), that when I am shooting grizzlies I never waste time taking a shot at a weasel. You just keep quiet).

Mr. B.L. Korchinski (Redberry): — I resent that.

Premier Douglas: — Well, I am sure the weasels will resent it too! The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) suggested that what happened in the Parliamentary Forum is probably a forecast of what will happen in Saskatchewan. But if I remember correctly, Mr. Speaker, he made a similar prophesy just before the Gravelbourg by-election, and the member for Gravelbourg sits on this side of the House this year, whereas last year he sat on the other side.

I want, Mr. Speaker, to extend my congratulations to the mover. (If the member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. McCormack) has anything to say I wish he would have the courage to get up and say it, instead of mumbling into his collar. If he says something it will be the first time since he came into this House that he has had the courage to get up and say something. He is much better at mumbling, facing the other wall, or getting into a radio studio where nobody has a chance to answer him. I will deal with him later before this Session is over, in no unmistakable terms.)

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to offer my congratulations to the mover and seconder, who made such an excellent job, yesterday, of discussing the Speech from the Throne — the Government's programme in the past, and their programme for this session of the Legislature. I have listened to many movers and seconders of Speeches from the Throne, in both the Federal Parliament and the Provincial Legislature, but I doubt if I have ever heard a more carefully worded speech or better oratorical effort than was made by the two members, yesterday. I do not want them to take too seriously the fact that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) chided them a bit with dealing with Federal matters, because, of course, the Leader of the Opposition does not want those two members, or any other members dealing with Federal matters.

This morning's 'Leader-Post' carried the story of Mr. Whiteside, the Federal member for Swift current, admonishing the convention which met there last Saturday, and saying to them, in effect, "now, do not let this C.C.F. crowd get you on some Federal matters. You want to insist on discussing Provincial affairs." And, certainly, if I were a Liberal Federal member, and I supported a government which has the woeful record which the present Government at Ottawa has, I would be asking people not to discuss Federal matters either. As a matter of fact, the Liberal party tried to follow that strategy in the Gravelbourg by-election. In the course of the Gravelbourg by-election, when the present member was being nominated, in the course of my remarks, I spent 85 per cent of my time discussing the provincial programme, and the last 15 minutes I dealt with the very pressing matter of the wheat marketing, which, at that time, was an issue. Immediately the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) and other speakers came into the constituency and said, "now you must not discuss wheat — do not talk about wheat. This issue has nothing to do with wheat. Let us get away from discussing wheat."

Mr. Tucker: — I have never undertaken to tell the electorate that they must not discuss anything, and what the Premier says is absolutely untrue.

Premier Douglas: — I heard you.

February 12, 1952

Mr. Tucker: — Get up and say you heard me.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I heard the hon. gentleman, on the radio, telling people that the issue was not wheat.

Mr. Tucker: — That is right. That is different.

Premier Douglas: — I heard him, and after he had gone around the constituency for several weeks telling people not to discuss wheat, he closed the campaign by speaking over CHAB, and I listened to him myself, and he said, “A vote for the Liberal candidate will be a vote for the Wheat Board and a vote of confidence in Mr. Gardiner.”

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, I must compliment the premier on the way he twists a thing. I said, “A vote against the Liberal candidate, and the defeat of that candidate, will be construed as a sign that you are dissatisfied with the Wheat Board.”

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, that is just a distinction without a difference.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) said he does not think we should bust into other people's business and talk about Federal affairs. Mr. Speaker, it is our business, as members of this Legislature. If the farmers of this Province and the working people of this Province are being punished by rising prices, by uncontrolled inflation, by unfair marketing policies, it is our business; and we have no choice but to speak in this Legislature, or anywhere else, regarding that which affects the welfare of the people we represent.

And, as a matter of fact, when my hon. friend gets up here, today, and criticizes me because I made some passing reference, by way of illustration, to the Churchill Government, these are the last group of people who ought to talk about people and members criticizing other governments. For years we have listened to them, wailing against the Labour Government in Great Britain, the Labour Government in New Zealand, and the Labour Government in Australia. They got over into the Soviet Union two or three times.

Mr. Tucker: — And the people got a chance to know what to do with them too!

Premier Douglas: — But this group must not discuss Federal matters. Of course, that does not apply both ways. The Saskatchewan members in Ottawa spend about half their time discussing Saskatchewan, if you read the speeches of Mr. Studer and Mr. Carl Stewart. Mr. Studer took up a good bit of the time of parliament, one evening, telling them he wanted Saskatchewan cut down the middle, and one half of it put into Alberta, and the other half put into Manitoba. That is all right. Liberal members in Ottawa can take up all the time they want discussing provincial matters there, but we must not dare say anything about the Federal Government.

Mr. Tucker: — . . . all red herrings.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I can assure you we will not desist, merely because we are asked to by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker), but I do not blame him at all for trying. Because if I were associated with a political party that had so miserably failed to take care of the interests of the people of Saskatchewan, as has the Government at Ottawa, I would be trying to soft pedal that subject too.

Mr. Tucker: — The hon. Premier is concealing motives and I ask the privilege to explain my motive in that regard. My motive is that we have provincial business to do. It is not because I do not think we have a good Government at Ottawa. I think we have a wonderful Government at Ottawa.

Premier Douglas: — As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate and understand the statement that was made by Mr. Knowles, who I believe has just been nominated as a Liberal candidate for the City of Regina, who, on the evening that he was nominated, said: "In my opinion the best chance the Liberal party would have in Saskatchewan would be if it would completely disassociate itself from the Federal Liberals."

Mr. Tucker: — You are wrong again.

Premier Douglas: — So, if that is how they feel I can understand them not wanting to discuss Federal matters. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) has also chastised the member for Gravelbourg because he referred to the C.C.F. programme, and that that programme had not been carried out by the Government.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear!

Premier Douglas: — I was very glad the hon. member for Gravelbourg reviewed the promises upon which this Government was elected, because it certainly was a gallant effort. He tried to make out that, somehow or other, they had done something to try and carry out their promise. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not have to try and convince the gentlemen opposite about carrying out promises. The people of this Province are the people to whom we made the promises and they will be the best judges of whether or not they have been carried out.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear! Go to them.

Premier Douglas: — And, in 1944, we went to the country on a programme. That programme had nine points. The first point was 'Security in your home'. Farm legislation, farm security legislation, rental control provided that security. (2) Real debt reduction and the seed grain debt reduction and the relief debt reduction took millions of dollars off the backs of the farmers and the people of this province. (3) Increased Old Age pensions. The Old Age pensions have been increased to the point where they are more than twice what they were when the Liberal Government was in office. (4) Medical, dental and hospital services, irrespective of the ability of the individual to pay. There are thousands of citizens in this Province, today, getting health services on that basis. (5) Equal educational opportunities for every child in the Province.

Mr. Tucker: — Yes, let's have it.

February 12, 1952

Premier Douglas: — Educational legislation provided for Larger School Units provided for free text books, providing assistance to Larger School Units to enable rural children to come and take high school; scholarships to enable students to go to University and Schools of Nursing have moved in that direction, and have gone a long way towards implementing that problem. (6) Increased Mothers' Allowances, maternity grants and care for the disabled. That, too, has been done. (7) Freedom of speech and freedom of religion. And this is the only Government in Canada that has put a Bill of Civil Rights on the statute books, and we are still waiting for the Federal Government to put . . .

Mr. Tucker: — It is the only place where you have got things like Ivanchuk happening too!

Premier Douglas: — We are still waiting for the Federal Government to put through a Bill of Civil Rights on the statute books of Canada, to give the people the same freedom from discrimination which they enjoy in this Province of Saskatchewan. (8) The right of collective bargaining for labour. That right of collective bargaining has been given and has been enjoyed and utilized by organized labour in this Province, with the result that Trade Union membership has increased by some 30 per cent since this Government took office. (9) Encouragement of the co-operative movement. The first co-operative department in Canada was set up in this Province and the co-operative movement, today, has grown to the place where we have become the banner co-operative province of Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that was the programme, in 1944.

Mr. Tucker: — A small part of it.

Premier Douglas: — We went to the country, in 1948, and the people were so satisfied that we had completely implemented it that they re-elected us in spite of all my hon. friends could do to persuade them to the contrary.

Mr. Tucker: — By the skin of your teeth!

Premier Douglas: — So that I do not think the gentlemen opposite should need to be too worried about the matter of keeping promises.

Mr. Tucker: — We are not worried.

Premier Douglas: — We have carried out the programme on which we were elected and when the time comes we shall go to the people in complete confidence, that having done the things which they elected us to do that we are perfectly justified in asking for a mandate to continue with our programme.

I was interested, this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, in hearing the new Liberal programme — we get one every session. The new Liberal programme can be summed up in one sentence. It is less taxes, and more services.

Mr. Tucker: — That is right.

Premier Douglas: — It is going to give up the public revenue tax; it is going to take the education and hospital tax off certain things. It is going to cut down the taxes! In the same breath they are going to give free power installations, cheaper power rates, greater educational grants, a greater highway programme. Of course, my hon. friend did it by spending the Federal subsidy five times — I counted them. He spent that Federal subsidy five times.

Mr. Tucker: — Your counting isn't very good. You had better go back to school.

Premier Douglas: — He has got that circulating theory of money. He can keep using it over and over. Well, you can, but you have got to buy it back before you can spend it over and over.

Mr. Tucker: — Oh, you are too smart!

Premier Douglas: — You know, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) ought to get together with his former publicity director, who is now one of the editors of the Regina 'Leader-Post', because the Regina 'Leader-Post', after the Ontario election, bewailed what they called 'the disgraceful spectacle of Mr. Thomson going out and promising to cut taxes and increase services'.

Mr. Tucker: — He did better than the C.C.F. anyway.

Some Hon. Member (Govt.): — His name was Walter, too.

Premier Douglas: — I would suggest that the 'Walters' get together and probably learn from past mistakes that the public is not fooled any more by the type of political dishonesty that goes out and suggests that with one hand you can reduce the revenue of the government, and at the same time, can go out and spend millions of more dollars than you are spending at the present time. The people are not fooled by that sort of thing. They were not fooled in Ontario, they were not fooled by it in Gravelbourg, and they will not be fooled by it in this Province.

I am not going to take time to comment on this farcical story about highways being built only where C.C.F. memberships are held.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear! Hear! That is true.

Premier Douglas: — That thing is not true.

Mr. Tucker: — It is true.

Premier Douglas: — That is not true, and I do not believe it; and I doubt if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) believes it.

Mr. Tucker: — I do believe it. I do believe it. I do believe it.

Premier Douglas: — I do not think any intelligent member in this House believes it.

February 12, 1952

Mr. Tucker: — On a question of ethics, Mr. Speaker, the Premier has no right to get up and say that I do not believe what I say. If he is going to resort to tactics like that I can say that he is also a liar, and I do say it when he says that.

Some Hon. Member (Opposition): — It wouldn't be the first time.

Mr. Tucker: — No, it wouldn't be the first time, that is right.

Mr. Speaker: — We are in exactly the same position as we were before. If the members will keep that in mind, that when a statement is denied by any member, that the person making that statement will accept that denial. I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) could save the situation from arising. If you do not obey the ruling . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. Premier said that I said something that I did not believe in. He said, "I do not think the Leader of the Opposition believes it." I believe it, because the facts bear it out, Mr. Speaker.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I shall abide by the rules of the House. I shall accept the hon. gentleman's statement, and I shall say that if he believes it, I think he is the only intelligent person in this House that does believe it.

I doubt if anybody believes it, anybody else . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Premier Douglas: — And I want to say, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Tucker: — And half your own supporters believe it.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, may I draw your attention to this fact — that the member opposite talked for one and three-quarter hours this afternoon; that he made a series of statements, most of which were inaccurate; he cast innuendos upon the integrity of some members of this side of the House, and not a member of this side of the House got up. I have been talking for 18 minutes, and the hon. gentleman has been on his feet half a dozen times, and this group over here have been howling like a pack of wolves. It begins, Mr. Speaker, to look as though the hon. gentlemen opposite have very tender toes.

Mr. Tucker: — Not half as tender as yours should be!

Premier Douglas: — I am coming back, Mr. Speaker, to this farcical story about the fact that highways are built, just as C.C.F. memberships are sought. I said, "I do not believe that."

Mr. Tucker: — I know it to be true.

Premier Douglas: — My hon. friend thinks he knows it to be true. I would be very glad to have the proof of it. I would like to have the proof of anybody who got up and said, "I have a little book here, and

unless these people's names are in this book, you are not going to get power in there." As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, every member of this House, if he wants to be fair, knows that when the budget comes in here, — The Minister of Highways (Hon. J.T. Douglas) got up, last year, and outlined his highway programme — to build so many miles from this point to that point; and so many miles grading from this point to that point. The Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Darling) brought in a power programme, outlining the programme, and set out a map. Those power projects had been planned the year before, the material ordered the fall before, and the plan was submitted to this Legislature. Does that look as though this plan was determined by someone saying, "if you do not buy memberships in this particular corner, the power line will not come in — or the highways will not come in?" Those programmes have been laid out by the officials in charge of the Department; they have been approved by the Cabinet; the amount of money has been requisitioned for that purpose and the orders placed. And anybody that comes along with this sort of story, that we are punishing anyone because of how they vote, let them look at the constituency of Arm River.

Mr. Tucker: — We had to go through it.

Premier Douglas: — Let them look at the constituency of the member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. McCormack) or any of the other constituencies upon which hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent.

(interruptions)

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — For seven years there has not been any money spent in Arm River, until we got the road from Saskatoon to Saltcoats and from Regina to Yorkton. We have not had any . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! Order!

Mr. Tucker: — Let him speak, that is a question of privilege.

Premier Douglas: — The rules of the House forbid that.

Mr. Tucker: — The member has been in the House a long time, he ought to know the rules.

Mr. Danielson: — This squirming does not get you anywhere. You and I will have a chat on this . . .

Premier Douglas: — Yes, I will be very glad to have a chat on that. I will take him over the rules sometime so he will get familiar with them.

Mr. Danielson: — If anybody breaks the rules of this House, it is the member for Weyburn (Premier Douglas). He thinks he is a privileged member here.

Premier Douglas: — I have not interrupted a single speaker in the entire debate to date, not one.

February 12, 1952

Some Hon. Member (Opposition): — Real good boy!

Premier Douglas: — My hon. friends have interrupted regularly for the very obvious reason that they haven't any other answer. The fact remains that a highway programme was put on in this Province, designed to build a highway system. My hon. friends know that. They cannot deny it. I know what is bothering them. What is bothering them is that they have got some bad memories. From the day when the Highway Department of this Province was the political machine of the Liberal party. If anyone will take the trouble to examine it they will know the facts.

Now Mr. Speaker, having made these few fragmentary remarks, I would like to come to the main body of the arguments advanced by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker), and seek, if I can, to prick that bladder at a more opportune time.

Therefore, I would beg leave to move the adjournment of the debate.

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

Premier Douglas: — I take it, Mr. Speaker, that it will not restrict it to a discussion upon the amendment. A non-confidence motion, I understand, allows you to cover the whole Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Speaker: — It is always understood that there will be no duplication of speeches.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:30 P.M.