

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fifth Session — Eleventh Legislature**  
**5th Day**

**Wednesday, February 13, 1952.**

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

**SPEECH FROM THE THRONE**

**Motion for Address-in-Reply**

**Hon. T.C. Douglas (Premier):** — I should like first, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of members of all parts of the House, I am sure, (this is probably the only thing I shall say today in which I shall have the support of all part of the House) to extend a word of welcome to the University of Saskatchewan students who are here from the Parliamentary Forum of the University of Saskatchewan. I wish to say how delighted we are to have you make these annual pilgrimages to the deliberations of the Saskatchewan Legislative Assembly. We hope that you enjoy them and that you will come as often as you can in order that you may participate in the social gathering and listen to the discussions.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Leader of the Opposition moved an amendment which stated that the present government had lost the confidence of the people of this province. This was preceded by a speech which lasted one and three-quarter hours in which a very dark and dismal picture of the province was painted. It is worthy of note that in the course of that address the hon. gentleman, instead of addressing you, Mr. Speaker, as is the custom in this House, kept saying, "Now, ladies and gentlemen," and "Furthermore, ladies and gentlemen". Of course the error is quite understandable. The Leader of the Opposition has played this phonograph record so often that all he needs now is to get wound up, put the needle in the right groove and away he goes. This record has been played before so many Liberal rallies and the Leader of the Opposition has made this speech so frequently that he is beginning to believe some of the facts contained therein himself. However I think he will find that the members of this House are not quite as credulous nor quite as gullible as some of the Liberal rallies to which he give the alleged facts and fallacious arguments of which he unburdened himself yesterday.

The Leader of the Opposition began his speech by saying there was nothing in the Speech from the Throne. That was rather interesting to me in view of the fact that the Regina Leader-Post in its editorial said:

"The C.C.F. Government's Throne Speech, which launched the Fifth Session of the Eleventh Legislature Thursday is patently a document designed — not without skill — to win friends and influence voters."

**February 13, 1952**

Mr. Bob Moon, the political commentator for the Leader-Post, said in his signed article:

“In all the Speech from the Throne touches on subjects of interest to virtually all groups in the province.

It proposes specific new principles for implementation which, in the immediate future, at least, will not likely boost costs very much.”

The Saskatoon Star-Phoenix said:

“For one of the distinguishing features of the new legislative program is that there is something in it for almost every economic group in the province.”

The Leader of the Opposition doesn't seem to be getting too much support for his contention that there is nothing in the Speech from the Throne.

At the beginning of his remarks he took occasion to make reference to the fact that some individual had been put in jail, he said, as the result of not having paid his hospital tax. He was very specific in pointing out that while legislation had been passed in this House providing that a man could not be put in jail for not paying his hospital tax, this man had been put in jail for not paying the fine that was levied for not paying his hospital tax. The gentlemen opposite thought that was very funny. Well, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the facts. The Leader of the Opposition did not give all the facts! This individual, whose name was Mr. Milton Abrahamson, was a person who had not paid his tax for some time on behalf of himself and his wife and his child. Investigation showed that he was in quite good financial circumstances. I have here a list of assets, which amount to several thousands of dollars including livestock which could easily have been disposed of. When he went into court he became abusive and told the judge that he would not pay the fine — a fine which amounted to \$6.00 and costs. Now I know people do not like paying fines or court costs. I have paid some court costs myself so I know and can appreciate Mr. Abrahamson not liking it. I didn't like it either! But the court decided he should pay his fine of \$6.00 and the costs of the court, and when he refused the Magistrate committed him to jail.

Mr. Speaker, that was not the fault of the legislation passed by this House. The Criminal Code of Canada, as the Leader of the Opposition who is a lawyer, well knows, provides that a judge may commit a man to jail for refusal to pay a fine. I do not know of any statute or any law in the statute books of Canada that denies a judge the right to commit a man to jail if he refuses to pay a fine. The Leader of the Opposition seemed to think there was something wrong about this. Is he suggesting that a judge should not have the right to commit a man to jail if he refuses to pay a fine? If he believes that he should get the Criminal Code amended. He should have tried to do so when he was a member of parliament. Or does he think the government should try to tell a Magistrate what to do with a man who appears before him or that we should try to

interfere with the courts of justice? Maybe Liberal governments do that — I don't know — but this government never has interfered with the conduct of the courts.

My opinion is that this subject was touched on not because we did anything to put this man in jail but because this is simply another attempt by the Liberal party to undermine public confidence in the Hospital Services Plan. This is a plan which they themselves lacked the vision to implement and ever since it has been inaugurated by this government they have done everything they can to undermine public confidence in it. I think the vast majority of the people of this province pay their hospital tax and do so gladly, because they know they get a great deal more benefit than what they pay for in the actual per capita tax. Those who are able to pay ought to pay and no person who is unable to pay need fear as long as this government is in office.

The Leader of the Opposition yesterday dealt with a very important problem, and that is the depopulation that has been taking place over the province during the last fifteen years, our changing agricultural economy and some of the difficulties that face an economy such as ours. I think he did a public service in bringing some of these facts to our attention. We must face the fact that placed as we are on a great, semi-arid plateau with a large part of our income dependent on agriculture, we have very real and very serious problems. I believe that those problems can be solved; I believe some of them are being solved; but they will not be solved by closing our eyes to them. We must look at them realistically and honestly. We must face the fact, for instance, that in the last quarter of a century a great technological change has been taking place in the agricultural industry of North America; that the increasing use of machinery which has replaced a great deal of labour on the farm has meant a steady shift of population from the farms to urban centres. The same situation is to be found in every part of this continent. The census figures will show that while there are more people on the North American continent today than there were twenty years ago, there are less people on the farms, or a smaller percentage on the farms than there was twenty years ago. The shift has been from the rural areas to the city as the machine has displaced the need for many people on the farms. That is true, whether you make a study of Illinois or Ontario; Montana or North Dakota. Saskatchewan is no exception. As a matter of fact, Saskatchewan has been more adversely affected than most areas because our economy is predominantly agricultural. Because we had so little in the way of industry, those who left our farms could find no other form of employment in Saskatchewan and so, through the 'thirties and early 'forties they drifted to the shipyards of British Columbia and to the factories of Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make two points crystal-clear. The fact that there has been a reduction in the population during the last fifteen years does not mean that we are producing less food or that we are producing less wealth. In 1943 there were 35,577,000 acres under cultivation; and in 1950 — ten years later — there were 36,477,000 acres under cultivation. In other words, during that ten year period we have brought under cultivation 900,000 more acres than were under cultivation in 1941. In 1941 the cash farm income for Saskatchewan was \$180 million. Last year it was \$622 million. I know that taking one year out of all the rest is not fair because that may be a crop failure year. Let us take five year averages. From 1936 to 1940

**February 13, 1952**

the average gross value of farm production was \$167 million. From 1946 to 1950 it was \$499 million. Now part of that could be accounted for by the increased prices, so if we take out the inflationary factor and use comparable prices, the figure is still \$211,511,000.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, with less population Saskatchewan is cultivating more acreage, producing more food and creating more wealth. The loss of population does not mean we are producing less — it means we are producing more with less people.

The second thing I want to make crystal-clear is that this decline in population cannot be laid at the door of the present government as was done by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday. He quoted the figures for the 1941 census and the figures for the 1951 census. That may be courtroom tactics but it is not good tactics here because most of the people in this province know that we have a census every five years. The Leader of the Opposition very conveniently overlooked the census for 1946.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I did not overlook that census at all, as all members here know I gave the figures for 1946 as well as for 1941, and when the Premier says I did not, he knows he is stating something that is untrue.

**Premier:** — Mr. Speaker, I will not try to reply to that type of invective. I will leave it to those who check the record as to whether or not the Leader of the Opposition quoted the 1941 figures, then quoted the 1951 figures and said that the province had lost some 67,000 people, and then proceeded to build up the argument that this was due to the policies of the present government. If my hon. friend gave the figures, so much the better; certainly I did not get them, but I am going to give them now. What are the figures, Mr. Speaker? From 1936, with the Liberal government in office, until 1946 — a period of ten years during eight and one-half years of which there was a Liberal administration in Saskatchewan — the population declined by 98,859, or almost 100,000 people. If we add to that the natural increase which should have boosted our population, it would be even higher than that figure. When we look at the rural areas of Saskatchewan the picture is even more dismaying because from 1936 to 1946 the rural population dropped by 135,346. That is a sad picture; 135,346 less people living in the rural areas of Saskatchewan in 1946 than there had been in 1936.

I want to make it clear that I am not blaming the Liberal government because there was that decline in population. The decline took place by virtue of technological changes which I have already mentioned. But I do blame them, Mr. Speaker, for doing nothing to try and stop that depopulation; for setting up no programs; for taking no steps that would counteract the depopulation which was taking place. During those years — and the worst years were in the late 'thirties and the early 'forties — there was a Liberal government in Ottawa and one in Saskatchewan, and still people were pushed off the farms. They couldn't get employment in Saskatchewan so they went either east or west. During those first few years in the 'forties — from 1940 to 1944 — the Federal Government spent hundreds of millions of dollars in putting up war plants. They built 113 war plants to say nothing of giving money to other corporations to build them. Not one of those war plants was built in Saskatchewan and certainly no war contracts of any proportion came to Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan was bypassed, as were the other prairie provinces but Saskatchewan most of all,

and of course that is still continuing. Of all the defence contracts that have been let under the present re-armament program, Saskatchewan, with seven per cent of the population of Canada, has had less than one per cent of the contracts; and western Canada, with some twenty-five per cent of the population, has had about seven per cent of the contracts. Money collected from all over Canada is being poured into Ontario and Quebec to build up an industrial machine to attract to those industrial centres an increasingly large population. I lay the blame squarely on Liberal administrations — federal and provincial — that from 1936 to 1946 they took no effective steps whatsoever to stop that gradual decline of the population of these prairies.

Now this government has taken steps which I shall outline. The best proof that these steps have borne fruit is that whereas from 1936 to 1946 the population of Saskatchewan declined by 98,859 people, since 1946 the population of Saskatchewan has declined by less than 1,000, or 960 to be exact. In other words, for every person who left Saskatchewan under a C.C.F. administration, about 100 left under a Liberal administration. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no reason to become complacent. We have stopped the bleeding; we have reduced it to a trickle; but there is yet much to be done. The decline must be stopped completely and the patient must be given blood transfusions so that we may reverse the trend and enable this province to grow up to that great economic destiny for which it was intended.

I want to discuss some of the things that this government has done to reverse this trend of the population. I will deal with it under two headings:

(1) What we have done to stabilize the agriculture economy insofar as the Provincial Government has jurisdiction; and

(2) What we have done to stimulate industrial development in order to provide employment for those who are displaced from the farms by reason of mechanization.

Let me deal, first of all, with what has been done to stabilize our agricultural economy. I need hardly remind the Legislature that under the constitution of Canada jurisdiction over agriculture is divided between the Federal and Provincial Governments. The Federal Government has jurisdiction in the matter of markets and the provincial government has jurisdiction in the matter of production. Yesterday the Leader of the Opposition wanted to know what the Provincial Government has done about damp grain stored on the farms. Well, the Minister of Agriculture will tell him later what has been done. We have done a good deal insofar as we have the power to do anything. The Minister of Agriculture was the first to make approaches to the Federal Government to get the tariff taken off driers coming into this province. We have tested scores of these driers because the farmers were naturally apprehensive in view of the warning issued by Mr. Vallance a few weeks ago and again in last night's paper by a representative of the Board of Grain Commissioners. These driers have had to be tested; and we have informed farmers by means of newspaper and radio publicity which driers have been found to be effective and which are harmful to the grain. We have advertising all through the United States and in our neighbouring provinces for driers and are paying part of the transportation costs to bring the driers into Saskatchewan. But, Mr. Speaker, if we get our hands on every drier in the country it will not even make a dent in the millions of bushels of damp wheat that are stored on the farms of this province.

**February 13, 1952**

The responsibility of handling wheat does not lie with the Provincial Government: that is what the Wheat Board is for: that is what we have a Board of Grain Commissioners for; that is what we have a Federal Department of Transportation for. There can be no gainsaying the fact that the answer to damp wheat is to dry it. The answer to damp wheat is to get that damp wheat off the farms to the elevators and then out of the elevators down to the terminals at the head of the lakes where it can be properly dried.

In the last session of this legislature we passed a resolution asking the Federal Government to appoint a transport controller. All through the summer months when the lake boats could have been taking grain across the lakes, emptying the terminals; when the box cars could have been taking wheat from the country elevators to the head of the lakes so that in the fall the country elevator system would be empty; what happened? A transport controller was not appointed until fall. The terminals at the head of the lakes and many of the country elevators were full. The few elevators that were open had the quota taken off and the farmers with the biggest crops filled them. The rest were allowed to dump their wheat on the ground or put it in granaries, if they were lucky enough to have sufficient granaries. Mr. Speaker, these are the people who have bungled the handling of the crop; these are the people who have allowed the railroads, because more profit could be made out of handling pulpwoods, newsprint, ore, automobiles and repair parts, to consistently devote their transportation facilities to that end rather than to the handling of grain. When this situation develops, the Leader of the Opposition then says, "What is the Provincial Government going to do about it?"

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is always strange to me that whenever the Federal Government gets itself into a jam — which it does not infrequently — the Leader of the Opposition thinks the Provincial Government ought to bail them out. Somebody should remind him that the Federal Government's surplus — the surplus alone — is about ten times our entire budget. But there is one thing under our constitution for which the Provincial Government is responsible and that is the productive aspect of agriculture. I think the House would be interested in hearing a few figures (I will try as much as possible to keep them from being tedious) on what has been done by the Provincial Government since taking office to bring more land into production; to produce more food and thereby stabilize our agricultural economy.

Let us take land brought under irrigation by the Provincial Government. Prior to 1944 — nothing! This year alone we will spend \$397,910 or almost \$400,000. The number of acres which has been brought under irrigation by the Provincial Government prior to our taking office — nothing! Since 1944 this government has brought 20,370 acres of land under irrigation and has completed preliminary work which will allow construction to be completed this year on another 15,490 acres — making a total of something over 36,000 acres which will have been irrigated as a result of the expenditures and efforts of the Provincial Government.

Then there is drainage, by which swamp land is drained and opened up for agricultural purposes. In 1944 the expenditure for this purpose was only \$5,000. This year, Mr. Speaker, the expenditure will be \$338,000.

The number of acres that have been drained and benefitted totals 36,940 and under the earned assistance program, 10,000 additional acres have been drained. The number of acres on which the survey has been completed and drainage is now beginning amounts to 160,000. Surveys are now being conducted on 77,000 acres. When this plan is completed, Mr. Speaker, a total of 284,000 acres will have been drained and made available for agriculture and for the production of food.

Land is being cleared in the north country to make it available to young farmers who want to go into agriculture. Prior to 1944 the number of acres cleared and broken by the Provincial Government — nothing! Since 1944, 12,849 acres have been cleared and broken. Cleared but not broken prior to 1944 — nothing! Now cleared and ready to be broken — another 2,261 acres — which makes a total of 15,110 acres reclaimed from the forest and made available to agriculture.

In order to help in the stabilization of agriculture the government has carried on a programme to develop feed bank and fodder projects. Some 4,710 acres have been brought under irrigated fodder projects to supply feed. The acreage sown to forage is 16,590 and another 22,290 acres are now ready to be sown. All this has been carried out since 1944. Twenty-six thousand, seven hundred and twenty-two acres have been re-grassed since this government took office. Eight thousand, one hundred farmers have been given grass seed under the Forage Crop Programme — a total 1,120,000 pounds of seed or enough to cover 110,000 acres.

The government has assisted in setting up co-operative farms and co-operatives for the co-operative use of farm machinery whereby farmers with small capital and small units of production are able to pool their resources, to buy more expensive equipment at a lower per unit production cost and thus get greater efficiency.

For some years now we have carried on a study of rural credit. As a result of that study the co-operative movement has become interested in this question. At the present session of the Legislature I believe a private bill will be introduced to set up a co-operative loan and trust company which will make credit available to young farmers anxious to enter farming but with insufficient capital to do so. The co-operative Guarantee Act passed by this government will be amended to allow this company to come, as the Co-operative Credit Society does, to the government and get from the government a fifty per cent guarantee on the money which it lends in any particular case.

We have helped to stabilize the agricultural economy by lifting off the backs of thousands of farmers in this province the burden of seed grain debt and relief debt which we found there when we took office. I noticed the other day that the Leader of the Opposition pooh-poohed the fact that the provincial government had been able to remove these debts. He had a hundred and one explanations and excuses as to why it was so easy to do it but I am sure any person listening to him must have asked themselves this question: If it was so easy for a C.C.F. Government to do it, why did not the Liberal Government do it before they left office? The big crop failure was in 1937; the year when the seed grain had to be issued was 1938; and the Association of Rural Municipalities in 1942 and 1943 asked the government of that day to settle the 1938 seed grain on the basis of fifty per cent of the principal with the interest wiped out. Why didn't they do it?

**February 13, 1952**

Well, they couldn't do it! They went down to Ottawa and the Federal Government would not let them do it because, Mr. Speaker, any leader of the Liberal party in this province has to take his orders from Ottawa, and in Ottawa they would not let him do it. So they came back and said, "No, we can't make that settlement." When this government took office we told Ottawa we were not going to pay except on the basis of fifty per cent of the principal and with the interest wiped out. The hon. members will remember that our subsidy was withheld; that we referred the matter to an arbitration committee which was set up; and that we had prolonged and protracted discussion and debate; until finally we got the settlement. We got a settlement which the Liberal administration had not got because they did not have the courage to fight through on behalf of the interests of the people whom they represented.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is proof that the measures I have been discussing have borne fruit. As far as stabilizing our agricultural economy is concerned, since this government took office our acreage has increased until we now have under cultivation some 886,000 acres more than there were when we took office; our field crops have increased in production from \$492 million in 1944 to \$601 million in 1951; and the farm cash income has increased from \$543 million in 1944, which was a good crop year, to \$622 million in 1951 which, as everyone knows, was a bad year with quite a bit of the crop still in the fields.

When I mention these things that have been done I would like to make it clear that we recognize more than anyone else that much remains to be done. We know that if we are going to have agricultural stabilization in this province we must be able to make better use of the land resources we have. That is why interest has been centred for so many years on the South Saskatchewan River Development Project. It is estimated that it is capable of irrigating at least half a million acres of land. For 20 or 25 years we have discussed it in this province. It was promised by the Liberal party as far back as 1935; it has been promised in every federal election since 1935, to say nothing of a few provincial ones. In 1949 the federal Minister of Agriculture announced that the site had been selected; the plans had been passed; and all they needed to begin work on the South Saskatchewan River Dam was to be re-elected. In 1950 a new wrinkle was introduced. Mr. Gardiner then said, "Well, we are ready to go but the Provincial Government has not indicated any willingness to pay its share." Mr. Speaker, we did not know we were going to be asked to pay a share. We had never been approached. We then requested Mr. Gardiner to meet with the provincial cabinet, which he did, and we asked him what he thought our share would be. He intimated it would be \$33 million, which is about one-third of the estimated cost of the project. Mr. Gardiner left Regina after the conference and before he had reached Ottawa an airmail letter from me was sitting on his desk telling him the Saskatchewan Government was prepared to put up the \$33 million requested and assume our share of the responsibility. When that scapegoat disappeared, Mr. Gardiner then said they were going to set up a Royal Commission to ascertain the feasibility of something that had been under discussion for fifteen years; something which their own engineers, the army engineers and their own economists had investigated and approved. Now a Royal Commission is going to sit on this matter and, as has been said in the Speech from the Throne, the Saskatchewan Government will make representations in the strongest possible terms urging that this project be proceeded with at the earliest possible date.



Mr. Speaker, there are other things which will have to be done. In addition to bringing more land under cultivation; in addition to getting better utilization of the land that is under cultivation; there are sociological changes which are bound to take place in a great, scattered province like ours. Whether it is to make power available; whether it is co-operative farms; whether it is the co-operative use of farm machinery; whether it is getting people to build along highways; a better sociological pattern has to be worked out if we are to get the amenities of life to the people of this province. Back in 1913 a Commission was set up to study this problem in the light of the conditions of that time. On that Commission were Mr. Haslam, Mr. Charles A. Dunning, Mr. George Langley and Professor Oulette. They brought down a report which has been a fairly good guide book to the people ever since. But the problems of 1951 are totally different from the problems of 1913. That is why this government is proposing, as suggested in the Speech from the Throne, the setting up of a Royal Commission, not to deal with the immediate situation — we are now dealing with the immediate situation — but to view this long-term programme and to lay a pattern to be followed in the next quarter of a century in order that we may build a stable agricultural economy in this province.

Mr. Speaker, we make no apology for appointing a Royal Commission because the record of this government on Royal Commissions is a good record. We set up a Royal Commission on Forestry and we have carried out the recommendations of that Royal Commission: we set up a Royal Commission on Penal Reform and we have carried out the recommendations of that Commission: we set up a committee to study provincial-municipal relations, often called the Britnell-Cronkite-Jacobs Committee, and we are one by one carrying out the recommendations of that Committee.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having said something about stabilizing agricultural economy, let me turn to what the government has done in the last seven and a half years toward strengthening and accelerating industrial development to provide employment opportunities for those who are displaced by machinery on the farms. I notice that some of the Liberal newspapers have been criticizing the government recently because we have spent too much money on health and education and social services, and too much money on hospitals and schools and social welfare rather than putting that money, as we should have done, they say, into development.

Mr. Speaker, we make no apology for the fact that in our first term of office we made our watchword “Security”, because we believe with Edwin Markham that, “We are all blind until we see,” — that in the human plan nothing is worth building unless it builds the man. The most important factor in any economy is the human factor. Unless people have a feeling of security; unless people have learned to live together and to help each other, until we have given better care to the aged and better opportunities to youth and greater security for the unfortunate and sick; then we really have not begun to build a decent society at all. Hence our first term of office was concerned, very naturally, with giving security to the farmer by getting rid of seed grain and relief debts; with giving security to the organized workers through his trade union; with building the co-operative movement; with the building of schools and hospitals; with providing better pensions for old people, widows and their children; with establishing the Hospital Services Plan and the car insurance scheme.

When we came to the election of 1948 we said very frankly to the people — I have the statements here which I made both before the election and immediately after — “We have now gone as far as we can go in terms of social security until we put a better economic base under our Social Security.” In other words, we must begin to produce more wealth if we are to have more social services. We said, therefore, that the emphasis in our second term of office would be on development and it has been. Now I do not mean that we were totally disinterested in development during our first term of office. During that time there was a tremendous amount of preliminary work to be done. The Leader of the Opposition yesterday talked about developing our salt, potash and other minerals. Why, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals did not even know they had those minerals when they were in office! They did not even have an inventory of the natural resources of this province. They did not even know what salt deposits there were! We not only discovered them but we are now getting them developed. They did not know there was potash here. We have not only discovered potash but we have two companies doing work on it and will be into the production of potash very soon. Uranium, bentonite, feldspar — these things have only been discovered in the province since the C.C.F. Government spent money in core drilling and research. Why, Mr. Speaker, there was not even a geological map of the province! As a matter of fact, in great sections of the province, there was not even a geographical map. Great tracts in the north had not been mapped. We found some timber operators from whom no royalties had been collected and who had not seen a representative of the Department of Natural Resources since 1934 when the Conservative government left office.

During our first term of office the preliminary work had to be done to ascertain what our resources were, where they were located, what could be done about developing them. When we started our second term of office, having that information and having done some of the basic research work, we were able to carry on a programme designed to stimulate and increase industrial development.

What has been the result? Well, Mr. Speaker, the investment figures put out by the Federal Government were not available before 1948. The Federal Government is now compiling figures and putting them out which show that in 1948 \$243 million of new capital was invested in this province. The Department of Trade and Commerce, in their publication “Public and Private Investment in Canada”, has a graph on Page 141. This graph shows Saskatchewan up among the top four or five provinces of Canada. As a result of this graph the following appeared in the Ottawa Evening Citizen on December 26th, 1951:

“One of the graphs in the Federal Government’s voluminous report on private and public investment in Canada shows new investment for the past three years by provinces, and on a per capita basis. Alberta towers above the others. Ontario and British Columbia are close together. But the interesting thing about this per capita graph of investment is that Saskatchewan, about which so many tears were shed, ranks above not only the four Maritime provinces but Quebec as well.”

This article concludes by saying:

“Mr. Duplessis might devote his next press conference to explaining this.”

They could have added, "Mr. Tucker might try to explain it too."

Mr. Speaker, let us look at the index of employment. My hon. friend yesterday was quoting some figures to show that there were a lot less people in jobs. Well, I checked the figures. The figures which he quoted were Department of Labour statistics for manufacturing industries. Those figures, first of all, are not a composite index of employment. Secondly, they only touch factories over a certain size and therefore in our province where there are small shops their figures are not included. But the Dominion Bureau of Statistics gives a composite figure taking all employment. What do we find? We find that the composite index for employment in 1944, when this government took office, was 119.5. Today it is 147.2 The index of payrolls for 1944 was 182.7. Last year — 1951 — it was 282.6, or an increase of 100 points. Now my friends say, "Ah, but the wages paid in Saskatchewan are less than in Alberta and Manitoba." Mr. Speaker, they have been telling us for years that we have been keeping industry out because we are paying too high wages in Saskatchewan. As a matter of fact, if you take the average wage, it always has been less in Saskatchewan because we have less highly skilled workers and more unskilled workers, and that brings the average down. But if comparable trades are taken, we are higher. The interesting thing, is, Mr. Speaker, that the average wage paid in Saskatchewan last year was \$46.67, whereas when we took office it was only \$30.09. That is an increase of more than fifty per cent. Let us look at construction. When we took office in 1944 the amount spent on construction in that year was \$12 million. Last year it was \$119 million. — almost ten times as much.

The Leader of the Opposition yesterday said something about forestry. He said our forest production had gone down. The Leader of the Opposition knows very well that under a Liberal Government in this province timber operators were being allowed to exploit our resources to the point, as revealed by the Forestry Commission, that in some areas we had only eight years' supply left and even in the best districts twenty years' supply left. Conservation methods have been put into effect so that forestry will continue to be a permanent part of our economy. In spite of conservation methods and in spite of cutting down on the depletion of our timber resources, the amount of timber products in 1944 was \$7,044,000. Last year it was \$9,758,000. — some \$2,750,000. more, in spite of the greatly reduced cut.

Then we come to the matter of minerals. Mineral production has increased very considerably. When we took office, mineral production was \$22,200,000. In 1951 it was up to \$50 million, an increase of well over one hundred per cent. It is interesting that the Leader of the Opposition yesterday made comparisons between Saskatchewan and Manitoba and between Alberta and Saskatchewan. I notice that he did not refer to the fact that whereas last year Manitoba's mineral production went down \$4 million, Saskatchewan's mineral production went up by \$15 million. If the shoe had been on the other foot this Chamber would certainly have been covered with gloom by the Leader of the Opposition. Saskatchewan today is leading both Alberta and Manitoba in the production of base metals and it has only started. When I tell you that in 1944 only 151 claims were staked in Saskatchewan whereas last year 2,030 claims were staked; when I tell you that in 1944 nothing was invested in uranium development but that last year \$6 million was invested and this year there will be \$10 million invested; you being to get some idea of the mineral development that is taking place in Saskatchewan.

February 13, 1952

Another indication of the industrial development is electric power, because in the final analysis there can be no industrial development unless cheap power and fuel are available. Well, Mr. Speaker, the total amount of power produced in 1944 was 244 million kilowatt hours and last year it was 450 million kilowatt hours. When it comes to discussing the Power Corporation itself, I would have expected the Leader of the Opposition to be very quiet, but he was not. I would not have expected him to say a word about it because in 1944 the Power Commission produced only 79 million kilowatt hours of power and last year, under this government, it produced 277 million kilowatt hours — an increase of more than 300 per cent. At the end of a ten year period of Liberal administration the Power Commission, which had been set up in 1929, had constructed 1,626 miles of transmission lines. In eight years we have built 8,600 miles of transmission lines, or an increase of 500 per cent. Figures have already been given for the number of customers. At the end of 1944 they had managed to serve 13,000 customers. Today the Power Corporation has over 70,000 customers. Now we come to rural electrification. I hear my hon. friends shedding tears about the farmers not having power fast enough. When I realize that after ten years of strenuous effort and unremitting toil a Liberal Government finally got power to 137 farms — the mountain laboured and brought forth not even a mouse, just a mouse squeak! When you realize that we have had to build transmission lines; that we have had to increase the generating capacity before we could take power to farms; that we have brought power to 8,000 farmers and this year alone we will bring it to another 4,000 farmers; when you realize that when we took office the total investment in the Power Commission was \$8,900,000. and today it is \$41 million; you get some idea of the tremendous growth that has taken place in a little over seven years.

Yesterday the Leader of the Opposition complained that we were taxing the farmers by charging them too much for their power. As a matter of fact, the net surplus of the Power Corporation amounts to less than one-quarter of a cent per kilowatt hour. You could not get any closer than we are now to giving power to the people at cost. The surplus is less than a quarter of a cent per kilowatt hour. Where does that surplus go? Into the Provincial Treasury? No! It goes, along with millions of dollars from the public treasury, into building more power lines to take power to more people. We cannot reduce the power rates by a quarter of a cent per kilowatt hour and I am sure no customer begrudges paying a quarter of a cent to assist other people who have not yet obtained the advantages of power.

Another indication of the industrial development that has taken place is the great expansion in oil development. I have never been able to quite understand the attitude of the Opposition. At first they were bemoaning the fact that companies were not coming into Saskatchewan. As soon as some companies began to come in, they bemoaned that fact also. They pointed out the other day that in the early stages Imperial Oil would not come into the province. Well, Mr. Speaker, Imperial Oil would have come into this province if we had been willing to give them the same terms and conditions they could have received from a Liberal Government! We were not elected, Mr. Speaker, to give away the resources of this province! We were elected to set down terms and conditions that would benefit the people of this province and those are the terms and conditions we set down. When any company was prepared to meet those terms and conditions, they were allowed to come in. Now Imperial Oil has finally come into the province,

not on the basis of special privilege but on the same basis as the other oil companies

The Leader of the Opposition on two occasions yesterday suggested that a Mr. Rhubbra got some special concessions. He did not say so, but that was the inference. Mr. Speaker, I never met Mr. Rhubbra in my life, but I want to say this. Mr. Rhubbra did not get mineral rights. What Mr. Rhubbra got were permits to search for oil. Mr. Rhubbra got oil companies to come in and conduct that search. He brought in a group of four companies — four of the biggest companies of the United States — under the group name of Tidewater Associated. They have carried out their commitments; they have paid their rentals; they have dug their wells and carried out the seismographic work they were required to do under the terms of their agreement. As long as they, or any other company, carry out their obligations, those agreements will be honoured by the government. No one has had any special privileges from this government at any time.

The Leader of the Opposition yesterday made some passing references to the Legislative Assembly Act and to certain amendments which were passed last year. I am not going to debate that matter now because legislation dealing with it will be brought down later. However, when he tells people, as he did, that he objected to those amendments, then I want to tell you that I have checked the records very carefully and while he and some of his supporters objected to the redistribution features, not one of them objected to the particular clauses to which they are now referring.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, it is part of the record of the House that we voted against that bill containing those amendments, not only on second reading, but third reading, and we also voted on an amendment which would have destroyed the bill. Now that is three times that we have recorded the amendment, and every Liberal voter voted to defeat that bill and every C.C.F.'er voted for it, Mr. Speaker.

**Premier:** — Mr. Speaker, that is not a question of privilege. That is just a case of trying to worm out of something. They moved an amendment to send the redistribution part of the Bill to a Committee but they did not (and the record is there, it was taken down over the recording system) at any time object to these particular clauses. Now they say that because they voted against the whole Bill, which included the redistribution, they were voting against these clauses. At no time according to the record did they ever raise the matter of these clauses. But, Mr. Speaker, be that as it may. There will be legislation brought down removing those clauses. My hon. friends may object but I want to say this: the hon. gentleman yesterday said, "We must do something to clear the good name of this Legislature". Well, Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House there is no reason to clear our good name. I am authorized here to say, on behalf of the C.C.F. group who sit with me, that not one member of this group has now, or ever has had, any mineral, or oil, or timber permit or lease, either in his own name or through any person at any time.

I am not going to introduce personalities into this debate at a time when we are discussing other issues but I will say this. Some gentlemen opposite, in other places and on the radio, have made statements and innuendos that reflect on members on this side of the House. The Liberal canvassers may get away with scattering filth in the back concessions and

**February 13, 1952**

with carrying on the favourite Liberal sport of character assassination but Opposition members cannot get away with it in this House.

Some of the gentlemen who sit opposite, before this Legislature is through its session, will get a chance to either “put up or shut up!” They will get a chance either to substantiate some of the statements they have made in other places or to eat their words and be known for the kind of people they are.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Brave words!

**Government Member:** — They are a matter of record.

**Mr. Danielson (Arm River):** — They are not on the records of this House.

**Premier:** — The member for Arm River talks softly. I don't blame him. This must be awfully hard to take back when you have been handing out baloney for so long.

We come now to the matter of oil. The Leader of the Opposition went all over this province saying, “There will never be oil until we get rid of the C.C.F. Government.” No? Well, Mr. Speaker, some people ought not to go into the “prophecy” business. He prophesied the C.C.F. would be defeated in 1948 but it did not happen. He prophesied we would be defeated in the Gravelbourg by-election but it did not happen. He prophesied we would not find any oil but we have found oil. Some prophets are wrong 25 per cent of the time, some 50 per cent of the time, but only a man with the genius of the Leader of the Opposition seems to have the capacity for being wrong all the time.

What are the facts? The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that during the last five years the Liberal party was in office the total amount spent in oil exploration of any sort was \$3,500,000. Why, in 1950 alone \$8 million was spent in this province. Last year \$18 million was spent in this province and this year already over \$30 million has been committed — and we think it will eventually be as high as \$50 million. When we took office in 1944, the oil production in this province was nothing. In 1945 it was 14,000 barrels and in 1951, 1,250,000 barrels. When we took office the number of wells producing in Saskatchewan was nil. In 1947 there were 22. Today there are 196 wells producing oil in the Province of Saskatchewan. The gentlemen opposite say, “You will never get oil as long as there is a C.C.F. Government.” I say we never got oil until there was a C.C.F. Government.

The same thing is true of natural gas. Until the last few years there has never been any serious attempt to search for natural gas. Yesterday a new well came in. As you know, Mr. Speaker, just before the Orders of the Day the Minister of Natural Resources announced that another new well has come in at Coleville. The one the day before was at Brock. Nine gas wells are now proven in that Brock-Coleville-Kindersley area.

With reference to transmission pipe lines, we already have made engineering surveys — three, as a matter of fact. The companies who are in the field have signed agreements by which they will search for more gas in order to prove up the reserves. If these reserves prove adequate, we propose to have natural gas transmission lines laid that will service the greater part of the province and will certainly service all the larger centres

of population in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, everyone knows how essential natural gas is to industrial development. We propose to see that that natural gas is developed speedily and is developed in the interests of the people of the province. I have not time to go into a list I have here of 90 new plants that have opened in Saskatchewan since this government came into office, but here is a list of these 90 new establishments. That does not look very much like stagnation.

Let me just take a moment or two to refer to the Crown Corporations. The Crown Corporations are industries and services owned by the people, operated by boards of directors responsible to the government and working in the interests of the people of Saskatchewan. I am not going to try to tell the members of this House that we have no problems in our Crown Corporations. We will be surprised if we ever get to the place where we have no problems. But I can say that these Crown Corporations are steadily improving. The Woollen Mill, where we have had some production problems in the past, is steadily improving both as to production and financial position. The Brick Plant, which has just been newly constructed, and the Big River Sawmill, which also has been newly constructed, have not had sufficient time yet to prove their worth but we think they are ventures that will be of benefit to the province. The Transportation Company last year had a very bad winter but in spite of that it came out on the right side of the ledger. This winter, with better weather conditions, we hope that its financial position will improve.

I am not going to review all the Crown Corporations. That will be done in the Crown Corporations Committee. That will also be done in the Budget Debate by the various Ministers concerned. But I do want to say that these Crown Corporations not only render a service to the people of this province; have not only given employment to the people of this province, have not only utilized the raw materials and natural resources of this province; but they did about \$30 million worth of business in 1951 and they will show a good surplus of something in excess of \$4,250,000. When the members opposite say, "Of course that is because of Power and Telephones," I want to say that if Power and Telephones are taken out, the other Corporations show a surplus of nearly 10 per cent on the capital investment. The Power Corporation which, as I said a few moments ago, operates as close to cost as possible, will show a profit of only a little over four per cent.

These Crown Corporations, of course, are among the things which the Liberal Party is going to throw out the window, if they ever get a chance. Out of the window — tossed to the wolves and to the Greyhounds! Mr. Speaker, I do not think they are going to get a chance to do that.

In its first term of office the C.C.F. had for its slogan: "Security". The second term of office had for its slogan: "Development". The third term of office will have for its slogan: "Expansion". Mr. Speaker, we have already entered upon that era of expansion. This province is on the march toward its great economic destiny. I want to say that the development which is now on its way, and which is gaining momentum every day and every week, will not be development at the expense of the people and their resources. It will be development of the people's resources, for the people themselves, by the people's government.

**February 13, 1952**

The Leader of the Opposition has moved a resolution saying that this government no longer enjoys the confidence of the people of Saskatchewan. I say, Mr. Speaker, that he has no authority to speak for the people of Saskatchewan. Certainly the people of Gravelbourg did not give him any authority to speak for them when they went to the polls last summer. I think the people of this province have confidence in this government. I believe they appreciate the security which was established in our first term. I believe they can see all around them the results of our development programme in our second term of office. I believe they will give us a vote of confidence and a mandate to go on to a great programme of expansion in the years that lie ahead.

I shall vote against the amendment and for the motion.

**Mr. B.L. Korchinski (Redberry):** — Mr. Speaker, we certainly have had an entertaining speech, this afternoon. I am sure, that after the coming election, our Premier will have no difficulty finding himself a job at some of the side-shows travelling this province. He painted a very rosy picture of Saskatchewan. Well, comparing his speech, today, with his speeches of the last few years, the speech, today, seems to be a little off-colour, because there are quite a few of their volunteer audiences in the galleries who are yawning and falling asleep.

He seemed to deplore the fact that the Leader of the Opposition, yesterday, said a few times, “ladies and gentlemen” — but, today he himself was continually facing the gallery — holding out his hands. He was not speaking to the Speaker, but to those in the galleries.

**Premier Douglas:** — I had a more intelligent audience.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — Do you admit that your Speaker is not intelligent?

I know it is very easy to speak as he did, without giving any solid facts about things. It is very easy to use figures — just certain figures — not all the figures; and that has been happening all the time in Saskatchewan, as far as the C.C.F. are concerned. They will pick out figures here and there, ignoring all the damaging ones, and they try to paint as rosy a picture as possible. For example, I noticed last summer when they were having their convention in Saskatoon, a press report where the Premier exclaimed to those assembled — his faithful — that “we have saved you \$120,000 instead of giving it to the Greyhound; we have put the \$120,000 into the treasury of Saskatchewan”. I wonder what the facts of that are — I wonder if the people of Saskatchewan are studying some of his reports, and some of the things he is saying, and how close he is on the beam.

Today he said that the people of Saskatchewan are paying less than one-quarter of a cent per kilowatt for electricity, and that was very little. Now they told us that there are 70,000 customers that take electricity and that there are 80,000 telephone customers; and also that the corporations made \$3,800,000 last year. Now if you divide that by those customers, each customer overpaid \$22.00, and that is not a quarter of a cent. It was \$22.00 taken out of each customer during the year for something which he did not receive.



Now there is no use shaking our head because that is actually what happened. There is no sense in trying to minimize the thing by reducing it to a quarter of a cent. I could have used the one-tenth of a cent that Rhubbra paid for the oil rights in Saskatchewan, for millions and millions of acres — one-tenth of a cent per acre. There was some talk about character assassination — I do not think there is anybody as adept at that as the C.C.F. are . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Korchinski:** — . . . in this respect, and it starts with the Premier of this province. All we have to do is remember the pamphlet he put out during the last election — “Who is Tucker”?

**Government Member:** — There should be one, “Who is Korchinski”?

**Mr. Korchinski:** — Yes . . .

**Government Member:** — Who is he?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Korchinski:** — I do not think it is necessary to tell the Premier who he is — he will find out tomorrow, more than he will today. As far as personalities are concerned, I think we should refrain from getting into personal matters.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think I will be voting for the Speech from the Throne. We are debating now on the amendment, and I beg leave to adjourn the debate until tomorrow.

The Assembly adjourned at 4:40 o'clock P.M.