

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Eleventh Legislature
7th Day

Monday, February 18, 1952

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

DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The House resumed, from Thursday, February 14, 1952, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Erb for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Tucker.

Mr. J. Gibson (Morse): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment on the debate on Thursday last, I had spent the better part of an hour dealing with matters pertaining to the Morse constituency; such matters as the need for the Federal Government to recompense the farmers for losses they have suffered, or may suffer, that are directly attributable to the neglect of Ottawa in not having boxcars available to get the tough and damp grain to the driers. I asked the Department of Natural Resources to do whatever is possible to lessen or eliminate the excessive damage done to crops each year by wild ducks; I pointed out the social and economic value to the constituency and the Province as a whole, of the Saskatchewan Government's Sodium Sulphate plant at Chaplin and the inestimable value to the constituency from the erection of a dam on the South Saskatchewan River.

The hon. member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski), on Thursday last, told us that the oil they were getting in Alberta at the present time was being taken from the edge of a huge underground basin, the centre of which is located in Saskatchewan. Well, I am sure that we are all very happy to learn that the hon. member has knowledge of this exact location, but I do not think we can be blamed for wondering if the hon. member has missed his calling. I am quite sure that the large oil companies would reward him handsomely if he would point out this location to them for it would save them many millions of dollars in further exploration for oil in this province and for the useless drilling of dry holes.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, today, in the time at my disposal, to deal briefly with the question of the new old age pension plan for the 70-years-and-over group, and the old age assistance plan for the 65 to 69 year group, and the ways and means of financing those plans. First, I would like to say that I am very pleased that the Federal Government has, at long last, seen fit to acknowledge its debt to the aged citizens of Canada, those pioneers who blazed the trails and built the roads over which others who follow will be able to proceed with greater ease and dispatch toward the further development of our Canadian heritage. However, I am surprised and disappointed at the meagre sum proffered in payment of this debt. Certainly it is not an amount commensurate with the services rendered by those pioneers. The C.C.F. believe that the Pension Plan — the universal Pension Plan — should include all citizens of 65 years and over; that the

February 18, 1952

Pension should not be less than \$50 a month and should include complete health services. I suppose there are those who, on hearing this, would say that here again is another of those C.C.F. utterly irresponsible proposals . . .

Some Hon. Member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gibson: An hon. member says "Hear, hear." Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not at all worried about that, for similar C.C.F. proposals in the past have been declared "utterly irresponsible" only to be accepted later as very necessary additions to our social structure.

When the C.C.F. party at Ottawa first suggested pensions without the means test it was dismissed as an utterly irresponsible proposal that no government could consider seriously. I do not argue, sir, that any government has given serious consideration to that, but I do know that we now have pensions without a means test. Today, the \$40 pension has a purchasing power of less than \$21 a month. To the many Canadians who have been fortunate enough to have acquired assets sufficient to provide them with a reasonable standard of living, this \$20 added to their assets may very well raise that standard to a moderately comfortable one; but to the many other thousands of Canadians who, through no fault of their own, have not been able to acquire such assets and have to depend entirely, or almost entirely, on the pension, it is entirely inadequate to provide for their needs; and it is little better than an insult for our national government to say to the recipients of the pension that Canada's gift to them is the equivalent of \$21 monthly. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that a pension of \$50 with complete health services to all in these groups would be more in line with the amount Canada owes to them; that is an amount well within our means and would not place an undue stress on the national purse-strings. This is one of the main planks of the C.C.F. platform and we will continue to press for it until we have obtained our objective.

The total estimated cost of both those pensions to the Federal Government for 1952 is estimated to be \$365 million — \$250 million over and above the sum formerly paid by the Federal Government on the old-age pension plan. \$250 million, Mr. Speaker, is a lot of money. As one newspaper put it, it is a lot of money to have to spend to appease the C.C.F. Another newspaper, in speaking of this pension, has an article in it by Blair Fraser, which I would like to quote in part. This article deals with the part the C.C.F. has played in bringing about a start of the 'Welfare State' in Canada, and the part it has played in forcing from the Federal Government at Ottawa an undertaking to bring in the pension law.

Before quoting from it, Mr. Speaker, I would like to give a brief history of the C.C.F. Party. When the C.C.F. Party started first, it was known as the Independent Labour Party, then as the Farmer-Labour Party and today as the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation; and the father of the C.C.F., Mr. Speaker, was the late J.S. Woodsworth.

I would like now to quote in part from this article in this magazine. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the reading of this article to every Canadian. I think it would be well worth their while to take the time to read this article. It is in the November 1, 1951, issue of "MacLean's

Magazine,” and while I do not intend to take up the time of the House by quoting it in full, I think it would be well worth every Canadian’s time to read this article, and I quote:

“Early in 1950, a CBC Citizen’s Forum was asked to name the 10 greatest Canadians of this century. Only two were chosen unanimously — MacKenzie King and James Shaver Woodsworth. They made an odd contrast by any material standard. MacKenzie King’s life was a triumphant success, Woodsworth’s a failure. A Methodist minister whose doubts of his own creed began even before he was ordained, Woodsworth left the church at 42 to become, for a time, a day labourer. He founded a political movement, the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, which will soon be 20 years old and gives no sign of ever attaining power. Of all his ideals and convictions, pacifism was the one for which he made the greatest sacrifices. To that ideal he never converted his own party, nor even his own children.

“Why should this crusader for lost causes be ranked among the great men of this generation? One Forum speaker gave an answer which the others accepted: Woodsworth was a saint. It is a queer word to apply to a professional politician, but that is what he was. That was the secret of his astonishing political power. Physically he was not impressive. He was a handsome figure with his neat white beard and fine features, but so small and frail as to give no hint of the strength he was able to summon. He was a competent and experienced speaker, but no orator, yet for more than 20 years, and for half of that time alone, this little man influenced parliament as no individual has done within living memory. Woodsworth was the father of the Welfare State in Canada, of what we have now and what we may have in store. He had one supporter, A.E. Heaps of Winnipeg. He and one supporter, A.E. Heaps of Winnipeg, forced the Liberal Government into a firm undertaking to bring in the Old Age Pension in 1925.

“He spoke for family allowances 15 years before they became a fact; for unemployment insurance nearly 20 years ahead; for national health insurance in the middle ‘twenties; things that are commonplace today were Utopian dreams when Woodsworth began to fight for them — more than Utopian, they were radical, dangerous, subversive.”

I would like to quote one other small piece, Mr. Speaker, if I may:

“When he came to parliament the subject of old age pensions had been discussed for ten years and

February 18, 1952

had been in the Liberal Party platform for two years. Nothing was done about it until 1925, when the balance of power between the two old parties was so delicate that even a couple of back-benchers could upset it. Woodsworth and his Labour colleague, A.E. Heaps, sent identical letters to Prime Minister King and Opposition Leader Arthur Meighen, asking what they intended to do about pensions. King wrote back immediately, undertaking to bring in a pension law.

“One day in 1931, when MacKenzie King was telling Parliament how the Liberals had brought in pensions, Prime Minister Bennett answered:

‘What would the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre,’ (Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, the member for Winnipeg North Centre was Woodsworth), ‘have said if, when the Bill was introduced, he had listened to the speech he has listened to this afternoon? He was the man who forced this upon a reluctant Liberal administration.’”

So let us never forget, Mr. Speaker, that had it not been for the C.C.F. Party it is not at all likely that we would have had old age pensions in Canada today.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gibson: Nor old-age assistance, nor family allowance, nor unemployment insurance, and as for national health insurance, we have been asking for it for 27 years and we will never give up until we get it.

Some Hon. Member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gibson: Let us never get the idea that because we have not got a C.C.F. Government at Ottawa we cannot make social and economic advances. Certainly, with a C.C.F. Government we would have made these social and economic gains sooner and on a more generous scale; but more and more people are seeing alike and taking note of the fact that much of the social and economic gains that we have made in the past 25 years have been the result of C.C.F. proposals. And let us in the meantime remember that the small group of C.C.F.ers we have had in Ottawa for the past quarter of a century have, by their activities in parliament, done more to improve the social and economic life of our country than any group in history of similar size.

The plan decided upon by the Federal Government to collect this \$250 million extra that is required by them to provide this old age assistance and old age pension plan is for a 2-per cent tax to be levied on taxable income with a ceiling of \$60. That tax is expected to yield \$95 million; and 2 per cent of the 10 per cent Federal Sales Tax is to be earmarked for that purpose, and that is expected to yield \$145 million, and a 2 per cent Corporation Tax is expected to yield \$65 million, or a total of \$305 million, or \$55 million more than the estimated requirements.

For my part, Mr. Speaker, I do not know why they make all this fuss about raising this money for these pensions. If you notice here, there are only two new taxes suggested; the first one a 2 per cent on taxable income with a ceiling of \$60 and the second one a 2 per cent Corporation Tax. The other tax, the Sales Tax, we have always had and if we earmark 2 per cent of this tax for this purpose we are merely taking the money out of general revenue account. Why we cannot take the whole sum out of general revenue account I would not know, but I do know that some of the Liberal papers have the idea of keeping us ever conscious, as one article here that I have in an editorial in the "Leader-Post" says:

"The people will ever be conscious of the fact that social services have to be paid for, and perhaps they will be more patient to wait for further services until the nation can see its way clear to foot the bill."

There we have it, "perhaps they will be more patient to wait for further services," the whole idea, of course, being to frighten the public from demanding those services which they know so well they are entitled to; and as I mentioned in the House here, on Thursday last, the public have no objection, Mr. Speaker, to paying for services which they receive, but they have to pay for so many services they do not get. It is those services, Mr. Speaker, that they object to paying for.

As I say, I cannot see why this amount could not be taken out of the general revenue account, nor can I see the reason for the fuss that is being made over the sum of \$250 million. It is less than 2 per cent of our national income for 1950. If the Federal Government is hard-pressed to find money for those social services (and I cannot believe that it is); if these taxes that I have just mentioned will bring in \$305 million, or \$55 million more than the estimated requirements, that would not indicate they are hard-pressed for ways and means to provide for this pension, Mr. Speaker; nor would the Federal budgetary surplus for the first nine months of the present fiscal year, amounting to \$721 million, indicate that they are hard-pressed. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, if they are, if they have any reason to believe they are, why don't they go to the easiest place to get this money? Why put this 2 per cent tax on taxable income; and why place a ceiling on it? Why not go to a much easier place? Why not reimpose the Excess Profits Tax? The last five years that this tax was in operation, Mr. Speaker — that is the five years 1943 to 1947 inclusive, it yielded \$2,331,000,000 in round figures. If we average the five years, Mr. Speaker, in round figures, it brought in a sum of \$466 million. This sum is sufficient to pay the total cost — not the Federal Government's share of the cost but the total cost — of a \$50 pension to each of the estimated 700,000 people who will receive that pension in 1952. And in addition to this it will give a birthday present, or allow for a birthday present, to each of the 145,000 estimated old-age assistance recipients, of \$30; and we will still have a handsome balance of over \$4 million left over. That, Mr. Speaker, is what it would yield if the rate of tax were the same as it was in those five years that I have mentioned, and if the Excess Profits were the same as they were at that time. But with profits some 30 per cent higher today than they were at that time, Mr. Speaker, we have every reason to believe that this tax would bring in at least \$500 million, which would only be some \$34 million more than it was in those years that I have mentioned. If this tax

would bring in \$500 million, then it would provide twice the sum of the estimated requirements for this year and surely that would provide a \$50 pension to every citizen 65 years and over, and leave a very handsome balance besides.

I know that some of those people who are opposed to the re-imposition of the Excess Profits Tax have their reasons. I have seen some of the reasons they have given and they are that, if we re-impose this tax on excess profits, excess profits will disappear and the source of the tax will disappear with it. Well, what is wrong with that, Mr. Speaker? After all, there is only one place that those profits can go and that is back from whence they came — that is back to the common people; and as soon as those profits disappear, Mr. Speaker, inflation will disappear with them. If those profits return, as I say, back to whence they came, to the common people, the common people will not only have more money to pay taxes with but, with inflation gone, it will not take so much money to pay the taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I shall support the motion.

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker so far in this debate we have heard from three Opposition speakers. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) did his usual annual hat-trick of reducing taxes and income of the government generally, increasing expenditure at the same time and still balancing the budget. All in all, I think he made promises involving some \$11 or \$12 million, at the same time inferring that he or his government could effect some reduction in municipal taxes. I presume that on the basis of that he hoped to convince some people. Personally, I feel like echoing the statement made by one of the members of the Opposition, that what we do need is more political honesty.

All three of the speakers objected, seemingly, to the idea of studying anything. For instance, they felt there was no point in studying the problem of surface rights. They carefully avoid, however, saying anything about how they might deal with the problem. All of them had some objection to what they called the ‘political aspects’ of the Throne Speech. Mr. Speaker, I do not know just what those political aspects were. Was it political, for example, to say that “the steadily rising cost of living occasioned by uncontrolled inflation continues to harrass the people of our Province?” Particularly, was it political when, last year, the Opposition voted unanimously for a Motion in favour of re-imposing price controls? Was it political to say that, “of equal concern has been the inability of our national transportation systems and storage facilities to cope with the volume of grain marketed?” Was it political to say that, “representations had been made to the Federal Government asking that the maximum amount of loans to individual farmers be placed at \$2,000?” The Association of Rural Municipalities and the Federation of Agriculture did not think so. Was it political to say that “the immediate construction of the South Saskatchewan river development project has been urged upon the Government of Canada,” and that the Provincial Government had pledged itself to an expenditure of \$33 million with regard to that project? Was it political to say that “the mineral production in Saskatchewan has exceeded

all records during the last year,” or to say that “the search for oil and natural gas has been conducted by exploration companies at an unprecedented rate”? Or was it political to say that “the value of forest production in Saskatchewan doubled last year,” or to say that the facilities of the Power Corporation have been built up to the point where a “greatly accelerated programme of rural electrification can be undertaken?” And I could go on.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the objection that the hon. members had to those excerpts from the Throne Speech was not so much to their political aspects as to the fact that they happen to be true. The truth about Saskatchewan and Saskatchewan problems is to the Opposition “political” — political because it is in favour of this Government. The truth about Saskatchewan is political because it continues to spell political defeat for the Liberal Party.

One of the speakers made what I thought must have been a slip when he referred to Saskatchewan’s Liberal press. Usually they say, “Saskatchewan’s daily papers.” This may explain, I suppose, why the “Saskatchewan Liberal,” once the paper of the Liberal Party of the Province, is no longer published. After all, why bother?

The Leader of the Opposition had something to say about the people electing a government that will know what farmers need. It seems to me that farmers hearing that statement would assume that they meant electing a Liberal Government, and would remember that we had a Liberal Government in this province for a great many years — for some 35 years. They would ask themselves: “Did the Liberal Government of that day know what the farmers needed?” And they will think back to those dear dead days quite beyond recall and remember that they did not get proper roads, proper health services, proper assistance for education; that they had no rural electrification to speak of, and no plan for public power development to give them rural electrification at any price; that they did not get any industrial development; but they did get, in those days, real stagnation.

They remember, too, Mr. Speaker, that we now have a Federal Liberal Government and that Government should know certainly what the farmers want. Certainly the farmers know. They want boxcars and storage space and grain-drying capacity and parity prices and price control. I thought, in connection with knowing what the farmers wanted, that an item appearing in the “Leader-Post on the 15th of February was rather interesting. It tells of a meeting called by the Kronau Committee of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool to consider problems facing the farmers today. Present at the meeting were a representative of the Canadian Pacific Railway, Mr. Austin Dewar, Liberal M.P. and Mr. J.J. Smith, also a Liberal M.P. At the conclusion of the meeting the representative of the C.P.R. said that he had sympathy for the opinions expressed and then, Mr. Speaker, the article goes on to say that sympathy was also expressed by Mr. Dewar and Mr. Smith. Truly the Liberal Party knows what the people want.

Some Hon. Member (Government): Sympathy is all they got.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: The Leader of the Opposition also had some remarks to make with regard to supposed persecution of the people of

February 18, 1952

Rosthern because of the fact that we have a C.C.F. Government and Rosthern has a Liberal member. That charge has already been answered by the Premier; but it seems to me that if it had occurred then the particular person might simply have been trying to take a leaf out of the book of the Leader of the Opposition. He might have thumbed over some old press reports and found, on April 2, 1948, a report of the Leader of the Opposition speaking in Saskatoon, speaking about the South Saskatchewan River development plan. And I read from the press notice of that date. He, (the Leader of the Opposition), promised:

“If the people of this Province give endorsement to my stand and elect a Liberal Government in Saskatchewan we will be sure to get it. Otherwise the outlook is not so sure.”

Now Mr. Speaker, talk about threats or bribes or persecution! There you have it on a really grandiose scale. Are we to infer from that that if a Liberal Government for this Province was not elected then the Liberal Government at Ottawa would persecute the people of Saskatchewan? Are we to infer from that that because the people here elected a C.C.F. Government, the Liberal Government at Ottawa has denied employment to the people of the province, has denied irrigation, power, industrial development — all of that? Well, Mr. Speaker, in the Speech from the Throne it was pointed out that the people of the province, through their Government, were willing to pay some \$30 million to help get the dam project. But certainly, if the cost of getting it is to elect a Liberal Government, that cost is too high.

The Leader of the Opposition sneered — I think that is the best expression — and certainly his followers jeered at the idea of legislation to establish a committee to prepare for proper observance of the Fiftieth Anniversary of this province. “Just think,” he said, “of putting that in the Speech from the Throne.” I have had the opportunity . . .

Mr. Tucker: The Premier is ahead of time, I said.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: I have had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, of discussing this particular suggestion with a number of intelligent and interested people in the province of Saskatchewan, people who wanted to mark that occasion in a meaningful and appropriate way. I found that, without question, they all welcomed the idea very heartily and they all welcomed the fact that we were going to start doing something about it now, not leaving it until the last minute to get ready. The difference may have been, I suppose, in fact that these people, who were exceedingly proud of the growth of our province, wanted to see it marked fittingly and they see in this a great possibility of developing varied considerable community interests and activity. They see the possibility of stimulating a very considerable interest in our Saskatchewan culture, of emphasizing the contribution which many groups have made in this province, and of honouring our old-timers. Mr. Speaker, 1952 is not too soon to begin plans for that. It occurred to me that that particular response, the sneering and the jeering, was rather typical of the lack of vision of many of the Liberal Party and of their lack of appreciation of anything less conspicuous than a hole in the highway. I can only feel that they would mark the occasion with a wordy proclamation, a few extra firecrackers, a great sale of hotdogs at 20 cents apiece and coca-cola at 10 cents a bottle.

Mr. Tucker: Big joke!

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: There was some attempt made . . .

Mr. Tucker: It would not be at public expense anyway.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: The Leader of the Opposition is making funny sounds again, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Tucker: If we put on something like that it would not be at public expense, Mr. Speaker, the way the C.C.F. do.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: There was some attempt made on the part of the speakers opposite to suggest to the people of the province that the Education and Hospitalization Tax on farm fuels was a heavy tax on production in this province. That tax amounts to something like three-quarters of a cent a gallon, on the average. It is a tax, Mr. Speaker, which all goes back to help pay hospital bills and education costs thereby reducing individual costs, and thereby improving the productive ability of the people of this province. If they had really been sincere about production costs in this province, it seems to me that they would have given at least equal attention to the increase in the price of farm fuel, not related to any provincial tax, an increase which has been many times more than the three-quarters of a cent a gallon which I mentioned. It seems to me that they might have given consideration to the very tremendous increase in farm machinery costs, which do not go back to the people of the province to help them with their services. Or they might have had some reference to the Federal Government's Sales Tax of 10 per cent on many articles, or to the tremendous increase in freight rates. They might even had had something to say about the Income Tax paid by the Saskatchewan farmers — an Income Tax which, in 1949, was 3½ times the amount paid by farmers in Ontario. Perhaps something could be taken off there. No, the real levy on farm production costs in this province is not because of any three-quarters of a cent per gallon tax. The real levy on production costs is because of excess profits approved by the Federal Liberal Government and the inequitable taxation imposed by it.

Then, of course, they had something to say about the developmental picture in the province of Saskatchewan. After listening to the Leader of the Opposition tell about how the province was going to the dogs, after reading about it in the newspaper, people in the province must have smiled to themselves when they picked up the "Leader-Post" that evening, and saw a quotation which says that the Imperial Oil is going to spend \$7 million on a Regina refinery. Or they may have read in the "Leader-Post", in the same week, an account of an address made by the mayor of the city of Regina to one of the service clubs here, in which he said: "Regina is fast developing into a great distributing point. A large number of concerns are in process of buying new sites now for this purpose." Well, if now it is becoming a distributing point, it must have something to distribute to somebody. There must be something happening in the province. Notice it is not just an ordinary distributing point, but it is a "great" distributing point! Well, they might have picked up the "Leader-Post" a few days later to see another statement where the Chrysler Company has announced that it is going to spend some quarter of a million dollars on a

February 18, 1952

building in the city of Regina. As I say, I think people must have smiled and said, "Well, after all, it is just the Leader of the Opposition talking again."

The member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) told us quite a lot about how the Province was going bankrupt, and then people could have read in the paper, just the same evening — quoting from the "Star-Phoenix" of Thursday, February 14th — an item which is headed, "A Buying Splurge in Canada — Saskatchewan grabs the lead." Speaking of this buying splurge, it says that when it came to gains over 1950, Saskatchewan grabbed the lead with 12.3 per cent. They must have had some money to spend somewhere.

The member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff) I thought did a rather good job, to begin with, of getting himself on the side of everybody. He was for the teachers and the trustees, the local trustees, the unit trustees, the secretaries, the teachers who were certificated and those who were not certificated. It seemed to me that he felt that certainly he was not in any position to antagonize anybody.

Reference was made again, as it has been made before, to the differential in equalization grants paid to larger units and districts not in larger units. The members of the Opposition have delightfully simple ways of doing their mathematics: they simply take the total amount of money paid to each group and divide by the total of operating rooms, and somehow feel that the answer should be the same. They disregard, entirely, at least three important facts. They disregard entirely that there are many programmes carried on in the unit which cannot be carried on in individual districts; that the units, for example, are assuming responsibilities for providing high school facilities for rural youngsters which the other districts cannot do. They disregard entirely the fact that, in every unit getting an equalization grant the number of districts with a high assessment are already helping to equalize within that unit, and in order that they do not have to carry the whole weight of the equalization, we take that into consideration and pay something for it. They disregard entirely the difference in the assessments — the difference in the ability to pay — of the two groups. In that regard, the average assessment per classroom, in non-unit areas excluding cities, is something over \$130,000 per classroom; the average assessment per room, in the units, is just over \$120,000 per classroom; so that there is a difference in the assessment per classroom of some \$10,000 per room. And if we include, in the unit group, as legitimately can be done, classrooms which are not operating because the youngsters from those districts are being conveyed from two or more districts, then of course the assessment per classroom in the unit is still less and the difference still greater.

I might just point out that, because the units have been able to set up satisfactory conveying systems, taking youngsters from two or more districts into centres, they have been able to save some 150 teachers during this last year. In other words, the Opposition disregards the entire purpose of the equalization grant. They disregard, particularly, this point: that the equalization grants, in 1951, were some \$2,700,000, whereas the total grant for all purposes paid by a Liberal Government, in 1943-44, was just \$2,800,000 — only \$100,000 more than the equalization grant now paid.

All of the members mentioned the teacher shortage, and that, Mr. Speaker, is a problem which is worthy of mention by all who speak in this House. It is a situation which, of course, is not confined to Saskatchewan and it is a situation which is not confined just to teachers. There is a shortage in almost every professional group. It can be stated that the Saskatchewan problem is more difficult than those of our neighbouring provinces. As I have said before, Saskatchewan has more one-room rural schools than the provinces of Manitoba, Alberta and British Columbia put together. It is more difficult, too, because of the percentage of our school enrollment to our total population. The percentage of school enrollment to total population, in British Columbia is 13 per cent; in Alberta 18 per cent; in Manitoba 16 per cent; in Saskatchewan 20 per cent. That means, of course, that we need more teachers. That means that there are fewer, relatively, people producing in order to pay the educational bill; and it means that there are more youngsters per capita actually attending school.

Now when my friend, the hon. member from Morse mentioned that this was a common problem in all provinces of Canada, some of the members of the Opposition shouted "No, no." Well, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, in British Columbia they have not any study supervisors. Nevertheless, in the province of British Columbia, in 1949-50, they had over 5,000 students enrolled in their correspondence school. We could have cut down, very materially, in the number of study supervisors in use in this province, if we had wanted to say to two or three thousand of them, "You will take your instruction through the correspondence school; stay home, do the lessons and send them in." We could have reduced the number of supervisors very considerably by doing that. We chose not to do so. Certainly, in every other Canadian province you will find this taking place. Certainly you will find it in Manitoba, you will find more unqualified people there than in Saskatchewan, even though Saskatchewan has to find over 7,000 teachers whereas Manitoba only has to find less than 5,000 teachers. Too, Manitoba has a much greater proportion of urban population, and it is much easier to fill your needs if you have a greater urban population. The salary for rural teachers in Saskatchewan, may I say, in 1950-51, was greater than the salary for rural teachers in Manitoba.

The province of Alberta reports a smaller number of study supervisors — somewhere in the neighbourhood of 200. In that province they need only 6,000 teachers as compared to some 7,200 in Saskatchewan. They have a much greater centralization of school population than we have. Consequently, they need fewer rural teachers. But even there, in 1949-50, the year we have been talking about, they had 10,000 people enrolled in their correspondence school — most of these people were in schools under study supervisors; 10,000 people compared to some 3,000 in the province of Saskatchewan. If all of our students under study supervisors had been sending their lessons to correspondence schools, we still would not have had 10,000 students taking instruction by correspondence course only.

Now it is quite true that teachers — too many of them — leave the province of Saskatchewan. It is quite true, Mr. Speaker, that one reason they leave is because some of the other provinces are paying better salaries; but it is equally true that an equally inducing reason which is taking them out of Saskatchewan is that there are greater opportunities in the other provinces to teach in non-rural areas; they have a better chance

February 18, 1952

of escaping from some of the isolation which they find in rural districts. Alberta attracts some; certainly it does not attract them because there is any greater degree of provincial support. One reason, may I suggest, that Alberta is in a position to attract teachers is because their larger units were started just about 10 years before ours were, and they have been in a position to make improvements which do attract.

We could have fewer study supervisors in the province of Saskatchewan — probably we could move to the point where we would have none at all, if we wanted to re-introduce our short courses for Normal School students; but we felt, again, that that was not the best way to proceed. We felt that it was preferable to use more study supervisors, getting the assistance of the superintendent, the helping teacher, in many units, and having the use of the correspondence courses, and possibly the lessons corrected at the correspondence school, if it was felt desirable. And so we had our choice to make between study supervisors and getting a larger Normal School Enrolment for a full year, and we chose, as I said, the use of the study supervisors, getting assistance from superintendents and helping teachers, the use of the correspondence courses and so on.

Because of this choice, and if we are going to compare, I think we must compare the number of people who have a standard of training less than an interim first-class. I am not including the interim first-class group, because these people have their grade 12, they have one year of professional training; that is a normal condition of teacher training across Canada, pretty well. In addition many of them have one and two years of experience, and some of them have some university work as well. I am not including those people who have what we call “Letters of Authority” because many of these people with Letters of Authority once had a permanent first-class certificate, certificates which, in this province, had lapsed because they had not taught for some time, but which, in many other Canadian provinces, they would have retained even though they had not taught. Some of them have university degrees but no professional training, and some of them have special skills in technical subjects. May I say if I did include those with the Letters of Authority in the picture that I am going to give, it would be still better from the Government’s point of view.

I am going to talk about the numbers in this group — teachers who have a conditional certificate (and remember, they have one year in normal school, they lack one or two subjects in grade 12; it is a better certificate than the old second-class certificate) — about study supervisors, and about people who have what we call the 12T and 24T certificate; and again may I point out that the 12T and 24T people all have several years of experience. If you take that group —study supervisors and people with a conditional certificate or a 12T certificate or a 24T certificate —we find that, in 1948-49, there were 1,838 in that group. In 1950-51 there were 892 in that group. That is still far from being satisfactory, but it does note an improvement of 946 in two years — 946 fewer people with certificates less than an interim first-class employed in the province, in a period of two years. If we look at the other side of the picture to see what is happening with regard to people who have certificates better than the interim first-class, then we get, again, an improved picture. I am talking now about those teachers who have a first-class certificate or who have a

junior high school or a superior certificate, or an advanced or collegiate or high school certificate; the latter three groups would require one degree, and some of them two degrees. In 1948-49, there were 5,563 in that group; in 1950-51, there were 6,159, or we had made an improvement to the extent of 596. So, with regard to the number with a qualification or certificate less than first-class, that number has substantially decreased in the last two years — the two years to which the member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff) referred. If you take the number with certificates better than first-class that number has substantially increased in the last two years.

I would like to go back and look at the situation in 1944. At that time the annual report showed that there were some 8,185 teachers employed in the province, and that 2,604 of them had a certificate less than first-class — that includes people without training, or very short training, or people with a second-class certificate. In other words, in 1944, 32 per cent of our teachers had a certificate less than the first-class level. I admit that that was wartime, but I also point out that, at that time, teachers had been ‘frozen’ in their profession for some three years. In 1950-51, when we had in the neighbourhood of 7,944 teachers, we had 2,041 with a certificate less than first-class or with no certificate at all — or some 15 per cent. We had reduced it from 32 per cent to 15 per cent. That is not good enough yet, but it is a substantial gain; and remember this, that it was not until 1945 that the province had the benefit of a C.C.F. budget or C.C.F. legislation. We have made, then, a gain of some 1,363 people in a period of six to seven years. We have reduced this group of people in our schools with a certificate less than first-class at the rate of over 200 per year.

Let us see what the Liberal Party did about this situation in the year 1944. It is 1944 that I have been talking about. In the face of that what did the Liberal Government say they would do in their Speech from the Throne? Well that Speech from the Throne — the last one in this province presented by the Liberal Government, Mr. Speaker — was rather a remarkable document. Here is what they said:

“The win-the-war committees which had been organized in many municipalities would be continued . . .”

That was all right — that was fine. Then they praised the Federal Government for Prairie Farm Assistance and for increasing the prices of agricultural products. That almost sounds like putting political words in the mouth of His Majesty’s representative.

In 1944, they were gratified, in the Speech from the Throne, because of the effectiveness of price controls. They mentioned the Saskatchewan Reconstruction Council set up by the Government to study the problems of the province. Mr. Speaker, imagine that! After 35 years of office, they had to set up a committee to tell them what to do — at least that is the way they talk now.

They announced a plan of adjustment of 1938 seed accounts, which, they said (and I quote) “undoubtedly would be acceptable to the majority.” Undoubtedly it was not acceptable to the majority. They announced that considerable study had been made of the farm debt problem,

February 18, 1952

and that information would be furnished to the members; but they did not say they were going to do anything about it. They announced that the Special Committee on Social Security and Health Services would be reconstituted — a special committee. They said they would provide treatment and hospitalization to persons suffering from cancer: they never got around to doing it . . .

Mr. Korchinski (Redberry): Would the Minister permit a question? What Speech from the Throne are you debating today?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: I am showing this, Mr. Speaker, and this, of course, gives rise to the question — that, in 1944, the Liberal Government faced a more serious problem in education and other things than the present Government faces now; and, in 1944, they, the Government, presented a programme to this House which meant nothing, absolutely nothing, yet, today, they are trying to tell the people that they have some ideas. They said, for the benefit of the member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson), that they would provide treatment and hospitalization to persons suffering from cancer without cost to that individual, which, I repeat, they never got around to doing before they were tossed out the window. But then, Mr. Speaker, the greatest achievement of all in the Speech from the Throne was this. They said that the Federal Government had announced its intention to establish a plan of national health insurance. Mr. Speaker, the members opposite have criticized the Speech from the Throne, this year, because of its reference to committees and commissions; they should read the 1944 Speech. They criticize our Speech because it has something for everybody: theirs, in 1944, had nothing for anybody, and in all of that, Mr. Speaker, not one word about education; not one word of consideration for teachers or the teacher shortage situation, or greater financial assistance for school boards. Would they have us believe that there is any difference between the Liberals then and now? Has any Moses appeared, in recent years, to lead the Liberals out of the wilderness? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they offer the same old wine, in old bottles; and I hope the member from Arm River does not think I am calling him an old 'crock' when I say that.

The present Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, recognizes the educational problem in several ways. The Royal Commission that has been referred to will undoubtedly study how educational resources and machinery which are now available, but which have not been available up until now, can be co-ordinated with municipal roads and power and other local machinery to do something about the problem there. The payments in lieu of taxes on government commercial property will provide more money in some municipalities. There is a special consideration mentioned to the municipal problem of rebuilding roads and bridges and that will help particularly in those areas where conveyance is a desirable solution to educational problems. The improvement in the tenure position of teachers is an added guarantee to teacher stability. The increase in retirement benefits will make possible a pension double, in many cases, to that possible when the Liberals left office in 1944.

It is not my intention on this occasion to deal with the financial assistance to school districts at any length, because that properly is a matter for the debate on the budget; but I want to say that the school grants have more than doubled since the Liberals left office.

I mentioned before that the equalization grant being paid today is only \$100,000 less than the grants paid for all purposes in 1943-44. Added to that, there are many schools in the province, previously receiving from 90 cents to \$1.50 per day, which are now all receiving at least \$1.50 per day. Added to that there are grants available to take care of part of the cost of building, which were not available before. Added to that there are Dominion-Provincial grants for technical education, not available before. Add to that the availability of loans to school districts to help take care of building costs. Add to that the greatly increased assistance to Normal School students and University students; and add to that the tremendous possibility of solving problems under the larger units, which were denied to the people of this province by the inactivity of the Liberal Government.

Some indication of the improved condition of the school districts is given in these figures: from 1944 to 1951 they increased their capital assets from \$26 million to \$48 million. At the same time they reduced their debenture indebtedness from \$8 million to \$5 million — in other words, showing a net improvement in their financial position of some \$25 million.

The member from Melfort, when speaking the other day, mentioned the new composite high school in the town of Melfort; and he pointed out (and I agree heartily) that very considerable interest was shown there, last Saturday, when some 2,000 people (according to the “Leader-Post”) came out to see the new school. That is a very gratifying fact in the face of the accusation made frequently by the members opposite that we have been destroying interest in education in this province.

I had a very pleasant drive up there. I drove up on a highway, some of it newly hard-surfaced, much of it apparently recently rebuilt. It was good to see there a housing development, an addition to the hospital, some library facilities, all of which had been assisted by finances from the Provincial Government. I had the impression that the community was really thriving and growing and expanding. This development is one of some 30 under the Dominion-Provincial plan in the province of Saskatchewan. It contains a number of classrooms, an auditorium, a library, some facilities for teaching commercial work, home economics and shop work. I was pleased to hear that in the shopwork section they intend to give major emphasis to motor mechanics and other kinds of shopwork which would be particularly useful to farm boys.

I want to submit, Mr. Speaker, that that kind of development is not possible without the larger unit. They needed, to build it in the first place, financial support of the larger unit. They needed the point of view of the farmers on the larger unit board in planning the facilities so as to meet the needs of the rural community. They needed the leadership of the unit trustees; and they needed the organization and the financial assistance of the unit in order to help bring rural youngsters into that school. When I say that successful projects of that kind are not possible without larger units, that is equal to saying that successful projects of that kind would not have been possible under a Liberal Government. That, and other similar projects, will attract more students and will hold them in school longer.

February 18, 1952

I would like to refer to the development (I have done it before in this House) in the Kindersley unit. It was one of the first organized in this province, in 1945. They have built in the town of Kindersley, which is a part of the unit, a school dormitory and a composite school. They have subsequently established a secondary vocational centre in Eatonia, having there a small shop and some facilities for home economics. They have a number of school buses. They have financial assistance for rural high school students who have to leave home in order to go to high school. They are already talking of an extension of their vocational facilities in the town of Kindersley. One year they had 70 students enrolled in night classes in woodwork, sewing, art and handicrafts. At two other points in the unit they had, last fall, two-week courses in carpentry and sewing. The boys built, I think, a granary or garage during that time, which was subsequently sold and the money recovered to go into a new project. They plan a further two-weeks' course in the spring at those two points, in motor mechanics and in cooking.

This development at Kindersley and Eatonia is assisted by an advisory council made up of representatives of co-operative organizations, the Farmers' Union, the Agricultural Society and local agricultural representative committees. In other words, the community is participating in determining the educational environment and sharing in the fruits of that environment, and that spells democracy, with capital letters. They have achieved some very concrete results. In 1945, for every 100 students in grade 8 in the unit there were only 12 in grade 12; but, in 1951, for every 100 students in grade 8 in the unit there were 70 to 75 students in grade 12. Their general enrolment had increased by 25 per cent. May I point out that Kindersley is a unit which receives just the minimum equalization grant; and also that it is an area as sparsely settled, I suppose, as any in this province.

I readily admit that I have chosen one of the best examples in this province. I would not pretend for a moment that every unit had made that progress; but other units are moving rapidly, and with the help of equalization grants, and once they have cleaned up some of the back-log of work which was left because of years of neglect, then they can go ahead faster.

One might just take a look at the figures for Sturgis. Sturgis is certainly not one of our higher assessed units. It has in it a great deal of land which makes education difficult; it is one of the areas that is continuing to develop. They, in that unit, established a composite high school and dormitory in about the year 1946. In 1946 their high school enrolment was 45; in 1951 it had increased to 155.

The Rosetown unit has a composite school there which is only about three years old. The high school enrolment in the town of Rosetown, in 1949 was 81; in 1951 it was 155.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, the equalization grants. The high school assistance paid by the units, the dormitories, the school buses, the composite school developments, are all part of a programme which will retain students in our schools for longer periods; and these again are policies which are only possible because of the larger units and the equalization grant policy developed by this Government.

Before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, I want merely to extend my congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. It seemed to me particularly appropriate and fitting that we had two young farmers whose parents had made homes in this province and who, in turn, have made homes themselves. They know, from first hand experience and from contact with their parents, Saskatchewan's story. They know the hopes of Saskatchewan's people; and they, with thousands of others in Saskatchewan, see the only fulfilment of those hopes in continued development and expansion with the C.C.F.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the amendment and will support the Resolution.

Mr. H.J. Maher (The Battlefords): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this Debate on the Speech from the Throne I do so with a little bit of feeling, particularly with the events that occurred on the day before this House opened. I refer particularly to the sudden and sorrowful passing of our late King, George the Sixth. I think it is the feeling of all members here that his passing was a loss to the world in general. He was, I believe, a good man and one of the outstanding kings that we have had. I think we all are pleased with our new Queen, and I hope that the era that she reigns will be similar to that of her predecessors Elizabeth the First and Victoria, and I think we are all looking forward to a reign by Her Majesty of eventful and prosperous times to all of the people in the Great Commonwealth that we all associate ourselves with.

In speaking to this debate, I would like, too, to congratulate both the mover and the seconder of the Address. I congratulate the seconder (Mr. E.H. Walker, as a new member in this Legislature and I think I can appreciate the nervousness that he would have, as I did when I first entered into this Legislature. In regard to the mover (Mr. Erb, I was rather disappointed in his remarks, particularly with his continuous attacks on the Federal Government. I am one who believes that the Federal Government has the interests of all of Canada at heart and I get a little tired in this Legislature of continuous criticism of the Dominion Government. I realize it is our responsibility to make suggestions to the Federal Government and make them strong, and I would like to refer to one matter that the member for Milestone mentioned, and that was the question of wheat, and also the Speech from the Throne stated that the initial payment for wheat was not high enough. I am one who believes the farmers should get as much as possible for their wheat, but I would suggest that the basis on which the Wheat Board is operated is giving the farmers of Saskatchewan an initial payment, then, as the wheat is sold, the proceeds are returned to them. I refer particularly to the 1950 crop where the Minister of Agriculture — I am sorry he is not in his seat — said that “we had had it” as far as the initial payment is concerned. I am going to suggest here that if it has not been for the Wheat Board in the Dominion of Canada today, then we would not have got near the price for our 1950 wheat that our farmers did.

I would like to suggest, after listening to my friend from Morse (Mr. Gibson), you would almost think that he was a financial expert for the Federal Government. He spoke in this Legislature for approximately

45 minutes, and said very little about provincial affairs. I am rather surprised, Mr. Speaker, that he has not been called to Ottawa immediately to advise the Minister of Finance. His whole time was devoted to Excess Profits Tax and why the old-age security should be \$50 instead of \$40. I think we all agree that the old-age security should be increased, and I am one who believes it will be. Our old people in this country are entitled to more consideration than they are getting. But I am going to suggest that the Federal Government, with their universal policy, is on the right track. I believe that they should be given credit for the work they have done in getting the old-age pension and the old age-security measures through as they have done now. And I would just like to say in passing that, while I will give Mr. Woodsworth a certain amount of credit for what he did, I am going to suggest that Liberal policies throughout the ages have always been for the betterment of our fellow men.

I would just like to refer to others that you never hear mentioned by that side of the House, such as unemployment insurance, family allowances, P.F.R.A., P.F.A.A. and many other measures. We, in the province of Saskatchewan, have gained a direct benefit from these measures. That is why I believe in giving the Federal Government a certain amount of credit for what they have done.

Turning now to the record of this Provincial Government, I am one who is prepared to compare the record of the Provincial Government with the Federal Government. I would just like to mention a few things, particularly with reference to the Premier's speech. He mentioned Mr. Fred Rhubbra, who, as we know, was one of the prime movers in Gulf Security, and he suggested that Mr. Rhubbra did a service to this province. I am one who believes that with the geological surveys that have gone on in this province, we do not need agents like Mr. Rhubbra to bring the oil companies in to this country. I think this province is big enough to go out on its own and say to these oil companies, "we have these resources," and keeping in thought the people themselves, to go to them and develop these things. We do not need these promoters and the like of that. There is no reason why these oil companies cannot develop this directly without paying royalties to such organizations as Gulf Security and Rhubbra and the like.

I would like to refer directly to the remarks of the Minister of Education with reference to grants and what this Government has done towards education. I give them a certain amount of credit. But the educational system in this province was built up throughout the years under Liberal administrations and, during the most difficult times from 1936 to 1944, when we went through most difficult times throughout the world, and then a war, these comparisons he made are, in my opinion, inadequate. It might be interesting, Mr. Speaker, to just refer to grants in British Columbia as compared with Saskatchewan. As the member for Redberry said, the other day, most government members are more concerned with comparing Saskatchewan with Saskatchewan. Let us compare Saskatchewan with other provinces. The grants in British Columbia rose from \$4 million in 1946 to \$13 million in 1949, while Saskatchewan's increase was only from \$3 million to \$5 million. And if you take the Minister's figures, the C.C.F. grants doubled while the grants in British Columbia were tripled. I leave that thought with you. This Government cannot claim credit for all of the social services and all the progress in education that was done throughout this province of ours.

I want to say a little bit, also, about social welfare and our hospitals. I am one who believes the hospital plan has been a good thing and I am going to suggest (I am sorry the Minister is not in his seat) this hospitalization is going to be under difficulties. I say this when you look at the statement. Here you have a hospitalization plan of which the collections due from the Tax are amounting to just around half of what is actually spent. I am going to suggest that here you have \$5½ million that has to come out of the revenues of this province. The situation, as I see it, is this. We have other social services, besides our hospitalization, that have to be looked after, and if the hospitalization plan is going to continue to take that much of the revenue out of the province, it is not going to be long until other types of social services are going to suffer. It is all right as long as these revenues continue, but if things get a little more difficult and we have a couple of crop failures, this Government is going to have to face something that they should be facing today.

I think another point in hospitalization is the question of bed room. I have heard it suggested by the Minister that the hospital beds in this province are adequate. Now, I am one who disagrees with that. They are not. I know in North Battleford that is a terrific time trying to get into hospitals, it is practically impossible. I had the opportunity, from a certain organization suggesting building old-age homes for the aged, of taking the matter up with the Minister, and here is what he said: "We feel that presented there are sufficient hospital beds in Saskatchewan to take care of the people who require active hospital care; and this Department does not, of course, provide, or assist in providing, for the accommodation of aged people." I realize this Department does not do that, but I think that is one of the problems that has got to be faced. We must have more homes for these people who are aged and not quite able to look after themselves.

I took the matter up with the Minister of Social Welfare with the thought of maybe bringing in an organization that would, backed with Government help, build another home for the aged in Saskatchewan. But the Minister did not give me much satisfaction. He said: "I would point out that the Provincial Government has now three such nursing institutions in Wolseley, Regina and Saskatoon, and we are presently undertaking the construction of a fourth at Melfort."

My contention is this, Mr. Speaker, I give the Government credit for erecting these homes, but I think they are missing a great deal with all the charitable organizations throughout this Dominion and province, regardless of their religious faith, regardless of the organizations, in not encouraging them to build these homes. I think we can assume that the home in Melfort will cost anywhere between a half and a million dollars. I think that is a good thing. But I think this will only help to fill the need in this province of ours for these aged people, and alleviate the problems that all of our hospitals in this province are having today. I believe this Government should take an active step to try and encourage the construction and building of homes of this nature for the people of Saskatchewan. I think they could give them as good service as you can in your Government homes, and, furthermore, I do not think it would be nearly the expense to the province.

February 18, 1952

Mr. Speaker, I want to say something about a subject in which I have really made a catch-phrase for this Legislature and that is the question of Crown Corporations. Yes, I heard, it is "Out the window." We will have to wait until we have an election, and then see who goes out the window. But, anyway, first of all I want to take issue with the Premier in a couple of speeches he made in the city of North Battleford. You know, I may be an idealist but I believe in sticking to the facts.

I have before me a couple of papers, one the "North Battleford Optimist" and the other the "North Battleford News." In one is a picture of the Premier in which he says the Crown Corporations, last year, made a net profit of \$3,815,000. "Where will this profit go when the Liberals throw the Crown Corporations out the window?" The other paper reporting the same speech says: "'The Crown Corporations,' he continued, 'after the expenses had been paid, had turned over a net profit of \$3,815,000 to the Provincial Treasurer.'" To the Provincial Treasurer, Mr. Speaker. "I want the Liberals to tell you who gets the profits when they throw the Crown Corporations out the window."

In the first place, Mr. Speaker, it is rather interesting to note that the \$3,815,000 never got to the Provincial Treasurer. The Provincial Treasurer knows that.

Mr. Tucker: Sure he knows it, they all know it.

Mr. Maher: Then the question in my speech, last year, where I said that the Power Corporation and the Department of Telephones should not be included as Crown Corporations because they were service organizations, I was pooh-poohed about that. It is rather interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, in the Government Finance Office annual report, that we received just last week, that the Power Corporation has been removed and it says right here:

"In accordance with The Power Corporation Act, the Corporation now receives its advances direct from the Provincial Treasurer."

I presume it will not be long, Mr. Speaker, until such time as the Department of Telephones will be put back in their proper place as a service organization for the people of Saskatchewan.

The Premier, in his speech, the other day, mentioned that after you took these out you made a profit, that they made a return of around 10 per cent. I have not got his exact figure, but I think that is what he said. I have been trying to figure this thing out, but it is rather interesting to know that in this financial statement — the one that was put on our desks the other day — if you take the Department of Telephones out, which is all you would need to do, the capital invested is \$9,309,000 if you take that out, and the net profit is \$437,000. And that makes 10 per cent! I just cannot see it. I am going to suggest . . .

Premier Douglas: On a question of privilege. You are speaking of 1950, I was speaking of 1951.

Mr. Maher: We have not got the 1951 . . .

Premier Douglas: — No, but I said that on the figures for 1951, the estimated gross surplus would be roughly \$4½ million, and if you take out the Telephones and Power Corporations, the corporations that are left on the basis of the capital invested in them would be about 10 per cent in 1951.

Mr. Maher: Well, naturally, Mr. Speaker, it is pretty difficult for me to argue that point because we have not got those figures. All we have is the financial statement of expenditures and revenue issued March 31, 1951. I realize these other statements are for the previous year, but I must use these figures. And there is another point I want to suggest, too. If you take these corporations, and take the investment that they have individually, it puts quite a different picture on it. And I think I will still have to use the figures that we have; they are the only figures we have. I want to say this: at the present time the Government Insurance Office has no capital invested in it out of the Government Finance Office; there is no capital. Therefore, the profit from that from an investment standpoint cannot be taken, and that amounts to around \$240,000. If you take that off these figures that I have you have \$192,000 profit on a capital investment of around \$9 million, and if you go through the various corporations and look at them — you have the Timber board, \$132,000 which is quite a profit, probably in the neighbourhood of 12 per cent or 10 per cent or 9 per cent. Now, that is not very hard to see, because, in the first place, the Timber Board fixes the price of the timber that they buy and they sell it on the market. My impression of Crown Corporations originally was that they were going to get all these big profits from these big corporations and take them and distribute them among the people of Saskatchewan for the express purpose of social service. But here in the Timber Board, all they are doing is taking the profit away from the timber operators in the north, the small fellow who has to cut the timber.

I was interested, too, in the Fur Marketing Service and the Fish Marketing Service. It was very interesting. There is another point where that is purely a service, and the profit there is coming from our fishermen and our producers of fur. These are not profits that are improving the position of the people of Saskatchewan.

I would like to say something about the Big River sawmill. I happen to have had the privilege of going up there for the opening and I would like to thank the Minister of Natural Resources and the member for Shellbrook (Mr. Larsen) for the courtesies extended to me while I was there. But in this Big River sawmill they have approximately \$370,000 invested, and they tell us what a wonderful thing it is. I am one who believes that private enterprise could have done a lot better than that. I happened to pick up an "Edmonton Journal," dated last June, just about the time I was up there, and here we have the Alberta Government let a contract for a \$3½ million pulp plant in Edmonton. Now, why cannot this Government, rather than build a \$350,000 mill up in Big River, bring organizations such as this in here, and why aren't they coming? The reason is, Mr. Speaker, on account of their socialistic dealings, the socialistic type of government that we have in this province. These are the sort of things we need — greater industries. And one of the reasons why this province is not going ahead faster is other things exactly the same as this.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word about highways. I refer particularly to the local seat, local as far as The Battlefords are concerned.

I understand No. 5 Highway from Saskatoon to Lloydminster is to be one of the main highways of the province, and I am one who has no quarrel with the start that the Government made on it; but I certainly have a quarrel with the way in which they are doing it. They paved the road from North Battleford to Radisson, and then they jump away up to Lloydminster and start coming back. Now, I do not blame the people in the Cutknife seat for endeavouring to get that, but I want to make this suggestion to the Minister of Highways. One time during Committee here during the last two years, he told us that the operation of their buses was a lot more economical when they were on blacktop highway. I am going to suggest to him that if they were to take the operation of the Saskatchewan Transportation buses or take the density of traffic as a yardstick for the building of highways, they certainly would be building a highway between North Battleford and Radisson. There are at the present time six Saskatchewan Transportation buses daily that go over that road through North Battleford and Radisson which is a disgrace today for a main highway. But while you go up into Lloyd there is just the one Greyhound bus daily. Now, I don't know whether the Minister of Highways is interested in providing good highways for Greyhound or not — you would not think so, the way they talk — but there is certainly a situation there. The road between Radisson and North Battleford is a disgrace to be called a highway.

I want to suggest something else. You know, you hear a lot about the way this Government is building wonderful blacktop highways. They started to build this highway between Radisson and Lang. A few years ago, in 1948, this Government built 13 miles of blacktop north of North Battleford of which, I am sure, the people of North Battleford are very grateful. Fortunately at that time, for some reason known only to them, they did call for tenders. They brought in there a regular contractor who had good equipment and built a real highway. It is a credit to the province, that 13 miles. I think the Minister will agree with me, if he has ever driven over it. It is as good a piece of blacktop highway as there is in the province. And down at Radisson they decided they would have to do it themselves in a socialistic manner; that is, by government crews. And I think there is a great comparison there, Mr. Speaker, between private enterprise building a highway and your government crews. As a matter of fact, now between Radisson and Borden you have a hard time getting around the holes, and it is just too bad that all the public funds have to be wasted on that highway, because it certainly is going to have to be built up. While I realize that with that type of highway a roadmix is cheaper, you cannot tell me it is any cheaper when you have to rip it all out and start over again, and when you can see how a highway that is built with a plantmix up north of North Battleford and other places in the province, by a regular contractor, can stand up and have no trouble with them at all.

Hon. J.T. Douglas (Minister of Highways): Would you mind explaining the difference between the portion of No. 5 built by roadmix from Langham east, built under dry weather conditions, and the road north of North Battleford? There is practically no difference. You are trying to make comparisons of a road that was built in very adverse weather conditions — certainly not because of the equipment.

Mr. Maher: Mr. Speaker, I realize there are times when a roadmix highway is all right; but I am going to suggest that, over the whole picture, a hotmix road will last longer; there is not the chance to be taken

and I think these government crews that are putting down this highway are a mistake. I do not agree with that policy at all. Now the Langham highway, the other side, which he mentioned, they have a certain amount of trouble with that, and I would suggest they had a lot more trouble with that, Mr. Speaker, than they have ever had with the 13 miles north of North Battleford. I do not believe in that principle of socialistic building of our highways. I think there is only one way to build highways and that is through the legitimate channels of contract, and then they are properly built.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about something else here today. I can still talk highways if I want. I am very glad that the hon. Minister mentioned that. We have one bit of highway, Mr. Speaker, that is a great concern to a lot of people in the Minister of Agriculture's seat, and if the Minister of Highways had not mentioned it I would not have thought of it. There is a piece of highway called Highway No. 26 on which a great number of farmers live. It is not in my constituency, but I know a lot of people there, and I think that if ever there was neglect in the Department of Highways, it was that bit of highway. It is just too bad, in that area there, that some provision cannot be made for allowing those people to come into the cities to do their buying and obtain the services that they need.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: Better now than under the Liberals.

Mr. Maher: Is that so? Well, something was done about it under the Liberals. Mr. Speaker, there is one thing I want to mention. I picked up a big envelope on my desk here the other day, and I picked a book out. I was rather surprised when I read this book. It is called "Progress, 1952. A summary of the Saskatchewan Government's activities from 1944 to 1952," and I never saw a book — I somewhat agree with the Foreword that probably the government of the day should give a report to the people of the province; and if I ever saw a biased report this certainly was. I have read this, and I do not intend to go into all the things I have read in it, but it is rather interesting to note that under our C.C.F. Socialistic administration they put out such a book. The first thing on the first page is an oil refinery at Lloydminster. I have been to Lloydminster several times, but I have never been able to find an oil refinery (it might be there) on the Saskatchewan side, it has all been on the other side. I am saying that I have never seen one on the Saskatchewan side. If we had had that in Saskatchewan we would also have had the roofing plant in Saskatchewan — if it had not been for a socialistic administration. I can say something else about it, too.

I am going to say something else which I did not intend to say and that is on housing. In the town of Lloydminster the lending institutions are loaning under Central Housing on the Alberta side, and in the city of North Battleford they are not. The only loans available there are the Central Housing direct with the Dominion Government.

Premier Douglas: That is an awful reflection on the Federal Government.

Mr. Maher: It is not the Federal Government; the reflection is entirely on you. The Federal Government are loaning direct under Central Housing in North Battleford, but in Lloydminster the lending institutions are. The problem there is that the amount of a loan today, under the Federal, is not high enough. I am not one who believes that the Federal Government's

housing situation is perfect by any stretch of the imagination. I think I can criticize them as much as anybody; but I can certainly say that this Government has never done anything, even with their legislation under Bill No. 35, to help housing in this province, outside of a few houses in Moose Jaw and Regina.

I want to get back to this book because the time is running on. As one goes along, I see here "The people's business," which again is a pet of mine. It is rather interesting to read one clause: "others like the wool plant, wool products, brick plant, box factory, are actively engaged in processing a number of Saskatchewan's natural products." Now, my recollection is that the Minister of Education who, I think, is the director of the wool plant, suggested to us that 65 or 75 per cent of the wool used in the wool factory was Australian wool; it was not Saskatchewan wool at all. And then you go on a little farther: another interesting thing. They tell us in this book in one place the profit of the Fur Marketing, during 1949-50, was \$237,000. But when it comes to the Fish Board and a few things like that, they are certainly never mentioned. Go over a little farther, and we see an article on Government airlines: "During 1949-50 S.G.A. carried 7,100 passengers, 1,807,500 pounds of cargo, 72,000 pounds of mail, showed a surplus of \$23,383. All the profits made by that corporation are paid to the Provincial Treasurer." And this is a book on a report to the people of Saskatchewan!

Mr. Tucker: What a lie!

Mr. Maher: It is rather interesting to compare the article about the clay products. They tell us about the new \$400,000 plant. Then you go over to the printing company. I notice the printing company — right at the end of it — "the net surplus earned by the printing company was \$38,000." But they do not mention anything about the surplus earned, or the loss, by the brick factory. They do not say a word about that. And I could go on through this book, Mr. Speaker, and there is nothing about the tannery, nothing about the shoe factory . . .

Premier Douglas: Anything about the briquetting plant?

Mr. Maher: Not a thing about the briquetting plant.

Now, let us go on to the "improved debt position." All liquor profits not used — all liquor profits were not used. "In the previous administration all the liquor profits were used for the reduction of debt, they were not put in the current revenue."

Some Hon. Member (Government): They are in this Province.

Mr. Maher: I could not find anything in it about that. We go over to another thing and we are back to highways. Here the Government are running around with a government plant — I think the Minister of Highways told us, last year, what a wonderful job they are doing. They did not put any of the Government plant's pictures in the paper, they put in one of these hotmix plants, and I do not think it belongs to the Government. I never heard of them owning one, but they might — I do not think so. And all in all, Mr. Speaker, I

think this book is certainly one of the greatest C.C.F. political documents ever put down.

I want to say something about health. I notice the Cancer programme: May 1, 1944, free cancer diagnosis and treatment. You would almost think from that that the Government previous to that had never seen cancer, never done anything about it. But here we all know cancer was not even started by the Liberal Government, it was started in the days of the Anderson Government. That is when it was started, and the Liberal Government, from 1934 on, progressed. I cannot understand why you insist on taking all this credit for everything that you have only had a small portion to do with.

Mr. Speaker, I think you will agree that, after these few remarks of mine, I will support the amendment and oppose the Motion.

Mr. J.W. Horsman (Wilkie): Mr. Speaker, speaking on this debate, it seems the usual thing to congratulate the previous speakers, and I wish to do so most heartily: the mover and seconder of the Motion, those of my colleagues who have taken part, and also the members from the other side of the House.

I was particularly interested, of course, in the Premier's speech of a few days ago. The Premier is not only an orator, but in his remarks he always manages to get in a good deal of humour, which is very nice to listen to. It makes you feel happy, makes you feel good; and it might divert the people's attention somewhat from the matters under discussion. It reminds me, Mr. Speaker, of a story I heard not so long ago. Two ladies were talking about the possibility of the next election. One lady was a very strong supporter of Mr. Tucker, the Leader of the Opposition, and the other lady was a great admirer and supporter of the Premier. The first lady said, "Well, I think Mr. Tucker is going to win the next election, and I will tell you why. He is a good man, he is a praying man." The other lady said, "What about Mr. Douglas, isn't he a praying man too?" She said, "Oh yes, sure he is; but the Lord will likely think he is only joking."

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, anyone listening to the speeches from the other side of the House would think that everything good that has ever been done in Saskatchewan since the country was discovered had been done since the C.C.F. took office. I believe that is what they think. This Government came into office during one of the best years we ever had, 1944, and since that time we have enjoyed a period of prosperity such as has never been in this province before — not because we had a C.C.F. Government in office. No, this prosperity was not confined only to Saskatchewan, but was experienced the whole country over. As a matter of fact, most other provinces fared better than we did during those years.

Of course, the hon. members opposite go back to the history of the Liberal Government, back to 1936, and they compare a period from 1936 to 1944 with the period from that time to now. Well, there is no comparison, Mr. Speaker, between those years. In the 'thirties we were in the worst depression the world ever knew. It was not anything that was peculiar to Saskatchewan, or Canada; it was something that was world-wide. And just

February 18, 1952

after that we got into the war, through the war years, up to 1945-46; and then, of course, things started to pick up after the war was over. When we went into the war we had a surplus of wheat of I do not know how many hundred millions of bushels in Saskatchewan. We remember the wheat acreage reduction scheme that the Dominion Government had, to take wheat land out of production, and try and reduce this great surplus of wheat. Finally we did get the wheat cleaned up, and as time went on and the wheat got a little more in line with demand, prices started to pick up, and from 1944 on things have progressed steadily; if they have not gone up high, they have at least paid a fair price. I do not say that farm prices are high. I do not say grain prices are high. As a matter of fact, I think grain is too cheap, but, on the average, I want to say that, in any part of Saskatchewan, during the last 10 or 15 years — the last 10 years at least — wherever crops have been good or fair, the farmers were never so prosperous as they are today. No one can gainsay that. That is something that everyone has to recognize.

Hon. Member: Even in Milestone.

Mr. Horsman: I can remember, back in the 1930s when people had no feed for their stock; besides, they had no food for themselves. The government of that day faced a situation the like of which we have never had since, and I hope we never have anything like it again. I often wondered, in those years, where they got the feed for the livestock. They did not ship it in by the carload, it came in by the trainload; and they saved the lives of the cattle and the horses anyway, and the people in the province, until they could get on their own feet.

Then, through the war years, we were all geared to a war economy. I remember, even when I first came into this House, hearing the Minister of Highways and other officials say that it was impossible to get heavy machinery then. Well, how much more impossible was it the few years before that? And yet those are the years that they compare with the years since 1944! They talk about farm prices. What about the price of beef? Beef has been at an all time high — higher than it ever was in the history of this country. I am sure that any member of the C.C.F. Government over there — the Premier or anyone else — if he goes out to buy beef, will certainly think that beef prices are high enough anyway. I do not think there is any question about that.

The Government seems to be quite concerned about the condition of the farmers even now. They intend to appoint a royal commission to try and find out what is wrong with agriculture, and what the problems are that face agriculture. I do not want to be unduly critical about this — perhaps a commission could find out something that might help; but it seems strange to me that the men who form this Government, many of them farmers who have farmed all their lives; it seems to me that the problems which face agriculture should be very familiar to them. We have a Department of Agriculture here in Saskatchewan, with the Minister of Agriculture at its head. He is a man with long experience in agriculture and stock-raising, and it would seem to me that if anyone in this province knows anything about agriculture it should be he; and it seems almost a slap in the face to the Minister to appoint a commission to investigate the things that he should know all about. If someone were to ask me to mention a man who, in my opinion, should be qualified to head a committee like, I would say, without hesitation, your Minister of Agriculture should be that man. He is

not alone there. He has a highly-trained staff of experts in agriculture. He has, in every district of the province, an agricultural representative — a trained agriculturist, most of them, probably all of them, graduated from some school of agriculture. It would seem to me that a group like that, if you got them together, should be able to tell you what is wrong with agriculture in this province. And I think it is an insult to the Minister and his staff to say that they cannot figure out what is wrong with agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I have lived a long time in this country, and I have farmed all these years. I started in when I was very young, when the country was very young too, and I have had everything happen to me on the farm that has happened to anyone else. I have been hailed out, frozen out, dried out and my crop has been eaten by grasshoppers. Those things are common to every farmer; and these are the real problems which beset agriculture — the natural hazards of this country. Some of them you cannot overcome. A storm comes up, and in 10 minutes your crop is wiped out, and so on. A year ago, in 1950, if the rain had not come when it did, in spite of everything the farmers, the Department of Agriculture and the municipalities, were trying to do, millions of acres would have been absolutely destroyed; we could not have stopped the grasshoppers. And that is one of the hazards. There are many other hazards, of course: soil drifting is something that has been more or less overcome; but still, the main thing that is wrong with agriculture in this country are the natural hazards, and principally drought.

Now I just want to say a word about highways. During the course of his remarks in this House, the Leader of the Opposition mentioned that, in some of the Liberal constituencies, there was very little money being spent on highway construction. The Premier took great exception to that, and said that if the Leader of the Opposition believed that, he was the only sensible person in Saskatchewan who did believe it. Well, I live in a constituency, of course, and I am a Liberal; and I think that is probably one of the best examples of what the Leader of the Opposition was speaking about that you could find anywhere in Saskatchewan. I am surrounded by C.C.F. constituencies on all sides except the west. Of course, the western side of my constituency is bounded by the province of Alberta. In all those surrounding constituencies, during the last few years, there has been hundreds of thousands of dollars spent on highways while, in my constituency, we have only got a little bit for maintenance. The member for The Battlefords just mentioned, a few minutes ago, the blacktop that is being built through the Cutknife constituency to the north. Now, we do not get anything done at all; and I do not know that it ever occurred to me that our constituency contributes as much to the revenue of the province as the average constituency in Saskatchewan does. Now I know that discrimination is an ugly word; it does not sound good. We are not supposed to believe that we are being discriminated against; but there must be some other reason. The only thing I could think of, offhand, is that perhaps the Minister of Highways does not know very much about the geography of this province. He may not even know that there is such a constituency such as Wilkie in the province. As far as highway work goes, it would seem so.

Now regarding revenue from that constituency, I have said I thought we had as big a revenue as most constituencies. We have a constituency composed of almost all good farm land. We have good farmers; we have a lot of good little towns up there too; good business men. The farms are mechanized,

February 18, 1952

the same as the rest of this province. There is a car and truck, an average of at least two motor vehicles, on the farms. They buy licences for those vehicles and everything like that; and besides all the taxes we pay, Public Revenue Tax and everything else, the same as anyone else does. We have certain sources of revenue there that the province gets that other constituencies have not got. We have developed up there (when I say that I do not mean myself, but people in that constituency) the best gas field in Saskatchewan, the largest producer of natural gas in Saskatchewan so far; and that is a source of revenue to the province. Out of that gas field development the Provincial Government has a power plant there, fuelled by natural gas from that gas field. It is the cheapest source of electric power in Saskatchewan. It must be a source of revenue to the province. They must also get a royalty from the salt plant up there. They must get a royalty from that, besides the royalty from the gas and the profit they made from the power plant.

Now it is mentioned in the Throne Speech that potash in Saskatchewan will be developed this summer. For the information of anyone in the House who does not know where those potash beds are (it is not mentioned in the Speech), I would just like to say that those potash beds are in the Unity area. I believe they are the greatest source of potash known in the world — on the North American continent anyway. Potash is a product that we have always had to import into Canada. There are not any mines, as far as I know, in Canada — nothing to speak of, anyway; and I know that this potash will be developed there. I have a clipping here from the “Saskatoon Star,” under date of December 4th last, about this product. It says:

“The 1952 programme involving expenditure of over \$300,000 has been prepared by Western Potash Corporation Ltd., of Calgary for further development of its Unity deposits.

“The programme calls for an extensive exploratory drilling programme to outline full extent of the potash basin and to determine the most promising location for further exploration.”

That, Mr. Speaker, will be another source of revenue for my constituency for the Provincial Government here; and I say we are just a “forgotten” constituency; they do not know we are up there.

I would like to say a word about our loss of population. The Premier, of course, in his remarks, pointed out that the greater part of that loss was during the years before this Government came to office. That may be true. He said they had this decline in population now reduced to a trickle. During the eight most prosperous years that this province has ever seen, we cannot do more than reduce our loss of population to a trickle! We still lose our natural increase, Mr. Speaker. I think this is a very serious thing. A trickle out of a pond of water in time will drain the pond; and a trickle out of our population and the loss of your natural increase year after year will mean that after a while you will not have anybody living in the province. There is, though, one part of our population that we having great difficulty keeping in the province, and it is not because they cannot get jobs; mechanization of agriculture has nothing to do with this class of population. I speak of the school teachers of the province. It is a well known fact that they are leaving the province

almost as fast as they are being trained in the Normal Schools. They are going to other provinces. They are not leaving because the farms in this province are mechanized, or anything like that. They are not leaving because they cannot get jobs. They are leaving for some other reason. We know that hundreds of school districts in Saskatchewan are crying for good teachers.

Now, according to the Premier the next slogan of the C.C.F. Party in this province will be "Expansion." I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that it is almost time we did have some expansion. I hope we get it. I believe we will see expansion during the next four or five years. I also believe, Mr. Speaker, that it will be under a different government. We will have expansion through the development of our natural resources, which I believe are unlimited in this province, if we could just get them developed; and that is the only thing that will stop the decline in our population.

Population, of course, is not the only thing that is declining. I think socialism, also, is declining. I think it is declining in Saskatchewan. I know it is declining in every other British dominion. The Socialist Government was defeated in England; they were defeated in Australia; they were defeated in New Zealand; and when the next election comes in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, we believe they will be defeated in Saskatchewan.

As I told you a few moments ago, I have lived a long time in this province — from the time I was very young. I may say I still have the old homestead. It lives on me, particularly in a year like this when my crop is under the snow; and, as I said, I have gone through everything any other farmer has; and I have raised a large family in this country; that is the only thing I have done that I am very proud of — my family. I do not take much of the credit for raising that family; I give the credit to my wife. Mr. Speaker, I just take the blame.

The Minister of Education just now was talking about the better financial position of the schools — how much better financial position they are now in than they were a few years ago. What institution is there, in this province, that is not in better financial position now than they were 10 years ago? Not only schools. Take the farm industry. As I say, in good crop areas where they have had good crops, they, too are in better financial position; but it was not on account of anything this Government did. They did not make it rain; they did not make the crops grow; and that is the only thing that is responsible for the success and prosperity of the farms. Now Mr. Douglas will know this — he is a preacher . . .

Mr. Speaker: Order! May I draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that it is customary to address members by the constituency.

Mr. Horsman: What I was saying was that the Government was not responsible for the rainfall, because it tells you in the Bible that He maketh His sun to shine upon the evil and upon the good, maketh His rain on the just and on the unjust. No government has anything to do with that.

Now, regarding the marketing of our grain, the Provincial Government has not anything to do with that either. That is under the Federal Wheat board — a wheat board not established at the request of anybody except the farmers of this country; they wanted a wheat board, and the government established it for them. I think it has been very successful.

February 18, 1952

I am quite sure that, last year, with the millions of bushels of seed wheat we had in this country, if we had been on an open-market system, every farmer knows what we would have got for that wheat; we probably could not have sold it at all. We certainly never would have got any second payment on it, anyway.

I was also interested in what the Minister of Education said when he spoke of visiting the Melfort school recently — the new school up there. He said he had a wonderful trip up there; the roads were good — he talked about the fine roads he travelled on . . .

Mr. Egnatoff (Melfort): All the holes were filled with snow.

Mr. Horsman: Oh. Well, anyway, I attended a school opening last summer, and the Minister was there also. He did not say anything about that. Of course, it was only a small school in a small town; but he certainly did not mention that he drove over any good roads to get there. I am quite sure he didn't.

There are a lot of these things, Mr. Speaker, such as our hospitalization plan and things like that which might have been overdue. They have just been built up from things we had before. Before the hospitalization plan was started (and I am not criticizing it); but when people say there never was anything done before that, that is what I want to take issue with. About half of the municipalities in this country had hospitalization plans and medical services of some kind of their own. Our municipality has had such a plan since way back in the middle 'thirties. We still have our medical services, and it has worked awfully good all these years. We had a hospitalization plan too, until the Saskatchewan Hospitalization Plan came into effect. Ours was not as broad as this, and did not have as great a coverage; but still it is from plans like that that these things have grown — they are just an extension. These things are not altogether the idea of the present Government. They have been extended by this Government, it is true; but I say we cannot stand still. No country can stand still. During the most prosperous years of our history we would not expect to stand still.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is about all I have to say. I will not support the Motion. I will support the Amendment.

Mr. A.L.S. Brown (Bengough): Mr. Speaker, before I take part in this debate, I wish to join with those who have preceded me in extending my congratulations to the mover and the seconder on the job which they did in moving and seconding this Motion which we are now debating. I do so not only because of what they tell you here in the House, but by virtue of the location of their constituencies; they are immediate neighbours of mine. The mover lives to the immediate north and east of me and the seconder to the immediate north and west of the constituency which I represent, and I could not help but feel that they expressed the ideas, the hopes and the desires of the people I represent, as well as the people whom they represent. They both told a story not only of the record and the accomplishments and the aim of this Government, but they told a story of how the people of Saskatchewan, working in co-operation and through

collective action, have been able to bring to themselves a great deal of security; and they told it in a manner in which the people of their constituency as well as the people of Saskatchewan can well, indeed, be proud.

Mr. Speaker, I wish for just one moment or two to refer to an incident which occurred in Saskatchewan during the month of July last — an incident which resulted in having the seconder of the Address with us here at this Assembly. At that time, or previous to the election which was held in Gravelbourg this summer, it was desirable that the C.C.F. should win that election. It was desirable that this Legislature should have the services of such an able man as was being presented by the C.C.F. in that constituency. It was desirable that the C.C.F. win that election to the extent that we here in Saskatchewan would know that the people in that area appreciated and understood what this Government was attempting to do. But while it was desirable (and I think the C.C.F. organization in Gravelbourg and the C.C.F. organization in Saskatchewan did their utmost to see that that desire was fulfilled, — it was essential that the Liberals win that Gravelbourg by-election, for if they lost the by-election, as they did do, it was another nail in the coffin of the Liberal Party as a provincial party in the province of Saskatchewan.

As one looking on from the outside during that election campaign, we saw the Liberals put forth every possible effort to win that election, but they were unsuccessful. What does this victory mean to us? It has meant that not only have we the services of the representative of the C.C.F. with us here, but it has meant that it has given us more courage to travel along that road which we in this Government have been travelling for the last seven or eight years. It has meant that the Liberal Party is no longer the formidable force that it suggested it was previous to the election, and also, Mr. Speaker, looking in from the outside I had a little personal interest in the election too.

You will recall that during the last Session this Assembly redistributed the seats, and after this Legislature got done with the seat which I represent they created somewhat of a predicament for anyone who represented that constituency. To get into one part of it I have to travel through the constituency of Notukeu-Willowbunch; to get into another part of it, I have to travel into the constituency of Weyburn, and to get into another part of it I have to travel into the constituency of Milestone; and into another portion of it I have to travel into the constituency of Gravelbourg. So now with the C.C.F. in the Gravelbourg constituency I am pleased to be able, to cover my constituency, to travel through areas which are represented by the C.C.F., which makes this very convenient for myself or anyone associated with me in that work.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that, about a week ago, we had two groups on two different occasions sitting on the floor of this Legislature from the University — a University group who are a part of the University Parliamentary Forum, and the Leader of the Opposition took some apparent satisfaction from the fact that the largest individual single group in that Parliamentary Forum was representative of the Liberal Party. I think there was one significant fact about the groups that visited us on those two occasions. One significant fact about the Parliamentary Forum at the University is that the representative from the School of Agriculture, every

February 18, 1952

single one of them, sat on the C.C.F. side. I do not doubt that what made the Liberals in the majority was possibly the Law Societies and the Law Colleges which employed them; but it is the School of Agriculture at the University which represents the practical agriculturists back in the country. It is these boys who go and attend the School of Agriculture who will come back and take a direct and active part in our agricultural industry. And the fact that they see fit, these future potential leaders of the agricultural economy of Saskatchewan, and are prepared today, to support the C.C.F., speaks well for the future of Saskatchewan, and I suggest that, as far as the rural areas of Saskatchewan are concerned, that future is indeed in good hands.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not doubt that during my brief remarks I will make some reference to items which some will construe as coming under Federal jurisdiction. I make no apologies if I do so, for, Mr. Speaker, there are certain basic economic principles which must be adopted within our Canadian economy to obtain a sane and sound, stable economy, and there are certain basic principles which affect all the people of Canada and all the people in Saskatchewan and affect all the governments of Saskatchewan, including this Government and including governments on a municipal level. I suggest to those people who would have us refrain from discussing those items under Federal jurisdiction which so directly affect us that they are betraying the trust that the people placed in them when they elected them to this Legislature. I suggest that the onus is upon them to give some leadership — if necessary, leadership to the Dominion of Canada — and certainly to give some leadership to the people of Saskatchewan in meeting and overcoming these problems which face us at this present time.

I note that the member for The Battlefords, in his short remarks this afternoon, suggests that, in reference to the old-age security which has been inaugurated finally by the Federal Government, they are now on the right track, and he further suggests that those things such as Unemployment Insurance, P.F.A.A., P.F.R.A., and Family Allowances are equally indicative of the fact that the Liberal Government is on the right track I suggest that they do indicate they are on the right track, but would also suggest that all of these are basically Socialist in principle, and furthermore, it has taken the combined efforts of not only the C.C.F., but the combined efforts of the C.C.F. along with other organized groups, to get the Liberal party on the right track, and it is going to continue to take the efforts of the same people to keep them on the right track.

He suggested that, on the basis of the returns we received for our 1950-51 crop, we got all that we could expect. Well, if that is all that the agricultural industry, by producing wheat as its main commodity here in Saskatchewan — if that is all that we can expect, I can assure you that we can expect very little. I agree that the Canadian Wheat Board, in marketing this wheat, may have done a good job; but I suggest that we should expect from Canadian society, through our Federal Government, much more than that — that they should be prepared to adopt that which has been advocated time and time again in this Legislature, namely, the principle of parity and apply it to our agricultural products.

I was interested in some of his forecastings as they affected the hospitalization plan here in Saskatchewan, and I could not help but think

that, as he was forecasting that times will get tough, he was forecasting the possible return of a Liberal regime in Saskatchewan, for that is one time when times will get tougher in this province. And that is, when, and if, we get a Liberal regime. No doubt if there ever was a Liberal regime returned to the province of Saskatchewan, we would have to curtail hospital expenditures; there just would not be any alternative but to do so.

I noticed in his reference to the Crown Corporations he attempted to keep himself from going too far out on a limb, but he did suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they would return the Telephone Corporation back to a service utility. Well, can anyone tell us that it has been anything different in the last seven or eight years? We have made it a true service utility, and approximately one out of every three telephones today used in the province of Saskatchewan has been installed since 1946. In 1950, we spent some capital expenditures of over \$3¼ million and, in addition to that, for renewals and reconstruction over \$834,000. Do you not agree that through this medium of investment of public funds in this Telephone Corporation we are indeed making it a true service utility?

He also suggests that in some respects private enterprise could have done a better job than we have been able to do through certain socialistic activities, and he suggests that possibly in the Department of Highways, through the medium of giving out contracts only to contractors rather than using our own construction crews, that we could have got greater road construction than we have at the present time. I think that we only have to compare our construction crews setting the standards and setting the price, as compared with the day of the Liberal regime when it was on a day-labour and rental basis, and costing this province an enormous amount of money for something they never got.

I was also interested in his reference to "Progress Report for 1952," and I do not doubt that they felt rather ashamed when they saw this come on their desks. Previous to 1944 there was no progress to report, and for that reason they could not submit a book anywhere near this size, nor anywhere near as colourful as the report submitted for 1952.

I also noticed from the hon. member from Wilkie, who spoke just previous to myself, that he suggested that the previous Government had problems of their day, and I will agree that they did have problems of their day; but by and large those problems were of their own making, and they never attempted to meet or propose any kind of solution to the problems that faced them at that time. I agree that there are natural hazards that face our agricultural industry, and I further agree that we cannot in entirety overcome those natural hazards. We have taken up agriculture as an occupation in this country realizing that there are natural hazards; but I think the onus is upon us that we shall not add to those natural hazards certain economic hazards that have faced us in the past.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the Speech from the Throne which was read to us there was reference made in the early part of that speech to the question of inflation, and the effect that it had on our Saskatchewan economy. This has been a problem which has faced us for a good many years, and it has certainly been facing us since 1945-46 when the Liberal Government at Ottawa, and the Liberal Party out on the hustings promised us that they would inaugurate a system of orderly decontrol. It takes no economist

February 18, 1952

to tell us that there is no such creature as an orderly decontrol, and what they suggested would be an orderly decontrol has turned out to be a disorderly uncontrolled inflation.

The Minister of Education, this afternoon, referred to the resolution which was passed, one year ago, unanimously by the House, asking for the reimposition of price control, and subsidies where necessary. Not only did this Legislature do it, but practically every organized group in Canada who had the interest of the common people at heart, had passed similar resolutions and made similar requests for a system of price control and subsidies, and we have, since the resolution was passed in this House, seen a steady increase in the cost of living, and also an increased cost of production of our agricultural commodities, which has further thrown out of line that which we received for our products when we sell them, and the cost of production. We have today a greater disparity than we had one year ago; and what action did the Federal Government take to attempt to meet this problem? Did they put on new price controls and inaugurate or put back in subsidies? Not by a long ways, Mr. Speaker. At this last Session, for weeks in the House of Commons, and page after page of it is in Hansard, was the discussion of retail maintenance legislation done through an amendment to the Combines Investigation Act. This may have some merit, insofar as it may influence competition on a retail level. To that extent it may have some merit; but on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, when we are living in a society in which we have too much competition and not enough co-operation, some of those merits will not be so great. But I will undertake to assure that the retail maintenance legislation will not reduce the cost of living by one point of one per cent. On the contrary, I think that we will see the effect of this legislation will, to some extent, increase the cost of living and it can very well increase the present disparity between our cost of production and those things we have to buy.

Mr. J.E. McCormack (Souris-Estevan): Are you opposed to the retail price maintenance legislation?

Mr. Brown: I am opposed to it if it is a substitution for price controls and subsidies which the people of Canada want, and not that which we are getting through the Retail Maintenance legislation. I suggest that as a solution to our problem it is far from adequate, and it is certainly not what the people of Saskatchewan want in its entirety.

I further suggest that the only means in which we can reduce the cost of living and also reduce the cost of our production, is through an adequate system of price control and subsidies, and an adequate system of price controls presupposes that we shall adopt here in Canada the principle of parity prices, and we passed a resolution here, one year ago, that this principle be adopted, particularly as it affects wheat — a resolution introduced by myself and seconded by the member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst), and it was only natural that the Liberal Government at Ottawa refuses to put in price control when the Liberal Opposition here in Saskatchewan votes against adopting the principle of parity as it affects our main commodity, wheat, as it did so here one year ago.

I suggest that this increased cost of living has affected this Government as it has affected all the people of Saskatchewan and by virtue of the fact that we have had this inflation in increased cost of

living, it has reduced the material services which this Government or any other government in Saskatchewan could give to its people. It has reduced the purchasing power of the mill on a municipal level, and it is equally true that it has reduced the purchasing power of the mill in providing educational facilities through our school districts. It has affected all branches of life, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if we are to have this re-armament programme, it should be done on the basis of equality of economic sacrifice, and this can only be done through the curbing of the unprecedented profits which at the present time exist.

A little later on in the Speech from the Throne reference was made to the Prairie Grain Producers' Interim Financing Act. The member for Milestone (Mr. Erb), in moving this Address, enumerated several of the difficulties (and there were many) that we encountered in harvesting. We had tough and damp grain to contend with; we had a low initial payment to contend with; we had no reserve upon which we could draw, for we had the settlement of the 1950-51 crop year which had no relationship to parity and no relationship to the increased cost of production that had occurred. There were indeed, many problems facing the farmers of Saskatchewan this fall, but there was one other aspect which faced a goodly number, not necessarily all the farmers of Saskatchewan, and that was the desire and the hope of giving some assistance economically to those farmers who had unthreshed and undelivered grain. There were many suggestions and offers made. The Government of Saskatchewan made proposals and offers to the Federal Government. The Farmers' Union did likewise, and the Association of Rural Municipalities, realizing this was an enormous problem, made their suggestions and their offer of help. The suggestion was made that advances could be made to farmers through the Wheat Board on the same basis as advances are made in the early part of the crop season before the price has been set; advances made through the Wheat Board which would not necessarily bear any interest to the producer or the individual farmer who had received the advance, with the responsibility of these advances through the Wheat Board being on the Federal Government. But what was the action taken? Once again it was an action which was definitely too late. It came in December, and was definitely too late.

The suggestion and the proposal made and enacted by the Federal Government was that they would make loans to the farmers not to exceed \$1,000 to any one individual farmer, and the maximum that could be loaned under the Act would be \$20 millions. These were loans not to be made by the Federal Government, but loans made by the bank, on which the Federal Government undertook to guarantee them 25 per cent. There were several peculiar things about this Interim Financing Act. One of them was that if any of the individual farmers had sold any amount of grain, the amount he sold was subtracted from the amount that he could qualify for under the law, which meant that where a farmer who had been able to thresh and deliver say 1,000 bushels of wheat and had the majority of his crop still out under the snow, his returns for the 1,000 bushels of wheat were needed to meet the harvesting expenses which had already been encountered, he could not qualify for any assistance under this loan Act, in spite of his need.

Furthermore, they suggested that the rate of interest would be the prevailing rate in that particular district. Further, this first grain delivered to the elevator would be the first charged against this

loan. This was the way the Federal Government dealt with this enormous problem which faced a large number of farmers in Saskatchewan, and in Western Canada in general this fall.

I think there are one or two very significant features about this, and the first one is that the banks were the ones to receive the consideration. It was the banks who received the guarantee on the aggregate loan that the bank made — their guarantee up to 25 per cent; the bank just cannot lose on this deal, and they are about the only ones who cannot lose in the business. And you will further note, Mr. Speaker, that this guarantee is made only to the banks, which are the credit facilities of big business. Your and my credit facilities, the Credit Unions, were not given the opportunity of having the same guarantee placed behind the loans which they were making to the farmers, as were the banks. Talk about discrimination — you certainly see it there. And further, Mr. Speaker, any credit extended under the provisions of this Act will be extended on the basis of security and not on the basis of need; so it is very likely that those people most in need will not be able to take advantage of it.

And further, Mr. Speaker, the Wheat Pool — our own marketing organization — offered to undertake this rather than the bank, and they were turned down and not given this guarantee, and it was done through the bank. And further, Mr. Speaker, I think it is significant to note that when this catastrophe (and I don't think it was much short of a catastrophe in most parts of this province) which we had, this fall, the Federal Government was not prepared to come through with one red cent to meet the situation in that regard. They have not yet even so far given the farmers of those areas any assurance that they will have any protection under the P.F.A.A., if they are unable to harvest the crop this fall, it will be because of crop failure, and get the benefits of the P.F.A.A. The question was asked them in the House of Commons and they refused to give it consideration. Once again it will be a question of too little and too late.

I was interested in the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition in his address, and those of the member from Melfort, and today of the member from Wilkie, in connection with a part of the Speech from the Throne which suggests that a Royal Commission will be set up to study the agricultural society of Saskatchewan. I suppose they are suggesting that they know all the answers in this rapidly changing economy, yet the only answer they have suggested, and the only solution which they have attempted to inaugurate is to adopt a "laissez faire" policy and let things drift where they may. There are many problems facing the agricultural economy, today, which I do not know the answer to, and to which I think the majority of members in this House do not know all the answers. We have reached the stage in our agricultural economy in which we are highly mechanized, and we have got to relate our agricultural economy to a changing economy, not only agricultural, but also to a developing industrial economy here in Saskatchewan. We have the high cost of production to contend with, and to meet this we are developing in certain parts of the province co-operative farms. Possibly they are the answer to some of our problems, but we do not know, and I do not think any of us can assure ourselves that they are necessarily all the answers to all the problems.

There is also one important aspect which I never heard any of the hon. members of the Opposition attempt to give an answer to, and that is: how has the change in our agricultural economy affected the family farm and what is the future of the family farm? I think it is only right that study should be given, and serious study, to our agricultural economy by an independent and unbiased royal commission which can submit a report to this Legislature, and upon which possibly some further action can be made. For one thing is certain, Mr. Speaker, Agriculture must not continue to be made the poor relation within the Canadian economy, and if this Royal Commission can come up with the solution and an answer to any one of the problems which I have raised, it will indeed have served a useful purpose, and it can give some suggestions and some leadership not only to this Government but to all phases of our agricultural and Canadian economy, then it will have rendered its service.

May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there are none so blind as those who will not see, and I suggest that what those who have spoken so disparagingly of the suggestions of a royal commission to inquire into our agricultural economy are afraid of is that it will bring to light those things contrary to what they want to advocate. I further suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition are the last people who should talk about the inadvisability of royal commissions. If they want to talk about the inadvisability of royal commissions they should direct their remarks to the Federal Minister of Agriculture as Saskatchewan's representative in the Federal Cabinet, which set up a commission to investigate the feasibility of the South Saskatchewan River project, a project which has been proven without a doubt to be practical and to have an economic value not only for agriculture in the form of irrigation, but also for power with a potential industrial development. Furthermore, when we see that this Government is willing to co-operate to the extent of one-third of the cost of the project, or approximately \$33 million, we can only surmise, Mr. Speaker, that this commission of theirs is not for the purpose necessarily of obtaining a report on the feasibility, but rather it is a delaying tactic to delay it so that it can be used in the Liberal platform for another election, as it has been used so often in the past.

But as far as the Commission which has been suggested in the Speech from the Throne, our farm organizations see the need of such a Commission, for they suggest that they do not know all the answers, and it would appear that everybody is out of step except the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Melfort, and, today, the hon. member for Wilkie. But realizing that this Commission can find some of the answers and add to the knowledge of what we already know, in our efforts to stabilize our agricultural economy, this Government has done much to stabilize our economy and improve the agricultural economy in Saskatchewan.

Under the leadership of our Minister of Agriculture, we have set up our Conservation and Development Branch, which has established irrigation projects, drainage projects and are undertaking soil conservation and proper utilization, reclaiming land that was formerly out of production and pushing back the frontiers and bringing more land into production. We here in Saskatchewan, with our jurisdiction over production, are doing something to stabilize the agriculture economy. We are not only making it possible to increase production, but, under the leadership of the Minister of Agriculture, we are undertaking to save that increased production through the

February 18, 1952

medium of extensive and extended weed control, and grasshopper control. And to further stabilize the agricultural industry, for instance in connection with earned assistance programme which was put into effect by this Government, this Department, last year, spent over \$150,000 in making it possible for those people who were willing to help themselves to stabilize their economy, and indicating that we are prepared to help them, and that the Government and this Department are building up a reserve in the form of fodder reserves and seed banks with which to meet the very situation which the hon. member for Wilkie suggested faced the former Governments in the 'thirties.

I suggest that through these mediums, we here in Saskatchewan, on the production level, are doing our utmost to stabilize the agricultural economy.

Then, as we look at the Speech from the Throne, what it forecasts indicates that this Government is going to continue to do what it can within its jurisdiction to stabilize the agricultural economy and the agricultural industry.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that you call it six o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: — The House will recess until eight o'clock.

The Assembly resumed at eight o'clock p.m.

Mr. Brown (Continuing): Mr. Speaker, before we recessed, I was outlining some of the things which the Department of Agriculture had done to stabilize the agricultural economy in Saskatchewan — those things that it has in its power to do and that it had been successfully able to do.

However, there are many other factors which this Government has undertaken, other than through the Department of Agriculture, which has done much towards stabilizing our main industry in Saskatchewan. I could, for instance, mention the work that the Department of Highways has done by building an integrated highway system throughout the province which has made it possible for our agricultural economy to expand and work more effectively and not only in its integrated network and the building of a good provincial highway system has it been felt in connection with the agricultural economy, but also the fact that the Department of Highways has seen fit to give greatly increased assistance to municipalities in the construction of their main rural market roads to a much greater degree than was done previously. This has been a factor, I think, in creating some stability in our agricultural industry.

I could also make reference to the power projects which have been undertaken in the last six or seven years, not only in reference to the main transmission lines which have been built throughout the province, but also through the accelerated rural electrification programme (I will refer a little more to this later); but also in connection with the stabilizing of our economy, the fact that this Government has undertaken to encourage and develop the co-operative movement has been an important factor

as well, by developing projects, such as our co-operative farms, for better land utilization, the development of the co-operative farm machinery associations for better utilization of farm implements and farm machinery, and also by encouraging people, particularly in rural areas, to work together and thus attain a higher standard of living, thus making it possible to achieve for themselves more returns from the products which they produce.

Considering what has gone before and what this Government has been able to do in that regard, and noting what is forecast for the future in the Speech from the Throne, together with answers that might come out of the report submitted by the commission on agricultural economy, and with the co-operation of all governments, farm organizations and other groups in Saskatchewan, Saskatchewan, as an agricultural province, may more properly, as the member for Milestone (Mr. Erb) so ably put it, better meet her date with destiny.

The Premier, in his speech the other day, suggested that the C.C.F.'s main programme, in its first term of office, was Security; in the second term of office, Development; and in the third term of office it will be Expansion. I think, if we look at the Speech from the Throne in that respect — on the basis of security, development and expansion, that we can realize more clearly the trail upon which we are travelling; and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we have not as yet reached the optimum in society security that the people here in Saskatchewan want and desire. We have been able to inaugurate such schemes as hospitalization, air ambulance, cancer treatment and complete care for aged citizens who are in need of this care; and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in these things, Saskatchewan ploughed new furrows and blazed new trails. While the future development of increased social security may not be quite so spectacular as that in the past, I am satisfied that all members of the Legislature will agree that the rest of Canada, and, indeed, the rest of the North American continent, is looking towards Saskatchewan to give them leadership in extending our social security programme. I suggest that they will be expecting us to blaze new trails in other fields as well.

And what is the alternative to what has been suggested as the programme which we have outlined and which we have inaugurated in the province of Saskatchewan? A year ago, and the year before that, we heard much talk of the proposal by the members of the Opposition, and one of the things which they would do, if elected to power, would be, for instance, to decentralize our hospitalization plan. They suggested that our hospitalization plan in Saskatchewan was top-heavy and the centralization of administration was not necessarily good. They were suggesting, I think, at that time — although you do not hear the suggestion made so repeatedly now, although no doubt it is in the back of their minds — that they would turn back our hospitalization scheme from a provincial scheme to a municipal scheme. They suggest that they would turn back to the municipalities the Public Revenue Tax which yields to this province approximately \$1.6 million, and at the same time they turned back to the municipalities this Public Revenue Tax they would turn back to them a burden which is costing the people of the province of Saskatchewan, collectively, many times that which is collected in Public Revenue Tax.

It is also possible that, with a scheme such as the hospitalization scheme, we would find in Saskatchewan the same results as they have

found in British Columbia, where we have an administration made up of political stripe similar to that of the Opposition; and when we compare what we have been able to do here in Saskatchewan, under our programme of believing in social security to all the people, and a programme put into effect by a philosophy which does not necessarily believe in complete social security, you find an enormous difference. You find an enormous difference in the cost of administration; you find an enormous difference in the method of administration; and you find an enormous difference in what it is costing the people of British Columbia as compared to what it is costing the people of Saskatchewan.

We also note that in the Speech from the Throne there is an indication of the trail which we will follow in a third term of office, with regard to expanding those social security measures that we are extending to ourselves, collectively, and particularly to those people who are least able to take care of themselves. For instance, reference is made to the increased mothers' allowance which will be introduced at this Session, and also the fact that the age-group 65 to 69 who come under old age assistance will have their hospitalization paid for them by the people of Saskatchewan, through this Government. What I have said in connection with health — the security and the development and expansion of that security — is equally true when we apply it, for instance, in the field of education, as was explained so ably here this afternoon by our Minister of Education.

Let me, for a brief moment, turn to the question of industrial development and exploration of our natural resources in the province of Saskatchewan. Previous to 1944, we had untold, untapped natural resources here in this province; but nothing was done in a concrete manner, nor was encouragement given to develop those natural resources. We have the great north land of which we have heard considerable, and we all know of the intensive search which is going on at the present moment for base metals in that area. In addition to that the search and development and the expansion of uranium development in the far north — a mineral which, in the hands of certain people can be a curse to humanity, but a mineral which, properly developed, and in the proper hands, can be a boon to the entire civilization. I think it is interesting to note that this mineral is being developed by a means which the members of the Opposition have been opposed to on so many occasions, and that when it is being developed by a Crown corporation, it is being developed by all of the people. It is possible that if the philosophy which was expounded here last Session was applied in the Federal field, this Crown Corporation would likewise be thrown out the window. And while we have had considerable development in our minerals in the north, the south country has not been forgotten and undeveloped; and we find development there in connection with oil, gas, clay, coal, salt and sodium sulphate; and these industries, when they are developed and expanded, as they will be expanded in our third term of office, lend themselves to a position where they can supplement and complement the great agricultural industry in southern Saskatchewan. Along with the development of these, we see the Department of Natural Resources developing and conserving those (as our Minister of Natural Resources refers to them) "replaceable resources," such as fish and forests, in such a manner that we, today, obtain the optimum from those resources, and at the same time conserve them for future generations who will come after us.

So, Mr. Speaker, we in Saskatchewan are no longer on the eve of an era of development of our natural resources in the interests of the people, but rather we are in the midst of it. It becomes a question of expansion. Those who, today, are investing in the development and expansion of our industrial development and natural resources realize that as long as they do what they are expected to do and do not exploit the people to whom these natural resources belong, they have nothing to fear.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that we should emphasize that the expansion in our industrial development, in our agricultural economy, will be in the interests of the people; and we have been able to do this through setting up Crown Corporations to undertake to develop certain aspects. We have been prepared to encourage the co-operative movement to undertake industrial development within the province. And if, as has been suggested, Crown Corporations as a medium of social ownership are to be thrown out the window, it is equally logical to assume that they will be thrown out of the province, and we will go back to those days when we had uncontrolled and unregulated development, but it resulted in no development at all. It will mean that we will lose that development which we have had. It could mean that we could reverse the trend that has been created and set by this Government and once again Saskatchewan could become the happy hunting ground for exploitation by outside interests. I trust that the people of Saskatchewan will never see the day which my hon. friend from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) refers to as a joke — of Saskatchewan being exploited, as it has been exploited, by outside interests, and those people who have only the wish to take out that which they can in the shortest possible time.

I suggested, a few moments ago, that I would make one or two remarks in connection with power. Power, as related to agriculture, can mean a great deal to any of us engaged in agriculture. It can be the greatest single factor in industrial development within the province, and as related to the work that is presently going on in connection with our minerals, particularly gas and oil, it indicates that here is a cheap source of power to create a greater source of power which can be fed along the network that is presently being built. It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that when we, back in 1944, undertook to lay the basis for an integrated network of power lines in the province, it was the members who then sat in the Opposition who opposed and opposed it on every possible ground; and it is indicated in the Speech from the Throne that, this year, there will be an expansion of this work on the building of this integrated network.

Reference has been made by speakers of the Opposition about our rural electrification programme, and I have suggested that an accelerated rural electrification programme can do much towards stabilizing our agricultural industry. One of the suggestions made by the Leader of the Opposition was that he was going to provide, if elected, cheaper and faster rural electrification. I suggest that if he is going to look into the future and forecast what it would be possible for him to do, if he ever did get elected in this province, that he should look back on what they attempted to do and what they did do previous to 1944 and, as an Opposition, what they did and attempted to do after 1944.

Previous to 1944, we here in the province had to start from less than scratch as far as a power network in the province was concerned. Certain companies, privately-owned, had the cream of the country. They were in the area in which it was possible to sell electricity, and were

February 18, 1952

not particularly interested in extending those services into areas which it was obvious would not be profitable as far as returns on investment were concerned. And when it was suggested that we should bring those companies, which had the cream of the country, into an integrated network, and make those people, who had the facilities of power and who were in a position to obtain power at a low rate, make some contribution to extending that same facility to other areas which were less able to pay, it was the Liberal Opposition who most emphatically opposed it.

My hon. friends undertake to compare rural electrification programme here in Saskatchewan with that of other provinces. I am quite willing to compare what we have done here in Saskatchewan, in the short space of some six years, with any other province in the Dominion of Canada — yes, and compare it with any of the States in the United States. We did it here in Saskatchewan, and we did it alone. We had no outside help whatsoever, which is certainly not true of many of the States in the United States, where the Federal Government made available loans at low rates, and in some cases no rates of interest at all, which gave those States an opportunity to expand their rural electrification at the scale they have been able to maintain.

And to compare with Manitoba, where they had a power corporation, or a power commission, which, for 20 to 25 years had a large and integrated system. They have been selling power to the city of Winnipeg for some 20 to 25 years, and they were able to build up a reserve, and it was out of that reserve that they were able to undertake a rural electrification programme in the province of Manitoba. In six years, in Saskatchewan, we have set a record that I think the rest of Canada can look upon with amazement; and we are, today, putting power into more sparsely settled areas than many of the other provinces of Canada, and indeed in many of the States of the United States.

What could happen to this programme of rural electrification that has been started and put into effect by this Government if the day ever comes when my friends in the Opposition are in power? Well, once again, I think that we have only to look at their past record and look at what they were prepared to do with projects in which the people of Saskatchewan had invested public money. I can refer you to one instance in particular, and that was the briquetting plant at Estevan, in which the people of Saskatchewan had invested a considerable amount of money and which was sold for the sum of \$1. I am not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal Party would be prepared to sell our Power Corporation, which has been built up by investing public funds in it, for \$1, but I would not want to lay too great odds that they would not be prepared to sell it for \$10 or \$15.

Eight years ago, in the province of Saskatchewan, rural electrification was strictly a dream. With the policies then in effect, it could remain nothing more or nothing less than a dream; but as a result of the action which the people took, in 1944, as a result of the actions which this Government has taken since 1944, that has been a dream come true

In the Speech from the Throne we see further development and expansion of this important factor in our life today. Take any other branch or activity of this Government — and there are many of them, as my hon. friends can find as they read “Progress 1952.” Take any of these activities

and branches, and the story of development and expansion is the same. The story of expansion and development is the same. The seeds which this Government sowed, in 1944, are indeed beginning to bear fruit, and we are seeing a more stabilized agricultural economy; we are seeing social and economic development, and we are forecasting for the future, as outlined in the Speech from the Throne, that the years ahead will be similar to those in the past, with the accent on Expansion.

So, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the Amendment, but rather I support the Motion on the grounds that it will, under the administration of this Government, provide us with an expanding economy, and I am in the firm belief that this is yet another milestone along the road to complete economic and social security.

Mr. J.R. Denike (Torch River): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the members of the Legislature to examine carefully a pamphlet which appeared on their desks some time today. It is entitled, "The Carrot River — The Pas Highway Joint Submission." It just happens that I have another booklet about the same size entitled, "A square deal for Agriculture," by Walter Tucker. I would suggest, though, the pamphlet which has appeared on your desk does, even though it is somewhat innocuous-looking, carry a better deal for agriculture than that suggested by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. This brief brings up a wide subject of land in the province of Saskatchewan and draws attention to an editorial prepared by the editor of the "Hudson Bay Post" last year. He made reference to this area in north-eastern Saskatchewan, which is referred to in the brief which you have before you and the editor of the "Hudson Bay Post" said that:

"This undeveloped suitable agricultural area has a potential invested wealth of upwards of \$100 million. This could have been added to the economy of this Province during the past six years but it has been kept hidden by the C.C.F. and their member for Tisdale. Since 1945 more than sufficient men and women and more than sufficient agricultural capital has left Saskatchewan to have fully developed this huge tract of ideal farm land."

There are some very pertinent points brought out in the brief prepared by the Carrot River — The Pas Agricultural Development Association and I want to draw your attention to two or three of these very pertinent points.

Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural Resources): — The Liberals burned the timber off.

Mr. Denike: The P.F.R.A. has now undertaken the work of the water situation at the east end of the area known as the Carrot River Triangle, which has been causing difficulties in the past years due to flooding by the Saskatchewan River and the Carrot River. The area is

February 18, 1952

1,326 square miles, and or about 8½ thousand acres and when it was checked over by the Department of the Interior Reclamation Service in the early years of 1920, it was then estimated that the reclamation was quite feasible and presented no engineering difficulties. Evidently the editor of the “Hudson Bay Post” has not investigated the history of this area very closely or he would have known that as far back as 1920 and even as far back as 1912 the area has been investigated and suggested as being a feasible project for agriculture. The estimated cost of the development at that time was about \$8 million with a maintenance cost of about \$500,000 per year. This organization feels that the time is now ripe to go ahead with the project and they say “we have the dam at Outlook in the making,” which will hold back the rushwaters at The Pas. I am afraid that the writers of this brief are quite sanguine about the whole thing. They do not know exactly what they are dealing with.

I have an extract here from Walter Tucker’s “Square Deal for Agriculture,” 1948, in which he refers to the Outlook dam. He said:

“This report tabled at the 1940 Session of Parliament declared the South Saskatchewan project to be feasible.”

And he went on to say that it would cost at that time about \$66 million and,

“The scheme would not only bring large areas of Saskatchewan land under irrigation, but surplus power developed by the water would be available. The report was tabled in response to my motion. I was of the opinion that the facts should be placed before the people of Canada as a basis for public discretion.”

I believe that the Leader of the Opposition did place the facts before the people of Saskatchewan, at least, in 1949 and they did return a preponderance of Liberal candidates at that time, which meant that the people of Saskatchewan were sympathetic to the idea, but where is the dam? I am afraid that the people of the Carrot River — The Pas area will have to wait some considerable time if they are going to wait upon the good graces of the Leader of the Opposition if a dam is required to control the flood waters in that area.

In tonight’s “Leader-Post” a piece from the Bureau of Publications indicates that Crown land was being opened to settlers. These Crown lands are in the Tisdale area, Big River and Choiceland areas — about 80,000 acres. This is some distance away from the project that the Carrot River — The Pas group are fostering, but it is significant here that 80,000 acres of land are being opened up in that area after considerable expense by the Department of Agriculture. Practically all of that is bushland which has been cleared and broken at a cost of \$25 to \$35 per acre. Certainly the Department of Agriculture would not spend \$25 to \$35 per acre to clear and break land if there should be easily available land in the Carrot River Triangle to be made available at a cost of about \$10 per acre. There is a lot more to it than just advertising the fact that it is there. Certainly the Minister of Natural Resources has not kept it a secret. It has been well

known all along. The former Liberal Government seemingly neglected survey in that particular area. As a matter of fact, the township survey east of Range 10 has not been carried out and never was carried out. It looks as though the former Liberal Governments were not prepared to take cognizance of the fact that the population of Saskatchewan might grow at some future time. They were going to let events look after themselves, the lack of planning characteristic of the Liberal Party in all political fields. No soil survey had been taken and no drainage, which is of paramount importance in that particular area. 15,000 acres have been developed at The Pas by the Manitoba Government. This is on more of an experimental basis and the land is allotted on a three-year lease. The Manitoba Government takes responsibility for what takes place. Last year the people farming at The Pas suffered as severely and worse than the people in the older established parts of Saskatchewan. Duck damage was extremely severe in that particular area. As it happens that area is on the duck flyaway between the south and north and the fields of grain at The Pas were, I suppose you might call it, "duck-soup" for ducks. The Manitoba Government has carried out some development projects in the area and developed on a plan somewhat similar to the Saskatchewan plan. The only thing is that land there which is developed for settlement has been sold to the highest bidder. That is a plan quite common to capitalist governments, to Liberal governments of the past. That has been done in Saskatchewan also.

Last year I mentioned holdings that were held by one man in the Moose Range Development area, something like 26 quarters that had been acquired by one man. C.C.F. policies would not permit that situation to develop and I think that the hon. members of the Opposition have their answer to the depopulation problem right there. They have not taken any steps, they have not made any provision to prevent depopulation in the Province.

There is another point that the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff) is going to have some difficulty in clearing up when he goes out campaigning when the next election does take place. Yes, several points. But one in particular is in reference to the disposition of the Crown lands, or Federal lands in the John Smith Indian Reserve. This matter was mentioned by the Hon. Minister of Natural Resources last year. I think that the hon. member for Melfort will likely meet with a pretty hot welcome when he goes out in that area to speak to farmers who have petitioned for that land which has been leased to wealthy business men in the towns of Melfort, Tisdale and Carrot River.

The matter of loss of population in the Province of Saskatchewan has caused considerable concern to the members of the Opposition but I fail to find that it has caused concern to anybody else in Saskatchewan. I have spoken to many farmers asking them how they feel about the loss of population in Saskatchewan. They are not particularly worried about it. They have not considered the matter because the farmer is an independent individual who operates in his own sweet way and he is a man upon whom we depend — agriculture is the basic industry in Saskatchewan. For that reason, whatever is good for the farmer is good for the rest of us. So we would wonder why the members of the Opposition are so interested in the matter of loss of population. The answer, perhaps, is here and might have been involved in Walter Tucker's "Square Deal of Agriculture," but the last issue of

February 18, 1952

“Saturday Night” indicated that almost as long as Canada has been a white man’s country it has lost population to the United States. Saskatchewan particularly is listed here. In the 1920s as many as 100,000 Canadians migrated to the United States in a single year. This movement continues but the widening of employment here and awareness of the growing opportunities in this country have reduced the loss to about 20,000 a year.

The Premier indicated that the loss from Saskatchewan has been reduced to a trickle, about 1,000 a year. The loss from Canada is about 20,000 per year. This is Walter Tucker’s “Square Deal for Agriculture” in referring to the Outlook dam:

“It is estimated that irrigated land would support 10 times its present population. Thus commercial, banking, industrial, railways and other enterprises would benefit from the increase in business which would result directly from the increase in population.”

That is a rather broad statement to include in the “Square Deal for Agriculture.” It sounds like a square deal for big business.

On January 20 of last year Mr. Tucker addressed an audience in Moose Jaw. Mr. Tucker said he was laughed at when he had asserted that the Liberal Party would increase social services and decrease taxation at the same time in Saskatchewan if his Party came into power. He said this could be done by encouraging the development of the province’s resources which we did not do. May I refer the hon. Leader of the Opposition to the copy of the “Saskatchewan News.” Of course, I know that it has been laughed at but . . .

Mr. W.A. Tucker: You will be changing the name of that . . .

Mr. Denike: Really, he should read this. This tells about Saskatchewan’s Big Muddy abandoned and tells about a wildcat well which has been drilled to the depth of 10,000 — 10,238 feet and finally abandoned. And the total cost of this well was in the neighbourhood of \$600,000. It does not sound there as if the C.C.F. had failed in attracting capital into Saskatchewan to develop its resources.

While I am on this point I would like to point out just how important the “Saskatchewan News” is to the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Tucker: (Interruption).

Mr. Denike: Last week I heard three Government members quizzing the Minister of Natural Resources about the oil business and how it is operated.

Mr. Tucker: For a good reason, all right.

Some Hon. Member (Opposition): He did not tell them, I bet you.

Mr. J.R. Denike (Torch River): Just what the necessity for another pipeline would be, the technical aspects of the oil business.

Some Hon. Member (Opposition): You know more about it than he does.

Mr. Denike: And I will admit that I was not familiar with the information contained in this issue of the "Saskatchewan News" and I am doubtful that very many of the members of the Opposition would be cognizant of what is in this. I think some of the information contained there is extremely important to the people of Saskatchewan who might be in danger of being hoodwinked by sharp operators who, as we know, are phoning people long distances and who are around selling stock. There is one article about people in general being unfamiliar as to the reason why an oil well is capped. They think that when the oil well is capped that means that oil has been discovered and the oil company has decided to save that oil for future reference and when the times comes they will open it up and sell it. People think that after a well has been sunk 1,000 or 2,000 feet likely oil has been discovered. The capping process, however, is obligatory upon the driller. In the case of the Big Muddy well two or three cement plugs had to be installed in the well, had to be placed in the well and the well had to be finally capped with a steel top welded on. The reason for that is to prevent the escape of salt water which might pollute the neighbouring country and destroy valuable agricultural land.

To get back to the people who laughed at Mr. Tucker. I have here a summary of some of the promises that were made in 1948 in connection with the square deal for agriculture. He is going to spend at least \$2 million more of the Provincial funds for education at the first Session of the Legislature under Liberal Government. And that the Liberal Party will increase school grants so that all land taxation can be reduced. The grants will be made on an equalization basis to permit a greater reduction on poorer lands. And also, at the first Session of the Legislature under a Liberal Government, at least \$1,600,000 will be voted to the municipalities.

Mr. Tucker: Hear, hear.

Mr. Denike: But the municipal grant has been raised from \$500 to \$3,500.

Mr. Tucker: But you promised that you . . . You told us . . .

Mr. Denike: And here is an editorial of November 16, 1950 in the "Leader-Post" — "The Liberals Draft a Programme."

"Among other things the convention went on record in favour of extending huge chunks of financial aid to all phases of education. It outbid the C.C.F. in offering to pay for full maintenance of the secondary highways and to increase grants in municipalities for market roads. And it promises to improve the present hospitalization system by increasing efficiency and to extend it to cover medical, dental and other services."

This was a programme designed, apparently, to meet the C.C.F. on its own ground, but there were doubts voiced that in one sense the programme was too liberal. As one delegate asked, "Where is the money coming from?"

February 18, 1952

But taken together they seem to us to be so ambitious that we doubt whether any government at Regina could begin to implement them all out of the resources of this province alone. This was from a “Star-Phoenix” editorial of November 16, 1950, the “Star-Phoenix” of the same date:

“We suspected that one of the reasons why the Liberals in this province have not met with too much success in recent years is that their platform lacked positive appeal. The Party seemed intent on concentrating its artillery on the defects of the C.C.F. policy and administration without bringing forward anything very much in the way of an alternative.”

The “Star-Phoenix” of the same date:

“Moreover there is some evidence that the C.C.F. record has been studied carefully, closely and that there is no desire to throw the baby out with the water.”

That accounts for the soft pedal criticism of some of the C.C.F. innovations last year and you will notice that this year the Liberal Opposition seems to lack a lot of the steam that it has had in the first two years of the Legislature. I am glad to see the members of the Opposition looking so well after their crow feast and the hon. member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. McCormack), seems to be enjoying his brick plant.

Mr. J.E. McCormack: When are you going to get it running?

Mr. Denike: The Convention appears to have place a good deal of trust in an extension of Federal grants to enable it to carry out the programme it drew up.

“We think this attitude is unrealistic,” — This is the “Star-Phoenix” editor — “and we suspect many delegates will agree with us when they have a chance to see the work of their busy two-day meeting in their proper perspectives. If so, they will have the chance in the two years or so before election time to whittle this new platform down until its promises carry more weight than they do now.”

Mr. Tucker: You have a lot of faith in the editor. Nice that you have something to laugh about, you won’t laugh long, I am afraid. He who laughs last, laughs best.

Mr. Denike: There is a comment in the “Saturday Night” of November 28, 1950:

“An impartial observer at the recent Liberal Convention at Saskatoon must have left with but one thought in mind. ‘Where is the money coming from?’”

There is another item in connection with the Liberal Convention dealing with power that is quite interesting and pertinent in the light of what the Liberal Opposition have to say about their attitude towards farm electrification:

“More provincial help for municipalities in the form of increased education grants and increased municipal grants for market roads was reaffirmed as Liberal policy. Farm electrification at reasonable rates as advocated by the Convention provided the loophole should it be discovered that heavy state subsidization is not feasible because of lack of money.”

Mr. Speaker, I have brought out these points in connection with the Liberal platform of 1948 and the Liberal Convention of 1950, the criticism of their own people who wondered where the money is coming from to carry out these grandiose schemes and the comments of the various editors who are also wondering just which way the Liberal Party is going. I think that this points to a very definite lack of confidence among the supporters of the Liberal Party itself. It is not necessary for us then to emphasize that the people of Saskatchewan will be equally doubtful when the time comes.

I support the Motion.

Mr. R.A. McCarthy (Cannington): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I would like to compliment the hon. member for Milestone (Mr. Erb), the mover of the Motion, and I would especially like to compliment the member from Gravelbourg (Mr. Walker) for his effort. They both did a fine job considering the material they had to work on. I do not think anybody could have done a better job. As I said, I would like especially to compliment the member from Gravelbourg. I do not particularly like the party he is representing here, but I am glad to see such a young man in the Legislature; and being young, I am quite sure that, as time goes on, he may see the light and transfer his affiliation to a party that has a little broader outlook on the problems of this province than the one he presently belongs to.

I would like, at this time, Mr. Speaker, to bring the attention of the Legislature to something that happened and I refer to the family of Youngs who won the Nipawin car bonspiel. That was quite an honour to come to the constituency which I represent. We had a member from Saskatoon (Mr. Stone) talking about the win of his high school team, and I was proud of that too; but after all that is not in the same class as a world bonspiel, and that Nipawin affair is a world bonspiel. This was won by a family from Cannington. Mr. Young Sr. is a pioneer of that district and his three sons, who curled with him, learned their curling in the curling town of Carlyle. It was an honour to Saskatchewan, to Cannington and especially to the town of Carlyle that they won that event. I would like also, to refer to the fact that Dr. Hewitt, also a resident of Carlyle, won the southern championship in the Brier contest, and we hope he will go on to represent Saskatchewan in the Dominion finals.

February 18, 1952

Before I begin discussing the Throne Speech proper, I would like to make a few remarks about something that the member from Bengough (Mr. Brown) said a little while ago, with regard to the Saskatchewan River dam. Like a lot of the other things he was talking about, he was quite a piece off his base. My understanding of the Saskatchewan River dam is that the Dominion Government have agreed to build the dam at a cost of somewhere between \$100 and \$150 million — I do not think anyone can say definitely what it will be. It is, as I understand it, the provincial responsibility, after the dam is built, to construct the works for irrigation and power or whatever use they care to make of it. So, for the member from Bengough to say that the Saskatchewan Government had guaranteed to put up one-third of the cost of the dam is absolutely away from the facts, Mr. Speaker. The fact is, the Dominion Government, when and if they do build it, will pay for the dam; the Saskatchewan Government's responsibility will be to construct the irrigation and power works from it; so when he said they would guarantee one-third of the cost of the dam he was a way off his base.

Premier Douglas: Would the member like a dam without any lateral ditches?

Mr. McCarthy: The Premier heard what I said, and I think I was quite explicit . . .

Premier Douglas: Explicit, and wide of the mark.

Mr. McCarthy: The Premier paid me the doubtful compliment, the last time I spoke in this House, of saying that I had two ears and one mouth and if I keep my ears open and my mouth shut I might learn something. I am going to return that compliment to him now, Mr. Speaker, with interest. I am going to tell him that if he would keep his ears open and his little mouth shut, he would not be so ignorant of the problems of the farmers in this province.

Before I start to discuss the Throne Speech, I would like to say that, in my opinion, the Throne Speech should be a factual document containing what the Government expects to do in this coming year. This document is far from that. It is a conglomeration of misstatements, half-truths and political propaganda. It is remarkable for what it has in it; and is also remarkable for what is not in it. One of the remarkable things that is not in it is that after they appointed a commission, paid them a lot of money and got all their reports, and this commission recommended, very definitely, that the Public Revenue Tax should be cancelled and left to the municipalities; it is a curious thing that there is no mention of it in the Speech, so I take it that they are not going to do it. Now that is one remarkable omission from the Throne Speech in my opinion.

I would like, just for a few minutes, to take a few of these clauses or chapters or whatever you wish to call them, in this Throne Speech, and just analyze them very briefly. The first one that I would like to discuss with you, Mr. Speaker, is the one where it talks about the premature weather and all that. Well, it is a good job the Dominion Government did not have anything to do with the weather, or they would have hooked them in on that; but they did not blame the Dominion Government for that. They go on to say:

“Of equal concern has been the inability of our national transportation system and storage facilities to cope with the volume of grain marketed.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion that is not the cause of our marketing situation; and if the people who wrote this knew anything about the farm problems they would know it was not. The bottleneck in getting rid of our crop this year is not transportation, not facilities, but it is the condition of the grain. We have in this province an enormous amount of wet and damp wheat, and just to show you transportation and facilities are not to blame, we, according to recent statistics, have moved more grain in this province than we ever moved in a comparable length of time, this fall. And yet they try to blame it on the transportation and storage facilities, which it is not. It is on account of the amount of damp grain.

We all know that we have some drying facilities in Fort William, but they are not adequate to cope with the situation such as we have this year; and, from my knowledge, these years with a great amount of damp grain occur periodically — probably 15 to 20 years apart. But there has never been a time that I can remember when we had such a vast quantity of damp grain that contained such a large percentage of moisture; and after all, the percentage of moisture has a real relation to how much they can dry. For instance, if it is tough, they can dry so many bushels an hour; if it is damp, that reduces the number of bushels they can dry per hour, and if it is wet that amount is reduced again. So we have not, at the Lakehead, anywhere near enough drying facilities to dry this grain, and that is the bottleneck in getting rid of our crop.

And it is serious. There is going to be, in my opinion, a bigger loss in dollars and cents from the spoilage of damp wheat that is presently on the farm than has ever been experienced in this country before — by a lot. As I said before, that, I do not think, is anybody's fault particularly. It just happened that we have a lot of damp wheat. For instance, even in October nobody knew we were going to have damp grain. We figured that the ordinary weather would take care of it, but it did not; and now we land up with an enormous amount of damp grain which is a real problem to our farmers.

Well, what is being done about it? The Dominion Government made arrangements for some drying facilities at Duluth, which are doing a good job. I believe they are presently trying to see if they can get more facilities at St. Paul and Minneapolis. They have also allowed portable driers to come in from the United States free of duty, and this Provincial Government has agreed to pay part of the transportation costs. That is fine. All those things help; but the only way we are going to get out of the situation is to assess it at its proper value and all work together to do something about it, because it is a serious situation. And for anyone to put into the Throne Speech that the reason we are not getting rid of our damp grain is because we have not transportation or storage facilities is a misstatement. It just is not a fact.

The next item I would like to discuss, Mr. Speaker, for a few minutes, is this one where it says:

“The low initial price of wheat a time when inflation continues to reduce standards of living denies the farmers their rightful share of the national income.”

They have some pretty smart men over there, and they are pretty good at juggling figures; but I cannot see how any of them could figure out the percentage of the national income the farmer is going to get, by his initial payment; because, after all, it is only an initial payment, not the full payment. Nobody knows what the full payment will be; and it is an initial payment. When the crop year is ended, at the proper time, we will receive our final payment. We have already received a 20-cent increase over the initial payment, and to put that sort of thing in a Throne Speech is ridiculous. It is in line with statements made by the Premier last year in this House, when he said that the Wheat Board was improperly withholding a large amount of the farmers' money. It is also in line with a statement made by the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) when they made the 84-cent payment on low-grade wheat, and he said, "You've had it." As a matter of fact, after that they paid, in one payment, 20 cents a bushel; in another one, 25 cents. That is, they paid a total of 45 cents a bushel after the Minister of Agriculture said we had had it.

That sort of thing, I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, does not help our Wheat Pools, it does not help our Wheat Board — men getting up and making criticisms like that, which are not in line with facts. As a matter of fact, during the last five years, we have received the best price for wheat that we ever received in the history of this country — probably the best price we ever will receive; so I just wonder why these statements are made. I wonder that. Could it be that some members of the C.C.F. over on the other side are more anxious to attempt — now I do not say embarrass, but attempt to embarrass — the Dominion Government than they are to back our farmers in their struggle with orderly marketing, to back our Wheat Board?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: That is exactly what "Jimmy" told us.

Mr. McCarthy: I do not say that all the members on the other side are guilty of that. I know we have members on the other side who are just as sincere and just as anxious to back their organizations as I am, or a lot of members on this side. But I do say that the people responsible for putting that sort of stuff in the Throne Speech are doing a disservice to our Wheat Pools and to our Wheat Board. One would think that, after the overwhelming majority the people of Manitoba gave the Wheat Board, the overwhelming vote of confidence the farmers of Manitoba gave the Wheat Board, those fellows over there would quit that sort of thing, because certainly the farmers do not want it, and it was absolutely demonstrated by their action in that vote that they were behind the Wheat Pool and the Wheat Board.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: They never needed a vote.

Mr. McCarthy: Another thing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss with you for a few minutes, is this paragraph about the Royal Commission they are going to appoint. That is a bright idea! I think that must have come from the "boys in the back room." They say — and this is the part that interests me particularly:

“. . . have made it increasingly difficult for young farmers to become established in agriculture.”

Well, I agree that that is a fact. But why is it a fact? You can go down and ask any man on the street down town, and he will tell you

why it is a fact. It is owing to the socialistic laws that this C.C.F. Government passed in connection with debt reduction — or debt security, I think would be the proper term probably. What did they do? A man can go out and live on a farm indefinitely, he does not care whether he farms or not; if his income is not so much you cannot put him off. What happens? Older people who want to leave the farm want to sell it, naturally. Most of them have not money enough to live without the revenue from their farm; and up until this Government took office there was no difficulty for a young man, who had a reputation, to go and buy one of these farms, make a small payment and become established on it. The situation today is that an older man who wants to sell his farm cannot sell it. He is afraid to sell it because of this socialistic legislation. Now if you get away from that, if this Government will repeal its socialistic laws and bring in laws to protect the honest debtor, and follow recognized business principles . . .

Premier Douglas: And help the mortgage companies.

Mr. McCarthy: Oh no, it is not mortgage companies, it is the actual farmer. There are not any mortgages to amount to anything in Saskatchewan today on farm lands. If you knew as much as you can talk you would not talk so much. There are not very many mortgages on farm lands; I can give you the figures. The Liberals pointed out, at the time this legislation was passed, that you were going to run into this difficulty: but oh, no, no, no! You were all ‘hepped’ up; you were going to do it. And a commission is not necessary. All it needs is a few men who have had a little experience to sit down together and figure it out, and the first requisite is to get rid of that piece of legislation, get it off their books, and I assure you that the Liberals, when they are elected, will do away with it.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: That is on the record.

Mr. McCarthy: The next thing I would like to call to your attention, Mr. Speaker, is this paragraph where they say:

“The Government is studying methods whereby farmers who do not own their mineral rights may be able to benefit when oil is produced on their land.”

Well now, I am very, very glad to see that our friends over there have had a change of heart. I am very glad to see that. But it is a little too late in a great many cases. The damage has already been done. I refer to this three-cent mineral tax they put on the farmer’s land. That has cost the farmers of this province untold thousands of dollars, for this reason. They put it on there (and remember, this is before we had very much oil development) and they said to the farmer, “You pay that, or we are going to take your mineral rights away.” As a matter of fact, they did take some away. So the oil men of this province went around and said to the farmer: “Have you got your mineral rights?” “Yep!” “What are you going to do with them?” “Well, I really don’t know.” “Have you paid your mineral tax?” “No, I haven’t the money and I don’t feel like paying for something that I am not sure is there.” “Well, all right, we will make a

February 18, 1952

little deal with you. We will give you 10 cents an acre for your mineral rights and we will reserve to you (I think it is) 12½ per cent . . . You will have to pay the tax to the Provincial Government.” Well, all right, they did that and 90 per cent of the farmers in my area transferred their mineral rights to these oil companies under those circumstances for 10 cents an acre. Today those same mineral rights are worth \$700 and \$800 a quarter, with \$1 an acre for the next nine years. Now, the C.C.F. Government are responsible for that loss to the farmers, directly, and no amount of talking will talk them out of it.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: Now you are talking bunk.

Mr. McCarthy: That is just another socialistic idea gone haywire.

Some Hon. Member (Government): It is your mind that has gone haywire.

Mr. McCarthy: Mr. Speaker, the next thing that I would like to talk about is the clause where it says:

“There will be placed before this Legislature for approval a plan of highway construction that will greatly exceed anything heretofore attempted in this province.”

Now that is a dandy! That really is a dandy! Could that be election propoganda, by any stretch of the imagination? It reminds me of what we had down in the Cannington by-election, where we were going to have \$800,000 spent on the roads in Cannington — and I do not very often compliment the C.C.F. on keeping their vows, but they made one promise they did keep. They said to the electors down there: “If you elect Ross McCarthy you will get little or no highway work done,” and, by golly, they kept that promise! They did, with a sort of death-bed repentance and a view to the coming election, go down and spread a little dirt around. Then they got off their tracks: they were going to go one way and they went the other. And then they get up there with that ‘holier-than-thou’ attitude and say, “There is no politics in our road system.” Well, you only have to look, Mr. Speaker, at the situation in Rosthern, in Cannington, in Kinistino and other constituencies that have been represented by Liberals, to see how much politics there is in their highway construction. It is an undoubted fact that political expediency, not need, is the yardstick by which this Government measured its highway construction.

Now I hope that they will be able to do some highway construction in the seats represented by Liberals, and have been represented by Liberals for eight years, just to show that the Premier is right; but if this Government is returned I have not too much faith in that.

Another part that I would like to discuss with you, Mr. Speaker, for a few minutes, is in that same clause dealing with the highways. It says:

“Special consideration will be given to the municipal problem of rebuilding timber bridges.”

Mr. Speaker, since when did the problem of building municipal bridges become a municipal one? — just when this C.C.F. Government came into office. Before that, every Government — Liberal and Conservative — recognized them as a provincial responsibility, and built them without expense to the municipality. The Britnell Report confirms that statement. I was contradicted when I said that the first time, but I think that by constant repetition I have finally got the Minister to where he is going to take it.

It is rather significant that in the conference which the representatives of this Government had with the municipal men of this province, with regard to the Britnell report, that almost without exception those municipal men told the Government that their bridge policy was unsatisfactory. That was almost without exception — I do not know them all but I do know some of them and I heard the reports from others. Now that again shows you. Now they say they are going to bring out a policy. Well, I do hope that it will be more satisfactory than the last one they brought out, because the municipalities which needed bridges were not able to put up the fifty-fifty, and in some cases the Department would not put up the fifty-fifty; and so what they did with their last policy was just to muddy up the waters. They have not built very many bridges — about one to a constituency, I believe.

The next thing, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to discuss with you, for a few minutes, is our rural electrification. I do not think there is anything of greater interest to the farmers of this province than the rural electrification of their farms. I do not think there is any other one thing that will stop the decrease of our population as readily as to have a system of rural electrification on our farms. It is significant, that I live right alongside the province of Manitoba, where they are electrifying 5,000 farms a year without cost to the farmer. All he has to do is wire his buildings and get his utensils, and he is hooked on. Compare that with our programme here, where it runs all the way from (I would say) five to seven hundred dollars now. It was more than that a year or so ago. Well, they are very proud of the fact that they electrified 8,000 farms; but they are still peddling this old bunk, saying what was done in '44, what was done in the 'thirties. I think that men of reasonable intelligence would know that they cannot put that over on the people of this country, especially anybody that lived here in the 'thirties. You could compare the farmer's income — what he was getting in the 'thirties. Take the garageman's income and see what he was getting in the 'thirties. Take your storekeeper's income; take anybody's income in the 'thirties, and would it be anything in comparison with today's situation? Certainly not. I am going to tell you people that you are not fooling anybody, and I get sick and tired of listening to it. I do not know why you do it.

I was rather interested, the other day, when the hon. member from Milestone was moving the Address. He said, "We have electrified 8,000 farms in the last six years; and behold, we are going to electrify 4,000 this year." Well, would that be election propaganda? It again reminds me of the Cannington by-election when they were going to do a lot in one year. It took them six years to do 8,000, but they are going to do 4,000 in one year — and there is an election coming. Well, I will be interested to listen to the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Darling)

when he gives his report as to whether there is material available to electrify 4,000 farms this year. I will be very interested in that. If they can do it, fine; but it smacks awfully like election propaganda to me.

I was rather interested, this afternoon, in listening to the address from the Minister of Education (Hon. Mr. Lloyd). He gave us quite a nice talk, and of course did a pretty good job with figures; but the figures that he did not quote were the figures that interested me. He said: "We have put so many of these higher teachers . . ." (Sure, where did they go? They went to university or high school) ". . . and we put so many of these other teachers in . . ." (Sure, where did they go? To the towns and high schools in the province). But he neglected to say what happened to the rural students of this province. We have an increased number of supervisors in our school; they have been increased, and they are still increasing. We have 150 less students taking the course at Normal Schools this year than we had last year. So what does that mean? It simply means that 150 more rural schools will be manned with these supervisors. Now, in an agricultural province, where, after all, the agricultural children are the main part of our economy, I think the people would be justified in dismissing this Government on that item if no other.

I was rather interested, the other day, in the remarks of the hon. member for Morse (Mr. Gibson) regarding ducks. He apparently has a similar situation to what we have; and I said in this House, last year, when I brought the matter up, that I am all for preserving our wild life. I think any pioneer is; but, on the other hand, they can be preserved at too great a price. They can carry the thing too far — and I think it is being carried too far. When you see a man with a crop, whose livelihood depends on that crop, and see the ducks fly in there and clean him up — which they can do in a matter of two or three days if they are in large enough numbers — I think that some provision should be made whereby that man can protect his crop. Sure we have provision now; but there is so much red-tape to it that by the time the fellow sees the ducks and gets through the red-tape, it is too late.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: Will the hon. member permit a question? Does the hon. member know that it is a Federal law that protects the ducks?

Mr. McCarthy: It does not make a bit of difference to me if it comes from Timbuctoo, it is still wrong. This is administered under your jurisdiction, and I do not think there is any reason for all this red-tape. I am not saying the Dominion Government does not make mistakes; but where you fellows are wrong is that, according to you, the C.C.F. could not make a mistake. Now, I know the Dominion Government makes lots of mistakes, and if they are responsible and they are making a mistake, I will tell them so.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have said about all I am going to say at this time. I will have something more to say to you a little later on, I hope, on some of the matters that, in my opinion, vitally affect the farmers of this province. I think you have gathered from my remarks that I will support the amendment, but I will not support the Motion.

M. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena): Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of coming eighth on the list to bat, today, so I suppose by the time I get through, there will only be you and I left to hear my main speech, because I imagine by this time the press reporters will be pretty tired, and before long the galleries will have to go home, and the members will want their coffee, so I will have to keep my remarks short so you and I can have our coffee.

While I was listening to the hon. member for Cannington, I kept looking for the string of Edgar Bergen who was doing the pulling — and I know there was a string there some place, but I could not quite see where it came from. Yes, you could see the lips moving and the actions were there; but I am not going to try and take time now to try and answer the different statements he brought up, because I think if one listened closely to a lot of his statements and statements by other speakers on that side of the House, a lot of his own statements have been contradicted. But I would, on this occasion, along with other members who have spoken, like to congratulate the mover and seconder on their efforts in this debate. I think a very good account was given by both the mover and the seconder.

I would also like to give my congratulations to the people of Gravelbourg for sending the youngest member of this Legislature to sit on this side of the House. Ed. Walker comes to this House with a very good background. His integrity and honesty have never at any time been challenged, and he is definitely a credit to the people of Gravelbourg. I have checked the Parliamentary Guide records and, as far as I can find, Mr. Speaker, this is the first time that two brothers have ever sat together in the same Legislature in this province; so I think that is a record, and they are two brothers of whom we, on this side of the House, can be well proud.

I have noted, while we have been listening to the speeches coming from the other side of the floor, that a lot of joy has been taken by various members speaking on the results of the Ontario election, or the British election, or the New Zealand or Australian elections — always some place else; but I have been interested, as the member for Cannington said, in what was not said. They have never yet said how it was that they lost the Gravelbourg by-election, and then since this month started in they have lost one of their former seat-mates. They have never tried to say to this House why their former seat-mate does not sit with them. I think it is just more signs of the times that there is more chaos within their group, and the longer it goes on, the longer that group continues, the greater will be the split. Rumours are running around quite frequently now, Mr. Speaker, that other members who are sitting to your left are very much dissatisfied over there, and do not know whether they should make a bolt from their party or not. Some of those rumours are quite openly talked of on the streets. Now I do not need to mention any names, because I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition will know who those men are better than I do, although I have had inclinations of several of them.

Now I would like to say a word or two about the Royal Visit which took place here last fall. I had the pleasure and privilege, along

with a number of the members, of meeting the present Queen — at that time Princess — and the Duke. It was a very memorable occasion, one, I think, which any of us who met the couple will never forget. But I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this occasion will not be marred by what followed after the Royal Visit of the King and Queen when they visited this country in 1939. It was felt at that time by a lot of people that the Royal Visit of the King and Queen was just a way of stirring up patriotism whereby they could launch another big capitalistic war in order to make a lot of profits, and war did come, but I hope war will not come after this visit. I sincerely hope that every stone will be moved, no stone left unturned, in order to work for peace, because as I intend to point out in a few moments, what it is costing this nation for war effort.

Now I would like to say a word about the passing of our late King George VI. To me, along with the rest of the hon. members of this House, it was quite a shock that he should pass so quickly, after we had had word of his increasing health, and better health, shortly before. But what I would like to mention here is that at the death of King George V, one of my neighbours (I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that this is very well known throughout the province), in fact, he lived only four and a half miles away from me all my life, was the official representative of Saskatchewan at the funeral of King George V. At the time of King George V's death, this man, Mr. Sid Hopkins, was visiting some of his sisters in England. He contacted the Canadian High Commissioner to England and said that he had no doubt that Saskatchewan would like a representative at the King's funeral, and that he would be pleased to act in that capacity if given the opportunity. I have seen pictures and photographs verifying the statement, and I know this man did act on behalf of Saskatchewan officially, at King George V's funeral. At the passing of King George VI, it brought back great memories to those people of that district who had the opportunity of discussing in detail, since the former occasion, the funeral procedure of our Kings and Queens of this fair land.

Now I would like to turn for a moment to a statement which was made by the Leader of the Opposition with regard to that hospital card, and the man who was sent to jail over it. I think the Premier quite ably answered that, but I have another point here that I would like to bring up, and that is another one of my neighbours a few years ago (this happened when the Liberals were the government) had his car — he had not driven it all spring, so on in June, when he was all through seeding he decided he would go down to Rose Valley (that was the closest town to him at the time, where they issued licences), and would get a licence for his car. He started his car for the first time, got as far as the country oil station where he stopped to fill up with gas, to pay a few little debts he had owing at the oil station, and while he was parked there, along came the police and they checked his car for not having his licence. He told them he was on his way to get a licence. They told him that did not make any difference — you are not supposed to drive without a licence; and that man was hauled before the J.P. and prosecuted for driving a car without a licence. He was so mad about it that he refused to pay the fine — \$6.00 and costs he refused to pay; so he served one month in Regina jail. Now that man was on his way to get a licence. It was the first time, that year, he had driven his car, and so he had never refused to buy a licence, but we heard no crocodile

tears coming from the Liberals then over men like that who had never had a warning, had never tried to break the law, and was on the way to see that he kept his bargain and responsibility towards the law.

Now, I recall too, in the early 'thirties just after the Anderson Government came into office, they put on a \$2.00 fish licence, and the Leader of the Opposition at that time (the Hon. James G. Gardiner), speaking at a meeting, was talking about this \$2.00 licence which had been put on for the fisherman. He said: "See what that is going to mean, friends, to the fishing industry of this province. It is going to kill billions of fish. As it was, no one needed a licence — they would go in there, they would chop a hole in the ice, and would take their line in and do a little bit of fishing. This would let the air into the lakes, and now this Government has put on a \$2.00 licence there would be millions and millions of fish who will wash up on the beach in the spring, dead, because they could not get any air, but I can assure you, ladies and gentlemen, the moment we are returned to power that fish licence will be cancelled."

Well, there is still a fish licence on the books today, Mr. Speaker, so I suppose they have two programmes — one for opposition, and one for when they were the government; but as far as I can find out the programme they had when they were in opposition they can hang on to, because they are going to have to use it for a long time.

Now, the Leader of the Opposition also said that we should not refer to Federal affairs, we should just concentrate on what the province was doing — the province was spending too much money on everything. Well, I noticed the other day, from a review of our Public Accounts, that we have some of our provincial expenditures down to what they were under previous administrations. I notice that, in spite of the spiralling costs, increased costs of everything, we are still buying the dye for our gasoline a little cheaper than we were before the increased prices.

Now, I would like to, for a few moments, just talk on what it is costing this nation for our war expenditure, this year. I am not arguing that it is not necessary to spend if we are going to be attacked. We have to be ready. But at the same time, Mr. Speaker, it always runs in my mind, when we talk about the 'thirties and so on, we say that that was world conditions, that nobody could do a thing about the depression, that it was not only here, but all over. But had some of the money been spent in those days for productive things, instead of spending it all on destructive things, our society today would have been a lot healthier than it is now.

During this past year, Ottawa was spending over \$1,600 millions on war purposes. If you take that amount of money, take it in dollar bills, and lay those dollar bills end to end it would reach over six times around the earth with the amount of money we are spending. It would cover a road from North Portal running to Regina through Moose Jaw to Saskatoon, Prince Albert and on to Waskesiu, which is over 540 miles long; it would cover that road with a 70-foot top with dollar bills. Or it would build 160,000 homes at \$10,000 apiece. With five people living in a home it would give homes to 800,000 people, or the equivalent of the

February 18, 1952

population of this province. Or it would pay the provincial and municipal tax payment for the next 17 years in this province. It would pay for over 100,000 farm driers such as they are using so successfully to dry their crops with. Yet they tell us there is no money to go ahead and do the things that should be done for construction.

Mr. W.A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition): Talk about your own Government.

M. Dewhurst: Well, you could do enough talking there.

Now, the Trans-Canada Highway which was promised by the Federal Government in the 1949 election, if the Liberals were returned to power, they were going to build a Trans-Canada Highway. When the smoke cleared away we find that the provinces have to pay for 60 per cent of the cost. Instead of it being a Trans-Canada Highway, it is a 60 per cent Provincial and 40 per cent Federal, so it is easy to see why they can build a Trans-Canada Highway when they can force the provinces to pay the lion's share of the cost. I think that is enough to give a picture of what it costs us to spend for war all the time.

I would like to turn for a few moments and talk about these farm driers — I referred to them as to how many farm driers it would have bought. Last fall, I had the privilege and opportunity of travelling to North Dakota, along with a carload of other people, to see some of these Campbell driers, which were made at Des Moines Iowa, in action. We went to Newburg, and saw one which was connected to the elevator and was working. Now I know there have been statements in the press from Ball of the Wheat Pool which I do not entirely agree with, and there have also been statements from the Board of Grain Commissioners for refusing to allow these driers to be connected with the elevators. In the States, we asked the elevator man how they managed to get connected, and if they had any trouble with the authorities there. He said the only regulations were that they had to be a certain number of feet from the elevator in order to comply with insurance regulations, and he said in their case they had to be a minimum of 10 feet. Now, the drier they had there was not the largest one which was made by the Campbell Manufacturing Company. The one they had was a 200 bushel-an-hour capacity drier, but they were only operating it at about 170 bushels an hour. Upon asking him if he could speed up to full capacity, he said he could but it would take a little extra attention. He said he and his helper were not only running the drier but they were also handling the grain in the elevator and business as usual. We asked him what it cost to operate the drier. Well, he said he had not been in operation long enough to give us a complete picture of it, but at the price of fuel oil in North Dakota, it was costing them \$1.79 an hour for fuel oil. He told us how many gallons they were using, and how much per gallon they paid, and it worked out to be \$1.79, and they were drying, as I say, not quite 170 bushels. So it was a little more than a cent a bushel to dry it. We asked him what he was charging for drying. He said they have very high prices for drying, and the reason for that, he stated, was that this was a farmers' own elevator, it is on a co-operative basis, and this drier is owned by the farmers on a co-operative basis. Somebody has to pay for this drier, but we may not need this drier here for the next ten years; but in the meantime, he said, we want it paid for. He added that there was enough tough and damp grain in this area that

with the prices we are charging, we will pay for this drier in one year's operation. By the time we finish drying this year, he added, our machine will be paid for. If we wanted to get the use of it again, it will be here, and if we do not need it, he claimed, it is paid for. In the meantime, they have saved all the grain for the farmers. That was a continuous flow type drier, and the cost which they were charging ranged all the way from about 4 cents upwards, and if you follow the "Producer", you will remember the figures which were quoted by Wes. Ball from the Wheat Pool. He did quote the correct figures which they were charging, but he did not say the reason why they were charging those excess prices. They told us that they figured 2½ to 3 cents a bushel would even dry damp grain down into the dry class. We asked them if it would hurt the germination of seed, if seed grain could be dried. He said he did not know how it would work for seed, to be definite on it, but he did know that they had dried a carload of barley. The barley had been shipped out to Minneapolis and St. Paul, and that barley went malting. Well, according to any information I have always had malting barley had to be able to be germinated in order to make malting barley.

We asked him how his tests of the drier held up with the official tests when the grain was shipped. He replied that he had just got returns back on a carload of grain which they had dried — down to 13.3 is what the moisture test was on it — and the test came back from Minneapolis and St. Paul as 13.8, so he said there was half of 1 per cent higher than what they had in their test. So from all the questions and information we could gather on it, those Campbell driers were definitely a success, because the grain, as I mentioned, was continuously moving. There was no chance of burning, and they used the cooling system to cool the grain to normal temperature without taking the moisture from the outside.

A group of farmers at Lintlaw, they were organized into a co-operative group and had solicited enough funds among themselves to buy one of those driers, only they figured on buying a 300-bushel-an-hour capacity instead of the 200. They had everything all set to go, but when the Board of Grain Commissioners gave the ruling that they could not be attached to an elevator, it stopped them right there and then.

We also saw the driers that were made by the same company which are called the Batch-type Farm Driers, but personally I was not taken up too much with those Batch-type driers. I could not see how they would do a good job without burning the grain, because grain was not in continuous operation and it could not be manoeuvred nearly as efficiently because there would be too much time lost in changing grain from one batch to another.

If we could have had the co-operation here from the Board of Grain Commissioners, the insurance companies and other responsible agencies as did the farmers of North Dakota, I am certain in my mind that at this time now, without any financial help from any place else, the farmers themselves would have had 100 or more of those driers in this province. We asked one of the representatives of the company from Des Moines what was the prospect of getting any of those driers up into this part of the country. He said they were pressed to keep up with the demand, because the

corn in the corn belt was tough this year and had to be dried; but he said they could safely guarantee, if they could get a market up here for their type of drier, they could send 10 up here immediately so that people would know what they could do, and then they would take the booking for the orders and supply them as fast as possible.

I do not think there would have been too much difficulty to have made arrangements with other companies, if that drier had been approved here to help manufacture that type drier. Now, I did not have the facilities with me to make a lot of tests myself, but this elevator was doing a roaring business there. They did not have the room either, to take all the grain into the elevator; but the way they did was — the farmer brought in a load of grain of a certain grade, the elevator man graded it, he checked it for moisture content, he checked it for dockage, the load of grain was put into the damp bin; the farmer would just go to the dry bin and get the same grade of grain back again, less the amount that would come off for moisture content, or dockage or other things that had to be cleaned out, because in order for that drier to be efficient, that grain had to be put through a cleaner first so that the drier would not plug with chaff or straws and dust, which would have a tendency to make the grain get hotter in certain portions, rather than an even heat all through the driers.

So I am sure that a lot of grain, this next spring, will never be dried. It is going to lie in the piles until it is absolutely ruined. The farmers are going to take it on the chin with the tough and damp grain, for the simple fact that a lot of it will never see the driers, and the grain, in the spring, if they are going to wait to get the grain harvested this spring that is lying in the fields, in order to mix the other damp grain with it, it will be too late before that grain is harvested. It will not be possible, this coming spring, to harvest the grain that is in the fields, get it into the elevators, or wherever else necessary, so as to mix the damp with the dry and help to stop the heating that way, because I know a year ago, right in the winter time, we had 1,000 bushels of oats heated that way, and no matter what we did this spring it was just a pile of white ashes.

I would imagine this afternoon's mention by the member for Bengough would bear some repetition, and that is regarding the advances to the farmers on the situation in which we find ourselves this year. Representation was made to the Federal Government by the Premier on behalf of the province asking that advances be made through the Wheat Board, and the elevators be used to give the advances, rather than bank loans, which is the system that was adopted. It is my opinion that had advances been made through the Wheat Board, and through the elevator companies, there would have been very little chance whatsoever of any loss from non-collection of those advances. A farmer would have just had to go into the elevator with his permit book; the elevator man knows how many acres he has in crop in the permit book; he knows what has been delivered; he knows the circumstances in that district; the farmer would have been able to get an advance on the grain which he had in the fields or in the bins; he could have gone and paid his municipal taxes, school taxes or other taxes; but as it is now, the farmers know they have penalties on their taxes for not paying them before the end of the year. They would sooner take a chance,

however, on a penalty from the municipality than on going to the bank and getting these bank loans. There are very few farmers taking advantage of these advances unless they definitely have to as a last resource, because they cannot see any reason why they should have to go into a bank and be guaranteed 25 per cent of the loan by the Federal Government to the bank, and then have to put up everything they have for security on top of it, and, in some cases, they tell me they have had to have co-signers on their notes. That is not the way the business should be run in a year like this, when the farmers are so hard-pressed in the northern part of this province.

Now, a lot can be said of what the farmers have had done to them these past few years. The farmers, by and large, appreciate very much what has been done by this Government over the past 7½ years, and I intend to give to this House a few figures, Mr. Speaker, but shall not take too long, because the time is getting on. I would just like to say, though, that during the past seven years, while we have been spending more money, as the Opposition have been saying all the time, we have the least increase of any budget in the four western provinces, and yet we have decreased our public debt by the greatest amount of any of the four western provinces, so that shows pretty well the general administration of this Government. When we consider, also, that today the purchasing power of the dollar is only half of what it was years ago, we will have to realize, as it was pointed out here on previous occasions, that a \$30 million budget in 1943-44 is equal to a \$60 million budget now, and we are doing a lot of things today, far more things than they had ever dreamed of doing back in the early 'forties, let alone without going back to the 'thirties. In the 'thirties they had \$17 million to \$20 million budgets, and the dollar then would have done three or four times as much as it would today. Labour was paid a very low wage, and we often hear the Opposition say that it is the high cost of labour which makes the cost of our things so high; but if that was true, and labour was the only factor (the labouring people and the amount of salaries they got in the 'thirties), then our budget should have gone a long way.

Now, we can take a comparison of Saskatchewan and Manitoba, or with Alberta, or other places, and we will find that anyway you wish to compare it, for the amount of time (during these past seven years), Saskatchewan had been equal, or leading any other province. We could also compare the figures to what the previous Government did, and we are leading there also. We have heard a lot about the farmers being the forgotten class by this Government. I think pretty well every speaker that has been up on your left has referred to the farmers not getting any consideration from the Government of this day. Well, all we have to do is look back and see what they were doing in 1943-44, and some of the things which have been done since. They had then 21 Ag. Reps. in the province; we have 44 now. When we come to land development for feed or fodder, they were not doing any, and we have over 24,000 acres that was developed in the year 1950-51 up to that time; and for irrigation, land brought under ditch, they had done nothing, while we have done over 20,000 acres up to that same time, 1950-51; for self-help projects, such as local irrigation, land reclamation, etc., a big zero again, while we have 169 projects; cattle tested for Bang's disease as up to December last, over 70,000; under the former Government, none. We hear them saying about the good price of stock, and the farmers

are making money out of their stock. How much more stock would there have been in this province today had former governments carried on a calf vaccination programme and Bang's testing programme. It would have helped today to have more and better and healthier herds of cattle in this province. In addition to the 70,000-and-over cattle tested for Bang's disease, there have been 23,000 calves vaccinated against the disease, and we have over a million acres re-classified for re-settlement where formerly there was no classification whatsoever for re-settlement. I could go on over a long list of them — over fodder which had been shipped; or seed for grass, etc., and the story is still the same. We could also discuss the different things which should help the municipality directly and indirectly in their purchase and expenses. We have 22 Veterinary Service Districts in this province where formerly there were none. That is a great assistance to the people of this province. Now in those Veterinary Districts, if any of the farmers need a vet. they no longer have to send miles and miles away, and pay probably expenses; they can get the vet. and the mileage is paid by the veterinary district, which is paid jointly by the area concerned and the Department of Agriculture, and all the farmer has to pay is a fixed fee for service rendered. Those are the things which are helping to stabilize agriculture in this province. I could give a lot more things which are working towards that trend, also.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is safe to be said that Saskatchewan today has the best government we have ever had, and I think that when the time comes the farmers of this province, along with the workers of the cities, are going to once again endorse the policies of this Government. I feel sure that they will not only endorse the policies of the Government as they did in 1948, but I think they will endorse the policies of the Government to an even greater extent, and I feel sure that some of our hon. friends across the aisle there are very much afraid that they are going to get the endorsement on the wrong side, and it is going to be "out" for them. I would like to predict that after the next election we will be back in office with a greater number of seats to your right, Mr. Speaker, than we have at the present time.

We heard in this Legislature, a few years ago, when the car insurance scheme was brought down, it was termed as the "greatest hoax ever perpetrated on the public"; but I have not yet at this Session of the Legislature heard one member of the Opposition get up and criticize our insurance scheme in this province. Other provinces are clamouring for insurance similar to what we have here. They are saying, "if Saskatchewan can do it, why cannot we have it here?" Maybe the hoax that was predicted then is going to backfire on the Liberals. Everything they fought against tooth and nail, we notice they are now saying little or nothing against it, or else they are giving it mild praise — the insurance, the hospitalization and a number of others. They are back-peddalling on their statements.

I would like to just quote what was said by a leading lumberman of British Columbia, a Mr. Ainley who used to be the mayor of Edmonton, was attending a banquet, and I will just read you these little paragraphs to give you what Mr. Ainley reported, and what was said at this banquet. I think this will show somewhat of the trend of the political thought of the West. He said:

“‘The Social Credit Government in Alberta now enjoys the confidence of big business’, Mr. Ainley declared. He made his point by referring to a private dinner, which he attended in his capacity as Mayor of Edmonton. The dinner guests, which included Social Credit leaders, was addressed by a prominent lumber magnate from Vancouver.

“As quoted by Mr. Ainlay, the Vancouver millionaire stated, ‘Saskatchewan now has a C.C.F. Government, Manitoba will soon have one. British Columbia is bound to return a C.C.F. Government. Alberta will then be the only province with a Conservative Government.’”

So you will see, Mr. Speaker, what the thought of the lumber man from B.C. is of the four Western Provinces here, that three of them before long are bound to have a C.C.F. Government. The Liberals both in the House here and on the hustings like to refer to Ontario. They have not yet told the House that their leader down there, Walter Thompson, was defeated by the C.C.F. member. Walter Thompson was very badly defeated. But, you see, it is very funny for them. They pretend they are a party to themselves, and there will be no coalition with other parties, but they like to mention the fact that the Conservatives won in England; they like to mention the fact that the Conservatives were re-elected in Ontario; but they never mention the fact that they were badly defeated in Ontario as far as their own leader was concerned, and that out of 18 seats out of which the C.C.F. lost, the Liberals came in riding the third horse, the Liberals were not in the forefront at all. The Liberals are out of the picture in Ontario and they know it. Their own leader was badly defeated there.

They also, as I mentioned earlier, are mighty shy as to explaining what happened in Gravelbourg, and as to what is happening in their own ranks, so I think any person who is out for progress for this province, and has the welfare of the province as a whole in his mind first, can do nothing else but vote against this amendment and support the main Motion.

Mr. V.P. Deshaye (Melville): In rising to speak in this debate — the hon. member for Wadena was complaining that he was the eighth — you can imagine how I feel to be the ninth. However, there are not very many left, as he says, in the gallery. The hon. member for Wadena was asking why we never spoke of the Gravelbourg election. I do not think there is any need to speak of it very much. Everybody in the province knows that it was the usual trick of the Government to hold elections when they felt that their position was most advantageous, and they held the election in Gravelbourg at a time when several hundreds of people were disfranchised. For that reason they happened to win. They tried the same trick in The Battlefords, but it did not work. The people of the province are aware of those things and there is no need for Premier Douglas to try and smile that off or anything else. That is the fact. And as far

February 18, 1952

as the member for Athabaska (Mr. Marion) is concerned, why, I do not think we are weeping very much about that. I think everybody knows, too, that he knew he could not get a Liberal nomination, so he crossed the House to try and get a C.C.F. nomination. I think he has finally fallen into the group that he should be with, and I would suspect that possibly the Provincial Treasurer had a little bit to do with getting him over there.

Hon Mr. Fines: I would ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw that. I had no knowledge that the hon. gentleman was going to move. I never discussed it with him. I am going to ask that that be withdrawn.

Mr. Deshaye: Well, I said it was my suspicion. If he wants me to withdraw my suspicion I can do that.

Hon Mr. Fines: No, I want a complete withdrawal of the whole thing, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deshaye: I said, Mr. Speaker, that I suspected it. Does he want me to withdraw the suspicion?

Mr. Speaker: The innuendo is there, and I would ask the hon. member to withdraw it.

Mr. Deshaye: At your instruction I will withdraw, seeing I will probably have to withdraw a lot more before I am through. It is the Provincial Treasurer — he is getting irritable.

When the Premier spoke, last Wednesday, I think we had again an example of the distortion of figures. I think every year we have the same experience of the Premier speaking. As I said before, there is no doubt he is probably one of the most glib speakers across this Dominion. However, that does not necessarily make a good Government, because a man can stand up and make seven out of two and two or distort figures to suit his own purpose. That does not mean to say that we get good government from a Premier who does those things. And the actions of the Premier remind us, I think, a great deal of the Pied Piper of Hamelin who led the children out of Hamelin to the river. I think the Premier with his sweet speeches, the same way the Pied Piper of Hamelin had his sweet music, is leading the people of Saskatchewan down the river.

Premier Douglas: The Pied Piper dealt with rats first.

Mr. Deshaye: I can assure the Premier that the people of Saskatchewan are going to enjoy the fact that the Premier of the province has referred the people to rats. I am sure they will appreciate that.

Premier Douglas: I have chased the rats into the river at two elections.

Mr. Deshaye: Well, they may have a little trouble distinguishing who you mean by that.

I think the Premier also said in his speech, last week, about “character assassination.” He talked about character assassination. I do not think there is any speaker that has ever stood in this House that is more guilty of that thing than the Premier himself, and I think that he probably tries to cover up for himself by accusing others of the things that he is most guilty himself of doing. I think that is one of the things that he is somewhat guilty of. He is also fond of making threats to try and scare people in interrupting debates. I recall — I think it was about a week ago today — that he said he was going to deal with the member from Souris-Estevan.

Premier Douglas: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I did not mention any member I was going to deal with.

Mr. Deshaye: Sure you did! There, Mr. Speaker, is the evidence again of how the Premier will act. I was sitting here and I heard him say that he would deal with the hon. member from Souris-Estevan, and I think it was a week ago today he said that. Two days later he spoke in this House and he spoke for 70 minutes and in that one hour and ten minutes he never once made reference to the member from Souris-Estevan. I wonder what does the Premier mean by these threats that he is making? It seems to me that if he was going to deal with him that is the time he should have dealt with him, when he spoke on Wednesday last. I do not think . . .

Premier Douglas: Don’t get impatient. Don’t get impatient.

Mr. Deshaye: I still do not think that those threats should be made. If you want to threaten anybody threaten the hon. member for Qu’Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. Dundas), he says you cannot do it to him.

Premier Douglas: Scared him right out.

Mr. Deshaye: Also, Mr. Speaker, it is strange how some people can refer to names in this Legislature and expect to get away with it and other people will more less innocently mention a name and then there will be a Minister (who is not in the House tonight) make a speech the next day for about an hour and a half and concentrate his whole speech on that as if it were a great crime. And I refer to the fact that two years ago I spoke in this House, and read from a letter the name of a person who was quoted in the letter. And then the Hon. Minister of Social Welfare gets up and makes a speech for an hour and a half about that. It was a terrible sin! And last Wednesday in his speech, the Premier mentioned the name of a man who went to jail, but that seems to be quite all right as long as it comes from that side of the House.

Premier Douglas: The name was in every newspaper in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Deshaye: Well, it was — after you said it, yes.

Premier Douglas: It was in, last fall.

Mr. Deshaye: I think there should be some uniformity about what is the expectancy of this House.

February 18, 1952

Some Hon. Member: I did not hear that.

Mr. Deshaye: We heard the member for Wadena talking a great deal trying to bolster up the C.C.F. Party, and I quite agree that it does need quite a lot of bolstering up; but I want to assure him that things are not as bright as the Government would like to have them as far as the C.C.F. are concerned. I think that already, where the C.C.F. have slipped with respect to the rural vote in 1948, they have now badly slipped with respect to the urban labour vote. And I think that is best exemplified if you happen to get onto a bus in this very city of Regina at about 6.15 in the evening, when the workers are going home and you will hear them talking of the present political situation. I think there is no better barometer of what the future will be with respect to the city vote than what you can hear travelling on a bus carrying workers returning home in this city. There you hear them criticizing the Government, criticizing those policies and criticizing particularly, the Provincial Treasurer. And there, I think, is the barometer of the future of this city. So I think probably the Minister of Natural Resources should pat the Provincial Treasurer on the back, because I doubt if he will have that opportunity later on.

Premier Douglas: You have been at the Assiniboia Club, not on the bus.

Mr. Deshaye: I have not been there. No. Wrong again, Mr. Premier.

This is quite a paper, the "Commonwealth" here, and I am just wondering and a lot of the people in the Melville constituency are wondering, and I am sure they are wondering in the Gravelbourg too, after the last episode, just where is the money coming from to finance this paper along with all the other propaganda that is being put out by the C.C.F. Party. It certainly is not coming from the contributions of the common people of Saskatchewan. Where is the money coming from? We know where the money comes from to print the propaganda that is put out by the Bureau of Publications, such as we received last week. We know that that comes out of the public funds; but where is the money coming from to print this publication and to pay the hired people that are running around the province promoting C.C.F. propaganda and policies? That is the \$64 question in the minds of the people of this province. It is growing every day.

Last week, enough copies of this paper were sent to cover the post office floors in Melville, anyhow, and I imagine in every post office in the constituency — letters with a copy of the "Commonwealth," and there were enough sent out to reach 10,000 voters. That was the intention. Actually, there was nothing much in it. There is a picture of the C.C.F. candidate in Melville, and I have no objection to that. There is one of the hon. member from Gravelbourg, but besides that there is not very much in it. But, nevertheless, to print that paper and mail it must have cost a lot of money and we know for a fact that the little episode here in the front that says it is sent out at the request of the Melville constituency — that may be so, but who has paid for it?

Premier Douglas: The C.C.F. supporters paid for it.

Mr. Deshaye: They did not pay for it; that is the thing. That is the thing we happen to know — that that money did not come out of the Melville constituency to pay for this paper; and it would be interesting to know what the paper cost and what the postage cost, and that is the question that lies in the minds of the people today. Where is the money coming from to pay for the tremendous amount of C.C.F. propaganda that is being circulated?

There has been considerable talk this evening about rural electrification. I think, regardless of what the Government speakers say, that they cannot convince the farmers of Saskatchewan who have received rural electrification that they have not paid for every cent of material and service that they have received. It is very easy for any government to do things when times are prosperous, and that happens to be the case with this Government. The C.C.F. Government have happened to hit the most prosperous era that Saskatchewan has ever enjoyed, and as a result of that, through no fault of theirs — we are all very happy that we have had this prosperous era; but as a result, they have had an expansion of certain services, and electrification is one of them; but, at the same time, they cannot deny that for every dollar that they have expended towards rural electrification, the farmers themselves have paid for getting that commodity. Therefore, I, for one, cannot see that the Government can claim very much credit for doing those things, because if anybody wants to pay for anything it is very easy to do it. The time it is difficult to do things is when there is not an ample supply of money; and we certainly are aware of the difference in the amount of money that was available up to the year 1944, and since then. And by the same token, we have the highways programme. There are very few extra miles of road in Saskatchewan today than there were when we had a Liberal Government. At the same time the revenues of the Government are much more buoyant than they were up to 1944.

You would think, from listening to C.C.F. speakers, that their Government had accomplished a very great deal, but when you consider the buoyancy in the revenues of the province, the C.C.F. Government has actually accomplished much less than the Liberals accomplished in the ‘hungry ‘thirties’ that they passed through.

Also, when you consider the highway question, the C.C.F. speakers fail to take into consideration the fact of the machinery that is now available to build highways — all of those things contribute to the net result in the work; whereas, when the Liberals were in power the machinery was of a different nature. They had to build highways with much smaller and much less equipment. Today the equipment is much larger, and it is expected that there will be much greater returns from that equipment; but all in all I think that, when it is figured out, the cost per mile of highway today is much greater than it was when the Liberals were building the roads in this province; and, as I have said, we have very few extra miles, today, of highway in Saskatchewan than we had when we had a Liberal Government up to 1944. So I, for one, cannot see that this C.C.F. Government can take too much credit for the highway story in this province.

At the same time, in my own constituency, we have been asking for certain roads which we feel are essential. We feel that they are essential because they will provide a short cut to travel. We also feel

that they are essential because the present roads that are being used are municipal market roads, and they are used by oil trucks and other heavy traffic, from which revenue is going to this Provincial Government. Therefore, we feel that the responsibility of maintaining and of building roads to carry this heavy traffic lies with this Government. This Government seems to refuse to do anything on certain of these roads which would provide short cuts, and as a result of these short cuts, it would save much traffic over longer routes which this traffic has to use now at certain seasons of the year. It seems to me it would be a good policy to build short cuts and thereby save miles and miles of highway surface.

I think it will be shown, before this Session is completed, as it has been shown in other years, that the revenue of this province is not well apportioned as far as constituencies are concerned. There are certain preferred constituencies in this province, and it is not difficult to see, by looking at the highway expenditures, just who is the member in these preferred constituencies.

There is one more thing I would like to speak on, this evening, before asking to adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker, and it is an item that has not received any mention in this Legislature at this Session: that is the matter of the further development of the Hudson Bay railway. I think that is something that is of vital interest to the farmers of this province. I think that, if we can finally get the Hudson Bay railway in a position where it can handle traffic on a larger scale and on a more definite scale than it does at present, the farmers in this province will save considerably. Also, as far as the town that I am concerned about — that is the town where I come from, — it will benefit considerably in that it is the gateway with respect to the Hudson Bay railway. It is the nucleus of the railroad over which the traffic will pass. I am somewhat disappointed, as I am sure a lot of the farmers of this province are, that nothing, as yet, has been said in this Legislature with respect to something being done about the Hudson Bay railway.

Premier Douglas: The Legislature has passed a resolution almost every session on the Hudson Bay railroad. I am sure my hon. friend must have forgotten.

Mr. Deshaye: The fact, Mr. Speaker, of passing resolutions is not enough. This Government has set up a committee on agriculture problems which it has a Minister and pretty large staff to look after. I think that that committee is a reflection upon the ability of the Department of Agriculture to look after the problems of this province, especially after this Government has been in office for 7½ years. But this Government has never seen fit to set up a committee to investigate the problems confronting the Hudson Bay railway.

Premier Douglas: My hon. friend is a lawyer, he ought to know that, under the constitution, we have nothing to do with railroads.

Mr. Deshaye: Well, I know that in the B.N.A. Act, true enough, it is under Federal jurisdiction; but nevertheless, there are many things that this province can do towards developing the Hudson Bay railroad; and if the Government was serious about it, they would set up a commission to investigate what this province can do towards developing the Hudson Bay railway.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: He wants another commission!

Mr. Deshaye: I think it was two years ago that we proposed a resolution with respect to insurance, and we thought that possibly the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office could provide insurance rates which would assist in promoting traffic over the Hudson Bay railway; but nothing that I know of has been done in that respect.

We, therefore, find that there are many things that this Government can do but has failed to do. The only things we learn that the Government has done are things that the people themselves have paid for, such, for instance, as the power development. There has been no master organization that I can see. There have just been programmes followed that any government, in times of prosperity, set up; and, therefore, once the prosperous times were here, the programmes developed and I say that nothing outstanding was done as a result of this Government.

I would like to have said a few things about the Social Welfare Department, but I see the Minister is not in his seat, so I will not elaborate on that tonight.

Someone is suggesting that it is getting late. I am quite prepared, Mr. Speaker, to beg leave to adjourn this debate.

(Debate adjourned)

The Assembly then adjourned at eleven o'clock p.m.