

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fifth Session — Eleventh Legislature**  
**8th Day**

**February 19, 1952**

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

**DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY**

The House resumed, from Monday, February 18, 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. V.P. Deshaye** (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate last night, I had spoken following the speech of the hon. member for Bengough (Mr. Brown); and he had said, in his speech, that the C.C.F. had inaugurated the hospitalization plan, the air ambulance and the cancer clinic. Now everybody knows that the C.C.F. did not inaugurate all of these three social services, and why the member from Bengough should say that, in this House, to be distributed to the people of this province, I do not know. But nevertheless, that does not vary from any of the statements made in this House.

The hospitalization plan, as it is presently set up, true enough, was established by the C.C.F. Government; but that was just an improvement on previous plans that we had in this province. The Liberals, up to 1944, had a hospitalization plan in effect. Now we, on this side of the House, do not any more object to improving plans for the service to be the people of our province than do the members of the Government. I can see no difference between the C.C.F. improving on the hospitalization plan than on them taking over the set-up in social welfare that the Liberals had established. After all, the Liberals in this province did establish a very enviable social service plan up to the time this Government took over. When they took over, they continued that plan and improved it where they could. The same thing applies to the hospitalization plan that was in effect. After all, that is progress that we, of this day, believe in. We have no intention of criticizing the Government for improving anything that they can improve upon. After all, things improve with time. We have the air services right across Canada and the world, which have improved with time. Now I can see nothing that gives the C.C.F. particular credit for improving on the plans which were in effect when they took over.

The Liberals even had a form of air ambulance at that time . . . Now the Premier laughs; but there was an air ambulance in the city of Regina at that time. We never hear it said but I do not think it can be denied, and I think it is on the books, too — if anybody required air service they could obtain it.

I would be very disappointed in this Government if they had not made some progress during the eight years they have been in office. After all, when the Liberals came into office they started from scratch,

**February 19, 1952**

and they made very many improvements in this province; and, therefore, it would be a sad state of affairs if this Government, after eight years in office, could not point to something which it had done; and it has done very little; but, nevertheless, these things have to be expected of a Government, and I cannot see that a Government can brag too much about a few improvements.

Now why the member from Bengough (Mr. Brown) should say that his Government had started the cancer clinic, or inaugurated the cancer clinic, is difficult to understand, because everybody gives credit for starting the cancer clinic to the previous Conservative Government of Mr. Anderson. I am disappointed, although it was not unexpected from the statements that have been made on the other side of the House, that the C.C.F. are claiming credit for the cancer clinic as well; and the hon. member from Bengough did claim credit for that, yesterday.

Now those are some of the things I think we should at least try to give credit where credit is due, and that is something that we find the Government on the opposite side of this House fair to do.

The member from Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) spoke, yesterday, and mentioned quite a bit, criticizing the Government at Ottawa with respect to grain driers. Now, as far as I can see, I think the Government at Ottawa has done quite a bit with respect to having the grain on our Saskatchewan farms handled as quickly as possible to be dried. I think our own Department of Agriculture is subject to some criticism in not doing something to examine the driers that have been imported. They urged that these driers be imported — so much credit to them for that; but at the same time, they have possibly urged the importation of something into this province that may have cost the farmers many thousands of dollars. If there is any truth in the reports that we read in the papers about this grain being damaged, then I say the blame for that lies on the doorstep of the Department of Agriculture for the province of Saskatchewan in not checking on the driers that they urged be imported into this province, so strenuously. Therefore, I think there is some responsibility on our Saskatchewan Department of Agriculture with respect to the farming problems of this province.

If we listen to the speakers on the other side of the House, we would think that all of the responsibility with respect to farming in this province lies on the doorstep of the Federal Government; but I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that such is not the case; that there is a grave responsibility on the Government of this province with respect to the farming problems of this province. I submit also that the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) has failed to attend to these duties of his Department in seeing that, at least, the proper equipment is imported into this province for the purpose of drying the crop that is presently in the granaries in a damp condition.

Now, in rising this afternoon, I wish, at the outset, before dealing with the matters with which I wish to deal, to address a few words to the people of the Melville constituency; and I think I will ask the indulgence of the members of this House who are probably not too interested in the seat which I represent. However, in the Melville seat, as I have said on previous occasions in this Legislature, in my opinion we have one of

the finest districts in this province. We have a very good agricultural district, and I think that is borne out by the facts. We have some of the finest stock raised in this province; we have taken top prizes at World Fairs. We have had the best strains of grain grown in the Neudorf district of the Melville constituency; and the man who has grown this grain has taken top prizes at World Fairs, both in Chicago and Toronto. We also excel somewhat in sport. I think the Melville Millionaire hockey team is known all over the province. Therefore, I, for one, am quite proud of the Melville constituency; and I again wish to bring greetings of the Melville constituency to this Legislature and I wish to send my own greetings to the people whom I represent.

I also wish, at this time, to express, on behalf of the people of the Melville constituency, our very grave regret over the loss of our late reigning Sovereign, King George VI. We, of the Melville constituency, just as the people all over the province of Saskatchewan, were deeply shocked at the loss of our late gracious King, and I join in congratulating the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition in the messages that they have sent to the bereaved Queen Mother and Queen Elizabeth, in England. I think that we have lost one of the finest monarchs that we have ever enjoyed reigning over us; I think that King George VI was an ideal man in every respect. He was a home-loving man; he was a man who took very seriously the duties of his office, and who was very much concerned about the problems of his country and of his Empire and of the world at large. I think that those very grave worries and burdens that he carried had quite a lot to do with his early death; and, therefore, I wish to express the deep regret of the people of the constituency that I represent for the loss of our late King George VI.

At the same time I wish to express welcome to our new Queen and also to wish her a long reign in the arduous duties that she will be in that capacity. We wish to our new gracious Queen Elizabeth many long years of health, of happiness and of success in her reign.

Now I wish to turn to some points that are more local, and I wish to say that I will speak very largely on problems that affect my own constituency of Melville. I may be wrong, but I do not think it is the position of a member, such as myself, in this House, to concern ourselves over world problems, or of problems that affect the Federal Government. I think there are men in this country and in the world who attend to those problems. Those are their problems. If they are members of Parliament they are elected to attend to those problems. I feel that the problems of the members elected to the Saskatchewan Legislature by the people of their respective constituencies are those of their own constituencies and province. I agree, probably some of the Cabinet Ministers must attend to problems which affect the province with respect to the Dominion; but all in all I think that too much time is being spent, in this House, arguing on Federal politics and on world affairs, when, regardless of what we say or what opinions we express, we cannot benefit by those discussions. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I propose to speak, very largely, on things that affect my own constituency of Melville.

I might say that, in Melville, we have a population of some 4,600 people, and in that population we have a great many of those people employed as labourers. We also have a number of retired farmers living in

February 19, 1952

town, and we find that these people are not entirely satisfied with the control which this Government is having over certain commodities on which they could control the prices. However, the greatest disappointment that we see coming up in our town now is in the class of the labouring groups. These people seem to be increasingly dissatisfied with what they are obtaining from this Government. The wages, as has been already stated in this House, are lower in the province of Saskatchewan than in any other comparable province in Canada. The treatment that the labour group is getting seems to have dwindled from the attention that the labour group received when this Government first came into office. This Government seems to have forgotten labour, and, as a result, labour is not entirely satisfied; and labour has turned against the C.C.F. not only in the province of Saskatchewan, but in other provinces in this country; and that is evident by the recent Ontario elections.

Although, as I said, we have a large labour group in Melville, we are, I think, predominantly an agricultural district, and we must depend, and labour must depend, in our town and in our district, on agriculture. Therefore, I think one of the things that this Government must be prepared to do is give more attention to the welfare of the farmers. As I proceed I shall deal with highways and other matters that do affect the farmers.

In our own district we are grateful for the work that is being done on Highway No. 10 which goes through the town of Melville, and through a good part of the constituency, linking such points as Duff and Balcarres and Lebret and those points. After seven years of C.C.F. Government we are finally getting some highway attention in the reconstruction of Highway No. 10, but that has been after two or three years of asking for improvement to this road by myself in this House, and it has been after seven years of C.C.F. Government. Much as we are grateful for having No. 10 reconstructed and hard-topped — as I understand from the Minister that this work will be completed this summer — we need other roads in the Melville constituency very badly, and if this Government is prepared to spend, in the Melville seat, the amount of money that it is spending in other seats represented by members of the Government, and particularly members of the C.C.F. Cabinet, then we will be getting these roads; because, when checking up on the figures, I feel that if the same amount of money is spent, proportionately, in the Melville seat, according to the population of that constituency, compared with the money spent in other constituencies, these roads can very well be built. I refer, particularly, to what is commonly known as the Bredenbury cut-off with which the Minister of Highways is very familiar, because several delegations have met him with respect to this road.

The story behind the Bredenbury cut-off is that there is, presently, a municipal market road adjoining No. 14 and No. 9 highways — a distance of approximately 14 or 15 miles. Over that municipal road heavy oil trucks and all other traffic is travelling in order to reach the eastern part of this province, and to travel into the province of Manitoba. Despite the various delegations that have come to the Minister of Highways of this Government to build that road, it seems that the Minister of Highways cannot be persuaded to make that into a highway. Now, the importance of having that road made into a highway is that traffic will be saved from travelling in unfavourable weather around by way of Yorkton, an extra distance of some 60 miles. It seems to me that, if we can reduce highway mileage, we

will save a great deal of maintenance on highways; we will save a great deal of time for the people who are driving motor vehicles, and we will save a great deal of gasoline consumption and wear and tear on these vehicles. I would strongly urge upon this Government that they give consideration to building that short cut-off, and therefore save the things that I have just mentioned. I can assure the Minister of Highways that both the people of the Melville constituency and the people of the Saltcoats constituency are most anxious to have this road built.

There is another road that requires construction for almost the same reasons, and that is the road leading from Balcarres to Ituna. There is another road that is a municipal responsibility, and I might say, at this time, that the time is coming when the municipalities can no longer maintain the roads that are carrying these heavy oil trucks and all of this heavy traffic, from which the revenue goes into the funds of the Provincial Government. The Provincial Government is getting the revenue from these heavy trucks, but it is the municipalities that are maintaining the roads upon which they are travelling, in very many cases. I have given to the Minister of Highways two instances where these trucks are travelling over roads maintained by the municipalities of the province, instead of by the Provincial Government. I also urge that this Balcarres-Ituna road be constructed.

There is one more request that I am making to the Department of Highways, and I am joined in this request by the member from Cannington (Mr. McCarthy), and it is that we feel that Highway No. 47 should be reconstructed, in order to give the people of our constituency, of the Cannington constituency, and other people who live north of us, an outlet into the south country. If we are to travel into the south country from that vicinity now, it is almost necessary to either come to Fort Qu'Appelle, or travel down No. 9 Highway. Now I urge, with the support of the member from Cannington and the member from Moosomin, that reconstruction of Highway No. 47 be taken care of.

We have heard, in this House, considerable discussion, particularly from the people on this side of the House, with respect to the grave situation in Saskatchewan brought about by the extreme shortage of teachers. I respected what the Minister of Education said, in his speech, yesterday. I can understand the problems that his Department is up against, and we, in this House, sympathize with those problems. We know that other provinces are suffering with the same handicaps. I have here figures showing that there are 558 schools in charge of "sitters" or "supervisors", in Saskatchewan, at present. There are 558 schools, probably containing an average of 20 pupils per school, that require the aid of an experienced teacher. Now I do not think there is anybody in this House who will sit back and not take notice of this terrific problem that is facing our people in this province. To me, there is nothing more important than the proper education of our children. I do not think that we can advance in this province in the years to come, unless we give our children every possible education.

I am not going to criticize the Government too much with respect to having these sitters. I feel that we would have done things that would have alleviated this situation somewhat; and I say that in all earnestness, because I think there is one thing we would have done — at least that I would have urged be done — and that is the re-opening of the Regina Normal

February 19, 1952

School. I urge the Minister of Education to give this further consideration. It is true that we have a Normal School at Moose Jaw. I do not know, but it may be true that there is room there to train additional teachers, but that is not exactly the whole problem. We have a lot of people in Regina who might attend Normal School instead of going to business college or going in training for nurses. Much as these professions require these people, still they do not affect the people of Saskatchewan the same way as teachers do, and I say that if we had a Normal School open in Regina, there may be a lot of young girls who go in for nursing or business courses who would take up a teaching course instead. I know for a fact that if the Regina Normal School was open there would be a great many young boys and girls, men and women — from the constituency of Melville who would attend a Normal School in the city of Regina. I say that for the reason that, if there was a Normal School in this city, it is much closer to the homes of the people in my constituency than Moose Jaw or Saskatoon. These people would not mind having their sons and daughters attend normal School in Regina, where they could be close to them and would be able to assist them in many ways, and where they could come home more often. It is to be remembered that a lot of these young men and women attending Normal School have just graduated from the local schools, and the parents are not too anxious to send them too far away; it often is the first time that these young men and women have been away from home. I say that, in my opinion, the teacher problem would be alleviated to some extent if the Regina normal School was re-opened. I also say that even if it only produced 30, 40 or 50 teachers a year, who, in turn, would teach probably 20 or 30 pupils each, it would be well worth re-opening the Regina Normal School for the younger generation of our province. I hope some consideration will be given to this problem.

I was hoping that the Minister of Health (Hon. Mr. Bentley) would be in his seat, because I wish to say a few things with respect to the congestion of hospitals in this province. If I thought he was going to be back I would leave the question . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — May I say to my hon. friend that the Minister of Health is suffering from the ‘flu’ and is in bed, so my hon. friend should probably just go ahead with his remarks.

**Mr. Deshaye:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Premier. Mr. Speaker, with respect to the hospital congestion in this province, there is a chap from the Melville constituency, who lives very near Melville, who has had his wife in Regina since Monday last — that is eight days now — waiting for a bed in the hospital here. People necessarily have to come to Regina at times for medical attention because of the specialists in this city, and it is a most regrettable situation that there is not hospital space for these people when they come in. I agree that certain extensions have been made with respect to hospital beds in this province, but I do not think the Government has kept pace with the requirements of hospital beds.

When I first spoke in this Legislature, three years ago, I recall that I urged, at that time, the construction of an old folks’ home or nursing home — and at that time I said that I thought that if nursing homes and old folks’ homes were established, the congestion in the hospitals would

be relieved somewhat. I am still of that opinion. It seems to me that old folks homes can be constructed much cheaper than hospitals can; and still we have in our hospitals in this province so many old people who require some care but who do not require hospital care; they do not require the services of registered nurses, who are so scarce in this province, as well. I therefore urge upon the Government again to work out a plan where there will be homes provided for the old and the invalid of this province, in order that the hospital space they are presently using will be vacated for people that the hospital space they are presently using will be vacated for people who require hospital care. There is quite a difference between those who require nursing homes and those who require hospital care.

In our town we have a very fine hospital, and we have a most excellent old folks' home, in St. Paul's Lutheran Old Folks' Home; and I might say, at this time, that the old folks' home in Melville, which is operated by the Lutheran congregation, is operated there without one nickel of assistance from the Provincial Government. I think these people are to be congratulated for operating a home in which their people can be put when they are old. We are very proud both of our hospital and of our old folks' home, in Melville. The Lutheran people are building a wing on the old folks' home there, and they are using their own funds to do so; there is no contribution from the province of Saskatchewan. That goes to show that people can still carry on their own efforts if they do not have too much interference from the Government. However, the situation with respect to hospitals, today, with the interference of our socialistic Government, is not quite the same. I think we are all aware that the Government pays so much per day per patient admitted to hospital. I understand that this amount that is allowed per day is a bare minimum, and, as a result, hospitals must curtail their services as much as possible to meet this minimum rate that is offered by the Government per patient per day.

I also understand — and if this is so, it is most regrettable — that the Government will only pay 80 per cent of the bed capacity of a hospital. Say a hospital has 100-bed capacity: even if those 100 beds should be filled throughout the whole year, the Government will only pay 80 per cent of the patients that entered that hospital; whereas possibly they should have got \$1,000 for a certain month, and they had their hospital filled with patients, that hospital would only receive \$800. I understand that is the situation. If that is not correct I would be glad to be corrected on it.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, if I may correct my hon. friend. Those are not the circumstances at all. I do not want to take the time, on a question of privilege, to go into details, but I can assure my hon. friend that is not the case.

**Mr. Deshaye:** — Well, I will be very interested in having the Premier or the Minister of Health explain that at some occasion. I am on a hospital board, and I understand that to be the situation. I have attended numerous hospital conventions, and I understand that is the way it is. No doubt the Premier, who is very skilful at explaining things, may be able to show this to be otherwise; but I still understand that all that the Government will pay is 80 per cent of the capacity of a hospital. As I said, possibly an explanation will be forthcoming with respect to that.

There have been certain insinuations from the other side of the House that we, on this side, oppose the hospitalization scheme. I wish to emphatically state, in this Legislature, before all of the members present, that we do not oppose the hospitalization scheme. As I said, at the outset of my remarks, this afternoon, we are misconstrued on too many things. Certain members may, at times, express their own opinions as to how certain things can be improved. I think it would be a bad state of affairs in this province if people did not have the right to express their own opinions as to how things could be improved; but then again, I wish to say that, when some individual, either on this side of the House, or on that side of the House, gets up and says, "This is how I think it should be done", I do not think that should necessarily reflect on the whole group, whether it be on the Government side or on the Opposition side of the House.

I have talked with members on this side of the House, and I have talked with the people who support us in the constituencies throughout this province, and we are in favour generally of the present hospitalization scheme, and we intend to continue it; and just as I said, at the outset of my remarks, we felt that the present hospitalization scheme is an improvement on what previous governments in this province started. We have to start somewhere, in everything. After all, whether it is highways, whether it is social services, or whether it is a hospitalization scheme, there has to be a start; and the start is, naturally, not the perfect start. It is the same thing as our P.F.R.A. in this province. That was started by the Bennett Government — we give them credit for that; but no one will deny, today, that that scheme has not been improved remarkably from the time that Mr. Bennett started it. Therefore, I say that if the C.C.F. Government across the way has improved the hospitalization scheme that was set up by the Liberals in this province originally, then they deserve some credit; but they certainly do not deserve the credit that they are claiming, because, as I said, things have to start somewhere. After all, the Government across the way has been in power in this province for practically eight years, and surely we can expect some improvement after that time in office.

There was one other thing I was going to say about hospitals, and I think possibly the Premier or the Minister of Health can deal with this when they speak again. We, in this province, have been very dependent on private hospitals, and I think they have rendered an excellent service to this province. We have various religious groups, who are "charity" groups, who have devoted their lives to the sick of this province, as well as of other provinces. However, regardless of how charitable a group is, it must work on the financial basis of the monetary system which we believe in if it is to operate, because charity alone will not pay the bills of a hospital. However, as I said before, I understand that this Government only pays 80 per cent of the bed capacity. I also understand — and I think that this is positively correct, because I have spoken to auditors on it — that this Government will not pay the bonded indebtedness of private hospitals in this province. Say, for instance, that when this Government came into power, there was a hospital with \$60,000 of debt against it, and therefore, the interest on its bonded indebtedness would be approximately \$6,000 a year. I understand that, in figuring out its rate, the Government will pay the bed rate that has been set, and the depreciation; but it will not pay the bonded indebtedness. As a result, we find that the people who are working for charity in these hospitals have to pay that bonded



indebtedness of these hospitals. I say that more particularly for the reason that, unless this Government adopts the policy of paying the interest on bonded indebtedness of these hospitals, we will never have any private hospitals being built in this province, because nobody is going to come in and borrow money to build hospitals and then not have the interest paid, at least. Therefore, I say, even if they are to work at cost, they should also have their interest paid by the people for whom we need hospital services.

I wish now to turn for a few minutes — I cannot speak very much longer because I must share this radio time with the hon. member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald); but I wish to speak, for a few minutes, on some of the things that are affecting the farmers directly, where I certainly do not agree with the actions of this Government.

Two years ago — on March 1, 1950, I believe — when I stood in this chamber, I spoke of the Government permitting, without licence or without restrictions, agents — that is private agents and agents respecting certain concerns going out and asking the farmers to sign to them, often with misrepresentation, their leases, for a 10-year period at 10 cents an acre. At that time I stood in this Legislature and I said to the members across the way that, in Manitoba, at that very time these sleek agents were running around here paying 10 cents an acre, they were paying \$1.50; and they were paying much higher in the province of Alberta. I am sure that the members of the Cabinet of the C.C.F. Government of Saskatchewan knew that these acres were being leased too cheap, at 10 cents an acre. The information was in their hands. It was in my hands — the meagre information that I had; and if I had the information surely the Minister of Natural Resources and members of the Cabinet had the information that these leases were being signed by the farmers too cheaply at 10 cents an acre. I asked, at that time, where the other \$1.40 was going. After all, if the leases were worth \$1.50 in Manitoba, they should have been worth \$1.50 in Saskatchewan, because the Premier and the Minister of Natural Resources had, on various occasions as far back as 1950, said that we had the greatest potential oil and mineral resources of any province in this Dominion of Canada. We, on this side of the House, agreed with that and we still agree with it; and that is why I say there was a lack of interest in the farmers of Saskatchewan by this Government when they permitted the oilmen to go around taking up leases at 10 cents an acre. The fact has proven itself now when we see them going around now and taking out the leases from people who knew the score, shall we say, a little better, and they are being paid \$1.00 and \$1.50 and even \$2.00 and more in certain places. I said two years ago that the farmers of Saskatchewan were being sold down the river by this Government permitting these men to go around and get leases at 10 cents an acre; and I still think that has been the case.

Yesterday, the member from Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) also explained how the farmers were being “railroaded” as you might say, into signing these leases on account of the 3-cents an acre mineral tax. The hon. member from Cannington said that these men came around to the farmers’ homes and said, “Well, you know, the Government is charging your land with 3-cents an acre tax on your minerals, and if you do not pay it you will lose these minerals” — which was all very true; and they said, “Now look.

**February 19, 1952**

You lease to us at 10 cents an acre, and we will take care of the tax.” The result was that the farmer got seven cents an acre, and the 3-cents that was taken care of by these companies; and this was an inducement brought about by the action of this Government in putting in, in 1944, a mineral tax of three cents an acre against every acre of farm land in this province; and I say that, by doing so, this Government has penalized the farmers of Saskatchewan who are already paying, in my opinion, more than their fair share of the taxation of this province.

For that reason I urge, with the other members on this side of the House, that this Government take steps to abolish that 3-cents-an-acre tax that was imposed under the Mineral Taxation Act of 1944. I do not think it is fair for any government to tax a farmer or anybody else on something that he does not know whether he owns or not. After all, here is a tax of 3 cents an acre, imposed by the C.C.F. Government of the province of Saskatchewan on something he does not know exists or not under his land; and I am firmly convinced that it is not right to tax anybody for something they do not know whether they have or not.

That brings to my mind another tax that I have, on previous occasion, urged, in this House, be abolished, and that is the Education Tax on farm fuels and greases and other commodities required on the farms. I have urged, and again urge, that this tax be abolished for the reason that I do not believe in having taxes on expenses. I believe that taxation should be on the production, not on the expenses. If a farmer buys farm fuel, or if he buys fertilizer or any of these things that are items of expense that go into the land, he is just adding to his expense. If he has a crop failure he has lost, in addition, that 3 per cent Education and Hospitalization Tax that he has paid on the items of expense already. Therefore, I do not think that is the proper policy. I think that the tax should be on the production only. If he has a good return he pays a larger tax, and the man who has no return, through circumstances often over which he has no control, can save the tax simply because he has no production. Therefore, I say it is wrong to pay tax on matters that go into expenses, and that would include so many items in respect to farms, such as lumber for granaries, and many other items which are classed as expenses.

I understand that the Government requires revenue for carrying on social services and all the other expenses that a government has, the same as any other enterprise requires money to carry on, and the question might be put: “Where are we to get the money, if we are going to take off this Education Tax, Public Revenue Tax, farm expenses tax, and this mineral tax under the Mineral Taxation Act?” The other day, when the Premier spoke, he said that the mineral production had increased, in this province, from \$22,200,000 to \$50 million. I also remember, in 1944 and subsequent years, when members from across the way went across this province and said they would remove the Education Tax as soon as additional revenue was obtainable by the Government. Some of them even didn’t go so far as to say that “as soon as additional revenues were obtainable by the Government.” They just said, “We will remove the Education Tax”. But I think, just as I said before, that what a few say is not the policy of the particular party which sets the programme. Because one man said, “We would remove the Education Tax” I do not say at this time that that was the C.C.F. policy.

I believe that the official C.C.F. commitments were that they would remove the Education Tax just as soon as they had additional revenue.

Now, instead of doing that they have increased it by another cent; but as I wish to point out, according to the Premier's own statement, there were \$22,200,000 in 1944, in mineral production, and there were \$50 million of mineral production in 1951. I say to the Government on the opposite side of this House that that is where you can get your taxation for the operation of the social services and the other expenses of this province.

Let those people who are making \$50 million in this province, in mineral production; who are producing \$50 million worth of goods and making money on those \$50 million worth of mineral production; let them pay their fair share of the taxes which we, in this province, are now taking from the farmers and the working people. Besides that, you have thousands more automobiles than we had in 1944, and there is an increased revenue of many hundreds of dollars. I think it is high time that this Government started keeping some of the promises which it made, in 1944, and subsequent years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with that, in order to give the hon. member from Moosomin time to be on the air, I will cease for this afternoon; and you can surmise that I will support the amendment and oppose the Motion.

**Mr. A.H. McDonald** (Moosomin): — I, too, would like to associate myself, and the people I happen to represent, with the things that have been said with regard to our late King George VI, and would also like to pass on my regrets to the royal family and our new Queen. I would like at this time to ask, on behalf of the people I represent, that we ask as little as possible, in that she is very young and has a very strenuous job ahead of her. I think if we, her loyal subjects, do not demand too much of her she will fulfil her duties for a good many years to come, and go down in history as one of our great Queens.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to deal with one or two things pertaining to my own constituency. I mentioned some two years ago when speaking in this House, something about the closing of the provincial gaol at Moosomin. I believe, Mr. Speaker that that gaol had a place in the society of this province. I believe that it was doing a good job in the segregation of prisoners — that is, in keeping the first offenders apart from repeaters or hardened criminals. I believe that the very geographical position the gaol had in Moosomin was an excellent surrounding for young people who happened to get into difficulty, and are put away in one of these institutions. I believe that young people who have to be taken care of in these institutions are much better if they are kept in the country away from the city lights, in complete segregation from second and third offenders, and the more hardened type of prisoner. Therefore, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that that gaol had a rightful place in this province, and I believe they were doing a good job.

However, the present Government deemed it necessary to close that gaol and I certainly cannot agree with the methods used in the closing of the gaol. At that time Mr. Christie, who was in charge, came down to the gaol in the middle of the night, broke into the gasoline storage place and filled up his trucks with purple gas, and took off with his prisoners for Regina. He lost a few of them out on the road — and this thing was carried out in the middle of the night. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the behaviour of this gentleman at that time was necessary at all. The people of Moosomin constituency were very concerned about it. I was also concerned about it at the time, but there was apparently nothing I could do. I tried my best to keep the gaol open and failed because the decision to close it had apparently been arrived at some considerable time before the action was taken; but in the face of this, the Provincial Government spent some \$10,000 on the buildings and the gaol the year they closed it. Well, I cannot understand why any government, if they have \$10,000 to throw away, should stick it in some building and then close it in the next breath. But the gaol has been closed, and I had asked this gentleman to utilize the facilities of that gaol for some other purpose. I have suggested, and I suggest again, that it might be converted very easily into an old folks' home, or to a boys' industrial school, or some of the other things that this Government has built new buildings to provide. I believe the building could be used for any of those purposes, rather than spending huge sums of the public money to construct new buildings elsewhere. I doubt very much if the gaol would ever have been closed had it been in a C.C.F.er's seat, and I know full well it would have been put to some use had it been located in a C.C.F.er's seat.

I also wish to say a few words with regard to rural electrification in regard to my own constituency. We have a great need for an expansion in the rural electrification programme in that area. It is a mixed farming area. The farms are not too large, and there is a tremendous amount of cattle and hogs kept in that area, which means that during the fall and winter months there are a tremendous number of chores to be done after dark, and that is when electricity really comes into its own. Not only does it supply the light so that a man can do his chores in comfort, but it supplies many of the conveniences in motors and electrical appliances to lighten the burden of the farmer. Therefore, I sincerely hope that we in the Moosomin area will soon be on the list to receive some of this expansion that we hear so much about.

The areas that we know do have electrification in the Moosomin seat — I could use my own home town as an example, the town of Fleming, which got its electricity from a private power company which was later bought out by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation; I must say we have had electricity in the town of Fleming for a good number of years, but service there today is dreadful. The lines are in a terrible state of repair. Often there, after a wind, you will find three or four power poles lying down in the town with bare wires and sparks flying off them all over the streets. The service as far as light is concerned is very, very poor. The lights are very dim, and we are without service many times during the year. I sincerely hope that the Minister, through his Department, will be able to do something to rectify this situation. I sincerely hope that we will be able to re-build . . .

**Hon. Mr. Darling:** — Will the hon. gentleman tell me the name of the town he is speaking of? I did not catch it.

**Mr. McDonald:** — The name of the town is my hometown, Mr. Minister, the town of Fleming. I would appreciate it very much if the Minister would come down personally and examine the state of the Power Commission in that town and examine the service that it is receiving. It is necessary to use 200-Watt bulbs to get the light that a 100-Watt or 50-Watt should produce. I certainly hope that he himself will look into this situation.

Also, while I am on this point of rural electrification, I would like again to bring attention to this House one particular organization in my seat that I think should be supplied with electricity at the first opportune moment, and that is an old folks' home situated in St. Huberts, north of the town of Whitewood. This Old Folks' Home is doing a wonderful job of providing a home for elderly and sick people, with no compensation from the Provincial Government. They have asked to be supplied with electricity. They are now generating their own electricity with their own plant, and it is a very costly situation. You know that, in a hospital, you must have electricity available day and night, and often you will find a big motor running there on a generator when there might be only one or two lights on in the entire establishment. Other times, they are heavily overloaded, and I sincerely hope that the Minister will find it possible to give these people the benefits of rural electrification at as early a date as possible.

I would also like to mention, Mr. Speaker, a little in regard to highways. This pertains chiefly to my own seat, as I have the knowledge first-hand there; but I imagine if the situation exists there, it probably exists in many other places throughout the province. As you probably know, some work was done on the Trans-Canada Highway in the year 1949, and at that time, and since, certain lands have been expropriated in order to build this highway. These lands, Mr. Speaker, have never been paid for. They were taken from the farmers in the years 1949, 1950 and 1951. The farmers have paid taxes on this land since that date. He has not had crop on it, yet he has had no settlement for it. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that is right and just. I believe that if the Government, whether it be provincial or federal, or who it be, must have land for construction work, that land should be paid for immediately. I cannot see why any farmer should be asked to wait one, two and three years for payment for property that has been taken over by the Provincial Government.

The other day, when the Leader of the Opposition was speaking, he made some reference to highways being used as a political "pork barrel" by the C.C.F. Party. I have gone to a lot of trouble to compile a certain amount of figures to back up that statement, because I believe it was the Premier himself who got up and denied it. Mr. Speaker, from the figures that we have available to us, which go up to the end of the year 1951, it certainly is a "pork barrel" and a good one! During the period 1944-48, which is called by the C.C.F. Party a "security period", we have some very interesting highway expenditures. These expenditures are for construction, reconstruction, gravelling, surfacing, black-topping

**February 19, 1952**

and what have you. Now, Mr. Speaker, the four seats which were held by Liberal members from 1944-48 received the average for each of the four seats of \$33,000 from this highway money spent in their constituencies. During the same period, 41 C.C.F. seats received an average sum of \$384,000 per seat — \$33,000 compared to \$384,000. Now apparently there are some individuals in the C.C.F. Party who were receiving better treatment than other members within that same party — and now I am referring to the Cabinet Ministers.

There are eight Cabinet Ministers who, during that period received on the average \$495,000. In other words, they had 15 times as much as the Liberal private members. The Cabinet of this C.C.F. Government received 15 times as did the members of the Opposition in highways money. Isn't that "security" in grand style? If not, then I have never seen it! Security for eight members of the Cabinet! The reason I say "eight" is because the four other Cabinet Ministers happen to represent city seats. However, there were two members of that Cabinet who did not receive the same security. They were the ex-members for Melfort and Saltcoats; they did not happen to get returned. I wonder if perhaps the reason for that is that they did not receive nearly as much money for highway work in their constituencies. The ex-member for Melfort received \$242,000 in his seat, and the ex-member for Saltcoats received \$294,000, whereas the average was \$495,000. The "Security" was not carried out to its logical conclusion in those two seats.

That was for the "security period" 1944-48. Now we come into the "development period" in regard to the Department of Highways. Within the "development period" we have 20 members on this side of the House, and the 20 members have received on the average of \$92,000 whereas there is not much difference between "security" and "development" — they both arrive at the same conclusion; but the only way to elect C.C.F.ers is to dip into the highways' money — the "pork barrel" — and get yourself about 15 times as much as anybody else, and you are in. Well, I don't doubt it a bit. I know if I had \$5,000 or \$6,000 to spend in my seat, by golly! you fellows — I could sure lick you. I'm like Fred Dundas — "I would sure fix you!"

Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with some of the things that have been said with regard to the 3-per cent mineral tax in this province. I believe this 3-per cent mineral tax was instrumental in causing the farmers of this province to sell, or to lease, their mineral rights at a price far under their actual value. I believe that, by the time these lessees took to the roads and attacked the farmers, this Government, either the Minister of Natural Resources or the Premier himself, or, better still, both of them, should have stood up on their hind legs and warned the farmers of this province not to sell at that price. Some of our neighbouring provinces did that — the provincial governments did that — with the consequences that those farmers in those particular provinces have received much more for their freehold land than the farmers in this province have received.

This Government has done nothing; if anything they even encouraged it. They leased permits in this province for one-tenth of a cent,

so I guess they thought the farmer was getting a good deal at ten cents. Mr. Speaker, many of these farmers who leased their land for ten cents an acre, today, could have received as high as \$10. Who got the difference between the ten cents and the \$10? I just mention that in passing, because there are a good many of the farmers in my area who did own their mineral rights, and the vast majority of them sold them, unfortunately, through not having any guidance from the Provincial Government, where the guidance should have come from.

We have also heard a good deal in this Legislature with regard to the decline in population. I would just like to say a few words in that regard myself. I might first quote from a speech that the Premier made not so long ago over the radio, when he gives the reasons for the decline in population in Saskatchewan, and I thought it was very good. It is the very thing that I believe myself, and is the very thing that the people on this side of the House have been saying for a good many years. He says:

“The reason Saskatchewan has suffered a loss in population as compared with other provinces is due to the fact that there have not been the industries here to which people could go. Consequently any of those who left our farms went to the larger industrial centres of Canada and the United States in search of work.”

Well, we know that is what has happened, and yet the Premier himself who makes this statement, is the Minister in Charge, and he is the man who is telling us about the industrial expansion we have in Saskatchewan. Yet in the next breath, he says the people are leaving here because we have not got industrial development. Why does he not make up his mind? Either we have got it or we have not got it; and as far as I can see, we have not got it, Mr. Speaker.

**Premier Douglas:** — On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend will read all the radio broadcast he will find I was speaking of the loss of population from the period 1936-1946, which was almost 100,000 people.

**Mr. McDonald:** — If the Premier wants to make a speech he will have the opportunity sometime later on. This is what he said; this is taken from his own speech, and is exactly what he said, and I read it out to you here. It goes without saying that if industrial development is not here, I think we will have to go elsewhere to get it.

Now the Premier, also, during his speech here the other day, made the remark that he did not think the Leader of the Opposition (and inferred that nobody on this side of the House) was in a position to say whether the people of this province had lost the confidence in this Government or not. Now, Mr. Speaker, for the reasons I have just stated — the grievances that arise in their own constituencies, and the grievances that are spreading over this province — I believe that the people of this province have lost the confidence in the present Provincial Government. I also

believe that this Government is directly responsible for the decline of population.

**Some Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. McDonald:** — Just the other day, the hon. member from Milestone (Mr. Erb) said that the time had now arrived when he was in agreement that the C.P.R. should be nationalized in Canada. Well, if he is going to nationalize the C.P.R., is he going to nationalize Imperial Oil, and Sohio, Tidewater, the Bank of Nova Scotia down on the corner? Where is he going to stop? If he is going to nationalize one thing, is he going to nationalize them all? Mr. Speaker, the people of this province are afraid that is what is going to happen; and if you people on that side of the House had the power, and were not afraid of the people of this province, that is what you would go ahead and do.

**Some Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. McDonald:** — Just last fall, when gas was first discovered in this province, what was the policy announced by the present Government? They said they were going to take over the distribution of the gas. Well, Mr. Speaker, if you can control a product after it is found — that is, control the distribution of it — then you have control of the commodity itself, have you not? Well, they have announced they are going to take over the distribution of the natural gas in this province; in other words, it is a monopoly. Well, I do not believe in monopoly. I believe that if that is their business, and I have no complaints there. But I believe that they should go into it on a competitive basis and compete with the other people, with private investors, co-operations or anyone else who is prepared and willing to go into this sort of business. The Provincial Government stated that they were going to find a market for this natural gas. There is no need to look for a market for natural gas in this province. The market is here. The people are sitting here waiting on this natural gas, and I am sure we would get a better service if this thing was left open to competition, and I am sure we would get gas delivered to the consumer at a more fair and equitable price.

That is another reason I believe the present administration has lost the confidence of the people of this province. I also believe that the attitude the present Government has taken towards debtors has caused a decline in population in this province. Chiefly there I refer to the young man who wants to set himself up, we will say, as a farmer in this province. Because of the attitude of the present administration, it is becoming increasingly difficult for a young man to do this, because the average land-owner today, who has land for sale, is probably old and wants to retire, or he wants to go into some other occupation — he is forced today to sell his land for cash. Well, no young man who is starting up as a farmer can go out today and pay cash for land at the price of land in this province. Consequently, any land that comes up for sale in this province has been taken up by the large landowner, because he is the only man who has the ready cash to pay for it. That causes a decline in the population of this province. It causes people to go into co-op



farms because they cannot get started on their own; and I do not believe that anyone should be compelled to go into anything. I believe that he should have the opportunity to go where he likes; that he should farm on his own with the same financial assistance as he would receive if he went out and farmed in a co-op farm. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the attitude of the present administration has changed the attitude of the electors of this province, and I do not believe that the present Government, or the C.C.F. Party will attain the support of the public when they do go to the people with these different issues that I have enumerated.

I also want to say a word in regard to the Department of Agriculture. When the Minister was speaking, the other day, he was talking about different things that the Department of Agriculture had done. You know, these people always remind me somewhat of the Russians. The Russians are always great people to be “first” — every now and again you read something in the newspapers about where they were “first”; they did something first. We all know that many of these things were working in the Western World before they were suggested in Russia. Well, these people are always “first”. No matter what it is, or where it is, they were first. As a matter of fact, the Premier said that the Minister of Agriculture was first to approach the Federal Government with regard to bringing grain driers into Saskatchewan duty free. Well, now, how he ever arrived at that I do not know. Whether he went down and looked at the confidential mail of the Federal Minister of Agriculture, I do not know; but I do not think that he or anybody else in this House is in a position to say that the Saskatchewan Minister of Agriculture was first — he may have been last; who knows? I believe in my own humble opinion that the Federal Minister of Agriculture was working on this plan long before our provincial Minister ever wrote him. You do not sit down and write to a Federal or Provincial member, or to anybody else and suggest something and it is done the next day; this takes time. (The Premier is mumbling in his board, but that is all right; we do not mind that).

I am convinced that he made another statement in regard to how they had given 8,100 farmers of this province free grass seed — enough to sow 110,000 acres. Well now, Mr. Speaker, I was the recipient of part of this grass seed, but I paid for it. They did not give it to me free — not very likely; I paid for it with my own money, and I think the vast majority of these other farmers paid for it as well.

He also went on to talk about all this work the Department of Agriculture has done; they have broken so many acres of this; irrigated so many acres of that, etc., and what did the Liberals do? Nothing! Well, Mr. Speaker, the Premier, yourself and everybody else in this House knows that it is only recently — as a matter of fact, since the last war — that much of the equipment used to do this work not only become available, but it was only invented. That brought quite a “Pooh! Pooh!” from the other side of the House, Mr. Speaker, and it only goes to show that neither the Minister of Agriculture, or the Premier, know what they are talking about. There was not a scrub cutter, a successful scrub cutter, to be bought in the province prior to the last war, and they know it. And there was not a piler to be bought. The big hydraulic plows that are used, and the

**February 19, 1952**

discers that are used today — there was not one in the North American continent, Mr. Speaker, and they know that as well as I do. And they also know that much of the equipment that is used today in the irrigation and drainage programme was not available prior to the last war. I do not care who was in power then; this stuff was not even designed, or developed, or manufactured, or put on the market.

They have done some drainage, and some irrigation — yes. The Federal Government built the dams for them to get their water from and yet the Federal Government have done most of that work, Mr. Speaker, since the last war, for the simple reason that the machinery was not available. It had never been designed nor developed before that date to do this work on a profitable basis, and to do it in the short space of time such as can be done today. There is a lot of mumbling over this, Mr. Speaker, but I do not mind that. If they can get me a scrub cutter that was built before the last war, I would like to see it, and would like to see it operating in the forest in the northern part of this province where they are operating now. I am not going to say there was nothing designed. I am going to say there was nothing designed that would do the work that we are doing today, successfully; and they know that as well as I do.

There has also been a good deal said, Mr. Speaker, about this last crop we had in this province. There has been a good deal said about the transportation and storage of it, and about the drying of it. Well, I would just like to say a few words about that at this time, and in doing so I would like to mention some things about our crop of 1950. In 1950, as you know, Mr. Speaker, we had a large crop in this province. Much of it was a very low grade, due to the heavy frost which hit us before harvest. I would like, at this time, to compliment our Canadian Wheat Board on the method they used in handling that grain. I would like to compliment them on behalf of the farmers that I represent, and I think the vast majority of the farmers of this province, for the price they obtained for that product. I can recall . . . (the Premier smiles — he should; he probably knows what is coming next) . . . when the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture got up on their feet after the initial payment was made on this crop, and said: “Boys, you have had it! That is it — you get nothing more.” Well, they were probably contented with the initial payment; they probably thought that was a good price for the product that was being sold. Probably it was a fair price, and probably that is all they would get from a C.C.F.er; but what happened, Mr. Speaker? You know as well as I do that a further interim payment of 20 cents and a final payment of some 25 cents was paid on that crop.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, in giving the credit where credit is due, and I think there is a lot of credit going to the Canadian wheat Board for the method it used in handling that crop.

**Hon. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. McDonald:** —We also know that, when we came into the present crop season, we had a carry-over of some 150 millions of bushels

of this low-grade wheat in Canada. this wheat was in our country elevators — part of it; part of it was in transit, and part of it was in our elevators at the Head of the Lakes terminal; and no doubt it did clutter up the flow of the 1951 crop to some degree. But after all, there was a reason for that 150 millions of bushels of low-grade wheat to be held back. After all, if they could dispose of all the 1950 crop with the exception of 150 millions of bushels at a good price and without depressing the price of coarse grains, oats and barley which were sold in competition too, then I think they did very well to get it down to 150 million bushels. but in spite of having this 150 million bushels of wheat on hand which is not millable, between the dates august 1 and November 22, 1951, there was a tremendous amount of grain moved out of Western Canada, and I would like to quote some figures to show the colossal effort that was made to move this grain out of the west.

For instance, the shipment out of country elevators in 1951 amounted to 210 millions of bushels compared to 156 millions of bushels for 1950. There was also shipped from the Lakehead 156 millions of bushels in 1951, compared to 51 millions in 1950. Overseas clearances were 107 million bushels in 1951, compared to 55 million in 1950. Shipments to the United States were 39 millions of bushels in 1951, compared to 15 millions in 1950. I think those figures will bear me out, Mr. Speaker, when I say that the Canadian Wheat Board did everything possible to get that crop out of the country.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — May I be permitted a question? Do these figures apply to the period July 31 to November 1?

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, I gave the figures, or the dates before I gave the figures — August 1 to November 22, 1951.

At that time, as we all know, Mr. Speaker, there was no difficulty in disposing of millable wheat. The market was there and the price was good, and the Canadian wheat Board opened the market, opened the quota, with the express purpose of getting millable wheat out of Canada as fast as possible. I think they were justified in doing so, simply because the market was there for the wheat, and it was a good price, and they wanted to dispose of as much of that wheat as was humanly possible.

There has been some complaint since over the opening of the quota at that time. Perhaps if the Canadian Wheat Board could have seen what was going to happen the quotas might never have been opened. But who knew the balance of that crop was to be harvested in a tough and damp condition?

Now, it also must be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that this 1951 crop has been a terrific problem to handle, and that was caused by two reasons; firstly, that it is one of the largest crops that Canada has ever produced, and secondly, that such huge quantities of that crop were in a tough and damp condition. This 1951 crop that we have just taken off, is second only to the crop of 1928; that is the wheat crop. In 1928, the wheat crop in Canada was 567 millions of bushels, and in 1951 it was 562 millions of bushels — some 5 million bushels less than in 1928. Most of

**February 19, 1952**

this wheat, as we know, Mr. Speaker, is produced in the western provinces. Out of the total of 562 millions of bushels, 531 millions of that was produced in the three prairie provinces of Western Canada, compared with 427 millions, last year. But not only did we have a large wheat crop in Western Canada, we had a large crop of coarse grains — oats and barley — record crops: 493 millions of bushels of oats as compared to 1950 when we had 73 millions of bushels less; and the barley the same thing — 253 millions, or 82 millions more than we had in 1950.

So we can see that it would have been a tremendous problem to handle this grain had it all been dry — it adds up to a total sum of 700 millions of bushels to be moved from the three prairie provinces. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this problem is not only going to be with us this year, I believe this problem is going to remain with us, because our system and method of harvesting in Western Canada have brought this situation on. We know that, in the old days when we threshed from the stooks with the threshing machine, we threshed into portable granaries, and probably the threshing ring had several farmers to thresh, and it was a month's or two-month's job to do it — sometimes longer than that; but today we have a new and modern combine, a large truck and everybody wants his crop taken off in about three weeks, and he wants to sell about 60 or 70 per cent of it in that three-weeks' time.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that any transportation system in the world could take care of 700 millions of bushels of grain in the short space of time that we are asking them to do it now. Therefore, I believe that some adjustment will have to take place. The farmers will have to realize that they will have to spread the deliveries of their crops over a 12-month period, and I do not think that is going to be a hardship on anybody. I believe that any farmer who can deliver a certain amount of grain every month of the year, or perhaps every three months of the year, is financially better off than the man who disposes of his crop in one lump sum, especially the young fellow, who might spend his earnings all at once and not look into the future. I know I have done that myself, and I know what it means. Therefore, I do not think this is such a terrific situation, or that there are very many hardships faced by it, but I believe . . .

**Mr. E.H. Walker** (Gravelbourg): — Where should we keep the wheat then — on the ground?

**Mr. McDonald:** — . . . Now that's funny, isn't it? There is a little fellow who came into this House not very long ago, and he has more to say than anybody in the House. He must be taking an example from his brother.

Mr. Speaker, that is what I wanted to say here today, and for the reasons I have expressed, I believe that the people of this province have lost confidence in the present administration, and for that reason I will vote for the amendment and oppose the motion.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — On a question of privilege. I understood he said no one had been paid for the land in his constituency.

Now I sent down and had the records sent up, and I want to show you the map here, which shows a very considerable portion (all those in red) have been completely paid for their land. Those in yellow have received partial payments, and the green are cases where the title is now being cleared at the Land Titles Office, and cheques will be going out immediately. So that statement is absolutely incorrect.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Will you send this map over to me now please?

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — Yes I will send it over.

**Mr. L.W. Larsen** (Shellbrook): — Mr. Speaker, I also want to congratulate the hon. member from Milestone (Mr. Erb) and my young colleague here from Gravelbourg (Mr. E.H. Walker). I also notice how these members that sit alongside me are progressing. I have an idea that he will soon be up that way too, and I will indicate another guy with a little bit of commonsense because they do not get much on that side anyway.

I have enjoyed all the speeches from both sides of the House. Some did not amount to very much and likely that is the category mine will be in; and some were real good. I can say I sure enjoyed the Minister of Education's speech yesterday, because he does quote both sides of the story — I also had a lot of pleasure listening to my friend from Wilkie (Mr. Horsman). He made a very good speech yesterday, and I can say all my sympathy went out to him when he mentioned how many years he had farmed up there. He was hailed out and dried out and 'hoppered out, and I could mention some more that is even worse than these three. One is rust. I know mine is rusted back, this year.

But the worst enemy of all is inflation. Where I came from, and I know some of you members know it, we had quite a few crop failures — one of the worst ones, too; make no mistake about it — when you go out and find a crop of thirty or forty bushel and then it only brings you half of what it costs you to take it off, for ten years in the lean 'thirties when our Liberal administration had no solution and the war came to help them a little. Even then four years of war only brought 50 cents a bushel to the farmers of my area. That is why I say — the parity price; we must not forget about it. What is the use of setting a big price on wheat, today? It might be out of date two years or six months from now with the inflation that is going on in this country. We are entitled to a parity price. If they do not like that word I would say give us a price that it will cost the consumers of this country to import it from the United States. That is what I have to pay for my machinery, no commodities to raise my crop. That is only fair. What is fair for one is fair for another. And I say what is breaking this country is the ruinous prices we are getting for the commodities the farmers are raising. You can see right now, that our market is gone. I know our Minister of Agriculture in his Department is doing a wonderful job as far as production is concerned, but what is the use of

producing 40 bushels if you lose money on it? And that is exactly the way it goes. The only thing we have left today is wheat. All the other margins are gone.

I remember listening to the Hon. James Gardiner in Battleford in the by-election, and I dropped in to listen to him. He was criticizing the C.C.F. most severely because they were hollering blue ruin — “the market is gone!” “Why”, he says, “Markets? I have so many markets I cannot fill all these orders. Why it is good for years and years, and I have got a \$200 million stabilization that can be used if necessary.”

Well, we were right. The markets are gone today. When I look over the situation today, Mr. Speaker, our market is gone. Today our farmers in this country do not take any faith in our marketing policies, which do not come under the Provincial Government’s jurisdiction. We have been importing carloads of beef, carloads and carloads of pork, carloads of lard, and carloads of eggs, dressed poultry, and the Minister of Agriculture at Ottawa and his staff are busy running all over the world, picking up a little butter in New Zealand, a little in Australia, a little over in Sweden and a little over in Denmark. Well, when that condition exists in this country it is no wonder the farmer is going broke, and that is exactly the conditions.

But I did get a real laugh when I picked up the “Leader-Post” a couple of days ago. Oh, how sorry the Federal Government is feeling for our farmers! Oh, yes! We get for the No. 1 hog at the marketing point — I think it is in Regina — 24 cents; but if his ears are a little too long, his nose a little dirty, if you can average 22 cents you are lucky. Yes.

Going home the other day, I had to sit beside some big well-to-do official in the packing plants, and he was telling the commercial travellers before we went to bed on the train, how much money inflation had really taken on this pork. Their packing plan was full to the roof; the roof was just bulging out. Then they filled an old brewery, and cold storage plant and other plants there with pork, and they did not know what to do with it. The only market they had was Ontario. We know where our bacon market went to: “Jimmy” fixed that. Well, Ontario can satisfy its own needs. It is absolutely no use to say there is any market for it whatsoever.

So when I get the article here (this is one of them) to stabilize the price at 26 cents — that would be Montreal and Toronto which would make it 24 cents, which is what it was this week and last week — we are out to stabilize the hog industry of Saskatchewan farmers. Oh, they were really out to help them! If you read down — this was in the “Leader-Post” Monday, the 18th, it is not very old; I will now read it to this House — and this is something of a new arrangement —

“Agriculture prices of pork boardmen offered to buy stocks of standard domestic pork cuts held by thoroughly inspected plants on September 30th at 36 ½ cents.”

Well, I just wrote it out on a piece of paper here, Mr. Speaker. I know up in my area there, we generally sold a pair of little suckers for \$25, and that is \$12.50 apiece. You take a hog up to the market at 150 pounds at 22 cents and that gave me \$33 and I pay \$12.50 for the little fellow and that gave me \$20.50. And what is the packer getting? They are getting my little hog here and even if they say it is 24 cents — 22 cents really; but 24 cents — at 12 ½ cents a pound, they are getting \$18.75 just for hanging that up in the cooler, and I get \$20 for raising that fellow and my fodder costs me 2 ½ cents a pound. Oh, no, that was not to protect the farmers. Just like if I went down to the Grain Exchange and I gambled and the market went down 10 cents and then “Jimmy” Gardiner came and said, “Here, now, we will put a prop under that you can get your money back.” That is exactly what it reminds me of.

It is not a case of production. I could go even farther than that. How the people do like the measly — I have another good paper here, I have taken this out, it is good — “Star-Phoenix”, January 12th and that was during University week; but I am sure the “Star-Phoenix” screwed up the headline a little bit. But the headline is “No Hungry ‘Thirties Ahead.” The farmers are so smart now they know how to farm — they can never get any lean ‘thirties. As I said a moment ago, it was not a crop failure that broke us up north. We were just as hard up as anybody. We would have made money if we had been hailed out or dried out instead of taking it off. Or even if we had put a match to it. Now, what a bunch of baloney. But it seems that the argument of this House has been all the time to produce and forget the main thing — what is the use to raise it? I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, what the textile factories in Quebec would get for their textiles if they had to export 10 per cent and that 10 per cent would set the price on the home market like it does for the farmers here. They were tired of that just like we are. And you do not need to take my word for it, honourable members, because Liberal M.P.’s in Ottawa stood up — there must be the odd good Liberal down there — and criticized their policy very severely when there was 50 per cent difference on washing machines, and frig’s and electrical appliances between Minneapolis and Winnipeg, which are made by the same manufacturer. And I kick too, but it does not seem to have had much effect on the majority of Liberal members, somehow or other. And I would say to these Liberal friends over here that, if they can get the Federal Government to help solve some of these problems we have in Saskatchewan, I am sure we can get along fine because policies whereby you buy under protective marketing you must sell everything you can. If you only have 10 per cent surplus — Oh, that reminds me of a story, Mr. Speaker. There was a farmer one day, and there were a couple of farmers out talking about the pigs and he says, “come on, I have got a lovely lot of pigs.” He used to raise 300 or 400 of them but he got nothing for them and he said, “I can’t afford to raise them.” So he says, “Well, come on and see these.” And he had 10 lovely ones, corkscrew on the tail, nice and smooth little pigs you know. So this farmer says to this guy, “Well, now, you should kill one.” “Why not kill two?” “Well,” he says, “if you kill one there will be no export. If you kill another one then the import price will set the price on the other eight and you will get more money for the eight than you will for the 10.” And there is a lot of truth in that, Mr. Speaker. And there is the whole policy.

What is the use to go out and produce if you go broke on it?

Now, as I said, our Minister of Agriculture in the Federal House has run all over the world digging up agriculture products, and I think it is a shame when the world is starving for food. There is more demand for food than there is for anything else, whether it is manufactured goods or whatever it might be. But the 300,000 wheat farmers out in this country cannot afford to produce at less than the cost of production, and that is why I say something must be done about the price structure. Forty bushel of eats are no use if you get no money for it; and the same thing with hogs. I am glad I said here — I could quote the exact date, as I sat here in 1950, I think it was March 20th; I made a statement in this House that “Jimmy” Gardiner did not need to worry about world production, we would not have enough pork to supply ourselves in a very short time. And apparently it has come true, because we import a lot of pork from the United States.

I know people say, “Oh, well, people are getting too lazy — listen to speakers of one party of another or read the Open Forums — oh, no it is too hard work or too much of it is gone in income tax.” That is a bunch of baloney, Mr. Speaker. You show all farmers in Saskatchewan something to invest money in, and they will raise more produce than we can eat and we can raise enough to feed a hundred million people. But if they cannot afford to raise it at prices they are getting that is the reason it drops down. And I say it is about high time that some changes in the marketing of our produce was started on the way, so we know where we are going. I do not know whether the Federal Government thinks we can raise hogs in three weeks; I never could. It takes at least around 10 months, to my way of figuring, before you can get it on the market, and this is only good up until the 30th of September, and I am sure that the farmers of Saskatchewan are not going to fall for that baloney. That is only to help the packers; it is not to help the farmers.

I could go on, so on down the way, for the western farmers have always been the goat when it comes to marketing their products, feeding the world and the consumers and paying two prices for everything they buy. I could quote the imports on beef and hogs, but I do not think it is necessary. I think I will only mention one little thing to end up in (it is an old sore amongst the farmers in Saskatchewan) and that was the 1945-50 wheat payment. Oh, yes! How good-hearted it was. No., I say, Mr. Speaker. Their conscience was bothering them when they came out with that four cents a bushel. I happened to take a trip in 1947 out to B.C. and visit some friends who had made their little stake and had gone out there to retire. Some were into chicken ranching, some into pig ranches and so on, and I was naturally interested to see what they paid. Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, they bought our No. 4 wheat out there for ninety-some cents, clean as a whistle, ready to seed, 62 pounds to a bushel. I said, “How can you do that? I cannot buy it less than \$1.25 or \$1.50 at home. If I take it into the elevator I get \$1.17½, and there were two 20 cent payments and a 10 cent payment to come out of that, which brought it up around a little over \$1.50 for No. 4 wheat, as there is a 24 cent freight rate.” So I said, “I am going home and sell my farm and come out here and raise hogs. I can get my wheat cheaper, and they are getting



\$10 or \$15 more for hogs out there.” But, behold! I buy a paper once or twice a day, and when I came to Calgary I read, “B.C. farmers and chicken-raisers wild because the Federal Government have taken the subsidy off.” So I kept my farm here; but I want to throw this out, Mr. Speaker, before I sit down. They bought the wheat I raised in Saskatchewan for 90-some cents, and when Mrs. Larsen went out and sold her chickens it was \$1.50 wheat; and I say here without fear of contradiction, the Liberal Government bought votes in the Maritime Provinces, Quebec, Ontario and B.C. with the Saskatchewan farmers’ wheat. There is no question about it. They sell our wheat for 90-some cents out there, and we kicked plenty when we got \$1.50. We all expected a two-bit payment at least instead of eight, and that was after their conscience bothered them so much that the -Liberal Party boosted it up another 4 or 5 cents. I say that was a rotten piece of trickery.

**Mr. Tucker:** — What year was that?

**Mr. Larsen:** — In 1947. I can show you a bill from the feed house; if you don’t believe me you can see it. I have several of them. That is why I got into farming, because if you are on the right side of the fence, apparently, they can give them everything at our expense. It did not cost the Liberal Government in Ontario to sell our wheat for 97 cents a bushel to them, and it realized here \$1.50, and you know how disappointed we were with that lousy little payment.

So I say here; it is about time we talked about marketing policy and cut out some of these little sniggings about where this highway is needed, or about the teachers. We can pay teachers and we can build highways only if we get some money from our products. Farming will be maintaining this province for a long, long time, whether they find minerals or oil or what; farming will still be the backbone of this province; and they are going to kill the goose that laid the golden egg, unless we improve our method of marketing. All we ask for is some equalization in the prices. If I have to pay two prices for my imported goods to raise my produce, surely it is fair to ask some parity price for my goods. I could say, here I will pay everything it costs to run a farm, and I will say to the other fellows, “You pay for your wheat what it costs you to import it.” That is fair enough. What is good for one is good for another; but that we should be the goat all the time and sell our produce for half the price — well, I know what is going to happen to your hog industry. If you can get 22 cents, grain price, today, you won’t have any hogs; and I can predict, just the same as I did two years ago in this House, you won’t have to worry about any surplus you have to import. The same is the case with the milk today. Half the milk you get today is milk powder, and that is because the farmers are lazy and do not want to earn a dollar; but the whole structure of sales of the products of the western farms is haywire, unless we all move into the cities and we all import all our agricultural products from somewhere. That is exactly what they are trying to drive us to.

Now I do not think I have much more to say, Mr. Speaker. I always enjoy the speeches forward and back, but I do not see why they go around the main things that will help this province. So, on both sides

**February 19, 1952**

of the House, let us forget about Ottawa for a minute; and let both sides of the House unite for some decent price for agriculture and keep agriculture where it belongs, so that it is not a stepchild all the time.

I have been 40-some years in this country myself; I see Mr. Horsman from Wilkie in his seat, and I tell you I would be tickled to death if some of my crops had been hailed, or dried out, instead of harvested, because I would have been money ahead of the game. As long as we have policies of that kind, we will never have a prosperous agricultural economy in this province.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion here for parity prices for this province to all farmers. Thank you.

**Mr. J.G. Banks (Pelly):** — Mr. Speaker, I want to enter into the compliments which have been extended to the mover and seconder of this debate, and also to join the others in referring to the death of the late King George VI and the accession to the Throne of our new Queen.

I am forced, I think, today, to deal at the outset with the question of rural electrification by reason of certain happenings in my own seat. I am glad to see the Minister, (Hon. Mr. Darling) in his seat because I am going to address certain questions to him.

We have, in my hometown, which is the largest in that district, quite a good up-to-date plant with five units. It cost a lot of money, I think possibly \$350,000 to \$400,000; but, at the present time, there is not more than enough energy to supply the immediate needs of the town of Kamsack. They are tied up with a couple of villages there, by contract — the village of Veregin, the village of Pelly; I think it is about 10 or 12 years since we took it over — and they, in their turn, have done very well out of it, as well as my own town of Kamsack. I do not know whether it is a political issue or not. I would say it isn't, if all politics were kept on the proper level, because I do not think, from what was said by the Minister when he was in my seat, that what is going on there is backed by the Power Commission.

I might say that, earlier in the fall, there was a great crusade of propaganda there for rural electrification. We are right beside the province of Manitoba, and it is well known that they do not pay much there — I think it is \$65 — to get hooked up; and up in Saskatchewan need power; we have milking machines and so forth. And our people thought they were going to get it because certain people went through the constituency and told them they were going to get it — they would have just the same thing as Manitoba. Well, those in this House know that is not the case, and has not been the case for a good many years; but I believe that thing got going pretty far. The hon. Minister came to that seat and he cured it for some time; he told them the truth. He said, "It is going to cost you \$500 or \$600, and maybe \$800." I think he also told them

that the power had been stretched pretty far, that there would have to be a new source of power; and it was a splendid thing because people knew where they stood, and the matter more or less died. They found this was a lot of propaganda, something which originated somewhere. I do not know where it originated and I do not want to blame anybody. But it became so acute that everybody was talking about it. I had them come into the office and tell me that they would get this power connection for \$150. That was early in the fall, and this has led up to another aspect of the matter. They called a meeting in my hometown, had the mayor, councillors and everybody that was interested in this power project, and they made this statement. They said the town of Kamsack and this plant is preventing the development of the power. I believe one of the main speakers was a reeve of a municipality. Of course a lot of people were there. They said, "It is our plant"; they didn't just know what to answer. "It is our plant, we own it. We have no obligations outside our town, and while we are sympathetic to you, our first consideration in this matter is to look after the lights and the power interests of the town; and then, secondly, the village of Veregin and the village of Pelly."

I have only the right to speak in a general way — and that is this. That meeting developed into this kind of a charge. They said, "You have to sell out to the Power Commission. We can't have you obstructing us here. We have to have rural electrification in this district."

Now the question of by-passing came up, and I presume it would be rather a serious thing, possibly, to have to by-pass a population of 2,500 to 2,600 people, and a town of that size and two villages; but, I want to say, right here, that our people, our town, our district and those villages are quite willing to talk to the proper people about this. We know the problems. We are not trying to obstruct the Power commission — not by any means. We want to see that power extended so that every farmer will get his share of the power; but, at the same time, we have, we think, the right to continue our plant.

Let me tell you something about how that Power commission is worked for our town and those two villages. I believe the village of Pelly has all her fixtures paid for completely — they have the line paid for; and last Christmas they had a fund of \$13,000 which was made by selling electricity in the village of Pelly. Veregin is in much the same position — however, I haven't got the figures for there. In our town of Kamsack they average, or make, about \$22,000 a year. That is a very tidy sum. As you know, the city of Saskatoon, I believe, and some of the others have helped to pay debentures and make these various improvements out of the power money; and having obligated the town alone to a composite school which will cost about \$300,000 the town of Kamsack and the officials there, and the district — I do not speak particularly here of the councils and trustees, because this is a matter that everyone is interested in. They do not want to see, just at this time, any question of interference with the revenues which they expect to use to pay off their obligations completely, and furnish that school.

Now this reached the stage that it became a matter of public importance and I am, today, putting the whole thing up to you, or to the

**February 19, 1952**

Minister. I would not like to rush him, but just when he has time, I would like him to state, in this House, just what the policy of the Government is with respect to a case of that kind. I believe that there is a tremendous preponderance of people who want things to remain as they are, to maintain the status quo. They want to continue using this revenue to look after their present needs, and, naturally, a man doesn't want to sell the best horse on the farm; he wants to keep it. That is exactly what they are wanting to do. I do not want to see this degenerate into a political issue, where there is going to be a lot of people running around through the district of my constituency, taking a man into a corner and telling him, "Look, I am going to get you rural electrification" — where and what it is going to cost.

I want to say a word of appreciation, because I heard it on every corner, to the Minister for the straightforward statement he made on the Power Commission when he made two or three speeches up there. I wouldn't want to say there wasn't a little politics otherwise in the speech; but not when he talked about the Power Commission — there was no politics there; and I don't think it would hurt if we had some of his views on some of the things that we have, in the House.

Now we have, up in that country as you know, a great forest which cuts along the northern part of the seat. I was a little afraid, this summer for while, that our Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank) was going to be demoted. We had so many candidates up there from his organization that I was sure he was going to get shoved out to make room for some of the rest of them. But there are some things I want to talk about, and one of them is this. It seems as if it is necessary to be a candidate or a runner-up before you can get anything worthwhile out of the Timber Board. It looks that way, because one of these gentlemen — (there were two of them contested the C.C.F. convention) two of these Timber Board men, and one of them got it. The one I am going to speak about did not get it, but he got something else very nice this summer, or this fall. He got a contract for 500,000 feet of spruce. Well, it pays to be in the right place and have the right connections, and I believe he is working away at that job now.

That is the lumber which will be cut, on behalf of the Government, taken out of the district, and shipped out.

Now I do not want to say that there isn't some other activity, but the point I want to make is that we are getting down to the last stick of virgin spruce up in that district; and whether or not this Government expects to be defeated and kicked out, I do not know; but they are certainly finishing the spruce before the end of this term. There is the spruce up in the west centre of the constituency, and there is some spruce on the east — of course that was burned out. I do not know just how that happened because I thought that everyone who lit a fire to burn the roots off their breaking was prosecuted; but still there was a fire there, and it was supposed to have burned down 1¼ million feet, but I do not think it turned out to be that much.

Then we come along a little further and we come to another

contract. This contract, or permit, I believe, was let about two weeks ago — I know it was just a day or two before I came here; and it was for 50,000 feet of poplar. I really do not know what the terms or prices are, but I guess it would be so much per thousand and so forth. But this is what I wanted to speak about with reference to that contract. This gentleman claims he did not ask for a permit this time. He said, “No, I was asked for that two years ago, but,” he said, “my boys went east this year,” (he has three or four boys), “and they are working in Ontario in the woods. They get about \$12 a day there for the same thing, and I would have kept them home if I had known I was going to get this contract; but they would not come home now; and anyway this contract has come, after I applied for it two years ago.” This contract was signed by the successful C.C.F. man at the convention.

I cannot help but think of the purity of this Government — oh, how they want to keep away from politics! How they abhor anything that takes advantage of the vote! But I am going to tell you that they were peddling permits there for both spruce and poplar — and do you know who is going to be the judge of who got it? Well, this C.C.F. candidate. He was parcelling out this lumber and timber amongst future voters, and an election will probably be held in the country in three months.

That is the situation there. Mind you, gentlemen, I do not say that I want to go too far or be mean about this; but it just goes to show you how those permits are handed out. It shows how new men, coming in there, in their zealously to make this thing work so well — and certainly this man wants to be elected — I do not blame him for that . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I would just like to know, in the knowledge of the hon. member, if there are any permits that were dealt with by the field officer referred to by the member, that were either wrongly refused or wrongly issued. I would be very pleased to have the names of the parties concerned if he would give them to me.

**Mr. Banks:** — I say here, you made it possible, in 1947, this House made it possible, for this to happen, because you said to this nominee, “accept the C.C.F. nomination and continue to hold the job until 30 days before the election.” Now, that is the thing that is at fault, today. I do not blame the gentleman so much. He wants to be elected, and you want him to be elected.

**Mr. Kuziak:** — He will be too!

**Mr. Banks:** — That is a new one — timberland. You know I wanted to say something about that, but you know there was a foreclosure down at Canora one time, a mortgage foreclosure, about four years ago. You all heard about it. There remained, under the old school system (my constituency is under the larger school unit) but my hon. friend (Mr. Kuziak) is in that “poor” constituency of Canora. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, some years ago, there was quite a little conspiracy in this House and it affected Canora. Oh, it was a wonderful one! It seems they wanted to get into the larger school unit, but they knew that this town of theirs would never be able to build a school, but it was too much politics, too

much C.C.F.; and they knew that it was absolutely impossible for the member to build this school out of town revenues. I might say that the one that has been built in the town of Kamsack is out of the town's revenues. Well, no doubt they looked up the law and they found out that, in the organization of the new school district, after bringing the different municipalities together, a town could not be included — just villages and rural municipalities. I asked a question here, what about the larger units? This was in 1949. Well, they said, "Government policy will be announced very shortly;" but I saw this little innocuous amendment to The Larger School Unit Act go through, which provided that the town could be one of the charter members of the larger school unit. It passed, became law, and in a short time, it was proclaimed by the Minister of Education, and the town of Canora became part of another larger school unit, embracing all these places and Canora. Well now, don't you see, they have a voting power of over 900 or 1,000 and they are 1/6th of the whole larger unit; and if you can throw all that weight on one side you can pretty well carry it. Well here this vote comes up. We heard all about this wonderful school that Canora was going to have. Do you know who was going to pay for it? The new larger unit — the farmers. That was a little scheme, and I am afraid that the Minister of Education — oh, probably he did not know about it all. I do not think he even went up there, but some of the people from his office did. Well, I am afraid they could not keep the secret because some of the people at Canora started to talk about the fine school they were going to put up, that they were going to carry the larger unit. And do you know what happened? — a vote of 3 to 1 against them. That is the situation, today, and that "poor" town of Canora — they are still poor.

You see there was a man came out of there. He spoke, I believe, on every platform in Saskatchewan, if anybody would listen to him. He spoke for some of the higher ones, and you know he told about courage, mortgage companies, and so on. I think everybody will recognize him. You know that this old man was one of the finest immigrants that ever came to Canada, with one of the finest mortgages. He had accumulated those 5 quarter-sections that the mortgage was on — I did not intend to say this, but I am going to say it, and I am going to say a lot more. He did not intend to lose it — he had five boys. Now wasn't that a wonderful start? I believe the member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) finally got two started; but this fine old Ukrainian had five boys, surely he had lots of help. Do you know that was the only mortgage that was foreclosed in that territory? Here was the other man, on every platform in Canada, saying, "The mortgage company took my poor father's farm"; but I have something to say about that myself — it may be a personal thing. I have a farm in my name today, but there is no mortgage on it. I paid it off. I never got a dollar out of it either; but it is there today and I keep it out of sentiment; there is 1,760 acres on it. But this other one — oh, my! Five quarter-sections of that beautiful land up there. You know that their point was this — blame Saskatchewan for losing that farm. I cannot see that. But, he said, that is one of the reasons why you should vote C.C.F.

Now I think a boy can be taught to make his own living, and I think that would give him a greater heritage than all the money in the world — teach him to be honest. Well that is the situation here. I did not intend to say it, and I would have passed it up, but I think the gentleman

wanted it very badly. He asked for it, and I do not know what more I can say on that question; but I want to say this much — if that is all the C.C.F. principles are founded on, do not bring them out. This was down in Shaunavon and all over the Gull Lake constituency, and here we have had such blessings over and above those of the people down in the Gull Lake constituency. We have no right to make a statement of that kind.

Now I want to deal with a little question here that affects my constituency, and I hope that the members will understand. It is another one I would like to have considered without any politics. No doubt you are familiar with the Indian Act. We have three reserves near Kamsack. I think you will find that there were about 100 returned men there, who served in the Army, and this question comes up as to their rights under the new Indian Act which was passed, section 95. Now I am not asking the Government to do this; I am asking them to consider it. This deals with the question of allowing them to go into the beverage rooms. There has been some publicity. I want to say here that the Indians in the Kamsack area have reached the stage where they are farming, they all live in homes, they own cars, and they have raised a lot of grain. Of course these laws brought down from, I think, 1870, have been very stringent; and any drinking these Indians have done, they have had to hide to do it. This involves also the person who bought the liquor for them, who is liable with them if they were caught and didn't drink it quickly enough. I know that there has been a lot of that going on; there has been the odd bit of trouble. There was some last summer; and I want to say right here that I do not think the average Indian wants anybody to apologize to him. He is able to work, he is able to produce and he knows that he must obey the law if he enters a beverage room. I wouldn't go very much further than that. This is an experiment. As it is they have been having all the liquor they want, because if they have the money to buy it there is always somebody who will take the chance and get it for them.

There were two boys I felt very sorry for. They came out west for the first time, drove their car out here to work in the harvest fields, and they fell into this. There were no Indians down where they came from; one of them came right from my old home in Ontario. He bought some liquor for an Indian; they were chums, working together on the same machine; and he got three months. Of course as soon as I found out about it I wrote to his mother — and he has now gone home and that is one of the things we cannot help. I am not blaming anybody in particular, but I do not think that we are going to shelve this custom by any pious thoughts. It is here. These fellows have all drunk. They drank when they were in the army; and they weren't any more trouble than the other men. If you go through these beer parlours in Regina you will find that they are not any more trouble. And any of them will testify that they are quiet, retiring fellows; and I bring this question up. It says this section shall not come into force — that is allowing them to go into the beverage rooms — until a proclamation bringing it into force in the province is issued by the Governor-in-Council at the request of the Lieutenant governor in Council. Now that is a matter which you may consider is going back. You may say — and I am sure there may be the same feelings on this side of the House — that we should continue

**February 19, 1952**

this. Well, I do not know. I have been asked to bring it up, and I can tell you the statute. It is the Indian Act, Chapter 29, 1951, Section 95, sub-section 2, which reads as follows:

“This section shall not come into force in any province until a proclamation bringing it into force in the province is issued by the Governor-in-Council at the request of the Lieutenant Governor of the province.”

With respect to the forest regulations, I was not going to go so far into those this time, because I will have a great deal to say about them in the campaign. I might just observe, however, generally, that when Socialism hit the timber areas, the first thing they ran into was a lot of established lumber companies. In our district (Pelly) there was the Porcupine Lumber Company who had been carrying on for a great many years; and they had all the equipment. I believe they were regarded as a good concern, reliable financially. Wages were not so high in those days, but I know that plain lumber, when they were in there, could be bought for \$65 a thousand. Now what happened to them? They had to sell; they got out. The rigid regulations and rigid inspections by these men who were up there kept them right on the line, and I believe there was none of this thing we complained so much about — the killing of the small trees, or the use of the treaded cat to cut a tree down and pull it out, killing all the small ones. I do not think that was practised, although there was quite a bit of propaganda against every one of those men. It seemed as if they had to be discredit in order to bring public opinion in so they would say, “Well, now look at what the white-headed boys are doing! They are going to conserve the forest; they are going to drive out these here capitalists” — probably Liberal capitalists, I don’t know. We have heard that expression used up in our district: of course they are pretty well all Liberal up there. Anyway they had to discredit them first; and they did thoroughly discredit a lot of them, and Mr. Campbell was quite glad to sell out; he didn’t have to say in that kind of business. The result was that in its place came the Timber Board. I referred to the 500,000 feet of spruce; that was all that was left, or practically all that was left of the Porcupine Lumber company’s reserve, and they could have, I suppose, if they had stuck to their guns — possibly they would have had to go to court, I do not know; but they didn’t do it, although they wanted to cut that last 500,000 feet and finish out the reserve. But no, they couldn’t do it. This Government put on so much pressure that they finally gave up and sold out — I do not know for what consideration, and I wouldn’t give it out here if I did. But that did not do very much good, because last year, or two yeas ago, that whole forest reserve and this 500,000 feet were burned over. I do not know whether that was the guiding hand from above or not, whether it was retribution, or what it was; but that is exactly what happened, and this Government has to face the question of logging timber up there.

I do not care how this is done, but I do not like to see hardship put on any man. They let a contract with a father and four brothers up there, delivering this spruce at Sturgis. Now that is a long



piece — I think about 74 miles; and the rate was \$72 a thousand. Well, winter came along and they tried to get along and couldn't make it go. I think they got 350,000 feet out. They believed, with efficiency, with them all working for nothing and throwing it into the pot, that they could even beat this low price; but they haven't done it. I believe that a settlement of some kind was made, because after that they have not come near me. I told them to go down and see them. But that goes to show you that after all the experience and after all the contracts, this Government still does not seem to know very much about timber, because isn't it better to give the man enough money so that he can pay his way! Now he is back doing it again, this year, but the timber is not as good. It is dried out, and that is about all you can say for it. Now they may get their money back — I do not know about that; but I know that they were hopelessly broke and so forth.

I want to say, just before I sit down, a word about the highways in the Pelly constituency. I must say to the Minister, and I want to say it in front of him before this House, that I have never had very much satisfaction from the Minister of Highways or his Deputy since I was elected to that seat . . .

**Opposition Member:** — Nobody else has either!

**Mr. Banks:** — I was promised, the first year I came in, two bridges — absolutely promised them. Well, I went home and told the people that, and you know I did not think so much of it the first year; but eventually some junior clerk would tell me the truth. I am going to tell you one thing, I have found the Premier a good sport, a very good sport. We were opening a hospital at Kamsack and I think he came in by aeroplane, and he made a very fine speech that day; but on the way in he got stuck on this piece of road; and you know, he did not say very much about it, but I remember very well. I was down in Regina for three or four days and the Minister of Highways was away, so I went in to see the Douglas I knew best, and do you know what he said? He said, "Come on in with me and we will talk it over." And he said, "Give this man what he needs. He is the member for that constituency." All I asked for was enough gravel to gravel that five miles, and we got it without a word. I want to commend the Premier and say that if the other man had some of those qualities we would get along an awful lot better.

I do not know just how many bridges we need now. There was a bridge put in just west of Kamsack and I want to give them credit for that. We appreciated that. But I believe, if I had been going to do it, I would have put a little of it in some of those outlying fringes where they have such a time getting out in the spring, and I would give them a little gravel. You see, I get blamed for that bridge. When having a serious time, like every party does, when the sitting member gets debated as we were up in Pelly, it gets pretty tough and they will have a tough time up in Kamsack. It is not because I am very strong or anything like that, but the Liberals are strong, and I want to tell you the C.C.F. have lost votes over there. There was a gentleman out in some places in the constituency and he said, "Will you be in to the convention?"

How are you feeling? You are a supporter of the C.C.F.” The chap replied, “Well yes, I have been supporting you, but look at the roads here. How are we going to get along? You take all our taxes and we don’t want very much, but we just want a little gravel to carry us along.” “Well, you will have to ask Banks about that.” The chap said, “Well, why would he know, he is not in the government.” Well, the government man replied, “Didn’t you see that bridge we put in next to Kamsack — right beside his own town? He put it in there.” Well the man came and asked me about this and, of course, I said I had nothing to do with it. Well the chap said, “I could have told him, at the time, I didn’t believe him, the way he spoke to me.”

The member for Canora and the Minister of Highways were up to my seat also, this summer. I must say that I couldn’t help but make that meeting for them. They had a very, very fine crowd and I sent them there. That was in the spring, and do you know what the situation was? Five weeks and they had not been able to get to town; and you know this is not near the railroad. If you look at the map you will see there is a road that runs 27 miles north and there is a splendid farming district there — a beautiful farming district. I had an awful time getting up there. I thought I would see one or two but there were about 60 people there, and they were pretty angry about this. “Well, “ I said, “you must remember that the Government has the treasury; they have the money. No matter how much I put in for we are not in the majority.” “Well,” they said, “how do you get anything?” I told them they had better write a letter; so they said for me to come up and they would make the Minister come up and I think they gave him an invitation and he put it off for three weeks. I went up there when the three weeks was up and the Minister did not turn up, but they appointed a Good Road Committee. A C.C.F., I think, was chairman, and they had about 15 men, I think, just about alternate Liberal and C.C.F., and this began to look pretty formidable from a political standpoint. You know, they tried to call it off. Our good friend from Canora had his fingers in that. Do you know what he did? This very man who kept the contract for the timber — he was reeve of the municipality — he says, “I will fix that road committee.” So he said, “I will tell you how to get the road. Come on down to the C.C.F. convention. Come down to the C.C.F. convention, and if we can get you into parliament you will have no trouble getting the road.” Delightful, wasn’t it? Well that was his little frolic, his little diversion; but they couldn’t both get it, so he didn’t get it.

Well now, that did not stop the Road Committee. They put another man in his place, and they were more angry than every; and so the Minister drove up into the bush about the 9th of September, I think, and he had the meeting of his life. He just talked 15 minutes, I understand, on his Department; the rest was good C.C.F. philosophy, C.C.F. accomplishments — but he made one mistake. I do not believe he knows how to spring a joke — the Premier knows how to put it over fine; but he was trying to put over a joke and he says, “You go and get Mr. Banks to build this road for you.” That is what he told them . . .

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — It is very difficult to hear what the hon. member is saying, but I would gather that he said that I had told this meeting that they were to go to Mr. Banks and get this road. Of course,

that is absolutely untrue. I can assure him of that.

**Mr. Banks:** — If it is not true I cannot help it, but it was reported from the meeting. Well, the main topic in their lives was this road. They want that road and they do not want any compromise and they do not want any excuses, because I want to tell you that it is a splendid community. There are 500 families in there; they have good schools and they have everything that a community needs except a road. I want to tell you that if we get in there, if we do, do you know what we are going to do? We are going to send the first money that comes in to the Pelly constituency. Is that all right?

**Mr. Kuziak:** — May I ask the hon. member a question? We cannot hear over here and I would like to know where that road is that he is going to spend that money on, 20 years from now.

**Mr. Banks:** — He comes in there though! There is one thing I can tell you; I never was in there but there wasn't a vehicle broken down, or else tipped into the bush. I have never been in there yet when there wasn't something broken down, or in the bush. I do not know how those people get around.

I didn't intend to talk so long, but I did want to say word about the Crown Corporations — those poor old Crown Corporations we have heard so much about. I remember very well the day it was announced, in this House, about the losses; and you know, that was one of the most astute things that I have seen the C.C.F. do, in all the time I have been here. They had that all figured up. You know, when the speech in British Columbia was made, when the Premier told them, "We have had trouble with the Crown Corporations, but it was only one per cent," and you know he was telling the truth. Do you know that he was telling the truth when he said it was only one per cent? Do you know how they made it? They brought in \$40 million of these two service corporations. When these original Crown Corporations would not stand the loss of \$3½ millions they couldn't stand it; it would have wrecked any government. I do not know who thought of it, but somebody was smart — you know, I think there would have been a better way out. In this world, after all, everybody seems to admire candour, and honesty, and I have an idea that if they had left those two corporations as they were, and come to the province and said, "Here, we have made a mistake on this socialism, we have lost this money," I believe the people would have given them another chance. But, no! I want to say that I believe that was one of the most serious things, because when I hear on the air about this \$4 million profits, I feel as if there is something wrong with that, that it is not true, that it is something that makes you feel badly when you have to listen to stories like that. No, it is not true; because those two larger corporations never lost money. They always made money — and why not? I am telling you right under the income tax department, if you have two companies with one of them losing money and the other one making money, you cannot charge up the losses of the losing company against the other one. They have not learned that yet, but I believe it is well known out over the province and it seems to me, it calls for a franker statement than has been given. I think you will understand that I am not going to support the Motion.

February 19, 1952

**Mr. W.T. Lofts** (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, I shall rise and say a few words but I do not intend to take very long, as time is going on, on this particular subject. I would mostly like to deal with how the socialist Government has affected our constituency of Meadow Lake.

I just got back, last night, from being at the nomination meeting and we are very proud that Mr. Dunfield was nominated as our candidate and we have no doubt that, in the next provincial election he will be the member for Meadow Lake. My name was mentioned, and I would like to have stood but I made it quite clear as far back as six or eight or ten months ago I could see that, although I wanted to be of service to the people of my constituency who asked me to run and who so thoroughly supported me, it was conflicting with my business and also I was not able to take time to take care of my constituency, and it is no good anybody running to be a member unless they are prepared or are able to take time to visit all points of their constituency and do the service to the people of their constituency which they deserve. So, therefore, I resigned both seats — my name was up in both places; but I regret to have to drop out after the good co-operation I have had on both sides of the House and especially from the Ministers, all except the Minister of Highways where I always had trouble. I could not get close to him with a 10-foot pole.

I would just like to take a few moments and say just how this has affected the constituency. We have been talking about the de-population of Saskatchewan. I am not familiar with much of Saskatchewan, but I am familiar with my own part, and I can just tell you why people left Meadow Lake and how they left it — by droves. And I think every member on the other side of the House will realize Great Slave Lake was hardly recognized before there was a Fish Board invented. I do not think it was. We never heard about it, or very seldom. But I am just telling you know, Mr. Speaker, and members, Great Slave Lake is controlling the Canadian fish market today, and they were forced to fish that lake when in the Fish board took over in the early days. I will admit that has been turned to a small fish co-op now which we advocated in the fall of the election in 1948. I am glad they thought about suggesting it and, from what I can find out, I believe they are doing a fairly good job. The fishermen seem to be satisfied. But I would just like to tell you that we suggested that in our 1948 campaign and before the election we fought the Fish Board; and that is for the fish line of it.

Well, now, you take the timber business, the same way. I have been in the automobile business, everybody knows, and we could always sell trucks at Meadow Lake until the present Government got in, and when they took control of the timber they more or less drove the little operators out. they are in Alberta now, at Wycock and some other places. I know them. I sold a truck, the other day, to a fellow up there. That is how our population has left Meadow Lake itself.

Now, the thing over which I feel the people have lost confidence in this present Government is the highway. Good gracious! We have not had a bit of road construction in Meadow Lake constituency this year. They graded a little between Green Lake and Meadow Lake. They did two miles on No. 55 and quit before they got into the Meadow Lake constituency.

We have not had a doggoned thing, and we are entitled to a little consideration. I have always made a point of going to anyone in the Federal field or the hon. Premier here at convention if he could not talk to our Minister of Highways to see if we could have a little consideration on No. 55 Highway. But we did not get it anyway. And all that put together makes the people fed up and they are pulling out.

I do not think I should take up too much time. I see it is getting on, and I do not know what you intend to do tonight; but I just mentioned a few of the things why I think the people are leaving our country and I think that I am right in saying it. I wish I could find my way clear to run at the next election, but I have told you plainly that I haven't and why I haven't, so that is all I have to say right now.

The question being put on the "no-confidence" amendment moved by Mr. Tucker, it was negated by 27 votes to 19.

**Mr. Speaker:** — We have just taken the vote on the amendment and I will prepare to take the vote on the main motion unless someone else wishes to speak.

**Mr. B.L. Korchinski** (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I understood at the start of this debate that the motion and the amendment were to be taken as one, that if anyone spoke on the amendment it would be taken that he spoke on the main motion too. That was referred to by the Premier, and I think acquiesced in by the Leader of the Opposition. If I have misunderstood you then the debate will be on the main motion.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I did not intend to waive any rights on behalf of the members of this side. Certainly I had no intention at that time. Now that the debate is back to the main motion, I do not think there is any right to curtail that debate under any agreement or anything else. But certainly there was no intention to make any agreement. All I agreed to was there should not be a repetition of debate which is a basic rule.

**Mr. Speaker:** — It is understood that we cannot have tedious repetition. Anyone who has spoken on the amendment I certainly would keep them strictly to the main motion.

**Mr. Tucker:** — If you will rule against tedious repetition I will certainly agree to that.

**Premier Douglas:** — If we are going to have on an amendment a general debate of the whole Speech from the Throne as we have had, in which the member for Redberry participated, then I think that Your Honour would be quite correct in insisting that speeches now confine themselves

to amendments when amendments are moved. Certainly my object in raising the question when I spoke on the amendment was that I be allowed to cover the entire field just as though I were speaking on the main motion. If members are now going to speak on the amendment and cover the whole field, and then, when the amendment is disposed of, cover the whole field again on the main motion, then we are going to have a lot of needless and tedious repetition, and in that case it means, from now on, if amendments are moved it seems to me that members ought to be required to stay distinctly within the confines of the amendment, and certainly that is not what the member from Redberry did when he was discussing the amendment before.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The amendment was, in effect, a “want of confidence” motion and in speaking to that the whole field was covered. I think it certainly will be in order that you can speak on the main motion, but you are going to put me in a difficult position as Speaker. That is, I am going to have to keep track of every word that is said to see that there is not repetition. Anyway, the debate is now on the main motion.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, before the speech is made it would be a strange state of affairs if a motion of want of confidence in the Government were moved and disposed of and then it were to be held, after that, that the programme, the alleged programme of the Government could not then be debated. That would really be something. We have debated for a day or so now the basis on which we say the people have lost confidence in this Government. That has been defeated by a vote of this Assembly. Now, we propose to deal with this programme as laid down in the Speech from the Throne. Surely we are in order in that. Had there been any thought that there was going to be any attempt to stop the debate, as hinted at here, we would certainly have carried the debate on, on the amendment.

**Mr. Speaker:** — You can speak to the main motion, but, practically every speaker stayed on the main motion and made specific references to the Speech from the Throne; so if now, in the debate, you go over the same ground again I shall hold that as tedious repetition.

**Premier Douglas:** — There has been no attempt here nor anywhere else to throttle discussion; but the fact does remain, whatever my hon. friend says it looks like, it certainly betrays his complete ignorance of the rules of the House and parliamentary procedure. Mr. Speaker, on the amendment of want of confidence almost every person who spoke on that side and on this side quoted from the speech from the Throne, quoted from the motion, referred to statements made by the mover and the seconder, all of which was completely out of order. We are now going to have a full-fledged debate on the motion by the same persons who took part in the debate on the amendment. But we have no objection. My hon. friends are welcome to make three or four speeches if they want to. I merely point out, Mr. Speaker, that from now on, if there are other amendments I think we, on this side, shall have to draw your Honour’s attention to the fact that those persons speaking on those amendments will have to confine themselves to the amendments, and if they wish to discuss the motion they will have to wait until the amendment is disposed of.

**Mr. Speaker:** — If you would obey my ruling that as you spoke to the amendment, which was practically an omnibus amendment, a want of

confidence motion; in dealing with it you did deal with the Speech from the Throne and now you are going back to the original motion. I must insist that you confine yourselves to that.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — Mr. Speaker, on rising to speak to the main motion on the Speech from the Throne I would like to take this opportunity to say something about the needs of my constituents.

The seat of Redberry, as you know, lies northwest of Saskatoon and that, as I have stated before in this House, is a completely rural riding. We have problems there in the seat of Redberry that this Government has completely failed to meet. Our greatest problem is the need for roads. I do not think that there is any seat, perhaps with the exception of the very far-north seats, that are so lacking in roads as Redberry seat. We, of course, have a highway running from east to west, No. 40, and in the bottom part of the seat, the very edge of it, there is Highway No. 5. These highways run to North Battleford and Prince Albert — No. 40 does; No. 5 runs near Saskatoon and to Battleford.

As I have mentioned on previous occasions, there is a great need of south and north roads in this constituency. People in the northern part of the seat, when they wish to go down to Saskatoon where they like to do their shopping or trading or selling of their products, such as livestock, they cannot go there without having to go through North Battleford, which means making an extra 80 to 90 miles on a one-way trip. And that takes a lot of their time and is a lot of extra expense. What we need, and I am going to continue as long as I can asking for it, is a connection from the north to these highways, and from No. 40 to No. 5. We need a connection in the first place from Blaine Lake to the Petrofka Ferry and then across to the new highway which has been built. If the Government cannot see its way clear to building a highway there, they should at least give enough grants to the various municipalities in these areas so that this road could be built up by them, so that it could be open and kept open during all weather conditions. This road would serve very many people. It would serve people all the way from Shellbrook to Blaine Lake; that includes Parkside, and Kilwinning and Leask and Marcelin and Blaine Lake. It would also serve the people along No. 55 Highway — Spiritwood, Mildred, Shell Lake and places all the way to Shellbrook. It would also take in a very large area of farmers near these various places I have mentioned.

Another road is urgently needed from Hafford to the No. 5 Highway. At the present time this distance of 21 miles cannot be crossed. The people have to travel to North Battleford and around all the way back to Saskatoon. For making 20 miles of distance, they have to travel 140 miles. Again, if the Government cannot put a highway in there they should help the municipality of Redberry, the municipality of Great Bend, assist them with grants to put these roads through so that the farmers and the people from various villages, from Krydor and Hafford and all the places north of there, could use it to get to Saskatoon.

Another connection is needed from Speers to Fielding. This is a distance of 11 miles. Again, to make this distance the people have

to travel some 80 miles, and I do not think it is fair to ask these people to make all this distance. They buy their licences for their cars and for their trucks; they pay the gasoline tax; they contribute heavily on the land in taxation; they pay all those taxes and I do not think it is fair that these people should be penalized by not having this service.

Then there is the question of the highway north of No. 40 to No. 55. There is a very large area there, and there are no provincial highways in that area. If you look at a highway map, I think that is the only place in Saskatchewan where there are no provincial highways. This area is settled just as thickly as many other areas in Saskatchewan. There are places like Rabbit Lake, Mayfair, Whitkow, Redfield, Mullingar, with no highways at all. They are far from highways. They are 30 or 40 miles from highways. I do not see why this Government permits this condition to exist. They boast about the great progress they have made in the Highway Department. It is no use talking to people of Rabbit Lake or Mullingar about this progress, because it is just so many words. Those people want roads, they do not want words. They want action and they want roads, and I think it is high time that something should be done. Those places have been settled for a very long time, and I think they are entitled to roads just as well as in other places in Saskatchewan. In fact, this area, I think is one of the best mixed areas in Saskatchewan, and I do not see why the people in that area around Rabbit Lake, Whitkow, Mullingar and Redfield, all these places, should be made to live there without any roads.

There was some talk, Mr. Speaker, in this Legislature about the vile tactics that are used by this Government, and I think that is true. I can corroborate that fact. Before the 1948 election, they promised a highway from No. 40 down to No. 55. In fact, they started some work just about a week before election on this particular stretch. But the results of the election were not favourable to the Government; they lost in that seat. In 1944, they had a more than 2 to 1 majority, the Government candidate was defeated. As soon as this was the fact, work on this particular stretch of road, north of Speers, stopped. Then, of course, I suppose you had the mill there, but the C.C.F. fans in this particular area — there were a few there — were equally offended, and they kept on harassing the Government and finally the work was started up again and at that time it was built for some 16 (or a few more) miles. This Fall, after many petitions . . .

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. This gentleman is saying things that are not correct. The work on that road was never stopped until it was brought to its present point. The only work that was started up was when we gravelled that road, and the statements he is making here are absolutely ridiculous and it shows that he does not know anything about his own constituency.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask if we are allowed to get up and contradict each other like that?



**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Tucker:** — I just want a ruling.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I called the hon. gentleman to order after he had corrected the gentleman who was speaking.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Highways is absolutely sounding silly. These statements that I am making are not ridiculous. I am making statements that are fact, and I take issue with him. He tells us that this road was started and completed. Certainly it was, as far as the C.C.F. are; but a little farther on where I got the biggest support in the polls, where the Liberals are very thick, they were told, “This is as far as we go. We are not going any further.”

I will tell you another incident, Mr. Speaker, that happened there during the election. There is a hall there, a little hall out in the country, and the C.C.F. were going to hold a meeting in that hall; it is a church hall. The man who had the keys for this hall was not around in the district at that time. So what did the C.C.F. say? They said that the people in this particular community, north of Alticane, were trying to keep this hall away from the C.C.F. candidate, from giving them the right to express themselves. And do you know what they said? “We’ll fix you fellows when we get a chance.” And the gravelling was brought right up to Alticane, as far as there was a sprinkling of C.C.F. votes; but the other four miles of this particular road that the Minister of Highways said was built, there was no gravel put on it. Now, can you contradict that? The gravel was just placed as far as the C.C.F. are. Where there are more Liberals, there is not a speck of gravel. And the Liberals there were told that this was their punishment because they would not let the C.C.F. speak in their hall at Alticane.

**Premier Douglas:** — Any more fairy tales?

**Mr. Korchinski:** — There are quite a few yet. In regard to fairy tales there is no one more adept at it than the Government on the other side.

Now, there is the question of these roads staying open in the winter. It is no use having roads if they are going to be closed five months during the year. I think that some time ago, when I advanced the theory that the Government snowplows should be used in opening the main marketing roads, they said it was impossible; they said that they could not spare the men. But yet the men were not doing anything very much at the time, and they could have been spared. And I notice that this winter, they did start opening some of these other roads which are not highways; and I think it is a step in the right direction. I do not know whether that is a change of policy in the Department of Highways, or whether the men took it upon themselves to do so, with regards to an election coming up. And there hangs another story.

The candidate up there now who lives, or who resides around Hafford . . .

February 19, 1952

**Government Member:** — I thought he was a C.C.F.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — If that is your measurement of a good man, you must have some poor pals up in that district.

He was around the district telling the people, “Look how good a fellow I am! As soon as I was nominated as a C.C.F. Candidate I got the snowplow to open the road to Radisson from Hafford.” Here is another of those C.C.F. magicians. But I think that is nothing else but this “pork-barrel” tactics of the C.C.F. Party.

**Government Member:** — Sold any membership?

**Mr. Korchinski:** — Well, I do not think he has sold any membership on that one.

They have a joker out there now running around the district who used to work for the Department of Social Welfare. He was trained under the Department of Social Welfare and he knows the ropes, so he now is the C.C.F. organizer. He goes around, he knows the ropes now, he knows the people; he had every chance to meet them when he travelled for the Social Welfare. He goes around and tries to sell memberships with the candidate, of course, and I am very glad of it because the more they pester the people, the more odious they become and the sooner they will be kicked out completely.

There is something else I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, about the seat of Redberry. I did not like the way the Government gerrymandered out there last Session, how they changed the boundaries of that seat. The more you look and examine the map, the more you will see how fearful those men are, how desperate they are to hang onto power. They tried to save their skins by every means possible. Take the seat of Redberry. Of course, by the old map, it looked quite sensible, but the way they have it now it would be difficult for anyone to cover that seat in any way. You cannot find any sort of a natural centre in that seat. Some of the members on the other side, speaking the other day, were saying that they had to go through so many seats to get to their own. I think it was the member from Bengough (Mr. Brown) who was very happy because he had to go through Gravelbourg because it was C.C.F. now. I might say that the only way you could cover Redberry seat now properly is by helicopter, because there are no roads there and there are no centres. The only way a person can see his people is to go through The Battlefords continually, because all the roads go through Battleford. But I have no particular objection to that because on the way down to see my people, say at Edam, I will be able to go on to Battleford and help my friend from North Battleford do a little work up there.

Why did they do this? Well, of course they claim that there were not enough votes in that seat, so it was to be enlarged. Of course, that is true; but the way they did it was that they just shifted the whole thing north, and if you examine the election results of 1948 you will see exactly what they meant by this particular map. They were trying to save, in some respects, what they have now. They were trying to save the member from Shellbrook (Mr. Larsen) by taking some of the very strong C.C.F. Polls off the Redberry seat. It is quite well known that he got in by a very small

margin, and there is quite a bit of change of opinion in that seat. So near Blaine Lake there are three polls which were predominantly C.C.F., but they, of course, belong to Blaine Lake area, and very naturally they belong to Redberry seat. So now, what do they do? They just drew a line straight along to Blaine Lake and along a certain road and got these polls off the Redberry seat and stuck them on to Shellbrook. These people have nothing in common with the people who live in Shellbrook. They all had everything in common with the people who live in the Redberry seat; but because they were strong C.C.F. polls they were put on to Shellbrook.

A little further up the other way, though, they took out a few polls from Shellbrook that were Liberal polls and they stuck them on to Redberry. They were very generous to me. They were very generous to Redberry seat. They threw all the Liberals they could into the Redberry seat, and wherever they could clip out any C.C.F. polls and stick them on to their own seats, well, they always did that. That just shows you how doubtful they are about their own position in the province. They are afraid of the people of this province. They are trying to use every possible trick to save their skins.

Mr. Speaker, by way of diversion, I asked a question in this House and I got an answer today — a very interesting answer. It was about telephones. I know that these telephones are run by the people in various districts, and rural telephones are usually organized by rural companies, but the C.C.F. talk about the tremendous progress that has been made during the last eight years. Now, this particular answer I got refutes all this claim, at least in the telephone department. The question was “How many rural telephone installations were there in 1944 in the new constituency of Redberry?” And the answer is 867. “How many on December 31, 1950?” That is the last record we have, and that was 905. That is to say, that in the seven years of the tremendous security and expansion or whatever they call it, “progress”, they put in 38 additional telephones in that area. Now, they said that the Liberals in 34 years did not do anything; that the C.C.F. did everything. Well, the Liberals put in 867 telephones which comes out to 25.5 telephones a year — rural telephones, that is right. There is nothing to laugh about; this is a fact. It comes from the books of your own Government. The C.C.F. in their great tremendous progress put in five telephones a year. Where is there anything to corroborate their statement that they made such a great progress? The Liberals, with the little they had in comparison to the C.C.F., with the meagre finances that they had, the hard years and everything else, were able to put in 25.5 telephones a year in the 34 years, and the C.C.F. with the great revenues that they have had, with everything they have at their disposal, with the greatest technical advances that we have now, they were able to put in five telephones a year. Now, that is a very sorry record. According to that record I would say that in the telephone field the Liberals were five times as good as the C.C.F. That is exactly what these figures show me. I do not know if that is the case in other constituencies or not, but that is exactly what it is in the Redberry constituency.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — You are probably referring to rural telephone that are put in by the people in the constituency, their own rural people.

**February 19, 1952**

It is not the Government's; they had nothing to do with it.

**Premier Douglas:** — He does not know that.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Surely he knows that.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — I told you that they organized. Why don't you listen? And you are the Government and everything that happens here you must take blame for it. You are taking credit for the Imperial Oil investing money in Regina. You take credit whenever it is to your benefit; but whenever it is to our benefit, you say, "Oh, well, we won't have anything to do with it." It is very, very nice; very nice to shake those things off. I am just using your own tactics. They say, if you want to fight the enemy find out how he fights and then fight him with his own weapons."

**Premier Douglas:** — You could not fight a feather duster.

**Government Member:** — If you would treat them a little more intelligently it would be more like it.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — Just a minute I will tell you how intelligent you are. I am coming down to you.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk about the depopulation of Saskatchewan, and the Premier tried to make all kinds of efforts . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Premier Douglas:** — That is "tedious repetition." Mr. Speaker, the statement which the hon. gentleman is now quoting is one which I made speaking on the amendment and it has now been disposed of and the hon. member is now speaking on the main motion. You cannot quote from something which has been said on the amendment which has been disposed of. If the hon. gentlemen opposite are going to waste time in tedious repetition then I say it would be our duty on this side to see that at least we stay somewhere close to the rules of the House.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, are you making a ruling now that my hon. friend, in dealing with the Speech from the Throne and its programme, which, of course, is a continuation of previous programmes, and he is referring to the loss in population, that because it deals with the same arguments that were used in moving the Address and in my speech on the Address, that my hon. friend here cannot use the same argument? Repetition of debate, I submit, your Honour, is when the same member uses the same argument, but I might say that if there is an attempt made to throttle a debate like this . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, that is what it is, Mr. Speaker; that is what it is. The question of my hon. friend here — he has not spoken on the main motion before. He is certainly entitled to discuss the record of this Government, and the fact that somebody else has mentioned or the fact that the

Premier has actually mentioned it, surely that does not prevent us from dealing with it. Now, the rule that the Premier has referred to is a rule that what was said in the previous debate in the same Session cannot be referred to. But this is all one debate. There is the main motion . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Tucker:** — All right.

**Mr. Speaker:** — If this is the same debate then the hon. member who is on his feet has no right to speak. It is either one thing or the other. I am holding that if you have spoken on the amendment you cannot speak on the same subject matter that you dealt with on the amendment and if you do, it is repetition.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, may I point out that the hon. member did not deal with it when he spoke. If your Honour had permitted me to continue I was going to say that, while it is the same debate it is a different phase of the same debate. Of course, there was an empty laugh from over there! I am not surprised. I can see where it came from and I am not surprised a bit. But I was going to say that if the amendment . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Will you give a ruling on that, Mr. Speaker?

**Mr. Speaker:** — We will now proceed.

**Mr. Tucker:** — The quantity is doubled but the quality is still the same.

**Mr. Speaker:** — There is absolutely nothing in the matter that presents a bearing on this at all.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I was going to say, Mr. Speaker, that if the amendment were an exact negative of the main motion, it would not be in order. The amendment does not cover exactly the same ground as the main motion. The amendment said, “His Honour’s advisers had lost the confidence of the people of Saskatchewan.” Now, we debated that as to why they had lost that confidence. Now, we are back and debating the programme that His Honour’s advisers brought forward to deal with the problems that face our province. We have a right, in the course of that, to deal with the extent to which similar proposals have failed to deal with those problems, the extent to which the province has failed to prosper and to exactly settle the problems and so on. In other words, this is a much wider field than the amendment. The amendment was that His Honour’s advisers had lost the confidence of the people. This is the complete field of governmental activity both as laid down in the Speech from the Throne and in their past record. Now, then, my hon. friend here is surely as much entitled to refer to the population figures, showing that the policies of the Government had been inadequate, as the premier was to refer to them and as I was to refer to them. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that we must maintain the right of freedom of speech in this House and, with all respect, Mr. Speaker, all we can do — we can be voted down by the majority, but we intend to assert our rights to

**February 19, 1952**

the extent that we can. I am just pointing this out, Your Honour; I hope it won't come to that in this House.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. gentleman's persecution complex is usually sticking out a foot. There was no suggestion in my remarks that the hon. gentleman could not discuss population. He is now discussing the main motion which covers the whole broad programme of the Government. I agree with what the Leader of the Opposition has said. The point I raised was that he cannot now proceed to discuss quotations from statements made by members on a debate that has been closed. If an amendment is moved to the main motion and the member makes a statement on that amendment in the course of an address and the amendment is disposed of, another member cannot then, proceeding to discuss the main motion, start to quote from the amendment, otherwise to quote from statements made on the amendment, otherwise you are debating the amendment and the statements made on the amendment. All I was objecting to was that my hon. friend was proceeding to quote what I said in the debate on the amendment. If that were to be permissible after a while, after you had had three or four amendments to the Speech from the Throne, you could be having quotations from every one of the particular debates even though three or four of them had been disposed of. I am simply pointing out that the hon. member cannot proceed now, under the rules of the House, to quote from statements made in the debate on the amendment. There is nothing at all to prevent him discussing any subject he wants to, if it covers the government's . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I was referring to your ruling, that the hon. member could not refer to population figures.

**Mr. Speaker:** — What the hon. members must realize is that I have tried to keep the debate on these motions in some reasonable limits. If any member now is going to be able to get up and refer to what has already been debated on the amendment then this can be interminable. If the hon. member has anything to say that is new in regards to population, because he had the opportunity when he was speaking on the amendment, he spoke after the Premier and was talking about the population; unless it is new it must be repetition, and I am going to hold the members to that or otherwise you could quote what each other member said and I don't think that can be properly be held in order.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, because one person repeats in a different way what another person said, that is not repetition. Otherwise, the debate in turn . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — If it is new material. If it is not new material I am holding that it is repetition.

**Mr. Tucker:** — We'll have to wait until you make a ruling, Your Honour.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I am making that ruling.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, if you are going to make a ruling, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member cannot mention anything if it has been mentioned

before in this debate, then, of course, I must appeal from your ruling.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I am ruling that the hon. member cannot repeat himself.

**Mr. Tucker:** — He never mentioned it before.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — Mr. Speaker, before I was interrupted by the Premier I was going to discuss . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — I did not interrupt him. The speaker interrupted him.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! He was interrupted by me. I called you to order.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — I was going to discuss population trends in Saskatchewan. It is a topic that I have not discussed. I cannot repeat myself in it, because I have not mentioned it before, and I have some new conclusions that I have arrived at. I don't know if the members are going to agree with me, but I am sure that the House will be interested to hear them.

The population trends — I am not going to quote the Premier because there is not very much to quote anyway. I am going to confine myself to what I have here in the press clippings and various books here, and I may say that the statistics show that in 1941-51 while Alberta increased their population by 18 per cent and Manitoba by 6 per cent, we decreased by 7.17. There is no other place . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — What period of time was that, May I ask?

**Mr. Korchinski:** — 1941 to 1951. There is no other place in the dominion where such a decrease took place. I suppose I cannot discuss what the Premier said about this, though it might be very interesting to discuss it because, in my opinion . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — You could have discussed it when you followed me, the other day. There was nothing to stop you then.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — Not the population trends, Mr. Speaker. I was not talking about population at all. If you will read my speech you will see; there is a lot of interesting reading in it . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — But you could have commented then.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — . . . but not on population trends. What does it mean to us? We are losing population in Saskatchewan, and while in 1941 we had 20 M.P.s representing us in Ottawa, 1953 or whenever a Federal election comes around we will have only 15. We lose 5. Instead of being the 3rd largest province in Canada we have become the 5th. We have dropped 2 places. Now, that could be attributed to the policies of this Government, no matter how you try to get out of it, no matter what figures you quote. No matter how you try you cannot get around it. Our population is decreasing and we

**February 19, 1952**

have C.C.F. Government in Saskatchewan, and that Government has to take its just responsibility for the decrease in population.

And that brings to my mind the book that was sent out to the people of Saskatchewan by the Minister of Agriculture, and that book is called "The Road to Survival." Perhaps that book has something to do with the decrease in population. I studied that book very carefully. That book was sent out by the Minister of Agriculture and there is printed on this book with a rubber stamp, "With the compliments of the Hon. I.C. Nollet, Minister of Agriculture." I think that there was a letter accompanying this book — I am sorry the Minister is not in his seat because I think there is something he should know . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — He has gone to get an aspirin.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — I do not know if he read this book before he sent it out, but I think it is a very silly book. The man who wrote it . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — He certainly sent it to an appropriate man.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Korchinski:** — That means that you have seen one too, because the question that they put out was sent to all the members and the Premier of Government too, and so he must have got a personal copy.

The main principle in this book is this: that there are too many people in the world, and that is why difficulties are coming; and the main conclusion in this book is that we should have fewer people in the world. That is exactly what this book says. This book was written by Vogt, and that is his argument. He discussed, of course, some of the things that lead to hunger, things that have to do with erosion of soil and loss of fertility and so on; but the main argument in this book is that there are too many people in the world and that the population should dwindle. And he makes some very peculiar remarks here. On page 48 this is what he says. This is what he says. This is about the "Dangerous Doctor." He goes on about the doctors; he attacks the doctor here. We know that the C.C.F. like to attack all these people like lawyers and doctors and druggists and so on, calling them the friends of the capitalists. Well, this is just along their line. This is what he says about the doctor:

"The modern medical profession, still framing its ethics on the dubious statements of an ignorant man who lives more than two thousand years ago — ignorant, that is in terms of the modern world, continues to believe it has a duty to keep alive as many people as possible."

He says that the doctors have a belief that they should keep alive as many people as possible. Well, what more does he want the doctors to do — to do away with some people? Is the suggestion that we are getting from our Department of Agriculture that we should do away with some people? What are we going to do about it?



**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Korchinski:** — What are we going to do about it?

**Mr. Speaker:** — It has been the custom to give a great deal of latitude to debate on the Speech from the Throne, but I think that latitude can be extended altogether too far, and I think the hon. member is stretching that a little too far. I am going to hold that that quotation that the hon. member is making has nothing at all to do with this Legislature, nothing at all to do with the Speech from the Throne, and I will ask him to kindly discontinue that kind of a quotation.

**Mr. Tucker:** — This book was sent out at public expense. This book that the member is reading from was sent out by this Government at public expense, and we are certainly entitled to read to this House the sort of information that is being disseminated by this Government at our expense. Now, surely this is in order. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that again any attempt made to show the sort of things that our money is being spent on by this Government by quoting from the literature they are sending out, I submit we are absolutely in order.

**Mr. Speaker:** — If the hon. member wants to censure this Government for anything sent out by the Government there is a proper place to do it. I am holding that this is not the occasion.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Here is the place. All right, Mr. Speaker, with all respect, I appeal your ruling.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The ruling of the speaker on the permissibility of quoting this has been challenged.

**Premier Douglas:** — I take it that Your Honour is simply asking that the hon. member do not continue in tedious repetition of matters that are not related to the general discussion. I would suggest that the matter be not pressed. The hon. member may be getting to his point. I admit, myself, that it sounds a little tedious and far-fetched from the subject, but he may be getting to the point. If he is reaching the point, as the Leader of the Opposition has just stated, then he is within his rights. But he has not got to it yet, and it is going to take a long time to get there. I would ask your Honour that it seems wise to me not to press the matter until the hon. gentleman finally gets to the point, if he has a point to get to. He has covered a lot of good terminal points in the meantime.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — Mr. Speaker, if we did not have the Premier getting up and interjecting I would have finished this. He should not make fun of the way I am trying to present my points. It is not up to him to tell me how to make speeches. I am not going to be directed by anybody on how to make speeches. I am trying to point out, Mr. Speaker, why . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — I am going to point out that you are putting me in a rather difficult position and that is that if this point of the

**February 19, 1952**

debate is going to go on it can go on interminably. And if I am going to allow one speaker to throw whatever he likes into this debate then it will apply to everyone in this House, and I will not make any ruling on what is relevant, and what is not.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I recognize the difficulty your Honour is in, but I might say that, as far as this side of the House is concerned, we are not going to try to stop this display. I believe the wits on the other side threatened they would get up and read for three hours tonight because they could not get their own way; so if they want to waste the time of this Legislature and make a spectacle of themselves — which they are now making to the people of Saskatchewan — as far as we are concerned we are quite prepared to let them read a book so that some of the other members can get prepared for the speeches that they did not take the trouble to prepare when they should have done.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — Mr. Speaker, that insinuation is absolutely out of order.

**Premier Douglas:** — It is only a fraction of what the truth is.

**Mr. Korchinski:** — I was trying to point out, Mr. Speaker, why Saskatchewan is becoming depopulated, and my quotations from this book are absolutely in order because that is the philosophy that this Government has, because they are spreading this philosophy among the people of Saskatchewan. Why was that book sent out? Was it just sent out for fun? Well, it should be one of the best books because we spent a lot of money on it. I think I have an absolute right to quote from that book. I did not write that book; I did not approve of it. But the Government approved that book, and now they are ashamed of the book and so they do not want to hear from it. I think they had better sit down and take their medicine. I claim in the first place that the Department of Agriculture has no business to deal with this question of limitation of population. If any place, it should have been done by the Department of Health. I think the Department of Agriculture should look after agriculture and leave the question of population alone.

Well, anyway, this book claims that instead of sending wheat and money to Europe we should not only preach freedom of press, but freedom of birth control. That is what this book is trying to say. If that kind of trash is sent out by this Government to the people of Saskatchewan, I think I should tell the people of Saskatchewan what is in that book. If the people of Saskatchewan are taking the advice of this Minister of Agriculture, if they are, I doubt it; but if they are, that is the point; maybe they are taking his advice, and there are fewer people in Saskatchewan. That is why our population is decreasing because the Minister of Agriculture said that it should.

There is a question of one title here in the Speech from the Throne, and I quote:

“Armed conflict and discord continue to plague the international scene. This has necessitated the diversion of billions of dollars worth of goods from peacetime pursuits to defence production. While recognizing the need for adequate defence against all forms of aggression, my Government believes that greater assistance to the hungry and underprivileged nations of the world would constitute a lasting contribution to world peace.”

That is to say that there is lots spent on armaments but not enough spent to feed the hungry of the world, and that is a little political criticism again aimed at the Federal Government. This Government continually uses those tactics to attack the Federal Government, and they want us to fight on that ground of Federal politics. Now, if we are going to have a Federal campaign in our Provincial campaign, there is nothing wrong with that. I am more than prepared to stand behind the Federal Government, because I think they are a good government. There is no question about that. And I think they are doing everything possible to help the underprivileged. There was something in the press the other day that they have donated millions of bushels of wheat to Greece. But this Socialist party that we have in Saskatchewan here — the C.C.F. Party, the Government at the present time of Saskatchewan — has a very peculiar philosophy. Mind, Mr. Speaker, I will not say that all the C.C.F. has this philosophy. It is just the inner circle, the nucleus, the ring-leaders. They have a very dangerous kind of philosophy, and the sooner it is exposed the better, because I can see that the rank and file of the C.C.F. up until now have not noticed this peculiar philosophy that guides the high command of this party. They never miss an opportunity to criticize the United Nations.

At the Convention that was held in Saskatoon there were some very interesting things happened. They were very, very critical of the United Nations. It says here — this was reported in the Star-Phoenix”, July 21, 1951:

“Dr. Mahood, Moose Jaw, in a fiery speech (should have been in a “Red” speech) said this inference was unfounded. The majority of the panel which have discussed the question, he stated, felt that the United Nations was subservient to one nation, namely the United States.”

That is a fact in the minds of the majority of the members, that the United Nations are subservient to the United States. That is his argument and that is the idea that the C.C.F. high command holds and this Dr. Mahood, whoever he is, in his fiery speech, stated that. And this question of this subservience was debated very heavily at their convention. Does it mean to say that the C.C.F. hold that Canada is subservient to the United States? Does it mean to say that Great Britain is subservient to the United States? Does it mean to say that all the 64 or more nations are subservient to the United States? That is the idea that they are spreading in Saskatchewan.

**February 19, 1952**

But it was clear that there are very many in the C.C.F. ranks who disagreed with this philosophy. There was a resolution (I think it came from Swift current) which censored the United Nations and this is where this argument arose, where Dr. Mahood made his fiery speech. "Mr. Mitchell . . ." — I am quoting from the paper again:

"Mr. Mitchell said he opposed the Swift Current motion because it inferred that the United Nations had quit working for peace. This inference was contrary to the fact, he declared."

So there was at least one sensible man there. Of course, he was not in the high command, this Mr. Mitchell; he was not Dr. Mahood or anybody in the higher command. And another delegate objected, stating:

"The fact is that all the democratic socialist countries of the United Nations have support of the United States."

That was said by Harry Wilkes of Regina. He said:

"There may be something in it. The United States may have used the United Nations in some respect. on the other hand the only way to stop aggression is to resist it."

There is another man who had a little sense — I think more sense than Dr. Mahood. This Party, the high command — the sooner that the rank and file of that Party see it — has very, very dangerous leanings. Why do they try to put through resolutions like this? Why, it is very clear. Today the world is divided in two parts. There is a Democratic side and Communism on the other side. This kind of talk is giving comfort to the communists. There is no question about that. It is called "giving comfort to the enemy." I think that the rank and file of the C.C.F. Party should see that. They should wake up before it is too late, because there is some little clique in this high command of the C.C.F. Party that have a stranglehold on the C.C.F. Party, and with these dangerous leanings there is no question where they would lead this Party if they had the chance.

There was another thing that was very significant about this Convention. The heading of the paper says "C.C.F. panels talk resolutions and meet in closed session." Why all the secrecy? Is there some conspiracy going on? If there is anything that has not support in this province, it is this secrecy: Little groups getting together in a corner and whispering and secretly discussing something. They are supposed to be a party to serve the people. There is no secrecy necessary. The business of this Province is everybody's business, and everybody should know what is going on. I don't see why all the secrecy. I do not think that this Party that forms the Government of Saskatchewan today deserves the support of the people of Saskatchewan. I think that the people of Saskatchewan have lost faith in this Party, and I think that the people of Saskatchewan have lost faith in this Government; they have lost confidence in this Government. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I propose to vote against this motion.

**Mr. J.W. Horsman** (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, I will have to watch my step very closely in this debate now, according to the speaker's ruling — not to be able to repeat anything that has been said whatsoever. However, I have not very much to say anyway. I never do say very much, and I will try to keep within the bounds of your ruling.

We are discussing the Throne Speech now, of course, since the amendment has been disposed of, and there are a lot of promises in the throne Speech. That was mentioned here before — there is something for everybody. I believe it is first-class political document. There is one thing that I did notice, though, about the Throne Speech and that was the lack of anything of a definite Socialistic nature. I could not see that there was any reference made to any new Crown Corporations, or any new Government business of any kind being started. I could not help but wonder whether this party is beginning to forsake its Socialistic principles. I do not think they are; but this sort of speech might indicate something like that. but I believe, that when the next election comes, whenever that happens to be, Socialism will still be one of the great issues of the campaign.

I am not opposed to some things being under the control of the Government. I think that certain public utilities should be controlled by the government. I would hate, for instance, to see our mail go under private enterprise, and some private company be responsible for the distribution of our mail. There are lots of other public utilities, such as power, telephones and things of that nature that are all right under government control; but I could not help but notice that there was no sign or indication in the Throne Speech that any new Socialistic enterprises would be started in Saskatchewan in the near future. I think perhaps they have found that socialism is getting very unpopular, and it looks as though they are trying to back away from it. Our Government, of course, has the distinction of being the only Socialist government in any British country, or anywhere on the North American continent. It is the last beach-head of socialism that we have, and perhaps when the next election is over, whenever it comes, that will also be done away with.

They have had many defeats — I have referred to them before, and do not need to do that again. I am a farmer and have lived a long time in this country. I know a lot of farmers, and have talked to a lot of farmers and I have never met a farmer yet, Mr. Speaker, who was considered to be a real Socialist. the reason I say that is simple. I have never met a farmer who was in favour of socialization of agriculture. If a farmer was a real socialist, he would not only be willing, but he would be anxious to have agriculture socialized. That is why I say I have never met a farmer who was a real Socialist.

Socialism can wreck our capitalist system; there can be no question whatever about that. The platform of this government says that they are out to wreck the capitalistic system; that no C.C.F. government can rest content until they have eradicated capital. Yet they expect capital to come into this country under that kind of a set-up, Mr. Speaker.

**February 19, 1952**

The hon. member from Saskatoon (Mr. Stone) at the Session we had here last fall, when he moved the Address in reply to the Throne Speech, said that he was not worrying much whether our present system did collapse, because he knew that it could be replaced by a better system. Now if that does not prove that this Government is still anxious to wreck capitalism, I do not know what does.

When you say that all the natural resources, all the principal means of production and everything should be under the control of the government, owned, controlled and operated by the government, you are not leaving anything out at all. When you say all the natural resources, that is where the oil companies come in. What would they think, for instance? That would mean their oil wells, their natural gas, and would mean minerals, ore, uranium, or any base metal that might be discovered there. Those are our natural resources — our lumber, our fish, everything else; and, last but not least, Mr. Speaker, it also means agricultural land. That is our greatest natural resource.

Many farmers who support the C.C.F. seem to think you are crazy when you say that agriculture might be socialized sometime; but under a complete system of socialization everything has to be socialized, and when this Government came into office that was their idea; no C.C.F. government would rest content until capitalism was eradicated and we have a complete Socialist economy. Under complete socialism, the whole economy of the nation would be operated by a small group. We only have, perhaps, one country in the world that is under complete Socialism, and they are handled there by a very small group. I believe, in fact I know, that if a man is a Socialist that is his idea, and I do not believe that any small group of men are capable of handling the affairs of the entire nation; it just simply cannot be done.

We have found another thing about a government like this. You take right now, they have some 6,000 civil servants or something like that; more than doubled, trebled since they came into office. When you get a following like that of people working for a government, naturally they will support the government, since each of them — no doubt many or most of them — control a few votes, because they are at liberty to go out and take part in an election, or do anything politically, or go to nominating conventions; they could even be nominated for candidates, or anything else. And when you get an army like that of paid men working for the government, it is just like a man working for anyone else — he would not very likely quarrel with his bread and butter; you build up a political machine like something we have never known in this country. We used to hear about the old Liberal “steam-roller” that we used to have. Well, I think that that was insignificant compared to a set-up like this. We never had anything like this.

**Premier Douglas:** — Do you know how many Federal civil servants there are in Saskatchewan?

**Mr. Horsman:** — Oh, yes, there are a few. And if a system like that went on long enough, it would be impossible to ever get the government out of office. Under this system, if you get complete government ownership —

and I believe that is what the socialists are working for — I am placing my argument on that, Mr. Speaker, because I think that is what socialism is; ownership of everything by the state, and under a system such as that there would be no incentive left for a man to go out and try to do anything for himself, because he would just be the servant of the state. Instead of having monopolies that we talk about — and we have some monopolies — we would have just one great government monopoly, and we would be worse off than ever. Socialism, as far as I can see anyway, is just a fine intellectual creed, and the people would have to pay for it themselves by their own sweat.

I did notice in the throne speech that some assistance is going to be given to municipalities in the improvement of main market roads. I do not know whether anyone mentioned that in this debate, Mr. Speaker, I know I did not . . .

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — You did.

**Mr. Horsman:** — No, I did not mention main market roads. I mentioned highways. Well, if they do intend to help the municipalities with main market roads, the best way to do that, it seems to me, would be to abolish the Public Revenue Tax and let the municipalities use their own money. I do not think any senior government has the right to invade the only source of revenue that municipalities have. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by Mr. McCarthy:

That the following words be added to the Address:

“but this Assembly regrets that the measure proposed do not include the abolition of the Public Revenue Tax, or any practical plan to assist the municipalities, school boards and other local government bodies in financing the additional responsibilities being placed upon them and meeting the increased burden of local taxation.”

**Premier Douglas:** — We have no objection to taking a vote on this immediately, if Your Honour considers it to be a proper motion; but I do point out that this motion that has just been moved by the hon. member deals with the abolition of the Public Revenue Tax and a “practical plan to assist the municipalities, school boards and other local governing bodies to financing.” Now, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a proper amendment to the Budget, but not to the Speech from the Throne. As a matter of fact, the Government has some proposals with reference to the Public Revenue Tax and with reference to assistance to municipalities and to school boards. It has some proposals; but those proposals would not be announced in the Speech from the Throne, and it seems to me — I could not make any reference to precedent without some study of it; but it would seem to me that for a member to move on the Speech from the Throne, for instance,

at Ottawa, that the Government had not reduced the income tax, would be completely out of order, because the Government would not announce through the Speech from the Throne that they were going to lower the income tax. They would announce that in the budget.

The Government has some proposals with reference to Public Revenue Tax, assistance to municipalities, and assistance to school boards, but they are contained in the budget. The Government is prepared to bring that budget down just as soon as the Speech from the Throne debate is closed. Therefore, I would question as to whether or not this is the proper amendment; but if you hold it to be a proper amendment, Mr. Speaker, then the members on this side (at least I speak for myself, and I think for most of my colleagues) are prepared to vote against it, because the amendment is completely untrue. It says we are not going to do anything about the Public Revenue Tax, or give assistance to municipalities, or give assistance to school boards. We are proposing to do something about it. The gentlemen opposite are just in too big a hurry — they have moved the amendment without waiting to see what we are going to do.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, if the Speech from the Throne had not contained certain provisions for carrying out the Britnell-Cronkite report, the argument of the Premier might have had some weight, but in this Speech from the Throne there is a provision, which after all, is a fiscal provision, for the taxation of Crown Corporations engaging in commercial enterprise, and that is only one of the recommendations designed to help out municipalities. There is a suggestion made for the setting up of a committee on provincial-municipal relief, which is another suggestion of the Britnell-Cronkite report. Then there is the suggestion made as to whether something is going to be done about the timber bridges that again is in the Britnell-Cronkite report. Certainly nothing can be done until the budget is brought down in regard to the taxation of Crown Corporations, and I do not suppose it will be done. We are interested in the Speech from the Throne, and when the Government undertakes to put in the Speech from the Throne its programme in regard to municipalities, we are entitled to say at this point in the debate on the Speech from the Throne that we regret there is nothing in it. There is something in it about the taxation of Crown Corporations. There is no more reason for that being there than the taxation of the Public Revenues Tax. It means the repeal of an Act of this Legislature, and the other think will entail, I take it, the passing of an Act of this Legislature. One is no different from the other, and there is no more reason why we should be held up until the budget speech is made, in discussing the programme laid down in the Speech from the Throne. There is no reason whatever, your Honour.

I suggest the Hon. Premier says they have a programme for dealing with municipalities. We say that we regret that in that programme they have not provided for the repeal of the Public Revenue Tax. We regret that the programme is not adequate. Now surely we are entitled to debate that question on this amendment. We have moved similar amendments in times past, your Honour and you have held them in order. Surely we are not now to be shut off because we are approaching an election, and the Premier does not like these things brought before the people, and does not like to have to dwell on them, your Honour.



**Mr. Speaker:** — I will hold this motion in order. The debate is now on the amendment.

**Mr. R.A. McCarthy** (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to second the motion of the hon. member from Wilkie, I suppose I will have to be very careful that I do not get off the beaten track, but I will try to confine myself strictly to the Public Revenue Tax and after all there is a large field for discussion there.

This Public Revenue Tax has always been opposed by municipalities, both urban and rural, which always have held, and still hold, that land taxation, which is the only source of revenue which the municipalities have, should be left entirely to municipalities. That contention has been very well put forward in this province (I was going to say as long as I can remember) at municipal conventions. I think there have been very few municipal conventions held in this province at which time there has not been a resolution pointing out to the government of the day how unfair it was for our government to take revenues from land tax and put them into the provincial revenue. This is an unfair situation to our municipalities. The Public Revenue Tax is the only remaining provincial tax on property. That theory holds out all over Canada and most of the United States, almost without exception, that senior governments should not invade the real property tax, because it is a municipal field.

Now, despite the fact that the C.C.F. Government is collecting more money from the people of Saskatchewan than any other previous government ever did, it still retains the Public Revenue Tax for provincial purposes. The amount of that tax in the last year was about \$1¾ millions. Since this province was formed, we have had two other forms of real property tax collected by our provincial government. In 1907, just after the province was formed, the government of that day introduced a tax known as a supplementary revenue tax for school property. It levied a flat rate per acre; but that tax was abolished in 1920 when the government decided it could carry on without it.

Again in 1917, we had a provincial tax known as The Wild Lands tax. This tax was abolished in 1936. Both these taxes were abolished by a Liberal Government on the grounds that they were unfair to municipalities.

Now we come to our present Public Revenue Tax. It was introduced in 1916 as a patriotic tax, at the rate of one mill on the assessment, to meet a wartime condition, and substantial grants were made out of this tax for Red Cross and other war purposes at that time. It was originally put on as a war measure, but in 1918 it was increased to two mills on the assessment, and was given the title it now holds of Public Revenue Tax.

This tax has always been objected to by the urban and rural municipalities, as an unwarranted invasion of the municipal field of taxation, and it is the only remaining provincial tax on land and real property,

**February 19, 1952**

and should be abolished forthwith. In taking the stand that we are, we are carrying out past Liberal policies. In 1937, as a result of representations made by the municipalities, both urban and rural, and the report of the Jacoby Commission of that day, the Liberal Government did reduce the Public Revenue Tax from two mills to one and a half mills. So it was the intention of that Government of that day to abolish the tax . . .

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, this man is simply reading a speech.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Is that the best argument you can put up against us?

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — No argument against you at all. You say you have not been reading your speech, prepared for you by somebody else.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — The Liberals did intend to take this tax off in 1927 . . .

**Hon. Members:** — Boo! Boo!

**Mr. McCarthy:** — All right, don't get in a hurry — just don't get your shirt in a knot! The Provincial Treasurer of that day, speaking in this House, and that was in 1927, said:

“The Public Revenue Tax, while it may appear small” (and I am quoting from his speech now; I am not reading his speech, for the benefit of the Minister of Highways — this is a quotation from a speech made in this House) . . . ”when you state it is mills on the dollar, produces more revenue at present than any other single source of revenue.” (That was in 1927). “At the same time it strikes at the only source of revenue that our schools and municipalities have, and at the main source of revenue which was some years ago, assigned to all our urban and rural municipalities in the province.”

Well, Mr. Speaker, that goes to show that previous Liberal Governments have not been afraid to reduce taxes when the time and circumstances warranted. This is in direct contrast to our present Government who, ever since they have taken office, have never ceased to raise taxes, levies, licences, and any mineral taxes, and any other public reform that they could. As far as I know they have continued to raise taxes, but they have never reduced any taxes to my knowledge despite the fact that they have a revenue two or three, or possibly four times as much as we had when some of these things happened.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think probably the assessment, based on an average of our 300 and some odd municipalities together would be around \$2 million. I am not stating that this figure is absolutely correct, but it is very close; and if you take that \$2 million and multiply it by 2 mills, you arrive at the place where the average municipality of this province is paying about \$4,000 into the Provincial Government. I am not absolutely sure that those figures are right, but they are very close anyway.

We hear a lot about grants that this Government has given to municipalities — well, \$4,000 is a lot more than any municipality ever got. I think probably the average grant for municipalities, last year, would run around \$1,200 — I am not sure of that figure, but I am not far off on that either. That would give the municipalities an additional revenue of some \$2,800 per municipality, varying, of course, with their assessments which are not equal.

I was rather interested in looking up, rather hurriedly, to see just what the grants in municipalities were — to see what a difference there is in grants, as I have not looked this matter up for quite a while; but I got this out of the table here in this book and was rather surprised to see the difference there was in the grants for the different municipalities, from the high to the low.

I would just like to give, very briefly, a few of the high ones and a few of the low ones. If you take Page 101 of this report, this is 1950-51 report — on page 101: Municipality No. 137 received a Government grant for that year of \$6,362. If you take No. 277, they received a grant of \$6,738. Of you take No. 374, they got a grant of \$11,488, and if you take No. 426 (I think I am right on that) they got a grant of \$13,176. Now, those are a few of the high ones — but they are not all that high, so let us take a look at a few of the low ones.

Take a look at No. 348 — they got a grant of \$655; take a look at No. 171, and they got a grant of \$492  
...

**Hon. Member:** — Quote No. 303.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — I'm doing this; you can quote whatever you like when you get up, my dear boy.

I just bring that to your attention, Mr. Speaker, to show you that the grants vary greatly between municipalities. If this tax were abolished, those municipalities would have a more stable revenue because the tax would be on their assessment rates. That would give the municipalities some chance to carry out the increasing burdens which are being placed on their shoulders at the present time. It would also carry out one of the suggestions in the Britnell report, namely that the senior government should be very careful not to lace municipalities in the position where they become collecting agencies of senior governments.

It is a well recognized fact all over the North American continent that this real property tax is a function of municipal governments, and should not be invaded by senior governments. If we want our municipalities to continue to fill their proper place — and I think everyone does — because after all the roots of democracy are in our junior government, and they build up from there to senior government; and if we do not have a strong municipal government in this province, we will not have a strong senior government, because they work from there up. That is the history of democracy: that it only works while we have strong junior governments.

**February 19, 1952**

I think that is all I want to say, Mr. Speaker, but there is a lot more I could say; but did you notice I have not even got my notes, hon. Minister of Highways? But I will support the motion. I do not think that anyone who has studied the municipal problem in this province can help but agree — and all municipal men have agreed ever since I can remember, and have said before — that this should be turned back to the municipalities, and the fact on the whole North American continent is that the municipalities should have this form of taxation, so I am going to second the member for Wilkie's motion.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — Before the hon. member sits down, I did not want to interrupt him when he was speaking, but I did not catch the numbers of the municipalities which he referred to. Would you mind repeating those please?

**Mr. McCarthy:** — I will give them to you in as much the same order as I can . . .

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — That is all right, just as long as you give me the numbers of the municipalities, and the amounts.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — I hope that I have these numbers right. They are quite a piece from the number over to the figure I am quoting, but I think they are right — wait until I find them again.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — And what are you quoting from?

**Mr. McCarthy:** — I am quoting from The Annual Report, Department of Municipal Affairs for the Province of Saskatchewan, Fiscal Year, 1950-51." I take it those are correct. No. 101 — but of course it runs over to 102, I suppose. Now where did we start here? I said that No. 137, under the heading of "Government Grants", had \$6,362.65 of a government grant; I said that No. 171 — no, wait a minute, that is a low one — I will give you the high ones first . . .

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — It was the high ones I wanted.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — I said that No. 277 had a grant of \$6,738 even; I said that No. 146 had a grant of \$13,167.25 . . .

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — That will be fine, thanks.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Do you want the rest of them?

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — That is fine, thank you.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — I said that No. 486 had a grant of \$11,000; wait a minute, I might as well give them all — I have a lot more here that are marked.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — That is all right.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — I am not just too sure of these numbers. I wish I had a piece of paper here, so I would be sure I had the right numbers, because it is a long way across there. Here is one I did miss

before, so will tell you now — if I can get the right number. No. 487 had a grant of \$18,234. I did not say it, but it is here, and I think it is No. 488 had a grant of \$9,681. Now, do you want me to give you the low ones?

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — That's fine, that is all I have asked for, Mr. Speaker. There is no necessity to repeat it. I only asked for the high ones.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Well, we will take No. 375, and if I can see it properly, it got \$210.90. Now, I wonder where, a few years ago here they were going to pay all the municipalities a basic . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! The hon. member took his seat — he has finished his speech. Is the House ready for the question?

**Mr. V.P. Deshaye (Melville):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this amendment on the abolition of the Public Revenue Tax. Now that the province of Saskatchewan's government has more resources than ever before in the history of this province, and more places from which it can obtain taxes for the operation of the province, I am in agreement with the amendment that the Public Revenue Tax should be abolished.

While the amendment was being made, I went through the Annual Report of the Department of Municipal Affairs just to see what saving there would be to the rural municipalities, the towns and the villages in my own constituency of Melville, and I am going to quote these figures, just to show what saving there will be to these different rural municipalities, town and villages.

As I said before, I think that with the increased revenue of the province, the Government should be prepared to relinquish this field to the municipalities, whose field of taxation is so limited, and who find it such a burden to carry on with the added responsibilities that have been vested upon the municipalities by this Government. To go into these figures, I will commence with the rural municipalities.

I find that the rural Municipality of Grayson has an assessment of \$1,653,981; to that municipality there would be a saving of \$3,307.96. The rural Municipality of McLeod No. 185 has an assessment of \$2,383,312, on which the Public Revenue would be \$4,766.52. That would be the amount of the saving for the R.M. of McLeod by the abolition of the Public Revenue Tax, and I am sure that that amount would permit it to build one of the much-needed bridges in that municipality.

The R.M. of Abernethy No. 186 has an assessment of \$3,181,744, and there would be a saving to that municipality of \$6,363,48; the R.M. of North Qu'Appelle has an assessment of \$1,874,465, on which the Public Revenue Tax would be \$3,748.93; the R.M. of Canadian No. 214 has an assessment of \$1,581,010; on which there would be savings in that municipality of \$3,162; the R.M. of Stanley No. 215 has an assessment of \$1,788,947; on which the

**February 19, 1952**

Public Revenue Tax is \$3,577.89; the R.M. of Tullymet has an assessment of \$1,118,047, and there would be a savings in that municipality of \$2,236.09. If that municipality could save that amount of money, it could possibly do some work on the road over which so many trucks are travelling and the municipal market road, from which trucks the Government of this province obtain the revenue, but apparently refuse to maintain; or build a road to carry the traffic from which it obtained the revenue, and leaves that burden to the municipality of Tullymet.

Now, the R.M. of Lipton has an assessment of \$2,018,470; and there would be a saving to that municipality of \$4,036.94. The R.M. of Cupar No. 218 has an assessment of \$3,093,530, to which municipality there would be a saving of \$6,187; and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you yourself would be very much interested in seeing that municipality save that amount of money for work there, because that is a municipality that has, by the redistribution, been put into your own seat.

Now, the town of Melville, which has an assessment of \$2,336,644, would save \$4,673; and the town of Lemberg, which has an assessment of \$421,860 would save \$843, and I am sure that that town could well use that money for its own improvement. The town of Neudorf which has an assessment of \$310,865, would save \$621.73. The village of Hubbard would, with an assessment of \$88,730, save \$177.46; the village of Killaley has an assessment of \$136,752 and would save \$273.50 annually. The village Lebret, with \$106,298 assessment, would save \$212.58; the village of Goodeve with an assessment of \$156,925 would save \$313.85; the village of Grayson with an assessment of \$180,040 would save \$360.08; the village of Duff with an assessment of \$78,370 would save \$156.74; the village of Lipton (which is also now in your constituency, Mr. Speaker) with an assessment of \$255,980, would save \$511.60, and I am sure the people of that village and municipality will be anxious to see your reaction to this amendment when the time comes.

The village of Fenwood has an assessment of \$99,902, on which there would be a saving of \$199.04. The town of Balcarres which has an assessment of \$351,890, would save annually \$703.78. The town of Abernethy with an assessment of \$251,965, would save \$503.93.

As I said in my opening remarks, with all of the new wealth which has come into this province, which the Premier and other speakers on the Government side of the House have told us about, there is a great source of taxation there for the province, and I think the least the Government can do is to allow the municipalities to retain these sums of money that I have quoted as it affects my own constituency, for local improvement. It is regrettable that the Government does not see fit to increase municipal grants, but if it does not see fit to increase municipal grants, we fell that the least it can do is to abolish the Public Revenue Tax, so that that money can be used for improvements in those municipalities, and, therefore, I wish to conclude, with those words, saying that I will support the amendment.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member referred to some parts of my constituency, and said they would like to know my reaction. Of course the hon. member knows that I cannot signify my support or not, but there is one

statement that the hon. member made which does affect my constituency, and which is erroneous, and that is regarding the secondary road from Ituna to Balcarres — that is not a municipal-maintained road. I thought you would like to be corrected on that.

**Mr. Deshaye:** Thank you for your information, Mr. Speaker. I will make a careful note of that and check into it to make sure that you are right. At the same time when I said I was sure that your Honour would appreciate these figures, I said when the time came you could express your opinion. I did not expect an opinion while you were in the chair.

**Mr. A.W. Loehr** (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, I am totally unprepared to really take part in this debate, especially insofar as the amendment to the Speech from the Throne is concerned; however, I am greatly interested in the matter. Having been a municipal man for a period of seven years and as Reeve of a municipality during the 'thirties, I know the difficulties that confront rural municipalities at least insofar as collection of taxes are concerned, and insofar as the building of roads are concerned.

I had great hopes that this present Government would implement the promises made of abolishing this Public Revenue Tax, and as time went on, and as the revenues became more buoyant all the time, I was in hopes that from year to year they would implement that promise; however, they have not seen fit to do so. Then of providing better roads, roads that will stand up under the heavy traffic roads are subjected to these days, even if they could build roads with the implements they used to have, such as slushers, wheelers and the like — even though, if they could build roads with such implements, if they had horses to do that work these days, they could not build the roads that are presently required. These days it takes big machines to do this work, to build proper roads to stand up under the vehicular traffic of today. Taking the record of my own municipality, and the surrounding municipalities, I find that those municipalities on an average have spent somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$20 to \$25 thousand dollars for implements for the purpose of building roads within the last few years, that is, since the war and just previous to the war.

It takes a tremendous amount of money to build rods. These municipalities in my surrounding district employ high-priced labourers to operate these machines. I know in my own municipality they have an annual employee who is in charge of these implements; in the winter-time his time is occupied in repairing those machines, looking after the repairing. He gets \$2,000 a year for doing nothing but look after those machines, operating them, overseeing the operation of them during the summer-time, and looking after the repairing of them during the winter-time. That takes a tremendous amount of money, and, so far as revenue is concerned, these municipalities have not any more revenue now than they had before.

In the municipalities in my surrounding district they have not increased at all the mill rate for the purpose of road construction within the last ten years or so. They have not increased it at all in my own

**February 19, 1952**

municipality; they may have increased it one or two mills in some of the surrounding municipalities for the purpose of gravelling roads. Now so far as I know there are only one or two of those municipalities that have ever done any gravelling, because the clamouring for road construction by the ratepayers of the municipalities is so strong that they have been forced to use this money that was ear-marked for gravelling for the purpose of constructing new roads.

Now, in my opinion the money that is collected by the Government in the form of Public Revenue from these municipalities — and in my region that average is about \$5,000 per municipality, some of them a little more and some a little less, depending upon, the assessment in those municipalities, which usually averages about \$2½ million — should remain in these municipalities. The grants which those municipalities receive average, as the hon. member for Cannington has rightly mentioned, about \$1,200. Not having had a chance to refresh my memory by looking up the records, I believe that in one or two instances in that immediate neighbourhood, the grants amounted to as high as \$1,500, and, by the way, the high grant went to the municipality where most of the C.C.F. votes come from in that area.

Now, I maintain that in view of the excessive revenue which this Government has received since they have been in power, they should have immediately abandoned this Public Revenue Tax. I do know it would be wrong to abolish that tax in rural municipalities if it is not abolished in urban municipalities. It would be wrong in this regard, that, while the urban centres perhaps have not the long miles of roads to construct, they still have other problems peculiar to their municipal centres, and it seems to me that, if these municipalities would be able to collect that two mills each year and devote it to construction of streets and sidewalks, it would be a great relief for them, and as far as the Government is concerned they could forget about grants.

In more sparsely-settled municipalities, the assessment is usually lower and as a result the public Revenue does not amount to as much as it does where the municipalities are better. There invariably the settlement is more sparse, the farms are farther apart, and not every road allowance needs to be constructed. Consequently, less roads are needed in those municipalities. I know that in some of the regions where I have been employed by the Department of Municipal Affairs and the Department of Agriculture, some years ago, there are a number of municipalities where, I would say, one-third of the road allowances constructed would have been quite sufficient to serve all the people residing there. The story is entirely different up in the north region where there are small farms, averaging possibly about a half-section to a farm. There, every road allowance must be constructed to serve the people. Not only that, the cost of road construction up in those northern regions is very high. For instance, in the area around Humboldt we have sharply undulating surfaces, and on the average possibly every half-mile has five or six little or bigger potholes that need filling. You cannot go in there and build a road without using Letourneaus or Beecheys to fill these holes. So the construction of the roads in that area is very high-priced. For instance, along my farm, a distance of three miles, the municipality built a new road this summer and I was told that road cost them just under \$2,000 a mile to build. That is a lot of money;



but, of course, the weather being such as it was, it perhaps cost a little more than it would have had conditions been dry. But to build a road anywhere up there nowadays to answer the purpose that is required of roads with the heavy vehicular traffic, a road like that costs in the neighbourhood of \$1,500 per mile.

Owing to the fact that the municipalities are being made the collection agencies for so many things — in our municipalities in the Humboldt district, for instance, there is the municipal money, there is the school money (and that has mushroomed up to three times as high as it used to be) since the inauguration of the larger school unit; there is the health service — on which we had to raise the mill rate three-fold since the late 'thirties, and the fact that the municipalities are held responsible for unpaid hospitalization taxes, these taxes have piled up and piled up, so that the municipal officials are very, very reluctant to raise the mill rate for the purpose of road construction in those municipalities. For that reason, I say that the Public Revenue should be abolished immediately and let the municipalities take care of their own problems. I am very much in favour of the amendment to the Speech from the Throne, and I think it is timely. I am sure that I am doing exactly what the people in the municipality in my region expect me to do, and that is to vote for the amendment.

**Mr. A.H. McDonald** (Moosomin): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with many of the things that have been said with regard to this amendment, and I feel that I should take some part in the debate on the amendment because I feel sure, as the last member mentioned, that the people whom I happen to represent — the reeves and the members of the rural municipal councils and the councils of the towns — would want me to support this amendment.

We all know the tremendous problem our municipalities, both rural and urban, are having to carry on with their present day problems. We know the conditions of the roads in our municipality. We know the conditions of the streets in our small towns and villages, and we know that both urban and rural municipalities would welcome the abolition of this tax.

I recall, a short time ago, listening to an address — I believe it was by the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. McIntosh) when he was discussing the tremendous problem that the municipalities were facing with the burden of rebuilding and maintaining the road system in the municipalities; I believe at that time he stated that the Provincial Government looked after some 8,000 miles of the road in this province, and that the municipalities were responsible for some 145,000 miles of road, and he stated at that time that this was a staggering load for the municipalities to carry. I am in agreement with that statement, and I believe that all our municipalities, whether they are rural or urban, would welcome this 2 mills to put into their general fund with an endeavour to improve the roads throughout the entire province.

Many things have been said here in regard to the assessment of municipalities and the amount of money that it would mean to a municipality. I know in my own constituency we have assessments that average around \$1,500,000 which means that this would give the average municipality some \$3,000 to be used on their roads. Today, these municipalities are receiving a grant from the Provincial Government somewhere between \$400 and \$1,500 — I think \$500 is among the low category ones, and \$1,500 would be the highest. Well I know for the ones in the \$500 bracket, \$1,500 to them in addition to this \$500 would mean a tremendous help; and those in the \$1,500 bracket would receive almost \$4,000 and that would do a tremendous amount to improve the roads in these rural and urban municipalities.

As I said at the outset, Mr. Speaker, the only reason that I rise to take part in this debate is to go on record that I have supported this amendment to give some help and some compensation to these municipalities. They have asked, I think, for a good number of years for help in some regard in money — and, as we all know, the only source of revenue they have is through land taxation. I believe, and I think I am expressing their beliefs when I say that they feel that this field of taxation should be left open to them.

The Provincial Government has had tremendous revenues from all fields, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we would be doing a just turn for both our rural and urban municipalities to hand this field of land taxation over to the local authorities. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will support the amendment.

**Mr. W.A. Tucker** (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, the question before the House having to do with the important question of the financing of municipalities, is so important that I feel I should not let this debate pass without indicating the position that I take on this matter, and the position of the Party I have the honour to lead takes in regard to the matter.

It is quite true that, in speaking on the main motion, I made passing reference to this — that we were disappointed that something was not being done about the Public Revenue Tax; but, of course, this motion goes further than the Public Revenue Tax. It expresses regret that the whole problem is not being dealt with by some workable plan.

I do not intend to take a great deal of time, Mr. Speaker, in dealing with this matter; but I do suggest that it is of such importance that it warrants the attention not only of the Legislature but of the Government. I am aware that this Government felt that it was a great problem, because, in the early part of 1948, they set up the Britnell-Cronkite-Jacobs Committee — a committee of very distinguished gentleman, and well qualified to study this question and make a recommendation in the matter. They referred the problem to this Committee in the early part of 1948. This committee went about its task very industriously and assiduously, and brought in a report which has been the subject of a great deal of discussion ever since.

I believe the report was submitted to the Government by the Committee on October 16, 1950 — that is well over a year ago. We are now in the second year; and since this report has been brought in the Government has brought in the budget of 1951, and during the period of 1950-51, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. McIntosh) went around the province and discussed the recommendations of the report with various municipal bodies. Of course, we are now in the second Session after this report has been brought in. It is quite true that the Government is proposing, in the Speech from the Throne, to carry out the taxation of Crown Corporations engaged in commercial enterprise, but, as everybody knows, that probably will yield around \$300,000, certainly not much more than that, to the municipalities involved; and it will not help the rural municipalities very much. In other words, it will bring help to the urban municipalities very much. In other words, it will bring help to the urban municipalities, but not to the rural municipalities; and the suggestion of the Britnell-Cronkite report, made well over a year and a half ago, has apparently been ignored by the Government.

Now how a government can set up, a matter of around 4½ years ago, a Committee of this standing, and then, so far as rural municipalities are concerned, practically do nothing about it — and here in the Speech from the Throne where it has laid its programme before us, propose to do something which we welcome and have advocated in regard to the taxation of Crown Corporations engaged in commercial enterprise, and yet in regard to the Public Revenue Tax which would help the rural municipalities nothing has been proposed at all!

The Government, since this report was brought in, has collected from the municipalities or the taxpayers around \$1¾ million, last year, and again there is nothing proposed in regard to lifting that burden from their backs in the programme now before the House. That is the suggestion to the Britnell-Cronkite report that would have brought the greatest measure of advantage to the rural municipalities particularly; and there is very little in the Speech from the Throne of a concrete nature that would help the rural municipalities; and this suggestion of a committee set up by this Government is so warranted so far as we are concerned yet it is being ignored, Mr. Speaker; and I think that the members who are sent here, in view of the Committee who went into the matter and made such a strong recommendation; I think it should receive very careful attention, people particularly when it has been supported by the municipal associations throughout the province for so many years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, so that there may be no doubt about the attitude taken by this outstanding committee on provincial-municipal relations, I am going to read a bit from the report from page 99. They said this:

“Despite the fact that we have been unable to find that the real burden of the real estate tax has increased in recent years, your Committee is of the opinion that the time has come for the abolition of the Public Revenue Tax. The reasons may be summarized under the following heads . . .”

I should perhaps observe, in connection with that first preliminary remark, Mr. Speaker, that they say the “real burden”, in their opinion, of the real estate tax has not increased, because they make the comparison as to taxes on the basis of present prices; so they say the actual proportionate payments to be made by taxpayers on real estate has not been increased. I am inclined to think that, under present circumstances, the burden has been increased; but what gives these recommendations even more strength is the fact that this Committee, even though it doesn’t find that basic fact, goes on to recommend the removal of the tax, for certain reasons, which I will now read to your Honour:

“1. Your Committee has found widespread dissatisfaction with this tax. This has been evident from resolutions of the two large municipal associations for many years; the Committee has become satisfied through meetings with executives of the rurals that the feeling is both genuine and strong even though abolition should involve the substitution of another type of tax.”

Here the Committee suggests that they have found, and have become satisfied, that the feeling is genuine and strong that this tax should be abolished. Well, of course, this Government can go on and flout public opinion, they can go on and flout and flout it; but the time comes when governments who take that attitude are brought to account by the sovereign people in our democracy.

“2. Your Committee is of the opinion that, even though the tax is not particularly onerous at the moment, . . .”

I must beg to differ with that. If one talks to those who have to pay the tax, and particularly in some of the districts where the crops have been light and so on, I think they find they do feel taxes to be pretty onerous; but at any rate this is the finding of the Committee and it reinforces their suggestion that the tax should be done away with, because they say its abolition would put the municipalities in a better position to cope with the demands for increased services, particularly in the construction and maintenance of highways — the construction and maintenance of highways. Now surely, if there is one thing that we should be bending a real effort to, it is to fight against rural depopulation; and this Government, by refusing to act on this matter, is permitting this trend to continue. The problem should have been tackled at the very earliest possible date. People who leave our province may not come back; but if steps are taken to keep them here, then we have them. The Committee goes on, (I will not read all of it), but I will read item 4 of the reasons they give:

“4. Your Committee is of the opinion that it is highly desirable that the municipalities should have one field that they can call their own. Allocation of this field to the local units would go far in the direction of developing a feeling of responsibility. They would realize they had one

dependable and significant field of revenue with reference to which their plans can be made.”

Mr. Speaker, one of the basic ideas of democracy is the strengthening of municipal government, and the increasing of the feeling of responsibility of elected municipal officials; and surely one of the ways to increase that sense of responsibility is, as far as possible, to ensure that the people who spend the money shall have the raising of it and have the control over the raising of it. The idea that this one field of taxation enjoyed by municipalities should be encroached upon by the Province in order to give them back the very money they take away from them is, of course, an encroachment on that very idea of strengthening municipal government. I am going to quote item 5:

“5. The principle that the real estate tax field should be considered as belonging to the municipalities exclusively in practice is pretty well conceded in Canada. Remnants of a provincial tax on land remain in only three of the other provinces, namely, Alberta, Manitoba and Nova Scotia, and for the last fiscal year available the combined collections in these three provinces for provincial purposes amounted to only \$442,614.”

Think of it, Mr. Speaker! Here is a Government enjoying revenues the like of which has never before been enjoyed by a Provincial Government in this province. When they came into office, the Government had enjoyed, in the previous year, revenues of \$28,800,000. Under the estimates as brought down, in 1950-51, that had gone up from \$28 million to \$56 million, just about double — an increase of almost \$28 million; and here the fact remains that the cost of living, during this period, has not increased by double at all, as my friend keeps saying, and during the period involved it did nothing of the sort. The fact remains that, if that is true, it is still true in other provinces the same as in Saskatchewan; and here we are, the only province in Canada, with this insignificant exception, levying a tax on land for provincial purposes; because, after all, a tax in three provinces that only total \$442,614 means that they have practically done away with it in those other three provinces. These other three provinces that have it raised \$442,614 in total. The other provinces in Canada raise nothing on land for provincial purposes. But Saskatchewan continues to cause her landowners, her homeowners, to raise a tax of 2 mills on the dollar and send it in to this Government that is enjoying revenues far beyond any previous government.

Reports regarding the new financial agreements indicate that when the new agreement is signed this province will get somewhere around \$24 million annually — \$22 million over and above the constitutional grant to which we are entitled. The previous highest grant obtained by any previous government to this, during the war, was less than \$9 million including the constitution subsidy; so that is an increase of about \$15 million. Still this Government, and I suppose it will be supported by its supporters, clings to this tax and insists that these homeowners, who are struggling with the

problem of maintaining their schools and keeping the roads up, raise that money and send it in to this Government. I think we would be remiss in our duties if we did not bring it before this Legislature and see where the representatives that the people send here stand on this question.

Now the other argument brought forward by this commission was this — and I again remind you, Mr. Speaker, that these are not my words; they are the words of the people who were appointed by this present Government as the people that they considered the best people to study this question and give them advice in the matter; and they have so far seen fit to ignore their own Committee in this matter. Here is item 6:

“6. Abolition of this tax was recommended by a Royal Commission after a thorough examination of the fiscal structure of the province.”

That was the Jacoby report; but it was followed, as hon. members know, by a period of such financial stringency that it was not possible to carry out that recommendation. The Jacoby report was brought in in 1937. The revenues of the Government at that time, including the tax, were \$14 million; and my friends opposite started to laugh because the tax was not taken off! Here were revenues that the Government at that time had of \$14 million. This Government has revenues of \$58 million, and they think because it was not taken off when the previous Government had \$14 million, there is some argument for not taking it off when the revenues are \$58 million. That is one thing I would draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker.

Another thing which I would draw to your attention is this. We all know that after this report came in, this province during that time was suffering from a very poor crop in 1937. I think that the yield per acre was less than 4 bushels per acre over the entire province, and we were in a position where we had to go to get help from the Federal Government to keep our schools open, and keep medical attention for the people and so on. We would have been in no position to go and ask for that help, if, before we went to get it, we repealed this tax. And so the fact that no action was taken following that is no argument. And then after that we had the period of the war and so on. (My hon. friends laugh about that). Well, you can laugh about the war and the war effort that was made by this province; you can sneer at it all you want, but I think that most decent people in this province are proud of the effort made by Saskatchewan in the last war.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. The hon. member has no right to suggest that any member on this side of the House sneered at the war effort. Members on this side of the House are just as proud of the war effort, and probably took as much part in the war effort, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition. What we are sneering at, and getting a little tired of, is the Leader of the Opposition using the war effort as an excuse for the long-protracted period of inaction.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I am not boasting about any part I took in any war. I was just speaking about the people of this province. I am not ashamed of the humble part I took, but I am not always boasting about it; and I would say that, when the energies of this province were being devoted in such a

whole-hearted manner to the prosecution of war, it falls with ill grace from people who pretend that they were interested in that war effort to say, "Why weren't they building roads at that time? and why weren't they building electric lines at that time" and why weren't they doing this and why weren't they doing that?" The members opposite know very well that even following the war — I heard the Minister in charge of hydro-electric development, for example, get up and say, "we have been hampered in our development because of shortages." That was in 1947. I wonder! He was one honest Minister — I must say that. He is one Minister who gets up and doesn't talk, all the time, to pretend that we should have had the same development during periods of depression and during the time we were devoting our entire energies to war as is able to be done now with the large revenues that this present Government enjoys.

**Premier Douglas:** — You couldn't build roads . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — The Premier said that people are getting sick of our saying that the reason more progress was not made was due to the depression period of the 'thirties, and due to the fact that we were absorbed in the war effort. This is the truth, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the people of this province are getting sick of the truth! I wonder if, on the contrary, they are not getting sick of this business of trying to pretend that because they are doing better than was done during a period of depression and during a time when our energies were absorbed in a war effort; if they are not getting sick of that dishonest argument, Mr. Speaker! I think that is what they are getting sick of.

Now then if you take this period, even in 1941, the Provincial revenues were only \$21 million; 1942, \$24 million; 1943, \$32 million; and the members opposite say, "Why didn't they do as much as we are doing?" when their revenues, during the last three years, have been running around \$50 million: 1949, \$48 million; 1950, \$52 million; 1951, \$56 million. this pretence . . .

**Mr. Kuziak:** — Bunk!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Tucker:** — The truth is regarded by my hon. friend from Canora as bunk. You know it is very interesting to me. We give the exact facts and the members opposite say, "bunk." They think that by branding the truth as bunk, they prove something. The hon. Premier said that the people of the -province are getting sick of things. I think they are getting sick of the attempt to dispose of honest argument and fact by ridicule and attempts to evade the issue. I think the people of the province are getting sick of that. I think our province approves the kind of people who like to look at facts; they like to hear facts . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Tucker:** — My friend the Premier is the last person in the world who should say "Hear, hear" to that, because we have steadily given facts . . .

**February 19, 1952**

**Premier Douglas:** — Excuses, not facts.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Tucker:** — They are not excuses; they are facts. I suppose my hon. friend, if he had been Premier during the war effort, would have gone ahead with a road-building programme when he couldn't get road machinery. I suppose he would have gone ahead with the hydro-electric programme, when you couldn't get copper or anything to do it with. If you want to talk about bunk, that argument surely is the bunk, Mr. Speaker.

**Premier Douglas:** — If you couldn't build roads, you could have given up the Public Revenue Tax.

**Mr. Tucker:** — My hon. friend says he would have built roads . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — I did not say that, Mr. Speaker. I said if you couldn't build roads then that would have been all the more reason to have given up the Public Revenue Tax during those years.

**Mr. Tucker:** — As a matter of fact, our revenues, during that time, Mr. Speaker, were, as I have mentioned, running well under \$30 million.

**Mr. Speaker:** — (after interruption) Order! Order!

**Mr. Tucker:** — There is no use in the members opposite thinking that they are going to put it over the people by pretending that they have done well because they have made progress since the war. The thing the people look at is not whether we made more progress than was made during the war in this development; but they look at it this way — they will look at the progress that has been made by other provinces and they will say, "Have you made comparable progress?" and they are not going to be fooled by the continual argument of the Premier comparing the situation during the period after the war with the period during the depression and the period of war. They are not going to be fooled by that, Mr. Speaker.

Now then, with further regard to this question — I have read the recommendations of this Committee, and they made the definite recommendation that this tax should be done away with. And what was done by the Government? They went out and talked to the municipal officials, talked to them and talked to them about this matter; and after they had met them all, so far as I know, every municipal body that was talked to by the Minister of Municipal Affairs said, "We still think the Public Revenue Tax should be taken off" — and still there was no action. Now then it might be said, Mr. Speaker, could these outstanding men in municipal affairs in this province have an opinion that is not worth listening to by this Government! I would not be a bit surprised that the Government have got such a swollen head by this time that they have become intoxicated with their own talk about the wonderful things they have done; and I wouldn't be a bit surprised if they are not in the state of mind that they do not think the opinion of the municipal men is worth anything; I would have thought that they would at least have paid some attention to the people they have gone to themselves for advice. But no, they don't pay any attention to them either.



In regard to the matter that has been mentioned, this Public Revenue Tax, as has been pointed out, the municipalities are having a difficult time handling their problems. I do not think you can deny that. Taxes are so high that they should not be put any higher. Taxes have gone up since this Government came into office. They have gone up, as I recall the figures, about 10 mills on the dollar. Now then, here is this Government with an increased revenue from the Federal Government during the coming year of over what it was when they came into office, of about \$13 million; with increased revenues, generally, over when they came into office, of nearly \$28 million. Well their own Committee says they should leave \$1¾ million with the municipalities, which, admittedly, as the Minister of Education said, yesterday, when dealing with the problem of schools, are having a difficult time. He admitted that teachers are being paid salaries at such a level that there was a tendency for them to leave the profession and go out of the province. His justification for that was that it is a problem which other provinces are suffering under. Well, here we are, a province with that problem, which he says is greater here than in other provinces, and here we are the only province left that is insisting on municipalities imposing a land tax and sending it into the central government, with the small exception which has been mentioned.

If the Minister of Education is right, Mr. Speaker, that this problem is greater in Saskatchewan, then we should not be the last province to insist on a land tax for the benefit of the central government; we should have been the first to deal with it, to help carry our schools and so on. Is it any wonder that with those admitted facts before the people and the stubbornness of this Government even to carry out the advice of its own Commission; is it any wonder that municipal people feel, "What is the use of passing resolutions; we have passed them year after year; we finally persuaded them to set up a commission; they get the Commission's report and instead of doing anything about it, in any major regard, they come out and talk to us some more." And here we are in our second Session after this report has been brought in, and still nothing has been done about it.

Here we have a situation where I am satisfied that people are moving off the farms because they feel they cannot get proper schooling for their children on the farms, and we have, in addition to that, people moving off the farms because the Municipalities have not had money enough to build roads or to keep them clear of snow in the wintertime; and if they stay on the farm they tend to become isolated. Many farmers no longer have horses, and they have to rely on motor cars to get to their shopping centre; and if the roads are not kept high enough to blow clear of snow for the farmers to get to town, then there is a tendency for them to move into a village or town for the winter-time. Once they have got used to being away from the farm; once they have got rid of their livestock and so on, it is much easier for them, later on, to decide to leave the province altogether. There has been nothing worthwhile done by this Government to halt that trend in our province. We in the Opposition feel that something should have been done long ago, and we say to the members of this Legislature that we think, if they believe these problems are so great, as the Minister of Education says and the Minister of Municipal Affairs says, as all our great municipal men say, as Britnell, Cronkite and Jacobs say; if they believe that, let them

vote as they believe.

I have heard a lot from members opposite about people voting as they feel, and I invite the members in this particular matter, if they think that the municipalities need this money more than this Government, then I suggest that they vote to express that opinion, and vote for this amendment, because that is a simple matter; and this Government has left the members of the Legislature in this position, by stubbornly refusing to act, that if they vote against this amendment they are voting that they are satisfied with the Government because it still continues to levy and inflict this tax on the municipalities.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come when democracy's wishes should prevail, unless there is some over-riding reason that the Government can bring forward — that it hasn't got the money, that it would in some way jeopardize the financial position of the province, or something of that sort; but how can they bring forward that suggestion.

You may be told, Mr. Speaker, that they have in mind some question of equalization of grants between the different municipalities. I suggest that the first thing that should be done is to return (as this Committee suggested) to the municipalities the sole right of land taxation. That does not exclude a system of equalization that would help the municipalities, in addition to that. But first of all, the right to have land taxation at their disposal should be returned to the municipality. Goodness knows! with the increasing demands that are made upon them, they need that land taxation more than this Government needs to hang on to it; and when we support this motion it is not to be construed for a single moment as saying that we are not favourable to assistance to municipalities based upon their fiscal needs. That should be superimposed upon the return to the municipalities of this Public Revenue Tax.

Just to illustrate the situation, today, I have just looked at the grant that is given to the two municipalities that surround my home: The Rosthern municipality would get, if this Public Revenue Tax were cancelled, \$5,426 more with which to help look after schools and roads. Now then the C.C.F. workers go out and ask for great gratitude because they are giving our municipality \$1,413 in grants. You know it is quite a thing if you can do this, Mr. Speaker; if you can make people collect on their land and homes and send to you \$5,400 and give them back \$1,400, and say "Now that deserves a real vote of gratitude." If you can get away with it, Mr. Speaker, you are good. But that is what they are going to try and do apparently. That is what they did with the rural municipality of Rosthern in 1950-51. That is what they have been doing right along. We can take the rural municipality of Laird: they would get, to spend on their schools, their roads and so on, if this tax were done away with, nearly \$4,800 to look after their affairs — \$4,786 to be exact. Well, according to the report of the Department of Municipal Affairs there is no sign of any grant to them at all during the year ending March 31, 1951.

That is the situation in the two municipalities with which I am most familiar; and I know I have to pay some taxes myself. I follow these tax notices, and I know just how they are rising. I know, also, from talking to people, just how difficult people are finding it to pay these rising taxes.

I know, Mr. Speaker, how unfair it is that those people, on their homes — and we have many fine and humble homes, for example, in the town of Rosthern, with some people raising large families without large incomes; and I consider it absolutely nothing but a shame that this Government should still insist on those people paying 2 mills on the dollar on their homes and farms in order to send the money in to this Government to waste on its socialist extravagance.

That is the situation we are confronted with today, Mr. Speaker, and I think that every person who does not believe in people being oppressed like that in order that a Government may squander money the way this Government is, should vote in support of this amendment.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, one would think, to listen to the Leader of the Opposition, that the C.C.F. put this tax on in the first place. He forgets to remind the House that this tax was put on by the Liberal Government and that it was left on for 25 years. Neither the depression, nor the war, covered the entire 25 years. It was left on all through the 'twenties — the years following the war. Following years of prosperity and inflation it was not taken off. They set up a commission in 1936. The Jacoby Commission reported in 1937, recommended to the Liberal Government of that day that the Public Revenue Tax should be removed.

The Leader of the Opposition says that the reason the Liberal Government did not accept the recommendation of the Jacoby commission was because the revenue was so small. Well, does my hon. friend think that the Jacoby Commission did not know what their revenue was? Does he think they did not know what the revenue and expenditure of the Provincial Government was at that time? Yes, in 1937 that commission, having made a very thorough study of the financial position of the Provincial Government, and after having advocated the imposition of an education tax and sales tax, also advocated that the Public Revenue Tax should be turned over to the municipalities. The Liberal Government, whose own commission recommended that in 1937, left office in 1944 with that recommendation not implemented. Of course, they carried out the other recommendation of putting Education Tax; but they did not carry out the recommendation of taking off the Public Revenue Tax. The Leader of the Opposition stands up here tonight and talks about people being oppressed, as if they just started to pay this tax after the C.C.F. came in! For just about 25 years they paid for it before the C.C.F. came into office at all.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Government it is true, in 1948, recognized that there were a great many problems concerning provincial-municipal relations. When my friend stands up here and says that we flout public opinion and that we have got so swollen-headed that we won't listen to anybody, that comes with poor grace from a political party that for years got resolutions from the same Association of Rural Municipalities asking them to deal with seed grain and with relief, and who turned a deaf ear to them. The same Association of Rural Municipalities has asked for the abolition of the Public Revenue Tax, not for one or two years, but for a score of years, and the Government did nothing about it.

**February 19, 1952**

Now, we recognize that the rural and urban municipalities have many problems. We recognize that just as there had been a study made of the respective responsibility of the Federal and Provincial Governments, there ought to be some study of the responsibility of the provincial and municipal governments, and that is why we set up the Cronkite, Britnell, and Jacobs Committee. That Committee which was established in 1948 brought in its report in October, 1950.

I am not going to take time now (there will be a more opportune moment later on, probably) to go over some of the things which they have said. They pointed out, for instance, that the present Government has taken an increasing burden off the shoulders of the municipalities in terms of social welfare; in terms of health legislation; by taking Old-Age Pensions and Mothers' Allowance cases off the municipalities insofar as providing them with health care is concerned; cancer patients; hospital care; social aids. Also that this Government has assisted the municipalities not so much by giving them back a field of revenue but rather by taking responsibilities from them. I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that in many respects it has been better for the municipalities to have responsibilities taken from them than to have given them two mills, because in many cases the two mills to a municipality with a high assessment, would have meant a surplus, whereas to a poor municipality with a low assessment, that two mills would not have begun to have enabled that municipality to look after some of the responsibilities which we have taken over on their behalf. Actually, the assuming of these responsibilities for social aid cases, mothers' allowance cases, old-age pensions cases and so on has been of much greater benefit to the municipalities than giving them back a field of taxation that would give benefits to some and much smaller benefits to others.

It is true that the Cronkite-Britnell-Jacobs Committee brought in these recommendations, and among these recommendations there was the recommendation to the Government that the Public Revenue Tax should be turned over to the municipalities; but my hon. friend had not drawn to the attention of the House this sentence on Page 101, which says:

“The responsibility is of course that of the Government and the Legislature” . . . (speaking about the proposals which they have made) . . . ” There can be no doubt that the implementing of the proposals will involve a considerable dislocation of provincial finances” . . . (It is not as simple as the Leader of the Opposition thinks, says the Committee) . . . ” Three years would, in the opinion of your Committee, be a reasonable period in which to implement all the proposals advanced in this Part, if the Government should decide to proceed by progressive stages.

This Committee recommended that if the suggestions and recommendations could be implemented over a period of three years, they thought that would be carrying out their proposals in a very satisfactory manner.

The recommendations are only a year and a half old — not two years, as I heard somebody mumbling over there — but only a year and a half

old. A year ago last October, these recommendations were placed in the hands of the Government, and one by one these recommendations have been carried out. The recommendations with regard to timber bridges, the recommendations with regard to market roads, the recommendations being carried out with regard to making payments in lieu of taxes; the increasing of the T.B. grant to \$2.00 per day, which under the Leader of the Opposition administration had been only \$1.00 — these recommendations have been implemented. Some of them were implemented within five or six months of the report being placed before us. The rest of them, most of them, are being implemented at this Session, although the report is only a year and a half old, and I want to suggest that long before this report is three years old the likelihood is that these recommendations will have been carried out almost in time.

The main criticism of the Opposition, and the amendment which they have moved, has to do with the fact that they say we have not included in the Speech from the Throne a statement that we are going to abolish the Public Revenue Tax, nor have we brought down any practical plan to assist the municipalities, school boards and other local governing bodies.

Mr. Speaker, as I said when I raised the question of whether or not this was a proper motion (I am not going to raise that matter again), in my opinion this is a much more proper amendment to a Budget motion. The Government, in its Speech from the Throne is hardly the place to set out the proposals with reference to financial assistance and plans for assisting municipalities and school boards, and any disposition the Government may wish to suggest with reference to Public Revenue Tax. At least the Government felt that was not the place to put it, and the Government is prepared, when the Budget is brought down (and the Budget is ready now) to make very specific recommendations to this Legislature with regard to the Public Revenue Tax and assistance to municipalities and school boards.

If I were of a suspicious turn of mind, Mr. Speaker (and the Attorney-General assures me that I am not) I would suspect that the Opposition had probably got wind of the Budget, and are trying to steal the Government's thunder by asking for some of the things which they know the Government is going to do, so they will be able to go back to their respective constituencies and say, "See what the Government did in the Budget! We made them do that; we moved an amendment to the Speech from the Throne, and you should have seen them tremble. There the members glanced, white with fear, and they went to the Government, and they said to the Government, 'Now you have to do something.'"

The only thing that is wrong with that theory, Mr. Speaker, is that the Budget is already prepared. The Provincial Treasurer is prepared to present that Budget tomorrow — anytime that the House is ready to hear it and to debate it. This Budget has already made provision for some of these things of which we have been talking. This amendment, if there is any attempt to steal the Government's thunder, is, I would like to point out, completely beside the mark.

The Leader of the Opposition makes a plea to the members on this side to vote as their conscience dictates. Well, that comes very well from our Leader of the Opposition, and I shall not go into that at this particular time or this late hour; but I want to assure the Leader of the

**February 19, 1952**

Opposition that, irrespective of this amendment, the Government is implementing step by step the recommendations of this Committee. The Government has proposals for assisting the municipalities and school boards, and those recommendations will be brought down in due course. We will not be hurried because of this amendment, and the Government will not be stampeded into taking any foolish or irresponsible steps merely because the Opposition decided to move an amendment. While we appreciate the lecture that has been read to us by the Leader of the Opposition about looking after the interests of the people, I want to say that we do not think we need a lecture on that subject, and certainly we do not need it from that source. The municipalities have had better treatment under this Government, more generous assistance under this Government, than they ever had in the 35 years that this province had under Liberal administration prior to this Government coming into office.

The Leader of the Opposition need have no fear but that this Government will do everything within its power, and everything within what we feel to be the financial resources of this province, to see that the municipalities and school boards are given all the assistance that is possible to give them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as the hour is getting late, I would like to move the adjournment of the Debate.

(Debate adjourned)

The Assembly adjourned at 11 o'clock p.m.