

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fifth Session — Eleventh Legislature**  
**9th Day**

**Wednesday, February 20, 1952**

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

**DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY**

The House resumed, from Tuesday, February 19, 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. Horsman.

**Mr. A.G. Kuziak** (Canora): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to this particular debate, I want to congratulate all members of the House that have taken part in the debate, and especially the mover and the seconder of the Throne Speech.

I am very glad to see in the Throne Speech that the Government has again looked into the distant future — planning the development of the natural resources and industry of this province. As I have stated in the House before we believe in a steady increasing and expanding economy within the province of Saskatchewan, and I am again glad, Mr. Speaker, that we have not followed the advice of the ex-member of Gravelbourg, who advised us, immediately after the war, to contract out belts, hold the economy in, bring about stagnation.

We do not believe in stagnation. We threw stagnation out the window in 1944, when the Liberals were thrown out. In going over the amendment the whole afternoon yesterday, the members of the Opposition spoke about the abolition of the Public Revenue Tax; in fact, they tried to make everybody believe that that tax as imposed by the C.C.F. I want to point out that that tax was imposed on the people of Saskatchewan by a Liberal administration, in the first great war.

They continued it on from then up until they were thrown out the window, in 1944; and I want to point this out, as a municipal secretary-treasurer I used to attend most of the S.A.R.M. Conventions in the Province of Saskatchewan, and I remember year after year the conventions had passed resolutions requesting the Liberal administration to do away with the public revenue tax. Did they heed those resolutions? No wonder the hon. Leader of the Opposition yesterday stated to us that the conventions are getting fed up with moving resolutions. They kept moving that resolution from the first great war up until 1944, and the Liberal administration, during that period, took no heed of the S.A.R.M. and the councillors of the Province of Saskatchewan, and I am sure that the hon. member from Kinistino (Mr. Woods) will very well agree with me. I know that in those days he used to attend those conventions very regularly too. In fact, they continued it up until about 1936, when practically all the rural municipalities of the Province of Saskatchewan faced bankruptcy; yet they did not take off the 2 per cent Public Revenue Tax.

**February 20, 1952**

In 1937, they appointed a Royal Commission, the Rowell-Sirois Commission, and they recommended at that time to the Liberal administration that the two per cent Public Revenue be taken off; and I want to point out, too, that this commission took the following points into consideration:

(1) Hospitalization: This service, at that time, was thrown, by the Liberal Administration upon the shoulders of the municipality, and so when some of the hon. members say, "We had a hospitalization scheme and the C.C.F. have only improved it a bit" I say they had nothing. They shoved it upon the shoulders of the rural municipality of that day.

(2) Direct Relief: In those days this was the complete responsibility of the municipality; and I want to point out that within that group was included those people who are today drawing pensions between 65 and 70; and I might also point out that even those over 70 who did not have naturalization papers in the Province of Saskatchewan were not, in those days, granted old age pensions, but were shoved, as a responsibility, on the municipality.

(3) Medical Aid of Pensioners; Mothers' Allowances, Child Welfare: These were all a responsibility of the municipality. Hospitalization of cancer cases were charged against the municipality.

Now I come to the seventh point that they had completely shoved on the municipality, and that point is road grants.

When the members opposite speak of road grants, I know something about road grants under their administration. I would like to point out that at all municipal conventions in those days, when the councillors had passed resolutions requesting the government to do away with the Public Revenue Tax there was a horde of government inspectors lobbying in the back alleys, whipping the boys into line and offering them grants for road building.

I remember when I came into this city in the good old days with my Reeve, and I remember when the municipal council paid us \$90 for expenses and we came over here and we lobbied for two days, and we went back home as heroes — \$200 grant for the R.M. of Keyes. Now, the hon. member for Cannington was also a Reeve (Mr. McCarthy), and he has the gall to rise in this House and criticize us for only paying \$1,200 to \$1,400 regular road grants to municipalities, and may I point out, not to politicians, as was done in previous days.

I remember a time in the R.M. of Keyes, when there was not a strong Liberal supporter on the council, the boys across the road gave the grant to an ex-reeve of a municipality. Talk about grants!

Now, I am going to go back over those same points. Point No. 1 — Hospitalization: This was the complete responsibility of the municipality. The C.C.F. Government, since 1944 has taken that responsibility on to its shoulders. In the R.M. of Keyes, in my municipality we used to have a five mill levy for hospitalization during the Liberal days. There is now no levy, and if there was a municipal levy we would have to

raise 10 mills on the dollar to provide hospitalization that would hardly be equivalent to the hospitalization which we now have. Therefore, on hospitalization alone we have taken 10 mills of taxation off the R.M. of Keyes; five times the Public Revenue has been taken over from that one point. Yet the members opposite will talk of political honesty, but they will not admit these things.

Point No. 2 — Direct Relief: I would like to point out that we budgeted in the R.M. of Keyes last year — last year alone — a thousand dollars for direct relief. This year we have already set the budget at \$500, because some of the 65-70 have again been taken over by the Provincial-Dominion scheme of Old Age Pensions. All in all, I remember that we used to budget two or three thousand dollars for direct relief, and now it has been reduced to \$500, and I would say that by taking over that responsibility we have reduced the mill rate in the municipality by at least another one.

Medical aid of pensioners, mothers' allowances and child welfare cases under the Liberal administration were the responsibility of the rural municipality. Today it is the responsibility of the Provincial Government — we have taken that over, and I estimate according to the past estimates of the R.M. of Keyes that we have saved another ½ mill levy in our municipality.

Hospitalization of Cancer Patients: I would like to point out that today we have yet on the books of the R.M. of Keyes in our Accounts Receivable, cases that we paid for — our patients being hospitalized and taking cancer treatment under the previous Liberal administration. Now that responsibility is the responsibility of the province. I would estimate that we have reduced there again, another ½ mill for the rural municipalities of this province, and the R.M. of Keyes.

Seed Grain Debt: Over and over and over again the rural municipalities passed resolutions requesting the government, and pointing out to the Liberal administration that they were almost bankrupt, to cancel at least a portion of that seed grain. No, they pussyfooted, their hordes of inspectors lobbied, and they did not do anything. This administration cancelled, since we took office, \$40 million of seed grain advances to the rural municipalities of this province. Do you realize that if you take the \$40 millions and divide it by the Public Revenue that this province obtains, that we have saved the rural municipalities over a period of 18 years the public Revenue levy?

All in all, Mr. Speaker, through the responsibilities that we have taken over from the rural municipalities from 1944 until now, I estimate that in the R.M. of Keyes, they have saved us from putting on an extra levy of 14½ mills. Mr. Speaker, we have up until today repealed the Public Revenue seven times within this Province of Saskatchewan, yet the boys opposite did not do a thing, and yesterday for two hours they kept shedding crocodile tears about the poor municipalities that must still pay this 2 mills that the Liberal administration put on during the First Great War.

**February 20, 1952**

Then of course, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) had some wonderful reasons. Why, he says, they did not have the revenue that “you boys” have at the present time. And of course every time he makes a speech, if he makes it out on the hustings, he always has different figures. Yesterday they weren't too bad, and mind you, they talk of political honesty.

I would like to point out, and I have Premier Patterson's budget speech — the last Budget Speech before they were thrown out the window — and the budget in that day was \$30,494,503. The budget last year (1950-51) under the C.C.F. administration was about \$58 million, and it was quoted for the first time correctly by the Leader of the Opposition that I know of.

Now, from \$30 million to \$58 million — I have asked dozens of farmers and would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that last fall I attended a public meeting when the Liberals held their convention in the town of Canora. Some of them had used these figures, and when their meeting was over, just before singing “God Save the King”, I jumped up and asked a question, and I asked it of the Leader of the Opposition, and I have asked him this question in this House, and I will again ask him that same question.

“Would not \$30 million in 1943-44 buy as many miles of highways as we are buying today for \$58 million? Would they not buy as many miles of gravel as we are buying today? Would they not buy as many miles of black-top as we are buying today for the \$58 millions? Should they have not bought in those days as many miles of electric power as we are buying today? Should they not have electrified as many farm homes as we are electrifying today?”

I still want to know what they did with their money, because I believe that the \$30 million then was even greater in terms of purchasing power than our budget of \$58 million at the present time.

Now, I picked up a pamphlet — they talk of political honesty — “Where Did the Money Go?” This is a pamphlet produced by the Liberal Association in 1948, and here is what they say:

“Last year the C.C.F. Government spent \$86 for every man, woman and child in Saskatchewan — about 2 ½ times more than the \$36 the Liberals spent in the last year.”

Now, our budget has been increased by 2 ½ times. The truth of the matter is that their budget in 1943-44 was \$30 million; in 1950-51 our budget was \$58 million — you know, political honesty! They were only out a measly \$27 million — that doesn't mean anything.

And so I want to ask that question again — I still want the members of the Opposition, and the Leader of the Opposition to tell me where they used to spend that \$30 million — where did it go to? They did not do anything in those days.

Now let's go on further to political honesty. I want to remind you of some of the things they told us prior to 1944 and during 1944. Yes, they told us that if the C.C.F. were elected, they would take away the homes, farms and confiscate the wealth of the people of Saskatchewan. I have somewhere over here — here is one of their wonderful pamphlets — “Do Not Give the title Up to Your Home”.

I want to point out, that the moment the C.C.F. was elected, we passed the Farm Security legislation, and amended the Mediation Board to give protection to our people in Saskatchewan, not from the C.C.F., but the mortgage companies — the friends of the Liberal Party.

Now, talking about confiscation of wealth — I would like to go back to 1945 immediately after the war, and this time I am going back a bit to the good old Federal Government. In 1945 they raised a howl over taking off price controls, and I remember when our C.C.F. Map's from Saskatchewan warned the Liberals in Ottawa that if they took off price control, prices would sky-rocket, and the companies would be given the opportunity to confiscate the savings and wealth of the Canadian people and the veterans returning with savings and credits from overseas.

The Liberals did not heed that cry nor that warning — they took the controls off, and I want to say that the C.C.F. has not been confiscating any wealth, but the Liberal administration in Ottawa, by lifting the controls has given high finance the savings and wealth of the Canadian people; they have continued it, and are continuing it today. They confiscated it not in the interests of a government who may give services back to the people, but in the interests of a few of their wealthy friends.

Another good story that they gave . . .

**Mr. W.A. Tucker** (Leader of the Opposition): — Order, Mr. Speaker! You will recall yesterday in the debate on this amendment Your Honour laid it down flatly that you were going to require the members to debate the amendment as it was moved. I listened to the speaker — he has been off the amendment for the last ten minutes. I draw this to your attention, Mr. Speaker.

**Premier T.C. Douglas:** — The hon. member is pointing out that this amendment which asks the Government to give certain assistance to the municipality . . . now the member is pointing out what has been done to assist the municipalities, and what the purchasing power of the dollar is now as compared with what it was when this administration took office. Mr. Speaker, I contend that the hon. gentleman's remarks are quite in order. The Opposition do not like it — they want to obstruct it as much as they can, but I do not think they should be allowed to use points of order of this sort in order to prevent . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, it is not a matter of us not liking it — we rather enjoy the remarks of the hon. member, because they are so far wide of the mark. I am just drawing your attention, Mr. Speaker,

**February 20, 1952**

to the fact that the hon. member is not debating the motion before the House. If your Honour is willing to let me proceed, well, that is alright with us, but I have done my duty in drawing this to your attention.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) that I have looked up the rules of the amendment, and as long as the speaker on the amendment is speaking relative to the main motion, it is in order. That is the position that you took yesterday.

**Mr. Kuziak:** — Mr. Speaker, only last night in this same particular amendment the Leader of the Opposition doubted the honesty of this side of the House, and I believe I am going to reply to him, and he nor anybody else is going to throw an iron curtain of their kind within this House.

I want to go on with some of the “political honesty” of 1944 and prior to it.

They told the people of Saskatchewan over and over again that if the C.C.F. were elected, there would be no elections. Why, that was a common thing in those days. did they believe it themselves? I want to point out that we were elected in 1944, and by 1947 some of the members opposite, after having made that statement, were already calling conventions and taking their nominations. You know, they had more confidence in the C.C.F. than they had in their own administration. They could not time their conventions to three years after — the last time they were in power they held out by dictatorial methods for six years, but when the C.C.F. took over and after telling the people these falsehoods which they themselves did not believe, because it proved the point when three years after they called conventions and took their nominations.

Another point — they told us prior to 1944 and during 1944 that if the C.C.F. were elected they would do away with freedom of speech, religion and voting. I would like to point out that this is the only administration — this is the only province within the Dominion of Canada that has passed A Bill of Rights guaranteeing this to every citizen of Canada as a birthright. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we went further — as far as voting is concerned, we widened the field of democracy and freedom and give the vote to the 18 — 21 year olds. The Liberals bitterly criticized this — they called it the “Chocolate Bar Vote” — Mr. Speaker, they insinuated that these young fellows did not have the intelligence to vote correctly, and yet today the Liberals and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) are appealing to this youth of Saskatchewan, asking them to vote Liberal — and prove that they have no intelligence!

**Mr. Danielson** (Arm River): — Is the hon. gentleman supposed to be . . . I say that . . .

**Mr. Kuziak:** — I have already checked your story. Sit down — you speak for two hours anyway when you get up!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Those are the kind of tactics . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — You voted against it yourself . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Kuziak:** — This has always been the tactics of the Opposition to cut a member off the air . . . I am pretty sure that when the hon. member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) gets up he will keep going for a couple of hours — I am going to put in only thirty minutes — let's have some fair play.

Another story that they told the people of Saskatchewan: why, they said the C.C.F. — this bunch of preachers, teachers and farmers — if you ever elect them, they will bankrupt the province. Honestly! The C.C.F. was elected, and I want to point out that this is the only government in Saskatchewan that has ever reduced the public debt of this province. I want to point out that Saskatchewan bonds are at an all-time high under this administration. I want to point out that every budget brought down so far by the C.C.F. has been balanced, and I want to point out, that the financial standing of the Province of Saskatchewan has never been in better hands.

Then it came on to 1948 and again they pulled these musty stories out — they dusted them off a bit — added new ones, and kept them rolling again, but in 1948 the people of this province refused to listen to that nonsense, and they threw them out the window again.

Now we hear further stories. I turn on the radio sometimes, and I listen to a Liberal speaker berating this government for granting out hundreds of thousands of acres of oil leases, and that the companies are making millions. I tuned in to another one, especially my friend, the hon. member for Pelly (Mr. Banks) and he is berating the Government; the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) does the same thing, and tells the people of Saskatchewan that we will never produce any oil, or the companies will not produce any oil under the C.C.F., because we will not give them a fair profit. The boys are getting desperate and contradicting each other!

I would say the same thing in connection with Crown Corporations. During 1948 prior to 1948, and even after 1948, they have been continuously telling the people of Saskatchewan, and manipulating the figures of the Crown Corporations, to show that the Crown Corporations are losing money.

Now they criticize us for loaning surplus money out! Could you imagine that? Why, Mr. Speaker, how can we loan out losses? Or were they telling you a story before that?

I wish I had the time to tell them of how we get our campaign funds. I understand they have asked us to tell them about how we get our campaign funds, and I assure you that we do not get them from any of the big firms that they get them from.

**February 20, 1952**

I want to point out that this fall I dropped in to the C.C.F. central office over \$2,000; I canvassed farmer-to-farmer; for example I went north of Stenen and I covered 23 farmers, one right after the other. Those farmers contributed to the C.C.F. cause some \$5 to \$25, and the next day I took another area north of Buchanan, and the results were the same. In fact, in a little better than a week's work, from house-to-house, I got in over \$2,000. All I had to point out (and which is true), we are financed by the people of Saskatchewan, and it is for the people of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Saskatchewan are beginning to know it, and I cannot forget when, one of those particular days I drove into the Mohella area — in fact I drove across to the Pelly constituency, and thought I would check up and see if the people of Pelly constituency are as generous toward the C.C.F. as my people of the Canora constituency. I drove in to a gentleman's home — had a very short visit, and the gentleman pulls out \$40, and says, "Alex, here is \$40 — you put \$20 in my brother's name and \$20 on myself — I still owe you \$5.00" I said, "What do you mean?" He said, "In 1948 I earned from the Liberal Pelly Association \$45; my conscience has bothered me, so I am giving you \$40 and I owe you \$5 more." That is the way we get our money!

There is still another way we get money. For example, last year when one of the members of the Opposition made a speech in the House and told us if they get in they would throw the Crown Corporations out the window, money started rolling into the office. Lately when the hon. member from Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) made the statement that, if they were elected they would very definitely throw out the Farm Security Act, I checked in the office and some more money started rolling in.

When the hon. member for Battleford spoke the other day, and told the people of Saskatchewan if they got in, the highways would be turned over to private enterprise and the contractors would do all the work, so more money started rolling in. I am going to tell you that my people are even going to contribute better when it comes to turning to highways as private enterprise. For 35 years under a Liberal administration, my people of the Canora constituency had only eight miles of gravel highway — the balance, driving all the way from Reserve to Canora, for 35 years they waddled in the mud — Liberal mud! Under seven years of C.C.F. administration, my people today drive from any corner of the constituency on fine, gravelled highways and south of Canora they coast along on black-top. My people, when they had to cross highway bridges in my constituency, pass through all those narrow, steel things, they have to be very careful to manipulate through them. Today they coast along, not even noticing that they are passing important rivers; they are riding over cement bridges that a Liberal mind could not even dream of.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I see that my time is going on. I will definitely oppose the amendment and support the progressive Speech from the Throne.



**Hon. I.C. Nollet** (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the congratulations to the mover and seconder of the motion and congratulate other members who have contributed to the Throne Speech to date. Some of the speeches were pretty good, and some pretty punk, Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Member** (Opposition): — There is one coming off now!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet**: — The hon. member will probably wish that so much was not coming off!

Mr. Speaker, this is the second amendment on the Speech from the Throne. Hon. Members opposite must think that by moving successive amendments to His Honour's speech that their confidence will be buoyed up and that the confidence of the general public in Saskatchewan will similarly favour the members of the Opposition. I can assure them that whatever amendment they move and every speech that they make in this House public confidence becomes more shaken in the ability of the Opposition to ever carry on the responsibilities of Government within this Province. Hon. members opposite are very careful to advise us not to talk about Federal matters, but they are constantly delving into Federal matters themselves. They do not seem to be able to stay away from them. I often wonder if their conscience is not bothering them just a little bit. We have seen the spectacle repeatedly of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition giving advice as to what Ottawa should do. We have witnessed the spectacle of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition making flying trips to Ottawa — at the time for instance when the decontrols took place on coarse grains when our livestock were just liquidated off the farm as a result of that action. but, it is getting so Ottawa does not listen to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) any more. As a matter of fact, the Hon. C.D. Howe suggested in reply to a statement or representations made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that no new ideas originated with him, that the Federal Government had already had the particular matter under consideration.

I do not blame the hon. members opposite for not wanting us to talk about Federal matters at all. I fully realize that it is embarrassing to them, but I want to assure hon. members opposite that as long as the policies of the Federal Government adversely affect the economy of this Province, particularly the agricultural economy, that we are going to talk about it, and I can assure them they are going to hear a whole lot more about it. Am I to assume, Mr. Speaker, that the reduction in the price of hogs does not concern us in this legislature; that the drastic decline in beef prices does not concern us; that the drastic decline in poultry products does not concern us?

If the hon. members opposite think it does not concern us, then they should begin so advising the farmers of this Province. It is only natural that we sponsor the cause of the farmer. Perhaps some people do not realize that the reason we are sitting, the reason that I am sitting on this side of the House is because this particular political movement arose out of the economic needs of the farmers of Saskatchewan, and arose

**February 20, 1952**

because of the neglect on the part of the Liberal Government to satisfy the injustices surrounding Saskatchewan agriculture. That is why we are here and we are going to consistently fight for a fair deal for the farmers of this Province, whether it affects the Federal Government, or any other Government.

Mention has been made by Hon. members opposite about the damp grain situation. Well, Mr. Speaker, everyone in this Province knows very clearly that the responsibility for licensing driers, for inspection services, for grading and marketing is a responsibility of the Dominion Government. Let us get that clear. Now that the Federal Government has successfully succeeded in so mixing up the situation that we face the prospect of millions of bushels of our grain being spoiled, as a result of the transportation problem. I know the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) suggested that there was no transportation problem. But before I am through this afternoon, I am going to prove to hon. members of this House that there is a transportation problem and that the Federal Government, through the Board of Grain Commissioners, has neglected to realize the situation and has offered no practical solution; has proffered no advice; has not even advised the farmers as to what the situation really is at the present time.

And the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) gets up in this House and says, "What has the Provincial Government done?" After the Federal Government has thoroughly bungled the whole situation he has the nerve to get up and say to us, "What have you done?" Everybody knows that the Dominion Government has not done a thing. How could they, when the Rt. Hon. J.G. is out here giving political advice to his fastly waning forces in Saskatchewan. He ought to be back in Ottawa, doing something about the situation.

And then when we step in to do something to salvage some of the possible loss, another member of the Opposition gets up and say to us that we are going to be held responsible for any grain that spoils as a result of drying. How can you satisfy people like that? Mr. Speaker, that is typical of the kind of Opposition that the Government has been getting ever since it has been elected to power 7½ years ago, and it is particularly that type of criticism that has lost them the confidence — any confidence that they might have as far as the electors of this Province are concerned. They can whistle in the dark by passing amendments to the Throne Speech to keep up their own courage, but despite the help they are getting from the two Liberal presses in this Province, they are not going to be the Government of this Province when the smoke of the next election battle blows away.

Mr. Speaker, I intend a little later on to go very fully into this whole damp grain situation, but I want to turn my attention immediately to the progress that has been made by this administration in seven and a half years of office. When I went over it the other night, taking each advance in chronological order, it even surprised myself. I want to say at each stage, every progressive step has been criticized and sniped at by the Opposition.

First of all, indebtedness has been mentioned to you. We took over a bankrupt province. The municipalities were bankrupt, the farmers were bankrupt, as the hon. member for Canora (Mr. Kuziak) said we took over \$40 million off the backs of the farmers and assumed that obligation ourselves. What about municipal finances today? I have in my hand a short article appearing — yes, it was the Star-Phoenix — it was not The Leader-Post. Appearing on the editorial page on municipal finances, it says:

“The report on municipal debt in Saskatchewan at the end of 1950-51 fiscal year is the most encouraging presented in several years. Coupled with the fact that many cities, towns and villages have undertaken sewage and water works, paving and other major development programmes, it strikes a severe blow that those who complained of poor conditions in the agricultural industry are strangling municipal finances. The report indicates that on the whole municipal budgets are holding their own without happily venturing into extravagances which might seriously threaten the soundness of their position in the event of an economic recession.”

Mr. Speaker, I suggest again that as far as recession is concerned, or as far as stagnation is concerned, I repeat, it ended in 1944. We inherited a highway system that was for the most part completely worn out, and every motorist in this Province knows that to be a fact. We have brought that highway system up to a high standard of reconstruction, and maintenance, in fact the highest standard ever before experienced in the history of this Province. And all motorists in this Province know that to be a fact, too. That highway programme will be accelerated and expanded in the future.

Take a look at transportation. There was no bus or transportation in 1944, publicly owned. Since then a transportation service has been provided to the people of this Province to areas where they never expected to have that type of transportation before. This was a service that was very badly criticized by hon. members opposite.

Public Health, as has already been stated, there was no hospitalization plan in 1944, regardless of what the hon. member from Melville (Mr. Deshaye) would like to have us believe. There was no hospitalization scheme as we have it today. As the hon. member from Canora (Mr. Kuziak) has so adeptly stated, it was the municipalities that carried the great burden there. I can remember when I was Reeve in my own municipality our hospital indebtedness ran around \$10,000 odd. That worry has been removed from the municipalities, that obligation has been removed from the municipalities, and all the worry associated with hospital accounts has been removed from the religious and institutional hospitals as well. Hospitalization is now on a sound basis in this Province, and the responsibility is spread throughout the entire province evenly. It will not be so very popular for the Liberal speakers to get out on the hustings now and say that they are going to decentralize this scheme and turn the responsibility back to the municipality. They would not take it, if you offered it to them, and the hon. members opposite know it.

**February 20, 1952**

We had no comprehensive automobile accident insurance in this Province in 1944. Now we have an automobile accident Insurance Policy that gives complete coverage at a very nominal cost. These are the things that are being more and more appreciated as time goes by. As more and more people involved in accidents receive the benefits of this plan, the plan is to that extent popularized. There is hardly a district in the Province of Saskatchewan where serious accidents have not taken place, and where the benefits are now known in that particular locality. In my own particular district, Mr. Speaker, I would like to cite one case.

A man was driving home one night in his closed-in cutter, and was just turning off the road when a truck hit him, killing himself, killing his two horses, demolishing his cutter. He was not driving a car and did not drive a car, but his wife and children got \$6,000 benefits and she is now able to send her children to high-school in Battleford, and the neighbours know about it. So they do not talk any more, do not condemn as they used to, the Accident Insurance Plan. But did they ever oppose it when it came into this House? And quite naturally so, because they are the friends of the Insurance Companies and the Insurance companies do not like these plans. They do not like to see it made possible for people to organize themselves collectively in order to obtain security and, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to this House that that is how we get security, by organizing for it, and that is how you get security inexpensively. It will never be given to you by any private corporation that does not have the public good at heart, but is more intent on extracting profits.

There were no health regions in 1944. Now, health regions are rapidly being organized throughout the Province. There was no ambulance service in 1944. I know the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Deshaye) said there was an ambulance service. If there was, no one knew anything about it. The Government of the day never owned a single plane; they never operated a plane, never could, apparently operate a plane successfully. The Anderson Government had a plane, and as I understand it, when the Anderson Government went out and the Liberal Government came in, they took the plane apart when they were going to repair it, and they could not get it together again, and that finished the plane.

The larger school units — there were no larger school units in 1944. There are 49 larger school units now, and I might say, Mr. Speaker, every time one of those units was being organized, it was bitterly opposed by — I will not say hon. members opposite — they opposed it in this House, and their little minions in the country. In my own particular district, when the question was up the first time they circulated a petition, and the organization of that unit was deferred and then a vote was taken, and every one of the local Liberals were out working against it, but we had a subsequent vote, and the people voted overwhelmingly for the larger unit; then these same little Liberal minions at the lower level wanted to get on the Larger Unit Board. And, in some cases one could almost say that they sabotaged — tried to sabotage some of those Larger Units of administration.

**Mr. W.A. Tucker** (Leader of the Opposition: — They won't be so little after the next election.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — They might not be so little outside this House, but they are getting smaller inside this House. I am not talking about physically, neither!

Mr. Speaker, when the Hon. Leader of the Opposition makes that funny noise and suggested to us that we should do something about grain drying, I thought it might not be a bad idea to get one of those grain dryers in this Legislative Assembly to process some of the hon. members opposite, because they are always all wet. Of course, we would not want to expose them to over 180 degrees Fahrenheit because their gluten content might be reduced to some extent. They might not be so buoyant.

**Mr. Tucker:** — If you would worry about the farmers more and us less, it would be better.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — I say to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that as long as I am concerned about the farmers, I do not need to worry about him.

**Mr. Tucker:** — That is what you should be concerned about.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — There was no Department of Co-operation in 1944. Now we have a well-staffed Department of Co-operation, and the Co-operative Movement has never experienced a period of such great expansion as it has in the past 7 ½ years.

There was no Department of Labour in 1944. We now have a Department of Labour similarly well-staffed to look after the interests of this large and important segment of our economy. Now, hon. members opposite have changed their tune. It used to be that we were doing everything for Labour, we were not doing enough for the farmers. Now, they have turned completely around and say that we are not doing enough for Labour. But this is typical before-the-election talk. I have heard it before on many occasions, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Kuziak:** — They are desperate now.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — They are more than that.

**Mr. Danielson (Arm River):** — That is not true.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — It seems, Mr. Speaker, that no matter what we do, we just simply cannot satisfy the Opposition.

Then we turn to the activities of Public Works. There was never even a dim prospect that we would have a medical college on the campus of the University of Saskatchewan. We now have a medical college and will have a University hospital. There were no accommodation for the students attending the School of Agriculture, now there are modern up-to-date accommodations for those of our farm boys who take the school course at the University. In addition to that, an Animal Disease Lab was erected on the campus and a new dairy and soil building added. As a matter of fact, the University at Saskatoon has never experienced such

tremendous expansion as that which has taken place there in recent years and all of this has been done in the short space of seven and a half years, Mr. Speaker, and are not finished yet.

Turning to power. In 1944 we had a Power Commission on paper. We had no power grid for the province whatsoever. We had a few isolated units here and there throughout the Province. We had a little isolated unit at North Battleford, and when I look at the map of that day it reminds me of a wire worm right in the middle of 160 acres of summer-fallow. It looked lonesome out there. Since then, in the short space of seven and a half years, we have a power grid developed for the entire province. Mr. Speaker, this expansion and development was opposed bitterly inside of this House by the hon. members opposite. We were told that this was interfering with private business enterprise.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That is not true.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman suggests that I am not telling the truth. What did they say about . . . My memory is just as good as the hon. member's from Arm River (Mr. Danielson), the only difference is that I do not talk quite as long as he does. I do not blame him for wanting to get up, Mr. Speaker, in an endeavour to take some of our air time when we are giving a very short and brief progress summary of this administration.

**Opposition Member:** — Did you write that book?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Yes, as a matter of fact we purchased one of those companies and they said we paid too much for it. But subsequently events proved that we got it very cheaply and that it added greatly to extending the power grid for Saskatchewan.

Natural Resources — there was no development in 1944. Last year, in the year just past Saskatchewan produced over 1¼ million barrels of crude oil on the Saskatchewan side of the border in the Lloydminster area. 1¼ million barrels in the last year. And some very important industries have sprung up alongside of that discovery there.

Mineral development. There was no mineral development to speak of in Saskatchewan in 1904. The only major mineral development we had was at Flin Flon, the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company just over the border in Manitoba. It would be ridiculous for us to say, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that they were afraid to come into Saskatchewan because of the Liberal Government, but they had every opportunity. They were taking very little royalty from them. The hon. member from Melville (Mr. Deshayé) suggests to us that we should get more revenue from that source. Well, I can assure them that since this Government came into power the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting have been paying far greater royalties than ever before. For instance, I am told that last year the royalties were \$1,277,000 from this one source alone. If they came into Saskatchewan they came in the underground way, following the mineral veins.

In 1944 there was no building brick industry in Saskatchewan. We had a derelict free enterprise proposition down at Estevan that has been taken over by the Government, and now we have an efficient modern up-to-date building brick industry in Saskatchewan. Yes, and Mr. Speaker, publicly owned.

There was no large scale sodium sulphate development in Saskatchewan in 1944. Now there is a publicly owned sodium sulphate plant operating at Chaplin, Saskatchewan, with increasing expansion and efficiency of operation taking place.

There was no policy of conserving our great timber resources. Saskatchewan had taken the lead in conserving and properly utilizing this great resource. In 1945 and 1946, Mr. Speaker, when I had the opportunity of flying over that area with the then Minister of Natural Resources, Mr. Phelps, you could see nothing but burnt-over logs. That has been changed. When we inspected some of the fire-fighting equipment there we found it not only to be practically non-existent but in a very bad state of repair. And, as I said before, they had no plans, no adequate fire protection. Since then Northern Airways has been established which was not in existence in 1944 — a Northern Airways service that has given a greater contribution to opening up the Northland than any other factor that I know of.

Speaking again of debts, the hon. member for Canora (Mr. Kuziak) mentioned it. We passed debt protective legislation; it was placed on the statute books when we came into power; the kind of legislation that was asked for by the organized farm movement, and now, to my utter surprise, the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) says that when they get into power they are going to repeal this debt protective legislation. You will not want to talk too much about that out in the country.

**Mr. McCarthy** (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, if he is misconstruing my words, I think my opinion should be received.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, I did not misunderstand the hon. member at all. The record will speak for itself. He said that when they get into power they are going to repeal this debt legislation that we now have on the statute books. Already they are going to try to back out of it, but it will be there and I can say this, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member did not refer only now to the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) he referred to all of us. He said, “Already we are trying to back out of something.” Well, there is nothing that we need to back out of. We said that we would maintain legislation to protect the farmer more effectively than the present legislation. And when he says we are trying to back out of something, he is saying something which is incorrect.

February 20, 1952

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, in that connection I would like to remind the Hon. Leader of the Opposition of the fact that they always said that they were the ones that passed this debt adjustment Act . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Exactly! Exactly!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — . . . and that we merely improved on it.

**Mr. Tucker:** — No, you made it worse.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — But now they say that it is the reason why young farmers cannot get started, so they are going to repeal the extra provisions we put in.

**Mr. Tucker:** — You made it worse.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — But I can say this for him, that any young farmer that undertakes to purchase a farm under agreement for sale without the protection of this legislation is taking a millstone around his neck.

**Mr. Tucker:** — He was protected better before you started monkeying with the legislation.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Believe me, without that protection these young farmers that start out now and try to pay their obligations for their land and their machinery will have whiskers as long as Rip Van Winkle before they ever pay for them.

Social Security — Saskatchewan now enjoys a most advanced Department of Social Welfare — a department that has brought a sense of security to many of our unfortunate citizens.

We hear an awful lot of talk about depopulation. The Provincial Government is supposed to have something to do with that, too. It is our fault, because the rural areas are not so thickly populated any more. I thought we might get blamed for the great increase in coyote population and the coyote menace, too.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Talking about the C.C.F.'s again!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Unfortunately, they neither blame us, nor do they give us credit for getting rid of the coyote menace in Saskatchewan. Of course, Mr. Speaker, there are some other “varmints” still around yet. Some of them have a rather broad Liberal stripe down the back.

**Mr. Tucker:** — You are really after the farmers, are you? You admit it.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — I want to say something about the good work done by the Department of Natural Resources under their coyote control campaign. I am quite closely associated with the work they are doing and particularly closely associated with the farmers who received the benefits therefrom. Farmers told me that last summer was the first time that they could ever leave their sheep out unattended, and not be afraid that



they were going to lose some. That is one depopulation step that is generally appreciated by the farmers of this Province.

We had a Department of Agriculture in 1944 pretty much the same as the Power Commission, mostly on paper. We did not have a Department of Agriculture that had long-term policies, that had an adequate staff to service this very important basic industry to our Province. We had no conservation and development branch whatever. We now have a conservation and development branch that has four times as much money appropriated to it as the Department of Agriculture — the entire Department of Agriculture did in 1944. I was interested the other day in listening to the references made by the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald). He said that they did not have the machinery before the war to build these big dams. Well, as a matter of fact, most of the dams in Saskatchewan were built before the war. I wonder if the hon. member ever went down to Fort Peck, Montana, and saw that big structure there — the largest earth-structure dam in the world.

**Some Hon. Member (Govt.):** — He was never out of Moosomin.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — I do not think he was ever out of Moosomin. But if he had just looked around a little bit, he would have seen some machinery. I think probably that that is the complex that the farm administration has been labouring under. They did not realize that there was modern machinery to build roads. There was modern machinery to put in irrigation works. One would wonder how the irrigation development took place in the United States and Alberta in those days. Using that as an excuse is pretty far-fetched. Yes, we do have equipment in the Department of Agriculture now. We have the equipment to do the job, to discharge the Provincial Government's responsibility for irrigation. Previously the Provincial Department of Agriculture, prior to 1944 did no irrigation whatever, Mr. Speaker. since then we have brought several thousand acres of land under the ditch. I do not intend at this time to deal with my department in detail. I will do so, perhaps, on another debate. Yes, the hon. members are glad that I do not deal with it too extensively, because by contrast it would look pretty bad for them as it existed in 1944.

There was no fur Marketing Service in 1944. Now, we have a Fur Marketing Service and Fish Marketing Service that is bringing confidence and security to the trappers and fishermen of the north.

Mr. Speaker, I want to apologize for having invaded the other Ministers' departments, but I did want to place this on the record in order that we would have just a quick look at the progress that has been made by this administration in seven and a half years of office. There is no doubt in my mind, whatever, Mr. Speaker, that as a result of these progressive programmes — and I might say that with just the expansion of the Highway department's programme alone, and the Automobile Insurance and the Hospital scheme, those three alone have been enough to win the confidence of the electors of Saskatchewan. There is no doubt whatever in my mind that this Government is coming back into power with a larger majority than ever before.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I almost forgot something. We did not have a south Saskatchewan River dam in 1944 and we have not got a dam now, by a damsite! Instead, Mr. Speaker, we have got promises. We thought that we had the dam at one time when the hon. Leader of the Opposition left the Federal House and a by-election took place. We were promised then that if we elected a Liberal candidate that would be our guarantee that we would get the dam. Well, the Liberal candidate was elected, but we still did not get the dam. In that election campaign up in Rosthern constituency, water was flowing all over the place. They had the farmers convinced that the water was practically there already. A good deal of work has been done since then. They have found the dam site to be sound, all the technical engineering information has been made available, The reports have all been submitted to Ottawa. As a matter of fact, there is no irrigation project that has ever been so thoroughly studies as the south Saskatchewan project has been, and what do we get then? We get a Royal Commission to investigate. If anyone should speak with authority on Royal Commissions, it ought to be the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) with his long association with the Liberal Party.

I think that the Liberal Party has a greater record of receiving reports from Royal Commission and doing nothing about them than any other administration. Now, Mr. Speaker, they do not even know what the terms of references are to the Royal Commission itself. The Royal Commission does not know what they are supposed to enquire into. Mr. Gardiner says that they are to examine the technical information. The Hon. Prime Minister says something different entirely. And everyone is at a loss to know just what they are enquiring into. All right, I will tell the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) what the Prime Minister said. First, I want to read to him the terms of reference. The terms of reference contained in the order-in-council read as follows:

“Whether the economic and social returns to the Canadian people on the investment in the proposed South Saskatchewan River project, central Saskatchewan development, would be commensurate with the cost thereof.

“Whether the said project represents the most profitable and desirable use which can be made of the physical resources involved.”

I would take it, Mr. Speaker, and I believe the hon. Leader of the Opposition would agree with me, that the physical resources involved mean the land and water resources associated with the project itself. The Royal Commission could not say what it meant, so we wrote to the Prime Minister to try to find out what was meant. It is necessary for us to know, in order that we can present an intelligent brief in the connection.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, now we are off the air, I am sure the Minister will not mind me asking a question. He says that the Royal Commission did not know what the reference meant. I suppose he will not mind (speaking as a Minister of the Crown) telling us what his authority is that they did not know what their own reference was.

**Hon. Mr. Fines** (Provincial Treasurer): — Let him finish what he was saying.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, it means that it could be . . .

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Well, I can answer that very well, Mr. Speaker. We have had our discussions, quite naturally, with the members of the Commission and all of these questions have come up, and we have asked them, “What are your terms of reference?” They do not know. To my knowledge they are spending a good deal of time in Alberta enquiring into alternative projects. We do not know if they are supposed to enquire into alternative projects or not, or whether they are studying the South Saskatchewan River project itself. Because, after all, there are other governments that are interested in further irrigation development, and Mr. Speaker, I want to say this right now. I do not know why Saskatchewan had to be singled out for special treatment; why we had to have a Royal Commission on the South Saskatchewan, and not any other project. And I want to say this to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — If the Minister would answer this question. I am told that it was questions raised by yourselves that we could generate electricity cheaper from coal than you could from that project that raised the whole question.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, he is absolutely misinformed. It has nothing to do with the Royal Commission whatsoever.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, that is the way we understand it.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — I want to clear this matter up. We wrote to the Prime Minister, had the Premier write to him, and we said this:

“It appears that there is considerable misunderstanding and uncertainty regarding the interpretation of terms of reference set out in order-in-council, P.C. 4435 of August 24, 1951, appointing a Royal Commission to conduct an enquiry into the proposed South Saskatchewan River project.

“As a matter of fact, we have been unable to obtain clarification from the members of the commission itself. It is most important to us that certain points in this connection be clarified. The terms of reference contained in the order-in-council read as follows:

“Whether the economic and social returns to the Canadian people on the investment in the proposed central development scheme would be commensurate with the cost thereof.

**February 20, 1952**

“Whether the said project represents the most profitable and desirable use which can be made of the physical resources involved.”

We want the these questions answered:

- (1) Would the scope of the enquiry confine to examine existing material associated with the project?
- (2) Does the reference to physical resources involved confine itself to lands and waters contained in and associated with the South Saskatchewan project itself, or
- (3) Do the terms of reference cover the entire South Saskatchewan River Basin?
- (4) Do the terms of reference go beyond the above basin, do they extend to the entire Saskatchewan River Basin?”

The reason we want to know this is because the Royal Commission is spending a lot of time in Alberta, interviewing the Government there and we are getting concerned about it. We are wondering what project they are investigating. We asked another one:

- (5) Should any other project be considered by the Commission either within or outside Saskatchewan as a possible alternative project to the south Saskatchewan scheme as now proposed.

Since we have been unable to obtain clarification on these points, I would appreciate answers to each of these specific questions at your earliest convenience.”

Then we got the answer as follows:

“I have your letter of the 21st instant, regarding the interpretation of the terms of reference of the Royal Commission appointed to conduct the enquiry of the proposed South Saskatchewan River project.

“It seems to me that most of the questions you uphold are questions which would have to be considered by the Commission itself and that it would not be appropriate, having appointed a commission, for me to attempt to define or circum-

scribe its terms of reference.”

In other words, the Government is saying that we cannot tell the Commission or set out the terms of reference to the Commission. It goes on:

“It seems to me, however, that your second question indicates an entirely different understanding from mine of the meaning of the second paragraph of the terms of reference.”

Now listen to this:

“By the physical resources involved the Government meant, and I am sure the commission understood not the resources of the south Saskatchewan which might be developed, but the resources of a nation in terms of material and labour and skill which would be expended in carrying out this development work. It seems to me that the interpretation of this phrase goes a long way to answer the questions you have raised.”

Isn't that a dilly! Here is a Royal Commission — it is going to examine all of the resources of Canada — the physical resources, the human skills, to determine whether a project in Saskatchewan is going to be of economic and social benefit to the Dominion of Canada. If I ever heard a farce, that is one! The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) should be the last one to talk about Royal Commissions at all; and to say anything about we not knowing what the agricultural problems are in this province. We know what they are; we know what the problem is . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Why are you appointing a commission then?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — . . . and everyone in this Province is going to have an opportunity to say, and register their opinion as to what the solution should be — you can be sure of that. And as far as our own Royal Commission is concerned, I welcome it. It is something that I wanted to see take place a long time ago; and it is necessary, if we are going to integrate all of the rural services into a sound over-all plant. Further, it is necessary to give an opportunity for our municipal associations, for our farmers' union and other farm organizations, to make their representation and their voices heard. It is necessary to get the best opinion of the Power Corporation, the Department of Municipal Affairs, the Department of Agriculture — all of this is a must; and then it is also necessary that we get competent people to head up such a Royal Commission. I can assure the hon. members opposite that it will not be an abortive commission; it will not be the type of Commission whose recommendations go unheeded . . .

February 20, 1952

**Hon. Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — But in the case of the South Saskatchewan Commission, here is the one Commission where they do not even know what the terms of reference are, and now they have to examine the resources of the whole Dominion of Canada and then compare them to this South Saskatchewan River development project. You can make all the promises you want in the next election, but you had better clear this up first.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I suggest that now the Minister has quoted from letters exchanged between the two Governments, between himself and a Minister of the Crown and the Prime Minister of this country — that he table this correspondence. I cite to you Rule 289 of Beauchesne so that there may be no doubt about it. We are entitled to have this correspondence now that he has read from it.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — I will be very glad to table it just as soon as I am finished here. I will be very glad to accommodate you on this. Mr. Speaker, they are looking at all the resources of the Dominion of Canada; and after appointing a Royal Commission to investigate the experts who have already reported, then they turn around and go down to Washington, as the Prime Minister did, and almost begged Mr. Truman to let him go it alone on the St. Lawrence Seaway — a project that will cost \$750 million. Why did not they have a Royal Commission on that? Maybe we would like to express our opinion on the St. Lawrence Seaway. We will be paying for it as well as other parts of the Dominion.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — I wonder if the Minister will permit a question? Are you against the St. Lawrence Seaway project?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Am I against the St. Lawrence Seaway? It is not a question of what I am against at all. It is a question if there is going to be an enquiry made into a project in Saskatchewan, and all of the people of Canada are going to have an opportunity of passing on it, then I think we should have a similar opportunity to pass on other large projects elsewhere; and I am merely pointing out that apparently they did not have the money for this; they questioned the social and economic benefits; but they could turn around and spend \$750 million for the St. Lawrence Seaway project.

Every time I see a person who is as self-opinionated as the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff), I am reminded of the fly riding on the back of the wagon that turned around and exclaimed, “My, my, look at the dust I’m kicking up.”

Mr. Speaker, I could hardly be expected to answer the hon. members question without having a Royal Commission look into it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say this to the members of the House that we are going to have to utilize the waters of the South Saskatchewan River for this development scheme because they cannot be utilized for any other project in Canada. Perhaps the Dominion Government will be driven into the same position as it was when they came to the St. Mary's. They went ahead with that project so hurriedly because the Americans would claim the water, because we had been so tardy in utilizing it. The same will apply as far as the south Saskatchewan River scheme is concerned. If we do not make use of it very soon, the Americans will say, "We want some of this water down here, and we will make use of it."

They talk about progressive administration. The whole record of Liberalism, in Canada, is one of lack of progress. They talk about depopulation. If you go back into the history of this country, we have lost an entire population to the United States, over the years, through the lack of development of these great and abounding resources that I used to hear Liberal statesmen talk about so eloquently.

**Mr. Tucker:** — We are going ahead faster than any other country in the world, except Saskatchewan.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Isn't that remarkable! I will come to that in just a minute. There are other influences, Mr. Speaker, that can cause stagnation. I referred to a few of them, very briefly, at the beginning of my remarks; and I want to deal with them a little more extensively. I can recall when the railways were first making application for freight rate increases, and the Transport Board, apparently was going to grant their request. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) stood up and he assured all and sundry, "The Government will not permit those increases to take place", but as usual, his influence was not great because three days later the freight increases were recommended and accepted. Ever since that we have had nothing but freight rate increases; and we had a Royal Commission too, and nothing effective has been done yet.

As far as stagnation in this Province is concerned, we have now the first indication — the Swift Current Co-operative Horse Processing Plant — closed down, primarily, because of freight costs in this Province.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Lack of horses.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Lack of horses, my eye; it is because it costs too much to bring horses from the north to Swift current and that is the reason they closed down. This is the first victim of increased freight rates.

I want to say something further about hog prices. In September hog prices dropped about \$6 a hundred in just about a week's time. We heard a great deal about the law of supply and demand. Our public relation men in the meat packing industry tell us that is the

way it works; when you have a lot of hogs the price goes down — the farmer knows that too — Louis Larsen knows that; but, last September, actually, one day when there were only 12 hogs on the Winnipeg market, the price dropped \$2 cwt; and it has been going down ever since until now the price is down to \$24.50 basis in Winnipeg, about \$24 cwt. here in Regina; and there has been nothing done to stop that trend whatever. We have a Prices Support Act, the provisions of which have not been invoked in a manner that would help the producers. There is no guaranteed floor to the producer for either poultry products or meat products whatever. The result is that egg prices have dropped down from 58 cents at November 27 to 40 cents a week later — 15 cents of a drop; and from November 27 to December 27 they dropped 25 cents a dozen for Grade A, and they are now 30 cents a dozen; and the poultry producers are asking the Dominion Government to bring that floor price up to at least 38 cents a dozen. They wanted to meet the Federal Minister in Regina but he did not have time to see them. The same Federal Minister that told these poultry producers two or three years ago that they would have to organize marketing boards before he would give them any floor prices; and now he was not able to meet them when he was in Regina. I guess politicking is a little bit more important than taking care of these basic agricultural problems. Believe me, if I neglected my department that badly, the hon. Leader of the Opposition would be justified in getting up and saying, “What has the Department of Agriculture done?”

**Mr. Tucker:** — You have done nothing.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — And I say it now, what has the Department of Agriculture done about it?

**Mr. Tucker:** — What have you done?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — And above all else . . . and I will deal with that one, too — what have they done about the damp grain situation?

**Mr. Tucker:** — What have you done about the things you have mentioned? Your government can fix these prices.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Listen! We should fix the price . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Yes, you . . .

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — The hon. Leader of the Opposition knows better than that . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — You have the constitutional . . .

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Typical Liberal talk! He thinks he is out on the hustings some place in an isolated school. He knows well that a provincial government cannot set prices.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, I know very well that the only people that have a right to set prices, during peace-time, are the provincial government and legislature. I know that, and he should know it.



**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — The honey producers of this province tried to set prices for honey consumed in Saskatchewan; but the Manitoba honey came in — it's nice and practical, isn't it? It does not work very well, and the hon. Leader of the Opposition knows that. He knows that there is only one agency that is responsible for fiscal policy and that is the Federal Government at Ottawa.

In addition, we have had a drop in beef prices. To be sure beef prices were high, but they have dropped about \$9 a hundred since the high period last fall. In fact, they dropped about \$6 a hundred in the short space of one week; and when all of this dropping was taking place the current retail prices remained up, so they had an enquiry at Ottawa; I think the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright) asked the Combines administration to investigate. Well, they made an investigation into these rapid drops in prices to the producers with no corresponding reduction in price to the consumer, but the combines administration said, well, it was all right; the packers were only making their profits in the natural way, so they could not do anything about it.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, if the Minister here thinks that is not right, there is nothing to prevent him from laying a charge against the Combines investigations act and proceeding; and I ask, if he thinks this is not right, that this government do something instead of talking so much.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — And similarly, Mr. Speaker, any group of producers can ask the combines administration to make . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Why do you not do it?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Because when they have already said that everything was normal; they were just making their profits naturally — well, that is it.

**Mr. Tucker:** — You can lay a charge.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Wheat prices. You know, we now have parity currency with the United States which was hailed as a great step forward. The good old Canadian dollar was back on a par with the American dollar again; but there was less parity for the wheat producer. His price immediately dropped by 10 cents a bushel as from last June; and from a high, when the relationship between the two currencies was more greatly in favour of the American dollar, as much as 16 cents a bushel; so actually our wheat farm is now getting less for his wheat than ever before, again.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Will the hon. Minister permit a question on that? The hon. Minister has spoken as if he were finding fault with the Wheat Agreement. Is he against the Wheat Agreement? Let him answer that.

**February 20, 1952**

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Again, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition is away off the beam. He is still all wet . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Oh yes, evade the question. He won't answer.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — We are not talking about the International Wheat Agreement.

**Mr. Tucker:** — That is what you were talking about.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — I am talking about the two currencies. Now that the currencies have reached parity, all the producers who are paid under the International Wheat Agreement are paid in terms of the American dollar . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Exactly!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — And when there was a disparity in the currency in favour of the United States, it favoured our wheat producers to the extent of 10 cents a bushel, as compared to last June, and 16 cents a bushel, at that time when there was quite a disparity between the . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, are you against that Agreement, or not?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — I am not against that Agreement at all, but I am against this — that our wheat producers are now getting less for their wheat and the cost of everything else is still going up. We have always taken the stand that when we enter into any long-term contract, or set prices for agricultural products, put that price where you may — but the price of things the farmer buys have to stay in their proper relationship. Is that clear to you? That is exactly what was not done, Mr. Speaker. It is not the price you get . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Might I ask the Minister another question? He says that you cannot fix prices in the province. Can you fix prices in the country, when you have as much foreign trade as we have, in Canada?

**Mr. Danielson:** — Most certainly.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — What is the difference?

**Mr. Danielson:** — I would like to ask just one little . . .

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — I have a question . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Will the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) sit down. If the hon. member who is speaking does not wish to answer a question you will kindly keep your seat.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Has he indicated that?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Yes.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — I stayed on my feet so I must have indicated it.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I wanted to ask what he thinks about the . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! We cannot let this get into a debating society with no rules at all.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, I cannot be expected to educate them all in one short lesson. I certainly have not the time today.

We now find agricultural products dropping, all along the lines, with no effective floor prices to the producer; we see our grain prices coming down, but the price of everything else is still going up. It might interest hon. members to know that the over-all price of machinery, since 1946 to 1951 has gone up 58 per cent. Little wonder that we are worried about it. Little wonder that we are concerned about this particular economic situation; and the hon. members opposite can talk all they please about not talking Federal matters, but we are going to talk about them, and talk about them plenty. I do not blame them for not wanting us to talk about them.

Now to go into this damp grain situation a little more fully, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) got up and said, "What has the Provincial Government done?" Well, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, there was no one who knew, either our own department or the general public, that the damp grain situation was as serious as it was until January 9th, when Mr. John Vallance made a speech at University Farm week, when he told us that it would be impossible for all drying facilities — at full capacity — to dry all the grain in the elevators and remaining on the farms. That was the first intimation we had of the extent of the problem. And, after having said this, then Mr. Vallance goes on and warns farmers against utilizing either home-made driers, or any other kind of driers. Now, since this is an exclusive field of federal jurisdiction since the Doming Government sets standards, quite naturally we look to them for leadership. That leadership has not been forthcoming, Mr. Speaker, and it is still not forthcoming. I would like those people to tell us now, either the Board of Grain Commissioners, or your Federal Minister of Agriculture, whether or not we have a salvage problem on our hands, or whether they think they can dry all of this grain still on the farms. There is not a farmer in this Province that knows what he ought to do. If it is a salvage proposition, then let us by all means dry this grain in any way at all; but, we did take action. Very early, I asked the Prime Minister, by letter, to take the duty off driers and accessories coming into Canada. I received a reply stating that that was being done; and that some of

**February 20, 1952**

I note, when looking over Hansard, that Mr. Wright, the C.C.F. member for Melfort, first raised this question on the floor of the House on November 20, or rather, it was raised by Mr. Thatcher of Moose Jaw, when he asked the Government if they were giving any consideration to removing the duty on grain driers coming in from the United States.

I might say the same question was asked by Mr. Wright, and when the matter was stressed, the Dominion Government then made it possible for the farmers to import driers duty-free. But those who came in to do custom work were still required to pay a nominal duty, but since having written to the Prime Minister, I am now assured that the duty is off entirely, although I hear in some instances we still have to pay the duty on the motors that go with the machinery. As soon as we knew that we inaugurated an assistance policy under which we paid 30¢ a mile for the transportation of drying equipment from the United States to Canada. We have had a very good response to this policy — there are quite a number of custom driers coming up from the United States, although they have a damp-grain problem of their own down there.

We are also extending the same assistance to farmers in Saskatchewan who purchase driers who use them for their own use, and for custom work on neighbouring farms. But we do not know if we should extend that assistance, when the hon. member from Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff) gets up and has the audacity to suggest that, because we have given some assistance to farmers in transportation on their driers, that if any of this grain is damaged, then it is our fault. Can you imagine anything more fantastic than that? Little wonder that people in the country have no more confidence in the Opposition with this type of criticism! Talk about whistling in the dark! Talk about agitating! As far as agitating is concerned, they have dropped to a new low level. Subversive elements wherever there is a trouble spot — they are in there rubbing the sore, hoping that these little troubles will add up, and thereby they might get back into office again.

Well, I have had quite a bit of experience in dealing with that particular type of political mind which exists in the Liberal Party, and I have seen them in action, too, Mr. Speaker. We do not know, as I say, whether the present terminal drying facilities are going to be able to take care of our crops or not. We do not know if there will be sufficient grain diverted to Duluth, or elsewhere, to do the job, but we do know this, we do know that the drying facilities that were available in Canada were not working at capacity. I have an article here which appeared in *The Leader-Post*, dated February 1, 1952, entitled, "Damp and Tough Grain Picture is Building." More gloom was cast over the drying equipment in the western division had handled only 13,242,000 bushels of tough grain, and — or rather the other way around, 13,242,000 bushels of damp grain and 12 million bushels of tough grain in the 10 weeks' period ending November 17 to January 14.

I was figuring that up, Mr. Speaker. We are told that the total drying capacity of all the terminal driers in Canada is 900,000 bushels a day, working at capacity on tough grain, but that would be reduced to around 500,000 with damp grain. According to this information, and only on the basis of the amount of grain dried in the 10-week period, indicates that those driers have only been working at 40 per cent capacity. I wonder too, if enough effort has been made to mobilize all the drying facilities in the country. I was called the other day by a representative of a brewing industry that offered a grain drier that they had in Vancouver, which does around 2,500 bushels a day, offering it for free. We are not in that business, so I referred him to the Wheat Board. I wonder if they have mobilized all the driers that are available of a similar nature.

It seems to me, too, Mr. Speaker, and I think the suggestion has been made, and is a practical one, that grain could have been taken to the port of Churchill to be dried. Surely we can improvise bins to take care of storage. We have improvised bins before on our farms, and that could have been done at some of these points, and thereby utilized the drying facilities that we have to the utmost capacity.

Transportation was mentioned yesterday as not being a factor. I want to say to the hon. members that transportation was a very important factor in this whole picture. I have taken the trouble of looking over some of the records in regard to transportation. I find this — first of all, that the 1950-51 crop year ended with millions of bushels of wheat still in the farmers' hands, and with the elevators flooded with grain at several points, especially in Saskatchewan. Wheat carry-over in Canada was 184,780 bushels compared to 1941-50 average of 246 million bushels. there was not a large surplus of grain on hand, and the carry-over was not so great. On April 4 this legislature asked the Government of Canada to appoint a transport comptroller, because at that time we were talking about box-car shortages. I can remember several of the editorials appearing in the daily paper on the same date, talking about that box-car shortage. That box-car shortage continued throughout the entire summer months, and continued right up through August and September. How can anyone get up and say, in this House, that our transportation system was doing its best in those months. It definitely was not doing any such thing.

We went into this new crop year in the full knowledge of what the situation really was, with everybody clamouring for box-cars, and still no transport comptroller appointed. The farm organizations at the beginning of the year again urged the appointment of a transport comptroller, and the wheat began going to the elevators in the new crop year. We knew we were going to have a big crop; estimates at August 15 indicated that the wheat production would be around 581 million bushels. August 16, 1951, the grain position at the Lakehead was as follows: 54 million bushels of 1950 crop in storage, which is close to the total working capacity of the terminals, which is around 55 million bushels; and there were also 2,385 cars on the track, and 4,600 cars in transit,

**February 20, 1952**

making another 76 million bushels, or a total coming to the Lakehead, or at the Lakehead of 130 million bushels. Churchill was also plugged, there were only five ships last year as compared to 14 at the same date the year previous. There were 100 cars on the unloading track, 358 in the yards, and 328 standing on the siding between The Pas and Churchill.

August 22, shipments down the Great Lakes since August 1 averaged 1¼ million bushels daily; deliveries to the country elevators were at the rate of 5½ million bushels daily. This indicated a potential lag of about 4 million bushels a day in deliveries, as against transportation on the lakes. Now, when I say 1¼ million bushels a day carried by the Lake boats during the war years, and when the Transport Commissioner came in, one of the first things he said would be to try and bring that 1½ million bushels up to 2 million bushels a day. And this was the situation he faced — the terminals were plugged with the hang-over of the late 1950 frosted crops; the country elevator space was non-existent at many points; 290 Saskatchewan Pool Elevators were plugged at that time; only 22 million bushels of space in them; priority was given to iron ore shipments on the lakes; there was a box-car shortage; Saskatchewan Pool Elevators required 1,700 cars a day as at August 23, and they had received only 300 cars a day during August.

Now, it appeared at that late date that it was going to take some doing for the transport controller to unravel that transportation situation. He has done a good job, but had he been appointed, as we suggested, I think a whole lot of the millable wheat would have been moved in September and August, and made the way clear for the movement of tough and damp grain.

Now, I am not going to burden you with any more figures, much as I would like to do so, only to again recapitulate. Somebody said there was a lot of wheat moved between August and the latter part of November. There was a great deal moved, but there was not very much moved in August and September, and what is more, when you look . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, I am very interested in that. The Minister says there was not much moved in August and September? Has he got the figures of the past year compared to the previous year? What was moved in August and September? The Minister made a bald statement there — now what were the figures?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — There is every indication, according to my figures here, that there was a very retarded movement in August and September compared to other years.

**Mr. Tucker:** — What are the figures?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — This is not too bad. I am not going to go over the whole thing — I could take it step by step, week by week — I would be very glad to give it to you that way, if you want to wait. Just to recapitulate: On October 18, 1951, there were 4 million

bushels in store at Pacific ports comparable to 19.4 and 19.5 million bushels in 1942-43. There were 29 million bushels at Eastern and Maritime ports in 1951, October 18. Afloat and in transit in the east comparable to 66.7 and 44.7 million bushels in 1942-43, which is quite a drop. There were 1½ million bushels of Canadian wheat at U.S. Ports, and in transit in the United States, compared to 19.3 million and 11.2 million in 1942-43. The figures for 1944 were 35½ million bushels in the United States. On January 17, 1951 there were 10 million bushels of grain at Pacific ports compared to 20.3 million bushels in 1942, and 19.6 million bushels in 1943. There were 31 million bushels at Fort William and Port Arthur compared to 108.96 in 1942-43, which indicates quite clearly that there was much more grain moved during the wartime period when our transportation system was labouring under a heavy burden of carrying war materials.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister permit a question? It seems to me all those figures show is that there was more wheat piled up in storage, but he must have the figures of the amount of wheat shipped out of Saskatchewan during those months for last year (that is, 1951) and in 1950.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, my figures indicate that there was insufficient wheat in the terminals, either at the lakeheads or at Vancouver, and at the latter part of October and even up until January than what it was in the previous years.

Sure, if you are moving grain you are going to fill up your terminals. The grain was not being moved. Now, a good deal has been said about the volume of lake shipments. I mentioned a moment ago that they were down to a million and a half bushels a day. While the comparison between the total grain moved last year and this year today is quite favourable, but we have to remember the shipping season was open longer this year than in any other similar period, and instead of the Lake boats taking the full capacity, they were down by 2 ½ million bushels a day as compared to what they carried in 1942-43, or I should say, 1944-45.

Now, this pretty clearly indicates, Mr. Speaker, that we have transportation bottle-necks. The hon. member is trying to smile — why, the Leader of the Manitoba Pool just got up the other day and said, “Give us box-cars”. And we will not need to worry about our damp grain. I am getting letters everyday from shipping points wanting box-cars, and in some bases, box-cars to ship out dry grain and tough grain. Well, it seems to me that there has been some bungling someplace down the line, and the bungling did not take place as far as the Provincial Department of Agriculture is concerned.

Now, the question is asked, “What have you done about it?” They say “Nothing” — we have done everything we could about it, and now, sure, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) would like us to solve the Federal Government’s problem too, in addition to our own. It is not our jurisdiction, nor our business, to interfere with Federal matters, and far be it from me to be infringing upon the jurisdiction of other

**February 20, 1952**

government agencies. If an Inspection Division is set up to set standards, to set grades and license grain driers — that is their responsibility, and as long as the Federal Government has the research services that it has, and has the benefit of the best advice that it can get from the engineering Institute of Canada, I think that they ought to be advising us as to what should be done in the fact of the present situation. At least they could tell us what types of driers are best suited for commercial drying under conditions which exist on our farms. they could also tell us as to whether this is a salvage problem — we have not been told that yet. All we are being told now is to be careful that we do not hurt the milling content! Nothing positive has come out.

We met the Farmers' Union today — the hon. members probably have a copy of the brief that was submitted, and they say this, "We are very critical of the fact that the Board of Grain Commissioners have not only failed to heed our advice, but instead deliberately discouraged farmers from using small driers on the farm or at local elevators. Now, after much valuable time has been lost, they have belatedly advised farmers to dry their own grain which they cannot deliver. If warm weather comes too soon, it may become almost impossible to save a good deal of this damp grain. We still believe the major responsibility for looking after the damp grain rests with the Board of Commissioners, and that the Board should, and will be severely censured by prairie farmers for failure to act on recommendations in this regard.

Now, as far as driers are concerned, if we could get all the driers in that are available in the United States, it would not make a dent on the problem. This is a problem that can be handled more adequately if provision is made on the terminal basis, from the point of view of milling quality, and from the point of view of getting a volume of grain processed, but I can assure the hon. members that we will do all we can as far as our department is concerned, to save as much of this grain as we possibly can.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote against the amendment and for the motion.

**Mr. Kuziak** (Canora): — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I would like to point out that the hon. member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson), when he stated he voted for the 18- to 21-year-olds getting the franchise, I have the records here, and he definitely voted against it, and it is recorded.

**Mr. Danielson** (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I have not got the records here, but I can go and check them up. I will check them myself; I am not accepting that kind of foolishness.

Mr. Speaker, the time is getting short. I have never sat in this House (and I have been here since 1934, Mr. Speaker), and I have never seen in debate on an amendment to any budget address or Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne, any person get up and speak for an hour and a half and never once mention the amendment.



**Mr. Tucker:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Last night we were very severely censured by you, Mr. Speaker, and probably you were justified; I am not criticizing you.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I would like to point out to the hon. member that is discussing the first amendment, you insisted that the amendment and the main motion should be kept as one, and after the vote was taken on the amendment, then you insisted that you should have the privilege of speaking on the main motion. The members who have just spoken have not spoken in this debate at all, either on the amendment or the main motion, and I shall hold that they have exhausted their right to speak on the main motion.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, that is just what I want to get at before I start to say the few things I have to say; and I want to assure you that what I am going to say this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, will be clearly on the amendment — nothing else.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Then I will have another time in this debate in which to reply to all the statements which have been made by the speakers on the other side of this House; but I am not going to do it now. I want that clearly understood before I start speaking, Mr. Speaker, that my address — my remarks this afternoon . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! Then I should advise the hon. member to look up parliamentary procedure before he goes on.

**Mr. Danielson:** — There is no parliamentary procedure on that. It is a motion before the House, and last night it was very clearly pointed out to a member sitting close to myself here that we were now speaking on the amendment.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Hear! Hear! We were held to it, too.

**Mr. Danielson:** — . . . and we don't have the same rules in this House today as we had last night.

**Mr. Tucker:** — No, we did not have them; the Minister did not even mention that we had them.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I am going to apply the speaker's rules last night myself, and accept that he was right . . . and he was right . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — He was right last night.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Absolutely right, and I do not say he was wrong; and I say today that he, Mr. Speaker, was right.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I did not quite hear all that the hon. member said.

**Mr. Danielson:** — You were right in your ruling, last night, that we were dealing with the amendment, and nothing else.

**Mr. Speaker:** — It was not taken that way . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — That may not be so, but your ruling was correct, Mr. Speaker; there is no question about that. Now then, this amendment held simply that the Government reserve the Public Revenue Tax for the municipalities. The same amendment which is before the House at the present time was before the House on this debate in the Speech from the Throne, last year, which action has been asked for, or recommended by a Commission appointed by the Government of Saskatchewan two years ago. An outstanding personality, a good capable man, had the charge of that Commission, and the report, Mr. Speaker, makes good reading for everyone. The Government has failed to implement that recommendation. It has failed to do so at a time when the revenue of this Government or of this Province, is higher than it has ever been — two or three times higher than they were during the days when this tax was put on.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Three times — four times the size they were in the days when this tax was put on. They are all talking about the municipalities. I have had reeves and councillors come to me and say, “What are they worrying about?” All they have to do is let us keep Public Revenue Tax, and we will look after our own road grants. We are not asking for any road grant if they will let us have that mill and a half on the assessment, which we now have to pay to the Saskatchewan Government.”

That is the attitude of the men whom it is affecting. That is the attitude of the men who have the responsibility of carrying on the municipal services of this province. They asked that this thing be done, and then they would not have to come to the Provincial Government, or to an inspector, or to any higher ranks, and beg for any grants, or any hand-outs from them.

It should be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that this tax has got to be paid by the municipalities to the Government, whether the municipalities collect that tax from the taxpayer or not. Did anybody ever think about that part of it? In the five or six years (up until last year) from 1944, two-thirds of the Province of Saskatchewan, more or less, and some of it altogether, has been under the provisions of the Prairie Farm Assistance Act. Each municipality has said that collecting is the most important factor; but in spite of that fact that it is their duty as a council to get that mill and a half and pay it into the Provincial Treasury; in spite of the fact, I have said that they have been unable to collect that tax from the taxpayers of that municipality, yet is the duty of the council to pay, and they are responsible for it.

Now then, I think it is about time that the Government of Saskatchewan, after three years of the most buoyant revenue that has ever been collected in this Province, after the doubling of taxes, licenses paid — all taxes that any department under Acts or regulations can collect from the people of the province have been increased, doubled and trebled in this province; the provincial revenue has come up from approximately 3 ½ millions to close to 10 millions of dollars . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Now, why should they not? What about the Education Tax? The Education Tax has increased approximately three times what we got out of that tax, and they have done that, Mr. Speaker, of course, by the rise in the price level of the goods which we, the people of Saskatchewan, have to buy, and on which we pay these taxes. All these things have been contributing to increased revenues for this Government; and, on top of that, during the last few years, this Government has been released of a considerable amount of demand for money from the rural municipalities, in view of the Reserve Fund. What I call it is a trust. Some people do not agree with me on that; but I think that the Public Revenue Reserve was an excess payment into the Government during times that the assessment of this Province was carried on, and was a trust fund for them. That is my opinion, and I am entitled to that.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — The provisions of that trust fund were not carried out as was agreed between the Government and the rural municipal executives of this Province. They took this money, and kept it, and the grants that have been handed out in the last few years to the municipalities across the Province of Saskatchewan was the taxpayer's own money and the municipalities' own money. Nobody is going to vote for those C.C.F.'ers who run all over the province speaking about the larger road grants. I know of a municipality in my district that paid in \$18,000; what do you think they got out of it? For the first two years they did not get a thing, and a very, very small amount since. They have not got back 16 per cent of what they paid in, and that municipality, Mr. Speaker, was in the complete 100 per cent area for relief for seven years. That's the hand-out they get.

In the northern part of the province there is one municipality, I understand, that has received over \$2,000 worth of grants and they were under-assessed approximately \$3,000. That is the kind of thing that has been going on, but that is the money that has been handed out by this Government. The farmers are being bribed with their own money as far as that grant is concerned. Today, all they ask, Mr. Speaker, is this: "Let us tend to our own business. Let us levy our own taxes, and you can take your road grants and forget about them."

But we do not stop there as a Liberal Party, Mr. Speaker. We know as well as anybody else that there are places in the Province of Saskatchewan, particularly in the northern area and in some other areas in the Province, where the assessment is extremely low, and the income on the basis of a certain mill rate in these areas is not sufficient to carry the municipalities through, or give them a sufficient amount of cash to be able to render the services, and carry on the functions which a municipal council should carry on. And for that good reason we, as a Liberal Party in this Province say, Do Away with the Public Revenue Tax. but that should not, and will not, prevent the Government in office in this Province, Mr. Speaker, from giving each municipality in this Province which has a very small assessment on poor land which is not occupied, probably bush land and so on — an equalization grant which would put them in a position whereby they would be able to carry on just like any other municipality.

During the period of distress which lasted for seven or eight years during the thirties, there is no need to tell you, Mr. Speaker, what that period did to the people of this Province. You were right in the midst of it. You know the experience, and you know the situation that faced you, as a farmer. You know the situation that faced your municipality, and you, as a taxpayer, during this period. In spite of that, we were able to cut down the rate from two mills to 1½ mills for the municipalities.

I would like to point another thing out — and I had expected to hear something from the group that sits on the other side of the House, when they had been talking about the Id days and the tremendous amount of shirking by the Liberal Party, because they did not do so and so and so. But let me remind you, Mr. Speaker, that through the drought area in 1936-37, the then Provincial Government wrote off \$7 million worth of revenue tax to the municipalities and the farmers of this province.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — The hon. gentleman from Canora (Mr. Kuziak) this afternoon made the statement that this Government had cancelled \$40 million debts on the farms of this province. Now, I am not going to go into that; but I am certainly going to deal with it another time, and there won't be any \$40 million left when I get through with it.

**Mr. J. Gibson (Morse):** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question? Will the hon. member tell us how much was cancelled in 1935-36 by way of taxes on mortgaged farms that the mortgage companies expected to have to take over?

**Mr. Danielson:** — Yes, I could tell you that, too. I have the whole province of Saskatchewan for the drought area, right here. I haven't the figures calculated, but I can tell you what was cancelled in my own constituency of Arm River:

Write-offs on mortgages, taxes cancelled, lease assessment cancellation. In my own constituency, Mr. Speaker, of Arm River, this was not all that was written off — but it did amount to \$6,185,856,000 — in the constituency of Arm River.

Let me point out another thing, Mr. Speaker — I do not need to tell you, because you know, that in 1931-32, relief \$12,698,875; in 1937-38 another adjustment (not sufficient) not too great by any means — \$32,156,899. In 1938-39, \$9,124,000; 1946-47, \$21,465,916; next year, \$75,446,558; in 1944, \$35 million to a total of \$230,446,000.

Now, then, I am not going to give you these figures now, but I am going to deal with a statement that has been made, and that is in answer to my friend over here. So you do not know. Well, I have the figures here, and you are going to get them. These are things that have been done. Now then, Mr. Speaker, it was a most remarkable performance that took place in this House last night, and I am getting to be rather an old man now — I am not ashamed of it; I feel younger than I did a year ago!

Let me tell you that, after the experience on the same amendment as we are having now, on some of the amendments we had last year, and this year again, it was voted on by every member on that side of the House except the member for Last Mountain, and you are facing the same thing now. I was very much surprised when the Premier, last night, got up on his feet and started to speak, and intimated — gave out a lead — of what is going to be in the budget. Well, it is not very long ago, Mr. Speaker, since similar things happened in the British Parliament; the British Minister of the Treasury over there, Mr. Thomas, stated something similar to that in an unguarded moment, and, Mr. Speaker, he was politely told that he would not have any job any more. He did not have his post any more, and that was the end of his political life. We find here in Saskatchewan that when things get pretty warm, and this Government “is taking it on the hoof” so to speak, and are facing an election, they are trying to justify it and make it known during the debate on this amendment that, by giving out a hint, something is going to be done when the budget is brought down. Isn't that a remarkable performance, Mr. Speaker, by a Government that prides themselves for being up to everything that is honourable and everything that is perfect, and everything that is good? There is nobody that speaks about themselves like these men do.

I have many things I could say in connection with this thing, but I do not want to break the promise I give you, Mr. Speaker, that when I started I was going to confine myself exclusively to the amendment to the motion on the Speech from the Throne, and for that reason, I am not going to dwell very long on this.

I was interested in what the other provinces of Canada are doing in regard to helping the municipalities out. To the east of us we have Manitoba, and to the west, British Columbia and Alberta; and we find that, in the Province of Alberta, they repealed the land tax back in 1947; absolutely said to the municipalities, “We do not want that money

from you at all; everything you collect is all for you; that is your business, and that is your money with which to carry on the duties which we are allocated to you as a municipal government.” That is what the Province of Alberta did, and that was back in 1947. And they have not been so terribly flush with oil money and oil taxes and oil revenues there — they have needed that money, no doubt, but they realized the duties and responsibilities that were on them, and they did something to take the load off the municipalities in their province.

British Columbia put on a sales tax, about 3 per cent. What did they do? Why, they gave one-half of it to the municipalities, and the municipal share, in 1950 was \$4 million. And this revenue is still going to the municipalities in British Columbia. That is what the province of Alberta did, and that was back in 1947. And they have not been so terribly flush with oil money and oil taxes and oil revenues there — they have needed that money, no doubt; they realize the duties and responsibilities that were on them, and they did something to take the load off the municipalities in their province.

British Columbia put on a sales tax, about 3 per cent. What did they do? Why, they gave one-half of it to the municipalities, and the municipal share in 1950 was \$4 million. This revenue is still going to the municipalities in British Columbia. That is what they do in that province.

Manitoba has done something similar to that. They have given to the municipalities their full share of everything they get from the Dominion Government on a fifty-fifty basis.

Now then, we have this “all things to all person” Government in this province who pride themselves that they have done so much for the farmers. Well, Mr. Speaker, if they can show me one solitary thing that they have done for any farmer in this province (except to pile more taxes on to them), I will apologize to them.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — That is the only thing they have done for the farmers. We heard something about the taxes for hospitalization, today. Well, we are dealing with more revenue for the municipalities in this motion, and I think when anybody gets up in this House and says that we are not paying taxes for hospitalization today, he must be deaf or dumb or blind, or something; or else he is so incompetent that he is not able to do his own business — somebody else has to do it for him — and he does not know what is going on. That is all there is to it. Who does not know that every person pays \$10 — \$30 for a family, and that we pay \$3 million to \$4 million in hospitalization tax? Isn't that a tax? That is just about equal, Mr. Speaker, to one per cent, or just the same as one mill. One mill is 1/10 of a cent; therefore one per cent on anything is the same as one . . .

**Some Hon. Member (Gov't):** — Figure it again.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, you go ahead and figure it out. One mill is one-tenth of a cent, and if there is one per cent on a dollar tax, that is one cent, Mr. Speaker, and we have this Education and Hospitalization Tax in Saskatchewan, which takes one per cent from everybody, whether he buys a suit of clothes or a pair of shoes or a hat, or the girl buys a little bottle of nail polish, or something she puts on her lips, or something like that, then the tax of one per cent will run up to more money, Mr. Speaker, than one mill. Four times as much. So it is silly for the member for Canora — of course he does not say very much that is not silly; especially when he speaks along those lines. This province pays for its hospitalization; the people of the province expect to pay for that hospitalization, in spite of the fact that this group over here told me, back in 1944, that they were not going to have to pay anything. They were going to take that from \$40 million of “capitalist” money that went out of Saskatchewan into eastern Canada, to Bay Street. And they were going to retain that in this province. Well, they just had to do like any capitalist government has done.

I have something here, taken from “Saturday Night”, and it is a most enlightening piece of literature, because it says, “Here is the new C.C.F. Dictionary.” And some day when I have more time in this House, I will read it to you.

I hope that my friends across here will have a change of heart and stand up and vote for this amendment. By doing that, they will be doing something that the people of the province will appreciate. I do not think they have any intention of doing that, because the Premier would never take that step, which is an astounding thing, when he stood here, last night, and gave us information that it was going to come out in the budget. We feel that we have done our duty, as we see it, on this side of the House. We are fighting for a fair share, and a fair deal for the municipalities of this province, which have been too long unfairly treated. I know we put this tax on — we do not deny that; but we are also here to take it off.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — You between we are, because there is no need of it any more. It may possibly be that the Provincial Treasurer and his friends over here would not have quite as many men running back and forth over the Province of Saskatchewan, working for election and on political activities for this Government, as at the present time. They may have to curtail and economize on a few of these fellows, but they would still have enough money left to have a large enough force to carry on; because, after the next election, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, they will not need so very many. They will have time to rest up, or get a new army ready for the field for the next election.

The Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) is smiling. I know he will be very generous with us, and will support this amendment; and when the Budget comes down it will be one he can be proud of, about which we will be able to stand here and praise and support him, because

**February 20, 1952**

I can assure you that, if he comes down with a Budget that will be of any assistance to the farmers and to the people of the rural areas, of this province, if he relieves them from some of the taxes they are paying into his coffers at the present time, that budget will have my full support, and, I think, the support of every member on this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I shall support the amendment, and I shall reserve my right to speak on the main motion for another time.

The question being put on the amendment of Mr. Horsman, it was negatived 26 to 18.

**Mr. A.C. Cameron** (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

The Assembly adjourned at 6 o'clock p.m.