

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Eleventh Legislature
20th Day

Thursday, March 6, 1952

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

BUDGET DEBATE

The House resumed from Wednesday, March 5, 1952, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair. (The Assembly to go into a Committee of Supply).

Mr. L.L. Trippe (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, having regard for the advice of the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. Benson), and for the fact that a number of other members may wish to speak on this debate, I am not going to take very much time of the House, this afternoon, in going over a few notes that I have here. I suppose that perhaps many of the people who send us down here are more interested in what we do than in what we say.

I would like, at this time, to make a few observations before I forget them, with regard to the fur situation in the North. I was particularly impressed, the other day, with the remarks made by the hon. member for Athabaska (Mr. Marion) and the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Blanchard) in this connection.

As we know, the real storehouse of furs and fur-bearing animals in this Province of Saskatchewan is represented by these two gentlemen, and it has been for many years, and I expect will be for many years to come, the source of our greatest amount and most valuable furs. Therefore, I would expect that the Government would have particular regard for any recommendations which these gentlemen might make. I was particularly impressed, myself, with their view of the situation and the recommendations which they made in regard to some of the things. I am in perfect agreement with them that the Fur Marketing Agency, if it is going to function as such, should be truly competitive. If it is a good thing, it should not have to have the advantage of some special deal to enable it to get along, but it should be able to come out and operate as the other fur marketing agencies do, in competition, and you should also give to these people who trap furs, a proper opportunity to sell them where they think they can get the best money for them; and, in some cases, where they can get paid entirely for them at the time they market them.

Something was said about the trappers' meeting that they have — the big one — up in Prince Albert, every fall. I have been anxious to attend this for a number of years, but usually it occurs just before this Legislature meets and we do not have time; and sometimes we do not hear anything about it. I do not regard this trappers' meeting as anything at all but a sort of meeting for the Government to pass off its obligations and sort of appease the trappers and keep them quiet for another year. I do not think

March 6, 1952

they take the recommendations of the trappers into consideration to any very great extent, and if they do they bring them back to Regina and nothing further is heard about it for another year. I do not think it is a really good, true, representative meeting of the trappers and I do not think their recommendations are properly taken into account and considered.

I must praise the Government very much for their efforts in the conservation areas. This is really a good thing, copied after the Manitoba system, and if you come to a point where you equal the Manitoba system, you will have advanced very greatly in the right direction. These conservation areas, worked properly, and kept as conservation areas, are going to really conserve our game animals, fur-bearing animals and a great many of our birds in this Province. There would be very little that would need to be done to make these very much more efficient. I would recommend to the Government that they brush a good broad line around these conservation areas and make it very plainly visible. One of the great troubles with those areas these days is that there is altogether too much poaching; and, in many cases, this is not wilful poaching — people stray across the line because they do not know where it is. This would also serve as a first-class fire guard; with some of the very good equipment that this Government has you could go along these blazed lines — I would say they should be about the width of the road allowance — and disc them up and make a black line where you could grow grass and have a fireguard and keep fire out of there. Fire is very dangerous.

I would recommend that any deductions you take from trappers in these fur conservation areas should be spent back in the areas. It would be a very good thing. You would accomplish this fire-guarding mark around and you should also build earth dams to raise the water level in these areas and keep the beaver and rats in good supply and do everything possible to see that these are made really good conservation areas. At the same time, beavers, which proved to be a nuisance to people in the settled areas of this Province (and they are indeed a very great nuisance when they start their business of building dams — they flood big hay meadows and things) can easily be taken out and transplanted to these conservation areas where they will prove very valuable indeed. I know that has been done, but I note with regret that there is some intimation, this year, that it is going to be stopped or eased up somewhat. That has been a very good service and I wish it would continue.

I was surprised, the other day, when I got a note from a mink rancher, who said he was very hard pressed, indeed, in his mink ranching operations in the northern country. Now these people go out there, at great distances, and really do not have a very nice life away out on the frontiers of this Province, to conduct their mink ranches. They feed their mink sometimes, on a low grade of unmarketable fish that are caught in the lakes and I would expect that the Government would give them every consideration to help them in this industry, but this fellow tells me that they do not do that. They charge their \$1.00 per head for each mink on the first 100 mink, for the fish that they use. This is bad enough — but, if they have over 100 mink, then they charge them \$1.50 per mink. Well, that is worse. But — if they have over 250 mink, the price goes to \$2.00 per mink, which is almost

prohibitive! I would suggest that the Government could give these people some kind of a good deal and not keep raising the price on them all the time for the off-grade fish that they use for feeding these mink. Besides that, they have to pay a fur farm lease and a fur farm licence, and I think you might ease up on these people quite a bit.

Mr. Speaker, during last summer I spent practically all of my spare time trying to find the new constituency of Turtleford. After the professional boundary manipulators got through juggling the lines up there it was quite a job — there are two polls that I have not found yet! You go 200 miles to find one and you circle up around Meadow Lake and come down the C.P.R. line and finally you arrive at the poll of Meetoos, and I have not yet found it! I know just about where it is on the map and some day I will have to try and get in there. This was a conspiracy, we are told, over a two-year period on which there was no leak, and I suppose they got the very best of advice on fixing up these lines for the very best political purpose that they could, but I am not so sure that they did just exactly good in this case because when I commenced to get over in there I found some of my old associates that I used to homestead among, and I lived among these people for 15 years. I think they got a little bum advice there and maybe it is going to backfire.

Without regard to the interests of the people in this constituency, they have clipped off the bottom and they have clipped off the top and just threw it east and west promiscuously to see what would happen. And while the people have no very great common interest on one side as compared to the other, those on one side hardly know the people on the other side, we are going to do the very best we can to get them acquainted and working together co-operatively. I might say, though, that the people here or anyplace else resent very much being classified and poked around just on the basis of voting potentiality. They do not care about being added and divided and subtracted in order to see how they are going to come out in the voting. I think you are going to find that out in more cases than one when you have an election.

Through this new constituency of Turtleford there is no decent road running east and west through the constituency. That is a very great disadvantage and there is no road adjacent to the constituency by which you can get east and west. There is not one particle of blacktop in the constituency. There is not one unit of rural electrification in the constituency, in spite of the fact that in the southern part it is very well settled. Not one farm is electrified. I would recommend to this Government, which has been recommended before, that they do subsidize this rural electrification and give these people a chance to get electrified and keep them more on the farms if it is at all possible to do so. It is a wonderful thing to have electricity on the farm and the expense of it is just beyond the reach of these small people on the mixed farms in this country. I believe that we could find the money to subsidize, generously, this class of electrification.

The rural municipalities that I visited have found themselves in a rather confused position. They have been reduced, they tell me, to nothing much more than glorified collection agencies these days. About

March 6, 1952

everything they get hold of they have to turn over to the Government. Among their taxes they only have left the municipal tax levy that they have any control over. Whatever they get by way of public revenue or telephone tax, school tax, sanatoria, union hospital debentures — all those things have got to be turned over. They have no control over the rates and they turn them over — some of them — whether they collect them or not. In the case of the debentures for the local hospital, in one case, that amounts to 5 mills alone, this year. So the rural municipalities find themselves very hard pressed indeed. Not only that, but all of the indigents under the age of 65 -- they at least have to contribute half to the support of these people if they come on the relief roles. They are also responsible for the hospital cards that are not paid for and get themselves into very great difficulty, indeed, sometimes, over someone being sick who does not have a hospital card and runs up a very heavy hospital bill.

I suppose there will not be anything very much done for these municipalities because they have refused to be banded together and forced into larger units, according to the will of this Government. So I suppose that is the penalty they are paying for not falling into line.

Perhaps the most urgent piece of highway in this new seat of Turtleford would be completion of No. 35 highway. Part of this was done, as one of the famous 'election roads' of 1948, but when the votes were counted the thing cooled right off and nothing more happened. They also built on the other side on No. 55 and I prophesied to the hon. member for Shellbrook, a few years ago, that it would never get out of his constituency. He hardly believed me — but it never did. It is still in there and last year they stopped abruptly. I guess somebody must have noticed where the line was and they stopped there abruptly and almost made skid-marks when they pulled out and went to another place. The contractor went to work at another place. He could just as well have kept on — I do not know of any more urgent project — this road is designated highway. It is low, there is not enough material to: maintain it, even as a dirt road, and you have not done a single thing on it in eight years, so I should think it is almost due for you to do a little something on it. Of course, there is an election this year so they will tell you that they are going to do a little something, but they do not tell you how much; and if they do not get it done before the votes are counted I am afraid it will stop again just about the way it did the last time. I do not hold much hope for it. But, of course, I suppose we can fix that up after the election if we do not get it done before.

In connection with this highway, a very good and representative group of citizens waited on the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. J.T. Douglas) last year. They came from all points along this line and they represented the Boards of Trade. They went up to Prince Albert to meet him, which is a long way. They were glad to see him but I guess he wasn't very glad to see them. He did not have anything much for them. They reported to me that the meeting was not very successful. They said that he was abrupt with them, that he was also unfriendly and inhospitable to them. Among this delegation there were quite a number of C.C.F.'ers. They did not report to me that they took any memberships along, so maybe this had something to do with it — I do not know. But there were not very many came back — I can tell you that — and if you do not do something pretty substantial on No. 55, this year

it is not going to do me any harm but it is going to do you an awful lot of harm, I can tell you that.

Hon. J.T. Douglas (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, just to set the record straight. It has been said that I was not very courteous to these people, but I want to assure you that I was courteous. I want to point out that I was asked to meet a small delegation, which I arranged to do. When they arrived in Prince Albert — or, when I arrived in Prince Albert — there was an army in there and many of them . . .

Some Hon. Member (Opposition): — Are you making a speech?

Hon. Mr. J.T. Douglas: — No, a statement has been made regarding me and I am going to . . .

Mr. Trippe: — He will talk for an hour on what he did at that meeting.

Hon. Mr. J.T. Douglas: — Just a minute. I was there and many of those people came there in a condition for which they were not responsible in regard to things they were saying. I had insults handed to me, but I can assure you that at no time was I discourteous at that meeting.

Some Hon. Members: — Oh! Oh!

Mr. Trippe: — I hope that went out on the air, Mr. Speaker, that they were in a condition of irresponsibility. They did report to me that the Minister was sober. I know the C.C.F. wanted to get rid of him years ago, but they could not make it, so I do not suppose my people can do it either.

The road from Spiritwood to Leoville is a very important project, Mr. Speaker. In the town of Spiritwood they have a hospital which they are doing their very best to maintain and it is surrounded entirely by mud roads. They also have the same condition in Leoville, 24 miles away, and there they have a little hospital, with a doctor, which they are doing their best to maintain, and this territory is also surrounded entirely by mud roads, where you cannot get out at all at certain times of the year. I think just a little bit of a grant there on that road would do a lot of good for those people.

We have a peculiar problem from Turtleford to the west, leading to the ferry. Here is a municipal road that is kept dragged at the expense of the Government. It has a very peculiar situation. It is in the very northern boundary of the rural municipality of Mervin and it is in the very southern boundary of the municipality of Paradise Hill, so that these municipalities do not have very much use for this road and do not feel like putting their money into it. It runs to this ferry, called the "Turtleford ferry", I believe, according to the Government records. Sometimes it is called the "Maidstone ferry." But I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that when you get on the other side into the constituency of the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) things are quite different. Everything is fine over there. You

March 6, 1952

can drive, on a gravelled road at 60 miles an hour, for 20 some miles, right into Maidstone, with no trouble at all. But on our side, again they stopped abruptly and we got nothing.

They are doing something, this year, from No. 26 in the direction of Onion Lake by way of Paradise Hill and Frenchman's Butte and that is very much appreciated. Again, if they get anything done before the votes are counted that will be final, because I do not think they will do very much after, as long as they are in power.

My impression of the Budget, Mr. Speaker, was that it was a very large one, a very large income to this Province which, in some ways, is spent very recklessly and in some ways, in my opinion, very wastefully. When the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) is taking this money in, it is just the old inflated 50-cent dollar; it does not amount to very much. But when he is spending it, telling how much he spends, it is really a good 100 per cent dollar. There is no argument at all about that! He had increased it so many dollars from this position to that position and they are really good dollars that he spends. Well, if we take his argument into consideration and if he only collects a 50-cent dollar, then everything he spends to equal that should be twice as much as it was in the basic period, without him bragging about it at all.

There has been no relief given to the taxpayers in this Budget — none whatsoever that I can see, and certainly the relief was not provided to the municipalities which they expected and had every right to expect. It was presented to show its good points. Significantly left out was the table showing the debt of this Province, which had been included in some of the other budgets. I was somewhat surprised when I looked at the debts of the Province to find out that it has increased considerably in this period. We heard some talk about the dead weight debts and the liquefying debt and that sort of thing, but I was interested to see just what the debt was, without regard of how we thought it was going to be paid. And so we find that the gross debt increased, in this year, \$6,370,000 odd. Well, then we wonder what net amount do we really owe? How are we getting along there? We find out that, in this period, that increased to \$10,973,000 some odd. Well, that is about \$11 million. No wonder we have so much money to spend around here and there! Of course, in this election year I suppose it is required to keep everybody happy for a while.

With regard to education, Mr. Speaker, I note that we are not doing very much better than we have been doing in the past. We are still loaded with study supervisors and the Government's only solution to the problem of getting teachers seems to be to close a thousand schools. Well, that is one way of getting them, all right; if there is no other place to go finally you will get them into the few schools that are left. I am not altogether convinced that that is a good scheme to close the schools either. I have cases, in my constituency, where infants go altogether too far to school. They get up altogether too early in the morning and they come home too late at night. They put in too long a day entirely. And when they get to the places where they are supposed to go to school they do not have any better teaching conditions than they had at the school where they were going, that was closed up on them. We have them down in the basement in Spruce Lake and that is not a very good condition at all.

The Province increased its study supervisors by 61 in this period. The Turtleford School Unit is two short of what they used to be and that is a very commendable thing, but the Meadow Lake School Unit did a little better — they got four extra. There seems to be altogether too many teachers of low qualification and I am not an expert on this thing and do not presume to criticize it too much, but I wonder if we cannot all get together and see if we cannot do something to get school teachers for these children and see that a child gets at least an elementary education in this Province.

I believe that the education dollar, today, is not properly spent, regarding the basis of elementary education. There is too much overhead and the local people do not have the proper chance to say what they think in connection with the teaching of these children.

The health services are just as much of a racket as they ever were. I do not see any difference, maybe it is a little bit worse. Dr. Mott, when he was here, observed that fact, that there was altogether too much hospitalization and this Government seems to find no solution for that, except to more or less bother the Hospital Boards, who have nothing at all to do with filling up the hospitals. I am not going to offer any solution to this, because it is not my business. The Government is in power and it is their business to find out how to run these hospitals. We point these facts out to them and it is their business to correct them. We have a system which would work, perhaps, but they will not take our advice on these matters, so what is the use of talking. I know that if they had given some consideration to some of the municipalities — they were doing good work in the hospital business — that would have been really a very good thing because I have some of them in the area I represent, one particularly notable one that ran a better hospital service than is ran, today, for 2 mills taxation, right in the local rural municipality. And, today, in that same district we are paying 5 mills all over the whole district for the hospital debentures alone. So, if you would spend some of the money that you give as grants and bonuses and payments to these municipal people you would, in some cases, especially in some of the smaller hospitals, work yourself into a very nice arrangement with these people.

The health units are not over-enthused about the inspection service in connection with these health units. These young fellows go through some kind of a course and learn what should be done to have the most up-to-date and sanitary requirements in a restaurant and, theoretically, you cannot find any fault with that style of teaching. But, actually, when you come into some of the small places you are going to close up some of the restaurants if you adhere to these rules absolutely, strictly, right to the letter. We have, in a small town that I know of, or did have, very good and efficient and well-run restaurant by a lady who depended on that for her living entirely, with no other support and it was run good and it was run well. She was a very good cook. But after the inspector visited her and told her all she had to do to keep running she closed the doors because she had to. She could not stand the expense of what he required her to do and today it is closed up and we have no restaurant where we used to have a very good one right there.

March 6, 1952

With regard to forestry, Mr. Speaker, I cannot see, in spite of all the Government says, a single conservation programme. I hope that they are not going to tell the people that they are conserving anything in this Province at all. There is nobody that has gone out there and cut any brush of young growing trees in times gone by. Everyone let the young trees grow. Who in the world cut them? They are doing nothing more than what the other people did. Just let the natural growth grow. They have been a little bit lucky with having wet weather and having fewer fires in the last few years and I am glad of that — very glad to see our forests protected in every way possible. Anyone could have always cut down the logging operations and in that way you can conserve the timber. When a survey is made you know what you have got left and you can always dish it out accordingly. But I do not know of any place where they have planted a tree in my constituency and I do not think you can grow any timber without planting a few trees some place or other.

As far as the lumbering industry is concerned, this thing is just entirely the most crazy thing that I ever saw operated by any government. Skinning out the last valuable forest in this Province and making \$4.55, I think it is, net profit per thousand feet — well, I am going to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I have had a little bit to do with the lumber business. I did not make anything big at it, but if they would ever turn me loose, or any efficient operator, at the prices that prevail, today, we would be able to pay all the dues that are paid to this Province and split a melon of about 30,000 profit with them, I can tell you that.

The pulpwood, according to the theorists, or experts, in this country, is supposed to have a sustained yield basis of about 200,000 cords. Well if it has, then why don't we cut it? Why do we monkey around and cut twenty, thirty or fifty thousand cords a year? This year we are up to about 50,000 cords. Why don't we cut the 200,000? Well, I will tell you why we do not cut it. Simply because they squeezed the operators so much that they do not bother with it. They pull out of here and they go to the Province of Manitoba and the Province of Alberta where they cut this wood and get a real good price for it. I will tell you how the price happens to be known. The American buyers come here and they cruise around among people who have pulpwood on their own lands and quote them the prices and when they see that the Government is nicking them about \$6 to \$8 a cord, they quite naturally do not go for that kind of thing. They pull out of here and they just move into Manitoba and cut this and pay the Government their royalty and get the full price that they are entitled to for their work.

I would suggest that you at least encourage wood lots. There are a lot of people that have got sub-marginal land and would grow wood lots on there very successfully. I would be very glad to see any government encourage these wood lots, by the way of grants or some small subsidies, or helping them get fireguards around it, or some concession in taxes or something like that to encourage the establishment of these wood lots.

And, in their forests, it might be a very good thing if they would burn the underbrush and make some very good fireguards to stop the run

of fires in the spring. The great staff that they have got out there could go around and burn some sloughs in the spring, places where there was grass, so you do not interfere with timber and make some really good effective fireguards, instead of sitting in their office and wondering when it is going to be five o'clock.

There has been a lot said in this House, Mr. Speaker, about what the Liberals will do to you if you do not look out and this is the regular old nursery boogie-man story that I do not think the voters in this Province are going to pay very much attention to. "Just look out for the Liberals, they are going to clean you out of everything. They are going to close up the hospitals. They are going to take the buses off. They are going to do everything possible to annoy you, when they get into power." And, knowing that they are going to get in, of course, you do frighten quite a few people that way. But I am going to say, with the authority of the Liberal party and of every member on this side of the House, that we are definitely going to do no such a thing. We are not going to curtail or dispense with one single public service which is of benefit to the people and you know it over there just as well as anybody else. You are fooling nobody but yourselves. And the voters are not stupid. You may add them up and subtract them and shuffle them around for constituency purposes, but you cannot do it on this basis. You cannot fool them on that stuff. I believe that we have our finger on the pulse of the voters just as well as any of the rest of you and we know that you just do not curtail any useful services. The people of this Province know we are not going to do it and they are not going to believe anything you say about that.

You know, the people of this Province are getting a little bit sick of this old game of harking back to the 'thirties all the time. This country progresses and, like every other part of Canada, we are going forward. There is no use harking back to old times. We know that it is really meat for you fellows to have poverty among the people. That is why you came into power. It is the greatest thing that ever happened to you. You can go around here and hope that you are going to make a big thing over every impending disaster that looks like it is going to happen in this country. You can get miles in advance of the foot-and-mouth disease and make a big thing of that. I thought we had it in the Chamber here the other day the way the row was going on about the foot-and-mouth disease and it never spread out of the territory where it started yet, so it must be really a sorrowful thing for the members over there to see that they could not make something out of this and bring something out on the Federal Government over this foot-and-mouth disease. You have done the very best you could to dissatisfy the people over the wheat arrangements and the damp grain and everything that has come up, but I think the people are commencing to see through this and they do not have very much faith in this kind of an argument any more.

Mr. Speaker, with these remarks, I shall not support the motion.

Hon. Mr. T.J. Bentley: — Mr. Speaker, before the hon. gentleman takes his seat would he answer one question for me please?

March 6, 1952

Mr. Trippe: — Me?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Yes.

Some Hon. Member: — He has taken too much time already.

Mr. A. Loptson (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, I did not think the hon. member for Turtleford (Mr. Trippe) was going to sit down so soon. I had not quite finished making up my notes, but I very much enjoyed what he had to say. This is the first time that I have had the honour of being on the air since I came to Regina, and I am going to give you an idea of what I am going to talk about, because when I get through doing that you will probably realize that it will take some time to finish.

In the first place I am going to tell this House that this Government, in passing a budget of \$66 million, is no credit to themselves. If the people of this Province can stand a budget of \$66 million, it is in spite of what they have done to prevent them earning it. They would have to give agriculture credit for practically all of it. I propose to show to this House that everything this Government has done, or undertaken to do, has decreased production in this Province. This Government hoped to get a large amount of revenue out of the natural resources. I presumed, when they were campaigning and talking about natural resources that they meant the north country where there were mines, minerals and fish. Well, I propose to take the Government's own statement which was filed in this House at this session to show that in every branch of the Natural Resources, the physical production has decreased since 1944, without any exceptions. It may have increased a little in dollars, but it has decreased in volume.

Then I propose to tell the House that this Government, instead of aiding agriculture, has done much to retard its prosperity. They have actually gone out of their way to stop, and to some extent have been successful in preventing the agriculturists from getting the amount of money which he should have got for his grain, particularly. I think I can prove that by actions of the Government and the spoken words of some of its members. I further propose to tell this House that our Highway Department is on the brink of the most disastrous thing that ever has happened to any province. They have spent millions of dollars on work that is on the brink of going all to pieces. I propose to prove that to this House. Blacktop has been put on a base that was not ready for it, and millions of dollars are in danger of being lost as a result of having to tear it up and build it over again.

Mr. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition): — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Loptson: — I propose to show that, while there were people who did think there was some virtue in socialistic policies, they should now be able to rid themselves of that opinion, by the fact that socialism has now proven a failure in three of our British Commonwealth countries.

That, in itself, Mr. Speaker, should be proof enough to a sound-minded man who had thought there was some virtue in socialism that socialism cannot function successfully under a Christian democratic system. Consequently, you must apply direction or dictatorship in order to make socialism work. The best you can do is to cause a stagnating condition.

I propose to try and prove that, and furthermore, socialism is basically one of the "have-nots" envying the one "that has." That is the basis of socialism, and the policy of bringing down those who have to equalize with those who have not must, necessarily, bring down the prosperity and the standard of the country. I propose to prove that before I am through.

I am also going to prove that the C.C.F. party has become a very dangerous organization to the security of our country. I propose to show that the C.C.F. today, has become a haven of communism — that they have infiltrated the C.C.F. party to the extent that a large number of those who are not communist, but are socialist, are leaving the party. Evidence of that was very strong, in the election in Ontario. No occupational class in the country knows more about the activity of communism than the labour man in the mines and in the factories, and I believe as a result of that, the labour man, in spite of the direction of the heads of the Unions, asking them to vote for the C.C.F. as their political arm, they voted against them, because they did not want to be associated with a party endangering the security of the country, knowing how their fellow-workers felt towards that. I am going to try to prove that also.

Further, I am going to try and prove that communism is anti-Christian. I am going to prove that before I am through. And, Mr. Speaker, I am going to give some extracts that will prove it conclusively, and I will ask, also, where do some of our Christian leaders stand insofar as they are concerned, in giving assistance to any parties that give any haven, or is in any way associated with communism, in this country.

I am going to have a little fun with the Premier (Hon. Mr. T.C. Douglas) here before I am through, and I will try to show that the Premier is quite a versatile politician.

Then I propose to show you that there is an, alternative — there is no need for the people to be jeopardizing the security of this country, or the security of our Christian philosophy in order to have a party that will serve them to the very limit of their desire and their ability to pay, insofar as social services are concerned. I may tell you something about the Liberal Party. I may also tell you something about the virtue of our leader here — a man who is the most outstanding in qualities as far as ability is concerned.

Now those are the things that I propose to dwell on before I am through. Then, at the end, I am going to take the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) to task, and I propose to move an amendment. I am going to give you an idea of what is in it, and give him a chance to think it over. Maybe he wants to check on it, with the records, and it is to

March 6, 1952

this effect, that the motion be amended as follows:

"That all the words appearing after the word 'that' be struck out and the following be substituted therefor:

"In view of the increased revenues of the Province, including the increased payment from the Dominion Government, this Assembly regrets that the proposed increased school grants on an equalization basis are not to be paid from such increased revenue, rather than from the receipts from the public revenue tax; and further regrets the measures proposed do not include the abolition of the public revenue tax."

Well now, that is going to be the amendment, so the first thing I am going to tell you is that the effort of this Government to raise revenue through socialized industries has failed miserably. When they came into power it was their purpose to raise revenue out of the development of the natural resources. I believe that was their honest intention, and they went out to try and do that very thing. They socialized the north country; that was the first thing they took over under their management. They started plants of various kinds where they expected to receive profits to pay for social services. All this was done on the theory that socialism was the real thing and nobody was going to take profit for himself, and the state was supposed to get all the profit out of the operations. Well, what has happened? I think the men at the head of this experiment were endeavouring to do a good job. I do not think there was any doubt about that. The fact remains that some of their undertakings had to compete with private enterprise, who did a much better job, and consequently were able to produce much cheaper than the Government could do it under the cumbersome way they do things.

This Government is probably no different to any other government. I do not think any government can run any business as cheaply as private enterprise can do it. They undertook to socialize the forests; undertook to socialize the fish industry; and the fur has already been spoken of by the previous speaker. They have not yet undertaken to operate the mines, but they have certainly talked a lot about them. But what were the results? They surprised me. In the first place, the fishermen were paid about half as much for their fish as they could have obtained from the private buyer. This Government sold the fish for as much as anybody else sold them for, and yet in spite of them buying the fish for half the price from the fisherman. They lost in the neighbourhood of \$200,000, with the result that after the Opposition made a lot of noise about it and the fishermen kicked about it, they have thrown it out of the window and I think they have done the wise thing.

The lumber operation is much in the same condition. They drove out all the efficient lumber operators from the Province. Why? Because they undertook to tell them what they could cut lumber for and they would not give them a permit to cut lumber unless they were prepared to

sell it to the Timber Board at the price they were prepared to pay here. I know large lumber operators that went to Edson, Alberta, and they are cutting lumber there, and receiving from \$15 to \$20 a thousand more for their lumber at the siding than this Government was prepared to pay them. I was talking to a lumber operator at Prince Albert who had a private claim. When this Government was paying less than \$30 a thousand, he was selling his on a private market for \$50 a thousand. And that is why they did not get the lumber out. Oh yes, they go around and tell the people that they have a planned management, and that they are not proposing to cut any more lumber than what is being cut. That is a lame excuse, because, today, there are tens of millions of feet of lumber rotting in the north, in some of the berths that this Government has bought and paid for with taxpayers' money. The trees are rotting on the stump, today, just because they cannot get men to cut them.

I am not opposed to proper management of forests. I think it is definitely a wise thing to do, but there is a lot of lumber up in the north that they are not able to get anybody to cut for the price they are prepared to pay. If they were ready to accept a reasonable stumpage, the same as they do in Manitoba, or sell it on auction to the highest bidder, they would be making far more money out of our forests than they are today; and they would be having a lot less trouble about it too, and they would be getting it cut.

Some mention was made about the pulpwood. The Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) has stated that there is approximately 200,000 cords of pulpwood available in this Province for annual cut. This is just the same as a wheat crop, and so is any other forest. When it is ripe to cut, then it should be cut, and if you do not cut it, it starts to deteriorate — not only is it deteriorating on the stump but it is subject to destruction by fire. Last year, according to the Government's own records, in the neighbourhood of 50,000 cords were cut. In Manitoba, they cut about 220,000. In order to be fair — now maybe I made a mistake, I quoted the figures that the Board handles, there were others that produced pulpwood besides the Board; I will correct those figures — I think it is in the neighbourhood of 100,000; but it is one-half the amount that is being cut in Manitoba. But, the fact remains, that even if it was 100,000 cords they still have 100,000 cords left on the stump in this Province that is going bad, and that is being lost to this Province.

Well, then we will go and see what progress has been made in the mines, and in the fishing industry — the production of fish. That is very interesting. In spite of all the money that was being spent in filleting plants, and all the advertising and all the hullabaloo that has been made about producing fish, production went down. In 1944, the production of commercial fish in the Province was 12,295,000 pounds — I am not going to give you the odd pounds. In 1944-45 it was 10,728,000 pounds; in 1950-51, it was 8,751,000 pounds. This is not as though it made a quick drop. Right after this Government came into power, or at least started to handle the fish, in 1945-46 (I will give you that figure) it dropped from 10,700,000 to 9,600,000. In 1946-47, it dropped from that last year's 9 million to 7,700,000, so you can see it has been progressively going down under the management of this Government.

March 6, 1952

Let us take the mines. As a matter of fact, there was only one mine in this Province when this Government came into power, and today there is only one mine — after all this tremendous fanfare that has been going on about mining in the north — not a single mine, in eight years has been put into production. Now let us see what has been done in respect to production. Here we have the returns from the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting — the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting produced, at Flin Flon, in 1944 (the year this Government came in) 121,000 gold ounces (I am leaving out the odd ounces). In 1950, it dropped down to 79,000. In 1944, they produced 1,736,000 ounces of silver; in 1950, it had dropped down to 1,207,000 ounces. In 1944, they produced 73,715,000 pounds of copper; in 1950, it had dropped down to 47,963,000 pounds — that is expansion, mind you! In the neighbourhood of 20,000 pounds less. The same applies to zinc. In 1944 they produced 87,231,000 pounds; in 1950, it had dropped down to 54,986,000 pounds. That is more expansion! I am not going to read the other metals because they are insignificant in amount, either in expansion or otherwise. But that shows you, Mr. Speaker, that since this Government came into power everything that they have touched went down. It all went in reverse with them. I do not think they had a forward gear at all. They have been travelling in reverse.

Now let us take this sodium-sulphate plant which is a famous operation. I want to say this to my hon. friend, the Premier (Hon. Mr. T.C. Douglas) that he had a meeting at Dubuc last fall — and that happens be in this new Saltcoats constituency — and he told the people there, according to the reports, that this Government had been very progressive, and had started the sodium-sulphate plant at Chaplin, Saskatchewan. He said that plant was the first of its kind in Saskatchewan — the very first of its kind in Saskatchewan.

Now I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, that I want the Premier to go back to Dubuc, if he made that statement, and tell them the truth — that was not the first of its kind in Saskatchewan. Most of those people do not know what a sodium-sulphate plant is, and it is very easy to go to people like that, especially when he is the Premier of the Province, and make fictitious statements to people who do not know; and I tell him, Mr. Speaker, to go back and make it right with those people in Dubuc.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I pointed out to the people there that it was the first plant set up in this Province to use the brine method; and I explained to those people what the brine method is. As a matter of fact, when my hon. friend says that they not understand it, he underestimates their intelligence on this point, as he does on so many other points.

Mr. Lopton: — That is a wonderful way of squirming out of it. But that was not the way the people understood it. They are not particular to whether it was the brine method or not. It was a sodium-sulphate plant, and that is what they understood and the way everybody else understood the statement.

I am going to tell you what progress they made on the sodium-sulphate production. The sodium-sulphate plant at Chaplin was certainly not the first one erected in Saskatchewan. As a matter of fact, some of the

plants have been operating for 20 years, and probably longer than that, as far as I know. But here is the record: in 1946, the production, in Saskatchewan was 105,919 tons; and at that time there were four plants operating. In 1947, there was 163,290 tons produced, and four plants operating, Mind you, that is 163,000 (maybe I had better leave out the odd numbers.) In 1948, there were 153,000 tons and still four plants operating. But, in 1949 there were 120,000 tons — 35,000 tons less — with five plants operating. That is after my hon. friends had started their plant.

Premier Douglas: — More than in 1944, though.

Mr. Loptson: — You were ashamed to put the 1944 figures in here, because it was so much more that year. I venture to say that it was far more than in 1946, and that is why it was not put in this book.

Now, in 1949 after the fifth plant was added, production topped from 163,000 to 120,000 tons. I wonder what purpose there was in building that plant; when the actual production already exceeded the demand. I presume the reason why the actual production was not any more was that the market was not there for it. It just was not necessary to build that plant. Then, in 1950, the production was 133,000 tons — it went up a little bit from the previous year, but it was still over 30,000 tons less than it was in 1947, with five plants operating. In 1947, it was 163,000 tons, with four plants operating.

I have proven to you, Mr. Speaker, that everything that this Government has touched has gone back. People just will not produce under socialism.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural Resources): — Even the Liberal party!

Mr. Loptson: — It had nothing to do with the Liberal party. It is the C.C.F.'ers. You could not touch any of us.

Now then, let us see what has been done with the uranium prospect. We hear on the radio a lot said about the development of uranium. Uranium is not the only metal that we have got up in the Pre-Cambrian Shield. I am told there is all kinds of copper and silver in the area where . . .

Mr. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition): — Maybe even gold.

Mr. Loptson: — . . . uranium is being located. No one can justly say that there is a good find there, of course, but at least we could get development money to see if we have got something, if we had the right kind of government in power here. The only real development there is up north is the mind that the Federal Government is developing.

Some Hon. Member: — Socialized mine!

Mr. Loptson: — Socialized mine — my hon. friend took exception to the fact that the Federal Government took over the El Dorado mine.

Some Hon. Member: — No, I am just reminding you.

March 6, 1952

Mr. Loptson: — Well, you took exception to it. I presume you would sooner have it open so that Russia might get some of it. That was the only reason why they took it over, to keep it from going to the enemy. You took exception to that.

Now then, here is a question that has just been tabled, and it reads:

"How many hard-rock mines have been brought into commercial production, in the Province of Saskatchewan, since 1944?"

The answer, that there are none, is true. Now then, let us see about the prospectors. They are flying prospectors over to the north, staking them, spending our money for all this kind of fanfare. The only province in Canada that has ever done that.

Premier Douglas: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Loptson: — And he says 'Hear Hear'. Why? Not a single other province in Canada does that kind of thing and they do not have to do it. Why? Because they have not got a Socialist Government, that is why. And no province in the Dominion of Canada who has a Pre-Cambrian shield, or a possibility of locating a mine, has less development than right here in this Province. Again I spy the reason is because we have got a C.C.F. Socialist Government. I am going to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that after this next election, the people of Saskatchewan will change that. I know they will. I know they have good judgment for the good of this Province and for their own good. Then, without a doubt, we will not have only \$17 million invested in industrial manufacturing as the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) says — and he is quite proud about it. We will have a billion and \$17 million besides, that is what we will have.

The Provincial Treasurer says \$17 million was invested in industry. Why that would not pay for the foundation for one of the chemical plants that in going into Edmonton, this year. \$17 million is all he says we have invested in Saskatchewan, in industry. Can you imagine that? Then, who has to pay the taxes of this Province?

I am not quite through with natural resources. I must take up the oil. They have said a lot about oil. Howling about a million barrels and all kinds of things like that and people are thinking that they are getting a lot of money out of oil to help to pay the expenses.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — May I just correct the hon. gentleman? I know he does not want to leave any false impressions, and I have a copy of the Budget Speech right here. I would point out that, "in 1951, despite brakes applied by Federal fiscal policy, investment intentions surveyed climbed still higher to close to \$350 million."

Mr. Loptson: — Just look at the figures. I am just going to show you the figures — that includes all the developments. But here you say, in industrial, \$17 million off that — it was \$17 million for industries, so you cannot get away from it.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Read the page, will you please? What page is he reading from? Let us keep the record straight.

Mr. Loptson: — I am going to tell you this. A lot of people think that this Government is getting a lot of money out of oil and gas in this Province, and much has been said about it. I have a return here tabled in the House, this Session, and the question is, "How much in the way of royalty did the Government collect from the production of oil for the fiscal year 1950-51?"

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Might I ask my hon. friend a question? Are those comparable figures for 1944 or 1943?

Mr. Loptson: — And the answer is, "\$23,549." That would not pay the grease and fuel for the tractors that go around . . .

Some Hon. Member: — Is that increase or decrease?

Mr. Loptson: — . . . to clear the land for the drilling rigs. Well, that is the tremendous amount that they get out of the oil development in this Province that they are crowing so much about — \$23,540. That would pay a lot of hospital bills, I am sure!

What about agriculture? After all, agriculture has got to settle the bills. I have got a really serious story. Agriculture, in this Province, is the basis of our economy. If the farmers were to stop for two years, in Saskatchewan, grass would grow on the streets of Regina. I am telling you that is what would happen in Regina and in every other city of this Province. And when this Government does anything, or any other government does anything to retard the prosperity and progress of agriculture in Saskatchewan, they are encouraging a period of depression which this Government wants to bring about in order to create an election issue. What has this Government done in order to encourage agriculture, particularly in the last two years? How about the fuss they made last session about the wheat agreement? Why did they make such a fuss about the wheat agreement? I am going to tell this House why I think they made such a fuss about the wheat agreement. Because they were figuring on an election in 1951. That is why they did it. And in order to create an election issue, this party, through their messenger in London, by the name of Graham Spry; who, by the way, cost us from \$30 to \$40 thousand a year, dutifully got the rumour rolling around, early in 1950, that the farmers in Saskatchewan and in western Canada were not doing too badly on the price that had been paid . . .

Premier Douglas: — On a question of privilege, That statement is absolutely and completely false.

Mr. Loptson: — I am giving my opinion and I do not want you to tell yours when I am talking. I am giving my opinion.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege . . .

Mr. Loptson: — I am telling it as I see it.

March 6, 1952

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker! Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a question of privilege.

Mr. Loptson: — I am continuing with my story.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a question of privilege and I have the right to the floor. And that is that the hon. member is now making a statement that an employee of this Government, in London, went out and started the rumour that the farmers were satisfied with their payment under the 5-year plan. I say that statement is absolutely untrue. I doubt if the gentleman himself believes it, and certainly no one else believes it and I deny it . . .

Some Hon. Member (Opposition): — How do you know?

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, the very fact that that gentleman is there — he cannot be there for any other purpose than to . . .

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, again on a question of privilege . . .

Mr. Loptson: — That man, Mr. Speaker, I am saying that that is what he could have done and the rumour was created . . .

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member did not use that term when he was speaking.

Mr. Loptson: — Well then, I will withdraw the other term.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, might I . . .

Mr. Loptson: — I am giving my opinion.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Just a minute. The hon. gentleman, a moment ago, purported to read from my Speech, Mr. Speaker — this is a question of privilege. The hon. gentleman stated that, in my Budget Speech, I stated that we had spent only \$17 million in industrial development. I now have it here, and the \$17 million is capital investment in manufacturing.

Mr. Loptson: — That is what I said.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — You said no such a thing.

Mr. Loptson: — That is exactly what I said. I did say . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — You did not say such a thing. Now, I believe this person is lying and everything else.

Mr. Loptson: — Well, I am going to tell you the story of how this Government undermined the "have-regard-to" wheat agreement, in order to create issue for an election in 1951.

Premier Douglas: — Our approach — I do not care if my friend is through or not, Mr. Speaker, under the rules of this House it is improper to impute motives.

Mr. Tucker: — Well you have been doing it all the time.

Premier Douglas: — I am not asking my hon. friend for an interpretation of the rules, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Tucker: — You have done it all the time.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, it is against the rules of this House to impute motives. My hon. friend is now making the statement that the Government placed a man in London in order to create a false rumour, in order to undermine the prosperity of the farmers of this Province and in order to create election issue for 1951. I say those statements constitute an unmitigated falsehood and I deny them categorically.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order. The speaker did withdraw that statement.

Premier Douglas: — Oh, no, he just finished repeating the statement. He said, "Why else was this man placed there?"

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend would like to shut me up, but he cannot stop me from thinking.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! Order!

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, nature anticipated it 20 years ago, on that point.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Some Hon. Member (Government): — Fifty would be closer . . .

Mr. Speaker: — No one can be stopped speaking, but there are certain rules which may stop you from expressing what you think.

Mr. Loptson: — Maybe I was a little blunt about it. I know that we have to be a little diplomatic — but the fact remains, that it is my opinion that that man was there for no other purpose than to be a liaison between this Socialist Government and the Socialist Government in London, and the picture is this — it is very plain. By not making any further payment to the farmers in western Canada, on the wheat agreement, it was good business for the Socialist Government in London to get out of it, because they could then blow about how cheaply they had bought wheat and they might be able to win an election on that. That is just logic. And it was very good logic for this Government not to get any more from Great Britain for the wheat, then they could go out to the farmer and say, "you sold it too cheap", and blame it on the Liberal Government at Ottawa. And they might get elected on that score too!

Premier Douglas: — May I ask my friend if we also got Mr. Howe to cable the British Government and say they had paid enough? Did we so persuade Mr. Howe to send that cablegram?

March 6, 1952

Mr. Loptson: — No, but this is the picture. It is very logical. Here is the Socialist Government in London. They were going to get elected on buying the wheat cheap, and the Socialist Government here, representing the largest agricultural portion, were going to get elected by blaming the Federal Government for having sold it too cheap. Now, that was the game. So, having done this . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — You can still pay the other \$48 million.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Loptson: — Having done this . . .

Some Hon. Member (Government): — Why didn't they pay . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Loptson: — Now, having done this, in the early part of 1950, Mr. Atlee advised Mr. Howe, when he was in London, last May or June, 1950, they were not going to pay any more on the "have-regard-to" clause. Everybody thought there would be about 45 cents a bushel coming on the first two years — that the contract would be levelled off at \$2 a bushel. It only represented in the neighbourhood of \$130 or \$140 million, which we really expected. And if it had not been for that sort of a connivance, as I think it was, the farmers of western Canada would have got this money, because it is very seldom the Englishman ever backs down on his agreement.

Premier Douglas: — Well I can tell that the Minister of Trade and Commerce said that he does not have to pay.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — It was a nice dream!

Mr. Loptson: — As a matter of fact, here seems to be the reason for this. I am going to quote from the Manitoba Commonwealth. What do they say about the C.C.F. and the economy of the country? They say:

"The concern of the C.C.F. is to its own wellbeing, during a period of political and economic uncertainty for the immediate future."

Their concern is the developing of the party — to heck with the economy of the country, and the more they can depress it, then of course, their wellbeing is more assured.

Now then, having finished so far, and told Mr. Howe they would pay no more for the wheat, our friend, the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) goes to the Farmers' Union convention, in Saskatoon, I think it was, in November, 1950; and I happened to be there. And one of the first things he said when he got up on the platform was:

"The price that you are getting now for your frozen wheat is all that you will get. You have had it."

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I might just correct the hon. gentleman by saying that I was quoting, exactly the information that Mr. Gardiner gave us at the convention.

Some Hon. Members: — Oh no, oh no!

Mr. Loptson: — I do not care what you were quoting from. The very fact that those words, or words of similar kind should come from a man in a responsible position, representing the farmers of our country, growing the grain we were selling meant that that was all their grain was worth. He could not have done anything more to undermine a further payment, or the sale of that wheat for more than what he said it was worth. He had to have his way. Since then, Mr. Speaker, there has been in the neighbourhood of 40 cents to 50 cents a bushel paid on this wheat, according to his opinion, just that much more than they should have got. He was hoping that that payment was not coming . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — We almost dropped dead when it did come!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Loptson: — Then of course the fanfare started. Redistribution was necessary. They started the boys working on redistribution. That was all fixed up; and even the ballot boxes were got ready — all ready for an election. There was no more money coming on the "have-regard-to" clause; and the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) was sure that there was no more than 80 cents coming on the frozen wheat, and there was every reason that he could create quite a dissension among the farmers, so an election was in preparation. But something happened! It seemed that the Prime Minister of Canada had occasion to go to London — I think that was in December 1950 (Maybe I am wrong but it was in that neighbourhood) — to attend a conference of the Commonwealth Premier. He went to Prime Minister Atlee, and got him to agree to open up negotiations on the "have-regard-to" clause. Well now, you remember the looks on the faces of my hon. friends over there just after this happened. They just could not sit still in their seats, they were itching so badly. They were passing resolutions condemning the Federal Government, this way and that way, condemning the Wheat Board and everything was going strong. Then, in February, Mr. St. Laurent makes up his mind that he will send Mr. Gardiner, the Federal Minister of Agriculture, to complete negotiations under this new arrangement, and before Mr. Gardiner got to London this Government got so panicky — why, I saw them and they simply could not sit still in their seats. Their plan had gone wrong, so they finally decided to let the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. McIntosh) throw the bombshell on the possibility of getting further payment.

What did he say? I will just quote from his remarks — I do not need to quote from his speech, because I remember his words by heart. Out of the blue, in his speech, he turns over to the Wheat Agreement, and he tells the world that the British people had paid \$182 million more than they needed to do under the terms of the agreement. Why did he do that just at that time? Why did he have to pick out, two days before Mr. Gardiner got to London, so that this statement would be on Atlee's desk before he got there? Isn't that proof enough that the rest of their former activities were true — which was the main reason, leading up to the hon. Minister's statement.

March 6, 1952

Now, having, thrown a bombshell into every possibility of the "have-regard-to" clause, and of course no Premier then could pay any more, because the people of Great Britain would not stand for it. This Government, having told the people of Great Britain they had already paid \$182 million more than they needed to have paid — then why should they pay any more?

Premier Douglas: — Sure, Mr. Howe told them they had paid enough.

Mr. Lopton: — Well, I am not blaming Mr. Atlee, but when the Rt. Hon. Mr. Gardiner came back home — and shrewd as he is, he knew what the game was — he gets from the Wheat Board a grant of \$65 million which was set aside in the Federal Treasury for Great Britain, and they said they did not need it, and were not going to take it. And that just swept the feet from under my hon. friends, and that is why there was no election in 1951!

Not only that — they had the Gravelbourg by-election, and certainly did their best to exploit this wheat question, but the measly majority they got discouraged them, so that they did not dare come back to the country, and if that is not the writing on the wall of what is going to happen after this next election, then I do not know what is, of what is going to happen after this election. I do not blame some of the boys for getting into private business, because they know what is coming.

Now then, that is what this Government has done to forward the prosperity of agriculture. That is not the only thing. There was another possibility after this one was swept away. We had a bad fall, this year. It was very hard to harvest the, crop, and of course there were millions of bushels of wet grain in the granaries and in the fields — in fact I have some myself. Did this Government do anything about it? No. They sat on their fannies and never opened their mouths until the farmers themselves got busy. Why? They were hoping that this grain would rot on the ground and in the granaries so that they could make a howl about it during the next election. They do not care how much the farmer would lose.

What could have been done? Why did not the manager of the Feed-Seed Cleaning plant at Yorkton get a dryer — and here is the member for Yorkton (Mr. Swallow), he does not say a word about it. He told me that if he had been able to get hold of \$8,000 last fall he could have dried every bushel of grain within the radius of trucking distance, probably 100 miles from Yorkton. He could have put a drying plant in there that would have dried 7,000 bushels a day, that is, working around the clock — for \$8,000. Did this Government offer to put it up? No — but there was \$75,000 available for Mr. Bodnoff, partner of Shumiatcher, Douglas and Fines, for a theatre, but not \$8,000 available to lend a cleaning plant to dry the grain that was in that area; and these could have been planted all over the country, last November and December.

But, when the farmers got busy and started to help themselves, the Minister (Hon. Mr. Nollet) gets very busy. The first announcement I saw was on the 12th of February. Why, he got very panicky because he saw the thing was running away from him; he was like the boy — he ran to Mama, the Federal Government, crying and making, a lot of noise about

what he was going to do then, after the thing was out. He can hardly deny that.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Ah, you're nuts.

Mr. Loptson: — I am telling you the facts. You know that you had done nothing, and if this Government is any good at all they should be looking after local affairs. That is what they are here for. They should be giving directions. If the Department of Agriculture was any good at all, it should have been out at the end of November, or at least the first of December, distributing these driers among the cleaning plants and the mills, and there would not have been any grain lost at all.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Will the hon. member tell the House how much one of these driers can dry in a day, and how many driers would be required in the Province?

Mr. Loptson: — I will tell my hon. friend that this plant that this man wanted at Yorkton would dry 300 bushels an hour. You can figure it out for yourself. It was a stationary plant. It was not required to go around the country as these other portable plants do; and he told me all that he required was \$8,000. I asked him why he did not get it from the farmers, but he said it was pretty hard to get it from them because they did not have the cash. I said: "why don't you go to the Government — they have lots of money?" He said he did not think he could get it from them either.

Premier Douglas: — Did he try?

Mr. Loptson: — The Government should have gone to him, because that is their business. That is the situation. This Government does not want prosperity because prosperity defeats them. Prosperity in Ontario defeated the C.C.F., and prosperity will defeat them here. They are trying to bring on a depression,

Well now, what will they say about this? Socialization — New Zealand got away from them; Australia got away from them, and now Great Britain — and it pretty near wrecked that country. It is quite safe to say . . .

Some Hon. Member: — What happened to the Liberals?

Mr. Loptson: — . . . that had they been re-elected in Great Britain it would have been too bad for Great Britain and the Commonwealth.

Now how did the C.C.F. party come about? Let us have a little talk on socialism. In the first place, I know all about how the C.C.F. grew up, Mr. Speaker, because I happened to be in the area, and knew about the people that were in it. It started out of a communistic move, and eventually it became a socialistic party, and the man who was elected to lead it was J.S. Woodsworth — probably the most honest man of purpose that could have been picked — a man that never, even if it was to his benefit, would say anything that he did not believe in. He never, at any time, divorced the C.C.F. party from the Communist party in Russia. Can anyone say that he made such a statement?

March 6, 1952

Premier Douglas: — That is absolutely untrue. I have heard Mr. Woodsworth again and again, from 1932 and 1933 on, repeatedly divorce the C.C.F. movement from any Communist party, or anybody having communist philosophy. My hon. friend knows it, and he is standing there deliberately trying to misrepresent the situation.

Mr. Loptson: — I am going to tell you that the only way he divorced it was in the dignified manner of getting power. Let me read Mr. Woodsworth's words here.

Premier Douglas: — Read all of them.

Mr. Loptson: — Here is a statement he made in April 23, 1935.

Premier Douglas: — Where? In the House of Commons, or where was it?

Mr. Loptson: — He made it before a thousand people in the Central United Church . . .

Premier Douglas: — Reported in what?

Mr. Loptson: — I will read you the whole article. I quote:

"The Socialist, Mr. Woodsworth says, stands for the abolition of capitalism. Our ultimate objective is collective ownership and operation of all wealth production, and to show conclusively this entire fealty to the Russian Soviet . . .

Mr. Woodsworth made this statement quite clear:

". . . and unequivocal declaration before the C.C.F. rally of 1,000 people on April 23, 1935, at the Central United Church in Winnipeg Manitoba:

"The doctrine of the C.C.F. is the doctrine of the United frontal Communists."

Now, will you deny that?

Premier Douglas: — I certainly do, and I do not believe my hon. friend can produce any such . . .

Mr. Loptson: —

"and all that keeps us apart is a difference of tactics and a suspicion of insincerity."

Now, that is Woodsworth.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, until my hon. friend can produce a document, rather than a piece of typed paper, I would say that I am not prepared to accept that statement, and I do not think any other sincere person will.

Mr. Loptson: — I know my hon. friend can deny anything. He is used to that anyhow. Here is another statement that was made a week later. Mr. Woodsworth, at Fort William, explained the Russian system and then he said: "Can it be done in Canada?" He said that himself and answered it himself. He says, "that has been done in Russia." And here is another statement: . . .

Premier Douglas: — What did he say? What answer did he make?

Mr. Loptson: — He answered it himself. He said it has been done in Russia.

Some Hon. Member: — What is the truth?

Mr. Loptson: — Well, you can go all the way down the line, but do not think that I, for one moment, think that all the people in the C.C.F. party are communists. I do not think so. I do not think there is more than 10 per cent of the C.C.F. party that are communists, but 10 per cent is just 10 per cent too many. It only takes one out of 10 communists to handle the party.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Was Woodsworth one?

Mr. Loptson: — If you had a Communist in your outfit, today, I will bet he would be dominating the whole crowd in no time.

Now then, what does communism stand for? The very fact that this C.C.F. movement got such a popularity is due to the fact that men like Woodsworth, who came from the Christian church, was leading it; and due to the fact that other men who came from the Christian church were leading it. Now maybe it was not harmful at that time. We were not so much concerned about communism at that time as we are now. Communism was not nearly so prominent, and they had not such a hold as they have had since the last war, because Russia was an ally of the free world. Communism became quite popular and these men, today, and I do not mean men on the street whom we can identify — there are men in every walk of life, they are in our universities our schools, they are in our defence departments, in our government service — not only this Government service — but in all government services — they are all over. And that is all the more reason why we should not have a party where they can be protected as something that they are not. Socialism is the first step towards communism. Nobody can be a communist unless he is socialist. That is certain. Communism is only a method of bringing socialism into effect by a method of administration.

And the hon. Premier (Hon. Mr. T.C. Douglas) can laugh at that. He is, himself, responsible for dragging a lot of innocent people into this party — people that do not want socialism. I am going to give my hon. friend all the credit that his geniality and his popularity has brought in the way of votes for the C.C.F. party in this Province, and he is guilty of getting these people to vote for something they do not want. The people are not socialist in this Province.

Mr. Erb (Milestone): — You are smarter than that.

Mr. Loptson: — I am going out to your constituency and tell your friends that. You are not any more of a socialist than I am.

March 6, 1952

Just because you think there is no danger of communism at the present time, does not mean it will not exist if we let it go too far.

Here is the situation as it stands today. We are in the midst of preparation of defence of our country. I do not think it is possible for anybody, as a communist, to get a job on a defence project. I doubt it. I would not accept a communist to build a ship or an airplane, or any of these important weapons of war, because it would be very easy for these men, who are very clever tradesmen — just as clever as anybody else — to make a sloppy job and it can fall to pieces when it is put to work. How would you like to have your son in an airplane with a defective brace, or bad welding on a wing, which may fall off when it gets up into mid-air? And yet that man can get that job through the C.C.F. party, because he can go there as a socialist.

I am not through with my hon. friends yet, because we have some of these men sitting right on your side of the House, Mr. Speaker, who have already indicated that they are not too friendly to the United States and the United Nations, and if they are not too friendly with them, then who are they friendly with?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Loiptson: — It is about time that the truth was told. At least five Ministers of this Government have already indicated that they are more friendly to Russia than they are to the United States, or the United Nations. Now then, from that standpoint I would say that it would be very difficult for anybody to reason out any justification why he should vote for the C.C.F. party and endanger the security of our country. And that is what he would be doing if he voted for the C.C.F. under present conditions. That is a fact.

Now then, I am going to take the other side. How about the Christian side of it? What is communism? Oh yes, Russia is a pretty fine power. The Dean of Canterbury supports communism. Dr. Endicott supports communism. It cannot be bad. These men are high up in the church. The Premier (Hon. Mr. T.C. Douglas) says there are only four points difference between communism and the C.C.F. policy. True, these four points are important; but they do not mean much when a communist gets hold of them. They soon set them aside. Now, how does communism fit in with Christianity? Let us just see what George Williams says about it. He has an article in his book — after he went to Russia, in 1931. He wrote a book, and here is what he says about Christianity in Russia:

"All Russian officials must be socialists . . .

Of course there is no doubt about that.

" . . . The Socialist Government of the USSR claimed that the church is the greatest bulwark of capitalism. They are opposed to all the existing orthodox churches, and do not consider them fit opponents for any set of ethics. They consider the church to be institutions of hypocrisy, mysticism, superstition, and claim that all existing churches

are a brake on the wheels of progress, and anti-religion is frankly taught in the schools."

I wonder if there is anything such as this going on in this country.

Let me give you another example, where the Minister of Education of U.S.S.R. is quoted as saying at a meeting in Budapest, in October, 1949, and it was quoted in "Outlook" which is a pamphlet edited by Gladstone Murray, and this is what was said there: (Oh yes, I know it is pretty hard to take, and you do not like it over there, I know, but just the same you might as well have it). He says:

"We hate Christianity and Christians; even the best of them must be looked upon as our worst enemy. They preach the love of our neighbours, which is contrary to our principle.

"Down with the love of our neighbour. What we want is hatred — we must learn how to hate, and it is only then that we shall conquer the world."

Now this is the outfit that you fellows are friendly to. Yes, five Ministers at least have identified themselves that they are more friendly to Russia than the United States and some of the private members also. I wonder who my hon. friend from Saskatoon (Mr. Stone) will consult when he gets this economy wrecked, as he proposed in his speech in this House; and our friend from Yorkton (Mr. Swallow) he echoed the same opinion.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of material here that I would like to read over, but I do not think my hon. friends are appreciating it. But here is the situation — we have some ministers of the church and of our Christian society promoting socialism.

Mr. Speaker: — Might I tell the hon. member that I have listened for some time now; and while I know it has been the custom to give a great deal of latitude in these debates, I think we are going far beyond that latitude when we are quoting people who have nothing at all to do with this Government, and discussing philosophies that have nothing at all to do with this Government, and attacking, directly or indirectly, the people's religious views.

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, if anything has to do with finance it is the principles and policies of governments and parties. Surely, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to have a communist regime here in the future, then we do not need to worry about what the budget is. To you and me it does not matter what is going to be in the future, but you and I have children and grandchildren, and it is our duty to hold up the principle which we think is going to be to their benefit; and any aggregation, ideology or party, that tends to a policy that is going to enslave my children and my grandchildren, for all the rest of their life, then it is my duty to go out and fight it; and I have never heard of a more insidious movement ever perpetrated on an innocent public as this C.C.F. Socialist party in Canada, and it is done largely by members of the Christian church. You

March 6, 1952

cannot deny it, and it is our responsibility to put it down, because it is now becoming dangerous. If they do not wake up it will get beyond their control. I know young people who go around the country saying things that are not very creditable to the church. Where do they get it from?

Mr. Wellbelove (Kerrobot-Kindersley): — The example of other people.

Mr. Loptson: — Exactly. From the C.C.F.'ers. From the C.C.F. policy and from some of these Christian ministers that support them. There is no socialist today — after the trial in three British countries — that can say he should be a socialist any more. He should be finding another place to go. You cannot make socialism work unless you wreck the economy first, and then you will get communism to put it back on its feet again. No one knows less about economy than the hon. Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Sturdy).

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question? Could he still be of the opinion that he was, in a previous session, when he said it was a communist that started the Wheat Pool?

Mr. Loptson: — Certainly. I will give you the names of them. They believed in communism. They did well when they started with the Wheat Pool. They were actually responsible for it, and they pretty near told the Wheat Pool what to do until about 1929, when they wrecked it, that same crowd. They are not there now, so you cannot get away from that, but here is the situation . . .

Premier Douglas: — Neither can you.

Mr. Loptson: — There is the situation. Now the alternative is this — as I was going to tell you. Every person now that is going to get away from this socialistic idea, unless he is communistically inclined, will have to find another party to vote for. There is only one other party to vote for that can give social services, such as my hon. friends are always talking about, and is able to make the economy so that it can pay for those services, and that is the Liberal party.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Overseas?

Mr. Loptson: — Yes, and I challenge my hon. friends . . .

Premier Douglas: — "My bonnie lies over the Ocean."

Mr. Loptson: — . . . to give one sound reason why a Socialist cannot vote Liberal. I can tell you that socialism is out of the question. The only thing you can get in its place is either communism or fascism. You have to have a dictatorial policy in order to bring socialism into effect. Liberalism is a reform party. It was established as a reform party. Liberalism has done much for Canada, and you all know it has done much for Canada. The Liberal party is made up of people from all walks of life. They do not owe their existence to any particular faction. From labour to capitalists, bankers, preachers and teachers, and every other class of people come Liberal supporters, and the Liberal party is what the people make it; and if my hon. friend, the Premier of this Province, had worked within the

Liberal party, he might have done some good. Now he has a situation that is very harmful and dangerous.

Our leader of the Liberal party will be Premier after the next election, and he is going to give the best government that Saskatchewan ever had. He has never belonged to any more than the one party all the time . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker (Hanley): — He called himself Progressive.

Mr. Loptson: — He called himself progressive, but that is just Liberals in a hurry. But you cannot say that about the hon. Premier here. You know he has had a most colourful political career, and he is smart, too. When he started out in politics he did it the right way. He did not do it like you and I, by going to our friends of one party — he got them all together, lumped them — all except one — he could not get the Liberals. First he went and made a deal with the Conservatives; then he took the nominations from the Social Credit; but he files his nomination for the C.C.F., and then along comes a communist, and he says, "we will give you a push too." So, ever since, he has had to satisfy these four factions. Consequently, he travels so far apart. In New York, he is capitalist; down where the Bolsheviks are, he is a Communist . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Where is that?

Mr. Loptson: — . . . but in the ordinary rank and file he has this Social Democracy party — I think that is really for the Social Credit but then he has another one — he says, "we are going to have free enterprise, we are going to have free co-operation, and we are going to socialize only such industries as tend to be monopolies." Well, if he wants that policy, he has got to be a Liberal, because that is what the Liberals have been doing, ever since they were organized, going on to 70 years.

That is going to be the chore of the people next election, to choose between the man who has no policy at all, and the man who has one sound policy, and that is Liberalism, and it is going to be the one that is going to put this country on its feet.

Before I sit down I am going to move an amendment, seconded by Mr. J.E. McCormack (Souris-Estevan):

That all the words after the word "that" be deleted, and the following substituted therefor:

"in view of the increased revenues of the Province, including the increased payments from the Dominion Government, this Assembly regrets that the proposed increased school grants on an equalization basis are not to be paid from such increased revenues rather than from the receipts of the Public Revenue Tax, and further regrets the measures proposed do not include the abolition of the Public Revenues Tax."

After the Speech from the Throne . . .

March 6, 1952

Mr. Speaker: — Order! This is the Budget debate. You have already propounded your motion.

RE ADMISSIBILITY OF AMENDMENT

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, before matters proceed, I would draw your attention to the fact that it is contrary to the rules of the House to introduce a matter during the Session which has already been disposed of in a previous debate. On Wednesday, February 20, the following amendment was moved to the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. The amendment read as follows:

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

That was, may I say, defeated by a vote of 26 to 18. Now here is a motion in the same Session, which concludes with these words:

". . . and further regrets the measures proposed do not include the abolition of the Public Revenue Tax."

I would take it, Mr. Speaker, that under the rules of the House, the subject matter or proposal has been negated in one debate, and it cannot then be introduced in another debate during the same Session.

Mr. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, the amendment proposed and voted on in this House was regretting that the programme outlined in the Speech from the Throne did not propose the abolition of the Public Revenue Tax. It further went on to say:

". . . or any practical plan to assist municipalities, school boards and other local governing bodies in financing the additional responsibilities being placed upon them and meeting increased burden of local taxation."

That was the amendment voted on there. But in the programme ready by His Honour, there was, first of all, no provision for the abolition of the Public Revenue Tax, and also no practical plan to assist the municipalities. Now, we proceed in the Session and the budget is brought down and we have a proposal in regard to the Public Revenue Tax which does not provide for its abolition. It provides for certain use to be made of it. Now then, we say, in regard to that specific proposal that we express dissatisfaction with the proposals in the budget, and express the view that the proposals would have included the use of the increased revenues of the Government to pay the equalization grants; and should have included the proposal to do away with the Public Revenue Tax.

We are dealing with two different things. In the first place we were dealing with the proposal laid down in the Speech from the Throne. Here we are dealing with the actual concrete budget proposals.

Now, it is a most amazing thing, Mr. Speaker, it would be a most amazing thing, if, because in the general proposals laid down in the Speech from the Throne, we regretted there was nothing in those proposals providing for a scheme to assist municipalities, providing for the abolition of the Public Revenue Tax — then, when we do get the proposals regarding what is to be done about the Public Revenue Tax, that we are precluded from expressing our opinion that the Public Revenue Tax should have been abolished in the budget and providing that we regret that the increased revenues are not going to be used to pay these proposed equalization grants which the present Government proposes to pay out of the Public Revenue Tax.

They are two different things altogether, Mr. Speaker. In one case we are saying that the speech from His Honour should have had something in it about the Public Revenue Tax, and should have had some workable plan in it to assist the municipalities. Here we are dealing with the concrete proposals of the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) and we are saying that the concrete proposals should contain two things. Firstly, the abolition of the Public Revenue Tax and the next thing, that it should provide for the payment of equalization grants out of increased revenues.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that motions like this have been moved over and over again in this House by previous Oppositions. I checked it up, Mr. Speaker. Motions along this line have been moved by the opposition to the Anderson Government — and they were moved by the C.C.F.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Not two in one session.

Mr. Tucker: — My hon. friend says, "not two in one Session." Just because they deal with the same sort of thing — the question of taxation - is it to be said, Mr. Speaker, that because in the Speech from the Throne you have dealt with taxation and the raising of money, that you cannot deal with it in the budget? That would really be some way to head off proper decision and discussion in regard to the budgets if a member in this House could get up and make a motion in regard to the Speech from the Throne and have it disposed of and then say, "Now, we cannot have a vote on this question in the budget", when the actual proposals come on, why, of course, our rules do not permit that sort of thing. Our rules, after all, are to enable the members to express their views on the actual budget proposals and they are designed, not only to allow the members to express their views on it, but to have everybody vote as to whether they are in favour of the financial proposals of the Government, or whether alternative proposals should have been brought forward.

All we are doing here is to say that instead of going into supply in regard to carrying out what the Provincial Treasurer proposes, we say that there should have been in those proposals concrete suggestions in regard to payment of school grants on an equalization basis.

March 6, 1952

I submit, it would be a most amazing thing to say that in this most important thing of all, Mr. Speaker — the granting of supplies to Her Majesty — that we are not to be permitted to put ourselves on record, or have the Government put on record . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Tucker: — Well, that is what it is.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Who said that you are not going to be permitted?

Mr. Tucker: — I am arguing that if the Premier is . . .

Mr. Speaker: — You are arguing on this motion.

Mr. Tucker: — Yes.

Mr. Speaker: — The motion can only be judged whether it is in order, on a specific thing. And that is whether the question has not been resolved by a vote in this House. That is the only question that has to be taken under consideration, and on that ground I rule this motion out of order because the last paragraph of the motion governs the whole of the motion and,

"further regrets the measures proposed do not include the abolition of the Public Revenue Tax."

That question has been put to the vote and resolved by this Legislature. Therefore I rule the amendment out of order.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, Your Honour did not follow my argument.

Mr. Speaker: — I followed your argument and I rule this out of order.

Mr. Tucker: — All right, but I must appeal your ruling then. I must say that I think it is a most amazing ruling and I appeal from it, Mr. Speaker, without any hesitation.

Premier Douglas: — There is a point that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) has made, with reference to the first part of the motion, and that is that it is making a concrete criticism of certain financial provisions in the budget; and at that there can be no objection. But when this motion which was voted on in February 20, was before the House — I raised the question at that time as to whether or not the motion was in order, in view of the fact that it properly was an amendment to the budget.

I pointed out that it was not customary for a Speech from the Throne to deal with budgetary matters and suggested that the amendment which was moved at that time could be more properly moved when the budget came down. You, Your Honour, thought it was in order and I, of course, bowed to your ruling because you know a great deal more about the rules of the House than I do. But the fact does remain that the House, on that day, 20th of February, 1952, recorded its opinion in precisely the same words as the last phrase in this amendment:

" . . . regrets that the measures proposed do not include the abolition of the Public Revenue Tax."

It now reads:

" . . . regrets the measures proposed do not include the abolition of the Public Revenue Tax."

Word for word, exactly the same thing on which the House has already expressed its opinion by vote. And I draw the attention of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) to Beauchesne's parliamentary rules and forms, third edition, citation 325, page 132:

"A motion or amendment cannot be brought forward which the same in substance . . . (this is identical in wording) . . . as the question which has already been decided, because a proposition being once submitted and carried in the affirmative or negative cannot be questioned again but must stand as the judgment of the House."

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is crystal clear that those last words which I read and which are identical with the words that were voted on, on February 20, makes the rest of the motion automatically out of order.

Mr. Speaker: — That is exactly the grounds upon which I declared this amendment out of order.

Mr. Tucker: — If I might answer the Premier, the motion that was made was that we regretted that this was not in the Speech from the Throne. The hon. Premier invited his followers to vote against that amendment because he said we did not know what was in the Budget Speech and he held out that idea to his followers. You will recall, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! This is not a matter of rebuttal between one side and the other. What really matters if we are going to settle arguments in this Chamber, according to precedent . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Can I not argue the thing in answer to the Premier?

Mr. Speaker: — If you will confine your argument. The Premier just cited his authority. He has cited his authority and if you will confine your arguments with the authority, that is permissible.

Mr. Tucker: — Yes, yes. The point is you cannot have the same thing decided, or debated, twice. To show that this is not the same thing, the Premier — one, that it should have been in the Speech from the Throne, that is the first thing. Now we say it should have been in the budget and the Premier invited his followers, as I say, to show you that they are separate things. He says, "we are going to bring forward proposals in the budget and therefore it should be voted down now." That was the argument. So does that not show that it is two separate things? Of course it is two separate things.

March 6, 1952

The first thing we said was that it should have been in the Speech from the Throne and we made that motion. Now we are saying, when the actual proposals have been brought down, as the Premier said they would be — and he invited his followers to vote the motion down because he said, "we are going to have proposals in the budget" and they voted it down on that basis. Some of them, perhaps, did vote it down on that basis. Now, we get the budget proposals and we regret, then, that they do not provide for the abolition of the Public Revenue Tax. They are two separate things altogether, Mr. Speaker, and if you maintain that ruling, well, of course, all I can do is appeal against it.

Mr. Speaker: — Might I point out to the hon. member that the function of this House is to decide on certain questions that are proposed in the proper manner. That is the function. As I read the rules, they state that when any question has been resolved by the House in the Session that question cannot be propounded again; and that is what I base my ruling on. I rule that this Amendment is out of order because the last paragraph governs the whole of it. And I understand you are appealing my ruling.

Mr. Tucker: — Yes.

The question being put by Mr. Speaker: "Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?" — It was agreed to by 29 votes to 15.

The debate continued on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Fines:

"That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair. (The Assembly to go into the Committee of Supply.)"

Hon. J.A. Darling (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, somehow or other, this afternoon, having listened to the hon. gentlemen opposite, I feel peculiarly uninspired to proceed with the debate. I have sometimes sat on this side of the House and listened to what I regarded as a point of view which it was possible for a sensible man to entertain, and I have sympathized with his point of view. This afternoon, I am sorry I cannot compliment the opposition on the speeches that we have been compelled, as representatives of our constituencies, to listen to.

I would like, however, in the few moments in which I intend to speak, to compliment the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) on the presentation of the budget. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that it is necessary to defend that budget, and in spite of all that our friend across the way has said, I am confident that the record of this Government, during the past seven years — eight years nearly — will give to the people of Saskatchewan confidence that this budget is in the best interests, particularly if they give it due consideration.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the most outstanding feature of the Budget is the disposition of the Public Revenue Tax, which has been the subject of so much contention. I seem to remember, in the early stages of the debate, that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) referred to the disposition of the Public Revenue Tax, which is proposed in the budget, as trickery.

Now we did not think of it as trickery when we were considering this, Mr. Speaker. We did not look at it from the point of view of the Leader of the Opposition. But on thinking it over and trying to place myself in his position, I realize that, from a political point of view, he is in just about as difficult a position as a person would be who tried to retrieve a broken string of beads in a crowded streetcar. His position is very difficult with respect to this disposition of the Public Revenue Tax.

I feel that the public will notice two things about this: One is that, in response to the recommendation of the Britnell-Cronkite Commission, the Government has shown a willingness to release, or to let go of \$1,600,000 from its general revenue; and that, as an interim proposal, is going to do something which everyone in Saskatchewan would like to see done — do something towards the equalization of educational opportunity and education costs in this Province.

I have no doubt whatever that there may be those who are prepared to see the tax simply wiped off, but that this proposal will be accepted as a reasonable interim proposal. There is a resolution on the order paper which proposed that a Royal Commission be set up to inquire into, and to recommend on, the problems which have developed in this Province as a result of the economic and social conditions in the rural areas, as a result of farm mechanization.

Mr. Speaker, I have noted that in the terms of reference, one of the subjects which they will study and recommend upon, is the further adaptation of social services and educational facilities, to meet changing rural conditions. It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that it was not an unreasonable point of view that we should leave those things — that is, anything that deals with educational conditions or situations in the rural areas — that we might well deal with these things on a temporary basis until we do get the report and recommendations of that Commission.

Now Mr. Speaker, I want to spend some time on my departments. I feel that the time available to me is insufficient to go forward with the Power Corporation, so I hope that you will allow me to adjourn the debate in a moment or two, and that you will allow me, tomorrow, to deal with the Power Corporation. However, as Minister of Public Works, I would like to at least mention that department. I am sure every member here has noticed the new Administration Building which is now in course of construction on the Legislative grounds. It is hoped that this building will be ready for occupancy sometime next summer, and it is proposed — our present intention is at least — that it will house three major Government departments, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Social Welfare and the Department of Natural Resources. We are proposing to make that building a model insofar as space utilization is concerned. We hope that within it, we will be able to house, comfortably, departments which, at the present time, are occupying much more space than they will need there, because of the architectural characteristics of old-type buildings.

So I am looking forward to being Minister of Public Works, possibly, when that time comes, and I hope to see those three departments in modern, well-ventilated, air-conditioned space, where they will be able

March 6, 1952

to carry on, close to the main administration building here, and in even greater comfort than they enjoy at the present time.

Another project which I am looking forward to carrying through to completion is the Training School for mental defectives, which is under construction at Moose Jaw. We are now working on the administration and hospital building, and upon six cottages. Those six cottages will house 600 patients. That will not be the ultimate capacity of the institution, but it will be the capacity to begin with. I might say we are also doing work on the boiler-house, and there will be stand-by generating equipment there to take care of any power breakdown which might possibly occur.

The hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff) will be delighted, I am sure, that we will be making substantial progress on the Home for the Aged in the town of Melfort this summer — and I think, Mr. Speaker, this will be built in plenty of time for the member for Melfort. This building will be of the most modern type of architecture for this type of institution. It will occupy only one floor. I understand there is only one institution of its type on the North American continent, and that is somewhere in the United States. I understand, too, that they are planning one somewhere in eastern Canada, but I cannot tell you the exact location. It is a strictly utilitarian type of building and will be designed to house 150 persons.

Now Mr. Speaker, those are the principal items which will occupy the Department of Public Works during this season — oh, I should speak of the University Hospital. We are making substantial progress there; in fact we are making much faster progress there than we had hoped for, and every time I visit the city of Saskatoon I get a great deal of satisfaction in observing the progress that has been made since my previous visit. The treatment of cancer is being carried on in wing "G" — that is the first wing of the University Hospital which was built, and I am told within a very short time the blood bank there will be ready — that is, space for it will be ready — for occupancy. I am more than pleased to be associated in any way with the construction of an institution which will very definitely, for a long period of time, be regarded with pride by all the people of Saskatchewan.

When I spoke last in the Legislature, we were still busy with the construction of the filtration plant at the mental hospital at North Battleford. I would recommend anyone who goes to North Battleford to go and visit that modern plant — it is really a model and is doing a very satisfactory job. They had, for a long time, at that institution, difficulty in obtaining adequate supplier of clean, pure water. Now they have a filtration plant which will provide 1,200,000 gallons per day, which will be ample for a long time. I think we should congratulate the Public Works engineer, Mr. Middleton, who stayed right on the job there, and who was so proud of it when I visited the place, that I think he showed me every last bolt and every bit of mechanism in that filtration plant.

Mr. Speaker, with those few words in connection with my Department of Public Works, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:45 o'clock p.m.