

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fifth Session — Eleventh Legislature**  
**23rd Day**

**Tuesday, March 11, 1952.**

The House met at three o'clock p.m.  
On the Orders of the Day

**STATEMENT RE FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE**

**Mr. Walter A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition):** — I would like to say a few words in regard to the question of Foot-and-Mouth disease, and perhaps ask a question of the Minister in regard to the matter. As the members who attended the conference last Friday of leaders of farm organizations will remember, Mr. Gardiner told them that he was going to interview the Government of Manitoba today in regard to endeavouring to get them to lift the embargo against the import of our animal products into Manitoba. I wish to assure the Government that if his efforts in this connection should prove unsuccessful, I would like to assure the Government that in any reasonable steps they may take to persuade the Manitoba Government, or any other provincial government, to permit importation of our farm products into those provinces, they will have the support of the Opposition.

We think that all possible steps should be taken to prevent the limited and now rigidly isolated outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease in a small area of Saskatchewan from doing any more harm than can be avoided to the livestock industry of Western Canada. Maintenance of embargoes on delivery of livestock by other provinces not only dislocates the industry but over-emphasizes the importance of the outbreak in other parts of the world, and may considerably delay the lifting of embargoes against importation of our animal products into those countries. The longer these provincial embargoes are maintained and the more controversy there is about the matter, the more harm will be done to our livestock industry which has already been so severely damaged. I thought it right at this time to assure the Government that in this very important matter, that is so very important to the livestock industry of Western Canada, in any reasonable steps they may take to co-operate with the Federal Government in getting provincial embargoes lifted, or in any reasonable steps they may take in the matter they will have the full support of the Opposition.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, with reference to what the hon. Leader of the Opposition said, I can assure him that we certainly appreciate any co-operation in that direction. But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to this House that in our opinion, and I think it is generally recognized by everyone, that the Dominion Government constitutionally has and administratively has for years had complete control over contagious animal diseases. It has an extensive meat inspection service

**March 11, 1952**

that protects the people of Canada, and it has been our thinking all the while, Mr. Speaker, that this is definitely a Dominion responsibility. Although, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the reason we have this confusion at the present time is because the Dominion Government did not simultaneously act when they announced the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease that they were taking under the control the movement of all livestock and the marketing of livestock, and the maintenance of prices on same throughout the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, we have a Dominion Health of Animals Branch that inspects meat and inspects livestock, and when a clearance is obtained from the Dominion Health of Animals Branch, in my own humble opinion that product is permitted to go interprovincially anywhere in Canada. However, in view of the confused situation now, we will certainly be glad to receive the co-operation of the members opposite, and we will certainly solicit the co-operation of other provinces and the Dominion Government in trying to rectify this very confused situation.

### **STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER**

**Mr. Speaker:** — Because of certain discussions that have taken place in this legislature, and also because of certain editorials, in my humble opinion, the honour and integrity of members of this legislature has been brought under question and as I am in a position where I cannot enter into any debates I think I should have the accordance of the House to make this declaration which I propose to table. This is an affidavit by myself and reads as follows:

"I, Tom Johnston, of the city of Regina in the Province of Saskatchewan, make oath and say that I have been a member of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan since anno Domini 1938, therefor I am not now, nor have I at any time since I have been a member of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, been the holder of any lease, permit, license, grant or other disposition or contract with Her Majesty or with any public offices or department of the Government of Saskatchewan or any corporation thereof, with respect to any mines, mineral rights, timber rights. Also I have no direct or indirect financial interest in any company dealing or operating same, either in my own name, or by the interposition of any trustees."

I think I am entitled to protect my own integrity, and I wish to table this affidavit.

## BUDGET DEBATE

The House resumed from Monday, March 10, 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. Harry Gibbs (Swift Current):** — Mr. Speaker, after that announcement you have just made, I think I could go on record too, because I intend to make such an affidavit before we leave this Session. I neither have any interest nor own any oil or mineral rights, nor, at least for the present, do I intend to, so we will just put that on the record to keep the boys simmered down.

Mr. Speaker, once again it is my privilege to compliment and congratulate the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) on the fine budget he has brought down, and again it will prove to the people of our province that the C.C.F. Provincial Government is keeping pace with development and expanded economic conditions which the era in which we are now living calls for. So it is only reasonable to expect that in advancing progressive measures and while existing under an inflationary monetary system (thanks to our Liberal Federal Government), naturally more money will have to be spent, and if this money is being spent on behalf and for the benefit and welfare of our people and the province as a whole, then I am greatly gratified, for in my opinion I sincerely think the Hon. Provincial Treasurer has done a good job and I am sure that future development and events that take place in the province of Saskatchewan will bear this out.

In listening to the speeches of my hon. friends, the members of the Liberal Opposition, (and I think you will agree, Sir, that so far this Session we have had an overdose), it seems to me they appear to be pretty desperate in trying to find some solid ground for argument. Their methods of attack have been practically identically similar, the basis of which is to undermine, destroy and condemn the good work and fine legislation the C.C.F. Government has given the people of our Province. I honestly believe, Sir, that the majority of the people of our Province recognize the fact that they have the best government this province ever had. I know my hon. friends do not want to be reminded of the days of the hungry 'thirties, when this province was under Liberal administration. Oh no, they want us to forget some of the terrible things and conditions our good people were subjected to under their administration. Lots of frozen codfish — you could half-sole your boots with some of the stuff that was coming into this province at that time.

This is a black picture, Mr. Speaker, and always will be, because undoubtedly, with tongue in cheek, bountiful private enterprise was, and is to them today, "everybody for themselves, and the devil take the hindmost." No, no, my friends, I do not think you will ever fool the electors again. Too many of them recall the black snake whip of so-called Liberalism which was applied in those dreadful days, and they know it will be God help our province, if they ever get back into office.

**March 11, 1952**

Just yesterday, Mr. Speaker, once again proving to our Opposition that the people behind this C.C.F. Government — I believe it was the member for Canora (Mr. Kuziak) that mentioned the contributions coming in, and lo and behold, Mr. Speaker, even the dollar bills were falling from the gallery — they were falling from the gallery like pennies from heaven — like that old song, "Pennies from Heaven." Well, that is a good sign; that is a good sign, Mr. Speaker. You know, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition):** — But you only got \$1 back for every \$5 you put up there.

**Mr. Gibbs:** — That is okay. We did not get it looking through the knotholes, you know, wooden legs or anything like that.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it is amazing to me how contradictory my honourable friends of the Opposition are, because on the one hand you have heard two or three of the members from the Opposition give credit to this Government for the things they have done, but most of them will not give us credit for doing anything and say we have done nothing, which I think will sound to you, sir, stupid and ridiculous. To me, well, it is rather cheeky and impudent, I thought. And, Mr. Speaker, I know that we, on this side of the House, have cause to be proud of the record and achievements of the C.C.F. Government since first elected in 1944. They have brought down legislation second to none in the whole of the North American continent, and our Liberal friends know it. Yes, they know it, Mr. Speaker. The Hon. Ministers of the Crown who have previously spoken have given excellent detailed reports on their various departments, and I am sure the people out in the country who have heard these speeches and reports will be enthused at the remarkable progress and development that has, and is taking place under this administration of a Saskatchewan People's Government, for without going into repetition of figures there is no gainsaying the fact that the health and hospitalization plan was one of the finest things ever brought out in this western hemisphere, Mr. Speaker. You take our air ambulance plan — surely, our Liberal friends are not going to say they had all these things before we came into office. And apart from that, I would just like to read briefly a report on the battle of cancer that is going on in this province. Once again, we were the first government and the first province to ever think of the Cobalt bomb, and I think that is something.

We are not out, as our Liberal friends would have the people think, to destroy everything. Yes, we do destroy some things. We are trying too — and that is one thing we are trying to destroy, Mr. Speaker, is the cancer in the human beings of our province. The Liberals could have done it, the Federal Government could have done it long ago, or gone into this field if they had wished to. I will just briefly quote a report in The Leader-Post — "Cobalt 60 Battles Cancer":

"The Cobalt bomb is one of the first major applications of atomic energy to the field of medicine, Dr. H.G. Johns of the University of Saskatchewan, Physics Department said Thursday night at Central Collegiate. Dr. Johns, who designed the first Cobalt bomb and helped install it in the University of Saskatchewan last year, spoke on Cobalt 60 in Cancer Therapy. His address was the last in a series of talks on atomic energies sponsored by Regina College.

"He forecast that in the next few years there would be a large number of Cobalt units in Canada. 'Canada is the only country in the world that can make the cobalt bomb,' he said, 'the bomb will produce as much radio activity as all the radium in the world. Construction of the unit was financed by the Saskatchewan Cancer Society. Research was financed by the Saskatchewan Cancer Society, and the National Cancer Institute. There is at present one other Cobalt unit in operation at the University of Western Ontario', he said, 'and the design and measurements for it were done by the University of Saskatchewan graduates. The machine is slightly better in cancer treatment than a 3 million volt X-ray machine that would probably stand 3 storeys high and cost about \$200,000 to build,' he said, 'yet the Cobalt unit at the University is relatively small, weighing one and a half ton and would cost about \$50,000 to build. The Cobalt Bomb is not a new treatment for Cancer,' he said, 'it might present the possibilities of improved techniques, but the principle of treatment is not new. There are two means of removing cancers', he said, 'X-Ray and surgery. X-Rays will eventually disintegrate any human cell, but healthy cells are less susceptible than tumors, and tumor growth can be destroyed by radio activity that has no appreciable effect on health surrounding tissue.

"The cobalt used in the unit at the University was excavated in the Chalk River atomic pile. This pile is the only one in existence with sufficiently concentrated activity to excavate cobalt sufficiently for an efficient cobalt bomb,' he said. 'The active cobalt consisted of 25 discs of cobalt which were left for a year in the atomic pile. They were put into a container and packed in a lead-casing. Work for the special head was done in Saskatchewan by the Acme Machine Shop."

**March 11, 1952**

So you see, Mr. Speaker, we are going places, as far as that is concerned. Then, again, a better and pronounced higher education and introduction of the Larger School Units, compulsory auto insurance, development and expansion of electrical power and telephone lines. Can our Liberal friends honestly say that they brought these assets to the province? I am asking them that, Mr. Speaker.

Highways and roads are above the standard — and I might say too that yesterday our good friend, the member from Melville (Mr. Deshaye) mentioned something about ferries — about some of the ferries that his Government has cut off since we came in office. Well, my gosh, Mr. Speaker, it is true, we may have, but what did the Liberal administration pay to the ferrymen when they were in power? Practically nothing — two-bits an hour, and they had to go and look for wherever they could get a meal. We have done something as far as our labour legislation is concerned in this province, Mr. Speaker, and I know that our Liberal friends know that. We have done a whole lot for labour, bringing up the standard of living that our Liberal friends never brought about, never would think of putting into action.

And I might say too, there was some remark about the highways, being blocked and one thing and another. Well, when the Liberals were in power, the highways were shut off year after year. They were blocked up with snow, and they never attempted to get them clear at all, they could not clear them — they were only cow trails anyway, they could not get down them.

Then again, Mr. Speaker, in the agricultural world, we are giving farmers, through agricultural radio broadcasts and ag. rep. division, up-to-the-minute information on agricultural research, livestock, crop problems and general farm activities, etc. I think there is a lot of credit coming to the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) in this province. I think he has done a good job and the farmers out in the country know he is doing a good job, so I say good luck to him — let him carry on, because in my estimation he has given the farmers of this province something that they have never had before as long as this province has been in operation.

And we come down to Labour Legislation, Mr. Speaker. Labour legislation, which provides collective bargaining. Just listen to this, my friends, collective bargaining, minimum wages, holiday with pay, 7.5 per cent under Workmen's Compensation and a great many others too numerous to mention. Some of my hon. friends will have the audacity to say that these things were invoked when they were in power. I say they were not, Mr. Speaker, because right today I can prove that Liberalism and the Liberal Party have been an enemy of labour ever since labour was brought about way back in 1893 under the Independent Labour Party.

And I would just like to say some of my hon. friends try to defend their stand on labour. You cannot defend their stand on labour, but I want to tell them that Liberalism was never a friend of labour. I could take you back to the formation of the Independent

Labour Party, back in 1893, when according to Keir Hardy and Bob Blatchford, Liberals were the sworn enemy of labour, and did all in their power to break organized labour. And today, my friends, Liberalism and the Liberal party is practically extinct in the Old Country. I know that my friends are going to yap and talk about the defeat of the Labour Party a few months ago. Were they defeated? According to the popular vote, my friends, they were not. They had over 200,000 of the popular vote over the Conservatives, and that is why I say now — yes, I know the member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) — every time I look at him he puts years on me — but I am going to tell you, Mr. Speaker — you see, they blame everything on the Labour Party prior to the election. I would just like to show you Lowe's cartoon a few months ago, because I want to show you that here is Mr. Butler, and he is a kind of a magician, and he has got on the verse here, "You would like to know what I have got under my hat" — and presto, cuts, cuts, cuts, out comes the axe, and then Shocks, Sacrifices, Austerity (this is under your Conservative Government), but look, the heart of the nation beats true — he pulls a heart out of the hat — then he drops it kerplunk in the hat, and the damn bottom of the hat falls out.

Then here on the side, here are two old middle-class women — we call them morons, talking to one another, and the first one says, "Isn't it a privilege to help dear Mr. Butler to save the country?" So the second middle-class moron she says, "How we would have howled blue murder if it had been that Gateskill saving it." And that is just the way it goes — just the way it goes.

Now I will mention some of the labour things. Why, the ones I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, are enough to confidently return any government to office and I conscientiously believe the public in general will give that confidence to a government who has had the courage to give them all this progressive legislation, because I think you will agree that it has given us all a better standard of living and security, and that in itself is the mainspring of life, happiness and comfort.

It is quite true that our old-age pensioners are not getting enough, and I quite agree and concur with my hon. friend, the member for Morse (Mr. Gibson), when he spoke the other day and said that the C.C.F. would press for increased aid for all persons 65 years and over. And I certainly do not think it would affect the Federal purse unduly, considering its budget surplus of \$721 million, and that brings me back to my definite stand on socialism. Because, the other day my hon. friend, the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson), was castigating the members on this side of the House for having this political belief. In his remarks, he said we were not Christians. Well I would like to tell my hon. friend that I believe I am certainly as good a Christian — if not better — than he is. At least, Mr. Speaker, I am not a hypocrite, nor do I pretend nor intend to practise hypocrisy.

Once again I want, to point out to my friends opposite that thousands, yes, hundreds of thousands of socialists have given their lives and blood on the battlefields of Europe for freedom,

**March 11, 1952**

democracy and pure love of their country, and we Canadians are no exception. I think the hon. members should feel ashamed of themselves for making such a remark. Some day it may come home to them.

At this time I would like to draw to the attention of the members of the House that I believe the Peace Lobby which the members received a few days ago was very enlightening. Although I only saw one Liberal member present, I personally was impressed, because no matter what others think, I believe the members of the peace organization are sincerely trying to bring to the attention of all governments the world over, the urgent need for peace and bring to an end this terrible bloodshed and slaughter that is taking place. And I say again that if more and more people were thinking and advocating in terms of peace rather than war maybe we could impress upon our governments to apply some money they are spending in materials of destruction to the fields of construction. Mind you, I know we have to have a defence programme, but surely we can be reasonable, and deal with these matters intelligently.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to quote what I read in the paper the other day of Mr. Wickens — Major A.J. Wickens, Q.C. of Moose Jaw, who is the Dominion President of Army, Navy and Air Force and I would just like to quote very briefly that he is going over to Paris where this delegation will represent somewhere in the neighbourhood of 40 million men, who were soldiers, sailors all over the world. Their mission is peace, Mr. Speaker; they are going on a peace programme and their slogan is 'Peace with Freedom', Mr. Speaker — 'Peace with Freedom' — and I have great admiration for anybody, or any organization who will go out sincerely and try to bring peace into this troubled world of ours. Surely to God we have had enough slaughter and bloodshed, and wars to do us for all time.

I could go on and read you some more, but I have not the time, so I am going to pass that up, about this peace programme. And that reminds me, too, of a quotation of what socialism means to an old lady friend of mine which is worth repeating. And this is what she had to say, what to her, socialism was:

"I believe in the full plan of life, the intellectual with the physical and the spiritual and the social. Socialism then to me is this: How can I be happy intellectually, physically, spiritually and socially if you are not happy intellectually, physically, spiritually and socially."

And you do not need to laugh because that is quite right. You guys over there do not know what it is. It is about time you started to read something that would put something into your noggin. And that embodies, Mr. Speaker, a great deal of what the common people are thinking and hoping for today. We are not wanting war or bloodshed on our doorstep. We wish to live generally in peace, happiness, and comfort, and without class division and surely, in a great country like Canada, this philosophy can be accomplished if we get together and oust the bitterness



and hatred from our social and political life.

I just want to make a few remarks about the oil and gas and minerals, which our friends over there used to say we could never bring in, and the C.C.F. Government — maybe they are sorry because they see it coming in — maybe that is what is bothering them. And I want to say too, Mr. Speaker, that it happens to be, shall we say my luck, the first gusher in the province happened to come in in the Swift Current constituency. Just like the bridges, Mr. Speaker, and I would just like to quote you briefly — wait a minute — I would just like to quote you briefly that one of the big oil fellows says, oh, this is Mr. Tucker's — I cannot give you that — it would only waste time. Where the heck is it — I had it here — no, I cannot find it just now.

I am just going to read you briefly what some of the big oil people say. This is from the Sun in Swift Current — it is out of the Sun:

"The Sun's correspondent sends the news along this week that last Wednesday five large tanks of oil were hauled away from Fosterton No. 1 well, each holding approximately 2,600 gallons or 75 barrels, destined for refinery at Saskatoon and that 4 to 6 of these trucks leave loaded thus every day. Drilling at No. 2 is done and a 3rd site for step-out will be made ready."

Now, we go on to say:

"Cars and equipment of oil companies including huge sectional machinery are now a common sight passing through Swift Current in tremendously large trailers. The activity is accentuating and when the warmer weather comes in it is expected this city will be a source of a bane for some very active oil industry movement."

Now, I wonder if our friends really think we have got oil up there, Mr. Speaker. I know the Leader of the Opposition is doubtful, and he is bemoaning because he was doubtful whether we would ever get a bridge, and he is doubtful whether we would ever get any oil when lo — under my desk I have got a sample of that — Mr. Speaker, that is a sample of the oil taken right from the well at Fosterton . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Don't make a mistake and drink it.

**Mr. Gibbs:** — I tell you it is so good — and I see quite a few bald heads over there, I believe it is good for that too.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Have you tried it yourself yet?

**March 11, 1952**

**Mr. Gibbs:** — That is the oil, Mr. Speaker, — I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, it is only a bit of fun anyway, but nevertheless that is the oil and I would be very glad to make a present of that to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) to show him that oil is at Fosterton, and because of that, we expect great activity in the very near future.

Now, I am just about ready for finishing off, but before I do finish off, once again I have got to bring to the Leader of the Opposition's notice that here we have got a picture of that bridge which says that "when" we get Jimmy Gardiner's dam it will be washed out. I do not believe that, and I do not believe any person in this province believes that, because they have never told us when this dam is going in. It might be 10 years, 20 years — yes, it might be 50 years from now. But I would say to the Leader of the Opposition that there is a very good picture in the Department of Highways annual report, and it is worth framing and I am going to advise him to take that home and frame it.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I had better do it right away before it is under water.

**Mr. Gibbs:** — I don't care whether you do it right away, or whether you get two of them, and then you will have them for all time. Mr. Speaker, my time is up, there is a lot of stuff I would like to give you, but we have got to be fair on this sort of thing. I would just like to quote you what Bob Blatchford said in 1907. This is for the benefit of my Liberal friends over there, and he said:

"The real importance of Socialism is the demand it makes which is the demand for something greater and nobler than bread and butter."

And I agree with him. And so, Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks, I will conclude and for the benefit of my friends over there, I would like to give them a toast, a good old Scotchman's toast, so "Here's tae us; wha's like us. De'il the ane is left!"

I shall support the motion.

**Mr. J.W. Horsman (Wilkie):** — Mr. Speaker, when my hon. friend across the House produced that bottle just now, and watching his performance, it just crossed my mind as to whether there was anything besides oil in that bottle. However, I listened with much respect and interest to his remarks. His opinion of the Liberal Party, of course, is not a very good opinion, and if everyone has that opinion, I am sure there would not be any Liberals in the country. But fortunately, Mr. Speaker, we do not hold that same opinion — if we did, why there would not be any Liberals here.

I would like to congratulate also, the Hon. Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) for the very masterly manner in which he introduced the budget. It was a real budget — a sunshine budget, you might call it — something in it for everyone! That is the way it appeared.

However, after the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson), our financial critic, got through with that budget, it did not look quite so rosy. A good many of the frills were torn off, and it was pretty well shattered. However, the hon. Treasurer does enjoy throwing the millions around — he always did ever since he has been here in this House. It must be a great experience — an experience that very few of us will ever have. The budget is the largest in the history of this province. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that we should be unduly critical of a budget just because it is the largest in the province. It would seem to me that the principal thing about a budget, large or small, is the manner in which the money is spent and distributed, whether it is distributed fairly, throughout the province, so that all parts of the country get a little out of it, and get a fair share of the money that is being expended.

I am quite sure of this, Mr. Speaker, that the people of my constituency will watch with a great deal of anxiety just how this money will be spent, as to whether it will be distributed throughout the province in an equitable manner. Not being an expert on financial matters, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to go into the financial aspect of this budget. I intend to confine my remarks to one or two things that I have had experience with. I was very much interested a few days ago in the address delivered in this House by the hon. member from Prince Albert (Hon. Mr. McIntosh), the Minister of Municipal Affairs. He spoke in a very clear, concise manner that everyone could hear; I like to listen to a speaker when I can hear everything he says. I do not suppose, however, that he expected everyone in the House to believe everything he said — that is the way he said it. However, he gave a very nice address. He spoke of the many hundreds of miles of roads that this government has built; of the many miles they had re-built, and the hundreds of bridges they had built and repaired. When he got through I wondered if there were any roads at all in the province, before they came here.

He spoke of the much-improved position of the rural municipalities throughout the province; the great change in road construction and road equipment. True, most R.M.s are in much better financial position than they were eight or ten years ago, just the same as most farmers and business men in the province are much better off than they were eight or ten years ago. The reason for this, Mr. Speaker, is not hard to see. We are passing through, and have been passing through, the greatest period of prosperity and high income that we have ever experienced in Canada. This prosperity is not by any means confined to Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker; but it is much more evident in some of the other provinces. Prosperity in this province is due, very largely, to what happens to the agricultural industry, as almost our entire economy depends upon the success of agriculture.

My, hon. friend from Saltcoats (Mr. Lopton) speaking here the other day made this observation. He said that if agriculture stopped producing for two years, the grass would be growing up the streets of Regina, and that, Mr. Speaker, is true — it is true. In those areas of our province where crops have been good or fair, coupled with fair

**March 11, 1952**

prices for our products, the farmers are in better financial position, I believe, than they ever were. This does not, however, apply to those areas in the province where crops have been poor. The prosperity of the farmers in this province is reflected in every other business, no matter what it is in the province. When we consider that around 85 per cent of the entire wealth of this province comes from agriculture, we can easily see why that is a fact, why, when farmers are prosperous, everyone else is prosperous too.

I would like to deal for a few minutes with some of the rural municipalities in my area. This period of prosperity through which we are passing affects the rural municipalities exactly in the same way as it does the farmers and the businessmen. Due to better crops and better prices, the municipal councils have been able to collect their taxes; in that way they have been able to pay off their debts, and in many cases they have been able to buy heavy road machinery, which they have needed for many years. Every hon. member in this House knows well, or should know, that during the war years heavy road equipment was not obtainable — you could not get it — but a great many rural municipalities throughout the province built up cash reserves during those war years, so that when this machinery did become available they would be in a position to buy it and pay cash for it. That is what they did. This was just good business on the part of the rural municipalities, and I fail to see, Mr. Speaker, where the government should try to take any credit for that fact.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Horsman:** — Now, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. McIntosh) also stated that public works and education were the principal problems of the rural municipalities. That is true, Mr. Speaker, they are the two principal problems, but my municipalities have other problems besides this. Those municipalities which provide health services for their people at a considerable expense to them — and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that those health plans in the rural municipalities is something that should be helped and encouraged by our government. If you keep these services close to the people, let them handle it themselves, handle their own money and do their own work, you will get a far better service at a greatly reduced rate than any other way. We have had health services in our municipality and adjoining municipalities for a great many years, and no one wants to drop those services, Mr. Speaker. They have always been very, very, satisfactory. We pay doctors on a fee-for-service basis now; we used to pay them by contract. I remember the time in the 1930's when we owed doctors in one town over \$10,000; they never turned down one of our patients; they knew that sometime things would take a turn for the better and they would get their money. That is how good this plan has been.

Then there is the health regions. My constituency is part of Health Region 13. I have no particular complaint to make about the health region, but our levy in one municipality there was \$692 last year. The service we get for that does not amount to an awful lot to a rural municipality. The sanitary officers they have through the country

do some good in the town, in keeping the restaurants and eating places cleaned up, and to see that everything is in a sanitary condition, and that refuse of all kinds is kept from piling up in the alleys and places like that. But out in the rural areas, I have never seen one of them checking up on a farm, to see if things are cleaned up or not — if they did, they would have an awful job anyway.

Then we have the district health nurses who go around and inspect the schools, see whether the children's teeth are in good shape, and whether their tonsils are also; they perform a good service in the summer-time, but in the winter when the roads are blocked up they cannot get around the country, Mr. Speaker. We like to see them around the country — they are really nice little girls — and I think they do some good, but I do not know what they do in the winter-time.

We have the dental clinics, too. I think the dental clinic in Region 13 has been on the go now for about three years. Up to the present they have not covered the entire region. I was in the office of one rural municipality about two months ago, and during my conversation with the secretary I was informed that the dental clinic had given no service whatever up to that time. He also told me that they had written the Secretary of the Health Region, and told him that they would not pay their levy for 1951 until they had received some service from this dental clinic. Well, this R.M. in question is in very bad financial circumstances, due to crop failures since 1944 up until 1950; in 1950 half or a great part of the crop was destroyed by grasshoppers, half of the balance was left out under the snow; in 1951 they had a wonderful crop — last year, but half of that municipality was wiped out completely by hail, and half of the balance of the crop is still out under the snow. So if there is any place that this service of the dental clinic was needed, this one municipality certainly did. People in that municipality, Mr. Speaker, would not be there — I do not know where they would be, but they would not be there if it had not been for what help they received year after year from the Prairie Farm Assistance Act, Family Allowances, and things of that nature — services which are rendered by the Federal Government at Ottawa.

So I wish to state, Mr. Speaker, what when the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. McIntosh) said the other day that taxation in rural municipalities were not out of line with their income, it certainly does not apply to a municipality like the one in question. The Minister also mentioned some of the rural municipalities (some of the other ones in my constituency), and he said that taxes had only increased slightly, since 1947. If he had gone back to the time before the large school unit was formed he would have found an entirely different picture. I am not criticising the larger school unit, but I just want to leave the record straight, and show you how taxes have increased. A year before the larger school unit was formed in municipality 381, the tax rate for schools was a little less than 7 1/2 per cent. The first year after the unit was formed, the tax rate was 15 mills, Mr. Speaker. That was raised later to 17 mills, and I understand this year it will be raised to 20 mills, which will be just about two and a half times what it was before that date.

**March 11, 1952**

You go down in that area, Mr. Speaker, go to some of those farmers who are paying \$80 on a quarter-section for school tax alone, and try to tell them that taxes have not increased; well, they would think there was something wrong with your head. And the main reason, Mr. Speaker, that the mill rate has not increased even more than it has, is due to the fact that in many of those municipalities there were large outstanding amounts in arrears of taxes. The different councils through the country knew, or figured, at least that they would collect some portion of those arrears of taxes each year, which that did, and that made it unnecessary to raise the tax rate any higher. The municipal tax rate and the school rate both will have to go up when those taxes are collected. There will be a very sharp rise in the mill rate when these arrears of taxes have been collected.

The Minister also mentioned the great increase in freight rates during recent years, and he said the rise in freight rates was costing the farmers more than their taxes were. That may be true — that may be true, but I want to point out that the rural municipalities, Mr. Speaker, have no jurisdiction over the freight rates, but they do have some jurisdiction over the tax rates, and it would seem to me that when other expenses are high, expenses over which they have no control, that it would seem to be good business to keep other things at a minimum.

Now, payment of taxes on Government property — I understand that is coming into effect this year. What good will that do to the rural municipalities, where the government have no property at all? It might help the cities a little. It won't help the small towns any, either, because this government has no property in the small towns and the rural municipalities. There is a power plant in Unity — I hope they pay them some taxes on that — it will probably help the town out a little.

Now, the extra school grants which they propose to pay from the proceeds of the Public Revenue Tax. Money collected directly from the municipalities — they are not giving us anything — they are just handing us back the money that we pay in — nothing else. That is the system. I am sure this system, Mr. Speaker, will remind men all over this province of the equalization grants which have been paid to certain municipalities in recent years from the fund established from the extra payments that were made years ago on the Public Revenue Tax. The origin and history of that fund is too well-known to municipal men in this country to need any further explanation from me. Those grants were paid from money that was property of the municipalities, Mr. Speaker. The increased grant now that they propose to pay from the Public Revenue Tax will be from money collected directly from the municipalities, and it is my opinion that if the Public Revenue Tax were abolished, that the average municipality could carry on their business, build what roads they needed, without any help from the government whatsoever.

Now, the Department of Agriculture, the Minister (Hon. Mr. Nollet) did a lot of talking about what his department does. I am willing to say that they do a lot of good. They have seeded down land to grassland that was blowing away, and things like that; — and established community pastures, and so on. Those are good services, but there is a group of people in my constituency who have done a good deal more than that, as far as land reclamation is concerned — that is, as far as it affects

them. The land — there is a strip of land there right near town, very light soil, and I remember a few years ago on a windy day you could not see across the street in town. The land drifted and covered the roads, and built up on the fences and everything else, and the people found that something had to be done or they would have to abandon that land. So they started sowing broom-grass; they thought they would get a little fibre back into the soil, and grow a little hay, and probably keep a few cattle or something that they could make a living out of. I have seen the time when you would not give a dollar an acre for that land, Mr. Speaker. But you cannot imagine the difference there is now. Wind erosion is a thing of the past. Most all, the weeds have been killed out — even wild oats, and some of the best and cleanest seed which you would find anywhere in Saskatchewan is being grown there on that broom-grass soil. Those people, when they got into that position where they could see something had to be done, they did not sit down beside the road and howl for somebody to come and help them. They turned out and solved their own problems, Mr. Speaker, and they did it absolutely on their own.

They have developed since then a broom-grass industry in that country which has become a major industry among the farmers there. Last year there were six million pounds of broom-grass seed sold in Unity alone, and that was about half the amount produced in that area. Many of those farmers just grow broom for seed altogether now.

That solved their problem as far as wind erosion and weeds are concerned, and if the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) can manage to keep that toad flax, which is so prevalent in his area at home, I think these farmers will have the weed problems solved as well. And they did it, Mr. Speaker, without any assistance from anyone.

I was not surprised when the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. J.T. Douglas) announced his programme in the House a few days ago. I was not surprised by the fact that nothing in that announcement had stated that any money would be spent in the Wilkie constituency. Perhaps it is a good thing. We are so used to that now, that I think you know, if he were to announce that there was an amount of \$100,000 to be spent on highways in Wilkie, that some of the people up there would be so shocked that it might be fatal to some of them. I know people, Mr. Speaker, of the age of yourself and myself, where their heart may be a little weak and a shock like that might just be fatal.

But at the same time, there are thousands of dollars being spent in the surrounding constituency. Black-top upon Cutknife constituency on No. 5; money being spent in Kerrobert-Kindersley, and in Biggar to the east, and we are told, Mr. Speaker, that this is not discrimination. I do not suppose it can be discrimination, because we have the word of an honourable Cabinet Minister that it is not discrimination — but I wonder what it is! It must be something, when the same thing will happen year after year. We will have to call it by some other name — I suppose it is just a pure coincidence! Anyway, a rose by any other name would smell as sweet — we all know that.

**March 11, 1952**

The Hon. Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. J.T. Douglas) also told us that day that his programme was laid out to connect the large centres of population. I would just like to tell hon. members of this House about the large centres of population that were linked up when Highway 40 was built from Battleford to Alberta border. Now, the first centre of population after you got out of Battleford is Prongua — it is not even a hamlet. I do not think there are ten people living there. The next place is Sweetgrass, a flag station on an Indian reserve. The next place is Gallivan, a very small hamlet. Rosemound, Cutknife — Cutknife is the largest village on that stretch of road, with a population of 410. Wilbert, another place — it is not even a hamlet, just an elevator there and that is about all; Tatefield, another small hamlet, Carruthers, another small hamlet; Freemont, another small hamlet. Freemont, however, is quite an important place because that is the hometown of our Minister of Agriculture — used to be. The next place after that is Neilburg, a nice little village of 213 people, and the last one on that road, Mr. Speaker, is Marsden, a population of 140. That is how the larger centres of population were connected up when Highway No. 40 was built.

Now, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. McIntosh) also told us during his speech that more money would be given to the municipalities to help them build main market roads. We were told in a few years we would have a good network of roads over the country that you could drive anywhere on. I am right behind the Minister on that, Mr. Speaker, ever since I have been a member in this House that is one of the things that I have advocated very strongly, that more help be given municipalities in the construction of main market roads. If you could help them to gravel ten miles of road a year in each municipality, in ten years, Mr. Speaker, you would have 100 miles of gravel in each municipality, and you would have a network of roads that could be travelled anywhere on in this province.

Now, that is about all I have to say, as my time is running out. There is just another thing I want to say. From the course of his remarks yesterday, the hon. Minister of Public Health (Hon. Mr. Bentley), in speaking of the address made in this House by the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson), he did not criticize very much anything the hon. member had to say — that is, nothing in particular. He did not answer any of his arguments at all, but just ridiculed him. He thought he was putting on a very nice show. But ridicule, after all, Mr. Speaker, is not such a nice thing in a House. It seems to me that things like that are below the dignity of a parliament. My hon. friend from Arm River, (Mr. Danielson) once said that "ridicule was the last refuge of a scoundrel." I do not want to say that the hon. Minister of Public Health is a scoundrel, but do think that when a man like that resorts to ridicule of that kind, it is just about one of the last things, and one of the meanest things he can do.

Mr. Speaker, you may have gathered from my remarks that I will not support the motion.



**Mr. Jacob Benson (Last Mountain):** — The first thing I want to do, Mr. Speaker, is congratulate my hon. friend who sits behind me. I want to welcome him into this corner. I issued an invitation last Session to all the members of the House, and told them that I would be glad to welcome any of them that wished to move up this way, and at the beginning of this session, my group increased by 100 per cent, and the leaders of both parties in the House, I am quite sure, would give their eye-teeth if they could have their groups increase by 50 per cent. A little later on I am going to extend to the members of the House a very cordial invitation to move up into this corner.

I want to commend the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) again on the job he did in delivering his budget speech. He does do an excellent job each year. This year he seemed happy to recall that his prediction of a few years ago had come true, and that he now had a budget of over \$60 million. The budget is, of course, approximately \$66 million, and I am quite sure, judging by the supplementary estimates that we have had in this House during all the years that the present Government has been in office, that before the end of this present financial year, if they remain in office, they will have spent over \$80 million. He appeared to be proud of his big budget. The money for this budget still has to come from the agricultural wealth of this province. There is not yet any other known source of great wealth in Saskatchewan, but the government is hoping, along with everyone else in this province, that because of the exploration and other developments that may take place, that we may yet obtain great wealth from new mineral and new oil production in Saskatchewan, and I am sure that everybody in this province is anxious that this might be so.

In my opinion, the budget is too big, and our provincial services are too extended for the present economy of Saskatchewan to maintain. The government has made no apparent effort to economize; the government has developed a bigger complex, bigger budget, bigger cabinet, bigger civil service, bigger patronage. I just want to read from Page 3 of the platform of the C.C.F. in regard to what it says on civil service:

"The C.C.F. has always opposed party patronage as a basis of civil service appointments. We believe patronage and its attendant graft and corruption to be one of the greatest evils from which Canadian political life suffers. The C.C.F. pledge is that it will, when elected to power, remove the civil service from the influence of party patronage."

I will quite agree that to some extent the civil service was removed from the evils of Liberal party patronage, but there is a little bit of C.C.F. party patronage evident here. The Government has launched on a bigger spending spree; the Government believes in bigger profits, a bigger industrial school, a bigger educational tax, bigger motor fleet and I want to say that some government of the future is going to have to get its feet back on the ground.

**March 11, 1952**

Now, in regard to this I want to read from Page 10 of the Platform:

### **GOVERNMENT ECONOMY**

"The C.C.F. realizing, as it does, the deplorable financial position of this province has been placed in by the inefficiency and the patronage policy of succeeding governments, pledges itself to bring about economy by:

(1) relieving the Treasury of the drain of maintaining party workers through patronage, by placing civil servants under an independent non-political commission.

(2) by reducing the number of governmental inspectors to a level that will provide efficiency.

I am glad both sides of the House agree with this!

(3) By re-organizing of departments to remove overlapping.

I notice the Provincial Treasurer is very enthusiastic about that one. We have four departments of the government now engaged in the work of clearing land in the north. It seems to me there is a little over-lapping there.

(4) By refunding the public debt at a lower rate of interest.

I want to give the Provincial Treasurer that credit, as he has done his best along that line.

(5) by drastic reduction of the number of numbers in the Legislative Assembly.

(6) by reducing Cabinet Ministers' salaries.

The Cabinet Ministers' salaries were reduced by \$1,000, I think, per year, but instead of eight Cabinet Ministers, we now have 12.

**Mr. Gibson (Morse):** — And they do twice the work.

**Mr. Benson:** — When this inflation spiral is over; and adjustments have to be made, then the grief begins. Prices of agricultural products are definitely on the downward trend. Every farmers' organization is aware of this. We are on a defence economy now. It appears that this situation may grow worse. The bigger ideas of the government have failed to solve Saskatchewan's greatest problem — that problem is, the problem of population and its related industrial development. To my mind, that is the most serious problem that Saskatchewan has to face at the present time.

There are, I understand, somewhere between 150 and 200 teachers in this Province of retirable age, and I want to say in all seriousness, Mr. Speaker, that if one-half of the teachers who are eligible for retirement, today, decided to draw their superannuation, the Teachers' Superannuation scheme would go on the rocks, financially, unless the Provincial Government really paid large sums of money into that fund.

We notice in the Annual Report of the Teachers' Superannuation Act that, in 1948-49, there was actually a deficit. In 1949-50, that deficit had increased to \$38,000; in 1950-51, there was a deficit of \$92,000. The deficit I am referring to, for the Minister of Education's benefit, so that he can follow it, is found under THE SERVICE PENSIONS ACCOUNT of the Teachers' Superannuation fund, as per balance sheet, Statement (1). It is true that there is a balance, today, in that account, of \$229,000. By 1947 there was a balance in the service pensions account of \$369,000, and that balance of \$369,000 is becoming depleted so rapidly that, at the end of June 1951, there was only a balance of \$229,000; and I say that if one-half of the teachers who are eligible for retirement, would all of a sudden pour their applications in for their superannuation pensions, that this scheme would be in danger of going on the rocks, financially.

It is true that the Minister of Education (Hon. Mr. Lloyd) dealt with some cases. I wish he would take a case of a teacher who now has rendered, say 30 or 35 years of service, and who will be retiring, say in five years time. I would like to know the extent to which the proposed amendment would actually benefit such teachers.

The Minister of Education pointed out that the average pension, in the year 1943-44, happened to be about \$520. He also pointed out that, in 1950-51, the average pension was somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$1,100, or, as he said, nearly double. But he and other members on the Government side of the House talk a great deal about the value of the dollar having gone down. Now if the value of the dollar has gone down for the Government, the value of that dollar has also been reduced for those who are receiving superannuation pensions. And if you reduce that \$1,100 pension of 1950-51, by taking into account the increase in the cost of living, you would find that that pension is only worth \$600, roughly, if you translate it in terms of the dollar of 1943-44. In other words, if there has been an increase in the average pension between the years 1943-44 and 1950-51, that increase, Mr. Speaker, with all due deference to the Minister of Education, has been only from \$520 to approximately \$600. Is that a good enough pension for teachers to retire on? I think, Sir, you will be the first to admit that that is not good enough — that that is not as good as the resources of this Province permit — that that is not as good as the people of this Province would like to see, and it is certainly far, far short of being sufficiently attractive to retain in the teaching profession, the type of people that I would like.

Again, when the Minister closes the debate, I would appreciate very much if he would deal with another problem arising out of this second reading of the Bill, and it is this: It is becoming the accepted opinion of an increasing number of teachers that the retirement pension should be not less than 70 per cent of the average salary of the highest five-year period.

**March 11, 1952**

Then the other problem we have today in Saskatchewan is the problem of damp grain. Last year we had frost, this year we had very, very wet harvest weather. These hazards to agriculture should be a warning to the government; a few bad years and our whole economy can be upset. The budget has followed the peaks of production. Prime Minister Churchill said just recently, "You can only see the future by looking at the past", and I think perhaps some of us should look back a little and see what we had in the past and try to learn some lesson from the past that will guide us when we look towards the future.

Now, I want to say a little about taxes. The budget shows that there are no new taxes, no tax increases — the education and hospitalization tax stays; it would appear that the Government has abandoned the idea of removing the education and hospitalization tax. I would like to read from Page 11 on the C.C.F. programme, in regard to taxation. (The fellows the other day asked me why I did not support the Government once in a while, and I told them quite frankly that as soon as the C.C.F. got back to its programme, I would support the Government). Now, this is what they say on taxation:

"The C.C.F. in this country maintains that the only sound system from which taxation can be based is ability to pay. The C.C.F. declares that the policy of the present government is curtailing the people's income, and at the same time increasing taxation, can only lead to ruin and disparity.

"The C.C.F. realizes that as long as they continue to pay high interest rates on our public debt, the people will have to pay high taxes. The C.C.F. pledge toward taxation is to refund the public debt at lower rates of interest, and to repeal the present education tax as soon as possible."

Now, I would like to also read what the late Mr. G.H. Williams had to say about the education tax when he was Leader of the Opposition in this House. I might point out to you, too, that when the education tax was first introduced in this province, every member on the Opposition side of the House of the day opposed the imposition of that education tax.

Mr. Williams, when dealing with the budget in the session, I think, of 1938, February 17th, said this about the education tax:

"I notice that the government is practising the same misrepresentation this year with respect to the so-called education tax as they employed last year. The total increase in educational expenditures for 1938, as against actual expenditures in 1936 is only \$907,000; yet the estimates for 1938 show that the government expects to take in an additional \$1,850,000 through the tax. It is quite obvious that the government is using this tax as a

means of increasing their general revenue; are using this money to replace money formerly used for educational purposes rather than increasing the expenditures of education by the total net receipts from the tax."

Now, this is an indication that when you are on the Opposition side of the House you can take one stand on those questions; when you get over to this side of the House you can conveniently take the reverse stand. I am rather anxious to see what happens after this next provincial election, if the Liberal Party should happen to come into power, because I am going to watch them very closely.

I want to say a word in regard to the public revenue tax. The rural municipalities of this province expected that this tax was going to be removed. It may be true that the Britnell-Cronkite report suggested that it should be removed within a period of three years, and the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. Bentley) said the other day that the government would remove it next year. Now, we have had a lot of "next year" promises in this province from both parties, and I am not taking that promise at the present time too seriously. I certainly did not like the sugar-coating that the government placed upon that pill, in order to get the people of this province to swallow it for this coming year.

I want to ask — is it necessary for this province to ask the Dominion Government to make loans to farmers because of crop conditions? We have been told that Saskatchewan is paying the lowest rates of interest of any province; we have been told that the credit of Saskatchewan is better than the credit of any other province. Then why was it necessary to ask the Dominion Government to come to the aid of the farmers of Saskatchewan in their time of need? Why could not the Provincial Government furnish part of the money to help those farmers out? I believe in doing for myself what I can, before asking someone else to come to my assistance.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — We did offer.

**Mr. Benson:** — If you offered, how much did the Provincial Government make available for this purpose? If nothing, why has the Government no faith in the farmers of Saskatchewan? We were told the other day that the farmers were the backbone of this province. I think they could prove that by helping them now.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege; I know the hon. member would not want to leave any misimpressions, but I do not know whether the hon. member knows or not that the Provincial Government stood ready, and discussed this whole matter with the municipalities, and was prepared to come to the assistance of the municipalities, but representations were made to the Federal Government, I think, by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker); ourselves, too, in the matter, and they chose to adopt the methods they have.

**March 11, 1952**

**Mr. Benson:** — Well, I am glad to hear that. I would suggest to the Minister of Agriculture, then, that it was his duty to advise the members of the legislature as to what the Government was doing in that respect.

We have had some comparisons made here during the past few weeks; we have had the years 1930 to 1944, compared to the years 1944 to 1952. I want to ask you: "Is there an honest basis of comparison here?" We have had a comparison of highways built during those years with highways built now; comparison of health and hospitalization provided with the same provided now; comparison of money spent on education with the money spent now; social services spent during these years, and social services spent now.

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd:** — Would the hon. member permit a question? Who gave the comparison of the money spent for education in the 'thirties and now?

**Mr. Benson:** — You did when you spoke.

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I did not. I spoke of 1943-44, which is not in the 'thirties.

**Mr. Benson:** — I will accept the Minister's statement, of course.

**Some Hon. Member (Opposition):** — You cannot get away with that!

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member over here says "I cannot get away with it." He had better read the records.

**Mr. Tucker:** — He does not know what he is talking about — he is just mumbling.

**Mr. Benson:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to draw up a few comparisons myself, that I think are fair comparisons, and I am going to make comparisons of the present time, between the province of Saskatchewan and the Dominion Government — the Provincial Government and the Dominion Government. Now, we happen to have a Liberal Government in Ottawa and a C.C.F. Government in Saskatchewan, and on the matter of old-age pensions, I find that the Dominion Government is paying the old-age pensions to all those people over 70 years of age. The Provincial Government is paying pensions to those 65-70, that is, paying 50 per cent of them. The Dominion Government pays the other 50 per cent. Then in regard to P.F.A.A. payments, the Dominion Government has instituted a crop-failure scheme here through the P.F.A.A . . .

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — May I ask the hon. member a question? Is that all that the Provincial Government is paying by way of pensions and assistance to pensioners?

**Mr. Benson:** — No, I did not say that it was all. The minister spoke here the other day, and it was his job to give a complete report of his department. If I have not the figures of the complete payments by his department, then there is no one else to blame but himself. Now, I am not trying to minimize this, but I am trying to draw the comparisons. The Dominion Government is paying the old-age pensions from 70 over, and 50 per cent of the pensions from 65-70, and the Provincial Governments pays its share, and then other services like health services and so on.

Then we have the P.F.A.A. payments. We make a contribution to this P.F.A.A. of a certain percentage of all the grain we deliver, and then when we have a crop failure we receive benefits from the Dominion Government, which have in the past amounted to a considerable sum of money. The C.C.F. Government here has no similar crop insurance scheme.

Then we have paid by the Dominion Government at the present time the Family Allowances to everyone. On the other hand we have Mothers' Allowances paid by the Provincial Government. Then we have P.F.R.A. developments by the Dominion Government, and we have development in the department of Agriculture in regard to soil conservation and so on, by our Provincial Government.

We also have Crown Corporations operated by the Dominion Government, not in the province — I should not have used that one, so I will not deal with the Crown Corporations now in this province.

Then we have the national railway system and the post-office, operated through this province by the Dominion Government. We have here to offset that by the Provincial Government, power, telephone, transport and so on.

Then we have grants to hospitals by the Dominion Government, and we have grants to hospitals by the Provincial Government. We have the Health of Animals branch here, operated and paid for by the Dominion Government, and we have the veterinary services here by the Provincial Government.

We receive around \$22 million or more in subsidies from the Dominion Government for our Provincial affairs, and the province makes grants to rural municipalities, schools and so on.

So when I look at these comparisons which are true comparisons, I ask myself which is the Socialist party in Canada? Which government gives Saskatchewan the most service? I heard the present Prime Minister of Canada speaking over the radio from the Regina Armouries during the last Federal campaign, and he was making an appeal to the people of Saskatchewan to support the Liberal party, and he said, "There is no difference between the C.C.F. and the Liberal party; the only difference is that the C.C.F. are in a hurry." And so far as I can see, there is not much difference.

**March 11, 1952**

I would like to ask members of this legislature on both sides of the House, "What is the basic problem in this Province over which you two parties are fighting?" What is the basic problem? And I would like to have you tell me during the debate what this basic problem is. I believe there is no basic problem that you are fighting over in the Province of Saskatchewan. Your differences are only imaginary and political. The one party is in power and wants to stay in power, and the other party is in the Opposition and wants to get into power.

**Hon. Member:** — And what does the third party want to do?

**Mr. Benson:** — Well, the third party wants to do just what I want you people to do, and that is to put Saskatchewan ahead of any political party -- work for Saskatchewan first.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — The man on the flying trapeze!

**Mr. Benson:** — The whole squabble here in my opinion is purely party; rabid partisanship at its worst. Both parties are interested in the welfare of Saskatchewan, and I believe they could do a better job by keeping the interests of Saskatchewan in the forefront, and working together.

I want to say a little bit about highways. The Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. J.T. Douglas) gave us a comparison the other day of the highways built before 1944 and the highways built from 1944 on. I want to say to him, that in the constituency of Last Mountain, all the highways in the constituency with the exception of a few miles, were built before 1944. During the time of the Anderson Government, the very large percentage of those highways were built. There was some of No. 6 and some of No. 20 built before 1929. I believe that the late Hon. Mr. Latta was Minister of Highways at the time; I want to point out that these two portions of highways which were before 1929 have never been rebuilt. There is practically no highway left there, and this year I am hoping that the Minister will take care of that particular section.

The Minister has already announced that he is not going to build the piece from Raymore south, and also that he is going to start at Bulyea and build north. Last year on the programme was the stretch from Bulyea to Duval, but through no fault of the Minister, but because of bad weather, the contractors were unable to complete that highway, and we did not get as much highway construction in Last Mountain constituency last year as we should have had, if we had had better weather conditions. And want to say to the Minister of Highways that I appreciate what he has done during the last few years in the constituency of Last Mountain. We have not received as much as we think was our fair share, but certainly we received more than we had during some of the previous years.

I heard some complaints from the other side of the House in regard to the distribution of the highway vote. I complained myself, and finally left the C.C.F. party and the Minister of Highways then began building some highways in the constituency of Last Mountain. I have



received more cooperation, more highway work done in Last Mountain, since I became an Independent, that I received before, and I want to tell my hon. friends who are complaining from the other side of the House, that I will invite them to join me in the Independent group, and I can assure you that you will get the highways built in your constituencies. Now, that should be an inducement.

**Mr. Tucker:** — It's too big a price.

**Mr. Benson:** — It's too big a price, eh? Well, apparently the Minister was willing to pay the price to get rid of me.

Now, I want to read from Page 10 of the C.C.F. Platform on highways and roads:

"The C.C.F. deplors the favouritism and wastefulness of the present policy of road construction and maintenance. The C.C.F. pledges to utilize all available government machinery in the construction of roads, and in so doing save the tremendous sum now being paid to contractors as profits, and distribute such savings to workers engaged in road constructions and maintenance work."

I believe the Minister tried to do that, but it said:

"and pledges itself to a more equitable distribution of road-work throughout the province."

Now, I could not agree that we were getting an equitable distribution of road-work in the constituency of Last Mountain prior to the last two years.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I guess you've got them scared.

**Mr. Benson:** — I want to point out to the Minister that No. 22 is in pretty fair shape where it passes through my constituency. No. 15 is in pretty fair shape from Raymore to Hatfield. It goes along No. 20 to Nokomis, but from Nokomis over to No. 2 (running up into Watrous) No. 15, is in a deplorable state, and it is absolutely impossible to drive along that highway when it is wet.

I also want to point out to him that No. 14 from Jansen to Guernsey is in a very bad state, and the people up there have been clamouring for that highway to be rebuilt for a good many years. The Minister promised two years ago, I think, or he put it into his programme — it was announced in the press, at any rate — that the highway two years ago (No. 14) would be built from Jansen to Dafoe, and up to the present time nothing whatever has been done on that stretch, and it is in a bad state.

**March 11, 1952**

I want to deal with hospitalization. We received a comparison here the other day from the Minister of Health (Hon. Mr. Bentley) comparing hospitalization in Saskatchewan previous to 1944, and again I say, Mr. Speaker, that there is no just comparison there. There was no money available during the 'thirties for anything. I remember during those years the Minister of Education at that time had to even reduce the grant to schools because they could not get enough money to pay the grants to the schools. I would like to read to you what Dr. Hugh MacLean had to say in regard to medical services when he was Vice President of the C.C.F. This is from a radio speech. Dr. MacLean says:

"By socialized medicine, we mean that system of medical practise which will guarantee to every individual of the state, without regard to their economic condition, all necessary benefits of medical science, both preventive and curative"

He listed possibilities under three headings:

- (1) The three main plans may be briefly discussed as continuing the present system — that is, the system we had in effect at that time; or
- (2) Bringing about health insurance of some type; or
- (3) Complete system of state or socialized medicine.

Further along it said:

"If we are to have an all-inclusive system the state must necessarily assume control. In this province much has been done."

Dr. MacLean even then agreed that much had been done.

**Mr. Tucker:** — What is the date of that?

**Mr. Benson:** — This is in 1938.

"The direct control by the state, of tuberculosis has resulted in such an advance in the treatment and prevention of tuberculosis that it is amazing.

"A Cancer Clinic has been set up under Government supervision, and while it has accomplished a great deal, it is entirely inadequate as presently organized to reach the objective which the people should demand."

I want to remind my friends that they should have been in this House during those years when there was not a nickel for anything, and pretty nearly everybody in Saskatchewan was on relief, and I say there is a tremendous credit coming to Dr. Munro for having established that cancer clinic.

He further says: "The object of a state medical system should be to prevent disease and to promote physical and mental health, and thus increase human efficiency, effectiveness and happiness."

Now, I want to tell the Minister of Health that I appreciate what the Government has done in regard to health services; so does everybody in the Province of Saskatchewan. I do not know a single soul who is opposed to the Hospitalization scheme — not one single soul. There may be some, and I also want to say to the Minister of Health that I have no complaints of the treatment he has given me since he became the Minister; I find him very, very easy to approach and to discuss problems with. I do not always get what I ask him for, but that does not make any difference, as long as he is willing to hear the problem, and I can say that he deals with any proposition I ever have put to him in a very, very sympathetic manner.

Now, so far as this question of health service is concerned, if we are to have a complete hospital or medical service insurance scheme in this province, I believe it is necessary to have assistance from the Federal Government. I would like to make one suggestion, though, again. I have made it before in this House, and that is that we should have an equalized mill rate established over the province for the building of hospitals. I know that I myself live in the district that is not under a Union Hospital, and my neighbours, though just a few miles away, are providing hospital facilities for me at no cost to myself. I believe that when this scheme was brought in that we should have had established at that time an equalized rate over the whole province for this purpose.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — Such as the Public Revenue Tax?

**Mr. Benson:** — Yes, such as the Public Revenue Tax, if you like. I also think the same applies to education, and it is long overdue in that department.

I want to say a few words about power. I was not fortunate enough to hear the Minister the other day, because I was attending all day at the conference dealing with the question of foot-and-mouth disease, and damp grain, and so on. But I listened to the Minister on the Radio in the evening, and I noticed that he gave his usual type of address — that he told us what he trying to do, and what he had done. I want to congratulate the Minister — I would sure like to have him in my group. I give him an invitation every year. But when the Minister spoke here, he made a comparison; I noticed that, Mr. Speaker, he made a

**March 11, 1952**

comparison with the conditions before 1944 and he was fair enough to say that there was no money available then to extend power as we would have it today. And I know that he is facing a tremendous problem. Perhaps I do not altogether agree with some of the policies which he is carrying out, but I do agree that he is doing the very best he can. This is a sparsely settled province, and it is going to be a long time before some of us are able to get power without a high initial cost to put it in. But anyway, he has my best wishes, at least.

Now, I wish to say a few words at least on education. The Minister corrected me just a little while ago in regard to the comparisons I made, and I am willing to accept his corrections, but we were just nicely getting out of the depression in 1944; I think the depression really ended about 1940. Things started to pick up a bit, and the government of the day had built up a cash surplus, but it was a very small one compared with the money that comes in at the present time, and there was no money available to expand education. The education tax had just started to bring in more money than was required by the government to pay out at that time. But I want to say to him, that while he has had a lot more money than any other minister ever had in this province, to spend on education, I think he is trying to do a good job. But I also want to say this, that in spite of all this money that we are spending on education in Saskatchewan — in Saskatchewan and in other parts of Canada — for some reason or other we are not getting the results we should be getting; and the reason I say that, is because of the reports that were given by President Thompson of the University of Saskatchewan; by President Smith of Toronto University; and by the President of McGill.

Just recently I noticed an article in the paper by the Superintendent of Schools in Toronto, and they all agreed on the fact that high-school graduates were leaving high-school and going into the university, or going into business offices, and they did not have the fundamental basic training which they should have had, especially in regard to English. Now, this is the case, and I believe the Minister of Education realizes that is the case in this province, and I believe he is trying to do something about it, and I wish him success. Because after all, when a student leaves high school, that student is supposed to have a certain standard, whether they go to a university, or whether they go into business. If they do not have the standard they are supposed to have, then they are going to get a severe jolt which does not do them too much good.

Now, I want to say a word in regard to the university students who were in here at the opening of the Session. You will remember they were entertained in the restaurant by the Government, and I want to refer to the speech of my hon. friend across the way, when he spoke to those university students. He first of all pointed me out as an Independent, and he warned those students of having too much to do with Independents, and he invited them to work within the Liberal party — take part in public life, and come into the Liberal party — he was looking for recruits. I want to say to my hon. friend, in all kindness, that we spend public money and we, or at least, the students spend their parents'

money, obtaining an education, What for? To develop character — to develop personality, and to develop individuality. And then the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Tucker) invites them, when they have graduated, to hide that character — that personality and that individuality in a political party. I invite them to join me in the Independent ranks of this province, and let their character and their personality and their individuality shine in this province.

Now, I want to say a few words for the benefit of my hon. friend, the Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Sturdy), in regard to soldier settlers. I did not catch what he said the other day when he was taking a left-handed slap at me over this 33-year lease. He said he had received (I think) only four letters after that resolution was introduced in the legislature. Now, I want to tell my hon. friend that every veteran that I met since I was in this House last, I have asked him if he would like to have the deal that was suggested in that resolution; and with but one exception, everyone of them wanted it. That one exception was a young chap, well-known to a certain number in this House, and he said he did not think it would be of any advantage to him, but when I explained that the money he had already paid should be applied on his purchase agreement, then he said, "I think that looks pretty good, and I will be for it."

Now, I want to tell you that I believe these young people should be given the chance to buy their land; and they should be given the chance to buy their land at assessed value, or somewhere near there; and they should be credited, on their purchase, with every nickel they have paid on rental. I am going to tell my hon. friend, the Minister of Social Welfare that I am going to do everything within my power to bring that about. These young fellows went and fought for you and me — they went and fought that I might retain my home. Then I say they are entitled to a home of their own as well.

I am going to tell my hon. friend that the Saskatchewan Legion in this province is advocating the same thing that I introduced in this Legislature last year. I am going to ask the Minister if he owns the home he is living in, and if he is the owner of the land which it is built on. Does he?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I am living in the Frontenac Apartments — I do not own them.

**Mr. Benson:** — You know, I cannot understand why the government is opposed to selling these fellows this half-section of land. They give Rhubbra 9 million acres to do with what he likes, but these fellows are just asking for a half-section. We are spending \$3,000 per year on each bad boy we have in Saskatchewan — and I would suggest that we could also spend a little money on these returned men we have in Saskatchewan. We are going to develop our natural resources by the people.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I wish to correct a statement here. The Government is prepared, anxious and willing to sell these farms to the veterans after a period of occupancy

**March 11, 1952**

of 10 years, which has been forced on us by our agreement with the Veterans' Land Act in Ottawa.

**Mr. Benson:** — Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I cannot agree with that statement. The men who are settled under the Veterans' Land Act, some of them today already have their land paid for; but these others have not even got started paying for theirs, and there is no reason why this Government cannot sell them that land, or could not have sold it to them the day after they signed their lease, and allowed them to go on paying for it. The only thing that could be held up was the issuing of the title to the land.

What about interest? Well, you know the C.C.F. told us they did not believe in interest. Now here the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) wants to charge these fellows interest. I do not want to charge them interest. I think they have earned their half-section from the Province of Saskatchewan. We were going to develop our natural resources for the people — we were going to produce lumber, bricks and cement, for use — not for profit. But now we produce them all for profit, and we let the boys holler for their homes.

I want to say something about the Crown Corporations, but am afraid I may keep you too long. I have not been imposing on the Legislature previously this session, so perhaps I am not over-stepping the mark too much. I want to say something in regard to Crown Corporations. We have three kinds: private, co-operative and public.

As far as the private corporations are concerned, I think we all believe in them. We all believe in private enterprise — even the Socialists believe in private enterprise, and so far as the co-operatives are concerned, I think we all believe in co-operative enterprise; and I believe that is where the future development of this country lies, in co-operative enterprise. I believe that it is a natural development, and that big business in the future will be the co-operative business.

I want to read from Page 4 of this little book on development of co-operatives:

"The C.C.F. believe that the development of co-operative enterprise offers the greatest degree of economy and economic safety to the people of this province, and will use every legitimate means to assist in the development of co-operation. The C.C.F. pledges itself to take immediate action, looking towards the setting up of either a government board, or a co-operative society to handle the sale and distribution of farm machinery."

**Mr. Tucker:** — What date was that?

**Mr. Benson:** — That was in 1938. We are investigating the question of machinery prices at the present time. The very fact that this committee was set up now is an indication that that particular

policy of the government has not proved successful; that it has not been carried out to its successful conclusions, but I hope that this Committee that is investigating the question of farm machinery right now, will be able to make some recommendation that will be of benefit to the farmers of this province.

I want to say something in regard to public enterprise. I stated previously that I think it is necessary, and I state it again, that the public should only deal with those things which can be, or have become monopolies, such as power, telephones, transportation, and so on. Crown corporations, no matter what size they are, should be service institutions — not profit-making organizations, and I have this from the Regina Manifesto which I would like to read:

"The C.C.F. is a Federation of organizations whose purpose is the establishment in Canada of a co-operative Commonwealth, in which the principal, regulating, production and distribution, and exchange will be the supplying of human needs, and not the making of profit."

Now, my friends agree with that, and I cannot understand why they support some of those Crown Corporations that they are operating today. I cannot justify the two stands.

**Hon. Member:** — Meets the human needs, indirectly.

**Mr. Benson:** — Governments are service institutions. Governments are not money-making organizations. Every public venture should be and must be for service only. I am absolutely opposed to any government using a Crown Corporation for the making of profit. Government should not be in competition with the people it governs. I want to ask what has happened to those small industries that the government is trying to run on a profit basis? What happened to the Fish Board? This province has lost over \$200,000 in trying to operate that Fish Board. They finally abandoned the idea. We have a woollen mill in the Province operating at a loss today, and altogether I think, if you consider interest too, we have suffered a loss of nearly \$500,000. We have a brick plant that is operating at a loss. We have a cannery that is gone — complete loss. We have a shoe factory that is gone — a complete loss. That should be experience enough for any government to learn that they cannot operate these little industries and operate them efficiently.

I want to say a word about the Timber Board. In my opinion, this Timber Board, which is a monopoly at the present time, should be a marketing service such as the Fish Marketing Service and the Fur Marketing Service is, except that they should be on a non-profit basis, the people who supplied the goods should get the full benefit of the handling of their products. And I want to compare them with the Wheat Board of Canada today. I am a member of that Wheat Board. I sell my wheat through that Wheat Board and I demand as a wheat grower the full benefits of the sale of that wheat. I do not allow the Government of Canada to take a profit out of the sale of my wheat. If they do then I

**March 11, 1952**

make a holler about it. And I hollered with the rest of the farmers in this province when the Canadian Wheat Board sold our wheat to the people of Canada for less than market price. And I say to the government that if I had my way the only proper way of looking at these problems is — what would you do yourselves if you had the handling of it? I would leave every cent in the Fish Marketing Service, and in this Fur Marketing Service, and I would leave it there to the credit of the people who supplied the fish and the furs.

Now, we have an Insurance Office here. What would I do with the Insurance Company . . .

**Mr. Willis (Elrose):** — What would you do there?

**Mr. Benson:** — I would use it as a service organization just the same as any Crown Corporation. Now, how do we make the tremendous profits in the Insurance Company? And here we have a C.C.F. Government advertising in the paper, boasting about the big profits. If it is necessary for the government to go into the insurance business, then they should go into it on a non-profit basis and bring the insurance rates down all over Saskatchewan.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — How about the Co-operatives? Do the Co-operatives do that?

**Mr. Benson:** — The Co-operatives are a different thing. They are not run by the Government. The co-operatives are run for the benefit of the people who own the co-operatives.

**Hon. Members:** — You see! There!

**Mr. Benson:** — I do not mind the interruptions — it gives me an opportunity to emphasize my point. I am pretty nearly through anyway. Profits, no matter who makes them, are the result of exploitation, and when the C.C.F. Government makes profits out of those people whose goods it handles, then it is exploiting those people.

I want to say something about protection. . .

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — How about private enterprise?

**Mr. Benson:** — I want to say something about protection of democratic rights. Well, you are a private enterpriser — you can answer that one yourself. I want to read from the Provincial Platform in regard to protection of democratic rights:

"To protect the democratic rights of the people

(1) by guaranteeing freedom of speech and right of assembly.

(2) guaranteeing religious liberty to all.

(3) introducing the single transferable ballot and guaranteeing the franchise to every adult citizen."



You know, this is another question. Every party that I have ever seen in this House, with the exception of the present group over there, have advocated the single transferable ballot for provincial elections when they sat in the Opposition, but in every case when they got over to this side of the House it was a bad thing for the province. That is what I cannot understand.

**Some Hon. Member (Government):** — You are going to follow suit, eh?

**Mr. Benson:** — No, I am not going to follow suit, my young friend. When I sat in this House for the second time I sat on this side, and I introduced a resolution or seconded it, adding for the single transferable ballot, and I supported it when I sat on this side of the House. I supported it when I sat on the other side of the House, and I am supporting it when I am sitting on this side of the House at the present time. I have been around quite a bit, and you will be around quite a bit too, before you are through. In this platform it says in dealing with what it calls 'real democracy':

"All we ask of the electors is that they show the same honesty of purpose and vote for us, or against us on the basis of our programme, rather than casting their vote on the basis of prejudice or party patronage. The people of the Scandinavian countries are attaining to freedom by voting definitely for certain well-defined legislation. Your sister Dominion, New Zealand, is following the same rule. To you, the electors of Saskatchewan, we of the C.C.F. offer the same road to safety and real democracy. We do it now, six months previous to the election, in order that our words may be given the careful consideration that they merit, rather than be judged as political campaigning."

Why have we not got the single transferable ballot? We asked the people to elect us on the basis of the single transferable ballot.

I want to deal for a little while with the question of patronage. I think I read this before, but I should read it again because I want you fellows to really take this in. Perhaps some day before the session is over, I will place a question in the House, asking how many former C.C.F. M.L.A.'s, C.C.F. M.P.'s and C.C.F. candidates are now employed by the Government of Saskatchewan. We condemned that sort of thing when we were over there. Every C.C.F. member in the House condemned that practice.

"The C.C.F. has always opposed party patronage as a basis of civil service appointments. We believe patronage and its attendant graft and corruption to be one of the greatest evils from which Canadian political life suffers — the C.C.F. pledges that it will, when elected to power, remove the Civil Service from the influence of party patronage."

**March 11, 1952**

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Can you give me one single case of where there is a former C.C.F. M.L.A. or member of Parliament, who is now a civil servant of the province of Saskatchewan. Can you give me one single case?

**Mr. Benson:** — Maybe they were not appointed by the Civil Service Commission, but they are working for the Government.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Does he know the difference between appointment by the Civil Service and appointments by Order in Council? Does he know the difference?

**Mr. Benson:** — Of course I would not know the difference. I was not endowed with the brain of my hon. friend, so I would not know the difference.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Evidence shows that you do not know very much of anything.

**Mr. Benson:** — It seems that we have had some oil permits made out to friends of the Government. That is the kind of thing that the Minister himself stood up here and condemned the Liberal Party for because they had given some contract to — what is the fellow's name? Well, anyway, a friend of the Liberal party for purple dye — do you remember how you howled and how shocked you were when this fellow sold a few gallons of purple dye . . .

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — A few gallons?

**Mr. Benson:** — I do not know how much it was. He never even told us. I want the Government to explain why they gave these oil permits to Shumiatcher and Harvard?

**Hon. Member:** — And Tommy Wood?

**Mr. Benson:** — I want them to explain how Mr. Charlie Broughton became the President of National Petroleums and obtained something like 600,000 acres of permits. I would have them also explain how Search Corporations obtained their permits. Then I want them to explain how Rhubbra obtained his permits. Now, this is the sort of thing that we condemn when we are on the Opposition side of the House. We were going to have these natural resources developed by the people of Saskatchewan, for the people of Saskatchewan. It seems to me that we are developing them for Rhubbra, Broughton & Company.

I also ask the Government why they charge farmers 3 cents per acre tax on mineral rights, when they turned over 9 million acres to Rhubbra for one-tenth of a cent an acre? I am going to ask the Government why it loaned Government money to build a theatre when it refuses to make

loans to young farmers? I am going to ask them if theatres are more important than agriculture? Are we going to develop the economy of Saskatchewan by building theatres? And I want to know what wealth they produce, what new wealth they produce.

**Hon. Member:** — For whom?

**Mr. Benson:** — Mr. Speaker, you will judge, no doubt from my remarks that unless these questions that I have asked today are answered to my satisfaction, I shall not support the motion.

**Mr. H.J. Maher (The Battlefords):** — Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention, at this late hour in the evening, to talk very long on this Budget Debate, but I would like to give you my comments of the Budget Speech, and also a few comments relative to what some of the members, during the past few days, have said.

I, like the member for Wilkie (Mr. Horsman), was very concerned with the remarks of the Minister of Public Health (Hon. Mr. Bentley) both on the day he adjourned the debate — as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I tried on three occasions to ask him a question, but he was so wrapped up in his own thoughts, or his own enthusiasm that I could not draw his attention to it at all. I think probably you saw me on my feet, but I did not want to cause any embarrassment whatsoever, but I did not succeed in asking the question. I listened to him, the second day when he spoke over the radio, and I had hoped that we would hear some solution or some continuation of a solution in the betterment of our hospitalization plan. The member for Last Mountain (Mr. Benson) said, and I believe this is a good scheme, provided it is not destroyed by the present administration. They started it, and I give them credit for it; and I sincerely hope that they do not destroy it. But the Minister seemed more concerned with blaming the Federal Government for the increased cost of the operation of hospitals in this province, and sitting back and attacking the policy of the Federal Government rather than attacking the problem that he has himself, of the terrific cost that it is on the ratepayers of Saskatchewan, and secondly, on account of the inability of sick people to get into a hospital. He can tell us as much as he likes about the 80 per cent — and 80 per cent is all they pay for — and that there are sufficient hospital beds, statistically, — I think he says there are 7 beds per 1,000, and that that is sufficient for the people of Saskatchewan; but I know from my experience in North Battleford, and I said the same thing in the Throne Speech debate, that there is not hospital space sufficient for the sick people of Saskatchewan, today. I think that is a problem that should be attacked by this Minister, instead of him standing up and trying to tell us all the Liberals did not do previous to 1944, and then condemn the Federal Government. If he would stand up and look after his own department, I think it would be of greater benefit to the people of Saskatchewan.

**March 11, 1952**

I would just like to compare him with the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Darling). I want to congratulate the Minister of Public Works. He gave us a very good picture of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. I, personally, was quite interested, because, coming from the city of North Battleford where the Power Commission made the deal to take over the distributing system, and I want to say right here that I supported that deal; I think it was a good deal, and I give the Power Corporation credit. They came into North Battleford and offered the ratepayers of North Battleford a good proposition, and I congratulate them on it. They are attempting to give the people of North Battleford power on a cost basis.

I would like to say a few words, Mr. Speaker, about the remarks of the member for Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs). You know I enjoy listening to the member for Swift Current. He is a very jovial and happy soul; but I am afraid, today, he seemed to get off on a little dangerous path — I do not think he was very dangerous — I wasn't nervous when he came over here, but I think some of the things he said concerned me; when he got on his socialistic plan, where he talked about socialism. You know this Government has been, on one hand, trying to pat private enterprise on the shoulder, and on the other hand, push the socialists away; and he was one that stood up (and I give him credit for the courage of his convictions) that he is one of the many socialists over there. I am going to suggest this — that speeches about socialism like he made today, are dangerous to the economy of this province. I think they do great damage . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Maher:** — We are still in the position (and you can laugh over there as much as you like) where we need development capital in this province. It is the only way this province will develop — by increased capital coming in here; and it is speeches like that, that in my opinion, are certainly dangerous to the development of our province.

I want to say one other thing about what the member for Swift Current said, and I am saying it in good spirit — he did make the remark that Liberal parties were the enemies of labour, and I am one that will disagree very violently with that statement. I have before me "Fifty Years of Labour Legislation in Canada" by Edith Lawrence, and so on; and I just want to suggest to him that the C.C.F. party are not the only people in the Dominion of Canada that have done anything for labour. I think, if you look at the record, it has been Liberal governments, both provincially and federally, that have given the workers of Canada — and put the workers of Canada in the position they are in today.

I will give you a certain amount of credit, during your short, term of office, that you have enacted reasonably progressive labour legislation, but when one looks at this report, and in the summing up — and I am not talking about any particular political party — I will read the headings. One heading, in the summary, "Each Provincial Legislature is responding to the needs and demands of its own province";

"All provinces have labour relations Acts"; "All provinces except Newfoundland and P.E.I. have factory Acts"; "All provinces provide compensation"; "All provinces, except P.E.I. have minimum wage legislation"; "In seven provinces there is legislation of industrial standards"; "In six provinces most employers are required to grant their workers paid vacations." I think it is a good idea, but I just want to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this Government here, are not the only people that have done something towards labour . . .

**Mr. Gibbs (Swift Current):** — Would the hon. member tell me if the Liberal Federal Government has brought in a labour code which is inadequate for labour for years and years? Is that labour code still in?

**Mr. Maher:** — The Liberal Government, in Ottawa, are doing what they think is in the best interests of all of the people of Canada — not only labour, but also all the basic industries; and we must always bear in mind that any government who is the Government of Canada, today, must be a government of compromise, a government that will be a benefit to the east and to the west, and to the labour, to the fishermen, to the farmers; and that is the reason for the success, of the Federal Liberal party in the Dominion of Canada, today.

**Hon. Mr. Williams (Minister of Labour):** — I would like to ask the hon. member a question — just this — if he can tell us what other province in the Dominion of Canada has a two weeks' holiday with pay Act, or has any legislation in regard to the eight statutory holidays — I refer to Christmas, New Years, Good Friday, and so forth. What other province, besides Saskatchewan, has those things?

**Mr. Maher:** — I do not know that, Mr. Minister, but I am merely reading from this book, and I have not had the opportunity to find that out but I am not criticizing your holiday pay. All I am suggesting, is this — that you, as a Government, are not the only Government in this Dominion of ours that has all the labour legislation. There are other parties and other governments very conscious of their responsibility to labour, as much as you are . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Even better off.

**Mr. Maher:** — . . . And I want to say another thing while I am on my feet, about labour. It is rather interesting to know, with our socialistic government in this province, that the average weekly wage throughout Canada, that Saskatchewan is one of the lowest. I would just like to read — and this is for the month of November last:

"The average weekly wages and salaries — for B.C. was \$57 a week; Ontario, \$54; Alberta, \$53; Manitoba, \$50; Quebec, \$49.50; and Saskatchewan, \$48."

**March 11, 1952**

And this is taken from the Canadian Statistical Review, which I got from the library for the month of January. If the Minister wants to check it up, he can find it there. I think probably he has read it; but I just leave that suggestion with you. I am not critical of your labour legislation, of your hours of work, and of your holidays with pay. I had the privilege of being an employee for quite a long time myself, and I went through the depression, and I have some ideas of the problems of employees. At the same time I can be sympathetic with any labour legislation — but we must never forget this — that unless you have development in the country or the province — as the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) said about the grass growing in the streets of Regina — we must have development. All the labour legislation that you put on any statute books will never provide jobs, if there is not development.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I spoke a little longer on the various members than I intended to, but I would like to give you a few of my comments on the Budget. I was rather interested in this very impressive document that the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) brought down, and I have dealt with quite a few of the things I intended to do while I was discussing this question of what the member for Swift Current said; but I would like to say that a lot of the expansion that he shows in this budget and the economic recovery is a wonderful thing for our province, but I am going to suggest this — that the bulk of this was caused, not particularly by policies of this government, but more by policies of the Federal Government. The development in this province has been in spite of the socialistic government that we have. The member for Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs) was talking about Socialism only a few minutes ago. That is one of the reasons we have not had a greater development; yet it is just unfortunate that we have not had our resources developed more rapidly. We have too many, as the member for Last Mountain (Mr. Benson) said, Rhubbras, too many Shumiatchers, and too many Broughtons, and so on; and that is one reason that this province has held back. I want to go on, Mr. Speaker — I do not want to take too much time as the hour is getting late, but I would like to turn to the page on the Budget which deals with public corporations.

You know I seem to have a little bit of a bug on public corporations, but I notice the name has been changed: I do not know why the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) changed them, but he changed them to Public Corporations — I suppose, therefore, I should throw them out the door instead of out the window, now that he has changed them to Public Corporations. But I want to deal with them again, with particular reference to the budget. The Budget reads — if I might be permitted to read this short part of it:

"The overall financial results, during the fiscal year 1950-51, reflect a rise in net earnings to \$3.8 million, representing a return of more than 8.5 per cent on monies advanced by the Treasury and outstanding at the financial year ends."

Now, when I spoke on the Throne Speech, the hon. Premier suggested I was in the wrong pew — that I should be dealing with the 1951 statements. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is just impossible to deal with those statements because we have not got them at all . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Maher:** — . . . and, therefore, the only record we have here is the record referred to in the Budget Speech. Down further he does mention that, for 1951, "interim figures reveal a net revenue of about \$4.3 million." But I, for one, and nobody, yet, can find out just what that is. It is rather interesting to look at this \$3.8 million and examine it rather carefully. I remember last year, in the summing up of the Budget, he mentioned the \$3.8 million, but when one looks at the Government Finance Office statement, he gets an entirely different picture. You know, I am inclined to think that the Provincial Treasurer and the Provincial Auditor remind me of a dog chasing a rabbit. The Provincial Treasurer is ahead, and he makes certain statements; but then the Provincial Auditor comes along and he is always behind, straightening things out. Now he mentioned, in the closing remarks of the debate on the Budget, last year, that the total profits were \$3,815,000 — and that is what he mentioned in this Budget; but if you take the Government Finance Office statement — that is the one that we had been presented for 1950-51 — you will find that it does not altogether add up.

I agree that they took the Power Commission out, but even if you take the profit that they had there, and add it on, instead of \$3.8 million, you get a net profit of \$2,408,000; and I cannot orient this thing around. If he had said these were gross — this \$8.3 million — sure. But all he said was that it was net profit. Well the net profit from the corporations, according to this statement, are \$2.4 million; and these are the things that bother me. Well then, of course, they took the Power Commission out. Well, I wondered at the time why they took it out, but I think, after making a study of the thing, I discovered the reason. I am convinced that in his Crown Corporations, the Provincial Treasurer is trying to juggle this thing around to look as good as he can to the public. I think that he is in the position that he is endeavouring, at all times, to make a statement so that the public will think it is 100 per cent, so that he and the Premier can get up and tell us about these wonderful profits.

So when he took the Power Corporation out, I wondered why he did not take the Department of Telephones out — the Government Telephones — but, after making a little study, I discovered this — that the profits of the Power Corporation are dropping, Mr. Speaker — they are going down. Now, I think that is probably a pretty good thing. The reason they are going down is this — that they are expending more capital in developing power throughout our province, with the result that their capital structure is getting high, as the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Darling) mentioned, yesterday, and the return is dropping. Well, when one looks at the Telephones we find that the Telephones is entirely different. I think he mentioned in last year's debate that the Power Commission was only returning 5.4 per cent — less than the 8.3;

**March 11, 1952**

but when one looks at the Telephones — and why he did not take the Telephones out — to me it is perfectly obvious . . .

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — I will tell you if you want to know. Because this Legislature, at the session two years ago, took the Power Corporation out from under the Crown Corporation Act, and last year, they took out the Telephones from under the Crown Corporation Act, so that, next year, in the Government Finance Office, even the Telephones will not appear in that statement.

**Mr. Maher:** — Well, the Telephones are out. It is all right. But it pretty well proves our statement. The point is this — the reason that he left them in that long, and while they are out, it is very interesting to know that our Department of Telephones, on an interest basis, is one of the most profitable that you have. In the statement last year, you netted in the neighbourhood of 16 per cent; and in 1951, you are going to net, I think in the neighbourhood of 12 to 13 per cent.

**Hon. Member:** — 15.9 per cent.

**Mr. Maher:** — Thank you, and here we have — I think, everyone's telephone tolls in the whole province have gone up. The tolls of the rural telephones have gone up, the price to the individual subscriber has gone up. I think long distance calls are up a little — I cannot confirm that, maybe that is incorrect (I see the Provincial Treasurer shaking his head) — but it just goes to show that when a government, Mr. Speaker, has a business which they control, that is where they are making their money — 15.9 per cent on the capital structure of the whole Department of Telephones. And it will be very interesting to see just exactly what happens when the Telephones are out of your Crown Corporations and a few more of the things get into service organizations.

Now, I see the time is getting on. I just want to make a few remarks relative to the Budget again, with respect to the estimates.

**Hon. Mr. McIntosh (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** — On a point of privilege, if I may, just in case some hon. members of the House, and others, might get the wrong impression from the remarks of the hon. member from the Battlefords, (Mr. Maher) might I just suggest that the bottle of oil be removed from the top of your desk?

**Mr. Maher:** — I will give that to Mr. Lopton. He can have that.

I want to say something, Mr. Speaker, about his estimates. I have only had the privilege of being a member here for the past three budgets, but one thing that has concerned me, and has concerned me quite a bit, is how the budget is arrived at. And one thing I have noticed, and I have these figures on a gross basis — that the estimated revenue, for this year, on the budget, is \$65,922,000, which looks, on the surface, to the average person reading this budget, that that is what the government is spending, but if one examines the thing a little further, you will find that that is not so — that there is a tremendous capital investment in this province every year; and looking over the record, and



I am going to refer back to 1937 and 1938. It is rather interesting to note how this thing is gradually creeping up. Their capital expenditures are getting greater all the time. Back in 1937 and 1938, expenditure on capital account by the government of the day was \$484,000 — that is on a gross basis. In 1941 and 1942 it was only \$250,000. Well then, when the C.C.F. came in 1944 and 1945, it jumped a little bit — it jumped to \$727,000 — not very much — they were quite cautious. Then, in 1945-46 the capital jumped to \$3 million which seemed quite a jump at that time; but since that time, in addition to the increase in our budget, on a revenue basis, our capital expenditures are jumping in leaps and bounds. Here you have, in 1943-44, capital expenditures of \$35,000 on a \$30 million budget. Those are gross figures, incidentally, and in 1951, you have, in accordance with these estimates, your capital expenditure is \$14 million on a \$70 million budget, plus the amount of your supplementary allowances. In other words, Mr. Speaker, my point is this — here we have a government that is going out and telling the people that they are only spending \$70 million, but at the same time, this capital expenditure is going up all the time; and I think that is a very dangerous situation. I think that with our Budget Bureau, (and I am one that thinks the Budget Bureau is efficient) — they do a good job — I think there is room for that; but it strikes me that there is something wrong with this great increase of capital, much greater than the increase in our current revenue.

This naturally leads one to the provincial debt, and I just want to deal very briefly with that as the time is getting on. It is rather interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, dealing with provincial debt, that notwithstanding the heading in the budget which says "debt improvement", that this year, the Minister omitted to put in the usual Table that he puts in. Notice — and I am going to suggest this — that both Tables were in last year, and he changes this Table, so when one looks at it, he thinks that the debt is improved. Well, the way it has improved, in my opinion, from 1950-1948, I think was the lowest figure — the net public debt was \$144 million. The way it was improved, this year, if you get that figure, as we got it through a question, the net debt is now \$160 million on the basis used in the Table for previous budgets.

In other words, the debt of this province is going up; and here we have a province in which we are having prosperous times — things are going along very well and we have prosperity. At a time when a lot of us should be putting something away for a rainy day, our budget is greater than it has ever been. I have no objection to that. I realize their problems. But in that budget there should be sufficient to put away for the time when we have a few dry years, or as the member for Last Mountain (Mr. Benson) said, a few more difficult years; but notwithstanding that, those big budgets, and our debt is gradually creeping up. It has come up from \$144 million by approximately \$16 million, since 1950. And these are the things that I object to on this budget, and I think you will agree, Mr. Speaker, with my remarks that I do not intend to support it.

**March 11, 1952**

**Mr. McCormack (Souris-Estevan):** — Mr. Speaker, the hour is getting on, and I do not want to take up too much time after we have had so many colourful characters here this afternoon. The member from Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs) — I cannot run across the floor with a bottle of oil, or a bottle of anything else for him, Mr. Speaker, but I think we could probably share one together, and I might get the same exuberance that he had about 3:15 this afternoon. However, I did want to just start out with a few matters tonight — just picking up a few of the odds and ends that have gone on in the previous debates in this House.

I am very pleased that the member from Morse (Mr. Gibson) is back here. I can remember in a speech which he made here sometime ago, he thought that the Federal Government should put on an excess profit tax to take care of all these old-age pensions. I do not know whether the member had been following what happened in England or not, but the Labour Government in England took the excess profits tax off, Mr. Speaker; I think possibly the gentleman should catch up on some of his reading. I would like to read a quotation here, and after I have finished some of it, I will tell you who said it: this is by a gentleman who is pretty well up on his financial problems of the country that he was the Chancellor of. He said:

"He told the delegates, most of whom think, or would like to think, that it would be easy to give the wage-earners more money by taking it from the rich, that it was not possible."

"If every penny of all incomes over \$2,000 a year were taken away, it would produce only another \$53 million in taxes."

He also went on to say this, and I am going to refer this to my hon. friend from Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs):

"The cost-of-living here will go on rising in 1952, even if the world prices are stable. If we go on pushing up our own costs by further substantial increases in wages and salaries — that is what we must avoid. If incomes go up more than production goes up, then prices will rise. The truth is as simple as that, and I would like to see it hanging as a text on the wall of every office inhabited by anyone, whether employer or trade unionist, who is concerned with negotiations about increases of any kind."

I am going to tell you who said that. That comes out of the Daily Mirror (Harry, you will remember that), and that was Hugh Gateskill, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, speaking at Blackpool on September 4, 1951.

**Mr. Gibson (Morse):** — May I ask the hon. member a question? Did the excess profits tax now collected from the Federal Government,

as I understood it, yield over half a billion dollars a year?

**Mr. McCormack:** — Well, apparently they found out even your Labour Government in England, that excess profits did not bring in . . . now, listen to this. Maybe I had better repeat this to you again. He said:

"That if every penny of all incomes over 2,000 pounds a year were taken away, it would produce only another \$53 million in taxes in England."

And they took it off. And he also went on to say this:

"But to subsidize (and you people all think of subsidization) the cost-of-living at the level it was a year ago would cost 600 million pounds; millions which do not exist and cannot possibly be raised by additional taxation."

He also said this:

"We really cannot honestly say that high profits have been an important cause in the rise in the cost-of-living."

You people should check up with some of your gentleman across the ocean. I think he was probably sensible — he could have gone into the Tory party over there. And then I just want to make a reference to a statement that the Minister of Health said the other day. He was referring to (I hope all his figures were not out as far as this one) infant mortality, and giving great credit to the policies of the provincial government here, with respect to the fact that infant mortality rates were falling. He said the infant mortality rate was 30 per 100,000 births. Well, according to his own annual report which was laid on the table here today for the calendar year 1949, it says this:

"The 1949 infant mortality rate of 39.0 per 1,000 live births is the lowest ever obtained in the province."

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — That was years ago, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. McCormack:** — Do you mean to say it has dropped nine in the past year?

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Yes.

**Mr. McCormack:** — I do not believe it.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I spoke from the record.

**Mr. McCormack:** — All right, I will read this. This is from the Canada Year Book, 1951, and is quoted in an editorial from the Ottawa Citizen, and it says this:

**March 11, 1952**

"The table shows, as the editorial notes, infant mortality rates are doubled in Canada, the lowest rates elsewhere. In Canada, the average rate is 44, but the average rate for seven of the provinces is lower. The figures being, British Columbia — 33; Prince Edward Island — 34; Ontario — 35; Alberta — 39; Nova Scotia — 39; Saskatchewan — 40."

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Mr. Speaker, these figures are always over when they come out in the Canada Year Book.

**Mr. McCormack:** — Well, that is the Canada Year Book, 1951.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Yes, but that has been taken from records that have been compiled years before. The hon. member knows that, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. McCormack:** — I am not so sure I do know it. Just because you say so, does not mean that it is right.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — I spoke from the records, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. McCormack:** — Then there was another question that came up, Mr. Speaker, in some of the previous . . . I cannot say that I should be like my hon. friend from Hanley (Mr. R.A. Walker). He said that he cannot understand why people are asking these questions, because he explained it all here last year. Well, you know, it's rather strange to hear those statements.

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — I understand now, after hearing you.

**Mr. McCormack:** — Well, I doubt if you ever would understand, my friend. As I said before, the hon. gentleman can explain these things to some of us, but I am afraid some of us cannot appreciate what he is trying to get at. I am sure of that, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a brief reference to what I heard in here about a briquette plant down at Estevan that was sold for a dollar. I have heard this nonsense so many times — and it is absolutely nonsense; and of course, it is the type of stuff that the C.C.F. like to keep pushing out all the time. I would not mind if they kept to their usual procedure of telling only half the truth, but in this case they only told a very, very small portion of the truth.

I had the opportunity this summer of having a talk with a man who was the Secretary-Treasurer of one of the companies that looked after this briquette plant at one time. The briquette plant was acquired in 1977, after the Federal and Provincial Governments, both of Manitoba and Saskatchewan had quite a bit of money into it, trying to get this experimental plant running. At that time, I do not think there was another briquette plant in operation on the North American continent at the time this one was started up at Estevan, and particularly trying to

make briquettes out of lignite coal. Now, the governments of that time had an opportunity to get some people interested in that knew something about this briquetting industry, and they turned this plant over to them for a nominal sum, but these people were committed to put a certain amount in and keep this plant running for a certain length of time. If some of the hon. gentleman who seem to insist on running around the country, spreading this nonsense, if they would like to get in touch with me, I will not take up the time of the House to give them the figures of how much these people lost, but it ran into over \$2 1/2 million in what they invested in it, and the shareholders had to put up the money with the bondholders.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Oh, so private enterprise loses once in a while.

**Mr. McCormack:** — That is right, private enterprise loses once in a while, but your socialist corporations that are not monopolies lose all the time, that is right.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is very close to six o'clock, and I would ask leave to adjourn the debate.

**Hon. Mr. Williams:** — Just before you put that motion, I wonder if I could briefly take up a question of privilege. I unfortunately could not be here this afternoon, but I understand the member for Last Mountain (Mr. Benson) quoted me as saying something to the effect that I was against immigration as far as this country is concerned. With your permission, I would just like to read the exact words I said; I will not go into the entire — in fact, I will be finished before six o'clock. I referred briefly to the fact that we did not have land for everyone who wanted to come in here, and I think I said that the Minister of Agriculture would like to know if there was any land available because he has hundreds of applicants from people who want to go farming. Then I referred to . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — The member must confine himself . . .

**Hon. Mr. Williams:** — I have the exact words here on immigration. Here is what I said:

"Actually I feel we should ask ourselves, 'Can the economy of this province now support many more people than are here now?' Following an expression of those views two years ago, I received a very indignant letter from the editor of a small town paper, who was all for unrestricted immigration, and stated we had lots of land. When I replied I asked him to let us know where some of this land was, because the Minister of Agriculture at that time, and I think still has, hundreds of applications from people who want to go farming and where would we find homes for these people if they are brought in on an unrestricted basis."

Now here is the paragraph I particularly want to refer to. I want to place it on the record.

**March 11, 1952**

**Mr. Speaker:** — You rose on a point of privilege — not to make a speech.

**Hon. Mr. Williams:** — I will be very glad to follow your ruling, but I want to . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Just correct the statement of the hon. member.

**Hon. Mr. Williams:** — All right, I will correct the statement in these few words. And if you want the exact words, I can give them to you, the way I put it, but I want to indicate to this House that I am not against an immigration policy controlled with common sense and properly applied on our economic structure. But there should be some sort of a definite plan, and I ended up by saying, "What sense is there in bringing people into this country to scramble with the unemployed who are in our cities now." And I referred to the fact that just a short time ago in Toronto, a number of displaced persons picketed the unemployment office, saying they wanted work, not unemployment insurance.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! The hon. member is more or less abusing the point of privilege. I think he just wanted to correct a statement.

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