

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Eleventh Legislature
27th Day

Monday, March 17, 1952

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

The House resumed from Friday, March 14, 1952, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Hon. T.C. Douglas (Weyburn):

That this Assembly, recognizing

(a) that in recent years the rapid increase of farm mechanization and the widespread adoption of new agricultural methods have resulted in basic changes in rural life and the farm economy of Saskatchewan, and

(b) that these economic trends are creating new rural social problems as well as adversely affecting the ability of our young people to become established in the agricultural industry, and

(c) that these trends also offer an opportunity for further extending the amenities of rural life,

agrees it is advisable that the Provincial Government should appoint a Royal Commission to investigate and make recommendations regarding the requirements of the maintenance of a sound farm economy and the improvement of social conditions and amenities in rural Saskatchewan, and recommends that such Commission, in its inquiry and recommendations, have particular reference to:

(1) the problems involved in present day trends in agricultural production, land use and farm costs;

(2) the need for farm capital and credit;

(3) the further adaptation of social services and educational facilities to meet changing rural conditions; and

(4) the further development of rural transportation, communication and community services.

Mr. W.A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes I was speaking on this resolution before it was adjourned, I referred to one of the causes for the fact that there was a trend away from the farms on the prairies, that in addition to the ones mentioned in the resolution, was the question of economic well-being. In the resolution it is set out that the rapid increase in recent years of farm mechanization and the wide-spread adoption of new agricultural methods resulted in basic changes in rural life and

March 17, 1952

the farm economy of Saskatchewan. I suggested that perhaps the rapid increase of farm mechanization was, to some extent, a result of the change in economic conditions. I think that it is quite clear to those who have studied the situation that if there had not been a great change in farm mechanization, it might be very hard for farmers to produce at a profit under present conditions, and that there is a question of how far this reduction and cost of production can go on. There is a limit certainly, to which the cost of production can be reduced by increased mechanization, and that problem — that question — is one thing that the Royal Commission might very well look into.

If the trend continues, which has been taking place to some extent in Canada, of people living in cities, particularly those who are engaged in industrial enterprise, and who are well organized, if that trend, in their case, towards shorter hours, better working conditions and better conditions of life generally, continues without a corresponding increase and better conditions of life for the farmer, better economic rewards, and so on, the trend away from our farms will go on.

In other words, the thing that affects trends into and out of a profession, or into and out of a country, are to a large extent, economics; and if any particular part of the country is better off economically than another part, then of course, there is a trend from the part that is not so well off economically to the part that is better off. It is one of the things which I pointed out in regard to the situation here in Saskatchewan. The proof that working people are better off elsewhere than they are in Saskatchewan is not to be found in statutes; it is to be found in the fact. Where are the working people going to and where are they going away from? It is quite clear that working people are tending to leave the Province of Saskatchewan and go elsewhere where they might be better off.

The same thing is happening in regard to transfers between the different economic groups. If people in the cities and towns are better off economically, and better off in their living conditions, then there will be a tendency for people to leave the farms and go to the cities and towns. I think that is one of the things that must make everybody very much concerned, that there has been this great trend away from the farms towards the towns and cities. It is something that must give a certain amount of cause for concern to far-sighted people, including far-sighted leaders of Labour, because if they are not interested they are not wise, but I think most of the far-sighted people are interested in seeing to it that the farmers who produce the food, which is an important part of what they work for, fare well — if they are not interested in that, increased wages does not do them much good if the cost of food rises too fast. Obviously, if too many people leave farming (particularly mixed farming) and go to the cities and towns, there is going to be a reduction in the amount of dairy products, and a reduction in the amount of meat products, and so on, produced.

It is one of those things that certainly confronts not only Canada, but the whole world today, and that is a proper interest in the conditions of the people that produce the food of the world. I do not

think there is any question about it — that is one of the fundamental problems that faces mankind in general. We are told that a tremendous proportion of the people of the world are actually short of food; we have not reached that stage here in Canada, but we still hear of people who have to live on pensions, old-age pensions and the like, and find that the rising cost of food is a very great burden to them.

If we do not make conditions on the farm better for the farmers, from the standpoint of the kind of life they are able to live there with their families; if we do not make the rewards commensurate with rewards they can get in the cities and towns, then the number of people who are willing to engage in looking after cattle; in looking after cows; producing the dairy products, producing meat products, will go on decreasing in numbers, and the time will certainly come when even in Canada there will be a shortage of these foods.

Now then, that is of interest to everybody, including the farmers. For the farmer it is a matter of seeing to it that he gets a reasonable measure of justice; it is of interest to other people because they will be affected if the farmer does not get a fair deal. But for the farmer himself, it is a matter of seeing to it that he gets justice, and that is one of the reasons why we have definitely taken the attitude that there should be a real interest in making conditions on the farm as far as possible, as good as conditions are in the cities and towns. Because, if people are not willing to stay on the farms, work on the farms, produce food, well, it will not be long until the people in the cities and towns of the Province will suffer very severely.

That is one of the reasons why we have advocated for several years that the Province as a whole should take some interest in providing electrical facilities for the farmers. Several years ago a Commission looked into this matter and reported to the Manitoba Government; they found that practically every country in western Europe, except Great Britain — where the population is much more densely settled than it is in this country — but they found practically every other country in western Europe felt that the country as a whole, should pay part of the cost of bringing the benefits of electricity to the farmers. I think it was a Minister of the Belgian Government that took the attitude that they regarded that as a measure of fighting against the depopulation of their rural Communities. That is the reason why we have urged this Government not to take the attitude that the farm electrification programme should be expected to pay the entire cost of carrying it on. As farmers are absolutely necessary to our whole economic setup, particularly so in Saskatchewan, then the Government as a whole — and the people of the Province as a whole — should be ready to pay some part of the cost of seeing to it that the farmer and his wife get the benefit of electricity.

They are a necessary part of our economic setup and there is no doubt in the world that everybody should be willing to take an interest in seeing to it that they have some of the amenities of life that they would get if they lived in the cities and towns. Surely the farm wife is just as much entitled to electric lights, and to the benefits of electrical washing machines, electrical radios, and all the other improvements in conditions that she could get if electricity is brought to the farm buildings, as her sister that is living in city or town throughout the

March 17, 1952

Province. We feel that the trend of population away from the farms, which we all realize must be halted in the best interest, not only of the farmers, but of the Province as a whole; that if that is to be halted, something definite should be done along that line.

I am quite aware that the Government says: "Well, we are doing something", but we are taking the attitude, for example, that a farmer has to pay \$600 or \$700 to get the electricity connected with his buildings. Well, that is bound to hold up the development of farm electrification, because on top of that, they have to pay for wiring their buildings, pay for getting fixtures, and so on. This extra \$600 or \$700 is bound to make it difficult to get a reasonably complete sign-up in any district. Unless you can get a complete sign-up in a district, then it does not warrant taking the electricity in to that district.

And so that is the main reason, I am satisfied, why Manitoba now has 46 per cent of their farms electrified, while we have somewhere between 6 and 7 per cent of our farms electrified. People who find fault with this programme say: "Why, it would be ridiculous for the Province as a whole to pay the cost of taking electricity to certain parts of Saskatchewan." Well, even parts of Manitoba has recognized that electricity cannot be taken to the farms in those parts. It is only proposed to electrify 50,000 of the 58,000 farms in Manitoba. There are parts in Manitoba which recognize that it is too expensive to take electricity to farms in those areas.

We have never suggested at any time that electricity should be taken into a district where the population is so sparsely settled that it would be quite unreasonable to do so. What we have said is that where it is a reasonable proposition to do it with a certain amount of help from the Province as a whole, then it should be done there; and we say had it been done when it was being done in Manitoba, some of the people today who are off our farms in Saskatchewan, would still be on them, because there is no doubt that if electricity had been taken to the farmers of Saskatchewan as fast during the past four years, as it has been in Manitoba, people would have appreciated live on the farm with that improvement, with having electricity, so much that I am satisfied a lot of people today who have left the farms, would be still on those farms here in Saskatchewan.

I quite realize that if, following the election which may take place in June, that if the Liberals are elected to office, and we bring in to . . .

Hon. Member: — Ha!

Mr. Tucker: — Well, my hon. friend laughs. It is for the people of Saskatchewan to decide, and none of us know what is going to be done — it is a matter for the people to decide in their wisdom. I do not think the record of the Government is such that they can be so very sure — they have no right to be sure about the results.

But, I was going to say, that if we are elected to office following the election, we could immediately bring into effect a similar

policy to that which has been in force in Manitoba for the last five or six years, that will halt the flow away from the farms, but it will not put a lot of people back on the farms who might have been there if this policy had been in force when it should have been as soon as possible after the second war, when the various materials were available. Now that is one of the things we feel would have done a great deal to help stop the movement away from the farms towards the city.

Another thing we have mentioned has been the provision of better market roads so that the farmers can get access to the cities and towns in winter as well as in summer. We feel that instead of squandering millions and millions of dollars on schemes that this Government sets such store by, they should have given more help to municipalities in building better market roads, and municipal roads out of the tremendously increased revenue; the extra amount given by this Government to assist in that regard is really very, very small indeed.

We have emphasized the necessity of better school grants so that the teachers could be kept in the rural schools; qualified teachers, who would not be leaving our Province in hundreds and leaving our schools to be manned by "sitters" who are not qualified to teach. The result is that farm mothers and fathers who are anxious to have their children get the benefit of a good education, have come to the conclusion that if this is the sort of school they must send our children to, then they might better move into the towns and cities. And that has definitely been a contributing factor.

Our attitude has been that we have a Government here that has been very, very blind toward the needs of the farmer, and after eight years in office, after this tremendous movement away from the farms towards the cities and towns, which they have done very little to try to stop in any way, or even halt, they now come along and say there is no real programme to lay before the people now, but they say "We will appoint a Royal Commission to look into it and see what can be done." Well, we do not think that every possible suggestion to help the farmer has been worked out yet, and for that reason, if the right kind of a Royal Commission is appointed, we are quite ready to support the idea. But we do not think it should be an excuse for inaction in some of these things I have mentioned; and if the people in their wisdom decide to replace the present Government by a Liberal Government, then there will be action taken along these lines, without waiting for the report of the Royal Commission.

These are steps which should have been taken long ago . . .

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — 34 years ago.

Mr. Tucker: — While I hesitate to mention the fact of the low income of the 'thirties, I pointed out this Government will likely spend, during the coming year, more than the total farm income in 1937 and 1938, and more than half of the total farm income even in 1941.

So when my friends talk about why more was not done in the days of the depression, and why as much was not done as was done by this Government when they are spending in one year (proposing to spend in the

March 17, 1952

coming year) seven times as much as governments in the days of the depression had to spend. They are fooling nobody by that dishonest argument, and when they talk about why rural electrification was not carried on during the war, when on the admission of the Minister in this Government himself, you could not even get material until the war was over at least a year, and in some cases two years, and so when they say why did we not do this during the depression, and why did you not do it during the war, I say let them ask their own Minister about that.

There is no use trying to put across on the intelligent people of this Province dishonest and foolish arguments like that. Now then, I say that if a Liberal Government is elected during this coming election, we will go ahead and carry out this programme that I have announced, without waiting for the report of the Royal Commission.

This resolution proposes that the Commission in its enquiry and recommendation, should have particular reference to the problems involved in present day trends in agricultural production, in land use and farm cost. That brings up the question of farm costs. I would have been happier if it had been put in there as a relative economic position of the people living on the farms, but the suggestion there is that the farmer is being hindered by rising costs, and I suppose it has in mind that his economic position should be looked into. Any Royal Commission, I fancy, would feel that that was one of the fundamental things that they should look into.

In looking into that, and looking into it properly, it seems to me that the makeup of the Royal Commission would be most important. The value of this Royal Commission will depend, to a large extent, upon the personnel of the Commission; upon the wisdom and the vision and the experience of the Royal Commissioners who may be appointed; and when we are looking into the point of the problems involved in present day trends in agricultural production and farm costs, and land use, it seems to me to have that done properly there should be on that Commission, without any doubt, a representative of the farmers themselves, one who has a real background of experience on what has happened in this western country for the last 20 or 30 years; and surely, there should be a representative of the farm women who, in many cases, have borne the brunt of the isolation of our farms and the difficulty of getting the children educated and so on; they have borne the brunt of it, and perhaps have suffered even more and felt it more than the farmer himself.

Then there should be, on that Commission, it seems to me, if a good job is going to be done, an economist who has made a real study of western conditions, and is very familiar with developments in our western economy, if a real good, far-sighted job is going to be done.

Then the second suggestion of the resolution is that they should look into the need for farm capital and credit, and along that line there is, no doubt, much that should be looked into; to what extent the bitter and violent attacks that have been made from time to time on people who have extended capital to people engaged in the industry of farming in

Western Canada, by the members of the C.C.F. Party, and by the attitude taken by them — not so much now, because it is deemed wise to soft-pedal on that at the moment — but it would be interesting to see to what extent it is felt that that has created a situation whereby there is no capital available for young people to get started in farming in the west, in the same way that there has been in the past.

Also, there is no doubt that the matter should be looked into again to see to what extent the Provincial Government might be expected to do something in regard to the matter. We are all familiar with what happened in that regard in the past, and why the Saskatchewan Farm Loan Board entered the picture. It was the result of a recommendation that the Provincial Government should do something about it, and the thought was that the Provincial Government would borrow money and re-loan it to people who engaged in farming. Well, when the Federal Government entered the field, I think it was felt that they had much more in the way of financial resources than the Provincial Government, and that the Provincial Government could withdraw from the field, and it has been withdrawing as rapidly as possible for several years now.

There may be some way in which the Provincial Government can re-enter that field in some way, and it would certainly be in order for the Commission to look into that situation, because it is one of the tragedies of present-day circumstances that young people who would like very much to stay farming, but find it impossible to do so and they see land which they might farm if they could get some credit, go into the hands of some person who is already a large farmer, trying to extend his holdings; and that young man who might have stayed on the farm goes to the town or city and then later, perhaps, leaves the Province altogether.

The third suggestion in the resolution raises again the necessity of having a good economist, who is thoroughly familiar with western conditions, being placed upon this Royal Commission. The third suggestion in the resolution is the further adaptation of social services and educational facilities to meet changing rural conditions. There is something that has had an affect on the movement of the people from the farms, as I have already said. The feeling of every father and mother that they want to get the very best possible chance for their children — and if the best that they can hope for is a person who is not trained to teach — who can only be a study supervisor or so-called “sitter” in their schools, then they have the feeling that if they move to the town or city they can take advantage of the benefit of well-trained teachers. That is almost enough, regardless of any economic pressure, to cause most fathers and mothers to say, “Well, we will make the sacrifice to make sure that our children get a good education.”

My own feeling is that our neglect of the educational system, so far as it affects the rural people of this Province, has been during the last four or five years, when the revenues of this Government have been so large, but the refusal to use a reasonable amount of those revenues to help our rural schools keep teachers, without having to raise

March 17, 1952

taxes beyond anything they can bear — I think that that attitude on the part of this Government is one of the things which the people will censure at the first chance they get, when an election is held.

But, in any event, that is so significant to those of us who live in Saskatchewan, with a background like we have, that that might be one of the most important features of this Royal Commission. So it seems to me that on that Royal Commission we should have a person who knows a great deal about educational problems, and knows a great deal about the development of our educational set-up in western Canada, and who brings to bear all the wisdom, vision and knowledge that he may have accumulated from his past experience and study of the situation; and that member of the Royal Commission would be one of the most important members of it.

Then there is also the question of social services as well as educational facilities. It seems to me that here we need somebody that is a trained sociologist and also has a background of a great deal of experience in Western Canada, who might be considered as a representative of the churches. Perhaps the representative of the churches should be included in this Commission in any event, because if there is any group of people who have taken a real interest in that branch of our set-up in Western Canada, it has been the various churches who have done so much good in Western Canada.

Then the fourth item in the resolution is a further development of rural transportation, communication and community service. That brings up some items I have already mentioned. In this day and age, when there is more community feeling — more desirability of people meeting together, more than in the pioneer days when it was simply not possible — if people are not going to be given the opportunity to be able to attend church and meet their neighbours — not only during the summer, but during the winter — by having proper transportation facilities, we are going to have them leaving the farm and continuing to leave the farm. That is where real help to our municipalities in regard to the great problem of transportation in our rural areas is so very important.

So it seems to me that somebody who has had experience with the problems of the municipalities as they have tried to deal with this question of communication and rural transportation — some representative of the municipalities who has had a real background of experience, as they have tried to struggle with those problems — should find a place on that Commission.

I feel that what we want in the way of a report from this Commission is a report that is based upon the accumulated experience of the people who have settled in Western Canada. No imported planners — no people that are not familiar with our conditions — but people that are thoroughly familiar with what the people who have settled here have been up against; and what we have been up against as we have tried to develop our civilization here on these western plains. That is what is needed on this Commission — people not only with the ability, the vision, the wisdom, but also the accumulated experience, and who know what is likely to be feasible and what is likely to be purely visionary — something that

might look good on paper, but which, from past experience, would be known to be of no use if it were tried.

So, Mr. Speaker, while I want to emphasize again the appointment of this Royal Commission is no excuse for the past inaction of this Government in regard to assisting our farmers and while it cannot be permitted to be an excuse for inaction for another two or three years — and we will not permit it to be so if an election is held and this Government is replaced by a Liberal Government — still, as I said before, there are so many deep-seated problems here that if a Commission with the background of experience (and there are many, many people who have that background of experience in our midst in Western Canada); people who have had that experience and are well-trained in regard to these various branches which I have mentioned; I feel that if a Commission like that is set up and has the full backing of the people of the Province, and of the Government of the day, they may be able to bring in recommendations and suggested lines of conduct for the Government that may be helpful, not only to the farmers of our Province, but to the Province as a whole.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, we will support the motion.

Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River): — In rising to support this motion and expressing a few thoughts that I have on this matter, Mr. Speaker, I thought when the Premier introduced this motion on Friday last that we might discuss this on a high plane — on a plane which would be above party politics and all that sort of thing. And I am going to give credit to the Premier that he did do very, very nicely. He did very well; but, lo and behold, his Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) got on his feet and I would say to you now, after he has embarked right into the political arena of this topic I am going to say a few words he might not like before I get through telling him. I would rather like to point out to him that before he sat down he made a statement which I tried to draw to his attention and he could not find anything else to say in order to take up the radio time, so he said, “You know, Danielson over there, he does not like the Ag. rep. service; he is against it.” Well, now, Mr. Speaker, just for the information of the hon. gentleman and the rest of the members of this House that statement is absolutely untrue and he knows it. I have never at any time attacked the Ag. Rep. service in this Province and I have no intention of doing so. In that service you have many good men — men who were there in the old days. We had an Ag. Rep. service in the Province before we ever knew the C.C.F. Government. I knew many of these men. I do not know many today, but I met a few old timers that were there before the advent of this Government. And when the Minister of Agriculture, in order that that impression should go out over the air into the Province that I, as a member of this House, was antagonistic to or has done anything or said anything against that service — he is absolutely talking through his hat and he knows he is telling an untruth.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I do not want to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but surely he knows it is against the rules of the

March 17, 1952

House to suggest that a member is making a statement which he knows is an untruth. I am not going to get into an argument with my hon. friend about it, but surely that is totally uncalled for.

Mr. Danielson: — It has been done time and time here. I even told you that myself, so you should be used to it by this time.

Premier Douglas: — I am used to anything from the hon. member.

Mr. Danielson: — That is all right; it is about time.

Hon. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — I have heard the hon. member criticize the Ag. Rep. service on various occasions.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, now he is going to suggest that everything is true when he made that statement.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Premier because this was one time when he was talking on this motion that he stayed in Saskatchewan. He did not go to Korea; he did not go to China; he did not go to Formosa; he did not go to the United States. He stayed right here in the Province of Saskatchewan to talk about some of the problems we have here. It is rather interesting, Mr. Speaker, after almost eight years of C.C.F. Government in this Province, that came in with a cut and dried programme that was absolutely perfect; it was planned and mapped out by the best farmers in the Dominion of Canada and what they were going to do for agriculture in the Province of Saskatchewan — bringing in a resolution at this time, in the dying days of this Government (and I think the dying days of the C.C.F. Party) — this resolution; when I read it today and read the declaration of policy and the principles and policy that the Premier laid on the floor of this House — almost like 1944, only stronger — I cannot believe that the same Premier was sitting in the seat at that time. He said this:

“Let not those who sit in high places lull themselves into a sense of false security. This Government has pledged the development of co-operative commonwealth federations in this Province and will put this programme into force just as soon as we are given the power of this legislature. Those that argue that the issue is free enterprise, as opposed to state control, were basing their argument on a completely false hypothesis, because free enterprise does not exist. The choice now facing the people is either social control, or economic responsibility.”

In other words, that should be clear enough to any person that this socialistic party in this Province were going to solve all the problems; and certainly there was no doubt about it, if the C.C.F. were elected.

Well, let them be happy, but after all, when I read this

Resolution, or Motion, before the House and read some of the statements made by the Premier in days gone by, not so very long ago — it was about a year ago now that he spoke to the Dairy Council, the National Dairy Council of Canada at Saskatoon and he said this:

“While Saskatchewan needs more population it does not want them on the farm. With increased mechanization we need fewer people on the land.”

Well, is that the same gentleman who introduced this Motion, Mr. Speaker? I can hardly believe it, and that is only one year ago. This was dated March 19th and it was just two or three days before that time that he made his speech. But after all, let us lay aside all this, because it is a serious situation that exists in this Province — extremely serious — Mr. Speaker. There is no doubt about that.

I came down on the train yesterday afternoon with a young man from my constituency. He is farming considerable land and he said this to me; “You know, the farmer that has land to rent at the present time does not want to rent it for farming to a farmer that might have a half section or one section; but they want to rent it to farmers with two sections or three sections.” I said, “What could be the reason” and he said, “I’ll tell you the reason. If they rent it to a farmer who operates an extremely big farm at the present time a person like that does not need the buildings. He can forget about the farm buildings out there; they are not going to be an expense as far as he is concerned, as far as upkeep and maintenance is concerned.” Now that is the situation. And it is a serious thing.

During the nine months during this current year, Mr. Speaker, in the first nine months of 1951 and 1952 there were 2,281 families receiving family allowances that moved into Saskatchewan and 3,862 families moved out. That is only families that are on the family allowance list, Mr. Speaker. 2,281 families came in and 3,862 moved out, so there was a loss of over 1500. So that is the situation in regard to families who have a growing family. Well, I have not got the figures, but no doubt this figure can be increased considerably if we had a record of the families who moved out and went away and left their farms; who do not have any members of their family who are in receipt of this family allowance. So we say that this thing is going on all the time. 1500 families that have left Saskatchewan more than the ones that have come in here in nine months of the last fiscal year. That is a serious matter and one that should make everyone sit up and take notice.

Even the Governmental services here realize the seriousness of the situation. At Swift Current, on August 1, 1951, the Minister of Agriculture had a meeting there and this matter was up for discussion and one or two of them took very serious views of the fact that the farm population is decreasing all the time. There was a gentleman there by the name of Mr. Dame, pioneer from the Tugaska area, and he said this: “That the rural areas were washed up and buried four years ago.” And he supported this argument by the fact that there was only one rural home

March 17, 1952

now, to ten in the past, and that farmers were operating in the summer time and moving into the town or city in the winter. He pointed out some of the reasons for it. The Premier probably won't laugh when he hears the whole story. There were two main causes. He said: firstly, education was obtained on a much higher level in the cities and in the towns. That is true, Mr. Speaker — it has always been true. It has always been true in Saskatchewan that the farmers on the land — ever since they built schools and settled this country, that they taught certain grades up to a certain level in the rural schools and then the children were taken into the towns or the cities for their high school education. That is not a new thing; it has always been done; but he says this: "In some larger school units (and he points out the larger school unit) many of the schools were closed in the winter and it was necessary to get the family into the towns and cities to go to school." I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that any enquiry, any Commission that looks into this matter under the provisions of this Motion, and does not look into that particular phase of the matter misses something that is very, very important, because I say this — and I know that the Minister of Education disagrees with me very violently on that — but I say that the educational questions and problems in the rural areas of the Province of Saskatchewan today are probably having more to do with the problem of people leaving our farms than any other single factor in this Province. And that is the thing that has come to pass, that has come into the picture the last four or five or six years since this Government took office. There has been nothing done to meet that problem, absolutely nothing. Things have not been done which should settle either of the problems, and I could tell you many, many cases, but I am not going to do that, here.

Now, those are things that must be taken into consideration. There is also in the Province of Saskatchewan a great need for more land settlement which calls particularly for young men; and the former Deputy Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Hartney — and I want to pay tribute to Mr. Hartney, because I think he was a remarkably good man and that is no reflection on the present Deputy Minister, not by any means; but he said at the convention of the Agricultural Institute last summer, "Twenty thousand Saskatchewan farmers are in desperate need of more land. There were 40,000 more asking for additional land. It is true that a million to one and a half million acres might become available for agricultural purposes in northern Saskatchewan, but these would be developed at high cost of clearing and drainage." Well, there is one of your — next to the Minister, the highest agricultural official in the Province — and I think you will grant one of the finest men, speaking a fundamental truth. There is need for more land for settlers in this Province, but it also needs some policy which will put the people back on the central plains of this Province, Mr. Speaker, whereas now you can go four, five, three, two miles and you never see a house of any sort, or a hen, or a cow, or any livestock whatever. These are the things that are taking place in this Province. Then they have been forced into the cities and into the towns and one thing that has more to do with it than anything else is the problem of education to rural children in this Province.

I am not going to take a great deal of time with this thing, because I think it has been very well covered by the previous speakers, but I want to point out one thing and that is this: I know we have had the

last few days one Commission sitting here enquiring into certain phases of implement prices and one thing and another and I have no fault with that, but one thing that struck me and that is the number of witnesses coming in from the Government with long written briefs and statistics which I think every farmer has, if he wants to look them up in his own home, if he gets magazines. There is the Dominion Bureau of Statistics which goes into many, many farm homes in the Province today; but they come in here and spend hours and hours reading them and then file them away. I do not say they are useless, but after all, there have only been one or two witnesses before that Committee to date that have really given the Committee something to think about, any real good facts which might benefit us in our decisions when this Committee is going to report. I want to say this; that I think when this Committee sits — the Royal Commission, as you call it — and is going to hear evidence, there should be less of that; and do not forget to ask some of the farm movement officials — some of the farmers themselves, some municipal officials that come in here and tell the Royal Commission some of their problems and what they think about it. They might be able to bring in a brief to this Royal Commission all nicely made up. But I think if you were to bring in some of the women out on the farm who probably wonder how they are going to get an electric washer, and where they are going to get power to use that washer, or an electric iron. Or the farmer who milks cows — used to do it — and they will have to do it again, Mr. speaker. If he can get an electric motor to put on his cream separator; and the municipal councils can build 12 miles of good road and raise it high enough so the farmers can drive over that road into town any time without getting stuck in winter time — those, I think, Mr. Speaker, are some of the things we should get first hand and get down to the roots of things; and then, if you have the men which I hope you will get, they can recommend something to be done, something which is practical that they can put into practise and which really will justify the amount of money that this Commission is going to cost. I am not complaining about the cost of this thing, but after all, this Government has been in office for nearly eight years and they should have done this two years ago, because they are not going to use it before election. They are doing it now in the dying days of their term of office and they are going to try to take a lease of life by being able to explain to some plain folk that sometime in the future, if this Commission comes through with a finding — which they expect them to do — then they are willing to go and (I should say) rectify some of the mistakes they already have made, because many of the things that are wrong with the farms today is due to this Government and there is no doubt about that, Mr. Speaker.

So, with these few remarks, I want to assure you that I shall support the Motion for the setting up of this Royal Commission and there is no need of me going over what the Leader has already done. I have pointed out to you some of the men, some of the practical men, some of the types of individuals who should be on that Commission; the background of these individuals — they should be practical men — and we do not need any Cadbury from Old England, or we do not need any Shumiatchers or McGraws or anybody else. We want practical men and practical men who do not look at everything through political eyes. Let us hope we do. I hope that will be the result; and with these few words, Mr. Speaker, I shall support the Motion.

March 17, 1952

Hon. Mr. J.A. Darling (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, I had not any intention of speaking in this debate until the Leader of the Opposition dealt so drastically with the programme of this Government with respect to farm electrification. He has done me the credit on several occasions to say that I am always fair in my arguments, that I do not bring forward statements with respect to what occurred prior to 1944, and claim that the government of that day might have accomplished something in the way of farm electrification. I appreciate that tribute, Mr. Speaker, but I think, in return, he might be equally fair in dealing with the same subject, because unquestionably he is not fair in drawing comparisons between Manitoba and what is being done in Saskatchewan and he is not fair when he says that we might have done what we have done now, several years ago.

I have so many times dealt with this in the Legislature that I feel it is a needless repetition. However, there is so much repetition on the floor of this House that perhaps it will not be out of place if I say the same thing two or three times over.

In the first place, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman said that the whole Province — that is, the town and city dwellers — ought to make a contribution to farm electrification. No one is going to dispute that, Mr. Speaker. We are doing it. I wish that it were possible to paint a map on the ceiling of this Chamber showing what the Power Commission lines were like in 1944; and also showing what those lines are like today. Until we had built the main transmission lines that make up our present grid, farm electrification was out of the question and it was the town and village load which made the building of those transmission lines — which take the power to the farm areas — possible. In that way, of course, town and village people have — or will — through their consumption of electrical energy, pay the costs of those main transmission lines. The contribution which the farmer makes simply takes care of the tap-in off those lines which, roughly speaking, you can say the villages and towns have paid for, out to the farms.

Hon. Member: — Partly.

Hon. Mr. Darling: — Yes, partly. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to take just a very short time on this subject. But the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in this House several times has referred to the contribution which the farmer makes as between \$600 and \$700 per farm. I am quite sure, although I have not the accurate figures with me, that the average paid by the farmer would be somewhere between \$450 and \$600. Some have paid more because of excessive mileage, but I am quite sure the average is somewhere between those figures.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition said that if we had gone forward, as they have done in Manitoba, that we might have had so many more farms served at this date. If we had been putting the power in to the farmers free of cost we could not have served one additional farm. We have never lacked for farms to serve at that contribution. Consequently, that has had no effect whatsoever on the extent of our programme and

I might say that it was not until 1948 that there was any relaxation in the scarcity of materials that was retarding the construction of electrical power lines. And even in 1948 we could not have had all that we could have used. It retarded even the construction of the main transmission lines between towns and villages and, as I said previously, those main transmission lines had to be served before we could proceed with farm electrification. And it was in 1949 that the Farm Electrification Bill was brought into the Legislature and we have had to build up an organization to take care of farm electrification since that time and we have been building it just as rapidly as it is possible for us to build it. You cannot pick up the type of man, the type of trained personnel, who can be useful in the power corporation organization, off the street. They have to be trained and we did not have them in the Province, or available to us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take up more time, but I do feel that this item that I received today in the mail is a matter of some interest. This was mailed to me from a gentleman whose name I have forgotten — I wish I could express my thanks to him, but it just came attached to a covering letter — it is “The Provost News” from Alberta and it is headed “Co-operatives Formed to bring Electricity to this District.” The first part of the article simply names the members of the Co-operative, and the directors and so forth. Then it goes on to say:

“One of the happy features of the Co-operative is the fact that by joining now before construction of the lines begin, it is cheaper for everyone concerned. However, if some people plan on waiting until the line is erected and then ask for membership they will undoubtedly find that they are required to wait many months before a crew will be back in the district to hook them up. Therefore, the cost to them will be higher than if they joined the Co-operative now before construction begins.”

Now, this is the important part, Mr. Speaker:

“The estimated cost of construction is \$900 per mile, plus \$257 per subscriber for a transformer, plus a share of the sub-station which is estimated at \$4,000. The estimated cost to the shareholder is therefore \$1385, based on a mileage of 1¼ miles.” (That mile and a quarter includes the tap-off which is only slightly more than the average that we build in our system.) “From this it may be seen that the more subscribers, the less mileage per subscriber, and hence lower unit cost.”

March 17, 1952

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the rest of the article is not of importance, but in the Province of Alberta this is undertaken by private enterprise, and although their rates are lower, in the Province of Alberta the main transmission lines have been built and the towns and villages are paying for those main transmission lines. All that the farmer has to take care of is the cost of generation, the cost of his line and the cost of generation; consequently, his rates can be much lower because the Calgary Power Company has no investment in the farmer at all. All he has to pay for is almost the equivalent of our run-off rate here in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the people of this Province properly informed with respect to our power programme.

Mr. B.L. Korchinski (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about this Resolution. It was strange enough to see the Minister of Public Works get up now and admit that prior to 1948 there were no materials available for expansion of power, although . . .

Hon. Mr. Darling (Minister of Public Works): — Mr. Speaker, I did not say “no materials.”

Mr. Korchinski: — Very few; although, up to that date, we have been hearing continually from the Government members that Liberals did not do anything in 1944 or previous to that; but they never said why it was not done. And now, they come up themselves and admit, one by one, that there was no possibility of doing anything in the war years because there were no materials available.

Mr. Speaker, the ground was pretty well covered by the previous speakers, but there are one or two things I would like to discuss. In my opinion, the farmers leave the land and move into the cities because they lack roads — all year-round roads — and because they lack educational facilities out in the rural areas and because there are not as many recreational facilities as the young people find in the cities. The time has come now that the roads that lead off the farms must become more and more a provincial responsibility. At the present time, due to the policies of this Government, I know very many places where farmers themselves are building the roads, without any aid of the municipalities, because the municipalities are so overburdened with the various problems that they have to face, that the farmers themselves get together and without any aid from outside, put out their own money and build their own roads. I know very many cases where that has happened, and I know very many cases where the farmers have organized the so-called snow clubs — snow-removal clubs. They have spent a great amount of money to remove the snow from the roads so that they could go into the towns and villages to do their shopping. When we kept on telling the Government, during these last four years, that something should be done about this snow removal in the rural areas and that the Department of Highways should take the initiative — oh, they thought it was a joke and we were criticized with the stock criticism that we

suggested a reduction of the budget and yet we suggested increasing services. The one excuse that this Government has when we suggest something good is they say, "Well, look at the Liberals, they say we should reduce the budget and yet they suggest more services." In our opinion both these could have been done and will be done after the next election. The budget could be reduced and services could be extended and the people of Saskatchewan know that, too.

What we need now, Mr. Speaker, is more farmers on the land, because the farmers have moved away from the land in such great numbers that this Saskatchewan of ours is becoming like a desert. If the trend keeps on we will not need the Legislature here — all we need is the mayors of the various cities and they will be able to run the cities without the help of the Legislature — because there are so many farmers that have moved away that the place is becoming a desert. So we must change that trend. There should be a back-to-the-land movement but I don't think there is anything that is being done by this Government to encourage a back-to-the-land movement. I have not heard anything said, any place — on the radio or in any publications — where young people are encouraged to go to the farm. I hear all kinds of propaganda speeches from the various Crown Corporations and the various Government branches, extolling the paradise that we have in Saskatchewan, but we have never heard where there was somebody saying that the best life is the life on the farm.

I feel that our educational system is to blame very much, not only for the fact that the rural schools are disappearing, but for the fact that the courses themselves do not seem to try to sell farming to the young people of Saskatchewan. It seems that everything that we do in the schools tends the other way, and I think that we should try to change the plans and try to encourage the young people to settle on the land because that is actually the best place where a man can feel independent and enjoy life so much more.

I think the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Education should embark upon programmes of education of our Youth in such a way that our young people will love the farm and go back to the land. We need small farms. I do not think we need any of these large, very large, farms; and I think it is due to the economic policies of this Government that the farms are becoming larger and larger. I believe that we should set our economic policies in such a way that the small farm is encouraged. And we need privately-owned farms. I do not think it is a practical idea here in Saskatchewan to have this idea of Government land lease to farmers. I do not think it is a practical idea any place wherever it has been tried. But, perhaps the people of Saskatchewan are not aware of what is happening. It is one of the theories of socialism not to have privately-owned lands. It is absolutely necessary, if you want to install socialism in a country that you do away with all privately-owned land, because for example, if I may be permitted to roam away from Saskatchewan, the best example is the U.S.S.R. They did away with privately-owned land and why? Why did they do that? Well, it is necessary to the socialist plans.

March 17, 1952

You see, a farmer who lives on the land is the most independent individual that you can find in human society and he cannot be pushed around and he cannot be regimented in any way. He has his own ideas. A very good example of this — how the farmers love the soil and how they will defend it with their lives — is the example of the French farmers. We know that France has very many small farmers, prosperous farmers, and they were the ones that, during the first world war, were the stand-by of the French army. They said that they would not let the enemy pass over their land. And that is true.

Now the Socialists cannot put their plans into effect if they have privately-owned land because the farmers will not be planned — they cannot stand planning, they cannot stand regimentation — and planning and regimentation is one of the essential things of socialism. They are basic things and we do not hear much about it now because I do not think that socialism is very popular in Saskatchewan today. In fact, we hear very little, outside of the member for Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs) who quite often pounds his chest and says he is a socialist. We do not hear anything from the Government members at all about socialism. The socialists — they were going to cure all the ills of Saskatchewan — it is not mentioned very much now. One of the things of socialism is the planned economy, but we have never heard about this planned economy and that is a basic thing in socialism — the planned economy — and if we did hear, it was just simply mentioned, it was never explained, what this planned economy means.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I would like to have the hon. member inform me on what Resolution he is debating now.

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Natural Resources was not sleeping in the House he might have heard.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I can get more when I am sleeping than he can when he is awake.

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker, I am talking about the setting up of a Royal Commission to investigate problems on the farms.

As was said before (and I did not want to repeat the same statements) the Socialists in Saskatchewan have been in power for eight years almost and now they realize that the election is coming on and probably something should be done to pacify the farmers because even the simplest person out in the country sees that something is wrong with our farm economy and nothing is being done by this Government, so now they are going to set up this Commission and I am talking on this Resolution

I maintain and I sincerely believe that socialism cannot solve our farming problems because their planned economy requires that everybody should be planned — there should be plans made for everyone in the human society. And, as I said, independent small farmers cannot be planned. They will not stand up, they will not subject themselves to any planning. Therefore, this socialist idea is absolutely impractical in

Saskatchewan. I was going to say that we have heard from those socialists the fact that some of the socialists believed partly in private enterprise, which is absolutely an impossibility. Either you are socialist, or you are not. Now, if you are not socialist you had better say so and come out on this side; and if you are socialist, then say so, so the people of Saskatchewan will know what you are, because this masquerading under different colours whenever it suits your convenience — well, I do not think the people of Saskatchewan will stand for that kind of stuff.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, socialism cannot solve our social problems because they believe — and you can study socialism in every country where it was tried — they believe that the only way they can put their policies into force, into effect, is that once they have a landless population, when they people who move from place to place . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask you, is the hon. member arguing for or against the motion now?

Mr. Korchinski: — I am just giving my opinion as to what should be brought before this Royal Commission. They should be told that socialism cannot solve the Saskatchewan Farm economy.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — O.K. then . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Korchinski: — Well, this is the preamble to the Commission's setting up. I am trying to say that socialism for Saskatchewan cannot solve Saskatchewan's farm problems, because basically the socialist philosophy believes in landless proletarians — that is workers who have no land — who can be shifted from place to place. The main thing in socialist philosophy is that there should be dissatisfaction and the labourer is always dissatisfied and the socialists thrive on that. Now, the small farmers cannot be regimented, as I said, therefore I maintain that socialists cannot solve their problems and I think that we should have small farmers. We should have small farms and we should have many of them. And I think we should have vaster educational facilities all . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Isn't there such a thing, in the book, Mr. speaker, about monotonous repetition?

Mr. Speaker: — I was thinking about that.

Mr. Korchinski: — There is no more monotony, Mr. Speaker, than the C.C.F. here usually talking about this thing that the Liberals did not do anything in 34 years — in fact it is very sickening.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! I might point out to the hon. member that as far as repetition between the groups is concerned I have not ruled on that, but I am going to rule on tedious repetition in one speech by one speaker and you were getting very close to the line.

March 17, 1952

Mr. Korchinski: — Mr. Speaker, I was going to say that the 33-year lease that this Government has in this Province is one of the causes why the people are moving away from the land, because this is an attempt to do away with independent privately-owned land where farmers can enjoy their own land in their own way and I was going to say, Mr. Speaker, that one of the steps that should be taken is to do away with that Act that provides for this kind of a setup where a person cannot buy Crown lands any more in Saskatchewan, but must lease them and be a tenant of the Government.

I think that this is again a socialist idea, because they want to get as many people as possible to eat out of their hands so that they can be in control. You see, it is quite a setup. Rent the land to the farmers so if you are their landlord they must be more or less friendly to you; likely they will vote for you; set up as many as possible Crown Corporations and hire half the population of Saskatchewan into those and those also will likely support you; so with all these things you can be sitting pretty. I think this 33-year lease is one of the causes why our people are moving away from the farms in the country and into the small villages.

So, to summarize, Mr. Speaker, I think we should see to it that the rural people have all year round roads; that a snow removal programme should be instituted and these people who have organized these clubs should be assisted in a small way with their club work, because the greatest enemy today of the farmer is the snow on his road. When he was using horses he was able to get around, but now because he uses his car, if his road is blocked he cannot get into his town or village and he must find some way to get there and I would like to see the Government do something about the snow removal on our rural routes; and I would like to see something done to improve our educational facilities; and if possible, something should be done to improve recreational facilities in the rural areas. I think that there are quite a few lakes and places that could be turned into parks and I am sure that something could be done in that respect.

I am going to support the motion, Mr. Speaker, because I think that something absolutely drastic must be done now to turn this trend of the farmers moving from the land and going to the cities and the villages.

Mr. A.L.S. Brown (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, this being March 17th and after listening to members of the Opposition, I am reminded of my friend, Pat, when he first came to this country and he asked "What is the Government here in Canada?" and before the person had an opportunity to answer Pat says, "Don't answer that, I am agin it anyway." Well, my friends in the Opposition do not apparently have the courage to come right out and oppose this Resolution, but it appears to me what they have done is damn it with faint praise and the hon. member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) who has just taken his seat, did not even get around to faint praise of this Resolution. It appears to me that they are aware that any constructive study of any of the problems that face us today and the solutions that any constructive study might arrive at, must be contrary to the policies advocated by the Liberal

Party and by the members of the Opposition. I think that in spite of the faint praise that they have levied towards this suggestion by the Government to set up a Royal Commission to study the problems facing the agricultural industry, that they would be prepared to see no solution brought forward, rather than to see a solution brought forward which would be advantageous to the policies of this Government and to the policies which have been inaugurated and put into force by this Government. I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, without presupposing the recommendations that any Royal Commission — or any investigation — may make, I would assume that the solution of our problems must lie in greater co-operation between ourselves as individuals and between ourselves as governing bodies and between ourselves as a part of different organizations, including farm organizations and organizations which have been organized in urban centres.

The Leader of the Opposition suggested that the setting up of the Royal Commission should not delay any activity which this Government might make in promoting a more stable agricultural economy in the Province of Saskatchewan. I think that the people of Saskatchewan, and certainly the members of this Legislature, appreciate that this Government, or the members on this side of the House, have never taken this as an excuse for not attempting to do that which we thought was in the interest of the agricultural economy and in the interests of the people of Saskatchewan. Time and time again we, in Saskatchewan, have been in the foreground in advancing ideas and policies, which later have been adopted by other provinces of Canada — policies which have proven of benefit to the people, and particularly to the people in the rural areas. I doubt if there has been any single action taken by this Government, or by the members on this side of the House which has not been, in the final analysis, in the interests of the rural people and in the interests of those people engaged in agriculture. For it matters little whether you improve the living standards of the people in our urban homes, or whether we improve the living standards of the people in the rural part, the wealth from which these improvements are made must come from the agricultural industry and the improvements in either the urban or the rural areas reflects back on an improved agricultural economy in the Province of Saskatchewan.

As we look over what has been attempted by this Government within their jurisdiction to improve our agricultural economy, the story is indeed long. The Minister of Public Works very briefly referred to the inauguration of a policy by this Government, which has definitely improved the stability and the living standards of those people within our agricultural industry.

It is true that the activities in the Department of Education, the establishing of the larger unit, has stabilized our agricultural economy in certain areas and in certain portions of this Province. And all of those things, and if we take them all collectively, we have done much within our jurisdiction to stabilize and make our agricultural economy secure. But I cannot feature a Royal Commission making recommendations strictly within the realms of the jurisdiction of this Government.

March 17, 1952

I can very well feature a Royal Commission indicating whereby I, co-operating with my fellow farmers, may see a more stable economy. We may be able to set up more co-operative movements and encourage and extend those co-operative enterprises which we, as farmers, have set up so that we may, to a greater degree, stabilize our agricultural industry. I can very well feature a Royal Commission making suggestions that must be fulfilled on a national level, within the Federal jurisdiction before we can expect complete stability within our agricultural industry; and before we can expect that we, in Saskatchewan, a primary agricultural province, can get the amenities of life as compared with other occupational groups in other parts of Canada.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that a Royal Commission has a much bigger job to do than simply suggest certain things that this Government may do and legislative action it may take to meet those requirements of the agricultural industry and I further suggest that by meeting the needs of the agricultural economy and improving the agricultural economy, they will be definitely improving the whole Saskatchewan economy and in the final analysis the economy of Canada as a whole.

My hon. friend from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) referred to the decrease in population and he suggested that possibly one of the reasons for the decrease in our population in Saskatchewan has been agricultural economy of the Province of Saskatchewan. I agreed that with the increase of mechanization within the Province of Saskatchewan and in our agricultural economy, and with a changing trend of our agricultural economy, and as we have improved the security of the whole of the people of the Province of Saskatchewan in other industries relative to agriculture, that as we have raised the opportunities for people other than in the agricultural industry, it is only natural that we should have a trend from rural areas to urban centres. I do not suggest that that is necessarily a bad thing, if we have in some cases a trend from rural areas into urban areas, because we expect — and I think we have a right to expect — that these people who have moved into urban centres may, in their position by living in urban centres, better serve the agricultural industry and our agricultural economy than if they had remained strictly as rural people in the rural areas.

I suggest that it requires the co-operation of those people in urban areas as well as the co-operation of those people in our strictly rural areas, because as our advancements have shortened the distance between countries and made the world smaller, it has made the relationship between rural and urban groups of people smaller in comparison as well. Advancements that we have made in our agricultural industry, advancements that have been made in mechanization, have definitely brought the rural people closer to the urban people. It has made the rural people, in some respects more dependent upon urban people, and in reverse it has made the urban people equally more dependent upon the rural areas. I think that today we have seen, as we have never seen before — and I think the people in the urban centres appreciate more than they have ever appreciated before — that their prosperity depends

upon the prosperity of our agricultural economy and they are as interested in the welfare of our agricultural economy, or at least they should be as interested in the welfare of our agricultural economy as those people actually living on the farm.

My friend from Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) suggested that socialists cannot solve our problem and then he went on to suggest that we needed a plan for the individual to fit into our economy. Well, I am going to suggest to him, who is going to do the planning if it is not people who are prepared to spend some time in an overall plan which we, as individuals, can fit ourselves into our society? And I suggest that anybody who is truly socially conscious, one who is prepared to study the problems of the day and study them constructively is, in my opinion, a socialist; and the type of socialist philosophy to which we on this side adhere and which we believe.

Referring back again to my friend from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) he made reference to the Farm Implement Inquiry which is presently being conducted. I certainly do not want to inject the Farm Implement Inquiry into this debate or into this Royal Commission. I think that either one of them in themselves has a big problem on their hands and a big job to do. But I think that the suggestion which he made indicates the philosophy of many of those people who do not want an answer to the problems which are facing us at this time. If we are going to obtain a true picture in a Farm Implement Inquiry, or a true picture of our agricultural economy then we must be prepared to do a lot of study and we must be prepared to compile a lot of statistics and information that can be made available and compile it in such a manner that we can digest it intelligently and from there arrive at an intelligent decision. I do not think that this Commission can go at a job in a piece-meal manner, any more than the Farm Implement Inquiry. We must be prepared to look at the whole problem. But I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the little that has been done in this inquiry in itself indicates the necessity of doing something that will give a study to the even greater overall question than that of implement inquiry. There have been, in my opinion, many factors come before our inquiry which we, who are enquiring on implement prices, can do very little about. But it does indicate, in my opinion, the necessity at this time of sitting down and very seriously considering the trend that has been created in our agricultural economy and try to figure out where we are going, why we are going and how we are going; and possibly, what is most important, to, if possible, point out to ourselves and to the people of Saskatchewan where we can expect to end up. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that a Commission at this time is very important. As the Premier pointed out when we passed through the industrial revolution there were many problems created and the solutions of which some of those problems have not yet been arrived at.

I do not think a Royal Commission is going to set up a Utopian society here within Saskatchewan, or that a Commission of this type is going to be able to suggest means by which we could set up a Utopian society within Saskatchewan. But I do think that a Commission of this type will realize that we are dealing not only with our agricultural economy, but that we are dealing with the people within that economy,

March 17, 1952

and as such, all of the people of Saskatchewan and that their welfare must be considered. We must not only consider the welfare of the people who may be directly engaged in agriculture, but we must also consider the welfare of those people engaged in servicing the agricultural industry within the Province of Saskatchewan. As I suggested a moment ago, I doubt if this Commission will come up with a complete solution to all the problems; but if this Commission can point out to myself, as an individual farmer; if it can point out to those people in the service industries — those industries servicing agriculture; if it can point out where they, as individuals, or as organizations, can better fit themselves into an agricultural economy in some small way, then I suggest it has done a useful purpose. If it can suggest to this Legislature some things which we have not yet done, or have not seen ourselves able to do, it will have served a useful purpose. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if it can suggest a way by which we collectively can make any further advancements, that it will indeed be well worth while and will justify any efforts and any costs which it may entail the people of Saskatchewan — if we can bring stability to the province and particularly to the agricultural industry.

And for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am indeed glad to support the Motion moved by the Premier.

Mr. Jacob Benson (Last Mountain): — Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity of expressing a few opinions in regard to this particular Resolution. First of all, I want to congratulate the Premier for having introduced the Resolution. I think it proves two things: first, that the policies followed by the Government during the past eight years have failed to solve the rural problem; second, it proves that when you have a serious problem to consider, that a party administration is not the proper body to consider that problem.

The Resolution asks for a Commission, which, I presume, will be free from all Parties and influence. If it is not free from that influence, then my opinion is that you might as well not appoint the Commission. (For sure, I am making a plug for Independent bodies).

Any time a group of people discuss and consider any problem, no matter who they are, they help in the solution of that problem. I believe that as far as our rural problem is concerned, the application of some of our labour laws in rural areas has intensified that problem, rather than help to solve it; it has intensified it in many ways.

The Government of the province has failed to solve these fundamental and basic problems, because these are the problems of individuals; they are problems of local communities; they are provincial problems; they are national problems and they are international problems. Before we can satisfactorily solve our rural problem in Saskatchewan, we will have to take consideration of that whole field.

Products that we produce on the farm, and the way they have to be marketed, brings into consideration matters that are definitely national and definitely international. I think this Royal Commission is going to have a big job on their hands in considering the whole field that will finally bring a solution to this problem in Saskatchewan. The first step to the solution of any problem is to admit that the problem exists; second step is to consider and recommend solutions; and the third step is to find ways and means to put those recommendations into effect.

I notice in the Resolution here that it is pointed out that these economic trends are creating new rural social problems as well as adversely affecting the ability of our young people to become established in the agricultural industry. Then we go down to No. 2 and review the asking of this Commission to study the need of farm capital and credit. Several years ago we had a Farm Loan Board operating in this Province (it ceased making loans, I think, in 1929) and then a few years later, when this Government got into power it brought in a Bill to abolish the Farm Loan Board as a lending institution. At that time I voted against the abolition of that Farm Loan Board as a lending institution, and at that time I pointed out there would be a time in Saskatchewan in the near future, when it would be necessary to make loans to young farmers in order that they might become established on the farms of this Province. I am not much of a guy to say, "I told you so", but on this occasion, I feel like saying "I told you so."

I am going to say a little bit about the old Farm Loan Board. The Provincial Treasurer will no doubt tell us that the Province lost several million dollars because of that Farm Loan Board operations. Every mortgage company that operated in the Province of Saskatchewan during those ten years also lost millions of dollars, and I believe that the losses of the Farm Loan Board were perhaps increased because of the fact that there was a little too much political influence in regard to the operation of that Board. I believe that any lending institution — and I might mention to the House that I was a member of the Committee that was set up by this Legislature that examined into the loans made by the Farm Loan Board; and I well remember some of the loans that were made, and it was the political influence that was brought to bear in order to have those loans made. I want to say that if there is any loaning institution established in this Province, to make loans to young farmers (and I think there should be) then that institution should be devoid from entirely any political influence whatsoever in order that it might be a success.

I believe there is need today — and there has been need in Saskatchewan for the past several years — for an institution of this kind to make loans to young farmers in order that they might be established, and I think that is one of the main reasons why young farmers have left the land. There was no chance — no opportunity for them to become established. Sometimes we are told that in order that such an institution as this might operate it must have a large capital. I want to point out to the House that if we had established a Farm Loan Board with a little loaning capacity six or seven years ago, it would not have meant there would have been need for a large amount of capital to

March 17, 1952

start. The capital expenditures would have grown as the demand grew. Every co-operative institution that was started in this Province, started out with practically no capital, but because of good management, and so on, those institutions all developed to the size they are today.

It says here in No. 3 that the Commission should study the further adaptation of social services and educational facilities to meet the changing rural conditions. I want to point out that every time we solve one problem — not every time, but often — when you solve one problem, you create a new problem. We were told, and have been told in this Province that the larger unit is the solution for our school problem. I think the larger unit has helped to solve our school problem, but it has created other problems. There will have to be a new look taken at the educational system in the Province of Saskatchewan.

No. 4 says “the further development of rural transportation, communication and community services.” When the rural school was closed, when the building was sold and moved out of the district, we removed the centre of social activities for that community, and I regretted to see that done, because I believe that those local communities were the fundamental base of our democratic institution. That is one reason I regretted to see them go.

In regard to rural transportation, communication and community services . . .

Hon. Mr. Lloyd (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question? How many rural schools does he know of that have been sold and moved away?

Mr. Benson: — Oh, quite a few. They are advertised every day.

Mr. Danielson: — Thousands.

Mr. Benson: — I just received “The Saskatchewan News” and it says here: “Two hundred and twenty miles of highways were blacktopped in 1952 — a master network of highways taking place in the Province of Saskatchewan.” What the farmer needs in the municipalities is a master network of rural market roads, in order that he — and that should be given, in my opinion, prior consideration to the building of a provincial highway system.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — You are opposed to No. 6 then, are you?

Mr. Benson: — No, I am not opposed to No. 6! It is all right for the Minister to say that “You are opposed to No. 6.” I am going to tell him that I am going to keep fighting for my share of the money spent on No. 6 just the same as these other fellows are in their own constituencies. If the Government is going to spend all this money on provincial highways, then I want to see it properly spread around.

As far as these rural roads are concerned, this last year, because of the wet conditions, they got into a terrible state, and I think

there are a few where the Provincial Government could do more than it has been doing to establish a good market road system in every municipality in this Province; and I think that should come before the highways. After all, these people who use market roads, travel on them perhaps 50 times to every once they travel on a Provincial highway, and I am not trying to belittle the needs for Provincial highways when I say good rural roads should come in preference to Provincial highways. Of course, I can understand these fellows who live in the cities — they want a good Provincial highway so they can get in their car and go from place to place — I also want a good road to drive on when I want to come to Regina or go to Saskatoon, or anywhere else.

I do not want to take any more time, but would like to commend the Government, though, for having admitted there is a problem there, and having admitted that they have failed to solve it so far.

I hope that this Royal Commission that is set up will be able to bring in recommendations which we can apply ourselves, as individuals; recommendations that the local communities can apply; recommendations that the Provincial Government can apply; recommendations that the Dominion Government will apply; and also recommendations that can be worked out internationally, so that we can sell our farm products.

Mr. Speaker: — I wish to inform the House that the mover of the Resolution may exercise his privilege of closing the debate. Anyone wishing to speak must do so now.

(Closing debate)

Premier T.C. Douglas (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to detain the House very long, but there are a few remarks I should like to make in winding up the debate.

Frankly, I am somewhat disappointed, as there seems to be a failure in some parts of the House to have come to grips with the real problem that is set forth in this Resolution. I was inclined at first to agree with the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) that I thought this would be a topic that would be above partisan discussion, and was very pleased when he started out by saying that he hoped it would be non-political. It was not very long, of course, until he got around to talking about the Government being in its dying days and that we were doing this to save our political life. I thought this was a strange way of being non-partisan.

He was also very glad that I had managed to “stay in Saskatchewan” in the course of my remarks; I wish he had been able to keep the Leader of the Opposition from wandering into Manitoba, and the member from Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) from getting into the Soviet Union, and over into France; but I suppose that was really too much to expect.

March 17, 1952

Mr. Speaker, there are two fundamental errors, it seems to me, that have been evinced as a result of the discussions which have taken place. The first is that the members of the Opposition have endeavoured on this occasion (as they have on others) to put forth the argument that depopulation in Saskatchewan, and shifts from the rural to the urban area, is somehow connected with the policies of this Government. They talked about rural roads and schools, and the lack of rural electrification at being the reasons why people have moved from the rural areas into the towns and the cities. If that is true, Mr. Speaker, and if it is the policies of this Government that have been responsible, they should have told us (and I hope sometime they will tell us) why, from 1936 to 1946, during which time we had a Liberal Government for eight and a half years, that 98,559 people left Saskatchewan? The C.C.F. Government did not come into office until the summer of 1944.

If you look at the rural population, the picture is even worse. In that ten-year period, 135,000 people left the rural areas of Saskatchewan. Now, Mr. Speaker, that cannot be attributed to the C.C.F. It cannot be attributed to roads and schools and lack of rural electrification under a C.C.F. Government. The Leader of the Opposition said: (I took it down and I think these were his words) "Working people tend to leave Saskatchewan for places where they are better off." Well, Mr. Speaker, let us have a look at how people left the rural areas, and what happened to them. I believe I put the following figures on the records the other day, but I just want to refresh the House's memory. From 1936 to 1941, 50,428 people left the rural areas of Saskatchewan; 14,873 of these moved to the towns and cities of Saskatchewan, and the rest left the province. That does not take any cognizance of the natural increase. From 1941 to 1946, 84,918 people left the rural areas of Saskatchewan, and only 21,614 of these moved into Saskatchewan towns and cities; the rest apparently left the province. From 1946 to 1951, 83,170 people left the rural areas of Saskatchewan, but 82,210 found employment and lived in Saskatchewan towns and cities, which left only 960 who apparently went out of the province.

Now, that does not substantiate the contention of the hon. Leader of the Opposition that people left Saskatchewan in order that they would be better off in other places. For the first time in a 15-year period, what we were able to absorb in the towns and cities almost balanced what had left the rural areas. Therefore the policies of this Government, rather than being held responsible for any loss in population, can claim the credit for almost completely stopping the loss in population that had been going on for the ten years prior to our taking office.

Now, the other fallacy, it seems to me, that has been advanced is the statement that after this Government has been in office for eight years, we are now finding out there is something wrong with the rural economy; therefore we have to set up a Royal Commission to see what is wrong with it. The member for Last Mountain (Mr. Benson) says we are now admitting our mistakes.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I do not need to go into the details because they have been done into in the budget debate. But the fact of the matter is that we are doing more today for the building

of rural roads than was done by any previous government — five times as much being given by this Government as by previous governments to assist in the building of rural roads and the construction of bridges. We are doing more in terms of helping education.

The Leader of the Opposition says, “That the refusal to use our revenues to provide rural education is responsible for the people moving out.” Why, he has only to look at the estimates to see that grants for education have gone in some eight years from \$2¾ million to \$8½ million, to say nothing of loans to schools and building grants and so on.

The assistance given in draining swamp land, in bringing new land into cultivation, in irrigation, all of these are expenditures being made by this Government that were not made by previous governments.

We are not presenting this Resolution because these present rural problems are not being dealt with. The problem of rural municipal roads and bridges is being dealt with. The problem of rural education is being dealt with. The problem of rural electrification is being dealt with. When the Leader of the Opposition says that “People would have stayed on the farms if electric power had been provided at the same time and in the same manner as it was provided in Manitoba.” I want to say that the Liberals are rather late in finding that out. Electric power was being provided in Manitoba when I was a boy 25 years ago; but they had a Progressive Government. At that time in Saskatchewan we had a Liberal Government, who did nothing about it. There has been a constant attempt to hide behind the fact that there was low income in the 1930s. The Leader of the Opposition says, “Why, it is dishonest to keep on saying that the Liberals should have done something during the depression years.” Well, if it is dishonest, I can think of someone very close to me who was then, therefore, very dishonest, because I heard the Leader of the Opposition in 1930 standing up in the House of Commons and saying, “What is physically possible can be made financially possible; we can put the people to work; we can irrigate the dry land; we can build roads, hospitals, schools; we can put everybody to work, if we will only utilize the credit of the people of Canada.”

That was a good speech. But where has it all gone now? There was no reason in the 1930s for not having rural electrification. There were plenty of supplies, lots of poles, and certainly there was an abundance of idle and unemployed people. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, we are applying ourselves to those rural problems. We are not suggesting the setting up of this Royal Commission because these rural problems are not being tackled, or because we need the advice of a Commission on how to tackle them. What we are saying is that in the years that lie ahead, in view of the technological changes in agriculture, there must be corresponding changes in the sociological pattern under which we live.

For instance, when you talk about fixing up rural roads, what do you mean? Is it suggested that you try to build all of the 200,000 miles of surveyed municipal roads in the Province? Would that be possible? No, my friends says, and I agree with him. Therefore, where are you going

March 17, 1952

to build these roads? Even if you build main market roads, how are you going to get to the people who are not on the main market roads? In other words, how do you get your population in a sparsely settled country like ours, so settled that they can be served by the minimum number of miles of market roads, the minimum number of miles of transmission line, and the minimum number of schools so as to benefit the greatest number of people at the smallest possible expense?

It is that sort of plan which has to be worked out. It is not that we just start haphazardly and say, we are going to take a power line and connect every farm, no matter where that farm is; we are going to put up schools all over the place; we are going to try to build every market road up to a high market road standard; we are going to try to set up the necessary type of farm form of organization, by which it will be possible to serve a greater number of people than it is possible to serve at the present time.

Now, I do not think I need to spend very much time dealing with the statement made by the member for Redberry that what we want to do is abolish privately-owned land. Mr. Speaker, this movement with which I am proud to be associated, came into existence because privately-owned land was being abolished by mortgage companies, and that thousands of farms were losing the private ownership of their land.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Would you permit a question?

Premier Douglas: — Yes, I would be very glad to.

Mr. Egnatoff: — If that is the policy of your Government, why is it that you have deprived more than 2,000 veterans from the right to own their own land?

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, the statement is inaccurate, of course, and the hon. member knows that it is inaccurate. He just likes to hear the sound of his own voice.

Mr. Egnatoff: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. That statement, if it is inaccurate, is a statement made by the Minister of Social Welfare. He said in Saskatoon the other day, at the Rural Municipal Association meeting, that there were more than 2,000 veterans who were under lease on Crown lands. Those veterans, and the Premier knows it, cannot get private ownership to that land. If you believe in private ownership of land, Mr. Premier, I wish you would explain to this House why it is that you have, in effect, deprived more than 2,000 veterans from the right of private ownership of land.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I can explain it once more; and while I can give the explanation, unfortunately I cannot give to my hon. friend the capacity to understand it.

Mr. Egnatoff: — I want to assure you that I can understand any honest answer.

Premier Douglas: — Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman . . .

Mr. Speaker: — The Premier is now proceeding to give the answer.

Mr. Egnatoff: — I asked for an explanation, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Will the hon. member keep his seat?

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I am proceeding to give it, if the hon. member will just contain himself for a few moments; if the hon. member will just hold on to his wings, well, I will be right with him.

I said the hon. gentleman was making a statement which was not correct when he says that we have denied the 2,000 veterans the right to own their own land. As the hon. member knows, the Government announced last year that these veterans would be allowed to purchase the land, and that they have the right — and if they want to — they can purchase that land after a period of ten years; and if they ask now, they can have the price given to them at which they will be allowed to purchase. Mr. Speaker, here is the amazing thing.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — You can explain it all over!

Premier Douglas: — Let us stop the clowning for a moment. Mr. Speaker, here is the interesting anomaly. The gentlemen opposite, one after the other, have complained about the fact that when a piece of land is vacant and some young man wants to get it, somebody with a lot of money comes along and buys it. (That is what the member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) was complaining about; and others complained about it.) I agree with my hon. friends that it is true, but at the same time they are complaining about that, they want the Government to take Government land and put it out. What would happen? The people with the biggest pocket-books would be the people who would get that land.

Hon. Members: — Oh, no, no!

Premier Douglas: — Absolutely. The only way. We would be back to having hotel-keepers and druggists and lawyers getting some of these leases, instead of the boys who want to farm the land. The Government holding ownership of that land ensures that land being made available to those who want to farm it. We are thereby preventing that land going into the speculative market, and going to the highest bidder. That is certainly what would happen.

But the most significant factors, Mr. Speaker, is that over 25,000 more people want that land than there is land available to be given out under lease. I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, that I do not think it helps the situation any to have a member like the member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) say that the province is becoming a desert and that we will not need this Legislature here very much longer because we will not have much left to legislate. That is certainly a great way to boost the province! Mr. Speaker, I hope he is not teaching that to the children in school. If he does not know, the fact should be shown to him that this Province in the last 12 months has produced more wealth,

March 17, 1952

agricultural and otherwise than it has ever produced in its history. This Province is far from becoming a desert. It is one of the most productive areas in the Dominion of Canada, whether you are talking about grain or livestock, or many of the other products which this Province is able to produce. For somebody to go around feathering their own nest by talking about the province becoming a desert, it seems to me is not meeting the situation at all.

While we are setting up this Commission we should recognize that this Government is tackling (and I believe tackling with more success than has ever been shown by any previous administration) the problems that confront the rural areas of Saskatchewan. It is advisable at the same time, that having in mind the technological changes going on, and likely to go on in the future, that we should be looking at the overall picture in order that we may plan intelligently for the future.

When you look to the east of us and see that in the Province of Manitoba today only 40 per cent of the people live on farms, as compared with 61 per cent ten years ago; when you look at Alberta and see there only 45 per cent of their people living on farms, as compared to 67 per cent ten years ago; you recognize that this is a trend that is going on all over Canada and all over the North American continent. If you see that a trend is moving in a certain direction, then you must plan, in order that you may meet the problems that this trend is likely to place on your doorstep. For that reasons we are asking this House to approve the terms of reference which we will give to a Royal Commission.

The member from Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) said that we did not talk very much about planned economy any more. Mr. Speaker, this is the basis of planned economy. That is how you have a planned economy — by sitting down and studying . . .

Mr. Erb: — They could never understand it.

Premier Douglas: — . . . the economic trends, studying economic costs, studying what are economic units, what are the best farm organizations hat can be set up to meet the problem of mechanized agriculture, and in the light of the information that is brought forth, then to plan your programme for the future.

Now that the Opposition members have said they are going to vote for this, I hope the fact that I said it was the basis of planned economy will not cause them to change their mind and vote against it. I want to thank both the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Arm River for the concrete suggestions which they made. The Leader of the Opposition said it was most important that we have the right kind of personnel and with that I heartily agree. I think that the value of this Commission will be in direct proportion as the kind of people appointed to it commend themselves to the people of Saskatchewan, and have the confidence of the people of Saskatchewan. Unless they are the kind of people who carry some authority, who are outstanding in their own particular field, and who at the same time have a practical grasp of the problem confronting this country; then, of course, unless that is done, the recommendations of the Commission will not carry very much weight. You may be

sure, Mr. Speaker, that the government will give careful thought to the appointing of the Commission and we shall certainly take under careful consideration some of the suggestions that have been made by the Leader of the Opposition.

Also the member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) wanted them to go out and give the farmers a chance to say what they thought about this problem. That, of course, is absolutely necessary. I would hope that such a Royal Commission would have hearings in various parts of the Province where farm officials, farm organizations, farmers, municipal officials, people interested in social questions, such as members of the churches, and school teachers, and social workers, and business men, may come and express their views in a most informal manner, because I agree that while you require on a Commission like this, people who are trained economists, and people who are familiar with economic laws, it is also necessary that we shall have the grass-root opinion of the people of the Province.

Now, as I said, the Government will do its best when it appoints this Commission, to select a Commission that will recommend itself to the people of the Province as being a Commission that can do this job and do it very adequately. Naturally, we do not know what the recommendations will be and I am not going to commit myself in advance, and say that we will carry out the recommendations of such a committee, when royal commissions are set up, they are set up to gather certain facts and to put recommendations before the Government of the day, along with supporting data as to why those recommendations should be carried out. But, of course, in the final analysis the responsibility must always lie with the Legislature and with the Government as to whether or not those recommendations will be implemented. But I do want to say this, that if the Commission is the right kind of a Commission (and we will try our best to see that it is) I feel confident that the kind of recommendations which they make will be recommendations that can be carried out, and recommendations that will, when carried out, resound to the benefit of the Province of Saskatchewan.

The question being put, it was agreed to, unanimously.

RE LIVESTOCK AND LIVESTOCK PRODUCTS

Moved by the Hon. Mr. Nollet, seconded by Mr. Thair:

“That this Assembly, regretting the failure of the Government of Canada to take complete control of movement, market and price of livestock simultaneously with the announced outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Canada and that certain Provincial Governments consequently felt it necessary to impose embargoes against entry of livestock and livestock products, urges the Government of Canada:

March 17, 1952

- (1) to take immediate action to remove such embargoes;
- (2) to assume complete control of the movement and marketing of all livestock and livestock products;
- (3) to maintain the minimum price for livestock at price levels prevailing during the week ended February 23, 1952, until markets return to normal;
- (4) to provide compensation for slaughtered animals at full replacement value plus additional compensation to farmers affected for loss of income, and
- (5) to provide adequate compensation for loss of income to packing house employees affected by layoffs consequent upon the outbreak of the disease.”

Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, in speaking in support of the Government Motion on the Order Paper, reading as above, I think it would be well, first of all, to just review the background in regard to the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Saskatchewan.

The disease was first discovered November 16th and it was reported to the Dominion Health of Animals Branch on November 28, 1951. The first quarantine was established for stomatitis December 2nd, on the Waas farm. On February 20th a general quarantine for stomatitis was imposed and then on February 25th, after the results of the laboratory test at Hull, Quebec, were determined, an announcement was made that the outbreak was foot-and-mouth disease. On February 26th the United States placed an embargo on live animals and meat, hay, straw and animal by-products from Canada. And then, on February 27th members will recall, I wired the Prime Minister expressing concern over the affect on the livestock industry generally, particularly with reference to market conditions. And to refresh the hon. members' memories, I will again refer to that wire and read it, in order to indicate that the resolution that is before the Legislature is consistent with the wire that I sent to the Prime Minister on February 27th, reading as follows:

“Great concern felt regarding calamitous effect on livestock industry of Canada due outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease to date confined to relatively small area surrounding Regina stop Suggest a market panic poses greater threat to industry than disease itself. Livestock men throughout Canada already face extremely heavy financial losses due above factors stop In interest of protecting livestock industry and general public would suggest invoking national emergency powers immediately for federal control of market movements in Canada and that producer price of all livestock be maintained at the same level prevailing during the week ending February

23rd until the disease has been brought under complete control and normal market circumstances again prevail stop Any action less than this could be a serious blow to the livestock industry.”

Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House that I have not, to date, received a reply to that wire sent to the Prime Minister. But, in the interval, a good deal has happened, as everyone knows. The Provincial Governments began to place embargoes on the movement of livestock and livestock products interprovincially, adding confusion to an already panicky situation. And, as a result of the imposition of provincial embargoes it was finally found necessary, by the Dominion Government, to impose an embargo on the shipment of meats from the United States to Canada. The one purpose that was intended was revealed in the statement issued by Mr. Gardiner in which he said that it was hoped thus to retain the Canadian market for Canadians. But when one looked about at the Canadian markets that were supposed to be retained for Canadians, we discovered, in Saskatchewan and Alberta, that there was no Canadian market available for our livestock. And, similarly, consumers in British Columbia and Ontario were denied meat products that could have come very handily from the western provinces. The result was a completely chaotic market situation; in some areas prices were advancing to the consumers, in other areas drastic drops in the price of livestock took place to producers. I cannot imagine a more confused situation. There never was a time when, in my opinion, emergency powers were more greatly needed. As a matter of fact, emergency powers were used by the Dominion Government in restricting the importation of meat and meat products from the United States. If that emergency power was used in that case, it was so much more necessary that the same emergency power should have been used, if necessary, if there was any question about jurisdiction, and applied to the movement of livestock and livestock products in the Dominion of Canada, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition): — If the provinces saw fit to impose an embargo, how would the Minister have gone about forcing them to be lifted? Would he use the troops or something, or would he have gone to the courts?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, my presentations right along have been — and the spirit of this Motion is — that we are criticizing the Dominion Government for not having announced that they were taking over complete control of the movement of all livestock in Canada and maintaining the price when they announced that they were taking over complete control of the movement of all livestock in Canada and maintaining the price when they announced the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease, because they should have known what was going to happen — and it did happen, Mr. Speaker.

And on these grounds, if the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) wants us to be critical, we certainly have an opportunity. There was a complete neglect on the part of the Dominion Government, Mr. Speaker,

March 17, 1952

Mr. Tucker: — He did not answer my question though.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I have answered the hon. Leader of the Opposition's question. I have stated frankly what action should have been taken by the Dominion Government; and subsequently the provinces, in self-defence, began to impose their own provincial embargoes, confusing the situation no end.

Mr. Tucker: — Will the hon. minister permit another question? Is he saying that if the Dominion had taken these steps the provinces necessarily would not have put on embargoes?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am saying exactly that. I am saying that in this situation, if there was any question at all about constitutionality or whose jurisdiction the control of contagious diseases came under — if there would have been any question at all about that — the Dominion Government could have invoked their national emergency powers and declared that they were taking over complete control of the movement and marketing and setting the price for livestock and thus preventing the terrific economic loss and financial loss experienced by our livestock producers and throwing the entire economic situation in Canada into complete chaos. Now, Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to be critical at all; I just wished to express disapproval that the Dominion Government did not act, and I think we have an obligation to point that out to the public of Canada. You may be assured of this much, Mr. Speaker, that as far as I am concerned, I will not move to the low level of debate that the hon. members opposite have in this House in any criticism that I have to offer to any government. And any criticism that I have to offer can be well substantiated with facts, Mr. Speaker.

There was some question, too, as to whether Canada could legally restrict the movement of meat products from the United States, where they have no foot-and-mouth disease, under certain treaties and agreements. And that has been referred to in the press. As a matter of fact, Dominion Government officials were running down to Washington, asking Washington to relax their embargoes against the importation of meat from Canada. But . . .

Mr. Loehr (Humboldt): — I would like to ask a question if you will permit it. You made the statement several times that the Government should not have placed an embargo against cattle coming in from the United States. You amplified the statement by stating that “in the United States, where they had no foot-and-mouth disease.” You still do not know — we do not know — nobody knows — where it came from; it may have come from the United States. How do you know that it did not come from the United States?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, this is not a question. It would be almost impossible to get down to the proper level to try to even attempt to answer a question like that. We know this much, Mr. Speaker, we know that the United States is free of the disease. We know we have the disease in Canada. And I can say this, that the American authorities have far more justification for placing restrictions on meat coming from Canada

to the United States than we have in imposing embargoes on meat from the United States to Canada. Now, I think a forthright . . .

Mr. Korchinski (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, I shall endeavour to get done by 6 o'clock; if I cannot, I will have to adjourn the debate. I will take the hon. member's question, I am sure it will be profound.

Mr. Korchinski: — Why didn't you make this statement at the meeting when Mr. Gardiner was there?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister to state clearly whose responsibility for the control of contagious animal diseases came under. He stated at that meeting very clearly that it came under the Dominion Government.

Premier Douglas: — The only people who are afraid of Mr. Gardiner sit on the other side of the House.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons that an embargo was placed on the importation of American meat and meat products into Canada was to endeavour, by that device, to induce the Provincial Governments to remove their own embargoes. That was one of those old round-about tricks of lining people up . . .

Mr. Speaker: — There are one or two schoolmasters over there and I think if they would exercise their disciplinary powers on the little group around them, instead of creating confusion in the Chamber, it would be more in line with their occupation. You have been one of the main offenders; you are not acting in a decorous manner at all. I do not think for one moment you would allow your pupils to act in the way in which you are acting, and it may be necessary for me to take more excessive disciplinary measure than you have to take.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, the position expressed in the Resolution before the House and the representations that we made to the Prime Minister have been endorsed and approved by various meetings. For instance, I have here in front of me a Resolution that came from a meeting sponsored by the council of the R.M. of Moosomin, and the representative organizations at that mass meeting were representatives of the Wheat Pool, the S.F.U., the Moosomin Chamber of Commerce, the Moosomin Retail Merchants' Association, the Ivanhoe Farm Forum, another New Hastings Farm Forum, Orangeville Co-operative Association, the Moosomin Wheat Pool Committee, Moosomin Co-operative Association, The Red Jacket Wheat Pool Committee, Fleming Wheat Pool Committee, Fleming Lodge, S.F.U., the Wapella Lodge, S.F.U., the Moosomin J.C.'s, Town Council of Moosomin, the R.M. of Moosomin and the Moosomin Co-op Creamery — a pretty representative organization. And here is the Resolution that they passed:

Hon. Member: — What was the date of the meeting?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The date of this meeting was — I replied to the letter I received on March 11th — it was just previous to March

March 17, 1952

11th, although in this particular correspondence I have here there is no date. Wait a moment, we might find a date here yet.

Premier Douglas: — I wish to rise on a question of privilege. It is not screamingly funny — the fact that a foot-and-mouth disease has upset the entire livestock industry of Saskatchewan — and if the member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. Dundas) is not interested he could absent himself from the House; but he does not need to disturb the entire discussion of the House of something which is a very serious problem and something which is affecting the welfare of the people of this Province.

Hon. Member: — The people of MacLean would like to know it too.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! It is just getting to the point where, as far as I am concerned, if there is not better decorum in this House I am going to adjourn the meeting. I certainly will not sit in this chair much longer and have the example that is being set for the people of this Province in the way the members are conducting themselves.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to you that this is not the first time that this has happened. When I was speaking, I have a good voice and it was almost impossible for me to be heard above the din kicked upon the opposite side of the House, and you sat there and said nothing.

Mr. Speaker: — No, it is not the first time, but it probably is going to be the last time. Most of the disorder in this House has been created by statements that simply lead to it and I have tried to keep those statements down as much as possible. But what is happening this afternoon is not even aggravated in that way.

Hon. Member: — The present speaker has been the worst offender of all.

Mr. Speaker: — He has not. The hon. member is speaking; the interruptions have come without any cause or any provocation.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — To proceed; the Resolution was as follows:

“We, the undersigned organizations and committee of Moosomin and district, urge that the Government of Canada take the following immediate action for the protection of the livestock industry: Immediate suspension of trading in cattle prices below the prices prevailing during the week preceding the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease and see that indemnity to producers in the quarantine area to be paid at the above market value, plus bonuses and payments to be made to further indemnify owners of dairy herds, owners of breeding stock and owners of unfinished stock.”

The above last paragraph was amended in the open meeting to read:

“and that owners of dairy herds, breeding stock and unfinished stock be paid at replacement value, free from income tax.”

Further:

“Take immediate steps to enforce floor prices for hogs.”

And wires were sent outlining this Resolution to the Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa, and similarly, to myself.

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin): — To keep the records straight, I would like to inform the Minister that the people concerned in Moosomin who drew up these resolutions are very pleased, incidentally, with the efforts that have been made by the Federal Government to control this foot-and-mouth disease. I happened to be there a few days ago . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Are you asking a question or trying to make a speech?

Mr. McDonald: — I am giving you the facts of the case.

Premier Douglas: — The hon. member, Mr. Speaker, can take part in the debate and give the facts if he wants to; he does not need to interrupt the speaker.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, this Resolution certainly does not express pleasure and the covering letter certainly did not express pleasure and the innumerable resolutions that I am getting from U.F.C. locals do not express pleasure and satisfaction. Who could be happy when they are getting from 3 to 8 cents a pound less for their livestock than they did a week preceding the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease? Who could be happy?

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, would the Minister table the covering letter?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Let the hon. member sit down for a while, I have answered enough questions.

Mr. McDonald: — I have as much right to stand up here as you have. I want to ask that the covering letter that is being referred to, is tabled.

Mr. Speaker: — That is quite in order, if he is prepared to table it. He does not have to.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — To go on, Mr. Speaker. I will take an unbiased opinion this time. We will go back to the Winnipeg Free Press and see what they think of the statement made by Mr. Gardiner on March 3rd, I believe, Monday, March 3rd. And the Winnipeg Free Press is commenting on this statement and I will refer to Mr. Gardiner's statement in a little more detail. It says as follows:

March 17, 1952

“The larger facts are these: It is Ottawa which is conducting the campaign against foot-and-mouth disease in Saskatchewan; it is Ottawa which is responsible for the quarantine; it is Ottawa which is paying compensation; it is Ottawa which is acting to alleviate the export situation through representations which have already brought important modifications in the U.S. embargo; it is Ottawa which has intervened to protect the price structure. In these circumstances, it is only reasonable that any measure necessary for the protection of herds in provinces outside Saskatchewan should also be left to the federal authorities. Certainly there was no request from Ottawa that provinces such as Quebec and British Columbia should intervene to impose barriers in the channels of interprovincial trade. Neither, once the outbreak was identified, was there any suggestion of federal dereliction which might conceivably have justified such action. Any fancied case which might have been offered collapses in any case with Mr. Gardiner’s decision to set up an inspection which will make it perfectly safe for other provinces to accept Saskatchewan cattle. Yet in these circumstances, and despite its own virtual admission that a ban on through shipments is unconstitutional, the Manitoba Government has acted to make a confused situation chaotic, a veritable Chinese puzzle.”

It is quite apparent that everyone agrees that this was a responsibility belonging to the Dominion Government constitutionally. And everyone realized too that under the circumstances, and considering the wide implications of announcing the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Canada, that simultaneously some action should have been taken to control the movement and marketing and price of livestock throughout the Dominion of Canada. I think that neglect is unwarranted, Mr. Speaker, and I believe this House would be derelict in its duty if it did not say to Ottawa, “We do not like it that you did not take the action that you should have taken.”

Now, speaking of markets, taking a quick look at what happened, I have mentioned already that the prices on the western markets dropped from \$3 to \$5 a hundredweight, comparing the period ending March 13th. I have figures here — I do not intend to quote them in detail, Mr. Speaker, but when comparing the prices in the week preceding the outbreak of the disease and the week ending March 13th, there is a very drastic decline in prices, particularly on the Winnipeg market; and I might mention this, too, Mr. Speaker, that originally — do not let the members opposite forget this — originally the Dominion Government put a ban on the movement of livestock from Manitoba eastward, in the hope that they could retain

Ontario for the U.S. market. But the American authorities put a ban on the importation of livestock from any part of Canada. And Manitoba did not like it. Manitoba asked us if we would protest to the Dominion with them against the ban on cattle moving from Manitoba eastward. And later on, in self-defence, Manitoba had to put on a ban against cattle coming from the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. If they had not, they would have had a glut on the Winnipeg market and they would not have had any place to find an outlet for their beef and would not have been able to handle the livestock.

I have some figures on livestock marketings here. In the week February 14th, for instance, in the western yards, that takes in Winnipeg, Calgary, Edmonton, Saskatoon, Prince Albert, Regina and Lethbridge, there were marketed 4,500 cattle. In the week of March 6th there were marketed 1,982 head of cattle. And if the Dominion does not take control of the situation, when the embargoes are lifted we will have an equally confused situation, with farmers rushing cattle to market and probably a further depression in prices in certain areas. To give you some examples, on the Winnipeg market, for instance, choice steers were selling February 21st for 30 cents a pound and on March 14th those steers were selling for 25 to 26 cents a pound. And good steers 28 to 29 cents a pound February 21st; March 14th, 23 to 24 cents a pound. And other random examples would be choice heifers were selling for 26 to 28 cents a pound February 21st and 22 to 23 cents a pound on March 14th.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, is the Minister going to give the figures during the same period for Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The eastern markets I do not have in this particular column, but in the same period of time the market price, I might say, in the east did not fall quite as drastically from \$2 to \$3 a hundred weight and it went up in some areas. There was quite a variation between the Toronto market and the market at Montreal as well.

Mr. A. Lopton (Saltcoats): — May I ask, Mr. Speaker, when did the Dominion Government put a ban on livestock going into Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — If I recall the date correctly, I think it was on February 26th or 27th.

Mr. Lopton: — Why didn't the Provincial Government do it itself? Is that not within the jurisdiction of the Provincial Government of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — That is a different matter. The Government of Ontario also asked the Dominion Government to place an embargo against livestock and livestock products, but the government at Ottawa said they were going a little too far but they would place an embargo against the movement of live animals to Ontario, and that was done.

Now, in regard to hog prices. It is not only cattle prices that have suffered, but hog prices similarly suffered. And I wish to point out that we were supposed to have a floor price on hogs, which was put in effect, if I recall correctly, February 16th, before the outbreak of foot-

March 17, 1952

and-mouth disease at all, and when the foot-and-mouth outbreak was announced hog prices went down too and the packers very happily began to buy hogs below the market price. I have a pretty good example of this, Mr. Speaker, in correspondence that I just received this morning from a Saskatchewan hog producer who, fortunately, got a hog to the Winnipeg market before the embargo went on. And he writes to me and says:

“I am writing in regard to the floor price on bacon pigs. I shipped one out that dressed 163 pounds and got grade “A” pay for it. The price they paid was \$23 per 100 pounds. But the floor price at Winnipeg is supposed to be \$24.50 a hundredweight.”

And this man had a grade “A” hog and the packers paid him \$23 a hundred for his hog and he was wondering why . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Has the Minister taken that up with Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The Minister is going to take this up with the proper authorities immediately, and the hon. Leader of the Opposition does not need to talk about it. There is nothing wrong, Mr. Speaker, particularly, except this; that the floor price is not guaranteed to the producer; it is guaranteed to the packer, that is the rub. And the packers have taken advantage of this situation to force prices down as they always do at every opportunity, to the producers of the raw materials. That is all that is wrong with it, Mr. Speaker. And I want to point out again . . .

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, might I ask a question of the Minister? Has it not been announced that the packers, if they do not pay the full floor price they will not get the premiums refunded to them?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — That has not got anything to do with this, Mr. Speaker. That has got to do with the overweight hogs that are being allowed now, that cannot be marketed, and if the packer does not pay the full floor price, as Mr. Gardiner said, he would be denied the premium.

I am using this illustration to point out the necessity of the Dominion taking over the entire marketing of livestock all across Canada and setting floor prices prevailing at the same level as the week preceding the outbreak of the foot-and-mouth disease, which was not done. Mr. Gardiner says in his statements here, speaking with regard to the banning of meat products coming from the United States;

“We have, therefore, under the Emergency Power Act, provided that no livestock or meats may be imported into Canada except on permit.”

If he could do it in the case of the United States meat, they certainly had jurisdiction in Canada to do the same thing, Mr. Speaker, and they did not do it. I know that the hon. members opposite do not like that but there are times, I think, when the hon. members opposite can

conscientiously criticize the Ottawa Government for things — for their failure to do things.

Mr. Tucker: — I did not follow the Minister. Where does the Minister say that the Federal Government should have imposed a ban on importation in respect of any province? He says they enforced a ban against the United States and he said they should have done it inside of Canada. I did not follow — where does he think a ban should have been put on?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I did not talk about any bans inside of Canada. The only ban that needed to have been in Canada was in the Regina quarantine area and the buffer zone surrounding, Mr. Speaker. That is the only ban that was required as far as Canada is concerned. And when meat and animals are inspected by the Dominion Health of Animals Branch and are declared free of disease and the meat is declared fit for consumption, then that meat or animal should move any place in the Dominion of Canada. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, we have not any constitution at all; we have nothing but a Balkanization and Balkanization is not good at any time; it is particularly not good in an emergency such as we faced, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, I have been trying to follow the Minister and understand him. If the province saw fit to impose a ban, what steps does the Minister say should have been taken? The other day I said if this Government took steps to enforce the right of interprovincial trade, I meant that in any reasonable steps taken by this Government to enforce those rights under the Constitution, we would give them support. Now . . .

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, the Minister has answered that question, I am sure now, twice. He has pointed out that if the Federal Government has authority to use emergency powers, which they did use to prevent importation from United States, those same emergency powers could have been used to meet a national crisis in Canada and to have taken over the entire marketing of livestock in Canada on a National basis, which would have made any interference by the provinces in the matter of setting up embargoes unnecessary.

Mr. Speaker: — Instead of interrupting so much and arguing the point across the floor, would it not be much better if the hon. Leader of the Opposition made notes and then came back with rebuttal? If he is asking for a point of information and the speaker is quite willing to give it to him, that is all right, but I do not think we have to . . .

Mr. Tucker: — I am not trying to engage in an argument; I am trying to understand the Minister of Agriculture. What steps does he think should have been taken by the Federal Government if the province saw fit — in facing what it believes to be a violation of the Constitution — to put on an embargo? Does he think we should have gone to the courts and asked for an injunction, or what — that is what I am trying to find out.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — No, Mr. Speaker, the thing is very clear. First of all the situation got confused because the Dominion Government did not take over the complete control of the situation. And secondly,

March 17, 1952

after the provinces did get into the picture as a result of lack of action on the part of the Dominion, then they could still have invoked their emergency powers to deal with the situation. I think that should be clear enough, and I think it is high time.

I want to draw another parallel, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the hon. members opposite. As they know, Newcastle disease has been a very serious disease in poultry and it is very pronounced in British Columbia and in Ontario to a lesser extent. We are importing hatchery eggs and baby chicks from British Columbia and Ontario and any Newcastle disease we have had in Saskatchewan has come either from the east or from the west, but we did not put up any barriers because it posed a threat to our industry. Because that is the constitutional responsibility of the Dominion Government, not only health of animals and control of contagious disease, but controlling the interprovincial movement of goods, and we have not done it.

Now, if we wanted to have done that, Mr. Speaker, we could have stepped in and put in a few embargoes of our own against poultry products coming in from British Columbia. Supposing we had retaliated, like some provinces apparently felt inclined to do? We would have had the whole picture confused more than ever. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that as long as we have a constitution and we are a Confederation, there are certain responsibilities that come under the jurisdiction of the Dominion Government and, in the case of animal diseases, we have recognized that. I am saying all the way through here, Mr. Speaker, that federal jurisdiction has certain fields and none of the provinces should trespass into that jurisdiction under any circumstances, particularly as far as contagious diseases are concerned.

Now I have had the representatives of the produce dealers come to me.

Mr. Speaker: — We are getting very close to recess, if there is any point in your address where we can call it 6 o'clock.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, I will call it 6 o'clock, even though it is four minutes to six.

The House resumed at 8:00 o'clock p.m.

Hon. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, when I called it 6 o'clock I think I was starting to talk about other problems in other products that were affected. Mr. Speaker, it is now 20 days since the announcement of the foot-and-mouth outbreak in Saskatchewan and, with the passing of each day we have evidence of new and increasing problems. The other day I had representatives of the Western Produce Association come to my office to discuss the accumulating surpluses of poultry

products in the storage facilities in Saskatchewan, and they pointed out that storage facilities here were very limited and they were very much concerned regarding the accumulation of storage space and the impossibility of handling additional poultry products unless they found an outlet very soon for these products. It was pointed out to me by the representatives that, under the embargo against the importation of meat from the United States, poultry products were exempted and they were very much afraid that British Columbia would import her poultry products from the United States, thus crippling the outlet to the west for Saskatchewan poultry products. I perhaps should read an extract from the letter sent by Mr. Brown and Mr. Sharpe to the Minister in British Columbia. They requested me to take some action in the matter too, and I wired the Minister in British Columbia as follows:

“Representations received from poultry produce dealers of Saskatchewan expressing concern re embargo poultry products to British Columbia and possibility of B.C. importing from the U.S. Carrying heavy stocks of storage products here. Appreciate removal of embargo on poultry products coming from Saskatchewan to British Columbia. Immediate reply appreciated.”

I had the reply from Mr. Bowman, the Minister of Agriculture in British Columbia a day or so later, in which he said:

“No change in embargo at present stop Expect information within few days which may enable us to relax stop Regret inconvenience your producers.”

I hope that this particular embargo on poultry products will be relaxed because it has been pointed out that in the processing of poultry they are exposed to temperatures that would kill any virus that might be evident and the poultry products that are expected to go to B.C. come from outside the quarantine area. Mr. Wilson, the secretary of the Western Canada Produce Association wrote to Mr. Bowman following up the wire which I sent. He said:

“May I present for your consideration a recommendation on behalf of the members of our organization which consists of approximately 90 per cent of the produce trade in the four western provinces, and of the poultry industry in general in those provinces, a suggestion that dressed poultry, including turkeys, ducks, geese processed and packed by registered grading and packing stations be exempted from the provision of order-in-council No. 476 (that is British Columbia’s order-in-council) of February 27, 1952, and may I present the following as our reasons for asking that consideration:

- (1) that it is the opinion of veterinarians that poultry is not subject to infection with foot-and-mouth disease, and

March 17, 1952

(2) that in view of the fact that poultry processed in registered grading and packing stations are scalded at temperatures from 125 to 135 degrees Fahrenheit during the killing and dressing operations, it would seem to provide assured protection against it being a carrier of this disease, and

(3) that the Department of Agriculture of the United States does not include dressed poultry, turkeys, ducks or geese in the provisions of the embargo imposed by them to prevent the spread of the disease to that country.”

This indicates, Mr. Speaker, the extreme precautions that have been taken by some of the provinces in their fear regarding this dread foot-and-mouth disease, and I just read that to indicate to you again the problems that are developing. I had further correspondence very recently from a gentleman who deals in frozen beef hides. He pointed out to me that the normal market for hides to Manitoba had been cut off and he was at a loss to know what to do with his accumulation of hides in view of the fact that the warm weather was coming and there was every possibility of spoilage. We are hopeful, therefore, that the embargoes will be removed in order that trade can get back to normal once again, but, as I pointed out, it is now 20 days — and it will soon be a month — since the first announcement of the foot-and-mouth outbreak. Surely, Mr. Speaker, that is sufficient time for some very definite action to have been taken. And it is for that reason that this Resolution has been presented to the House and we hope to follow this Resolution up with further representations and, if necessary, a conference between provinces in order that this matter may be satisfactorily dealt with as soon as possible. I should mention, Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons too, that the Resolution is somewhat critical — and I think justifiably so — is since this does establish a very serious precedent in dealing with any contagious diseases, as I mentioned previously, provinces have already shown indications that they wanted to put on their own embargoes. I am one who has full confidence in the Dominion Health of Animals Services and their inspection staff and, in my opinion, that matter can be more adequately dealt with by the Dominion Government.

Now the dairy industry is also under serious handicap. I would like to mention to hon. members that normally we export between 50,000 and 60,000 dairy cattle to the United States. That market will be shut off and certainly none of us lay any blame whatsoever on anyone for the import restrictions to the United States. But the fact remains that those dairy cattle will still remain in Canada this summer and it will lead to increased dairy production, which is a good thing, but it means, too, that our seasonal surpluses of dairy products will be larger this summer than they have been in any previous year; and the effect will possibly be a further downward trend in the price of dairy products, an industry that is already suffering under quite excessive strains. As a matter of fact, in looking at this evening's paper, and perhaps some of the hon. members have looked at or read the statement made by Mr. Turnbull,

the president of the Co-operative Creamery, and who is now the National President of his dairy association, in which he says:

“Canada’s huge dairy industry, doing about \$750 million worth of business a year, has been a victim of Canadian government policy,” J.S. Turnbull, Regina, president of the National Dairy Council, said Monday.”

And he gives this pretty much as his reason; because of the fact that prices have not increased at the same rate as other products, Mr. Turnbull felt that the industry was entitled to expect more sympathetic attitude and appreciative understanding of our situation by the Government and consumer. In other words, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the Government at Ottawa has been inclined to put price control on farm commodities when there is any tendency towards a rise in prices and at the same time the goods and services required by farmers are permitted to advance in price. Now this situation will be aggravated as a result of the fact that we will not be able to export the usual number of dairy cattle to the United States, and it is just one more good argument that market control and price control is particularly necessary at this time; and not only at this particular time but more so when the embargoes and the restrictions are being removed, because there is no doubt, with the backlog of marketable livestock that has accumulated and that should have normally been marketed two or three weeks ago, there will be a flood and quite heavy marketings will no doubt take place. Therefore, I believe that the need for immediate action to remove the embargoes, to assume complete control of the movement and marketing of all livestock and, more particularly, to maintain the price of livestock at levels prevailing during the week ended February 23rd is justified, until the markets return again to normal.

I should say something about the quarantine control. I should like to mention to the members of the House that the Provincial Government is co-operating very closely with the Dominion Health of Animals Branch. We have some 8 or 9 cars that we have made available; we have made other equipment available and we have made about 17 members of our staff available to the Dominion services. There is no doubt in my mind but what the disease is now under control and that it will be stamped out completely, we hope, in the very near future. All indications point in that direction. In other words, Mr. Speaker, there has been a whole lot of alarm, a whole lot of sensationalism and a whole lot of unnecessary market panic that could have been avoided. Again, and I hate to be critical — and I am not one to cry over spilled milk — but here is a case, I believe, that demanded pretty strong measures and I feel that much economic loss and confusion could have been avoided. And it is only sensible to suppose that when a major announcement of that kind is made, that simultaneously the Dominion would have taken over the control of movement, marketing and more particularly sustaining the price of livestock and other agricultural products that might be affected.

Now, as I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, there will be a greater demand than ever for orderly marketing once the restrictions and embargoes have been removed. I therefore hope and I trust that the Government at Ottawa will give a favourable reception to the Resolution passed by this

March 17, 1952

House. I should make some reference, too, Mr. Speaker, to the compensation for slaughtered animals. I believe the seconder of the Motion, the hon. member for Lumsden (Mr. Thair) will deal with that matter in more detail. It is my understanding that a Board of Review is being set up and we have every expectation that the farmers will be adequately compensated.

Then there is the other matter of providing compensation for loss of income to the packing house workers, and no action has been taken in that regard. I was very pleased to have been able to arrange a meeting between Mr. Gardiner and the representatives of the Packing house Union and I want to say that Mr. Gardiner expressed a great willingness to have such a meeting and it is my understanding that such a meeting was held, at which the workers were able to present their problems. We are hopeful therefore, too, that the men who have been laid off through no fault of their own will receive adequate compensation for loss of income and loss of time.

Now, I was almost going to say, Mr. Speaker, with these “few” words, I now move, seconded by Mr. Thair, the above motion.

Mr. Wm. S. Thair (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet), has dealt very fully with practically all sections of this Resolution now before this Assembly. I would just like to say that most of the infected herds are in my own constituency of Lumsden which I have the honour to represent. Indeed, a number of the farmers affected very lightly are my close neighbours and friends. And I have been very deeply interested in clause (4) and I am going to quote it:

“That this Assembly urges the Government of Canada to provide compensation for slaughtered animals at full replacement value plus additional compensation to farmers affected for loss of income.”

I say that I am deeply interested in this particular section of this Resolution — that the farmers may be compensated adequately for their losses — and I would like to make a few general statements with regard to Section 4 of this Resolution.

Before doing so I would like to say that up to the present time over 1,300 animals have been destroyed and more than a thousand of these have been in my own constituency — a great many of them, as I stated along the Wascana Creek where many of the farmers, while being big wheat farmers, are also in the cattle business because of the pasture in the Wascana Valley. The Leader-Post makes a statement this morning to the effect that the cost will run very high for compensation and expenses — probably half a million — and I am not taking any time to go into the details of these expenses, or as they name it here, costs of compensation and other expenses; but if payments are made on an adequate basis of compensation or on a replacement basis, plus the loss of income, I would

predict that if it should cost three-quarters of a million, or even a million dollars it will be money well spent if it should do away with this dreaded disease, and if the compensation is adequate and the loss of income is accounted for also, I believe it will take upwards of three-quarters of a million dollars to adequately compensate the farmers.

As pointed out by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Nollet), the Federal Government is giving consideration to all owners of slaughtered herds who may not be satisfied with the appraisals made by the officials of the Federal Government. Up to the present time I believe all compensation has been made under an old Act which has been in force for many years, and I believe that was to the effect that it would be the commercial value plus \$40.00 for ordinary commercial stock, \$100 extra for purebred stock. But I understood, in speaking to Dr. Christie today that a new Act is to be put into force very soon — if not already under consideration and under these new arrangements settlements will perhaps be carried out on a little different basis and may allow for replacement value, which I hope is the fact.

And I was also informed today from reliable sources, that two others have been added to this Board — you are well acquainted with the members of the Board — Mr. Robertson, the Wheat pool, a gentleman from P.F.R.A., and a gentleman from the Ministry of Finance at Ottawa. I have been informed today by a man — my neighbour — who appeared before the Board both on Saturday and this forenoon, that Mr. Stillborn and Mr. Loveridge will also act in an advisory capacity to assist them in establishing values under this new Act on slaughtered animals on a replacement basis. I think that will give them more consideration than they would get under the old Act. An additional compensation to farmers will be granted and we had hoped, also, the loss of income that will occur to many farmers over a one or two year period at least.

Some of my neighbours — one in particular — a man on a rented farm for years, has 400 acres of valley, and his entire herd of 35 head has been slaughtered. It is a commercial herd and he can neither take in stock to pasture, nor can he start a herd for another year or possibly more. A small experimental herd may be tried for a few months. His loss of means is practically wiped out for two years, until he is established again, a hard-working conscientious farmer. And I feel that we should go the second mile in any consideration that can be given to any of these farmers because, after all, if we stop it now it has not been a very great cost.

I understand that the two officials and the Board will make recommendations; that is, this Board that has been set up and the two officials will make recommendations to the Federal Government as to the final settlement for slaughtered herds. This neighbour of mine who was in this morning made reference to his purebred herd — there is more than one purebred herd, I might say, out in this area close to my own farm. I feel men like Mr. Loveridge and Mr. Stillborn are qualified to act in an advisory capacity with regard to lines of breeding and the pedigrees of all purebred beef cattle — also the pedigrees and the milk records of dairy cattle. I believe they have them, according to Mr. Brockelbank of the Production Branch of the Provincial Agricultural

March 17, 1952

Department. If at all possible, they are ordered to ascertain the actual value of these animals. But with regard to loss of income I am given to understand by this gentleman who was before the Board both Saturday and this morning, that nothing is to be done about it; it has so many ramifications, so many conditions that affect even the income of every farmer who has cattle in the country, as pointed out by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Nollet), the lower prices that are likely to be paid, and all the conditions entering into it, even to the packing house workers. The loss of income, he pointed out to this gentleman, will not be considered. I think it is unfortunate, but probably they could not take that into consideration, although they did say that in the replacement value they might take in and give some consideration to loss of income under that heading. But otherwise, loss of income, I am given to understand, will not likely be considered. Again I repeat, it is rather unfortunate for these people who have no income. Take the dairy farmers — one gentleman out here, Mr. Hahn, with 180 cows — has no income, only the compensation value.

There is nothing more I need to deal with. I trust that the recommendations of this Board and the Advisory Board are ample and will take into consideration the loss of income to these farmers who have lost their herds in this unfortunate scourge. And I believe, and I know that from talking with the gentleman who made the first appraisal of livestock — an official of the Federal Government — he said that he appreciated very much the co-operation of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Nollet) and other members of the staff, Brockelbank and some others, who, over the past three weeks have given the best of co-operation in order that this may be dealt with and the scourge eradicated and the farmers compensated adequately.

Now there is not any more I need to say on this matter and I might make many other statements of human interest stories. I might give you one or two of them. I was told the swath was all to be burned in some areas out there because the cattle had roamed over this swath previous to being slaughtered. Another man said that it was vital that the deer be shot. I understand Mr. Paynter has made a survey by plane the latter part of the week and they were only able to rouse out some 52 and with field glasses they were able to ascertain whether they were affected with the foot-and-mouth disease. He claimed he saw no signs of any dead animals. They do not necessarily die, but no danger of infection could be seen in any way.

And of course, you know the newspapers have not failed to play up and even the picture shows. I understand a show downtown has a picture of foot-and-mouth disease and how fatal it is to human beings, which has really thrown a scare into the people who are going to eat meat and anything of that nature. In fact I have had one or two people refer to me about this matter.

I take pleasure in seconding the Motion, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. J.W. Corman Q.C. (Attorney General): — I did not intend to speak on this but I notice, under (5) is a recommendation that adequate compensation for loss of income to packing house employees affected by lay-offs consequent upon the outbreak of the disease be provided.

Naturally I have a direct interest in that, with two packing plants in the City of Moose Jaw; and I know it has been a serious matter for them and it will be more serious if it continues and I would like to give support to the whole resolution, and particularly to that section. I believe this is a National calamity.

I remember the last time I was in Ottawa there had been a serious fire in the Province of Quebec in some town and the Federal Government was doing something to help the people; quite properly so. I submit that packing house workers in Saskatchewan, who are affected by this National calamity, should be looked after. Whether we live in the city or live in the country we are all one people and I know the people in the City of Moose Jaw will support the part of this resolution that attempts to do something for the farmers, just as I am sure that the farmers of Saskatchewan will want to see that the people who work in packing plants do not suffer.

Mr. W.A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to speak at any length on this Motion, because with most of it, with the purpose that is expressed, I think we would all be in agreement.

The part of it that I feel is unfortunate is that an attempt has been made in the preamble to make out a case against the action of the Government of Canada. Now, the actual wording is:

“This Assembly, regretting the failure of the government of Canada to take complete control of movement, market and price of livestock simultaneously with the announced outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Canada, that certain provincial governments consequently found it necessary to impose embargoes against entry of livestock, and livestock products.”

Now, I listened to the Minister, and so far as I know he brought forward no proof whatever that it was the failure of the Dominion Government to take complete control of the movement, market and price of livestock which caused the provincial governments to set up these embargoes. There was absolutely nothing brought forward that I heard that established that; and when we are asked to pass a Resolution asking for certain action, it is unfortunate there is put in the first part of it something that is not proved at all. As far as I could understand, as I listened right from the start of that conference that was called by the Minister of Agriculture, and presided over by him, there was nothing brought out in that conference either that bore out that suggestion. What was said there,

March 17, 1952

without contradiction by anybody, was that these embargoes were put on in order to make sure that the disease did not spread into those provinces, and it is unfortunate that the Minister of Agriculture, who was there and heard that, took no issue with it whatever. Nobody who was there and heard that, took no issue with it whatever. Nobody took any issue with it. Now he comes into this House and asks us to endorse a statement of fact that has not been proved, and that nobody suggested was the case, until he brings it forward in this Resolution.

I suppose if we say anything about it, there will then be an attempt made to represent that we are against the main representations of the Resolution. Well, while that may be very smart politics, if the trouble is as important as I think it is, then I think this is one Resolution that the Minister of Agriculture might have left a little bit of his petty politics out of.

As was pointed out in his presence, and was accepted by all the farmers there — not dissented to by anybody — that the reason why these quarantines were put on was because the provinces concerned wanted to make doubly sure that they kept the disease out of those provinces, it was not the failure of the Dominion Government to declare an emergency.

I think that the Attorney General — I was hoping that he was going to speak on this aspect of the matter, on the right of the Dominion Government to override the constitution in time of peace by declaring an emergency. I doubt very much if the Dominion has rights like that. Supposing the province does not agree with the Dominion — even supposing they do have those rights — supposing that it was established that they have those rights, but supposing the provinces do not agree with that viewpoint. How much further off are you if you take drastic action like that, arousing the animosity of the provinces and they say: “All right, we have as much right to our viewpoint of the constitution as you have to yours.” Then what does the Minister of Agriculture propose to do about it? I asked him over and over again this afternoon, what action does he think the Dominion Government should have taken that it did not take? Now I do not know whether the Minister of Agriculture did not understand that simple question, or whether he deliberately avoided answering it, but he knows very well that that was brought up at that conference; and I think most of us from Saskatchewan have a great deal of sympathy with the viewpoint that we do not want this country of ours to become Balkanized. We do not want interference with trade between one province and another.

We were very much in agreement with that viewpoint, that any steps that would encourage the opening up of the trade channels, subject to making sure that the disease was not permitted to escape from the quarantined area, that everything possible should be done to re-open the markets within Canada. When it was brought out about British Columbia putting on an embargo against the import of cattle from Alberta and Saskatchewan, the Minister of Agriculture (Dominion), recalled the discussion in that regard and asked them where they expected to get their meat from. The answer was “from the state of Montana to some extent” and it was pointed out the cattle that came from the state of Montana

might come from closer to the area where the disease existed than if they took cattle from parts of Saskatchewan and from Alberta. I thought their attitude in that regard was not consistent.

I also felt that the argument brought forth by the farmers at the conference — I had a great deal of sympathy with it — that here we are; it is bad enough to have the loss arising out of the disease and the loss necessary that arises out of the slaughter of these cattle (some of them very fine and almost irreplaceable) and all the dislocations that it leads to, but there is a worse thing still that arises out of this and that is the loss of the markets in the United States.

Any one of us that remembers the long fight to get the embargo against the importation of cattle from Canada to the United States lifted — and the opposition to it, allegedly on the basis that it was feared that there was foot-and-mouth disease in Canada — will remember that it fitted in very well with the interested groups in the United States that did not want cattle imported from Canada. We have seen how much it has meant to our cattle industry to have that great market there, and what it has meant to those men in the past and what we hoped it would mean in the future.

Now, to have those people who want to keep our cattle out given an excuse now, to continue keeping them out for perhaps some considerable time, they are justified under law in keeping them out, I think, for 60 days after it has been established that the disease is completely cleared up; and in view of what happened before, there is the danger that it will be very difficult to get the embargo lifted for some considerable period after that.

There is the possibility of tremendous damage to our livestock industry, and the farmers at that meeting, I thought, were very understanding. Their attitude was this, Mr. Speaker. They regretted the tremendous amount of publicity that this matter received over and above what was absolutely necessary. They felt that this was going to make it much more difficult to get this embargo in the United States lifted; that the tremendous amount of discussion that had taken place in Parliament and some of the publicity appearing in the eastern papers — and which had got down into the United States papers — apparently had done a lot of damage. They seemed to feel that the less we said about it, in the way of making a big fuss about it, the better.

Another thing that was quite clear to me was this; that they felt that the Dominion Minister of Agriculture's suggestion that the best way to get these embargoes lifted was to go quietly to these fellow-Canadians of ours and tell them, "There is no longer any risk in you taking cattle from Saskatchewan and Alberta, because we have made sure that the disease cannot escape from the quarantine area." As I understood the argument — and I felt that the farmers agreed with it — there were two reasons at least why they felt that the proposed action of the Minister of Agriculture was wise: one was this; that it was likely to be more speedy if they could be satisfied that there was no

March 17, 1952

danger in taking cattle from Saskatchewan and Alberta; then naturally, as good fellow-Canadians, they would certainly lift the embargo without any necessity of taking drastic action. They would do it, it was expected, very speedily, as soon as they felt that there was absolute safety from the standpoint of protecting their own livestock industries in those provinces; and knowing something of the delay entailed in court action, I think they were right in that regard.

There was some suggestion made at the conference in all good faith, to get an injunction. Well, the dominion might apply for an injunction. Who knows how long it would take before they would be able to get an injunction that would prevail against the decision of a provincial government which they are allegedly taking, under their rights under the constitution, to protect the health of the animals within the province?

Premier Douglas: — Under what rights under the constitution?

Mr. Tucker: — Well, they have the right under agriculture, for one thing. The Provincial Government has a right to legislate in regard to agriculture.

Premier Douglas: — Has it the right to stop interprovincial trade?

Mr. Tucker: — There again are conflicting rights. Now then, it has always been regarded that the right to not interfere — the prohibition against interference with interprovincial trade does not override certain rights to prevent disease from being spread around and the like. That is a provincial matter — the question of protecting health. I would not, at this time, be prepared to argue the constitutional question, but I do know this, that I think myself when it is all thought over, there would be no doubt that these provincial embargoes at present — and when it is quite clear that there is no real risk of the disease spreading, I think a court would hold that the province had no right to maintain those embargoes. I hope so — and I think so — but that was not the argument. The argument was this; even assuming that they were right, to get this decided by a court it would naturally give them a month or so to prepare arguments; and by the time the thing was decided by a court, it might run into three or four months.

That is the first thing; then it was felt by the Dominion Minister of Agriculture that if he did everything humanly possible to make sure that this disease could not get out of this infected area, by first of all drawing a line around it; then putting a buffer area around that of considerable depth; if he could go to these provinces and say, “There is no risk to you of getting this disease by taking cattle from Saskatchewan and Alberta.” He felt that he could persuade them to lift the embargo. He felt certain, and I think it is still likely true, that if we do not take too strong an attitude towards our fellow-Canadians in Manitoba and British Columbia — do not shake a big stick over them, or threaten them — I think that if we go about it by way of friendly persuasion, we are likely to get quicker action than if we say to the Dominion Government, “You should have asserted your rights under the Constitution

and gone to court if necessary.” I think you would still get quicker action.

That was the first argument — to get action as quickly as possible. Then there was another thing which I must say influenced me in my thinking. And mind you, Mr. Speaker, I am just as strong as anybody against this idea of trying to Balkanize Canada. I think we are one country, and while there are certain rights given the provinces which should be respected fully, I certainly want to see everything done to preserve the unity of our country. But there is this other question, and that is the question of publicity. Supposing action were taken and the provinces then thought it was a matter of protecting and establishing their rights that they should fight this thing, not as a matter of anything else except establishing their rights under the Constitution, and we get it into the courts, and the thing is fought over in the courts and reported in the United States. Then the idea gets around, “Well, (the people who are against importation of cattle into the United States will say) how can they expect us to let cattle into the United States when fellow Canadians of other provinces will not let cattle into their provinces?” And if you get a fight going, and that sort of an idea gets abroad that Canadians have so little faith in our Health of Animals Branch that they felt it necessary to establish and maintain provincial embargoes, then how much damage have you done to the whole situation?

The moment you bring a court action, then the question comes up of people who are wanting to maintain these provincial rights, and you might have a fight where otherwise you can avoid one.

Then there is another reason. First of all, there is the reason of time and then there is the reason of the effect upon public opinion in the United States and other parts of the world in regard to it.

Premier Douglas: — May I be permitted a question?

Mr. Tucker: — Yes.

Premier Douglas: — Does he not think that the American public pretty well know now that these embargoes have been put on by various provinces?

Mr. Tucker: — Oh, I think so, but I think this; that if they can be persuaded to take the embargoes off, the thing will be forgotten about much more quickly than if we start a court action and one of these provinces gets into its head that they should fight to maintain the right to keep that embargo on, as a matter of constitutional right. Then, of course, if we get the thing fought over in the courts, the thing will go on much longer and it will attract attention in the United States and other parts of the world.

So, to put it shortly, Mr. Speaker, I thought the explanation of the Minister of Agriculture, the Dominion Minister of Agriculture, setting out the steps we are taking under the advice of some of the finest

March 17, 1952

experts on animal diseases in the world, covered the situation. We are taking them in conjunction with some of the outstanding experts on animal diseases in the United States. Once we have taken these steps, then we are going to go to the other provinces, and as a matter of persuasion say, "There is no reason to maintain these embargoes"; and from anything I have heard, I think the Dominion Minister of Agriculture is still working along those lines. Certainly the farmers attending that conference, and anyone who was there agreed fully with that attitude of the Minister of Agriculture. I must say that sitting there, I was under the impression that the Minister of Agriculture of this Government was in agreement with that view — that he wanted these embargoes lifted as soon as possible, but that he was in agreement with the idea of proceeding as the Dominion Minister of Agriculture suggested — by persuasion.

I am glad he nodded his head, because I felt that was right, and I am glad we are not in disagreement about that. I still think that we should go by those methods until it is quite clear that they are not going to succeed. But I think they will succeed. I have enough faith in my fellow-Canadians in British Columbia and the other parts of Canada, to believe that once they feel there is no longer any danger of this disease spreading from the infected area, I think that those embargoes will be lifted. I think that the attitude taken by the Government of Canada in refusing to be stampeded into taking too strong an action was an attitude which should be commended, not found fault with, because there were people who were so incensed with what they felt was an interference with the right of interprovincial trade, that for the moment they felt some drastic action should have been taken.

But, as the Minister pointed out, suppose we do declare this invalid. How are we going to enforce it? How are we going to enforce it against a province who sends its officials to stop animals being imported from Saskatchewan into Manitoba? The only way you can stop it, short of calling the army out, or something of the sort (which I do not think anybody would suggest) would be to get a court injunction against those officials doing that very thing. So that I feel the Dominion Government, by not taking drastic action that would arouse animosity, and would cause publicity, that by following ways of persuasion, I think they are entitled to credit, not condemnation.

Now then, in regard to the actual things that we were asking for — leaving aside the recital — the first thing is to take immediate action to remove such embargoes. We all agree with that, I think. We think that action should be continued to get those embargoes off as soon as possible, and I think that this has been done and is being done. I asked the Minister if he wanted a court action brought, or what he had in mind, and he did not say so. I would hate the idea to go out from this Legislature that we are endorsing some drastic court action, or something. I would rather have it felt that we are endorsing the idea that is being carried out today, by trying to get this done by negotiation, and pressing for it as quickly as possible; and let it be known that we feel that they should be taken off right away, because we think that the disease is now contained, and there is no danger of it spreading.

If that is as far as we are going, I am all in favour of it;

to let our fellow-Canadians know that we feel that we have perfect confidence in the work done by the Health of Animals Branch; that they have the disease under control; that we think they have taken steps to stamp it out and have taken steps so that it will not spread from the infected areas, and it is quite safe to take cattle from Saskatchewan and Alberta.

If we move a vote of confidence like that in the Health of Animals Branch, then I think it will do a lot of good, but I regret that it is coupled, as I say, with a recital which sort of indicates that we have not got faith in them, because those farmers there who know very much about it, unhesitatingly and unanimously passed confidence in the work being done by the Health of Animals Branch in regard to the handling of this disease. I was glad to hear that, because if we do not establish in the eyes of the world that we have confidence, the power and the will to stamp out a disease like this, then we are going to shake our position in world markets.

I think we, as a Legislative Assembly in this Province, should stand behind the farmers in their attitude that we have faith in our Health of Animals Branch.

Then the next item is this: "To assume complete control of the movement and marketing of all livestock and livestock products." Well, I do not see myself, what is to be gained by that. If we get these embargoes lifted, why should we upset things more and cause more commotion and more trouble, by interfering with a setup that has been working well up until now. Again, it gives undue importance to this matter, because it was only an outbreak in a very small area. It was not a serious outbreak of this disease — I mean, it was not a serious form of this disease — and I do not think that we should ask our Dominion Government, on account of an outbreak in a small area, to change the whole system of marketing. I doubt that, but as I say, if it is the feeling of this Government that it is in the best interests of our producers to ask that, they have the power to carry this Resolution in this House by a majority, but I regret that this is in there. I doubt the wisdom of it.

Now, No. 3: "To maintain the minimum price of livestock at price levels prevailing during the week ended February 23, 1952, until markets return to normal." I see no reason why we all should not be able to agree on that, because those markets have been affected by the outbreak of this very bad disease, and I do not see any reason why the livestock producers should suffer on account of that. It seems to me that that is a good suggestion. That is what the farmers asked for and it has our support.

Then the 4th item: "To provide compensation for slaughtered animals at full replacement value, plus additional compensation to farmers affected by loss of income." Now, I read over the debate in the House of Commons when this Bill was passed to deal with this matter. It goes much further than any previous legislation, as it properly should, and my understanding of the setting up of this advisory committee, conjoined with the very general terms of the legislation. It was deliberately done that way to make sure that full justice should be done to people who lost their

March 17, 1952

livestock, or suffered damage on account of their stock having to be slaughtered because it was either infected, or was exposed to possible infection of the disease.

The legislation is drawn in very broad and general terms, and the suggestion was made that the kind of people who are being put on the advisory board, headed by Mr. Robertson, Secretary of the Wheat Pool, that we could rely on that board to make recommendations that would be fair to the farmers, and the suggestion was that because of the general nature of the legislation, the Minister of Agriculture would have power then, to see that full justice was done to our farmers. So I think what is asked for here is really envisioned in the Dominion legislation, and I think again that when we are passing Resolutions, saying that we are favourable to this, we should not couple it with condemnation of the Federal Government for what they have done in the matter, because they have done the very thing we are asking for here.

Item No. 5 — I would be personally in favour of that myself, because again I think that this laying off of workers arises out of an attempt to stamp out a disease. It is not a normal thing. It is not a lay-off of workers that you might think would be covered by unemployment insurance legislation. This arises not only out of doing away with the animals that were sick, but doing away with all the animals that were exposed to infection; and interfering with movement out of a tremendous area to make sure that the disease is not spread, and then closing up packing houses for fear that they may be a centre from which the disease may be spread out.

And so, the closing of packing houses, it seems to me, is part of a campaign to wipe out the disease, and I do think myself that a very good case can be made out for compensation for these people, much beyond the ordinary provision of the Unemployment Insurance Act. That, however, is a matter for the Federal Government, but is something, I think that is quite proper for us to pass a Resolution on, expressing our views on the matter.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to speak unduly on this matter, but just to sum up, I feel that the first item, the Dominion Government is doing what is recommended in it; and we in effect are endorsing what they are doing. I hope that is our attitude and I believe from the reaction of the Minister of Agriculture in this House, as I have been speaking, that he agrees with that.

In regard to No. 2 — “to assume complete control of the movement and marketing of our livestock products,” I was not convinced that it is a good thing to have it in there, but I do not think we would be justified in voting against the whole resolution just because that is in there; but I think it would be better if it were out.

We are wholeheartedly in favour of Item 3, “maintaining the minimum price of livestock at these levels.” We think that Paragraph 4 is the proper idea, and we think it will be done under the existing legislation; and we are in favour of Paragraph 5, so that in effect we are in

favour of the whole resolution, except we doubt the wisdom of Item 2. I really wish the Government would re-consider that, because if you are trying to say that, is our opinion, this thing is now under control; we have it stamped out, then should we go on to say that we should take the whole livestock industry under control? Floor prices is part of the policy of the government, and it is not necessary to have the whole industry under control to apply floor prices. Had that been in there in place of Paragraph 2, I would have said that — the actual time of the Resolution — we could vote for them all. I do regret that when we are working together here in a co-operative effort in regard to this disease — and when I saw such harmony that seemed to prevail between the Government here and the Government at Ottawa, in dealing with this disease, in getting the farmers together so that they could give their expressions of their views on the matter; and when certainly there was the greatest amount of confidence expressed in one another's departments, and the work that had been done — I do regret that in connection with this matter, we express the feeling in any way that the Government of Canada failed in the matter. That certainly was not the attitude of the farmers. I do not think it is the attitude, really, of the people of the province as a whole.

I think the way they would want us to deal with it is the way they dealt with it, to say we have faith in our own fellow-Canadians, both in the Health of Animals Branch, provincial and federal; we have faith in the people of other provinces, that they will do right in the matter, and we suggest that what has been started shall be continued and in this national calamity, the losses suffered by our farmers, livestock men, and working people, should be assumed by the nation as a whole, and not left on the backs of individuals.

I think from that you will see, Mr. Speaker, that we certainly do not intend to do other than to support this Motion, because it has so much in it with which we agree, despite the fact there are points in it with which we do not agree and which we would much rather have seen omitted from it.

Mr. F.M. Dundas (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, the disease happened to be first allocated in the constituency of Qu'Appelle-Wolseley, on the farm of Leonard Wass and I might say I have been in contact with Mr. Smith, Mr. Wood and Mr. Wass, and that they are fully confident that the Federal Government will compensate them to their satisfaction. I might also say that the man who came around with me and told them what their cattle would weigh — they were perfectly satisfied that he was giving them perhaps a little more even than they actually weighed.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy (Minister of Social Welfare): — Mr. Wass' herd is a dairy herd, is it not? Are they being compensated on the basis of weight for dairy herds?

Mr. Dundas: — Yes, it is a dairy herd. I am talking about the weights. The man who came around valued them by weight, and the farmers

March 17, 1952

were all satisfied. But they have not received any compensation yet; but they thought, from Mr. Gardiner's talk, which they had with him the other day, that he was going to do what was right and I think you can depend on that; they have done a wonderful job to stamp out the disease as well as they can, because it was a new thing for the veterinarians of Saskatchewan, and I am sure that the people of the province will have their cattle in the hands of Mr. Gardiner and I think he will compensate them quite adequately; and I am sure they will be satisfied.

I am sure I will see to it and I have some authority at Ottawa (Mr. Gardiner is a good friend of mine; his seat is just across the river, and my seat is the other side, so we get along wonderfully), and I know Mr. Gardiner will do what is right. I am sure I will support the Motion. The only thing I regret of the Minister of Agriculture, is that he always puts politics into it — just like the Minister of Social Welfare, — and I do not believe that is the right thing. I think we should forget about politics in a calamity like this. I will support the Motion.

Hon. Mr. J.H. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to say just a few words on this Motion. There has been some objection taken to the words in the recital that “This Assembly, regretting the failure of the Government of Canada to take complete control of movement, market and price of livestock simultaneously with the announced outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Canada.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Federal Government knew very well that once this disease was recognized as foot-and-mouth disease, there would immediately be an embargo on all animal products, and animals, going to the United States. They knew, too, that we have been exporting quite a bit of those products to the United States. That alone, leaving out the question of the provincial embargoes — which, incidentally, are just some of the provinces who are supposed to be friends of Mr. Gardiner's, but are not acting like it — but leave out of the question altogether the provincial embargoes; the fact that there was an international embargo on was quite sufficient to create a situation which could actually cause far more loss to the rest of the stock-growers of Canada, than the direct loss from the disease itself, although, of course, the direct loss is concentrated in a small area and upon a few individuals.

When they receive compensation — and I certainly hope they receive the generous compensation which they should receive — there will still be a lot of farmers in Canada, who, during the last few weeks and during the coming months, will have livestock to sell, and on account of the way this has been handled, they are going to lose very substantial sums of money, because you cannot crowd unlimited supply of livestock into a market when you curtail the outlets of that market.

I was at Prince Albert over the weekend; I heard of a farmer out of Prince Albert who brought in a baby beef. Last fall he had sold a similar baby beef at 34 cents a pound. He was offered 17 cents a pound

for that baby beef, and he took it home again. But that is not very satisfactory. I think it is right, Mr. Speaker, that we should voice our disappointment at the fact that these controls were not taken over and in No. 2 in the Resolution we asked the federal Government to assume complete control of the movement and marketing of all livestock and livestock products. I think that is necessary, because when you have too many livestock ready to go to market, to supply that market — and let us remember there are only a limited number of cold storage facilities — and unless beef and pork is going to be frozen there is only a limited time that it can be kept in a chilled condition. So that you can only handle a run of livestock without an outlet for a very short time. What can be done about it? Well, there certainly could be a study made of the situation with a view to encouraging people by financing them, to keep that stock on the farms which would continue to improve and add value and not have it go to market. There is a lot of flexibility in the marketing of livestock, by planning it properly; either a whole lot of stock can go to market — good stock — or, if it is properly planned, a lot of that stock can stay on the farms and feed the market as it needs it. If ever there was a time — an emergency — when there needed to be some regulations, some control in the marketing of livestock, I think it is now.

Members on the other side, Mr. Speaker, have expressed their approval of Item No. 3 “to maintain the minimum price for livestock at price levels prevailing during the week ended February 23, 1952”, and I do also agree with that; but I think if you ask the Federal Government to do that, and at the same time take any objection to some control and regulation in the livestock business at the present time, you are putting the Federal Government in a tough position, because undoubtedly, if that price is maintained, that will encourage (unless there is some counter-balance) the flood of livestock to go to market. So I do not think it is very reasonable to on the one hand say that the Federal Government must not take control, they must leave this marketing situation alone, and on the other hand guarantee a floor price. It is only reasonable, if we ask them to guarantee a floor price, that we say, “Assume control of this; regulate this in the interests of the farmer first, and the consumers in Canada second.” I certainly agree with No. 1 that steps should be taken to remove the embargoes.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) made quite a point of the idea of going to court with this thing. Well, naturally, most people do not run into court without giving it some serious thought, and I am sure that no one had any idea of the Federal Government running to court with this thing; but I do think that there is a battle to fight here, and you may talk about some provinces standing on their rights. I would bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that the Province of Saskatchewan and the Province of Alberta have some rights, too, to the trade and commerce of Canada, as well as the other rights that have been talked about with regard to Manitoba and other provinces.

I was glad to hear on the radio tonight news from Manitoba that the Premier there had said that they were considering the taking off of the embargo, and I certainly hope they take it off pretty quick.

In regard to Item 4 and 5, I need say no more than this: the coming of this disease to Canada was a national disaster. In some

March 17, 1952

countries in Europe they have had so much of this disease that they have given up hope of ever getting rid of it; and they had adapted their methods to control, rather than eradication, but I do not think there is any question about it, that in Canada where this is the first outbreak that the wise thing to do was to take steps to try to eradicate it, and that eradication is a drastic medicine. This disaster is not only an extreme loss to the farmers, but is a very serious loss to the workmen in the packing plants. In such an instance, in an emergency, where a small number of the people of Canada must suffer loss — serious loss — in the best interests and for the welfare of the whole of Canada, Canada should do nothing else but compensate them generously and well, whether they be farmers, or whether they be unemployed workers from a packing house.

I will support the Motion.

Mr. Ross A. McCarthy (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a few words on this Resolution. I attended that meeting we had here a week ago Friday, and was very much interested in what went on there and also very happy to think that while there may have been some minor criticisms of what was done, that everyone there agreed that all had been done that was possible to be done up until that time. I was rather surprised to hear the Minister of Agriculture making some remark somewhat to the contrary here tonight.

This thing no doubt is a national calamity. The loss to our farmers in this immediate district is serious, but it is very, very small compared with what has happened, and what may happen all over Canada. It has a lot of repercussions — just as he mentioned about the eggs and everything else — it goes a long way. I think that meeting was absolutely on sound ground when they said this, “the first thing we should do is to tell the people of the world that we are satisfied that it is being controlled”; and the next thing we should do is to try and give out that we are satisfied so that nobody else on the other side of the line, or anywhere else can say, “Well, the people of Saskatchewan themselves do not know whether it is controlled or not, so why should they expect us to take their stock?” Anything that is done in this House, that has a tendency, whether it is intentional or unintentional, to advertise the fact that we are not satisfied that this thing is now under control, is doing a disservice to the farmers not only of this province, but all of Canada.

Now, there is one item in this thing that rather struck me, and that was this: they talk about the floor price here. First, I might say that I think that everyone is in favour of No. 1; I do not think there is any argument about it. In my opinion No. 2 is debatable; I think it would be a lot better if it was out, despite what the Minister of Natural Resources just said — “and I very much regret” — this regretting and all this stuff — I think we should leave this out. Now, when we come to Item No. 3, I was in agreement with quite a bit of what the Minister of Natural Resources said that there was some point in that which had not yet been spoken of and I feel very strongly about it, and that is this.

We are exporting from 300,000 to 350,000 head of cattle every year. I do not think it is possible to set up a floor price, take everything that comes to that market and store that stuff. In my opinion one of the most important things in this situation was left out, and that is the possibility of getting a market for this stuff. You cannot go to work and pay a floor price for stuff and pile it up — we have not the storage facilities, for one thing.

Premier Douglas: — Isn't that why we need No. 2?

Mr. McCarthy: — Just wait until I am through now. I may be wrong on this, but this is the way I see it. The fact that you can control the moving of it does not affect it. Eventually we are going to have to find an overseas market for this stuff. The people in the United States, as we all know, the farmers down there for the last few years have been very unhappy about the fact that our Canadian cattle are going over there, and now we have the embargo. The Government over there did not want to put it on on account of the consumer, but now they have been obliged to put it on, and in my opinion it will be a long day before it comes off. I do not think this is a temporary thing where you are going to put on a floor. I do not want to be pessimistic, but in my opinion this is not a temporary thing — it goes further than that. We have to take a long-term view of it, and the most important thing today, in my opinion, is to explore a market where we can get rid of this surplus beef. Now, that in my opinion, is very important, and I do not think it is possible to set a floor price, store that stuff up in this Canada of ours, without you have an outlet. That brings you to another phase of it, and that is this. When you get into that overseas market you are going to run into competition with Argentina frozen beef and all the rest of it; you are going to run into the scarcity of currency in the British Isles to buy our beef, and all these things, and it seems to me that is one of the very important factors. If I were making any recommendations to the Dominion Government, I would be inclined to recommend this, that they spend every effort to find some outlet for our surplus beef, in lieu of the one we have previously had with the United States. I think this should be given consideration, too, and with the rest of it, I am quite in agreement.

But I would suggest to the Minister of Agriculture that he drop all this thing that could tend to be political — whether it is or not — and let us all get together and support something for the good of the farmers of Canada.

Mr. J. Benson (Last Mountain): — Mr. Speaker, I attended the conference that was held in this building a few days ago to discuss this question and every one of these items was dealt with during that conference and I left that conference feeling pretty good about the situation, and I did not go there feeling very good about it.

Now, I think it was agreed by everyone there that everything was being done and would be done to bring about a solution to this problem. I know that item No. 1 was discussed at great length and we were assured by the Minister of Agriculture that he would do everything he could to persuade the people of Manitoba and British Columbia that the disease was getting

March 17, 1952

under control and a proper buffer zone was going to be placed around it and he said, "When we can convince them that we have it under control in its present area I do not think we will have any trouble in having the embargoes lifted." And I believe they would have been lifted at the present time had not a couple of new cases developed. I am quite sure that these two cases that developed about a week after the conference was held would make the people of Manitoba and British Columbia wonder a little bit as to whether or not the disease was really controlled. I think that we should remember too that just previous to the outbreak of this disease cattle were being shipped into Ontario and British Columbia, and beef, from the United States because the prices in Canada were getting higher than they were in the United States.

When we are dealing with a question like this, and after having held a conference such as we had in Regina dealing with this matter, I really think that we should tone down this preamble, and I think we should tone it down in the interests of the livestock industry of this Province. I do not believe that we should try to make any capital out of this calamity, and it is a calamity. So I am going to urge the Minister of Agriculture to tone down this preamble, because I believe the officials who are concerned and the officials of his department are just as concerned as the officials of the Dominion Department. I think they are doing everything they can — they know what the situation is and they know how to handle it. We are not on the spot as they are on the spot and we cannot know what they are doing as well as they know what they are doing. I am going to urge that this preamble be toned down in the interests of the livestock industry of this Province.

Mr. John Wellbelove (Kerrobot-Kindersley): — Mr. Speaker, the member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) objects to the second clause there and yet was wholly in sympathy with the third. I think if we are going to insist on the third clause "the Federal Government assuming the responsibility of putting a floor price under beef" at least we should insist on the second, "that they take complete control of the movement of the marketing of livestock." I do not want to repeat anything that has been said in this discussion both before and after dinner, but in the approach to it before dinner, it was suggested, "why did not the Minister of Agriculture make a greater stand in that meeting with regard to the responsibility of the Federal Government?" My impression was at that meeting, that the farmers were facing up to a complicated situation that existed then, and I think we are quite within our rights in the preamble that is here; that the Federal Government were lax in their responsibility if they had the authority.

Now, the Leader of the Opposition says he is not prepared to argue the legal standing as to whether they had the authority or not to put on a Federal embargo. But it so happened I came into Montreal at the time this story broke and the Montreal papers had their headlines "Billion Dollar Industry Threatened" and I was much concerned about it because it mentioned Regina as being the centre of the outbreak. I do not think it suggested itself to anybody there in talking about it as laymen informally, that it would resolve itself into a provincial responsibility.

When the Federal Government had taken over the responsibility there, under the authority they had, to control the spread of the disease, I think we all thought they would take on the full Federal responsibility with the control of the disease and the movement of cattle; and I, for the life of me, Mr. Speaker, cannot see that there is anything remiss with the preamble as the last speaker has mentioned, bringing something into it which is controversial. If the Federal Government has that authority — and I think if they had exercised that authority whether they have it or not, in time — I do not think it would have been seriously challenged.

So far as the controlling of the disease is concerned, all those that have acted in that regard are to be commended in that they have controlled the spread of disease and they have inspired confidence, I think, in the minds, not only of the consuming public of Canada, but in the minds of the importers in the United States.

But as far as clauses 2 and 3 are concerned, I would not want to see No. 2 deleted, because I think they are inter-related so far as their import is concerned.

Mr. A.L.S. Brown (Bengough): — Like many who have spoken in this House this Session I did not intend to say anything until I heard somebody else make some remarks and that is true as far as I am concerned in this debate.

It was a reference made by the Leader of the Opposition and also by the member who was last talking in connection with the conference which was held here under the call of the Provincial Department of Agriculture which was chaired by the Provincial Minister of Agriculture. The Leader of the Opposition was not the only one who attended that conference and it does appear to me that an analysis of what took place at that conference was pretty well decided by where your prejudice lay. If your prejudice lay with the Federal Minister of Agriculture and the Liberal Party, you pretty well got the analysis which the Leader of the Opposition suggested. If your prejudice lay with the interests of the Agricultural economy of Saskatchewan, particularly the Livestock Industry of Canada, your analysis was considerably different.

I attended that conference and I was pretty well satisfied in my own mind that it was proven beyond a shadow of a doubt that it was the failure of the Federal Government who had the power, so they admitted, to take action at the time that the outbreak was indicated and at the time that the outbreak was proven to be foot-and-mouth disease. It was their failure at that time to take action to control the movement, the marketing and the pricing of our livestock products that forced — I say “forced”, Mr. Speaker, — forced the Provincial Governments in Canada to place an embargo on our stock. If the Federal Government had taken the action at that time to assure all those people engaged in Agriculture and all those people who were dependent upon the livestock industry that they would in no way, by virtue of this outbreak, of either an economic loss, or if they had economic loss, that the Federal Government would assume its responsibility and reimburse them for any economic loss, or if

March 17, 1952

the spread of the disease did extend outside the area in which it was assumed to be at that time, that the Federal Government would assume complete responsibility for it. That assurance was never given to any Provincial Government and was certainly not given to the livestock industry. With that lack of assurance, the Provincial Governments, through an attempt to protect their own agricultural industry within the confines of their own boundaries, could very well assume to have been forced to place this embargo on. If those people who now assume full responsibility had at that time assumed full responsibility and assured that there would be an adequate floor price placed on our agricultural products, particularly beef, although it equally applies to hogs as well, you would not have seen the decline that has occurred in the livestock prices, particularly beef, in the last two or three weeks, following the outbreak of this disease.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the preamble in this Resolution is not only important, but it is necessary that we here in the interests of the livestock industry in Saskatchewan, and in Canada, should place on record that we realize that it was the failure of the Federal Government to act at the time when they should have acted that has created this chaotic condition within the livestock industry.

My hon. friend from Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) referred to the question of marketing and he was suggesting that clause 3 in the Resolution which was suggested by the Minister of Agriculture, has some relation to the possibilities of outside marketing for our livestock products. He also further suggested that he had attended the conference held here in the legislative building. I think that if he will think back he will recall that the Federal Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. J.G. Gardiner, stated very clearly that within the quarantine area and within the buffer zone, taking them both combined, there were not sufficient livestock products to be placed on the market to meet the demand within that quarantine area and that further, the potential livestock marketing under an orderly marketing, or even a normal marketing in the next six months; there would not be placed upon the market any more than what the people of Canada would consume. If that statement is true, and I assume that from his knowledge of the agricultural conditions in Canada, and certainly from the facilities that he has available, he should be able to make a statement like that as a true fact — and we can assume that that condition will exist in the next six months. And if that condition does exist, then there is certainly no reason why the Federal Government could not place a floor price under our livestock products for the next six months, at least at price levels prevailing during the week ending February 23rd, 1952, because these products will be marketed entirely within the Dominion of Canada and it certainly should not, with an orderly marketing within Canada, cost the Federal Government one red cent.

And on Item 3 we are not happy that the Federal Government necessarily assumed the cost of maintaining a floor price, because I do not think anyone in this House will suggest that the livestock market prevailing on February 23, 1952, was above parity or was above what the livestock producers in the Dominion of Canada were entitled to receive.

And further, Mr. Speaker, in any of the statements which the Minister of Agriculture, or anyone on this side of the House has made,

are we in any way suggesting that there was any question in regard to the actions of the Health of Animals Branch — the motions which that Health of Animals Branch of the Federal Department of Agriculture took within this Province. But what we are severely criticizing is the enunciated and acted upon policy of the Federal Government, not only in connection with the control and the measures which they took to control the disease within Saskatchewan, but particularly upon their failure to act to protect the livestock industry outside the quarantine area and outside the buffer zone which was established in connection with the foot-and-mouth disease.

I think it was my hon. friend from Shellbrook (Mr. Larsen) who once stated to me that the effect upon the market would be much greater than the disease itself. I think he stated to me once that if this thing created the chaos within the agricultural industry which it apparently has created, that he would sooner see his livestock have the foot-and-mouth disease than have his enterprise subject to the chaotic conditions which presently exist in the livestock industry. And I think that is generally true — a statement which can be expressed — a sentiment which can be expressed — by many of us who are presently engaged in the livestock industry. I think it is only right that we should point clearly that this is the result of the Federal Government's failure to act at a time when they had the power to act and when they had the opportunity to act. Once again it is a question of too little and too late.

I shall support the Motion.

Mr. V.P. Deshaye (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this Resolution as well. It was with considerable joy that we heard tonight that the Manitoba Government were considering releasing their restrictions on their embargo and permit our cattle to cross over their borders. However, I have the feeling — and I regret to say so — that a Resolution such as this, with the debates that we have coming in from the Government side of the House, is going to do very much to delay the lifting of such embargoes. I think at one time both the Minister of Agriculture and the Federal Minister of Agriculture blamed the press somewhat for the publicity which was being given to the foot-and-mouth disease and the resultant embargoes that were resulting from that unfavourable publicity. Now, just at the moment when we have prospects of having these embargoes lifted, the Government chooses to upset the apple cart, shall we say, and bring in a Resolution that will renew the publicity of this most unfortunate disease amongst our livestock. And I chastise the Government for bringing in a Resolution such as this at this time when they know very well that they do not intend to accomplish anything by it, and at the same time they are going to do our livestock marketing a great deal of harm. That is, I am sure, very evident; that if the Minister of Agriculture wanted to propose these things to the Federal Government he could have done so very well, without renewing all the publicity about the foot-and-mouth disease all across Canada again. And I say that I do not agree with these political tactics that are going to cost our farmers so much in dollars and cents and I think that this could have been handled very well in another manner.

March 17, 1952

Now there is no need to argue, but that this is strictly a political movement on the part of the Government of Saskatchewan and I think that our Government could have done very much more in other channels to assist the farmers if they chose. I think that the Provincial Government is lax in some ways. The member for Lumsden (Mr. Thair) said that they were trying to determine the disease — whether the deer were carrying the disease — from an airplane. Well, if the deer are carrying this disease I am sure that it cannot be determined by trying to make a survey from an airplane, and our Provincial Government is at least responsible to that extent and I submit that they are not taking care of their responsibility in that field.

I think that the member for Last Mountain (Mr. Benson) was very fair — I think he is fair in most of his comments — and I think he was very fair when he said that he thought the preamble should be deleted, or at least moderated, and I agreed with him very much. I do not think that we should play politics with such important Resolutions, or such important items as this.

I also wish to speak for a moment or two on the problem that was spoken of here, on floor prices. I fail to see how floor prices can be maintained when we have not the storage spaces — the space for the products — that would be brought upon the market as the result of floor prices. I do not think that we are fooling the farmers of this Province by making Resolutions such as this. I think the farmers of Saskatchewan know and understand the problems that we are having with the foot-and-mouth disease. I also think that the farmers of Saskatchewan are appreciating how the Federal Government is handling this terrific problem. I sincerely believe that everything that could possibly be done is being done by the Federal Government. I know for a fact that when the Federal Minister of Agriculture was in Regina during this period he was continually in conference with Dr. Wells and the other veterinarians and they were in conference until after midnight each night they were here because I have first hand information on that. These men worked terrifically hard to control this disease in Saskatchewan; to do everything possible for the people of Saskatchewan, with respect to this disease. I do not think that these Resolutions, well as they may be meant, are going to assist very much and I repeat what I said before, before I sit down, that I think they are renewing the publicity that is going to spread across Canada and into the United States about our disease that the Government of Canada is trying to reduce. That is unfavourable publicity and I think that because we are so close to getting the embargo lifted in Manitoba — as was announced on the radio tonight — we should prevent such things going out in the press again and hope that this thing will remedy itself without the evils that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition stated can develop from bucking the legislation in certain provinces and think they are entitled to put on the books.

And if Manitoba felt, for their own protection, that they should put on an embargo, I think that we should try and satisfy them in a peaceable manner that that legislation should not be there and not try to force them in bulldozing methods to take that legislation off, which, I submit, would lead to bad publicity and have the legislation stay there longer than it would ordinarily. I think by doing it the way the Federal Minister of Agriculture has tried to do is the proper way and I think that what can be done is being done.

Although we say that we may agree substantially with what is in the Resolution — that is what we would like to see done, — I do not think the method that has been adopted has been proper. However, as I agree with that in principle, I will support the Resolution.

Hon. Mr. T.C. Douglas (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may just say a word. When everyone seemed to be in general agreement I think it is unfortunate that the last speaker should have accused the Government of playing politics in introducing this Resolution and saying it is designed to embarrass the Federal Government and to do harm to the livestock industry.

As a matter of fact, a great deal of harm has already been done to the livestock industry. First, by irresponsible publicity; and secondly, by the lack of any national leadership to deal with this situation with a firm hand. We are not going to aid the situation by all of us getting into a bomb-shelter and trying to pretend that this situation does not exist. The fact is, that there is now, and has been, a very considerable dislocation in the livestock industry and we would, it seems to me, be remiss in our duty to the livestock producers of our provinces, if we did not express our views with reference to this very serious problem.

Mr. Speaker, there is no desire to embarrass the Federal Government. I want to say that probably no government in Canada has done less to embarrass the Federal Government on this matter than the Saskatchewan Government. We called a conference to give the farmers an opportunity to hear Mr. Gardiner and to listen to the progress which the officials of the Health of Animals Branch were making in combating the disease. I think the farmers appreciated that opportunity and I am sure Mr. Gardiner welcomed the opportunity, as did his officials, of placing the facts before the farmers rather than leaving the farmers to get second-hand information which oftentimes is badly coloured. I want also to say, we have at all times, publicly and privately, said to the people of this Province and to organizations representing people in this Province, that one thing we must do is to retain public confidence in the Dominion Health of Animals Branch. There are those who wanted to argue about the fact that the first case of the disease had been reported on the 1st of December and it had not been pronounced foot-and-mouth disease until 13th of February and whether or not there had been any dereliction of duty. We have not felt that those matters were matters of debate or argument at this time. If there had been any failure to report or any laxity, those are matters that will be dealt with by those who are supervising that staff. The one thing we in Saskatchewan, irrespective of our political view, want to do is to (1) reinforce the confidence of the farmers of this Province in the Health of Animals Branch and (2) assure the rest of the people of Canada and the people of the United States that this epidemic is now well in hand and is under control and that everything that is humanly possible to be done is being done. We have tried to do that, Mr. Speaker.

Now, to express regret in the preamble is no reflection on the Health of Animals Branch, but on the matter of a much more important thing, on a higher level of policy. Some time or other I think we have to

March 17, 1952

grow up as a nation. I think, some time or other, some government in Canada has to give leadership to the people of Canada and come to recognize our nationhood. When a great national emergency faced this country — not the little small area of 50 miles each way in which there were some infected cattle — but an emergency that could dislocate the entire livestock industry and ruin our trade particularly with the United States. When that situation arose it seemed to us that that was the time for the Federal Government to say, “Since we are responsible for contagious diseases, since we are responsible for inter-provincial trade and the movement of commodities from one part of Canada to the other, we have taken over the entire situation. Maybe for a few days we will stop all movement of livestock altogether, then when we have the situation well in hand we will order when livestock may be moved and to where it may be moved and in what quantities it may be moved.”

That would have been giving leadership. Instead of that when the announcement was made that the epidemic had broken out, every province was left to its own devices. It is all very well to say the Federal Government was going to proceed by means of negotiation. I am all for negotiation as long as negotiation is possible. But while the Government of Manitoba and British Columbia and Quebec has the right to safeguard its people against contamination, it has not got the right to prevent commodities passing through its territory and to say that livestock cannot be shipped from Saskatoon to Toronto because they happen to lie in-between. The member for Melville (Mr. Deshayé) apparently wants us to say, “Well, if they want to act as a bottleneck and stop commodities moving from one part of the Dominion to the other, then, of course, we will have to let them.” I think it is time we got it cleared up once and for all, as to whether or not any province sitting in the centre of Canada, or in any part of Canada, can prevent trans-Canadian shipment of commodities from one province that wants to export them into another province that wants to import them. I think we are going to have to face up to that and I am not so sure that the Federal Government would not have exercised its authority a little more aggressively if the circumstances had not been different. I remember when Alberta was going to pass the Bank Act and was going to go into the Banking business. I was amazed at how quickly they could step into the picture and they said, “No, you don’t, you cannot do that.” I am quite sure if we decided that because Newcastle’s disease was in poultry in British Columbia, that we were going to stop all poultry passing from British Columbia to Ontario and not allow it to even run on the trains through Saskatchewan. It would not have been long until we would have been told that we could not stop interprovincial trade. I think we would have been told that very quickly.

Mr. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I think the Premier’s memory is at fault. I think that Banking Legislation went through the courts and was ruled out of order by the Supreme Court

...

Premier Douglas: — No, that legislation was declared ultravires immediately. As a matter of fact, the Lieutenant Governor was ordered not to sign it, as I remember correctly. I remember Mr. LaPoint making an

announcement in the House and giving the reasons why the Federal Government had disallowed the legislation. No, that legislation was disallowed. As a matter of fact, our own Farm Security Legislation was held up for weeks while we were asked to come down and meet a committee of the Cabinet and give reasons why it should not be disallowed. They can act with considerable dispatch if they want to; but in this case, of course, they were not going to get into a row with the provinces. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, and I speak here not offensively — but I speak with a good deal of sadness — at most of the Federal-Provincial Conferences I have attended I have been appalled at the failure of the Federal Government to stand up to some of the provincial rightists. A good bit of the fight against the provincial rightists has had to be carried at the Federal-Provincial conferences by provincial governments. Well, the Federal Government it seems to us, ought to be making a stand for Canada being looked upon as a nation, because whatever our faults may be here in Saskatchewan, the one thing we have not been is provincial in our outlook. When our friends in Manitoba had a flood a year ago last spring, though it was none of our business, we did not sit and look across our provincial boundary. We took in hundreds of their patients, old people and school children. We took them into our institutions and into our homes and our hospitals to look after them. We sent material down to them in whatever quantities they required. The people of this Province went out and subscribed in excess of half a million dollars in cold cash and sent it down to help the victims who had been driven out of their homes. The Federal Government put in several million dollars (I have forgotten now how many) but a very considerable number of millions of dollars to help those people. It was a national emergency. We, in Saskatchewan were one of the first to recognize that if these people were afflicted by a national emergency, then all of us as Canadians had some responsibility to help them.

I do not take it too kindly that the farmers of this province, facing a national emergency — and not just the farmers whose cattle are afflicted with foot-and-mouth disease, but the other farmers of the province — were cut off from the markets and that some were required to keep stock that they were going to ship with the price going down. Faced with that situation, the contribution they got from a neighbouring province is an embargo, not only on cattle going into Manitoba, but cattle going through Manitoba, which it must go through to get to the great market in Ontario. I think it is time, as members of this Legislature, that we expressed ourselves (1) to say that we think in a case of this sort, now, or if it ever happens again, that we believe the Federal Government ought to give some leadership in asserting that Canada is a nation and that they will deal with a matter of this sort, rather than allowing it to be dealt with piece-meal by various provinces as they see fit, and (2) having failed to deal with it in the first instance that now, of course, they will use all the persuasion they can. If persuasion won't work, that the Federal Government will have to assert its authority and decide once and for all whether Canada is a nation or whether it is a collection of 10 little states who are hardly on speaking terms with each other. It is just about time we got to that position.

March 17, 1952

Let me say just a word or two about these various clauses. No. 1 is to take immediate action to remove the embargo and I repeat what I said, that I think that there should be persuasion where possible, but if persuasion does not result in the removal of these embargoes, then I think the Federal Government ought to step into the field and say any interference with interprovincial trade, anything in restraint of trade, is contrary to the constitution of Canada and that we must insist that the people of Saskatchewan and Alberta be given the alienable right to ship their goods to market in other parts of Canada.

With reference to No. 2, nearly all the members opposite have said that they prefer No. 2 be taken out. This provides for assuming control of the moving and marketing of all livestock and livestock products. Mr. Speaker, I do not know how you are going to have a floor price, especially if it is going to be a floor price paid to the farmers, and not just to the packers. I do not know how you are going to have a floor price paid to the farmers unless you are going to have some regulation of the flow of livestock to the market. The member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) put his finger on it. It will not only be a matter of paying a floor price, but it will be a matter of selling that livestock somewhere and surely the Federal Government, who is going to be charged with the responsibility of finding markets, will want some control so that the livestock will flow onto the market as they are able to dispose of it; and to be able to keep it back from the market during the period when they cannot dispose of it. I think control is absolutely necessary, both of movement and marketing.

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Premier a question? You are in effect asking the Federal Government to put on a floor price. Then, why should it concern us how they control the flow of market? You ask them to pay a price and then you are telling them the only way they can pay it is by taking control. I would say it would be quite logical to leave it to them whether they want to control it or not. What we want is the floor price. Let them deal with the . . .

Premier Douglas: — What I am afraid of, Mr. Speaker, is a floor price without control means that you would get into the same position you are in with reference to hogs. That is, the floor price will be a floor price to the packer. The packer will be guaranteed — the same situation you have now with eggs . . .

Mr. Loptson: — But we want the floor price.

Premier Douglas: — Ah, but just a moment. It makes a great deal of difference who the floor price is guaranteed to.

Mr. Loptson: — Well, it is to the farmer.

Premier Douglas: — But just a moment. Right now, you have got a floor price on eggs. But what is the floor price policy? The floor price policy on eggs is that as of August 1st the Federal Government will take any eggs which the packers have in storage at — I think it is 34 cents a dozen. If they want to buy them in the meantime at 23 cents a dozen there is nothing to stop them.

Mr. Loptson: — No, that is not right . . .

Premier Douglas: — May I finish the point? I am going to ask, Mr. Speaker, if I may clarify this point. The packers we will guarantee a given price for livestock and if they get that livestock and cannot sell it then the Federal Government will either make up the difference or we will take it off their hands at the end of a given period. That does not say that the packer has to pay that price to the farmer and if, when this embargo is lifted, there is a sudden rush of livestock on the Winnipeg and Toronto markets there is nothing to prevent the packers saying “We have got so much cattle here that we will drop the price 8 cents or 10 cents a pound. If they buy up the livestock and later they cannot sell it, they turn it over to the Federal Government on the floor price basis. Who has made the difference? They have, and that is exactly what is happening to floor prices today. The floor price on eggs, Mr. Speaker — there is no use you gentlemen opposite saying “tut, tut, tut” . . .

Mr. Loptson: — Bunk.

Premier Douglas: — It may be bunk but I will defy my hon. friend to go out into the country and tell the farm women it is bunk.

Mr. Loptson: — All I am going to say . . .

Premier Douglas: — Just a moment. Will the hon. gentleman just sit down? He can talk all he likes when I get through if he wants.

Mr. Loptson: — Yes, but the Resolution does not ask for that at all. Talk to the Resolution.

Premier Douglas: — I answered a question which my hon. friend asked and now he says it is bunk. I want to tell him how much bunk it is. I will bring him 15 or 20 letters that have come to my desk in the course of the last few days from farm women . . .

Mr. Loptson: — Keep to the Resolution.

Premier Douglas: — My hon. friend asked a question on floor prices and I am telling him how floor prices have worked, if you do not have some control. What is happening with farm wives today is that they are bringing in eggs and getting 23 cents and 24 cents and 25 cents a dozen. The floor price of 34 cents a dozen is not doing them one bit of good, because it is not a floor price to them.

Mr. Danielson: — That is ungraded eggs.

Premier Douglas: — Oh, but even on graded eggs. I will give my friends lists of the prices that have come in. What is happening today is that the floor price is to the packing company. That is the situation.

Mr. Tucker: — I understood it was true that if they do not pay floor prices the eggs won't be taken off their hands when the time comes. That is certainly my understanding, Mr. Speaker.

March 17, 1952

Premier Douglas: — Nonsense. No, Mr. Speaker, I have checked very closely with the marketing people; I have been checking it as these letters keep coming in increasing number to me; and my information is — as I get it from my officials who contact the Federal Officials on the matter — that after a given date, if the company has a large surplus of eggs on hand, they can turn around and the Federal Government will take those eggs off their hands at a given price; or if they have to sell them for less than that price to get rid of them, they will make up the difference. But that does not guarantee anything as to what they will pay the farm women; and we are afraid that exactly the same thing could happen with reference to cattle. We fear that if a great rush of cattle floods the market the moment that the embargo was lifted, the packers could very easily take advantage of that situation.

With reference to Item 3 “to maintain the minimum price for livestock” — everyone seems to be in general agreement with that; but we would take it to mean that that price would be a fixed price to the farmer, not just to the packers. And Item 4, “to provide compensation for slaughtered animals at full replacement value, plus additional compensation to farmers affected for loss of income. The leader of the Opposition said, “Well, that which we are asking for is being done.” But we are not sure it is being done, Mr. Speaker.

Legislation was passed and that legislation is very general in character. It gives wider powers than the powers that were contained under the old Contagious Diseases Act. The terms are general and not specific and while I am subject to correction, the information that I have is that no regulations have yet been passed and no order-in-council passed under the Act. Specific terms are not set out and the Board of Review are simply feeling their way, pending further instructions.

I think that Mr. Gardiner assured the people when he was here that they would try to give them adequate compensation. But the treasury are also in on this because I notice one of the treasury members on the board and until the treasury get through with their regulations I am never just sure. I think Agriculture will certainly try to see that they get adequate compensation, but in the regulations, I would like to see it laid down in specific terms.

Not only must there be adequate compensation for the actual livestock slaughter, but this serious question of loss of income must be dealt with. It is particularly serious for dairy farmers who did not raise livestock with the idea of marketing it. That livestock is their means of production and if it is to be taken away, they are going to be deprived of an income for at least one year.

And certainly something has to be done with reference to that particular group who are virtually unemployed insofar as their industry is concerned for a considerable period of time. The same thing is true with reference to the packing-house workers. Packing-house workers are in no way responsible for the fact that their packing plants have to be closed. They are in exactly the same position, it seems to me, as the people of Winnipeg, who were flooded out, or the people in Rimouski, whose homes and places of business were burned. I think that the people of

Canada will find it a small price to pay in order to wipe out this foul disease if all they had to do was to give compensation to the farmers and to the men who are rendered unemployed as a result of this epidemic. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that all parts of the House will support this resolution in order that we may express, on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan, our views to the Federal Government with reference to the matter now under consideration.

Mr. McCormack (Souris-Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, would the Minister permit a question? I did not want to interrupt him when he was speaking. The Rimouski affair and the flood at Winnipeg were national disasters; I think we appreciate that fact, but in both those cases, in addition to the Federal Government putting something in, the Provincial Government put something in. I was just wondering if there was any idea on the part of the Provincial Government here to make any contribution or assistance, along with the Federal Government.

Premier Douglas: — Well, Mr. Speaker, we have never been asked to make any contribution. I do not know what contribution the Manitoba and Quebec Governments made either to the Rimouski fire or to the flood. I know it was nothing like the amount of money which was contributed by the Federal Government.

Mr. McCormack: — The Manitoba Government put in a substantial amount.

Premier Douglas: — Yes, but it was nothing like the \$7 or \$8 million which I think the Federal Government put in. We put in a considerable amount from the people of this province. It has never been suggested that we should make any contribution because this is a matter which comes directly under Federal jurisdiction. But it always rather amazes me, Mr. Speaker, that whenever the Federal Government is faced with a problem — a government that has a surplus of \$700 million — and this thing could cost them anywhere from half a million to a million dollars — the gentlemen opposite merely rush to say, “Well, what is the Provincial Government going to do?” Well, the Provincial Government will do anything which is necessary to be done and so far the Federal Government has never indicated that it is in such a bankrupt condition that it is not able to carry the load. But I am sure if they get into a position where they feel they cannot carry the load, we would certainly be glad to step in and help them.

Mr. Niles L. Buchanan (Notukeu-Willowbunch): — Mr. Speaker, it seems as though this has got away from the foot-and-mouth disease, and as the Attorney General says, it is now more of a “mouth” disease. There is one thing though, that I think should be mentioned and stressed, and that is under Item 4 “to provide compensation for slaughtered animals at full replacement value, plus additional compensation to farmers affected for loss of income.”

That has been looked at from the point of view of the affect that this is going to have on the other stock-growers in the Province. If there is not adequate compensation given to those people who have suffered

March 17, 1952

the loss of their herds, and as a result the loss of their income, people in other parts of the province are going to look at this and wonder just what they might get, should the disease spread.

Now, we hope the measures taken are going to prove adequate to contain this disease, and that it will not spread, but I represent a constituency that has a large number of stock in it, and the people there are very interested in finding out what compensation is going to be paid for the loss of the stock to these people around Regina, and what compensation is going to be paid for the loss of income during the time they are going to be out of the cattle-raising industry. If they find that these people are not adequately compensated, they will worry for fear that, if the disease should spread into their communities, for example, that locally it may not be reported, and the individual farmer, fearing loss of income and fearing loss of his herd, is going to try to stamp it out himself with inadequate measures. So it is not only affecting the person, the immediate person who has suffered the loss, but it could have a widespread effect on the stock-growing industry as a whole over the province, if the disease should spread.

(Closing Debate)

Hon. Mr. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, with reference to the question raised by the hon. member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. McCormack), who is out of his seat at the moment, I might say that the Provincial Government, as I mentioned in the course of my previous remarks, has already made available automobiles, bull-dozers, and facilities, and some 17 of our own field staff. We do not know if we are going to be reimbursed by the Dominion Government or not. We have not asked that question, but we feel that it is a contribution that we should make in co-operation with the Dominion authorities. Many of the veterinarians coming in from the outside did not have adequate transportation facilities, and they did not have drivers. They were unfamiliar with the country; we allocated those vehicles and drivers, and other equipment to assist in the control of this disease.

Mr. Deshaye: — How many bull-dozers?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I could not say how many we have; they have acquired some from the Conservation and Development Branch; the P.F.R.A. have some; and I have been informed that we have been required to give some assistance there too. Also the Department of Highways has supplied equipment to open up roads, and has made available the warehouse in Regina here, at some inconvenience to them.

Mr. Speaker, with reference to the points that have been raised that perhaps there is some political bias contained in this Resolution, I want to assure the hon. members of the House that as far as I am concerned, there is no political bias involved. There is no inconsistency. It has been a matter of being consistent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have had these problems brought to our

attention previously. We have discussed this matter of contagious disease control at provincial ministers' conference, and we would see the consequence of the continuing trend on the part of some provinces to put up their own provincial embargoes, so we were very sensitive to that. I was particularly sensitive to it, Mr. Speaker, and realized what might occur in this particular case. We therefore wired the Prime Minister, and I have read the wire to the Legislative Assembly — I read it again this afternoon, in order to point out the fact that we were alarmed, and indeed I was alarmed. We wired the Prime Minister direct, asking him to take complete control over the situation, if necessary; if there was any doubt as to constitutional jurisdiction, then, under the provisions of emergency powers, and as I have stated, I have not yet had a reply to that wire.

But, once the Provincial Government placed the embargoes on that they did, I quite agreed, — and I quite agreed at the conference that it was no time then to try to face the issue — that we could possibly accomplish a whole lot more by a negotiation, and by assuring the rest of Canada that we have this disease under control. So we had been consistent all the way through, Mr. Speaker, and we certainly have not done anything that might be embarrassing to the Dominion Government.

I might add further, Mr. Speaker, that in this particular province — in this particular area — the Dominion Government itself has prevented meat from being shipped into the quarantine area and has taken full control in that regard, in order to enable us to market the uninfected livestock within the area, to be marketed at the Burns Plant here, in Regina.

Now, the Dominion Government acted, — and we feel that that is their jurisdiction completely; and within the province, Mr. Speaker, we feel stronger in the matter of interprovincial trade, and that this whole question of disease of animals and the control of this disease, does affect interprovincial trade. I think I have emphasized that before, Mr. Speaker, and I merely reiterate it now to again inform that we have not put the preamble to this Resolution to be diverse-minded, or to be unduly critical in this regard.

I do think it will serve the useful purpose of pointing out to the Dominion Government, and perhaps to some of the other provinces, that we have grown up, as the Premier has indicated, as a nation, and it is time that we considered those problems, and the constitutional division of responsibility that has always been regarded, in this case, to be the Dominion's. I hope that when the disease is under control, we can have a conference at the first opportunity, to once and for all clarify this particular matter, so that in the future in the event of contagious disease breaking out, we will know who the responsible agency is.

Now, I do not therefore feel that we need necessarily to tone down the preamble at all. I must say again that I reiterated this same attitude at the conference of farm organizations here in Room 267, when I pointed out very firmly, I think, to the Federal Minister that, in my opinion, the Dominion Government had complete and full jurisdiction in that regard; and that if the provinces could not be brought together by

March 17, 1952

arrangement, and by the assurance that there was no further danger, then if this was going to be a continuing situation, I still think, Mr. Speaker, that the Dominion Government should take their emergency powers and take full control.

Now, that is all I want to say in conclusion; and I would like to express appreciation that all the members of the Legislature have indicated support for this Motion. I am sure that that support will be reassuring to the farmers of Saskatchewan.

The question being put, it was agreed to, unanimously.

The Assembly adjourned at 11:00 o'clock p.m.