

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fifth Session — Eleventh Legislature**  
**33rd Day**

**Tuesday, March 25, 1952**

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

**Visit of**  
**MR. JUSTICE BLACKWELL**  
**South Africa**

**Mr. Speaker:** — We have with us today a distinguished visitor from South Africa, Mr. Justice Blackwell. Mr. Blackwell was long, long a member of the Parliament of South Africa, and also is a life member of the Parliamentary Association. I am sure we are all pleased to have him here visiting this country of ours, and perhaps he would like to give a word of greeting to the House.

**Hon. T.C. Douglas (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, If I may, in extending a word of welcome to Chief Justice Blackwell, I would like to move, in order that we may have an opportunity of having a few words from him, seconded by Mr. Tucker, that proceedings be now suspended in order that the Assembly may hear from Chief Justice Blackwell of the Supreme Court of South Africa.

**Mr. Speaker:** — You have heard the Motion, moved by the Hon. Premier Douglas, seconded by Mr. Tucker, that proceedings be now suspended in order that the Assembly may hear from Mr. Chief Justice Blackwell of the Supreme Court of South Africa.

The House is suspended and I am sure we would now like to have a few words from Chief Justice Blackwell.

**ADDRESS OF MR. JUSTICE BLACKWELL**

Mr. Speaker, I had imagined that my parliamentary days were over. I did not think that I would ever stand on the floor of a legislative assembly again, or that I would ever address fellow-parliamentarians. I am deeply sensible of the unique honour that you have done me in inviting me to take a seat on the floor of this distinguished House of yours and of addressing the hon. members. I have come a long way to do this, Mr. Speaker, I have travelled right across the world. I travelled from South Africa to Australia. A month ago I was in Canberra, in the parliamentary capital of Australia, and I there watched the members debate the adoption, or otherwise, of the Peace Treaty with Japan, a matter that may concern your Federal Parliament in Ottawa. Then I visited the State Parliament in New South Wales, and from New South Wales I came over to this country and I am engaged in a tour of Canada under the auspices of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs.

I find everywhere a very acute interest in South Africa. Perhaps it is the interest, Sir, that a father of a family takes in the most mischievous member of the family, the most troublesome of his children,

**March 25, 1952**

I do not know, but I find a very acute interest in South Africa, especially at this particular time, when this matter of grave constitutional import has been before our Supreme Court. That, of course, I cannot discuss with you, and you would not be interested in hearing me discuss it. That is the sort of matter I am talking of when I address the Canadian Institute of International Affairs and I try to tell them something of my country and something of the problems that it has to solve, very deep and very serious problems.

I have been in Canada now for eight days, and landed in Vancouver. I am progressing gradually, step by step and town by town across Canada until I finish at Saint John on the 20th of April. Then I go to the United States, then over to England and so back home. I want to take this opportunity of thanking the people of Canada, through you, for the hospitality they have shown me, and the interest they have shown in my country. I would like to congratulate you on the beauty of this Chamber. I am somewhat of a connoisseur in debating chambers, having travelled very widely and having made it my business, whenever I travel, to visit a foreign House. I would like to say that I do not think I have ever seen a more beautifully proportioned or a more dignified Chamber than you have here, and I am quite certain that the proceedings before you, Mr. Speaker, are suited — always suited — to the dignity of your Chamber. Again I thank you, Sir, for receiving me and asking me to address you. It is an honour that I will always appreciate, and I am sure it will be appreciated back in my country when I write and tell them about it.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all members in all parts of the House will join me in extending to Mr. Justice Blackwell our thanks for visiting our assembly and for bringing us greetings from South Africa and for saying these few words to us.

I am sure all the members will be interested to know that Mr. Justice Blackwell was a follower and supporter of the world famous soldier and great Commonwealth statesman, Field Marshall Jan Smuts. Mr. Blackwell tells me that he entered public life as a young man, defeating the leader of the political party to which he was opposed, and both the Leader of the Opposition and myself have decided that that method of entering public life should be frowned upon in this Province.

I am sure I would like to say to Mr. Justice Blackwell how pleased we are to have him here and to ask him to carry back to his own country our good wishes for their success and for their future prosperity.

**Mr. W.A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition):** — I wish to say that we on this side certainly support the Premier in what he said in regard to cordial greetings to the distinguished representative from South Africa, and our very good wishes for the success of that country in solving the problems which it is confronting today.

On the Orders of the Day.

**Mr. W.A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make an observation about one of our colleagues, whom I am sure we are all delighted to welcome back again today. He is the member for Kinistino, (Mr. Woods). I was looking through my desk just now and ran across the note which I sent to the Premier just a little over three weeks ago and I see in it that the doctor had advised that, in view of the very serious nature of the operation, all he would say was that he was hoping for the best. And all I can say when I see how well the member for Kinistino has come through that very serious operation, and is able already to be back in the House, we are heartened to hope that perhaps this difficulty is what has been bothering him and now that he has had the operation in regard to his appendix we hope, and have reason to believe, that he is going to enjoy better health than he has in the past. In any event, we certainly rejoice in his rapid recovery from that very serious operation and are delighted to have him back with us today, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Mr. T.C. Douglas (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, may I too, on behalf of those on this side of the House, extend a word of welcome to the member from Kinistino (Mr. Woods), to say with what anxiety we heard of his serious illness, how pleased we are to have him back, and to trust that his good health and good fortune will continue.

**Mr. W.C. Woods (Kinistino):** — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take this opportunity of thanking the members on both sides of the House for their many kindnesses during my illness. I was here, I think it was the last day of February, when the illness which forced me into hospital struck me while one of the members was speaking. When I left the House I did not think it was anything out of the ordinary. It seemed to me it was a carry-over of last year's trouble, but when I got to hospital I found it was an appendix which had been bothering me for some little time and had gone much further than it should have been allowed to go before I went into hospital. But, like my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, I am hoping that from now on I will enjoy better health due to the operation, and I will be able to keep my seat in the House occupied the majority of the time.

I again thank you very much for the many expressions of good will from all over the House.

#### **MOTION RE INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT**

Moved by Mr. Brown, seconded by Mr. Dewhurst:

That, in view of the fact that the International Wheat Agreement does not sufficiently protect the Canadian Wheat Grower against variations in the international exchange and economic situation, this Assembly request the Federal Government,

**March 25, 1952**

(1) to adopt a policy designed to maintain the price of wheat to the Canadian farmer at a parity level, and

(2) apply the principle of orderly marketing and parity price to all agricultural products.

**Mr. A.L.S. Brown (Bengough):** — I think, Mr. Speaker, that, from reading that Resolution, you will realize that this Resolution does open up a very wide field for discussion. It could open up the whole question of the Federal Government's policy, or, as some might like to intimate, lack of policy in relation to the marketing of our agricultural products, and the relationship of the Federal Government to our agricultural industry in general. But, in an attempt to keep my remarks as brief as possible, I shall attempt to confine my remarks to the three specific references made in the Resolution:

(1) In reference to the International Wheat Agreement,

(2) The question of orderly marketing as it affects our main Saskatchewan commodity, wheat, and the relationship of parity to that agricultural commodity,

(3) The adapting of that same principle of parity and orderly marketing to all agricultural products.

In reference to the International Wheat Agreement, this appears to me to be a natural outgrowth of the development of the agricultural industry, particularly in Western Canada, and if we look back over the past number of years I think we can realize there has been an insistent desire on the part of those people engaged in agriculture to bring to their industry some security and some stability, and it is largely the lack of this security and this stability that has led those people engaged in agriculture to attempt many methods to find a solution to the problem and, as such, bring themselves security and stability.

The lack of security and lack of stability have seen us, in many years, in Saskatchewan in particular, grow abundantly and with very little net return to the agricultural producer. In the early stages of organization and demand on the part of those people engaged in the agricultural industry they attempted to obtain some protection for themselves. In the first instance, a bill of protective legislation was passed by the Federal Government in connection with the marketing of their grain.

Realizing that simple protective legislation was not sufficient, there was the endeavour to step out into the commercial field, particularly in respect to setting up and operating their own elevator facilities, by which they took their grain from the point of delivery and placed it upon the market.

The third step might be considered to be in that phase in which the same producers stepped out into the international field and, through establishing their own central selling agency, placed their products, in this case wheat, upon the markets of the world. However, I

think the events have shown very clearly that a group of producers such as the wheat producers cannot, in themselves, secure for themselves security simply by placing their products upon the international markets of the world by so doing as producers, but rather that there must be some intervention on the part of the National Government to place those products on the world market and, at the same time, have the facility that is available through federal government or a national government, to give some security to the producer. I think that the early days of depression following the crash of 1929 proved very conclusively that we, as producers, could not, in ourselves, solve the problem and required some additional support and effort on the part of the government or the people of Canada as a whole to see that necessary security and create the necessary stability in our agricultural industry.

Following that experience, and relating back to earlier experiences following the First Great War, it once again came to the question of the possibility of a national marketing board under the authority and jurisdiction of the Federal Government and out of that demand and that apparent necessity emerged the Canadian Wheat Board as we know it today. The Act was first passed in 1935, establishing the Canadian Wheat Board. The Act at that time had considerably wider powers than the Acts following but nevertheless we did see then established in Canada something which has remained constant since 1935. At least we had on the Statute Book a semblance of a system of orderly marketing. It is true that following 1935 there were times when the Canadian Wheat Board, as such, was placed on dry dock and made inoperative, but nevertheless there remained the skeleton upon which an orderly marketing of wheat could be based and could be built, and that was around the Canadian Wheat Board.

For many years this Canadian Wheat Board, as part of orderly marketing, marketed only our wheat and had no relationship and no effect upon our coarse grains or upon flax. In the years subsequent to 1935 there were added powers to the Canadian Wheat Board, by which they were given the right to market our coarse grain. But, at the same time, we have not reached the state of perfection as far as even using the Canadian Wheat Board as a system of orderly marketing is concerned, for we still have our coarse grains, the Canadian Wheat Board using the Winnipeg Exchange as part of their system of marketing of our coarse grains.

However, even with the establishment of the Canadian Wheat Board as part of orderly marketing, I do not think anyone would have suggested that was necessarily the end in orderly marketing. The next natural step, it appears to me, was the one that was taken after considerable demand by the farmers in Western Canada for the establishment of bulk marketing agreements, and the first one of any significant nature that was entered into in respect to bulk marketing was our Anglo-Canadian Wheat Agreement over a four year period in which we, as a Canadian government and as a Canadian people, agreed to give to and sell to Great Britain a certain specified amount of grain at a certain specified price. This, I suggest, was our first significant step out into the field of bulk marketing.

As I suggested a moment ago, this was for a four year period and, as far as the Canadian wheat producer is concerned, there entered into this four year period contract with Great Britain, the five year pooling system which was established by the Canadian Wheat Board, by which we pooled

**March 25, 1952**

the returns for five years, including the four years of the Anglo-Canadian Wheat Agreement — pooled the returns for the five years back to the producer, and we received the same price for our products irrespective of what year we may have grown it. This, I suggest, was another step in the direction of a more complete system of orderly marketing.

In the last year of that Agreement between Canada and Great Britain, the major exporting countries and the major importing countries entered into what is known as the International Wheat Agreement. It was entered into and became effective on the 31st of July 1949. I suggested that it was the major exporting countries and the major importing countries; at the time of signing and entering into the Agreement there were four exporting countries and some 37 importing countries, involving a total of approximately 531 million bushels of wheat per year. This was an Agreement entered into on August 1, 1949, an Agreement which expires on the 31st of July 1953.

I further suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the International Wheat Agreement was a natural outgrowth of the trend which had been created in the years past. The International Wheat Agreement had in it factors considerably different from those factors which were incorporated into the Anglo-Canadian Wheat Agreement. There is no set binding price within the International Wheat Agreement as there was within the Anglo-Canadian Wheat Agreement and there is no set amount which one country necessarily must export to another country or which one country must import from an exporting country. In general, and in brief, it is the setting up of agreements whereby an exporting country agrees to provide to an importing country a specified amount of wheat if the importing country is prepared to pay the maximum price set by this Agreement; and that an importing country must be prepared to accept a certain specified number of bushels of wheat if the exporting country is prepared to accept the minimum price set under the International Wheat Agreement. The maximum price set under the International Wheat Agreement is stable, that is, for the length of its term it remains at \$1.80 in terms of United States dollars. That means that if an importing country is prepared to pay Canada \$1.80 in U.S. dollars then Canada must be prepared to supply that country with the amount of grain stipulated under that Agreement.

As far as the minimum prices agreed to under the International Wheat Agreement, in 1949 they were set at \$1.50 and each subsequent year it is to be reduced by ten cents. That means that in the final year of the Agreement it will be \$1.20. That then means that during the crop year 1952-53 if we are, as a Canadian exporting country, prepared to place upon the markets of the world wheat at a price of \$1.20, then the importing countries under the Agreement must be prepared to pay and accept that specified amount of wheat.

I would point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Agreement suggests that the payment shall be in terms of U.S. dollars. This means that when the Agreement was first entered into in 1949 we here in Canada received \$1.98 because at that time the U.S. Dollar was 10 per cent above ours which, translated on the basis of \$1.80 a bushel, meant an additional 18 cents which we, as Canadians, could expect when it was translated into Canadian dollars. That meant then that for the first year of operation of the Agreement, we received in Canadian dollars, from the importing countries,

\$1.98. This has been reflected back in an increase in the returns to the Canadian farmer.

But since July 31, 1949 we have gradually seen the Canadian and American dollar come closer and closer to par until today they are at par. Then that means that the Canadian Government, or the Canadian Wheat Board, now receives for its wheat which the importing countries accept, not \$1.98 in Canadian dollars but \$1.80 and this will, according to the adopted policy of the Federal Government, be reflected back in lower returns to the Canadian wheat producer.

As you will note, on the first part of the Resolution, I suggest that the International Wheat Agreement does not sufficiently protect the Canadian wheat grower against variations in the international exchange and in the economic situation, and this indicates one way in which the Canadian farmer, by virtue of the adopted policy of the Federal Government, is today suffering because of the fact that the United States and Canadian dollar is at par. It has meant, by the enunciated policy of the Federal Government, a reduction of 18 cents a bushel to the Canadian farmer for every bushel of wheat sold under the International What Agreement.

The second thing I would like to suggest in connection with the International Wheat Agreement is that it does not, in itself, necessarily provide for variations which we cannot control here in Canada and I would suggest that in future agreements a principle could possibly be incorporated which would retain the purchasing power of the bushel of wheat under an International Wheat Agreement at basically the same level. That is to say, if this principle had been adopted in 1949 through the medium of the International Wheat Agreement, that we would now be in a position to say that, on the international market, our bushel of wheat should buy as much today as it did in 1949 — that is on the international level. I do not suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we can in any respect blame the International Wheat Agreement for the inflation we have here in Canada, we cannot blame the International Wheat Agreement for the fact that our bushel of wheat in Canada does not buy as much as it did in 1949, but I do suggest that that principle could possibly be adopted in a future International Wheat Agreement in relation to those products which our bushel of wheat buys in the international field.

I agree with Mr. Wesson when he was speaking in Saskatoon on Thursday, June 14th of last year, speaking to the Dairy and Poultry Pool Convention, when he stated, in part, as reported in the “Western Producer” of June 14, 1951:

“‘Inflation in Canada and the United States,’ declared Mr. Wesson, ‘was no business of the importing countries that were buying the wheat. In Canada inflation was the business of the Canadian Government,’ and he urged farmers to seek the solution of their problems of rising costs by fighting inflation at home and not try to change the International Wheat Agreement.

“The speaker noted that when Britain devalued her currency she did not ask Canada to lower wheat prices because the pound sterling would buy \$2.80 worth of wheat instead of \$4.00 worth, as formerly.”

**March 25, 1952**

And I suggest that, in relating the International Wheat Agreement back to our own economy, that is indeed a sound principle which we should be prepared to adopt. We should not blame the lack of the purchasing power of the bushel of wheat in Canada upon the International Wheat Agreement and in negotiating the future agreement we cannot look too greatly at the inflation which exists in Canada at the present time but rather that it is the fault of the fiscal policy of the Federal Government that has allowed the purchasing power of the bushel of wheat to degenerate to the place where it is at the present moment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, turning to the second part of the Resolution, in relation to parity price and a system of orderly marketing of wheat. I contend, Mr. Speaker, that the Canadian Wheat Board has within it the responsibility of the Federal Government, through the medium of such source as the Canadian Wheat Board, to give us a true system of orderly marketing. This is particularly true of wheat because wheat is one commodity which we must export. It is not a commodity which can be consumed in its entirety in Canada but is one which must of necessity go on the international market. And for that reason, along with many others, I suggest that the marketing of our wheat must remain a national responsibility and I suggest it can be done in an orderly manner through agencies such as the Canadian Wheat Board.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Canadian Wheat Board must be expanded to become the sole marketing agency for all our grains, as it is in the case of wheat. I would also point out, Mr. Speaker, that even the future of the Canadian Wheat Board, as it presently exists, is not definite, that the Canadian Wheat Board is only in existence, unless renewed by parliament, until July 31, 1953, which coincides with the expiration of the International Wheat Agreement.

I would further point out, Mr. Speaker, that we possibly were further ahead back in 1945-1950 when we pooled the returns for our grain over a period of years, in which it was possible that in one year we did not grow as much wheat, or that some of us may have had crop failures, and that creates a condition whereby there would be a variation in price from year to year and if you happen to be fortunate enough to have a good crop in the year in which the returns from the Canadian Wheat Board were high you got more returns than if you happen to get a good crop in the year in which the Canadian Wheat Board did not pay as much as it did in other years.

I suggest that possibly that principle of pooling which we had in 1945-50 was superior to the present policy of the Canadian Wheat Board of pooling it only for one year at a time. However, I do suggest that, even with the Canadian Wheat Board, we have not reached the ultimate goal in orderly marketing and I can refer to the settlements which were made in connection with the five-year pool, which included the Anglo-Canadian Wheat Agreement. I do not think there is anyone who will suggest that the farmers, for the settlements on that five-year pool, received a parity price. There has been much discussion, both in this House and in many places in Canada, in respect to the settlement of that five-year pool.



I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Government, not by virtue of the fact that they established the Canadian Wheat Board, but by virtue of the fact that they are responsible for the policies of the Canadian Wheat Board, must accept the responsibility for the fact that in that five year period we did not obtain parity price to which we, as producers, are entitled.

We can refer to the settlement of the 1950-51 crop. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that one year ago in this House a Resolution was moved by myself asking that an initial payment for the crop year 1950-51 be immediately raised to \$1.75 and that the final settlement be made on the basis of parity. I will admit, Mr. Speaker, that the members sitting in the Opposition voted against that Motion and we did not have unanimous approval coming from Saskatchewan in respect to the settlement of the 1950-51 crop, that we did not have unanimous requests from this Legislature asking for the principle of parity for the 1950-51 crop, but I think that the farmers, the wheat producers of Saskatchewan, after they received their settlement for the 1950-51 crop, will realize that the Federal Government took no recognition of the resolution which was passed in this House asking for parity, because, for the crop year 1950-51 we were further from parity than we were even during the five-year pool.

In relation to the purchasing power of the bushel of wheat, the basis of the settlement of the 1950-51 crop was lower than the purchasing power of the bushel of wheat during that five-year period and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, before the Canadian Wheat Board can become a true system of orderly marketing that works in the interest of Canadian economy and works in the interests of the agricultural producer, that it must adopt the principle of parity price.

I have referred to parity price several times in my remarks this afternoon. It is a term that is widely used, it is a term that may have many definitions in the minds of different people, but I like to think of parity in the terms that it will provide to the producer of any given commodity a fair return as related to other groups; that those engaged in agriculture, through the system of parity price, a parity relationship or a parity structure, would get a return for those products which will enable them to live on a standard of living comparable with those in other occupational groups; that it is a return for their products which will give them the same security, the same stability that is enjoyed by other occupational groups. And in that price there must be incorporated sufficient so that the agricultural industry can maintain for itself the services to which it is entitled. That the people engaged in that industry and the people who depend upon that industry can receive services and goods comparable to other groups.

I suggest that if we think of it in those terms, of a parity relationship between our different occupational groups, that we will go a long way toward smoothing out the inequities that presently exist between our different groups in the Dominion of Canada.

I further suggest, Mr. Speaker, that until the Federal Government, (and it must be the Federal Government who adopts this principle), is prepared to adopt this principle of providing parity between our different

**March 25, 1952**

occupational groups, there will be no security and no stability in our agricultural industry and I suggest that, in many respects, the Federal Government has ignored the question of parity. They have even gone so far as to ignore it in respect to domestic consumption of wheat in Canada. I think it is all agreed that the price which we get under the International Wheat Agreement, at even the maximum price of \$1.80 translated into the purchasing power of the bushel of wheat in Canada, due to the inflation that has existed in Canada, that this \$1.80 is far from parity. And, by virtue of the fact that they are selling this wheat for consumption in Canada at \$1.80, far below parity, it means that the western producer of wheat is subsidizing the consumer of bread in Canada, and if we accept that parity of price, which will bear some true relationship to the cost of production, if we set a price of \$2.25 to \$2.35 as a price which will place those engaged in agriculture, those engaged in the production of wheat, on a comparable level with other occupational groups in Canada, if we accept that as being somewhere near right, and that is the figure which has been suggested by many farm organizations, then it means that we are subsidizing the bread consumer in Canada by some 45 to 55 cents.

Now, turning to the other question which I have raised in the Resolution, that of parity price for other agricultural commodities and the application of a system of orderly marketing. I have suggested in my preceding remarks, Mr. Speaker, that it is possible for us here in Canada to establish a system of orderly marketing by putting into effect a true Canadian National Wheat Board, a Wheat Board which will be responsible for the marketing of all our agricultural commodities, all our grain production, and no longer using the medium of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange in any respect whatsoever. I think I have been able to indicate that if we are to obtain parity it is the responsibility of the Federal Government, through that medium of orderly marketing, to see that the wheat producer does receive a price which bears a fair relationship to its cost of production.

Now, translating that into terms of our other agricultural products, other than wheat, we find in Canada we have no great semblance of orderly marketing of our other agricultural products, even to the extent that we have in relationship to wheat. We have no national marketing boards for the marketing of our cattle, our hogs, our poultry, or our dairy products. It is true that there has been established certain marketing boards, one of which has been established in the Province of Saskatchewan — a producer marketing board established by the producers. But, while they can be a part of a national marketing scheme, or a part of an orderly marketing scheme, I do not think that we in any way want to suggest that they are the final solution, but that rather they should be a wheel within a wheel, that in the final analysis for all our agricultural products we need a marketing board of a similar nature to that for which we hope we will have in connection with our grain production.

In relationship to establishing parity for other agricultural products, I think that the same general formula can be used, and that is to relate the returns which that product brings to the agricultural industry in such a manner that those people producing that agricultural commodity will be on a par with other groups and with other people in Canada. We might even go further and suggest that wheat, being the largest single commodity which we produce in Canada, could be used as a barometer or as a yard-stick and once having established a parity relationship for wheat, we

could tie our other agricultural products to that commodity. The fact that the Federal Government has refused to adopt the principle of parity in relationship to our agricultural products has meant that we have had no stability within our industry whatsoever. Anyone who has been associated with the agricultural industry has only to think back to a year or two ago and see what has happened to our hog industry, what has happened to our poultry industry and what is today happening to our cattle industry in the Dominion of Canada. It is all a direct result of the failure to establish and adopt the principle of parity price.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that there has been passed an Agricultural Prices Support Act which much has been made of in certain quarters and by certain people, but as far as inaugurating the principle of parity prices, parity structure or parity relationship, the Agricultural Prices Support Act has proven practically valueless. However, when it was first inaugurated I think the hope was held out to the farmers that, through the medium of the Agricultural Prices Support Act, we might be travelling along on the trail towards parity prices. So it was stated, at the time that this Act was inaugurated, that the purpose of this Act was to maintain a fair relationship between returns from agriculture and those from other occupations. If that statement had been lived up to in the spirit of the Act, I think that possibly by now we would have established in Canada a parity structure. But, since the inauguration of the Agricultural Prices Support Act, and enunciated policies of the Federal Government, we find that they regard the Agricultural Prices Support Act not as a means by which we can maintain a fair relationship between the returns of agriculture and those of some other occupation, but they have regarded it more in the light of unemployment insurance, that it is strictly a floor price, and a guaranteed floor price comparable to that of unemployment insurance. It is not, and has not become a part of a parity structure to benefit agriculture generally.

I think if we need any further proof of that we can make reference to the floor price which was placed under hogs, certainly not at a level which bears any relationship to the cost of production, or certainly it will not place the hog producer in a fair relationship with those in other occupations. The same is true of floor prices placed under eggs. I would venture to predict, Mr. Speaker, that when the floor price is placed under cattle it will be a very comparable situation to that respecting hogs and I think, Mr. Speaker, that it should be clearly pointed out that the Agricultural Prices Support Act does not even provide a floor price to the producer, but rather it is a guaranteed price only to the processor and to the packer, that, under the Agricultural Prices Support Act, they agree to take off the hands of the processor, or of the packer, the products which they have on hand at the end of the year. This very well means that, as far as the producer is concerned, as has been illustrated in respect to poultry products, that in spite of the fact that there is a so-called floor price to the packers and to the processors, the price of eggs to the producer has fallen far below that even established as the floor price under the Agricultural Prices Support Act.

So that the Agricultural Prices Support Act, as far as bringing agriculture into a position of parity, has done nothing in that respect and I think that, on the basis which it is set up, we can expect it to do very little.

**March 25, 1952**

I suggest further, Mr. Speaker, that we have a need for all our agricultural commodities, whether they are marketed in Canada or whether they are consumed in Canada, or whether they are placed on an international market of the world — that we do, in the interests of the Canadian economy, need National marketing boards. I have suggested that we, as producers, have a part to play within an overall scheme, and I suggest that we can do this, and are doing it through the establishing of producer-marketing boards, but our hands are tied, to a degree at least, in establishing producer marketing boards because we have not got the sufficient support, under our prices, to operate a marketing scheme which will necessarily work in the interests of the agricultural producer.

Now Mr. Speaker, I do not suggest that the establishment of orderly marketing and parity price is the entire solution to the welfare of our agricultural industry. I think that if we reach the day when we have a parity structure in Canada that we, as farmers, and as people engaged in the agricultural industry, will be prepared to adjust our economy in light of a parity structure and that we, within the agricultural industry, are prepared to see that those people within that industry get that service and goods on the basis of need. I think that we here in Saskatchewan, as a government, if we were working under a parity structure, could very well widely extend the services which we are now able to provide to our people and extend the services to even a larger degree than we do now.

Mr. Speaker, let me just briefly review what I have said. First of all, through this Resolution, we are approving in principle, the International Wheat Agreement. We suggest that possibly there is something in a future agreement which may be taken into consideration to more adequately protect our Canadian economy, but that we approve of it as a means of bulk marketing of our main commodity, wheat and we suggest that our Canadian Government continue the principles enunciated in the first International Wheat Agreement, and that they go forward with a second agreement based upon the same general principles on which there is an agreement between countries to export and to import.

Secondly, that we request the Federal Government to expand the principle that as far as wheat is concerned has been started in Canada, through the Canadian Wheat Board, as a means of orderly marketing, and that the Canadian producer receive for the wheat which he places and sells through the Canadian Wheat Board, a parity price and that that principle apply to all agricultural products produced in Canada.

I therefore move this Resolution, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst).

**Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to second this Motion it gives me a good deal of pleasure, as one of the farmer-members of this Legislature. It is my opinion that the agricultural economy not only of Saskatchewan but of the whole of Western Canada has never had a square deal in what is coming to them. The history of the wheat movement in Western Canada is a long story in itself. We can go back to just at the turn of this present century and we can find where they had commissions and enquiries of one kind and another to enquire into

the costs and price of wheat and into the spreads of one grade and another. It was through those enquiries and dissatisfaction in the early years of this century and the dissatisfaction of the conditions at that time which led to the organization of our three Western Wheat Pools today, one in Saskatchewan, with which I am most familiar. There are now around one thousand or more elevators in that set-up and they are the largest grain-handling concern in the province.

The mere fact that the farmers organized their own elevator company and take delivery of their own products is not enough in itself to cure the evil which agriculture is subjected to and I want to make it quite clear at the outset Mr. Speaker that nothing that I may say, and I am certain nothing which the member from Bengough (Mr. Brown) has said, is in any way a condemnation of the Canadian Wheat Board. I firmly believe in the marketing of all of our grains through the Wheat Board and I know the mover also believes in it, so I would not like any member of this House to misconstrue and say that we were trying to condemn or oppose the Wheat Board.

But you will recall, Mr. Speaker, going back to the Wheat Pool movement again, that when the Wheat Pool came into being we found a considerable spread between one grade and another of grain in the price returned to the farmer and if the grain happened to be in a tough or damp class the spread was considerably greater again. Throughout time, by the farmers' own organization, they have consistently brought that spread down between one grade and another. Also the handling charges of elevators have been greatly reduced. All that in itself has been of great benefit to the farmers but it has not really answered our old question. It seems that when the farmer, on his own initiative, makes a move to try to better his lot, those who have been in control of the final say-so of marketing of our commodities have used that extra of which we have been able to help ourselves, to be able to say we are getting that much more for our products. They will be able to cut off from the top end what we should have had, what we have been trying to save in the middle.

The history of the cattle is the same. I can well recall that at the end of the First World War, when a lot of the soldiers came back to this country and were buying cattle to try and get re-established to start farming again, they paid a good price for cattle but within two years after that time the cattle prices were down to rock bottom. These farmers were forced out of business with little or no monetary return for their cattle. Consequently they were in debt for some years to come because they did not have the money with which to pay their obligations. A battle has been put up by the veterans who were on the Soldiers' Settlement Board to try to get a square deal for those veterans when conditions over which they had no control, the price of their products going to pieces on them different times that way, put them in debt which a lot of them, even today, have never been able to recover from. A lot of those veterans lost their land and others, through deprivation of their wives and families and semi-starvation, were able to maybe pay up their debts.

We have heard a lot in this Legislature about the loss of population in this Province. I think one of the greatest factors that has had anything to do with the loss of our population has been our farm policies, the farm policies of our marketing. Back in the First War we all recall that the price of wheat started to go up so fast, because wheat was so scarce,

**March 25, 1952**

that the government of the day had to put a ceiling price on wheat so it would not go too high. There was a lot of battling to try to get them to do anything when the price was going down. We all recall that during the 'thirties the opposite was true, the bottom went clear out of the market on wheat and, while there were millions and millions of people throughout the world starving because they wanted a slice of bread, the farmers of Western Canada could not sell their wheat. If we had not, at the same time, during those 'thirties, been plagued by drouth and crop failures, the situation would have been far more disastrous even than it was. Had the farmers of these western plains been able to produce wheat like they normally should do under favourable conditions, I do not know what would have happened to the farmers of this Province. We would have found a lot more of them going broke not because they were not producing but because they were producing and could not sell it.

Now I do not think that, in my opinion, we have ever, at any time, reached complete parity of price to the agricultural industry of this Western Canada but if we want to take 1945 as a basis of parity, in my opinion I believe it was, in that year, closer to parity than we have had at any time before or since. I have a few interesting figures to give you for 1945, using it as a parity. Now, it is true the price of wheat in 1945 was only obtained after great pressure on our Federal Government. We all recall the Ottawa delegation which went to Ottawa in the early 'forties asking for an increase in wheat prices. We did, after considerable pressure from legislatures in the West and from farm organizations and others, at long last get the Federal Government in the early 'forties to agree to increase the price of wheat somewhat in relation to other commodities which the farmer had to buy. During those years we had a controlled price system, where prices of farmers' needs could not rise so rapidly and as helter-skelter, as you may say, as in these days. Now it seems to be that if anybody wants to stick the farmer a little more he can just go ahead and do it, nobody is there to try and protect him, but when the farmer comes to sell his commodities his price is always put down.

As I was saying, taking 1945 as a basis, if we are agreed that this was the closest year we have had, for the price of our wheat — and I may say, Mr. Speaker, that wheat in the West here, as far as the farmer is concerned, is the gold standard. We can talk of what our dollar gold standard is all we like, but the price of wheat by and large throughout the history of this West has been the dominating factor in the rest of our agricultural products. If the price of wheat goes down everything else goes down with it. If the price of wheat comes up then we have a chance to get the other products to come up accordingly. Now, in 1945, the cost structure of the farmer's dollar, according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, was set at 152.1. If we take that as 100 and the price of wheat, which was then \$1.64, as 100, we find that in 1946 the parity structure had gone up to 1.03 and that should give us \$1.69 for our wheat, using 1945 as a basis for parity. But, instead of \$1.69, which would have been five cents greater than in 1945, the actual price, (and these figures are all taken from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics), which we received over that year was \$1.62. In 1947 we find it has gone up another nine points, making it 1.12 and our price that year should have been \$1.84 on a parity price but we only got \$1.63. We were up one cent to what we were on the average of 1946. In 1948, using that same basis, our parity price should have been \$2.13 but, instead, it was only \$1.63, the same as in 1947.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that while on the one hand costs climbed each year, our price was remaining the same in 1947 and 1948. In 1949 it had climbed, the parity price should have been \$2.20 but we are now starting to take a loss on the price which we receive for our grain. The actual price was \$1.61 for wheat. In 1950 it should have been \$2.26, while all we got was \$1.50 and in 1951 we should have been \$2.53 while all we got last year was \$1.57. Now these figures are taken, as I said, from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and they are figured on what the farmers' needs are. That is not just figuring the cost-of-living index which is generally used for the urban dwellers. I have right here, Mr. Speaker, the charts showing the cost-of-living index of the farmers' commodities, which is the compounded index, exclusive of living costs. I will not weary the House with all these figures but I think any hon. member can check the figures if he wants to confirm those which I have given.

Now we find in the United States, this past year, that their parity price for wheat was \$2.43. In the United States they guarantee 90 per cent of their parity price as a minimum, which made their price \$2.17. So I contend that if we do not get a parity price we cannot continue to have our costs of what we are producing continue to go up and, at the same time, the actual money we are having paid to us for our products go down. This is calculated on the basis of the selling price of No. 4 Northern wheat under the International Wheat Agreement and subtracting 16 cents per bushel for the freight and handling, so you will see that this is the price as paid to the farmer, not the price at the Lakehead.

Now, in 1950 the Western Provinces here suffered one of the greatest catastrophes that has happened in the West, when the frost came and froze all our crops. Last year we had another major set-back through the very adverse weather conditions in which we were not able to get our crops off. And in 1950 the policies for our farming system further aggravated the plight of the farmers of this province for the spring of 1951. In July 1950 oats in the elevator was selling at 92 cents a bushel. Now the farmers all knew that if they held their 1949-50 crop over in the granary until after the 31st of July they would not only take the 1950-51 price but they would also have to take deliveries off their quotas for the 1950-51 crop year. The crop looked very promising in the early part of 1950 and I know in my part of the Province, in the north, there was a considerable amount of coarse grains. Consequently, the farmers held on to their oats and their barley until July, before the dead-line came for getting the price of that crop year and getting in on the then year-ending quota. Consequently, in July the farmers all emptied their bins and sold their oats and barley because the crop prospects were good and they did not see that they would have too much difficulty for seed, but when the big frost hit in August it left all the northern country in a terrible plight to get seed for the following year. So we will see that our marketing policies put the farmers to inconvenience, they can never plan ahead for their production. The same oats that were selling for 92 cents, had they held them over until August would only have sold for an initial payment of 50 cents, then, in March 1951, there was a 10 cent adjustment, which would have made it 60 cents.

Now, we cannot expect the farmers of the West to always, as the mover has pointed out, be subsidizing the Canadian consumers through the length and breadth of our Dominion while, at the same time, taking all the

**March 25, 1952**

risk on his own behalf. So I submit that until we can get a parity price for agriculture so that farmers can plan their production on a long-term basis, we are going to have insecurity and instability among our agricultural economy.

The farmers of this Province, and all of the West are not asking for something, Mr. Speaker, that is not coming to them. I have heard many a farmer, this past year or two, when the price of beef was such a good price, say — and they have admitted that, in their opinion the price of beef was high and that maybe it was too high for the workers in the cities who have to buy their meat, but the thing that worried them was that in two or three years' time there would be no guarantee that they could at least get the cost of production for their beef. There is no guarantee. They could not plan to put up a shelter, buildings and get equipment to look after a herd of cattle where there is no guarantee of security. I am confident, from my talks with farmers, that they would have been far more satisfied these past few years to take a little lower price on beef, and I believe beef is the only thing for which it could be argued that the farmers have received above parity. They would have been a little more satisfied to take a little lower price on beef and know that in three, four, five or ten years from now they were still going to receive the cost of production to them. Or, in other words, the parity price; a parity, the mover has pointed out, which related their income with other groups throughout our society in this Dominion.

If we do not have some assurance for our agricultural economy that way, we will find that, in a few years, we have people starving in the midst of plenty again, because the moment the farmers' prices fell so low that he could not keep up with the cost of his production he had to do as the veterans did after the First World War, in order to pay off their land, he had to quit consuming things which he should have in his own home. His own living standard has to be lower. Consequently, the things which he would buy for his home or for his comfort and for the comfort of his wife and family are not bought. So some place or other, it may be in this Province, it may be in Eastern Canada, it could be in European countries, some worker is thrown out of work because the farmer does not have the money to buy the thing they are producing. Consequently the moment that worker is thrown out of work he, in turn, does not have the money to buy the agricultural products that the farmer produces and it just becomes a vicious circle. So I think that any government of any nation has a responsibility to all phases of society in their nation to guarantee parity within their domains — any Federal Government of any country has that power and authority. A provincial government does not have that power or authority to set prices for farm commodities. They can only have jurisdiction while those products are in the confines of any one province and our commodities in this Province, while we produce abundantly, do not have the market in this Province.

Now I can go on and give the same information with regard to oats and barley. The price here has been coming down in face of the costs going up, but I think, Mr. Speaker, that I have, with this explanation, shown, through my figures, how the parity would work in the case of wheat, and it would work in the same relation for other commodities on the farm.

I take great pleasure in seconding this Motion.



**Mr. L.W. Larsen (Shellbrook):** — Mr. Speaker, it is an honour for me to have the privilege to stand up and support a Motion of this kind presented by the hon. member from Bengough (Mr. Brown), because, in my estimation, that is about the only commodity we have left that is a little bit of security for the farmers in the four Western Provinces.

There is no question in my mind, since prices keep on going up and up, there is not much use in setting a price on wheat any more because it is generally out-dated the next day, so we must come back to a parity price. There is no question in my mind that our Government should at least set a parity price for home consumption and they also should set up a representative group of farmers to see how the produce is sold in the Wheat Board office.

Why I want to speak particularly on this Motion, Mr. Speaker, is this; when I look over the other activities of other countries and see the calamity of their industry today, where fellow governments have to run up and down all the countries in the world to pick up a little butter here or there and you go over to the hog and bacon industry and see our market gone there, that is why I like to speak about this Wheat Motion, because I do not want to see it go the same way.

Besides, when you see all the packing plants and cold storage plants loaded to the roof and no place to sell it, they have to put it in tin cans, that is indeed a sorry condition for agriculture in these Western Provinces. It has a tendency to eliminate all our small farmers. There is no remuneration for their labour when it comes to livestock. We could go on further down, we all know how we lost the bacon market.

I should like to see our Government in Ottawa arrange for a two-way trade with Great Britain and other countries who want dealings with us. I do not know whether the Federal Government did not like that government that existed in Great Britain at the time we lost this market, but I am sure that if Winston Churchill or his Food Minister could announce in the House over there tomorrow, "The Canadian packing plants are full of good bacon and we are arranging that you can get, instead of four ounces a week, a whole pound a week. And we can also sell our manufactured goods on the Canadian market," that is the only thing that will establish our market beyond dangerous ground like that today. Just to give a little instance: We have seen the cattle market, our beef industry gone down; we market an average of 400,000 cattle per year and nobody can contradict that it is down at least ten cents a pound or more in a lot of places, on certain animals. Well, that is \$40 million. They might go down another \$40 million and that might be a yearly event, particularly, when I look back on it, when the Federal Government kept their embargo to the United States on a lot longer than was necessary. But they only took it off a few months prior to the last Federal election.

When I see these things happening to this market and that market, well, of course, we are trying to hold what little we have got and that is why I am anxious to speak on this Wheat Resolution. If the cattle market is kept off — and I do not trust these politicians down east, they might keep this embargo on even if the United States does not want it, for longer than necessary. Since we produce, and we should produce, ten times more than we can consume ourselves in this country — we should have three

**March 25, 1952**

or four million people in this Province. We should produce 50 times more hogs than we are producing today and there is a demand for it in the world, but the reason we cannot sell it is that there are dumping duties and everything else against these people who want to buy these things, to protect a few monopolies. And after all, Mr. Speaker, these monopolies, in most cases, are foreign industries or assembly plants down here.

You are paying practically \$1,000 more for a car here than you pay down south. The same thing in respect to a truck, and so on. It seems funny to me, Mr. Speaker, that the members opposite in this House always talk about their loyalty to the Crown, and we are supposed to be Communists on this side, and they were the very ones that gave Great Britain the knife in the back and not only put a duty on, but put a dumping duty on and made them take their agriculture, or their manufactured goods back to Great Britain. We should have a sale here so that you and I and the rest of the farmers could sell our produce at a reasonable price. I say here, Mr. Speaker, that there is something wrong down there, and in my estimation we have no license for Saskatchewan to send one Liberal down to Ottawa at any time, we should not have a member of this House who is in affiliation with that Liberal party in Ottawa. I know there are some good members over there, but they are in the wrong crowd.

Now, coming back to this wheat. I have been in the wheat business a long time and the tariff walls and protections and obstructions here and there — there is only one way to handle it and that is through our Wheat Board. A grower should have some more representation and a little more to say on how it is sold. I will never forget the day when I had to raise oats, three grades, to get 1½ cents a bushel on the old market, Mr. Speaker. We cannot go back there but I also remember, in 1946 and 1947, when I went out to British Columbia and saw our wheat sold out there for some 90 cents a bushel. And I remember how we kicked here when we got our final payment on the five-year pool and it averaged \$1.50 or better here. That was just a little bit of giving our stuff away and that is why we must have some farm representation on that Wheat Board to see how it is sold.

It was just a gift? Oh, I do not know, maybe they were playing a little politics, buying a few votes for the Western Canadian farmers' wheat. But that is the way I look at it. Our dairy industry is gone, our bacon market is gone, we have already taken a loss of \$40 million on our cattle industry and unless we look after this wheat business here there is nothing left. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, it is the cash that was ringing up when our farmers were prosperous, the labour was taken care of and the average little man or business man was taken care of, and I think it is about time that we took a little stock in trying to get some of these markets back — hold what we have and increase our markets.

We showed what we could do in the way of producing commodities of something to eat and there is nothing the world is crying more for today than something to eat, but we cannot keep on producing at a loss. The dairy industry has been held down, the hog market has been held down and destroyed, and now with this terrible disease which has come in among our cattle, nobody knows — if we have to eat them all I am as sure as I am standing here that they will go down another ten cents a pound., that will be another \$40 million. That is \$80 million a year. I do not know how

long we can stand it, there is nothing left. That promise to the Western Provinces; “you do not need to worry about what business you are in,” but the Liberal policy is not the policy you want in Saskatchewan and that is why I still can support the hon. member’s Motion here, to do something, get at least parity prices on one item, because I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that even if the wheat rose five cents that it would raise the value of the wheat in a loaf of bread more than one cent. So we do not need to be afraid of that, but it makes a wonderful difference in the economy of the whole country.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to support that Motion and I tried to throw some of these other things up as well; that we get a fair and just deal and develop some markets for our produce, otherwise we are sunk.

**Mr. A. Loptson (Saltcoats):** — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Heming:

“That this Assembly respectfully urge upon the Federal Government that, in view of the fact that the serious lack of housing in the urban centres of this Province has resulted in severe hardships to large numbers of families and is contributing to broken homes, the undermining of the health and morale of our people and the retarding of the development and wellbeing of the Province generally, measures be undertaken to provide adequate housing and that, to this end, the restrictive regulations under the National Housing Act, particularly with respect to section 35 thereof, be immediately removed; and, further, that building materials be made available in sufficient supply and at a price that will make possible the construction of homes at a reasonable and equitable rate.

and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Loptson, as amended by leave of the Assembly:

- (1) That the word “Federal” in the first line be deleted and the word “Provincial” substituted therefor:
- (2) That all the words after the word “end” in the seventh line be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

“the Provincial Government consider the advisability of providing all necessary material to complete homes at cost to those who are building homes for themselves; and further that the Federal Government

**March 25, 1952**

be urged to modify their restrictions in the National Housing Act to enable people building homes for themselves to borrow an equivalent percentage of the cost of these homes as if they were buying the homes under contract, thus making it possible for people in the lower income bracket to own their own homes.”

**Mr. J.G. Egnatoff (Melfort):** — Mr. Speaker, before adjourning the debate on this Housing Motion I endeavoured to make four or five observations clear . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — With regard to this Motion, you will remember, at the time I was looking up some authority whether the Motion was in order and I find this: That on Tuesday last, when this amendment was moved by the hon. member for Saltcoats, the Premier asked me to consider its admissibility in its present form but, since he did not press the point, I allowed the debate to proceed.

In the interim, I have made some study of the authorities and precedents and I would refer the House to a lengthy ruling given by Mr. Speaker Agar on a Point of Order raised by the Hon. T.C. Davis with respect to a series of Motions of Opposition members (including myself), each of them involving expenditure of public money. I may add that this ruling was confirmed by direct correspondence with Mr. Beauchesne and the form of a private member’s “money” Motion then published is, in my view, the form we should maintain, and insist upon, in this Assembly.

Since the debate has proceeded thus far, I shall follow the precedent set by my predecessor in the Chair and allow the amendment to be dealt with, if the House agrees, provided the opening words in clause (2), “the Provincial Government provide”, be changed to read, “the Provincial Government consider the advisability of providing . . .” If the hon. member is willing to accept that I will still maintain it is in order.

**Mr. A. Lopton (Saltcoats):** — Mr. Speaker, I will be prepared to make that change.

— Agreed —

**Mr. Speaker:** — The Motion will be changed accordingly.

**Mr. J.G. Egnatoff:** — Well now, Mr. Speaker, as I said a couple of moments ago, before adjourning the debate on this Amendment I endeavoured to make five observations clear, and just to recall the memory of the hon. members to those five observations I wish to submit them in summarized form.

The first observation that I endeavoured to make to the House is that in 1943-44 the C.C.F. Party had recognized housing as a provincial responsibility. Hon. members can recall that in the election campaign of 1944 the C.C.F. had definitely promised that if elected to office they would do something to alleviate the housing shortage which at that time was evident in the Province.

Secondly, I endeavoured to make clear that the C.C.F. Party, back in 1943 and 1944, pledged themselves to make available long-term loans at low interest rates. These loans, Mr. Speaker, were not to be made available by any Federal authorities or by the banks or by any loaning institutions, these long-term loans were going to be made available by the Provincial Government if the C.C.F. were elected in 1944.

Thirdly, the C.C.F. Party in this Province had promised to establish factories on the prairies for the manufacture of plastic houses and that the style of these houses could be changed at the whim of the owner simply by sending in the plastic material to the factory, having it dissolved and re-designed to meet your own requirements.

**Some Hon. Member:** — Blowing bubbles.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — Fourthly, I drew to the attention of this House — I am sorry the Premier is leaving, there will be a reference to him shortly — I hope he will be back in time . . .

**Some Hon. Member:** — He is the one that said it — he does not like it.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — Fourthly, I drew to the attention of this House that the C.C.F. Party, in 1943 and 1944 promised to convert last year's straw stacks into this year's houses and chicken coops and what not.

And fifthly, I drew to the attention of the House that the C.C.F. Party had promised to establish in this Province a Housing Commission, to make a study of the housing problems and to bring in recommendations to the Provincial Government regarding what the Provincial government was to do to alleviate the situation. As a matter of fact, members of the C.C.F. Party had even promised to the people of this Province, not only houses but that those houses out in our rural areas would contain running water and bathtubs and everything else that may be desired.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, you will recall that, in 1944, a gentleman by the name of T.C. Douglas, who is now the Premier of this Province, went around this Province putting on a wonderful little show, a one-man show, with regard to syrup jars and plastics, and he used to wave a piece of plastic before his audience in a very entertaining manner, pointing out how hard that plastic was as he struck it against the table, and drawing to the attention of the people that if only he and his government were elected they were going to build houses . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Have you not said that word for word before in this Chamber, in this debate?

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — No, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think you are simply reiterating every word, exactly word for word, that has already been used in this debate.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — Mr. Speaker, I happen to have right here on my desk a copy of my remarks before this debate was adjourned and I want to draw to your attention that this interjection is absolutely unwarranted

**March 25, 1952**

because in that speech I made absolutely no reference to the Premier's addresses at that time with regard to the plastic and the syrup jars that he used to carry around.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think we can find a record that those statements have been made exactly, as I recall it.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — I will be glad to send a copy of the transcript of my remarks. I am not repeating.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order. I cannot recall that the hon. member used those words, but someone used those words in this debate.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — Mr. Speaker, I will be very glad to send you a copy of my remarks so that you can have them before you. I certainly have no desire, and never had any desire in this House, of repeating any statements that I have previously made.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I am quite sure that I can recollect those exact words.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — Oh, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you can recollect those exact words, those are the exact words that the Premier used back in 1944.

**Mr. Speaker:** — No, no, I am referring to words in this debate.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — I am very glad that you recognize them, very happy that you recognize them Your Honour.

**Mr. Speaker:** — No, it was words in this debate.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — I am sure that if you check my previous comments you will find that what I have just claimed to be absolutely correct and I think it is important for all hon. members, particularly those sitting on your right, to recall those one-man entertaining shows that were put on by a gentleman by the name of T.C. Douglas with that plastic and those syrup jars.

**Some Hon. Member:** — Everything but snake oil.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — I know, Mr. Speaker, although some of those promises were labelled as fantastic dreams of the socialists, the C.C.F. leaders reassured the people of Saskatchewan that the C.C.F. promises were not to be taken lightly. Their leaders assured the public that the C.C.F. Party in Saskatchewan did not make a single promise which it could not and would not fulfill. Now, it is quite understandable to hear members, like the member for Canora (Mr. Kuziak) or the member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Walker) making fantastic promises, after all people do not take them very seriously anyway. But when men who today occupy the office of Minister of Natural Resources and the high office of Premier in this Province, stated that their promises were to be taken seriously, then I think the people had every right to accept them at their word. For instance, here is what the present Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. J.H. Brockelbank), is reported to have stated in this Legislature and I am quoting from a report of his address as reported in the March 1st issue of the "Saskatchewan Commonwealth",

1944. On page 7 of that paper we find the following words with regard to what he had said, and he was referring to C.C.F. promises at that time. I am quoting now:

“They are great promises but they can and will be carried out. The reason I am confident of this, Mr. Speaker, is because the C.C.F. is a political party which is voted for, controlled and financed by the people of this Province. I am sure that my hon. friends opposite know many people who have made contributions to the C.C.F. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that when people back up their beliefs with contributions of hard-earned cash they mean business.”

**Mr. Speaker:** — You are reading excerpts, those are only excerpts. That is not a verbatim report.

**Mr. Speaker:** — That, Mr. Speaker, represents a transcribed copy of my remarks on this Housing matter at the Fifth Session of the Eleventh Legislature of the Province of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Speaker:** — But you referred to plastics in exactly the same words.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — And if those are only excerpts of my address, then there must have been something wrong with the transcription system in this House because that was what was sent to me, Mr. Speaker, for correction. Now, I am sorry that there has been this reflection made by Your Honour on the transcription system put into effect in this House and I hope that does not mean that the entire system of transcribing speeches in this House is now being brought into question by Your Honour’s interjection.

**Mr. Speaker:** — What I am pointing out is that there was more said than what has been read.

**Mr. W.A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition):** — That is probably true a lot of the time.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, if I have said more than what is in there, I want to call your Honour’s attention that that simply means that my remarks were inaccurately transcribed and that they only transcribed part of them. I know that that happened in a previous debate, but surely you are not suggesting that is going to happen in every debate in which I take part.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I have just had it drawn to my attention that those other words were used in the Budget Debate. I knew that I had heard those words, exactly as you had repeated them.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — Yes, the Premier said those words back in 1943-44. However, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — No, no, it was . . .

**March 25, 1952**

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — . . . I think we might as well settle one matter right here and now. I would like to know whether I may have the privilege of proceeding with the debate or whether there is going to be a constant interchange of words between Your Honour and myself.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I was just trying to find out . . .

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — Now I want some assurance from Your Honour that I may have the right to speak in the Legislature . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Yes, you have the right . . .

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — . . . without constant interjection from Your Honour.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I was trying to establish that I did not want repetition and I was quite sure that the words had been used — I had heard — in some debate here. That was what I was trying to draw to your attention. It was word for word. It was used in some debate.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — And I was just drawing to your attention that I do not repeat anything today that I have previously said.

**Mr. Speaker:** — O.K. go ahead.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — I hope that I may have the privilege of proceeding . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Go ahead, go ahead.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — . . . without this constant interruption from Your Honour.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I am just trying to point out that I am not going to allow repetition. I am not going to allow tedious repetition. The words you were using struck my memory as being exactly word for word and I am quite confident that those words were used by someone in a previous debate. That is what I was drawing to your attention. If they were not used by you then they were used by someone else. Proceed.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — Mr. Speaker, we might as well get this cleared up now . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Proceed. It is settled. Proceed.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — Does that mean that a member cannot ever say anything that has ever been said before?

**Mr. Speaker:** — No.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — Pardon? Well, I wish you would explain that before I do proceed, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — It does mean that you cannot go on with tedious repetition.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — Well, I quite appreciate that and I appreciate an acknowledgement from Your Honour that statements of promises of the C.C.F. are now classed as tedious repetition.



**Mr. Speaker:** — Order. I did not make that statement.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — Now, here is what the man who is the Premier of this Province said back in 1944 with regard to the promises which were made by that party. In a radio address on February 17th, 21st and 23rd of 1944, again as reported in the “Saskatchewan Commonwealth,” here is what the Premier is supposed to have said:

“The one thing about which I am quite determined is that no C.C.F. Government will ever be elected in Saskatchewan by promising to do things which we know perfectly well cannot be done by the Provincial Government. I grant you it would be easier if we had a C.C.F. Government at Ottawa, but there is not much we can do on our own until a more friendly Federal Government is elected.”

Then again, the hon. Premier (Hon. Mr. Douglas), before he was elected to that high office, had this to say at Estevan on June 12, 1944, as reported in the Regina “Leader-Post,” and I quote:

“Don’t think that we can give you an entirely new society,’ Mr. Douglas warned, ‘nobody can do that in one province, for we must have a brand new society in all Canada because, under our constitution, there are certain things that only the Federal Government can take over, like the banks and issue currency and give you parity prices and control tariff and freight rates. I do not want the C.C.F. Party to get one vote in this election by saying that they are going to do things they cannot constitutionally do. Under Section 92 of the British North America Act there are things we can do and those are the things I pledge myself we will do.’”

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, you can see that the C.C.F. leaders wanted the people to believe their promises. They wanted the people to believe their promises about housing being a provincial responsibility. They made serious promises and the people took them seriously. Now they seem to laugh at their own promises. Now even Your Honour does not seem to like my drawing to the attention of the House those very promises — promises which they said they would not make unless they could actually put them into effect as a Provincial Government.

So now I ask these questions. How many plastic factories did the Government establish to build houses? None. How many plastic homes have been built by the C.C.F. Government of Saskatchewan? Not one. How many wooden houses for that matter have been built by the Government of Saskatchewan? None. How many straw stacks of last year have been converted into this year’s houses? Not one. How many long-term loans have been provided at low interest rates by the C.C.F. Government? None. Not even a single long-term loan at low interest rates has been provided by the C.C.F. Government in spite of their promise to do it. Now, it is true . . .

**Mr. A. Lopton (Saltcoats):** — What about theatres?

**March 25, 1952**

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — I'll come to that. It is true that the present Provincial Government has done something by way of establishing a few veteran's suites in several of the points of this Province and I am going to congratulate my hon. friend the Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Sturdy) for the part that he has played in the establishing of some of these veteran's suites. We happen to have one in Melfort and those suites are very greatly appreciated by the people in my town. However, what we need is not crowded suites, we need homes, we need houses to raise our children and that is the crying need in every town in this Province today. In Estevan they need more homes, in Swift Current they need more homes, in the City of Moose Jaw they need more homes, in Saskatoon, North Battleford, Melfort and you can go right across the province, almost every fair-sized town or city is in need of homes.

Now the Timber Board made a substantial profit. So very often the hon. members on your right talk about subsidies. There is a real opportunity for the C.C.F. Socialist Government to actually put into effect some of the theories that they have been preaching with such great volume throughout the years. However, instead of encouraging the construction of homes, the Provincial Government's Timber Board charges \$95 per thousand board feet for 2 x 4's and 2 x 8's and for shiplap at its own yard in the town of Nipawin. Spruce flooring bought from the Timber Board yard at Nipawin costs \$105 per thousand, at least so we were informed in the Crown Corporations Committee by the Minister in charge of that Timber Board. Not only that. Instead of encouraging people to buy housing material and to construct houses, the Provincial Treasurer has to put an extra squeeze on them and charge them Education and Hospitalization Tax on building materials. That is something that the Federal Government does not do. But the Provincial Treasurer makes it more difficult to build homes by charging Education and Hospitalization Tax on those materials.

What we are really doing today in the Amendment that was proposed by the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) is simply inviting the Provincial Government to put into effect some of the promises on which they were elected in 1944. However, we on this side of the House realize that housing is a Federal responsibility and are therefore called upon, not only the Provincial Government but the Federal Government to do something further in this regard. Personally, I do not feel that the Federal Government has done enough to relieve the housing shortage. I do not feel that the Provincial Government has done enough to relieve the housing shortage, or else there would be no housing shortage. But I cannot help but feel that had the Provincial Government in the Province of Saskatchewan done proportionately as much as the Federal Government has done at Ottawa, then there would be no housing shortage in this Province today. Mr. Speaker, instead of finding ourselves in this ridiculous situation where the Provincial Treasurer, through the Government Insurance Office, makes a \$75,000 loan — what for? The theatre business. A theatre business with which he and the Premier are associated. I say that instead of making a \$75,000 loan for the theatre business, in which two members of the Government are associated today . . .

**Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I would ask that that be withdrawn. The hon. gentleman knows that the statement is a deliberate lie and I would ask that it be withdrawn.

**Mr. W.A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition):** — We do not have to withdraw it when he says that.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Mr. Speaker, I deny the statement and I insist that it be withdrawn.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — Mr. Speaker, I think I should ask the Provincial Treasurer to withdraw that.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think the hon. member must withdraw if the hon. Provincial Treasurer says it is not true. If you cannot substantiate . . .

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — Mr. Speaker, I think it might be well to get this rule straightened out. Just because the Provincial Treasurer says something is a deliberate lie does not say that it is. As a matter of fact it is a good proof to the contrary.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order. Order. There is such a thing as personal honour — respecting members — and when any hon. member gets on his feet and says someone is making a mis-statement it is generally the rule that he will accept that statement and withdraw, unless you have specific proof of your statement.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — Well now, that has happened before.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Withdraw or get out.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — Pardon?

**Some Hon. Member:** — “Withdraw or get out,” he says.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — Mr. Speaker, what I tried to say was this, that in my opinion, instead of the Provincial Treasurer, who is in charge of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office, making a \$75,000 loan to a theatre, the firm of which . . .

**Some Hon. Members (Government):** — No-o-o.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — . . . both the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer are today associated. Instead of making that \$75,000 loan for the theatre, it would have been more in the public interest for the Provincial Treasurer to loan . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order. Order. Is that statement . . .

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — That statement is incorrect, Mr. Speaker, and he knows it is incorrect.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — Mr. Speaker, I think it is a shame if we have to go into this whole case of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance . . .

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman knows the statement is not correct. No money was loaned to any theatre company in which the Premier and I are interested. I would ask that that be withdrawn, in fact I will demand that it be withdrawn because it is absolutely incorrect.

**March 25, 1952**

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think the hon. member who is speaking must take the word of the hon. member who objects to it that it is not a statement of fact. You may have opinions about things, but I think it is generally accepted as a rule when a member for the Legislature makes a categorical denial that you must accept his word.

**Mr. Tucker:** — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, or on a point of order. Many things are said by the Government with which we do not agree, and because they do not agree with us they cannot make us stop saying these things. Just let me recall to Your Honour what has been proved. It has been proved that a \$75,000 loan was made to Mr. Bodnoff and Mr. Bodnoff . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order. Order. That is not the point of order. The point of order is that when an individual makes an individual charge against an individual, it is not a question of opinion, but when one member of the Legislature makes a specific charge against a specific member, if that member gets up and on a point of order, point of privilege, denies it, then it is only gentlemanly to accept his word. It is not a question of opinion, it is a question of . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, I am going to point out to you that if one person makes a statement of what he believes to be a fact, just because the members opposite say it is not a fact does not mean that their word as to what their opinion of the facts are must be taken over our word. You are presiding over this House as an impartial officer of the House. It is not for you to say that because the Government says something is a fact we must always accept that. We have as much right to our opinion as to what the facts are as they have and when we state that money was loaned to a man who is now a partner of the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer, that was established as a fact, Mr. Speaker. That was established as a fact. We do not have to take it back.

**Premier Douglas:** — On a question of privilege. That is not what he said. He said money was loaned to a firm with which we were associated. It was not loaned to a firm with which we were associated. Nobody pays any attention to the member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff), I do not care personally what he says because anything he says is immediately discounted 90 per cent. He might as well try to stay to the facts insofar as he is congenitally capable of doing so.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared to settle this. Are you going to allow the Premier to make a statement such as he did here just now — that any statements which I make in this House are discounted 90 per cent as fast as they are said? Is that parliamentary? Is that parliamentary? I ask you.

**Mr. Speaker:** — It is not like a direct charge against an individual. You associated the Provincial Treasurer with a certain transaction which the Provincial Treasurer denies and I think that, as a gentleman, you should accept the other gentleman's denial. If you say it was a Government policy, that is a different thing.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — All right, all right Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw what the Provincial Treasurer thinks I said. I will withdraw what the Provincial Treasurer thinks I said, because I do not want to say anything

that will really offend him in any way. That is not my intention. I cannot be held responsible for his thinking, that is certainly very true, but what I endeavour to say, Mr. Speaker, is simply what has been proven in the Crown Corporations Committee. Firstly, that the Provincial Treasurer, as head of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office, did make a loan of \$75,000 or thereabouts for the theatre business. That is a fact. Will the Provincial Treasurer deny that? No.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Mr. Speaker, I must deny it. The Provincial Treasurer does not make loans for the Insurance Company, the directors do.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — The Provincial Treasurer, I hope, is in charge of it. Either he is held responsible . . .

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — There is no dictatorship there.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — I hope he knows what is going on in his insurance business. Secondly, the fact has been established that both the Provincial Treasurer and the Premier are in a partnership with the man to whom the loan was made. Will you deny that, Mr. Provincial Treasurer?

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — We are very proud of that.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — I am very glad to get such a confession from him that he is very proud of it. It is my opinion, my conviction that instead of lending \$75,000 to the theatre business it would have been in the public interests to have made a \$75,000 loan which would have put up a housing project of approximately 20 or 25 units. My people in Melfort, in Tisdale, I am sure the people in Estevan, the people in North Battleford, would be interested to know . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural Resources):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I would like to inform the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff), that he has no people in Tisdale yet. He does not represent that constituency and I would like him to stay in his own back yard. I represent that constituency.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — I want to say that my people in Tisdale, Star City, in Hudson Bay — why certainly, we are all people of the Province of Saskatchewan, all of us. All people of the Province of Saskatchewan.

**Some Hon. Member:** — Sometimes I doubt that you are.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — I think that the Government of Saskatchewan could have encouraged and should have encouraged the establishment of co-operative housing project and might very well have made a loan of \$75,000 to such a co-operative housing organization to put up anywhere from 20 to 30 homes.

**March 25, 1952**

I feel that this amendment which has been introduced by the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loftson) is really doing two things. One, it is calling upon the Provincial Government to really implement their housing promises of 1943-44, promises which they said they would not make unless they could actually fulfill them; secondly, this amendment is calling upon the Federal Government to modify their restrictions in the National Housing Act to enable people building homes for themselves to borrow equivalent percentage of the cost of these homes as if they were buying the homes under contract. I do not know of any more sensible amendment that could possibly be introduced than one which calls upon both the Provincial and the Federal Governments to take effective measures to help alleviate this housing shortage.

The question being put, it was negatived 29 to 18.

The debate continuing on the Motion, in amendment thereto it was moved by the Hon. Mr. Sturdy, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Williams:

That the following words be added to the Motion:

And further, that this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government of Saskatchewan the advisability —

1. Of providing that, of the 25 per cent of capital construction cost of housing allocated to the Provincial and Municipal authorities under Section 35 of the National Housing Act, 15 per cent be borne by the Provincial Government and 10 per cent by the municipality concerned, and
2. of granting loans to a maximum of 60 per cent of the contributions required to be made by Limited Dividend Housing Corporations organized by municipalities under Section 9 of the said National Housing Act.

**Hon. Mr. J.H. Sturdy (Minister of Social Welfare):** — Mr. Speaker, the facetious speech of the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff) frankly, leaves me quite unmoved. We, on this side of the House . . .

**Mr. J.G. Egnatoff (Melfort):** — On a point of order. Is it in order for him to refer to a speech which I have made on the amendment?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — We are dealing with the resolution.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — The amendment is finished.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Mr. Speaker, let us get this straight. May I deal with the matter dealt with in the speech on the amendment?

**Mr. Speaker:** — No, the matter dealt with on the amendment was tied up with the Motion, but there was no reference to the speech.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — All right, I will not make any reference to it, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, it does not warrant any reference being made to it.

The Opposition is very fond of making light of any statement to the effect which I have made from time to time, that housing is a Federal responsibility. I would like to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the Winnipeg "Free Press" June 6, 1945, just before the last Federal election, in which an appeal was being made to the mothers, to the women of the land, by the Liberal Party. And this is what it states:

"Women have faith in the Liberal working plan. The home is the heart of the nation. It must be sound and strong."

And then they proceeded to promise that they, the Government of Canada, would build 100,000 homes each year for 10 years. They have not built a third of that many each year for 10 years.

**Mr. W.A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition):** — I do not think there was ever any promise that the Government itself would build 100,000 homes.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — This was published by the National Liberal Committee.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, read the advertisement though.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — That statement is immediately followed by this, Mr. Speaker:

"Installments as low as \$9.58 per month on purchase of homes . . ."

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, the Minister said that the Government was going to build 100,000 homes. I suggest that that is not in that editorial at all. I suggest that he read the editorial and he will prove that what he said is wrong.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — It is very, very clear that the statement was to the effect that the Liberal Government would build 100,000 homes a year for 10 years.

**Mr. Tucker:** — And I suggest that that is not in that advertisement at all. If he reads it, it will show that it is not there.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — And I will go further. As a safeguard to the homes . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — On what authority are you reading?

**March 25, 1952**

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I have given you my authority. In the Winnipeg “Free Press”, Wednesday, June 6, 1945, and published by the National Liberal Committee.

**Some Hon. Member:** — That is little enough authority . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Read what is in it. Read what is in it, not what he says.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order. Order.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — This is a further statement, Mr. Speaker:

“ . . . guarantee security of the homes. The purchasing power of your dollar will be maintained by the price ceiling under the Liberal management.”

And:

“Special war taxes will be removed or reduced and consumer goods soon will be available at 1941 prices.”

And then, in order to take care of the health of the home:

“ . . . comprehensive national health plan has been announced.”

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, the Minister still has not proved what he said, that the Government promised to build 100,000 homes. I suggest that that is not in there at all.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — “New Low-Cost Homes,” that is the heading.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Where does it say the Government will build them?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — And these are the exact words:

“50,000 homes immediately, 100,000 each year for 10 years, with installments as low as \$9.58 per month under the new National Housing Plan.”

I assume that is the housing plan they were going to put into operation if elected.

**Mr. Tucker:** — There was no suggestion under the housing plan that the Government would build the homes. The Minister just proved that what he said was wrong. The Government never promised to build the homes.

**Premier Douglas:** — Does the Leader of the Opposition suggest that the Liberal Party makes promises and then expects somebody else to carry them out? Is that what he states, . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — As a matter of fact, 100,000 homes have been built in the year . . . every year.



**Premier Douglas:** — Not per year.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Yes, per year.

**Hon. Members:** — Yes, exactly — no, not per year.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I categorically deny that statement. I have before me here, “Housing in Canada.” It is prepared each quarter of the year by the Economic Research Department of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and it is entitled, “Housing in Canada.” You see, they have research departments down there too. Why they needed such a large one for the number of houses that have been built I would not know, but there is their quarterly report. Now, the amazing part of it is, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot anywhere in this report find the number of houses actually built by C.M.H.C. But even including all the houses that have been built in Canada, that is all the information contained here, never in any one single year has it come up to 100,000, and this includes the houses built by private enterprise, by private persons, by individuals. As a matter of fact, in all the years since that date about 400,000 houses have been built in Canada, including houses built by private builders, by private enterprise, as well as those by the Federal Government at Ottawa. There is the story. Here is the statistical information . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — It is pretty close to 100,000 a year. It is a good deal closer than you kept your promises.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — It was six years . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — No, 1951, 5 years.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Count with your fingers then.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Up to what date did that cover — that report?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — Who is squiggling now?

**Mr. Tucker:** — Up to what date?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — The report includes the first three quarters of 1951.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Yes and that started in 1946.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Yes.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Yes, not quite five years — 400,000. That is closer than you came to carrying out your promises.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — But the Liberals were going to build 100,000 a year. Mr. Speaker, it may not be the practice in Canada to make

**March 25, 1952**

housing a federal responsibility. I find it difficult to determine the policy of the Liberal Government at Ottawa, but I will say this, Mr. Speaker, that the forward, progressive nations in the world assume that housing is a national responsibility — Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Britain, Australia and New Zealand — these all assumed that housing is a national responsibility. Now, if my hon. friends opposite wish to place Canada as a second-rate retrogressive type of nation, they are at liberty to do so. I am merely pointing out that elsewhere in the world housing is a national responsibility.

Why, in Britain, the government — not the government and private builders, private owners, but the government alone — has built a million and a half houses since the end of the war. And that was a country which had economic and production and supply problems undreamed of in Canada and yet they accomplished that objective. But here in Canada we have not even succeeded in providing homes for the immigrants that have been brought into this country and the natural increase in population which has occurred since the end of the war. And we have not caught up with the backlog of 750,000 houses that were required in this country at the end of the war.

So when my hon. friend from Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff) states — pardon me for referring to his speech, I won't do it, but it has been stated that housing is badly needed in this Province — then he certainly did not understate the situation. Well, we wanted to do something about housing and we have attempted to ever since we took office.

Immediately after the war, in 1945, we went to Ottawa and offered our services in connection with home construction in the Province of Saskatchewan. I give you, in the words of C.D. Howe, his refusal of our offer to participate in home construction in this Province. He said in his letter to me of July 17, 1946:

“Materials are in very short supply for even our current housing programme. The participation of provincial or municipal housing authorities would merely develop a transfer of housing from one type to another, rather than add to our new supply.”

So it is evident that Ottawa did not wish the Province to participate in housing.

**Mr. Tucker:** — When was that?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — In 1946, July 17, 1946. Well, this Government accepted that situation with respect to building shortages, but we did not stop there. Through our Saskatchewan Reconstruction Corporation we went ahead and built housing units from Air Force buildings in the amount of over 700 suites. I have a statement here that I happened to pick out of the file. It is not the most up-to-date one. It is:

“As of March 31, 1949, the Provincial Government had expended \$840,000 on housing in this Province and at that time we had provided 625 housing units.”

I would like to point out to my hon. friends opposite that the only public housing they ever got in Estevan and Melfort and Humboldt was provided by this Government and not by the Government at Ottawa.

**Mr. J.E. McCormack (Souris-Estevan):** — Mr. Speaker, would the Minister permit a question? Who provided the buildings for your suites?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — We bought the buildings.

**Mr. McCormack:** — You did not.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — We bought the buildings and, in the case of Melfort and other municipalities, we moved them long distances because the housing situation was desperate. And when I look opposite I find that we provided housing for the hon. member for North Battleford and Saskatoon, in a total of 13 municipalities in the Province of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Would the hon. Minister permit a question? How much money did you make out of that housing enterprise?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — We have consistently, Mr. Speaker, lost money. As a matter of fact, in Saskatoon . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order. The Minister has not finished answering that question. You must finish answering . . .

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Yes, I would like to answer your question.

**Mr. J. Wellbelove (Kerrobert-Kindersley):** — Did the other provinces that had the opportunity of purchasing this material avail themselves of that opportunity?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — There is not a single provincial government elsewhere in Canada, to my knowledge, that provided a single housing unit as far as airport buildings are concerned. I know some of the municipalities built airport housing units, but not provincial governments.

As a matter of fact, year after year we have lost money on our housing. I am not saying we are doing so today. I hope that we will be able to break even from now on, but when we were providing 187 housing units for veterans' families in Saskatoon and providing dining room facilities for them as well, we lost up to \$60,000 a year on our overall housing project in Saskatchewan. The loss was greatest in Saskatoon, but since some 600 veterans were housed while attending university, the loss was warranted.

**Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River):** — Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Did you get any money from the Dominion Government to help you at all to build and erect these housing units? Did they give you any grants to do it?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Yes, I will be happy to answer that question. After we had demonstrated that we were doing something in respect

**March 25, 1952**

to housing, we did get a relatively small grant to assist in the construction of these suites. But for many of them, several hundred, we did not get any grant at all. Finally, however, Mr. Howe said, "We will give you a grant for the construction of these suites." This is what he said in a letter to me:

"We are grateful for the activities of your Government in assisting the Dominion to meet the current national housing emergency. You may look forward to our continuing to work with you to this end."

**Mr. Tucker:** — The Minister has read a letter from a Minister of another Government, will he table that letter? And, while I am on my feet, the other day I asked that a letter or correspondence be tabled by a couple of the Ministers. I just wonder if they have tabled that correspondence.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I am dealing with housing now and I wish you would not interrupt . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — But, Mr. Speaker, we are entitled to have this letter tabled.

**Premier Douglas:** — Certainly he is entitled to ask for this letter, but he is not entitled to raise another matter with reference to other letters. It can be raised in Orders of the Day.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — All right, so much for that, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I would like to have that letter tabled that he has just read from.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — We have had it tabled in the past . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, I would like to have it tabled now to make sure it is the same one.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I do not like that kind of an aspersion, Mr. Speaker and I think it should be withdrawn.

**Mr. Tucker:** — It was no aspersion at all. I said that I would like to make sure that this letter he has read from is the same one that was tabled before.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order, order, order. Is the hon. member willing to table the letter?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Of course, after I have completed my address. Now on August 5, 1945, Mr. Abbott, the Minister of Finance, in introducing an amendment to Section 9 of the National Housing Act, had this to say:

"The Bill," (the one that was before the House having to do with the National Housing Act), "provides that a low-dividend housing corporation or a life insurance company may undertake the project, and if it does, it may do so under the terms set out under the

Bill. If it is a limited dividend housing corporation, the Dominion Government will lend 90 per cent of the cost of the project at 3 per cent, on certain conditions, the conditions being:

That the low-dividend corporation can make no capital gain out of the venture.

That the rate of return will be limited to 5 per cent.”

We took that legislation at its face value and this Legislature, in 1946, passed the Saskatchewan Housing Act and made application for loans under this Section of the National Housing Act, and this was the result. Again, my letter from Mr. Howe:

“I gave careful consideration to your letter,” and so on, I will not read all of it. He said, “There are, as you know, good reasons why the Dominion at this time finds it difficult to make a loan under Section 9 to a province or a municipality. Past experiences with loans of this type does not lend much encouragement. Facilities for such loans would have to be extended to all provinces and municipalities. All of these reasons lead me to believe that it is not a propitious moment to enter into this new field of financing. I would prefer to leave the matter as outlined by the Minister of Finance in the House of Commons on September 13, 1945.”

And incidentally, Mr. Ilsley, or was it Abbott at that time, stated that no loans would be made available to the provinces or municipalities.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, what was the Minister reading from just now?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I am reading a letter from Mr. Howe.

**Mr. Tucker:** — What was the date?

**Mr. Speaker:** — He gave the date.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — July 17, 1946.

**Mr. Tucker:** — The same letter?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — The same letter. To proceed, Mr. Speaker. Along came 1949. Until then we were absolutely refused, and so were the municipalities, the right to establish limited dividend housing corporations to borrow money from Ottawa with which to undertake home construction. I have made that very clear. Section 9 was limited to lending institutions such as banks, insurance companies, mortgage companies and so on.

**March 25, 1952**

**Mr. McCormack:** — May I ask the Minister a question? I am sure he would not want to mislead the House. There are several projects that have been established, particularly in Ontario, under this particular section 9, where service organizations have got together . . .

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I am coming to that. Then along came 1949, with a further amendment to the National Housing Act, this time Section 35 of the National Housing Act. Now, Ottawa by this time had reversed its stand on provincial and municipal participation in public housing. Now they wanted us in on the basis of 75 per cent of the cost of a housing project to be contributed by Ottawa, 25 per cent to be contributed by the province and the municipality, or by the junior governments. Now, personally, I welcomed this arrangement, although I did so with certain reservations, because I had had disappointing experiences with Ottawa in the past. Also, it was approaching the 1949 election and I knew that the millennium was near and so I was hoping for the best, and I was not disappointed. Speeches started to be made. I am only going to quote those made by the Prime Minister of Canada. In Edmonton, in April 1949, he made this statement:

“I express heartfelt approval for the initiative and planning on housing coming from local authorities.”

We are now in — the provinces and the municipalities. We have the approval of the Prime Minister of Canada. And then again, in a radio address, the Prime Minister made this statement:

“The people in each locality should decide upon their own measures as appropriate to attain the results they want in housing.”

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, will the Minister tell us what he is reading from now?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Indeed I will be very happy to. This is a pamphlet brought out by the Community Planning Association of Canada, dated Ottawa, 1950. It is entitled “Making good use of our new Housing Laws.” I have done my best to make good use of them and I have not got very far yet, I am sorry to say.

This publication was authorized by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation so that it is an authentic pamphlet. But the next statement by the Prime Minister was a gem. We were now approaching the election in 1949 . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Is that in the pamphlet? Is that a quote from it?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — In Moncton, in May 1949, the Prime Minister of Canada made this statement:

“It is up to the provincial and municipal authorities to decide what public projects are desirable. Any provincial government that really means business will

find no difficulty in securing co-operation from the Government at Ottawa. Our Government will not be satisfied until there is a decent house for every Canadian family.”

Do not forget that statement, gentlemen. These are election promises — propaganda, yes. Really in the light of performance, Mr. Speaker, if every Canadian would take as his political watchword, “I shall not be influenced by the propaganda of words, but only by the propaganda of action,” then . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — You would not be elected.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — . . . I am afraid no Liberal Government would ever be elected in the Dominion of Canada. They certainly are not going to in this Province.

All right, all we had to do was to go to Ottawa. The Prime Minister was anxious to have us go there because he wanted, “a decent home for every Canadian citizen.” He was waiting to co-operate with us. Well, we went. But before going there we again amended our Saskatchewan Housing Act to enable us to participate in this agreement. Also, we set aside \$2 million so that we could go ahead with housing under section 35. You know it was going to be so easy to get housing, any kind of housing. It said in the pamphlet:

“The new programme is very flexible and wide in scope, making possible the public purchase and planning of large vacant plans, the sounded mixture of single and multiple family buildings for sale or rental, of accommodation that pays for itself and accommodation that does not,” and so on.

Well, I did not anticipate very much difficulty, but I was still skeptical, Mr. Speaker, because I had had some sad experiences in trying to get Ottawa to implement — the Liberal Government to implement — their political promises.

We interested the municipalities in this agreement under section 35 of the National Housing Act. A relatively large number of municipalities expressed interest and some of them made application for housing. We proceeded to Ottawa. I spent some time with the President of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and was amazed to be informed that unfortunately they could not go ahead with their promises under this particular scheme. That was on February 24, 1951, when I went to Ottawa. I had applications to present to Ottawa and agreement forms drawn up. The Minister was not there, but he promised to write me later on and make clear his position, and on March 9, 1951, he wrote as follows:

**Mr. Tucker:** — Is that the right date? Did you say 1951?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Yes, 1951.

“Following your conversation with the President of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation on February

**March 25, 1952**

24th, I have been giving consideration to the practicability of proceeding with housing units in partnership with the Province under section 35 of the National Housing Act.

“Defence demands in the construction field are very great and have priority over everything else. Already there are indications that building materials for residential construction, particularly those that are composed of steel, are in short supply. Nor is there any prospect of an improvement in the situation.”

From 1945 until 1951 the National Government had the opportunity of building up supplies in steel and building equipment and material of all kinds and then we are told that there is not sufficient to proceed. To go on with his letter:

“Therefore, I believe that the provincial and Federal Governments should at this time postpone housing development under section 35, except in those areas where there is immediate need for housing for defence purposes. I appreciate that your negotiations with the municipalities have now reached the point where a review of the physical conditions and types of housing needs might be the next step. I think you will agree that unless we are confident the housing can be completed then it is definitely out.”

I was not satisfied. I wired to Mr. Winters, whose letter I have just read, as follows:

“Widespread dissatisfaction over change in housing policy submitted in your letter of March 9th. Would urge reconsideration, at least in respect to municipalities where housing situation is desperate. On basis of priority could Saskatchewan be considered for two thousand housing units, construction commencing in 1951? Local suppliers and certain manufacturers contacted report availability of considerable building supplies.”

As a matter of fact, I made a survey — had our people make a survey — and that survey revealed that there were sufficient building supplies, enough to provide for two thousand houses. I got a reply back on March 21st, in which Mr. Winters said:

“I greatly regret that it has become necessary for the Government to take certain steps to retard the rate of new housing stocks. The main reason for this is that there is a real shortage of building material, chiefly products of steel.

There always will be in Canada incidentally, Mr. Speaker, so long as we export all our ore to the United States — or most of it, for



processing. I followed this by a letter to Mr. Winters, pointing out . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — I would like to ask the Minister a question on that. Is it not true that we import more steel and iron than we export?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I beg your pardon?

**Mr. Tucker:** — Is it not true that we import more steel and iron than we export?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I am referring to ore, and ore is what I said. There is a vast difference between ore and steel and iron products.

**Mr. Tucker:** — But if we get more iron and steel back from the ore we export are we not better off? Well, I am just asking the Minister.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Well that was the problem that confronted us. We were refused the opportunity of proceeding under section 35 of the National Housing Act. We were faced with another disappointment. I continued to make representations to Ottawa, to Mr. Winters. I had finally got his consent to proceed with the construction of 500 houses in Saskatchewan, to be allocated to the various municipalities. These allocations were made, but my next disappointment was his refusal to permit towns to participate under section 35 of the National Housing Act. He stated categorically that such towns as Indian Head and Estevan and Melfort, and so on, could not participate under this section. As a matter of fact, he refused . . .

**Mr. McCormack:** — Could I ask the Minister a question? Has he got correspondence to that effect, about exempting the towns?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — You will have to accept that statement. I have it on file but cannot locate it at the moment.

**Mr. McCormack:** — Well, the reason I brought the matter up . . . I am not a judge . . .

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — But the fact remains . . . The hon. member can look over the correspondence if he wishes . . .

**Mr. McCormack:** — I would like to.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — The hon. member must accept the statement on my authority that Mr. Winters refused to permit towns to participate in this particular scheme under section 35. Those are the facts. And, as a matter of fact, he wanted to limit the size of the cities that could participate under section 35 to 20,000 people, meaning that only Regina, Moose Jaw and Saskatoon could participate in the scheme. He relented later on and said that he would leave it open to the cities, but the fact still remains that we cannot get an agreement with Ottawa to go ahead with housing insofar as towns are concerned, under section 35 of the National Housing Act. And if my hon. friend from Souris-Estevan (Mr. McCormack) can get that commitment from Mr. Winters, I will be very much obliged to him indeed, because I have not been able to get it for eighteen months.

**March 25, 1952**

Well, that is the story, Mr. Speaker, insofar as this Government is concerned. I recognize just how serious the problem is — the housing problem in Saskatchewan. There is not a day of the year goes by but what applications are made to my office by telephone, by personal interviews, by letters, pointing out the desperate housing situation that exists in this Province. As an example, to give you the type of letter, this is one I picked up off my desk on leaving the office today:

“I would be very grateful if you could please suggest to my husband and me the best way to apply for a suite or a house in Regina. My husband served in the Canadian army six and one-half years, spending 6 years overseas. He receives a ten per cent pension, yet we are unable to find anywhere to live together in Regina, as we have a three-year-old daughter. It seems to be a crime these days to raise a family. I have applied to Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, who say the outlook is hopeless.”

That is a desperate situation insofar as the people of this Province are concerned. Talk about depopulation — the depopulation of this Province was a flood between 1936 and 1946. It has been reduced to a mere trickle between 1947 and 1951, but I do say this, Mr. Speaker, that with decent, modern homes in our cities and towns the depopulation would cease overnight. Why people will not come to Regina and many of them will not stay here because there is not decent hygienic housing accommodation for them. The fact remains . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Is the Minister saying that other provinces have handled this thing so much better that people are leaving here and going there? Is that what he is saying?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I am saying that housing in every province in the Dominion is in a serious condition. All you have to do is investigate the rents that are being paid from Victoria to Halifax to see what people are paying for housing in the Dominion of Canada. And one-half of the population of Canada are in rented accommodation, according to the information contained in this publication “New Housing Laws.”

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister a question. He says the reason we are losing population is because of our housing situation. Well, is he suggesting the housing situation is better in other provinces?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I told the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that the housing situation is bad throughout the Dominion of Canada. Personally I do not think it is worse anywhere than in the City of Regina and in the City of Saskatoon.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan is even now engaged in industrial expansion and, without additional housing, that expansion will be retarded. This city's immediate needs are two thousand homes. Swift Current and Moose Jaw require 300 and 800 respectively and Saskatoon, within a hundred miles

of the gas fields, could do with an additional thousand homes. This Province is faced with the necessity of providing homes, not in hundreds but in thousands, in the very near future. As a matter of fact, we require at least 5,000 homes in Saskatchewan to take care of those who are presently in desperate need of housing in this Province. Why, even agricultural centres such as Indian Head, Estevan, Assiniboia and Melfort have requested additional homes on the basis of economic rentals or purchase to keep their contiguous farming population in the Province.

And I understand their problems. There are many elderly people who wish to retire from their farms, after turning them over to their sons, and move into towns. But the terrifically high cost of housing and the lack of housing has retarded this. And so, in many cases, they move to such a province as British Columbia, where the climatic conditions are not so rigorous as they are here. I say that every city in Saskatchewan is suffering from overcrowding. People live in unhygienic, unhealthy basement and attic suites, emergency shelters, (such as we have in this city), slum homes, unmodern shacks, that should not exist in any modern society.

Mr. Speaker, I see that it is now about six o'clock. There are several other things that I would like to have said but I wish to see the following amendment voted on. Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. C.C. Williams:

“That the following words be added to the Motion:

‘And further, that this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government of Saskatchewan the advisability —

1. of providing that, of the 25 per cent of capital construction cost of housing allocated to the provincial and municipal authorities under Section 35 of the National Housing Act, 15 per cent be borne by the Provincial Government and 10 per cent by the municipality concerned, and”

It is now 12½ per cent each. This amendment states that it will be 15 per cent by the province and 10 per cent by the municipality. And, further, I would ask the Provincial Government to consider the advisability —

“2. of granting loans to a maximum of 60 per cent of the contributions required to be made by limited dividend housing corporations organized by municipalities under section 9 of the said National Housing Act.”

Now, just a brief explanation of that.

**Mr. Speaker:** — May I call the attention of the member — It is now six o'clock.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I shall be through in just one second, Mr. Speaker.

**March 25, 1952**

**Some Hon. Members:** — Six o'clock.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Just a brief explanation, Mr. Speaker, it will only take half a minute. Under section 9 a limited dividend housing corporation can now be established by a municipality or a province and that municipality can go to Ottawa and borrow up to 90 per cent of the lending value of any housing project, or a fair sales price of any housing project. In order to assist these towns the amendment suggests that the province consider the advisability of granting loans to a maximum of 60 per cent of the contributions required to be made by the limited dividend housing corporations, set up by municipalities under this Section of the National Housing Act.

**Mr. McCormack:** — May I ask the Minister a question? As I understand it, this section provides for 90 per cent to be put up by the Federal Government. Is that correct? Of the cost of construction?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — That is loaned, yes, over a period of 50 years.

**Mr. McCormack:** — I would like to get this straight. Is that the cost of construction or the lending value?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — That is not the cost of the project, that is the lending value, or fair sales price of the project, and I am hoping that they will place the lending value, or the sales value of the housing project very close to, if not equal to the cost of the housing project.

**Mr. Speaker:** — We will now call it 6 o'clock.

The House resumed at eight o'clock p.m.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The Hon. Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Sturdy), I think was answering a question. Who was it that was asking that question?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — The member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. McCormack), Mr. Speaker.

**Some Hon. Member:** — Do you want to go ahead and speak now — well, go ahead.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the hon. member for Souris-Estevan is not in his seat as he had certain questions on the amendment which I should like to answer.

There appears to be, now, two ways in which we can participate along with the Federal Government and municipalities in providing housing in Saskatchewan. The only thing that stands in the way would appear to be a scarcity of building supplies of all sorts, which I trust will be made up, and in view of the critical housing situation which exists, I am hopeful that this will be done.

The first is, under section 35 of the National Housing Act, where the provinces and municipalities are required to provide 25 per cent of the capital cost of any housing project. Hitherto we had agreed to share

fifty-fifty with the municipalities, the amount required by the province and the municipalities. This amendment proposes that we, the Provincial Government, provide 15 per cent of this 25 per cent and the municipalities 10 per cent. The way it will work out would be as follows:

Assuming that we are dealing with a \$10,000 house, the amount required to be put up by the province and the municipality on the 25 per cent basis would be \$2,500. The province would provide 60 per cent of this, which would be \$1,500 and the municipality's 10 per cent would be \$1,000. Now, the municipalities can include in the capital cost of the project land assembly — that is, the cost of lots and local improvements, so the cash outlay to the municipalities should not be serious.

May I also point out that, under this arrangement, the Dominion Government and the Province and the municipality will be repaid over a term of years if the house is sold and if there is economic rental on that house. If the house is rented at economical rental over a period of 40 to 50 years, then all participating parties should be paid out in full. If it is a subsidized rental housing for workers and low income people then, if there is a subsidy required, say of \$20 a month on the rental, the Federal Government would provide \$15 of that and the Province \$3 and the municipality \$2, making the subsidy of \$20 a month.

The second, which deals with section 9 of the National Housing Act, simply means this; that according to the 1945 amendment to the National Housing Act the Dominion Government will lend 90 per cent of the sales value of the project at 3½ per cent on certain conditions, the conditions being that the low dividend corporation can make no capital gain out of the venture. That the rates of return will be limited to 5½ per cent. This means then, that the Federal Government will be repaid its 90 per cent loan over a period of 40 to 50 years. The municipality and the province will have to depend on this 5½ per cent rate of return to liquidate their investment under this particular plan. It would work out something like this. A house worth \$10,000, assuming that the lending value of that house was \$9,000, or the fair sales price — the term used by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation — was \$9,000, then the limited dividend housing corporation could borrow 90 per cent of that \$9,000 or \$8,100. It would mean then, that the amount which the limited dividend housing corporation would have to invest would be \$1,900 and of that amount the province would be prepared to loan up to 60 per cent, which would be \$1,140 and the municipality would contribute \$760.

The manner in which this second amendment would work is this: if a municipality wished to set up a limited dividend housing corporation it could do so and borrow 90 per cent of the fair sales price of any housing project from the Federal Government and we would be prepared to loan to that municipality 60 per cent of the amount which the municipality contributes — was required to contribute.

**Mr. A Loptson (Saltcoats):** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question? You say that you can borrow 90 per cent from the federal housing. Are you proposing to put up 60 per cent of the 10 per cent? Getting off pretty easy aren't you?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Assuming, for an example, that the town of Estevan set up a limited dividend housing corporation that was approved

**March 25, 1952**

by the C.M.H.C., then it could borrow 90 per cent of estimated sales price of the housing project and they could come to the Provincial Government for 60 per cent of the amount which they would have to put up in cash. I have illustrated it by means of a \$10,000 house, for which the municipality would have to put up \$760. Again, may I point out . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — Just a question. On a \$10,000 house, you borrow \$9,000 from the Federal Housing, there is just \$1,000 to be put up . . .

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — No, you have that wrong. Assuming . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — It is 90 per cent of what?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Of the lending value or the fair sales price of that house.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Yes, but you cannot arrive at a lending value of a \$10,000 house, what is the lending . . . ?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I am assuming that the lending value is \$9,000.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Well then, the lending value is \$9,000. In that case you would have to put up \$1,900, is that the idea?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Yes, we would . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — We borrow \$8,100, then there is \$1,900 to be found by the municipality and the provincial government?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — That is right.

**Mr. Loptson:** — And you propose to put up the 60 per cent of the \$1,900?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — That is right.

**Some Hon. Member:** — Then the individual will not be required to put up anything?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Well, the individual, when he purchases the house, will make his arrangements with the limited dividend housing corporation as to the amount that he will pay down for the house.

I do not think that there is much possibility of cities participating under this section 9, but certainly our negotiations with C.M.H.C. lead us to believe that they intend to have towns and smaller communities take advantage of this section. I might point out also, that for the purpose of providing homes for aged persons, an organization such as the service clubs or church organizations may borrow money under the same terms and conditions for this purpose. That has already been done in the town of Owen Sound — I do not now whether it has city status or not — but a group of people there organized a limited dividend housing corporation for the provision of a number of home units for old people at a relatively low rental rate. I am hoping that organizations, Church organizations and so on, will take advantage of this arrangement to provide housing of this nature, and I would hope also that the Provincial Government would be prepared to extend to such

a limited dividend corporation the assistance that I have mentioned.

Now, if there are any other questions on this amendment I would be pleased to answer them.

**Some Hon. Member (Opposition):** — Are there any copies of the amendment available?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I just have the one copy here, would you like to see it? I will send it across the floor of the House.

**Some Hon. Member:** — I would like to see it.

**Mr. W.A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition):** — Mr. Speaker, this is a most amazing proceedings. We have a Motion moved by — and, as a matter of fact, the Hon. Minister has been speaking on this thing and he has been entirely out of order. He moved this Amendment and then, having moved it, and the way he put it he had already spoken to it when he moved it, and has no further right to speak to it after he moved it. He has gone on speaking to it. It would have been much better also, Mr. Speaker, had he had the courtesy to provide us with a copy of the Amendment. We have not had a copy of the Amendment yet. He has been talking away about something which we have not got in front of us, we have no means of knowing what he is proposing at all. It has been discourteous to say the least, and he has been entirely out of order. If he had let us have a copy of the Amendment it would not have been necessary for him to go to such great length to explain something that we could not properly follow because we did not have a copy of the Amendment he is proposing to move.

Now, further, Mr. Speaker, this is a rather surprising procedure . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, is my hon. friend speaking to the amendment, on a point of order?

**Mr. Tucker:** — Yes, I am speaking to the amendment, and pointing out . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Have you read the Amendment, Mr. Speaker, or moved it?

**Mr. Tucker:** — Yes, he has read the amendment.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I have not finished my explanation.

**Mr. Tucker:** — You have no right to have the floor at all.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order. Order. The Leader of the Opposition is, in a degree of right, but I understood that just before he called it six o'clock the member for Estevan (Mr. McCormack) was asking for an explanation and I took it for granted that the Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Sturdy) wanted to give that information to the member.

**Mr. Tucker:** — The reason we asked for an explanation was because the Minister of Social Welfare had not had the courtesy to send us a copy of

**March 25, 1952**

this Amendment, and we were trying to find out what he was trying to put before this House.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I read the amendment.

**Mr. Tucker:** — You read the amendment, but you read it in such a way that, in all deference Mr. Speaker, it would be very difficult to follow what in the world the Minister of Social Welfare and you were trying to put before this Legislature and what we were trying to find out was what we were asked to consider. Now, I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that you . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order. Order. Might I point out to the Leader of the Opposition that if my rendering the amendment was so unintelligible you could have asked me to repeat it.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, it was six o'clock.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I regret that I had been remiss in failing to send over a copy of the Amendment. However this transpired, Mr. Speaker; the Hon. member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. McCormack) asked certain questions and as soon as it was six o'clock he came across the floor of the House. He discussed this and I offered to secure an Amendment form, and he said he could get one. Now, all I have asked to do since eight o'clock has been to explain the purpose of this Amendment.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Which, of course, you were out of order in doing because you had already proposed the Amendment that had been approved. As far as taking your seat, but you were, as I understand it, answering when I called it six o'clock, a question of the hon. member for Souris-Estevan.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — That is exactly what I was doing.

**Mr. Speaker:** — For the edification of the House — the hon. Leader of the Opposition said that he did not understand that I read it, or a part of it he could not understand, so I am going to read the Amendment again:

“Moved by the Hon. Mr. Sturdy, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Williams:

That the following words be added to the Motion:

‘And further, that this Assembly recommends to the consideration of the Government of Saskatchewan the advisability —

(1) of providing that, of the 25 per cent of capital construction cost of housing allocated to the Provincial and Municipal authorities under Section 35 of the National Housing Act, 15 per cent be borne by the Provincial Government and 10 per cent by the municipality concerned, and

(2) of granting loans to a maximum of 60 per cent of the contributions required to be made by Limited Dividend Housing Corporations organized by municipalities under Section 9 of the said National Housing Act.”



**Mr. Tucker:** — When I was interrupted, Mr. Speaker, by the question of privilege by the Minister of Social Welfare, (Hon. Mr. Sturdy) — I am still in doubt as to what this question of privilege was, but in any event, let that pass. But we have a rather surprising spectacle of a Minister of the Crown here moving an Amendment recommending to the Government of which he is a member that certain steps should be taken. Now, if he is speaking on behalf of the Government it is not the usual thing for a Minister of the Crown to move a recommendation to the Government and yet, when he was speaking about the matter, he said, “we” would do this and “we” would do that. Well, if he was speaking on behalf of the Government there is one way in which it should be introduced and that is by an actual Amendment to the Act involved, preceded by the information to this Assembly that it had the approval of the Lieutenant Governor. There is a certain way in which matters such as this should be brought before the Assembly. If the Minister has the support of the Government, then it should be introduced in the ordinary way, with the intimation to the Assembly that it has the approval of the Lieutenant Governor, as this would involve the expenditure of provincial money.

If, on the other hand, he has not yet had the approval of the Government on this thing, I wonder about this matter. What right has the Minister to get up without . . . ?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, it is a recommendation to the Provincial Government to take this action, quite unlike the amendment moved by my hon. friend from Saltcoats (Mr. Lopton), which was that the Provincial Government do certain things.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Yes, well I do not know whether that was a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I do not suppose the Minister of Social Welfare knows the difference but, in any event, I do say that there is a great deal of difference between the Opposition moving an amendment recommending certain things to the Provincial Government and a Minister of the Crown — a member of that Government, moving an amendment recommending certain things. Either he has got the support of the Government in the move he has made, in which event it should be by an actual action by this Government indicating that they have so decided and this is their policy, and preceded by the intimation that the Lieutenant Governor, having been advised of the subject matter of this Resolution, recommends it to the Assembly, which is the only way in which a Minister of the Crown can properly bring a matter like this before the Assembly. Or else, the Minister of Social Welfare is bringing forward something which he himself is trying to put forward for whatever purposes he thinks wise, and which he has not got the Government’s consent to. It is either one or the other. I take it from the way it is brought forward that he has not got the Government’s consent to this, or else it would have been done in the ordinary way, by an amendment to the appropriate legislation, preceded by the intimation that the Lieutenant Governor has been advised, and so on.

Now, on the other hand, the way the Minister spoke, Mr. Speaker, he talked about “we” would do this and “we” would do that. Now, I think that before we undertake to debate this thing we should know whether this is the policy of the Government or whether it is an idea of the Minister of Social Welfare. I think we should know because it is an entirely different

**March 25, 1952**

matter. Mr. Speaker, for a private member to introduce an amendment like this recommending something like this to the Government and to have a Minister of the Crown, who is a member of that Government, introduce amendments recommending something to the Government and then going on to say, “we” would do this and “we” would do that.

Now I think before we undertake to discuss this, Mr. Speaker, we should know whether this represents the policy of the Government or whether it is a private venture of the Minister of Social Welfare.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Would the hon. Leader of the Opposition hold that because a member of the Government is moving an amendment that he has to surrender his privileges as a private member?

**Mr. Tucker:** — No, no, I do not suggest anything like that.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Well, that is what he is imputing. As a matter of fact, this is exactly the same course as we held was in order with the Amendment; that is, that they recommend it. I treated this, not as a Government Resolution — because if it is going to be a Government Resolution I think you would be quite right that it should come in in the proper manner, but I treated this exactly the same as a private member’s amendment.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether that is the intention of the Government or the Minister of Social Welfare, that they are not prepared to stand behind the Minister of Social Welfare. They are sending him out on a venture of his own to throw out this Amendment and if they are not behind him, if that is the case, and he is on his own on this thing, well that is, of course, something that is very interesting. But he did not speak that way.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I take it that you are not opposing this on the grounds that it is out of order?

**Mr. Tucker:** — Oh no, I admit that the Minister of Social Welfare has got the same rights on the floor of the House as anyone else, but it is a rather unusual proceeding that they put up a Minister of the Crown here to move an amendment recommending something to the Government which apparently they have not decided upon themselves, because otherwise there is no need of a Minister of the Crown asking this Assembly to recommend something to the Government if he has not the support of the Government in what he is doing, and yet he spoke as if he did have the support of the Government.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, is my hon. friend speaking on the Amendment?

**Mr. Tucker:** — I spoke and I sat down in courtesy to His Honour the Speaker, because he rose. Now, of course, I know that you do not recognize that obligation, but I do. Now, His Honour will realize that I sat down because His Honour rose and I think that is quite in order. I suppose the Premier would like to have me sit down and stay sitting. I do not blame him for feeling that way, but when His Honour rises I try to give him the deference which is due to his office.

Now then, I know that amuses my friends opposite because it is so far beyond their understanding of the proper respect due to His Honour that it is beyond their comprehension, and had there been a little more respect to your office, Mr. Speaker, we would not have been under the same criticism we have been under in the country.

As I said, we have had a rather amazing spectacle. Either the Minister has been — I take it as a fair inference, when he has to come to this Assembly and ask us to pass a recommendation to his colleagues in the Government that certain things should be done, that he has been unable to convince them that that is the right thing to do, and so he resorts to this Assembly to try to convince his colleagues that it is the right thing to do. Now, that is a very interesting . . .

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — The hon. member cannot impute motives like that, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, I am just drawing inferences. If you had a policy in this matter, I take it that you would introduce legislation and introduce it in the proper way, but instead of that, what do we find, Mr. Speaker? We find the Minister getting up and asking this Legislature to recommend certain things to his colleagues in the Government. Well, if he had been able to persuade his colleagues in the Government that this is the right step to take he would not have had to resort to asking the Assembly to urge his colleagues in the government to take this step. If that is the case, if his colleagues in the Government are so blind to this deplorable situation that he depicted in such glowing and moving language, then I must admit that we on this side of the House are bound to have a great deal of sympathy with the Minister of Social Welfare, that he is associated with colleagues that are so blind to the situation in this Province that he depicted in such moving terms. If the situation is as bad as he says, Mr. Speaker, is it not a rather surprising thing? It is a sad thing that he has to resort to this Assembly to pass a Resolution to urge his colleagues to do what he says should be done.

If the solution to this problem is so clear to the Minister, why is it that he has not been able to persuade his colleagues to take steps in the matter, instead of asking this Assembly to recommend that they consider it? Is it true, can it be said, that this matter that the Minister, in regard to a situation, moves us almost to tears about, has got this situation, that he has got to ask this Assembly to actually ask his colleagues to consider this matter? Is it possible, Mr. Speaker, that he has asked them to consider it and they will not even consider it and he has to have the backing of this Assembly to get the Government to consider it? Well, if that is the case, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, we have heard my hon. friend say the same thing over fourteen times. How many times is he allowed to repeat?

**Mr. Tucker:** — Now, that is quite a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It certainly reflects the thoughts and state of mind of the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker). It is too bad, I know you would like to silence me if you could, but fortunately the only people who can silence me are the good

**March 25, 1952**

people of Rosthern, and there has been a great attempt made on the part of many people opposite, in the past, to get them to do so, with very conspicuous lack of success.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying when I was so rudely interrupted, it is a matter where we should extend sympathy to that gallant knight who, across there, is fighting single-handed, this battle for the homeless that he has got to come with such a harrowing tale to this Assembly and ask them to back him up in this fight, to ask us to actually say that his colleagues should even consider this matter. I take it that they will not even consider it, Mr. Speaker, that is what he is asking this Assembly to do, that we ask his colleagues to even consider it, let alone act on it. No, he wants us to say that they should consider it.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — That is a pretty small charge.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, it is funny, as a matter of fact, that the Minister, if you look at it in one way, should be driven to this position where he has got to ask this Assembly to pass a Resolution that his colleagues should consider the matter — not that they should do anything about it, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Might I point out to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that this is a private member's resolution and the Minister of Social Welfare, in moving this Amendment, was not moving it as a member of the Government, he was moving it as a private member and it has nothing at all to do, as you will find out, with the Government measure that comes before this House with a message from His Honour. But surely, as I understand it, and I think I am correct, a private member's resolution can be spoken to and an amendment can be moved by a Minister of the Crown as a private member. What your ideas might be, of course, are your own, if you want to ask the Government a question it is their privilege to decide whether they will answer it or not, whether they are going to support it, but I would propose that their support, or otherwise, would be signified when the Motion was put.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, I am just observing the state of affairs opposite I think a fair comment on the situation is that it is quite a confession that, instead of the Minister being able to stand up and say: "This is the policy of the Government, which we have adopted after due consideration of this problem, this is the policy of the Government, this is what we are going to recommend, this is what we have the consent of the Lieutenant Governor to do as a Government, and this is what we are going to do", he gets up in this House and asks us to make some recommendations to the Government. Is this rather a confession of lack of policy on the part of the Government? Instead of being in the position where they have a Minister of the Crown make an amendment to a private member's resolution, they should be in a position to get up and say, "We have a policy in this matter."

Now, it may be that when the Minister talks about the sort of thing he would do that, "we would pay a certain portion and the municipality would pay a certain portion," I do not know if he is speaking for the Government on that or not. It will go out in the country as though he were speaking for the Government but yet, as a matter of fact, when it is

not introduced in the ordinary way it cannot be taken that he is speaking on behalf of the Government. It is one of these ways of pretending he is speaking on behalf of the Government, because when he speaks on the floor of this House he speaks as a Minister of the Crown here, and I remember he said, “we” would do this and “we” would do that. Does he mean that he, as a private member of the legislature would do this, or did he mean that “we” as members of the Government would do it?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I termed, “we” would do this and “we” would do that, but this was conditional on this being adopted. If it becomes Government policy and this is adopted then we would do this and we would do that. Is that clear?

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, I am obliged to the Minister for clearing up that point. I take it then that after nearly eight years . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member was taking these as hypothetical cases and he was using these expressions to explain what would happen, that is how I take it.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I take it then, Mr. Speaker, that here we are with this terrible situation which the Minister of Social Welfare depicted in this Province, that is so bad compared to other provinces that people are leaving this Province and going to other provinces because they presumably handle the situation much better. But here we are, after they have been in office eight years, this Government has no policy yet. I take it from what he says that the Minister says the Government has no policy in the matter and they will not have a policy unless we support this Resolution.

Well, if they are in such dire straits as that they cannot make up their minds, then the least they could have done was to let us have a copy of the Resolution. I think that we would have helped him out with his colleagues if they are so reactionary and so blind to the situation that they can sit here for nearly eight years and see the situation such as has existed and described by the Minister. And he has just said that the Government has no policy in the matter. Well then, I think we would be moved to try to help him out. I think all the Opposition would like to help him out, but it is a rather surprising spectacle that the Minister gets up on the floor of this House, after describing the situation such as he described, and I must say I was moved by it. And he gets up just now and says the Government has no policy, no policy at all, that if this Legislature decides to support my Motion then we will have a policy. Well, that just bears out what I have said, Mr. Speaker, for some time, that this Government just blunders along, it does not know, it has set up Royal Commissions to find out what it should do, it has to rely on the Minister of Social Welfare getting up and asking an amendment like this, that shows such a lack of preparation that there is now even a copy for the Opposition. Then he gets up in this Assembly and says: “This is the thing that will solve the thing, but the Government has not got it as a policy unless you people will support it.”

Well, that is quite an admission, Mr. Speaker, and if that is the situation in the Government opposite then we extend to the Minister of Social Welfare, as he stands alone in this fight, without the support of his Government — we are inclined to support him and help him all we can,

**March 25, 1952**

because we are very sympathetic to the Minister in this fight he is putting up, this lone fight, and I think after his call for help and assistance, that will not go unheeded on the Opposition side. I think we will rally to the support of the Minister of Social Welfare in his fight to get his Government to do something about this, because it is a sad state of affairs. All this Government has been able to talk about in the midst of this situation has been that they have got some buildings from the Federal Government at about 8 per cent of their cost and they divided them up into suites, (it was a good thing when it was done). That was done quite a long time ago and we are told by the Minister, as I understood it, that outside of administering that and trying to administer it so they would not lose any money on it, this kind-hearted, big-hearted, public-spirited government administering these suites in such a way that they would not lose any money on them, since doing this, in the last three years they have done nothing but, on the Minister's own statement, make trips to Ottawa trying to get Ottawa to do something about it. Here they are, they did something about five years ago and since then they have done nothing, Mr. Speaker, but the Minister tells us he has been fighting a lone battle, cannot get Ottawa to do anything, cannot get his own colleagues to do anything. There he sits. Well, he is an object of sympathy and pity and I can tell him that our hearts go out to him, Mr. Speaker. That is all I can say, and we are inclined to back him up. But I never thought that a Minister of this Government would get up and paint such a harrowing picture of the colleagues of his Government that went into office with that great slogan of "Humanity First".

It really is a spectacle, and I so suggest, Mr. Speaker, that instead of asking the Legislature to beseech this Government to do something about this, it would have been much more comforting to us if a Minister had been able to get up and say, "Well, this is a very difficult problem, we think Ottawa should have done more . . ."

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I did not ask this Legislature to beseech the Government.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Oh yes.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Oh no, I did not. All I suggested was that they give some consideration to, which is certainly no "beseeching" them.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well, I was moved by the Minister's moving words, they went much beyond the terms of this Resolution and I was just interpreting the way he talked to this Assembly and, as I say, I felt moved by his words. I admit that when he moved this Resolution it was asking us to recommend to his hard-hearted colleagues that they give consideration to this matter but I was going to say that it would have been a very fine thing had the Minister been able to say, "Well here, the Federal Government has not done as much as it should have done, but in the last three or four years we have done something within our sphere of power, bearing in mind all the promises held out, when this Government was asking to be elected, that they were going to do something really worth while, not only about solving the question of housing in the cities and towns. I well remember the members opposite talking about what they were going to do in regard to the rural areas, they really had great visions. They were not going to stop at solving the problems in the towns and cities, they were going to solve the problems in the rural areas.

I remember attending a meeting, a very enjoyable meeting I had with the Premier at Watrous — I think it was Watrous — where he had some plastic that he was waving around, and he had a bottle of syrup that they were going to manufacture in this Province. It reminded me of one of those old medicine shows where they sold snake oil and everything else. The Premier was shaking his bottle of syrup and he was slapping this plastic around and it was really quite a show, Mr. Speaker. I had never thought, as I sat as a colleague of the Premier in the Federal House, that he had such capacity for showmanship as I discovered when I met him on the same platform at Watrous.

But at that time, in 1944, Mr. Speaker, we were informed that the Provincial Government was really going to do something worth while about this problem. They were not going to stop at putting in a few suites for returned soldiers five or six years ago and then resting on their laurels and talking about nothing else and saying, “From now on we just wash our hands of the thing and we send the Minister to Ottawa to make requests periodically.” And then when we get to the stage where the Minister has to get up and ask this Assembly to give him some backing in this thing against his own colleagues, the situation is worse than I thought it was, Mr. Speaker. I feel myself, Mr. Speaker, that we should give every support we can to the Minister in this fight he has for the good cause.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is always at his best when he trots out his elephantine humour.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I am not very proud of it, of course.

**Premier Douglas:** — It is a bit like an elephant tramping on eggs, but it is at least amusing, because he . . .

**Mr. J.G. Egnatoff (Melfort):** — You’re some egg, aren’t you?

**Premier Douglas:** — I did not hear the remark of the member for Melfort, but the member for Melfort, during this Session, Mr. Speaker, has been striving desperately to achieve the reputation of being a wit. I would like to encourage him by telling him that he has partially succeeded. At least he has the reputation of being a half-wit. He is half way there.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — At least it is not a tissue.

**Premier Douglas:** — I cannot hear the member for Melfort, he keeps mumbling into his beard. If he wants to say something I would be very glad to have him get up and say it, if it is worth hearing. If not, he might just as well say it to himself.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — I said at least the member — the Leader of the Opposition has issues to discuss — not fabricated tissue.

**March 25, 1952**

**Premier Douglas:** — I do not know how the member for Melfort would know. He just came in, so I do not know how he would know what was being discussed, Mr. Speaker. But he does not need to know what is being discussed, he can talk whether he has heard what was being discussed or not. Now, if he will just keep quiet I will go on with what I was saying.

The Resolution on Housing which was moved by Mr. Heming, one of the members from Moose Jaw, expresses certain views with regard to housing. An amendment by the Opposition has been defeated, and the Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Sturdy), who is in charge of housing for the Government, has been outlining something of the Government's programme with reference to housing, and something with reference to the Federal legislation concerning housing. He has now moved an amendment to express certain views. This is a private member's resolution and not a Government motion. It is a private member's motion asking the Legislature to support certain views contained in the Amendment. After all, the only way the Legislature can express its views in a private member's resolution is by voting for that private member's resolution. Anything in that resolution cannot be of a mandatory character, it cannot commit the Government to doing certain things. I can only express certain opinions and ask the Government to consider certain things, or to take certain things under advisement.

The Amendment now being sponsored by the Minister expresses certain views with reference to the Government's programme on housing. Now, there are two possibilities. If it were a Government Motion, the Minister could move it and commit the Government on certain things. This is not a Government Motion however, it is a private member's motion and, as such, the only thing he can do is to ask the House to give its approval to certain proposals.

The other thing that can be done is being done, and the Leader of the Opposition asks whether or not the amendment moved by the Minister of Social Welfare reflects Government policy. The answer is "Yes." The fact that it is Government policy is shown by the fact that this afternoon the Minister of Social Welfare moved first reading of the amendments to the Housing Act, and when he moved first reading, when he asked for leave to introduce the Bill, he read the prescribed statement saying that His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of this Bill, recommended the consideration of the Assembly.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, I hope the Premier does not suggest that we had knowledge, or had any means of knowledge of what was in that Bill. We do not know what was in that Bill.

**Premier Douglas:** — I am not saying that the hon. member had any knowledge of what was in that Bill. I am pointing out that the Government is proceeding with certain amendments to the Housing Act, and the Minister is amending a private member's resolution to ask the members of this House to approve, in principle, certain aspects of a housing programme. The Government then will proceed to bring down legislation, and has already taken the first step to bring down legislation with reference to this particular matter. I like to see my hon. friend in good humour, and anything that keeps him happy certainly is what we like to see, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister is not alone, he does not have to ask anybody to "beseech" the Government. The Amendment the Minister has moved is moved with



the complete support and with the enthusiastic co-operation, not only of his colleagues in the Cabinet, but of all the members who sit with him.

**Some Hon. Members (Government):** — Hear. Hear.

**Premier Douglas:** — The fact is that we support it. We will always be glad to get the support of the members opposite, but whether we get the support of the members opposite or not, legislation will be brought down to implement the recommendations that are suggested in the Motion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just one other thing. The Leader of the Opposition, of course, talks a great deal about nothing having been done in housing because whenever the Leader of the Opposition finds himself in a dangerous spot in trying to protect the Federal Government and their apathy and their complete inactivity on any particular subject, he always throws up a great many words. The words cannot conceal two vital facts that were brought out by the Minister this afternoon. The first is that section 9 of the National Housing Act was put there, it gave the insurance companies, banks and lending institutions the right to go to the Federal Government, through its housing corporation, and borrow 90 per cent of the lending value of houses. This Legislature, on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan, passed legislation which would have given us, as a province, the same right as a lending institution. When we went to Ottawa and asked to be given the same rights and privileges, we were denied that right. The Leader of the Opposition was a member of the House of Commons at the time we were denied that right. Insurance companies could go, banks could go, lending institutions could go, but a provincial government could not go, a municipality could not go and the co-ops could not go. And, until just recently, even Church organizations were not allowed to come in under this. But lending institutions could. Oh yes, they could lend 90 per cent out to private companies, but they would not lend to public organizations representing the people.

My friend does not like to face up to that fact. Some years later, they found that private enterprise had completely failed to give them housing and had completely failed to carry out the promise which they made of building 100,000 homes a year. Then they added section 35.

We started then to work on section 35 of the Housing Act, which called for the Federal Government to put up 75 per cent and the provincial and municipal governments to put up the other 25 per cent. I was with the Minister in Ottawa when, after a terrific struggle, we finally wrested from the Federal Government an agreement for 500 houses in Saskatchewan. That was really a struggle. We should have been building in terms of thousands of houses, but we managed finally to wrest from their grasp 500 houses.

Then, when we returned and began to make the agreements with the cities, even those began to be lopped off, because we found the towns were not going to be included. They would not agree to letting section 35 apply with reference to the towns, but only to the cities and, for a while, only to those cities where there were defence projects or where there were air force stations being built. Now, at long last, they are going to re-invoke No. 9 again, which allows the municipalities and the provincial governments and church organizations and service organizations to qualify for loans.

**March 25, 1952**

**Mr. McCormack (Souris-Estevan):** — Mr. Speaker, I do not want to interrupt the Premier, but my understanding is that section 9 has been in effect for considerable time. In fact, I was talking to one of the members from Ontario and he has at least one of these projects which was started, I think by the Kinsmen and two or three other clubs have buildings under section 9, which have been up for at least three years. I was down in Ottawa last spring myself, at the same time as the Minister of Social Welfare.

**Premier Douglas:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt Section 9 has been there a long time, nobody is denying that. In fact it was put on the Statute books in 1945, and our legislation was put on which would have enabled us to come under section 9. But having it on the Statute books and having the housing authority allow you to avail yourself of it are two different things. We have the letter from the Minister, Mr. C.D. Howe, dated July 17, 1946, rejecting the application of the Province to come under section 9. Not a single province or a single municipality has been allowed to come in under section 9. I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is nothing short of shameful that lending institutions, (people who are in business to make money, people who are primarily concerned with getting a good return on their investment), should have been allowed, over the years, to come under section 9 and to get up to 90 per cent advanced to them on the value of the house, or housing project and that provincial governments and municipalities who were prepared to build houses, (not to get a return on their investment, but to provide homes for people) should have been rejected out of hand and be rejected consistently right up until the present time.

Now, after waiting eight years — this was done on July 17, 1946 — the Federal Government is prepared to allow section 9 to be applied, we think, only to towns, not to cities. Cities will have to come under section 35, under the 75-25 basis. But it is likely that section 9 will have reference only to towns and probably to service clubs and Church organizations. Municipalities smaller than cities may be allowed to come under section 9 of the Housing Act.

Mr. Speaker, I think of the hundreds of thousands of houses a year they were going to build, I think of the survey that was made by Dr. Bruce, who acted as Chairman, and who was Lieutenant Government of Ontario. This survey made by Dr. Bruce and Leonard Marsh and some others who were on that commission revealed that over one million houses were needed in Canada. When you realize how much the population has grown since — when you realize the years that have elapsed, the number of houses that have become no longer fit for habitation and see the pathetic performance that has gone on, Mr. Speaker, I do not wonder that the Leader of the Opposition has to throw words around to cover up the complete failure and complete ineptitude of the Federal Government with reference to housing.

They promised people they would build 100,000 houses a year and the very first thing they did when they got back into office in 1945 was to keep out the provinces and keep out the municipalities from the one effective section that might have enabled them to build houses; namely section 9. That would have allowed them to obtain 90 per cent of the lending value of a house so that they could proceed with the building programme. Had we been allowed to proceed under our Provincial Housing Legislation, had we been able to go ahead and borrow 90 per cent of the lending value of

a series of housing projects, with the municipalities and ourselves only responsible for the other 10 per cent, (with the provincial government taking 60 per cent of that and the municipalities taking 40 per cent, and being able to put up a good bit of that 40 per cent by means of lots and public utilities), we could have built houses all over this Province. Instead of that, the Federal Government preferred to put its faith in lending institutions and in private companies who miserably failed them. Now that they have failed them they are turning to us and asking us to do now, at least in part, what they were asked eight years ago to give us authority to do.

**Mr. J.E. McCormack (Souris-Estevan):** — Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the Amendment I spoke on the original Motion when it was brought in, but I would just like to point out this, that the Premier has made a few statements which I do not think are entirely correct under the provisions of the Housing Act.

Now, section 9 was not available only to lending institutions and banks and people like that. Section 9 of the Act was set up whereby if a non-profit organization was set up they could go in and get 90 per cent of the cost of construction, or what they call the “loaning” or “lending” value of the property. It was never set up to give banks and lending institutions and people like that . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Would he not consider the provincial or municipal government a non-profit organization, and would he not think that they should be allowed to come in under that section, Mr. Speaker?

**Mr. McCormack:** — Yes, I am coming to that, Mr. Speaker. I can tell you I have never been entirely satisfied with the provisions of the Housing Act and its application, but I do not think that the impression should be left that Section 9 was just passed so that somebody could make a lot of money — the banks, lending institutions and those horrible people we hear so much about in this House.

Section 9 was set up that any — and I gave the example here before when I was asking a question — it has been done in three or four places in Ontario. I think the Minister of Social Welfare knows about it, whereby people got together in their communities and they set up a company, a non-profit organization. I think the total realization that they are allowed to get back from it is 5 per cent over and above the rentals, and the loan can be extended over a period of, I believe, 50 years. Now, all that any municipality had to do, or organizations in a municipality, if they were seriously interested in it, was to set up one of these organizations and they could go into the business of putting up these houses. Now, I am inclined to agree with the Premier and the Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Sturdy) that possibly it might have been a good thing to have let the municipalities go into this type of business, but I would like to point out that if you go to any urban conference or convention the urban officials will tell you that they do not want to get into this business, they do not want to get the municipalities into the housing business, and it has been evidenced when they have had these plebiscites or votes in the cities of the province, that the municipal people do not want to get into this business.

**March 25, 1952**

Now, whether they should or should not is another matter. But I just thought I would point that out, that section 9 was not just made available to lending institutions. I am afraid the wrong impression might have been left if I had not spoken on this.

**Mr. H.J. Maher (The Battlefords):** — Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this Amendment, I have been rather surprised and amazed at the confusion that has gone on with this Amendment of the Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Sturdy). It reminds me somewhat of the confusion that seems to be going on in regard to housing in this Province.

**Mr. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition):** — Hear, hear.

**Mr. Maher:** — I am one too that is not too satisfied with the Federal policies in housing, but I am getting sick and tired of the Government over there continually condemning the Federal Government and trying to get out of their own responsibilities in housing.

Now this Resolution, in my mind, does very little. It just cuts down the amount the municipalities have to contribute from 12½ per cent to 10 per cent on the first clause and stops there, which is very little. Well, I am one, and I have said it many times in this House, who says that there is only one way that we will get housing now. This Government passed the Housing Act. Why do they not quit fiddling around about it? Why do they not allow people to build houses in this Province? I am absolutely convinced that if this Government would get into a housing policy of their own, assisted under this section 35, which actually states that the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council, and so on — the conditions under which family housing may be sold or leased — and allow people who have a small down payment to build a house — they can supervise it. And this idea of pinning this on the municipalities all the time, I am one who believes that the municipalities today have enough capital expenditure without worrying about housing. I look at the supplementary estimates and see that. I think there is \$650,000 with which the Province is assisting the city here for water. Well, in addition to that the city of Regina must finance, through capital, the balance of that project and most of the municipalities in this Province have not the financial backing or the ability to borrow, to get into the housing business as it should be.

Here was an opportunity for this Province to get started on housing, set it up, set up housing authority, (and I do not want to hear about this Federal and Provincial responsibility), and set up an organization that will allow people to build houses, with small down payments. I just happened to pick up a paper here, unfortunately I could not get one very close to Saskatchewan, but houses are being sold in other parts of this Dominion of ours. And I just ran down a column here, "Properties for Sale," and I would just like to read a few of them: "\$1,500 down," "\$1,400 down," "\$1,350 down," "\$1,000 down."

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy (Minister of Social Welfare):** — May I ask the hon. member from what paper he is quoting?

**Mr. Maher:** — I am sorry, Mr. Minister, as I said, it was the only paper I could get hold of, it is the Toronto “Star” but it gives you an idea of how, in other provinces, you are able to buy a house with a small down payment when you are not able to do it in this Province.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Does the Province of Ontario provide any loan to the purchase of the house? In Ontario or any of those provinces?

**Mr. Maher:** — No Mr. Speaker, they do not have to. There is no Socialism in Ontario. The various lending institutions are prepared to take the normal risk in housing and allow people to buy houses with small down payments and pay for them over a great number of years, and that is one of the faults and the reasons we have such a terrible housing shortage in Saskatchewan. It is on account of the socialistic principles of the Government of this Province. I have known people who have moved from Saskatoon to Edmonton and from Saskatoon to Calgary, or Regina to Calgary, and they have found houses. They have also found houses to rent. Why? Because private enterprise there is building houses and is selling them. They are doing something about the housing situation, and all that this Government has been able to do is to slither around . . .

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

**Mr. Maher:** — Go ahead, I will answer it.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Is the hon. member aware that rentals in Calgary and Edmonton are very much higher than they are in Saskatchewan, and that also there is a housing shortage, a very great housing shortage in both those cities, but Edmonton just happens to be fortunate because it is a military centre?

**Mr. Maher:** — All I am going to say to that is this; that there are houses to rent in Calgary and Edmonton and there are not in Regina or Saskatoon. And, actually speaking, in regard to the building of houses, if a house is built in this Province, this Province does not control the rent, it only controls rent on houses that have already been occupied, and some of those adjustments of rent are far from being just. But I do not want to get off the question of this Amendment.

I still say, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come for somebody to build some houses in this Province. Now, I think that if this Government would get into housing and erect houses for sale and, in addition to that, erect houses themselves, or go to contractors and build houses for rent, the chances are that they have not got any money. I think there is plenty of money in various organizations in this Government. I was just looking at the Government Insurance Office sheet; they have assets in the neighbourhood of \$3 million, of which \$2,900,000 are bonds and debentures. The Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) will say that you cannot do that with insurance money. Well, I would like to suggest to him that if he took the liquid assets of the Government Insurance Office and bought bonds, sold the bonds and used the proceeds of that for housing, we might get somewhere.

He was telling us quite frankly the other day how he borrowed \$20 million for the current running of this Province without any

**March 25, 1952**

without any trouble, at 4 per cent. Surely he could divert a few million of that into housing and set up proper housing. As I said before, I give the Provincial Government credit for their housing in the various cities like North Battleford and Saskatoon, but I want to leave the impression about six or seven years ago. I just do not want it said, Mr. Speaker, that they are the only ones that looked after housing. In North Battleford I think Central Housing and Mortgage built 200 or 250 houses. I think they should have built more. I think you should have done more. But the thing is this; we sit in this Legislature — I have sat here for three years and have heard housing, housing, housing — but to date there has not been one house provided for people by this Government, or for one individual family in this Province.

The question being put on the Amendment, it was agreed to.

**Mr. D.R. Heming (Moose Jaw City):** — Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you would not like to become involved in another debate this evening and I would ask that this Motion stand.

Agreed to unanimously.

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