

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Twelfth Legislature
5th Day

Wednesday, February 18, 1953

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

DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The House resumed, from Tuesday, February 17, 1953, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mrs. Cooper for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Tucker.

Hon. T.C. Douglas (Premier): — I should like first of all to congratulate you on having been selected for a third term to act as Speaker of this Legislature. I would like to assure you, on behalf of those with whom I sit, that we will co-operate to the best of our ability to assist you in conducting the proceedings of this Assembly with dignity and decorum.

I should like also to extend my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne. Many fine things have already been said about both the junior member for Regina (Mrs. Cooper) and the member for Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. Willis). I am sure there is no need for me to add anything to the many compliments that have already been directed their way. I do want to say, however, that in the years that I have sat in this Chamber I doubt if I have ever listened to better maiden speeches than the speeches we heard last Monday. I am sure that their performances were a source of pride, not only to their constituents but also to their colleagues who sit with them in the House.

I should like also, Mr. Speaker, to extend my congratulations to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) on the speech which he made yesterday. I always enjoy listening to that speech. Despite the fact that I have heard it often, I find it very soothing to listen to it again. Many of the criticisms which my honourable friend levelled at the government can be answered by drawing attention to just one thing and that is the motion which was presented by my honourable friend at the Session last year. On February 12, 1952, it was moved by Mr. Tucker, seconded by Mr. McCormack:

That the following words be added to the Address: We respectfully submit to Your Honour that Your Honour's present advisers do not possess the confidence of the citizens of Saskatchewan."

On the eleventh day of June last, the people of this province went to the polls and told my honourable friend that he was wrong. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that he is still wrong!

Yesterday the Leader of the Opposition spent some little time seeking to explain away the results of the provincial election. I was some-

what surprised when he suggested that the provincial Liberals had been defeated because of the unpopularity of the federal Liberals. I did not think that was a very diplomatic suggestion, coming from one who aspires to federal office. Apparently, the Leader of the Opposition has a fairly low opinion of the intelligence of the electorate, because he suggested several times that they had been duped and fooled into voting on the wrong issues in the election. Mr. Speaker, the people of this province knew the issues. Neither my honourable friend nor I made the issues. The people themselves decided what the issues were! My honourable friend's quarrel with the people of Saskatchewan is not that they were fooled about the issues but that they were not fooled about the issues! They were not duped into believing that a Liberal Party would do all the things it promised to do. They knew that it had failed to do so during the thirty-four years it was in office.

The press in this province and again the Leader of the Opposition have suggested that there is not very much in the Speech from the Throne. At first glance, that impression may seem to be the proper one. But I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this Speech from the Throne contains what is, to my mind, a most dynamic principle of democracy. It states that the Government has called the people's representatives together for the purpose of implementing the program on which the Government was elected. If a provision like that were contained in every Speech from the Throne that was brought down in every parliament and legislature in Canada, we would see some great changes. Can you imagine what would happen if the Federal Government, in calling Parliament together, announced that the purpose in convening Parliament was to put into operation all the promises and election platforms which the Liberal party had advocated over the years?

Mr. Speaker, the important thing in this Speech from the Throne is contained in the fourth paragraph. It reads as follows:

“This Legislature has been called to its first session to deal primarily with the programmes and plans recently endorsed by the electorate of our Province. Legislation and estimates which will be presented for your consideration and approval will reflect the initial stages of the implementation of these plans.”

Many of these plans and programs do not require spectacular legislation. In many cases the necessary legislation is already on the statute books. Every member knows that having statutory authority is one thing but to lay plans and to find the money to put those plans into operation is a much larger undertaking than merely presenting legislation. Therefore the programs on which the Government was elected will be reflected not so much in spectacular legislation but in the budget and in the estimates which the various Ministers will bring before the House and in the plans which will be outlined in their speeches in the course of the Session.

As honourable members know, the Government prepared a five year program which would make it possible for us to reach certain targets for the advancement and development of our Province. Those targets were not prepared merely as a vote-catching technique. They were prepared in the light of what we thought could be in the best interests of the Province. They were targets which we thought would be physically and financially possible.

After preparing these plans we took them to the people last year. The people endorsed these plans by giving the Government an overwhelming mandate at the polls. We are now meeting the Legislature to discuss these plans. I shall discuss them now very briefly and the various Ministers, either in this debate or in the budget debate or in the course of other legislative items, will deal with them in detail.

The little card on which we placed our C.C.F. Program for Progress begins by saying:

“An expanding economy guaranteed by the continuing development of gas, oil and mineral resources and by steadily improving agricultural production will enable a C.C.F. Government during its next term of office to provide the following:”

The first item in this Program is:

“A \$75,000,000 highway and market road program.”

Roughly, this program is aimed at the building of some 2,230 miles of grade; of 2,208 miles of new gravelling (in addition to any re-gravelling required) and of 1,334 miles of bituminous surfacing, which will bring the total amount of blacktop in the province, when it is completed, up to 2,350 miles. This program also envisages a 14 per cent increase in bridge construction and is based upon assistance to municipalities for the construction of market roads on the basis of need.

A rough estimate of the cost of the five-year highway program is in the neighbourhood of \$79,425,000. No person, of course, can estimate what the cost will actually be over a five-year period, but roughly it is \$80,000,000.

The second item in our Program for Progress is:

“Power to 40,000 farms and all towns and villages.”

As honourable members know, we can only set targets. In some years adverse weather conditions may cause us to fall short of the target. In other years we will go over the target. For instance, we set a target of 4,000 farms to be served with electric power in 1952, but good weather conditions made it possible for us to serve 4,300 farms as well as to add some forty hamlets and villages to our power system. Our schedule for the future calls for 5,500 more farms to be added to our power grid in 1953. If we are able to do that, Mr. Speaker, it will be a greater number of farms added to our power system than the Manitoba Power Commission has ever been able to add in any one year in its entire history. For 1954 we are aiming at 6,500 farms; 7,500 farms in 1955; 7,500 farms in 1956 and 7,500 farms in 1957. If we can keep that schedule, at the end of the five-year period we will have something in excess of 40,000 farms and all towns and villages served by electricity. The estimated cost—and again it can only be an estimate because costs fluctuate from year to year—is \$58,298,000, or roughly \$60,000,000.

It will cost \$140,000,000 to carry out the highway and power planks in this program.

Before I leave power may I just make reference to something which was said yesterday. My honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, said that power services ought to be given at cost. Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what the Minister in charge of the Power Corporation has said repeatedly that we are endeavouring to do. At the present time, if the Power Corporation surplus remaining after debt retirement and depreciation are provided for were returned to power customers, each customer could get only one-fifth of one cent per kilowatt-hour. Therefore, we are operating as close to cost as it is arithmetically possible to do so.

The third plank in our Program for Progress is:

“Continued development of Saskatchewan’s oil and mineral resources.”

Mr. Speaker, almost every honourable member knows of the strides that have been made in the development of our natural resources. I can only spend a moment or two touching on the highlights. Most of the members know that claims staked in the pre-Cambrian area went up from 2,030 in 1951 to 4,100 in 1952. Some \$15,500,000 was spent in exploration and development work in the far north in 1952. Already over \$11,000,000 is committed for 1953 and there will probably be more. Twenty-seven mining companies were engaged in doing exploratory and development work in the far northern part of Saskatchewan in 1949. In 1950 there were forty-two; in 1951 there were forty-six; and last year there were fifty-nine. In 1950, Saskatchewan’s mineral production was valued at \$35,800,000. Last year it was valued at \$48,600,000. It is rather interesting to note that in the same period of time Manitoba’s value of mineral production went down from \$32,600,000 to \$24,800,000. In other words during the period of time that our mineral production in dollar terms increased by 30 per cent, Manitoba’s decreased by some 25 per cent.

My friends in the Opposition have talked about the fact that the government is always on the verge of having something developed. A few years ago they asked when we were going to get the potash development we were always talking about. My friends will be glad to know that we now have a potash mine. A potash plant is going up. Further potash development is now in the exploratory stage. They will also be glad to know that the salt industry, which was not in existence until this Government came in, increased its production from 31,000 tons in 1951 to 33,000 tons in 1952.

Almost everyone knows the story with reference to oil production. During last year we produced 1,600,000 barrels of oil. We now have some three hundred and seven wells, representing some ten different oil fields. The money spent in oil exploration last year was some \$31,000,000. Already over \$45,000,000 has been committed for this coming year to which must be added another \$20,000,000 or \$25,000,000 for expansion of oil refining capacity. An oil pipeline was built from Milden to Saskatoon during 1952 and an announcement was made in New York the other day that the Socony-Vacuum Company is planning the construction of an oil pipeline from Fosterton to Moose Jaw and Regina.

Yesterday the Leader of the Opposition said that our Crown Corporations had never really given the people a profit. My honourable friend has trouble with the Crown Corporations. At one time he says they never give the people a profit; the next moment he complains that the profits they make are really hidden taxes. He has a great deal of difficulty in making up his mind which foot he wants to stand on. The financial re-

ports for these Crown Corporations have not all been audited. As soon as they are audited they will be laid on the table and referred to the Crown Corporations Committee. However, a preliminary estimate shows that these Crown Corporations, which in 1951 made a surplus of about \$4,250,000 made a surplus of about \$5,000,000 last year. If we take out Telephones and Power, to which my friend objects, we will still find that the other Crown Corporations, with which the Leader of the Opposition has found so much fault, have made a surplus of about \$1,000,000. My friend can find all the fault he likes with these Crown Corporations! The fact remains that they are giving to the people of the Province of Saskatchewan services to enable us to expand still further the economy of this Province.

The fourth item in our Program for Progress is:

“Natural Gas in larger cities and intermediate points.”

As you know, Mr. Speaker, a start was made in 1952 by bringing a pipeline to the towns of Brock and Kindersley. That project took a little over five months to construct. Nineteen and one half miles of transmission lines and 65,600 feet of distribution system were built at a cost of \$410,000. As has been announced by the Minister of Public Works, the Power Corporation has now agreed to bring natural gas to the City of Saskatoon in 1953. That will require some 12,000 tons of steel pipe, 140 miles of transmission lines, and 1,000,000 feet of distribution system and a total expenditure somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$7,000,000. Yesterday the Leader of the Opposition said that this is something which ought to be operated at cost. Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what the Minister of Public Works said in his discussions and in his correspondence with the City of Saskatoon. We propose to operate a provincially integrated system that, insofar as it is arithmetically possible, will give to the people of the province service at cost. Not at cost at any one point – but a service to the people generally at cost in order that even those points which may be marginal will get natural gas if it is at all possible to bring this service to them.

My friend said that he was a little disappointed in that there was nothing in the Speech from the Throne indicating that some rate review body would be set up. Well, it is a minor piece of legislation. The fact is that the Minister of Public works, on behalf of the government, has assured the City of Saskatoon that there will be an independent body to review any appeals in the matter of rates. That commitment stands.

The fifth item in our Program for Progress is:

“Construction of the South Saskatchewan Dam in co-operation with the Federal Government.”

Mr. Speaker, let there be no doubt in anyone’s mind about the fact that the Federal Government has been committed over the years to proceed with the South Saskatchewan Development project.

I have copied out an advertisement, any person can find it by going to the Library. This advertisement, covering an entire page of the Moose Jaw Times Herald for June 9, 1945, contains a nice picture of Mr. J.

February 18, 1953

Gordon Ross, the Liberal candidate, in the center of the page, and these words in big type:

“The Southern Saskatchewan Thunder Creek irrigation project alone will undoubtedly contribute much to the prosperity of both our city and surrounding district, which interests are interlocking. This project will be commenced immediately men and materials are available—it has been approved.”

That was June, 1945. There are many other items I could read.

There is one statement by Mr. Gardiner that I would like to put on the record because of what may happen in the not too distant future. In the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix for Wednesday, October 20, 1948, Mr. Gardiner, speaking on the South Saskatchewan dam at Allen, is reported to have said:

“Most of the money would be provided by the Federal government because it could not be expected that Saskatchewan, subject to drought, could carry the load of such a capital expenditure.”

I hope that the Federal Government will remember Mr. Gardiner’s statement because some of them are now trying to wiggle out from under the burden and are seeking to push it on the Saskatchewan Government.

Then, of course, I do not think there is much need for me to quote from the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix for October 21, 1948. When my friend, the Leader of the Opposition, was speaking in the Rosthern by-election, the following was reported:

“Mr. Tucker said that it is ‘now up to the people of Rosthern to give their endorsement by electing William A. Boucher, the Liberal candidate, if they want the project proceeded with.’ He added, ‘You certainly won’t get anywhere by sending C.C.F.’ers to Ottawa; the election of Makaroff would be tantamount to repudiation of the great scheme’.”

We heard something, yesterday, about mixing up the issues and making unethical appeals to the voters. Well, there is no doubt that the Federal Government has, through the years, been committed to proceeding with this project. I will not review what has happened at any great length. I will simply remind the honourable members that on February 2, 1951, the Saskatchewan Government met with the Right Honourable James G. Gardiner to discuss the South Saskatchewan dam. It was suggested to us that our share would be \$8,000,000 for the hydro-electric installation (which of course we expected), \$6,000,000 for the levelling, and \$19,000,000 for the lateral ditches and canals. On February 10 I wrote Mr. Gardiner – and I shall table the letter. (See page 18). After outlining the proposal which he had put before us, I stated as follows:

“My colleagues and I are most anxious that the South Saskatchewan River Development Project

shall be proceeded with at the earliest possible date. As soon as the Federal Government has announced its intention to proceed with this undertaking we are prepared to negotiate and sign an agreement on the basis of the allocation of costs outlined above.”

The honourable members know that, despite the fact we were assured then that if we acceded to this proposal the dam would be proceeded with during the summer and there would be an item in the 1951 budget for it, nothing was done. Instead a Royal Commission was set up and all honourable members are familiar with the report of that Royal Commission. When its report was made public I wrote to the Prime Minister on January 23, 1953—and again I shall table the letter. (See page 19). After telling the Prime Minister that the Government of Saskatchewan did not agree with the recommendations of the royal Commission, and after asking him for permission to submit, on behalf of the Government of Saskatchewan, a brief setting out the reasons why we did not agree with the Royal Commission, I wrote this paragraph:

“In order that there may be no misunderstanding on anyone’s part, may I refer you to my letter to the Rt. Hon. James G. Gardiner of February 10, 1951, copy of which I am enclosing. At that time the Saskatchewan Government expressed its faith in the soundness of the South Saskatchewan River Project and declared its willingness to meet its share of the cost. Nothing in the findings of the Royal Commission has altered our opinion in this regard. When the Federal Government is prepared to proceed with the South Saskatchewan River Project, the Saskatchewan Government stands ready to enter into an agreement committing itself to pay its share of the cost.”

That is where we stand, Mr. Speaker, I may say that the Prime Minister has replied, saying they would be glad to receive our brief. That brief is just about completed and will go to the Prime Minister in the course of the next day or so.

I noticed yesterday that the Leader of the Opposition suggested that our job now was to persuade the people of Canada that this was a good project. Well, Mr. Speaker, when the Liberal party were asking for votes they did not say they would build this dam providing the rest of us could persuade the people of Canada. They said they were going to build it – period! After all, Mr. Speaker, who persuaded you and me that the Federal Government should build the Canso Causeway? They just went ahead and built it. Who persuaded all of us in western Canada that the Federal Government should proceed with the St. Lawrence Seaway? They just went ahead and built it. They don’t need Hansard containing some of his remarks about the water of the South Saskatchewan River and this is what he said, as reported on page 1,770 of the un-revised Hansard, February 9, 1953:

February 18, 1953

“Personally I think that it is a good use to be made of it, and if I can be convinced to the extent where I can honestly say that I believe it to be the best I will recommend to my colleagues to make the recommendation to parliament.”

So all we have to do is to persuade the head of the Liberal Government that he ought to keep the promises that have been made by the Liberal Party.

The sixth item in our Program for Progress is:

“Reclamation and settlement of new Northern areas.”

Yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition had a little fun pointing out that we had been eight years in office and were only now talking about settlement in the new northern area. Of course nobody knows better than my honourable friend that this program has been going on ever since 1949, that this government was the first government to set up a Conservation and Development Branch and that, under that Branch, we have already spent \$4,416,000. That expenditure of roughly four and a half million dollars established 1,298,000 acres in Provincial Community Pastures and 14,000 acres in minor reclamation and miscellaneous projects.

We have cleared and set up 1,684 new farms and 158,000 acres have been cleared and broken by the Government and the lessees at a cost of some \$715,000 of government funds plus the crop remissions which we shall be making to the lessees over a period of years. When we talk about a northern reclamation and settlement program we are not talking about a new program. We are talking about expanding the program which we began and which we have been carrying on.

The seventh item in our Program for Progress is:

“Abolish the Public Revenue Tax December 31, 1952; assist municipalities on basis of need.”

As honourable members know, the Public Revenue Tax will not be collected by the Provincial Government this year or from now on and if the municipalities retain it for their own use it will give them \$1,800,000 annually to be spent on other things. This means that the municipalities will now have the entire land tax field to themselves for their own use.

We say more than that. We are prepared to assist the municipalities on the basis of need and to that end the Municipal Advisory Commission has been set up. Their job is to assist municipalities by advising them on a more efficient and economic basis of operation, to recommend more efficient methods of administration and to recommend to the Government, where they think it is advisable, to give assistance to the municipalities on the basis of need.

The Leader of the Opposition thought it strange that we put it on our Program when the Act had already been passed to abolish the tax on December 31, 1952. Well, Mr. Speaker, when we realize that a Liberal party put on the tax in 1917, and that they kept it on for more than a

quarter of a century, how did we know that if they got back in they would not rescind our legislation and re-impose the tax they had become so fond of over the years?

The eighth plank in our Program for Progress is:

“Increased grants for education.”

All I am going to say about increased grants for education is this. When we took office in the fiscal year 1944-45, the provincial government's grant to education was \$3,167,000. In the fiscal year 1948-49 it was more than doubled to \$6,578,000, and this last year, 1952-53, it was \$8,853,000. That last figure represents about thirty per cent of the total amount spent by the school boards of the province for education. We haven't any doubt that as the economy of the province expands, as we develop more of our natural resources and as we increase our wealth production, it should be possible to give more and more assistance to education. I want to assure my friends opposite that any government which has almost trebled grants to education does not need any prodding from a party which, when it was in office, almost starved education to death.

The ninth plank in our Program for Progress is:

“Extension of medical care program.

Mr. Speaker, I could not, in the limited time I have, go over all the ramifications of the health program. I think it is one of which the Government and the people of this province can be proud. We now have complete hospital care over the entire province. We have complete care for those suffering from tuberculosis, cancer, polio, mental illness, venereal disease and we have eight public health regions established. We now have complete health services for certain groups, such as Old Age Pensioners 70 and over on a means test, Mothers' Allowance cases, indigents and so on. In Health Region No. 1 we have complete medical and surgical care and dental care in many municipalities under municipal doctor's schemes, for which they receive a grant from the Provincial Government.

I think it is safe to say, Mr. Speaker, that our health program has now reached the place where most of us can agree with the Saskatchewan Health Survey Committee, who, among their recommendations in their 1951 report, volume 1, say as follows:

“A comprehensive health insurance program should be undertaken in Saskatchewan at the earliest possible date. This health insurance program should be integrated with and built upon existing health programs, which should be extended, modified, and co-ordinated as required, to the end that adequate health care of high quality shall be available to all residents of the Province on the basis of need and without regard to individual ability to pay.

They also say:

“The Federal Government should extend the scope

of the National Health Grants Program by adopting immediately a national health insurance program.”

Mr. Speaker, the question of national health insurance is one with which the House is very familiar. Again I refer to the records. I refer to the advertisement which appeared in the Winnipeg Free Press of June 14, 1949. It is a very chatty little ad. with the title, “This is a family affair. Your future and Canada.” It goes on to say:

“Then, there is the Liberal health program. Already Federal grants are helping the provinces to increase their health services. But, the Liberals’ aim is a nation-wide contributory health insurance plan which will end, for everyone, the tragedy of inadequate health care and the financial strain of lengthy illness.”

That is clear enough. But I noticed in the same Free Press of May 20, 1949, a report of a speech made at Moncton, New Brunswick. It said this:

“In the keynote speech of his campaign, Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent said here Tuesday night that a Liberal government, returned to office June 27 with a fresh mandate, would pursue these objectives in co-operation with the provinces,

- (1) An active housing programme.
- (2) Contributory health insurance.
- (3) Contributory old age pensions.
- (4) A method, satisfactory to all Canadians, of amending the constitution.”

Well there can be no argument about point No. 2 – Contributory health insurance. But the December 4, 1952 issue of the Regina Leader-Post under the heading – “National Health plan not timely” said:

“However, Dr. E.A. McCusker, parliamentary assistant of Health Minister Martin, said in the Commons, Wednesday, it is not yet time to launch the plan as a national health insurance scheme.”

The health insurance program was put in the Liberal platform in 1919 – thirty-four years ago. And it is still ‘not time’ to put it into operation! What are the excuses? The first excuse is that it would take too much money — \$700,000,000. Mr. Speaker, in the first place, the people of Canada are spending almost that amount now for health services. But the burden is falling upon those who are sick instead of being spread over all the people. The second excuse is that we haven’t got the facilities; we haven’t enough hospitals; we haven’t enough clinics; we haven’t enough trained personnel. Mr. Speaker, that is the greatest and most damning indictment of a government that was ever made by itself. After having been in office for twenty-seven out of the last thirty-two years it still has to say that there aren’t enough facilities to set up a health insurance program in Canada. We hadn’t facilities

in Saskatchewan eight years ago. We have facilities now! We could proceed, if the Federal Government is prepared to proceed, according to their own program, and we would certainly co-operation with them. We may have to do it alone. If we do it alone, the program will be much slower because the entire financial burden will fall upon the people of Saskatchewan rather than being spread over all the people of Canada. But we shouldn't have to do it alone! The Federal Government should be expected by the people of this province to live up to the commitment which it has made.

I was rather surprised to notice yesterday that the Leader of the Opposition seemed to prefer the Blue Cross scheme in Manitoba to the Hospital Services Plan in Saskatchewan. Of course the cost of the Manitoba Blue Cross scheme this year is not going to be \$31.00 as he suggested. It is now up to \$39.60 for a family – considerably higher than ours. But it has very limited coverage. It only covers a given number of days; it only covers certain services; there are many things for which they do not pay; there are many people who cannot qualify, because they have a high morbidity rate or because they are chronics. When I hear the Leader of the Opposition praising the Blue Cross scheme (and I am not finding fault with the Blue Cross scheme) as compared to a contributory health insurance program, which our hospital plan is, I begin to wonder if the Liberal party really believes in contributory health insurance or whether it has been fooling us throughout the years.

The tenth item in our Program for Progress is:

“Extension of social welfare benefits.”

When we took office in the fiscal year 1944-45, the amount spent for social welfare was \$2,561,000. The amount voted last year was over \$8,000,000. Again, I say the same thing as I said about education. We will never be satisfied, as a government, that we are spending all we want to spend on either health education or social welfare. The only thing that will ever limit the amount we spend will be the capacity of the Saskatchewan people to provide the necessary money; we think that health, education and social welfare are basic for the future development of the citizenship of this province!

Mr. Speaker, that, very sketchily, is the five-year program which we asked the people to endorse on June 11

last. Looking at that program I want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that this is a most ambitious program and that it is going to cost many, many millions of dollars. I would be less frank if I did not warn the House that it will tax all our physical and financial resources; that it will need our every hour of work, every ounce of energy and every dollar we can get to put this program into effect. It will mean (and I think we should recognize it now) imposing discipline on ourselves. Governments like individuals, have to set up an order of priority and say that essential things will be done first and other very desirable but less essential things will have to wait. That is what we must do under this program. The people have elected us to do the things we have set out. These must be done first and other things will have to come second.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that it is not only an ambitious program, it is also a sound program because a large part of the money that is spent will be spent for revenue-producing purposes such as to give people power; to give people natural gas; to give people telephone services. Some if it will be

spent to help people save money. It is estimated that in Saskatoon alone a savings of half a million dollars a year in fuel costs will be made when anticipated levels of consumption are reached. In addition the City of Saskatoon will make another quarter of a million dollars in taxes.

Every time we put in a blacktop road, people save one or two cents a mile in the operation of their cars or trucks. Many of the expenditures here (and they will be heavy) will bring revenue back to the province, either directly to the government or to the people of the province through savings and through better services.

I want to point out that many of the things that are included involve capital expenditures. They will be heavy the first few years, but once we get over the hump (and this next four or five years will be the hump) we can expect to see a very good return for the money we are investing. Some may argue that the program we are undertaking is too ambitious – a little heavier than we can carry. Mr. Speaker, we do not agree. We concede that it is ambitious but we believe that the province is now embarked or probably the greatest period of expansion in its history. We believe that the people of Saskatchewan should rise to meet the challenge of the times in which we live, that we should expect great things and that we should attempt great things. This plan represents our faith in the future. This Government believes that these are times when we must have faith to see the opportunities of the future and have the courage to seize them with both hands.

Mr. Speaker, having said so much with regard to the plans and the programs which we hope to carry out during the lifetime of this Legislature, let me turn for a moment to the critical situation in our agricultural economy which is causing a good deal of concern to all of us. The fact is that we have been steadily losing our overseas markets for livestock, dairy and poultry products, with the result that we now have growing surpluses and falling prices.

During 1952 livestock prices, basis Saskatoon, declined as compared with the year 1951 by the following percentages:

Cattle — 27%
Calves — 26%
Hogs — 23%
Sheep — 22%

I will try not to weary the House with a lot of statistics but one ought to see the picture in Saskatchewan as provided by the statistics issued by the Department of Agriculture. For instance:

In 1952 we marketed 261,767 head of cattle which was below the 1951 figure of 304,698. The average price per animal, in 1951, was \$244; in 1952 it had dropped to \$178. The total value of cattle marketed dropped from \$74,338,000 in 1951 to \$46,595,000 in 1952. The average price per cwt. dropped from \$30.87 in 1951 to \$22.61 in 1952.

In 1952 we marketed 55,370 calves as compared with 70,907 the year before. The average price per animal dropped from \$94.00 in 1951 to \$70.00 in 1952. The total value of calves marketed dropped from \$6,673,000 in 1951 to \$3,876,000 in 1952. The average price per cwt. dropped from \$37.24 in 1951 to \$26.19 in 1952.

In 1952 there were 534,673 hogs marketed which was higher than the previous year when we only marketed 327,926. But, in spite of the increased production, the average price per animal dropped from \$48.00 in 1951 to \$37.00 in 1952. The total value of hogs marketed increased from \$15,619,000 in 1951 to \$19,783,000 in 1952, but the average price per cwt. dropped from \$31.06 in 1951 to \$23.74 in 1952.

In 1952 we marketed 45,783 sheep which was above the year before when we marketed 41,443 but the average price per animal dropped from \$18.00 in 1951 to \$14.00 in 1952. The total value of sheep marketed dropped from \$746,000 in 1951 to \$641,000 in 1952. The average price per cwt. dropped from \$30.59 in 1951 to \$22.51 in 1952.

In 1952 we marketed almost the same amount of milk as we marketed the year before – about 1,550,000,000 lbs., but although the amount marketed was the same, the money received by the farmer dropped from \$41,775,000 in 1951 to \$37,658,000 in 1952.

We increased our egg production. In 1951 we produced 28,301,000 dozen and in 1952, 35,329,000 dozen. In other words we produced 7,028,000 dozen more eggs in 1952 than in 1951. But the average price dropped from 40 cents a dozen to 24 ½ cents a dozen. Although we produced 7,028,000 dozen more eggs, we received \$3,117,000 less in income – a drop from \$11,773,000 in 1951 to \$8,656,000 in 1952.

No person who is interested in the agricultural economy of Canada and of Saskatchewan in particular, can help but be alarmed at this steady decline in prices and in the volume of our livestock, poultry and dairy products marketed. I submit that there are several reasons for the situation in which we are finding ourselves. One of them is that in spite of all warnings to the contrary, the Government of Saskatchewan has allowed our long-term agreements, with the exception of wheat, to end one by one. No matter how much we tried to warn the Government that ending those agreements on bacon, cheese, eggs and other farm products would have a ruinous effect, we were told that we could consume all the pork we could produce here in Canada. Just the other day the Federal Minister of Agriculture said at the Canadian Federation of Agricultural Convention:

“I don’t think that the British market, as opposed to the Canadian market, is a good place to sell food at present.”

That attitude fails to recognize two things. The first is that Canada must always depend upon the export of its primary products for economic prosperity. This talk about being able to consume our own products is sheer nonsense. As long as we are a country with only 14,000 or 15,000 people, we must export large quantities of our primary products if we are to have any degree of prosperity at all. The second thing we have to keep in mind is that the natural market for our agricultural commodities lies in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and in Western Europe. It is all very well for Mr. Howe to keep assuring us, from time to time, that what we are losing in Great Britain and in Europe we are making up by increasing our sales to the United States. We are all delighted that we are getting increased trade with the United States. But that increased trade with the United States is in terms of timber, in terms of minerals, in terms of oil, and in terms of pulp and pulpwood. In the main it is not in terms of agricultural commodities. As a matter of fact, the United States can never be a long-

term market for agricultural commodities, because the United States itself, over a period of years, is an exporter of farm commodities. At this very moment, farm prices are dropping in the United States and very soon probably there will be a clamour for embargos against importations of food products from the outside. That has already been done in the matter of dairy commodities. Great Britain on the other hand, even if they farmed every acre and put their people on a Spartan diet, could never supply itself with even forty-five per cent of its food requirements. They must always import anywhere from fifty to sixty-five per cent of their food from the outside. Great Britain and Western Europe will always remain a market for our products, providing we can keep that market and keep it from going elsewhere. But the tragedy is that we have been losing the British market. Everyone knows what has happened. We didn't need to worry so much about holding the British market before the war. Before the war the British were the bankers of the world. They could afford to buy from Canada. They bought \$500,000,000 or \$600,000,000 a year more than they sold to Canada. That credit was transferred from the sterling area to the dollar area and we were enabled thereby to buy from the United States \$500,000,000 or \$600,000,000 a year more than the United States bought from us.

When the war ended, Mr. Speaker, the famous trade triangle was not as it was before. Great Britain came out of the war, not only having lost 4,000,000 homes, thousands of factories, hundreds of thousands of shipping tonnage; not only having lost many of their overseas markets, but also having liquidated her overseas investments, upon which she depended for purchase of raw material and food stuffs. Ever since the end of the war, Great Britain has only been able to buy (particularly in the dollar area) where she could repay by the export of goods. She has rationed her people so that she could send her goods abroad to pay for the capital goods that she has needed to re-equip her factories and to rebuild her devastated country.

The trade triangle picture has been getting worse lately. In 1950, we sold to Great Britain \$65,700,000 more than we bought from her. In 1951, we sold her \$210,500,000 more than we bought from her. Last year we sold to Great Britain \$395,000,000 more than we bought from her. On the other hand, we bought from the United States, in 1950, \$109,000,000 and in 1952, \$607,000,000 more than they bought from us. That triangle has continued but it has been made possible by two things. Until 1949 it was made possible by the Marshall Plan. Since 1951 it has been made possible by offshore purchases under the Mutual Security Plan. This means that the British may buy in Canada anything that can be used for defense purposes by paying for it in sterling with the Americans supplying the dollars.

The plain fact is, Mr. Speaker, that since the British have not the dollars, and since they have not been able to get into our market to earn the dollars, they have had to cut off, one by one, nearly all the commodities that they used to buy from us, notably agricultural commodities, excepting wheat.

Our sale of grain and grain commodities has held up fairly well. In 1951 it was \$210,236,000 but our bacon exports dropped from 692,310,000 pounds in 1944 to 1,800,000 pounds in 1951.

Our beef, bacon, pork and poultry exports dropped from \$180,098,000 in 1944 to \$630,000,000 in 1951, less than \$1,000,000!

Our cheese exports dropped from 128,873,000 pounds in 1944 to 27,152,000 pounds in 1951.

Our egg exports dropped from \$1,758,000 in 1944 down to nil in 1951.

One could go on and mention the salmon market and the apple market in addition to the bacon, cheese, poultry, and egg markets. One by one, Britain has had to curtail and finally stop altogether her purchases of these commodities in the Canadian Market.

I think one of the most startling things I came across was a fact I noticed the other day. In 1944 our sales of poultry, dairy and livestock products represented sixty per cent of our total agricultural sales to Great Britain. In 1951 they represented only four per cent of our agricultural sales.

All this is a serious situation. I am suggesting that the time has come when Canada must give some leadership in this question of world trade. I suggest that she must give leadership in the first place to the removal of tariff barriers and trade restrictions in order to enable a free exchange of goods and services. After all it should not be too much to ask a Government that has always talked about free trade to give some leadership in the matter of removing trade restrictions. I suggest that it is absurd for a country that depends on exports, as we do, to have any restrictions whatsoever against goods coming in from Great Britain. Only if Britain can sell in our market on a fair competitive basis can she hope to earn the dollars with which to buy the things that our farmers want to sell. The second thing I suggest is that Canada can give some leadership in setting up the international machinery to facilitate the exchange of goods, irrespective of currency restrictions. I think that has to be done. No country could do better than Canada in giving some leadership in setting up an international currency stabilization fund. We would sell our surplus products to Britain and Britain would pay for it in dollars from the sale of all the goods we bought from her. If there were a gap of several million dollars (as there was last year) between what she sold to us and what we sold to her, we would get a sterling credit which we could draw on anywhere in the sterling block. Some ask what good is a couple of hundred million sterling in a currency stabilization fund? I say, of what use is it to us to have one hundred million pounds of pork stored in Canada, when the people of Britain are going hungry for pork!

Last summer we could not dispose of all our eggs. Those we did dispose of were sold below the cost of production. In Britain when I was there, the people were getting one egg a week and paying a shilling a piece for them. They were rationed to two ounces of bacon a week; we have a hundred million pounds surplus! In India, a little over a year ago, a million people faced starvation while we have 900,000,000 bushels of wheat in storage and almost every farmer in the country has his bins full.

Mr. Speaker, surely in the name of humanity it is not beyond the wit and ingenuity of the human race to find some way by which the great surpluses of food in one country can find its way into the stomachs of the hungry people of another country. I say, Mr. Speaker, that if we can find the answer to this problem, if we can find a means by which goods and services can freely move from one country to another, irrespective of trade barriers and of financial and currency restrictions, we shall do more

to lay the basis of world peace than anything that has been done in the last hundred years. Clausewitz once said that war was simply the extension of politics. Whether he was right or not, there is no doubt about this – trade policies are always the forerunners of either peace or war! Nations do not go to war just because they do not like each other's looks. Nations go to war because they are driven to war by hunger and frustration and because they can find no other way to take care of the needs of their people.

The tragedy of our time, Mr. Speaker, is that we have failed to recognize that we are living through a period of world revolution in which the great millions of Asia, Africa and the coloured people of the world are rising to protest against poverty and hunger; they are in protest against landlordism and usury and, above all, in protest against the exploitation by the white man and the domination of the white nations.

Mr. Speaker, many people blame this disturbance on Communism. Communism is not a cause; Communism is an effect. If we could take the Soviet Union and Communism out of the world tomorrow we would not have solved the problems of the hungry millions of China and India and Africa. The Communists have been shrewd enough to ride the crest of this great world revolution and to ally themselves with the forces for national aspiration and economic emancipation – often times in order to divert it for their own sinister ends.

The British, I think, made a contribution when they tried to divert these forces for change toward social democracy. I think the finest thing Britain ever did was when she stepped out of India, Pakistan, Ceylon and Burma and handed back, without the shedding of a drop of blood, the governments of those peoples into their own hands.

Unfortunately, however, our friends in the United States sometimes tend to see only black and white. (I have great affection for the American people. I have studied amongst them, lived amongst them and visited them.) But their leaders are in danger of thinking that in order to stop Communism, they must ally themselves with every reactionary and every dictator from Franco to Chiang-Kai-Shek.

Our position has always been perfectly clear. The C.C.F. before this war, during it and since it, have supported the principle of collective security. We believe the only hope of building a world community is through a world government – a world police force – a world court of justice. We think there are two things about which this country should be warned in these troubled days. The first is we think the Canadian Government ought to make it very clear that any unilateral action taken by the United States, without consultation with the other members of the United Nations, with reference either to the use of the atomic bomb in Korea or with reference to a blockade or an attack upon the mainland of China, can only produce a prolonged and costly war that will settle nothing.

We feel the time has come for Canada to speak out through its very capable and brilliant Secretary for External Affairs, Mr. Pearson, and say to the world that if the United States or any other country, unilaterally, without consultation, at the instigation of the China lobby or any trigger-happy general in the Pentagon, decides to use either the atomic bomb or to launch an attack on the mainland of China, Canada will give no support whatsoever to any such an undertaking or to any war that may result therefrom.

I think the other thing which needs to be said, and be said again and again, is that while we support collective security, and while we have supported N.A.T.O., the building up of armaments by itself is the negative aspect of peace. They are the restrictive measures for peace; they are not the positive. What are we doing about the positive? I cannot do better than to quote Dr. Hugh L. Keenleyside, former Canadian Minister to Mexico, former Deputy Minister of Mines and Resources and now the head of the United Nations Technical Assistance Administration. This is what he said to the Canadian Federation of Agriculture as reported in the Western Producer, February 5, last:

“It seems to me to be unreasonable to devote \$100 to direct military defense for every one dollar we give to the saving of the underdeveloped nations of the world.”

Mr. Speaker, bombs and guns and tanks may help to restrain aggression. It is still true, however, that “the meek shall inherit the earth.” “Not by might, not by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord” is still a great truth. It is still true that goodwill and co-operation will do more than force. It is still true that every dollar we spend to feed the hungry, every dollar we spend to give technical assistance and machinery to raise the standard of living of the underprivileged people of the world, every step we take to remove trade restrictions to enable the people of the world to exchange their goods and services, does a hundred times more for peace than all the armaments we can build in the next half century.

We are proud of the fact that Canada has become a great nation among the nations of the world. We often boast of our leading position in the councils of the world. But, Mr. Speaker, great opportunity brings great responsibility and Canada never had a greater responsibility than she has today. She never had a better chance to speak out. It is just possible that her voice, speaking at the right time, might help to keep the world from drifting down the road toward chaos, tears and bloodshed, which will inevitably follow in the wake of a third world war.

The Opposition has moved an amendment which:

“regrets that Your Honour’s present advisers have as their ultimate objective the socialization of our economy as laid down in the Regina Manifesto.”

Mr. Speaker, I do not know any amendment upon which I would rather vote than that. I know of no time when I would rather declare my faith in the principle of building a co-operative commonwealth, in which public enterprise, co-operative enterprise and private enterprise will work together for the development of our resources in the interests of all the people.

It is twenty years ago this year since the Regina Manifesto was first drawn up. I am more convinced than I was then that it is the only hope of bringing lasting peace in the world. As long as we maintain an economic society founded on greed and selfishness and on brute force, just so long can we expect to have class warfare within the nation and civil war on a world scale between nations. The only hope, Mr. Speaker, is that we shall try to build a new kind of world society. The old competitive society has failed. It has brought us nothing but depressions at home and wars abroad.

February 18, 1953

The hope in a society based on co-operative living. That is the hope of tomorrow. When our friends ask us to stand up and vote against this amendment and thereby declare our faith in the Regina Manifesto I, for one, shall stand up very proudly and gladly because, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced now, more than ever before, that in the building of a co-operative commonwealth there lies for us and for our children, and for their children, the best hope of living prosperously in a world at peace.

Following is copy of letter referred to on page 6:

REGINA, February 10, 1951.

The Rt. Hon. Jas. G. Gardiner,
Minister of Agriculture,
House of Commons,
OTTAWA, Ontario.

Dear Mr. Gardiner:

This will confirm the conversations which took place between you and the members of the Saskatchewan Government on Friday afternoon, February 2

.
Our understanding is that the Federal Government is prepared to accept full responsibility for the construction of a dam, the estimated cost of which is to be in the neighbourhood of \$68,000,000. It was further suggested that the distribution system at an estimated cost of \$19,000,000 and the cost of levelling the land for irrigation, which is estimated at \$6,000,000 were to be the responsibility of the Provincial Government and the water users who will benefit by this project. It was also suggested that the installations for the generation of hydroelectric power at an estimated cost of \$8,000,000 were to be the exclusive responsibility of the Provincial Government. While this is not the allocation of costs which was suggested when this project was first proposed, if this is the only basis on which the Federal Government is prepared to proceed with the project, I do not see that we have any alternative than to base our discussions on the allocation which you outlined to us.

My colleagues and I are most anxious that the South Saskatchewan River Development Project shall be proceeded with at the earliest possible date. As soon as the Federal Government has announced its intention to proceed with this undertaking we are prepared to negotiate and sign an agreement on the basis of the allocation of costs outlined above. You were good enough to suggest that this allocation of costs was not to be considered as final but merely the basis for future negotiations. It is understood that if any more favourable terms are given any other province, e.g., the St. Mary's Project in Alberta, Saskatchewan will receive similar treatment.

May I say how pleased we were to have the opportunity of discussing this matter with you and may I express the hope that in view of the agreement contained in this letter, it will be possible to proceed with the construction of the South Saskatchewan River Development Project sometime during the present year.

Yours sincerely,
"T.C. Douglas"

Following is copy of letter referred to on page 7:

REGINA, January 23

, 1953.

Via Airmail

The Rt. Hon. L.S. St. Laurent, Q.C.,
Prime Minister of Canada,
OTTAWA,
Ontario.

My dear Prime Minister:

Mr. J.W. Pickersgill has kindly informed me that he is forwarding three copies of the Report of the Royal Commission on the South Saskatchewan River Project, for which I wish to thank you. While the copies of the report have not yet arrived, the recommendations of the Royal Commission appeared in full in the local press two hours after the report was tabled in the House of Commons.

The Government of Saskatchewan desires to express its disappointment at the approach taken by the Royal Commission and its disagreement with its findings and recommendations. We would like the privilege in the near future of submitting to you and your colleagues a fairly detailed brief, pointing out what in our opinion are inaccuracies in the report and the reasons why we think the Federal Government ought to ignore the recommendations of the Royal Commission and proceed with the construction of the South Saskatchewan River Project.

A press report under an Ottawa dateline appeared in the Regina Leader-Post of Thursday, January 22

. In this article the writer, Mr. V.J. Mackie, speculates as to whether or not the Federal Government will ignore the recommendations of the Royal Commission and whether it will proceed with the project. Mr. Mackie concludes his article with the following paragraph:

“Whether the Saskatchewan Government will be prepared to give a hard and fast commitment to carry out its share of the scheme in the light of the Royal Commission’s report remains to be seen. Certainly the Federal Cabinet would never agree to proceed with the construction of the dam unless there was an agreement with Saskatchewan that it would be prepared to spend the funds required to implement its part of the project.”

In order that there may be no misunderstanding on anyone’s part, may I refer you to my letter to the Rt. Hon. J.G. Gardiner of February 10

, 1951, copy of which I am enclosing. At that time the Saskatchewan Government expressed its faith in the soundness of the South Saskatchewan River project and declared its willingness to meet its share of the cost. Nothing in the findings of the Royal Commission has altered our opinion in this regard. When the Federal Government is prepared to proceed with the South Saskatchewan River Project, the Saskatchewan Government stands ready to enter into an agreement committing itself to pay its share of the

cost.

In the meantime we are preparing our brief setting forth our objections to the findings of the Royal Commission and the reasons why we think the Federal Government should proceed with the South Saskatchewan River Project. Trusting that you and your colleagues will give our submission careful consideration and that it is clearly understood between us that the Royal Commission's report has in no way altered the Saskatchewan Government's attitude with respect to the South Saskatchewan River Project nor our willingness to accept our financial responsibilities on its behalf, I remain,

Sincerely yours,
"T.C. Douglas"

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honour to be associated with the Premier of this province and with the organization which represents this Government. I am also very pleased to associate myself with the previous speakers who are supporting the motion to the Throne Speech and I must congratulate them, as well as the Leader of the Opposition, for the excellent speeches which have been made, preceding me.

Once again I believe that the Government has indicated in the Speech from the Throne to the citizens of this province and to this Assembly, the well-planned and expansive programmes that it has in mind and which, within its limits, it is able to give to the people of this province. Such a positive programme indicates, Mr. Speaker, continued progress in the province of Saskatchewan and the establishment of social democracy as pointed out by the Premier. Positive, too, is the fact that such progress is being obtained by democratic processes. It is fitting also that much of this advance and progress should come about in the days of our beloved sovereign, Queen Elizabeth II, who is to be crowned shortly, and I believe that this progress will be recorded in the books of our country in the same way as has been the progress of the British people under the first Elizabeth.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we are living through what I would call a humanizing revolution. Society, if we look back into history through the past, has always tried to reach higher levels. We have passed through the days of slavery, feudalism, capitalism, and lately we are passing through what we call monopoly imperialism. I think there is only one course through which we can reach a higher level and that is by social democracy. We are, today, in a transition period and we are striving to reach for greater freedoms, greater justice and understanding between peoples and mankind the world over. From this development there appears to be growing a greater understanding of dependence and interdependence, both within a nation and as between nations. There is also, with this understanding, a demand for acknowledgement of human rights and human privileges and justice as contained in the Atlantic Charter. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the world today frowns on the settlement of disputes and misunderstandings by use of force. I fully agree with the Premier of this province that the only way to bring about peace and understanding is by the co-operation of people and the working together of nations throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, the return of this C.C.F. Government, I think, clearly indicates to everyone that this Government has the full confidence of the citizens of this province. It was pointed out, I think by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday, that we in the C.C.F. were not elected on our programme. I think that the Premier has made it quite clear that we have been elected on the programme which we presented to our people. I think that actually the hon. Leader of the Opposition was rationalizing and making excuses for himself, because I do not think that he and the members who associate with him clearly realize the reason why they lost the election. Mr. Speaker, I think if the hon. Leader of the Opposition had looked at the Prince Albert 'Daily Herald' only yesterday, he would probably have seen the reason why C.C.F. people have been re-elected to the government. We have men, for example, such as Mr. Gray who has devoted his whole time to the work of this Party. Mr. Gray is quite willing, although he is a great loss to this Government, to give up his job and get out and work for the people. Money is no consideration. And those are the kind of people, Mr. Speaker, that we have working for this movement – people who are willing to sacrifice their time, their jobs and stay away from home when necessary, to try and build the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that any government, if it is to continue in office, if it is to serve the people, must have the confidence of the people. Keeping faith with the people is, I believe, the price of survival. Certainly I do not think that any movement can well survive without it. Neither can we discount in slightest measure what is known as public opinion. Today Saskatchewan public opinion, I believe, which emanates from the farmers and the working people, the business men and the professions, has made an indictment against monopolistic imperialism, and it has been noted in this Chamber the increase of the people who represent that public opinion. I trust that our good friends in the Opposition will take cognizance of these facts, and make a full and careful introspection of themselves. I hope to see the time, Mr. Speaker, if they realize the truth of their position (I believe that they represent communities of the same nature as we do) that they will join forces with us and work together to try to achieve more progress, more prosperity for this province of Saskatchewan. I say these things, Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity, because I believe that we shall have to work together if we are to get ahead in this country.

I feel it is necessary to repeat my congratulations to Her Majesty's advisers for the beneficial and constructive programmes which have been submitted. As I said before, there are limitations as to what a provincial government is able to do, because of financial handicaps. I expect that this House will make very strong representatives to the Federal Government so that we may proceed with public works development and providing necessary services. I was surprised, yesterday, when the Leader of the Opposition charged that this Government has not done for education as much as it could have done. I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that whether back in the 'thirties, or five years ago, or now, the governments – and I will give credit to the Opposition – have been doing for education what they possibly could do within the limitations of provincial revenue. But I do say that in the world today, education is being recognized as a Federal responsibility – the responsibility of a nation. Although we have made representations to Ottawa from time to time through various Associations to obtain Federal aid for education of the children of this country, the Government at Ottawa has always hidden behind the provisions of the B.N.A. Act.

I notice that some exception has been taken to the methods that we believe in for obtaining of revenues and so forth, for example such ideology as nationalization of the banks and certain industries, and I would just like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that there is where we can get revenue if we can't get it anywhere else. Now, it is true that the Federal Government has surpluses and could provide out of those surpluses grants for education; but if they could not, had they nationalized the banks of Canada there would be probably a hundred million dollars for the people of Canada for that purpose. I have before me a statement of the Royal Bank of Canada. In that statement it is pointed out that last year, 1952, the gross profit was \$14,743,446.93. For the privilege of doing the bookkeeping for many people of this country, that is what the Royal Bank of Canada earned in profit. Now, true, it paid in income taxes to the Dominion \$6,325,000, and there were deductions for depreciation of bank premises of \$1,291,000. The fact nevertheless remains that a few shareholders of this country – not the general people but a few shareholders – have made themselves for that small service a profit in a net sum of \$7,129,000 and odd cents. Now, Mr. Speaker, when you multiply that by 10 (I don't know whether this is the largest bank in Canada or not); but if you multiply it by 10, this makes a substantial sum of millions of dollars which could go, instead of into the pockets of a few people who don't need that money, to aid the provinces of Canada for education.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Cumberland constituency have entrusted their affairs to me, and I am going to endeavour to the best of my ability to make their requests, their grievances and opinions known to this House. If I am to perform my duty well, then I am not going to spare anyone, either on this side of the House nor on the other side of the House, because I believe that when the rights, the freedoms and privileges of people are in question, then it is the duty of the representative to make it known to the government. I, of course, feel some modest pride in representing Cumberland constituency. There are a number of reasons for that. This constituency, as is probably well known to most of the members here, derives its name from the settlement of Cumberland which, I believe, was established by Samuel Hearne in 1774 on an island of the Saskatchewan River. The reason for the establishment of this settlement was the fact that the peddlers from Montreal at that time, as they do now, were exploiting the people of the west. There were other reasons why it was established. Some of these were that the hinterland to the settlement was wealthy in furs, forest, good land and a complete waterway by which one could travel by canoe in different directions to obtain game and fur. In the early days of this century mineral wealth was discovered at Flin Flon which, since 1930, has developed, I believe, into one of the largest mines in Canada. With time other developments came about, and I believe that now there is a development at Birch Lake which is a potential mine. I believe that with great concentration of activity more mineral wealth will be discovered in that particular region, and if we are to have development in this part of Saskatchewan then this Government must give some consideration to the construction of main arteries or roads into that area.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this construction are equal to any anywhere in this country, or for that matter, on this continent. They are a very thrifty, hard-working people, and I think have considerable vision. They are representative of the best pioneers in Canada and they originated in many countries: Some from Britain, some from eastern Canada, some from the Ukraine, Poland, Germany, Hungary and other countries, the Scandinavian countries, for example; yet they all work for a common interest.

I am proud of them all, whether they are trappers, white or native, farmers, or workers in the mines. I am proud of them, because I have lived with them for so many years, and I have seen them hew out the trees, clear and break up primeval forests; I have seen them raise fine cattle, and I have seen them apply themselves to industry. As I go through my constituency I can hear the echoes of the axes in the forests, the hum of tractors and trucks. I see these people bring an abundance of forest products into the city of Prince Albert and into the market points in my constituency. I also see an abundance of furs being shipped out to the Saskatchewan Marketing Service and, of course, to private dealers. Every day regular shifts of men enter the bowels of the earth underneath Creighton village where they obtain the ore of copper, zinc and other associated metals. In my constituency also, Mr. Speaker, you will find all across the north hundreds of lakes, some of them accessible by car, and these call to the farmers and tired businessmen and anyone who has an opportunity to vacation to come and enjoy himself on the warm sands or in sport during summer.

There is a wealth of human and natural resources in Cumberland constituency, and these resources must be conserved, I submit, and developed for the national welfare. Therefore I urge this Government that if possible and I hope with Federal aid that it can accelerate development by bringing about land reclamation, road construction and to fruition the possibilities of this section of Saskatchewan. I think it also proper, Mr. Speaker, that I should enumerate at least some of the achievements as to programmes and projects initiated by this Government, by past C.C.F. Governments, and mention the resulting progress as seen from the point of view of a northern representative. I hope that what I have to say will not be construed – that is the praise I will give will not be construed to party affiliation, because I also intend, where I feel the government has failed or has been too cautious, to give constructive criticism, and I hope it is not considered by my colleagues here as paradoxical, but I trust that my remarks will be received in the same spirit as they are given. I have one other reason in taking this stand and it is due to the fact that the members on the other side of the House have received very little confidence from the people of Saskatchewan, and I feel it is the responsibility of members on this side of the House to give constructive criticism and advisement to the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is my duty to go on record within the time in which I am privileged to speak, to present my people's unprejudiced opinion as to whether this Government is implementing the policies, legislation, and performing at the highest level those commitments which it was elected to do. First of all I wish to commend the Government for its conscientious consideration of the welfare and security of the people of Saskatchewan and, of course, the people of my constituency. The Saskatchewan Hospitalization Plan, aid to education, old-age security, widows' allowances, car insurance, protection of the rights of labour and, just as important, conservation of natural resources, are all valuable and important. This legislation and related programmes are highly gratifying to the constituents of Cumberland and are appreciated in the same way as is the case throughout the rest of the province of Saskatchewan. I do not intend to dwell on the details of these because some speakers have already mentioned details and more will be said in the future by others.

I am also pleased to congratulate the Government on specific programmes and projects which particularly affect my people in their way of

life. We are pleased with the forestry Road projects carried on by the Department of Natural Resources. The planned network of forest roads is, I believe, paramount in importance to the northern settlers. These are invaluable in forest protection and providing access into previously inaccessible areas for the obtaining of timber. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that these northern roads built up to the present standards will do more to bring the pulp industry into Saskatchewan than any other encouragement to the industry we may offer.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear, Hear! It should have been done years ago.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, I believe that what we have done in developing northern roads will not only bring in time a pulp mill, but it will bring in other forest industries which will accrue to the benefit of the people of the north as well as my constituency.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear, Hear! No hope from the present Government, though.

Mr. Berezowsky: — I remember quite well what the Liberal Government did many years ago. They did nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to members on the opposite side that all this progress in the north — that is, the road construction, the Saskatchewan Timber Board, the utilization, the inventories made and so forth — were made following the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Forestry, and I must commend this Government that, when they got this report, they got down to work and implemented those programmes, and this certainly cannot be said about the previous Liberal Governments of this province.

The forest industry, I believe, Mr. Speaker, is about third in importance in the province of Saskatchewan, and again I must commend the Government for its conservation policies and particularly the educational policies that have been brought about in the last two or three years. We have (it is not generally known) what we call a Conservation Education programme, and I believe that the programme and programmes of that nature are doing more to bring about the conservation of our natural resources than any other programme that we have planned. I believe that field officers, say, or conservation officers, by going into the schools, by meeting with the children, by attending meetings and discussing the value of the natural resources of this province with the people of our province, bring about in them a realization of the value of these resources and also bring about their co-operation to protect same. I would like to say that, in my district which is very close to Prince Albert, since that programme was initiated we have had next to no fires and although I recognize the value of the Forestry Branch in providing fire-fighters and using every means at their disposal to protect and save the forest wealth and, of course, the wild life within the forest yet I am quite sure, and I want to bring this to the House, the educational programme has done as much as the protective action.

While I am discussing conservation education, I would like to mention something also about the Provincial Museum. I have very rarely heard any mention of it in this House, but it has been invaluable to Conservation Education. We have had every co-operation in the north from the

Regina Provincial Museum in obtaining specimens, and it has been invaluable to the progress of the effort. As a matter of fact, I have met visitors from south of the border who have come to the north and who stopped in at the museum, and they remarked very favourably about it. I feel that this Government should probably give some consideration for better housing of the museum. If that is not possible, or a suitable spot cannot be found in Regina, I would suggest to the Government that maybe it could be taken and established in Prince Albert. Certainly we would have no objection to that.

Mr. Tucker: — Lockie did not put you up to that, did he?

Mr. Berezowsky: — No, he did not. I want to discuss something, Mr. Speaker, that is very close to my trappers and that is the fur conservation programme that we have. We have been criticized for a number of years for considering the welfare of the inhabitants of the north, and I am referring particularly to the fact that this Government and C.C.F. Governments have brought about, through the various conservation programmes, more wealth into the hands, or more money representing wealth into the hands, of the northern people, be they Indians or whites.

Particularly there has been considerable criticism of the fur Marketing Service in the past. Now, I have made it my business to attend, during the last three years, the Trappers' Convention in the city of Prince Albert and these trappers represent the different conservation blocks throughout the north (they are delegates there) and this year, the same as last year, the question of orderly marketing was presented to them for their consideration. I was rather amused when the member for Athabasca (Mr. Ripley) tried to make a very good case against orderly marketing. I do not know why he did it unless he had a number of friends in the north who would like again to be able to obtain fur next to cost; but anyway he did put up a pretty good case on their behalf. I was also glad, on the other hand, that the Minister of Natural Resources was at that meeting and explained very clearly to the delegates that, if it was their wish now that they knew the value of the marketing service and knew the value of fur conservation blocks in the area, if it was their wish to have the furs sold on an open market (and I am referring to the peltries of beaver and muskrat) then certainly, he said, that he would bring it to this Government, and being a democratic government their wishes would be given every possible favourable consideration. Well, I do not think the trappers failed to realize the value of the Fur Marketing Service, and again this year as in the past year, as a matter of fact by an overwhelming majority of 34 to 14, they gave approval to the Fur Marketing Service as far as muskrat and beaver are concerned. I am very pleased at the decision because it will mean considerably more money to the trappers of the north than would otherwise be the case.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I have some figures that I compiled some time back, and I think I should present them to this House to show just what it has meant in the past. Now, in dollars and cents, back in 1945 one of the members of the staff of the Department of Natural Resources made a check, and he found out that the income of the fur trappers in the north at that time (1945) was anywhere from \$200 to \$500 a year. Now I believe this was the time that we brought in, in co-operation with the Federal Government, the fur conservation programme. Later the same man checked these settlements — I could give you the settlements. They are Deschambault, Stanley and Lac La Ronge. He found that at Deschambault,

for example, the average income for the year was over \$700 for each family, and in Stanley settlement the average was over \$1,000. In Lac la Ronge, of 71 families that were checked, \$2,353 was the average per family. Now, I think this indicates remarkable progress and I think that what this Government did in bringing about fur conservation and the marketing service positively effected this particular increase in income for the people of the north.

Again, we can look at other figures, and these will indicate to the House just what happened. You may have had some of these figures before, but when the programme was first initiated in 1944, all the beaver that were trapped in that year were 473 beaver. I don't think anybody would deny the fact that with 473 beaver there would not be very much income to the trappers. The muskrats were not so bad. There were 114,481 muskrats trapped in that year. Then we come to the year 1951, when we find, instead of 473 beaver, that there were 14,071 beaver trapped and instead of 114,000 muskrats there were 302,177 muskrats. This increase helped to bring about a higher standard of living for the people of the north. And I would not represent them well if I did not support that kind of a programme. But, as I said before, notwithstanding the attempts made to get them to repudiate orderly marketing (the same as the marketing through the wheat pools), they nevertheless could see the value to themselves and went on record at this last convention, 34 to 14, to support in full the Fur Marketing Service. And I might state for the benefit of this House and particularly for the member for Athabasca, that I was approached by a few trappers' delegates there, and they indicated to me that they were considering bringing in a resolution to get all furs marketed through the Saskatchewan Fur Marketing Service in future years.

As I pointed out, Mr. Speaker, I believe I am the only one that can boast of a hardrock mine and it is, of course, the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company mine at Flin Flon. As soon as I think of mining I must think, Mr. Speaker, of the progress that has been made in the mining development throughout Saskatchewan. I am quite pleased with the success of the hardrock development there and, as I said, part of it lies in my constituency. I do hope that this Government will continue the prospector's assistance plan. As a matter of fact, I would like to see it expanded, and I would go further than that. I would suggest to this Government that we go into the prospecting business, and if anyone feels that this would be a precedent I would refer him to the fact that in the north, today, the Dominion Government has prospectors working for them under the Crown corporation El Dorado Mining and Smelting (1944) Limited. As matter of fact, they have made, only recently I understand, further discoveries in between upper and lower Foster Lakes, and if the Dominion can see its way (and I believe that it is going to be profitable for them to put prospectors in the field and try to discover the minerals that they require), then I do not see why this province should not do likewise.

Now, I may be biased a little, Mr. Speaker, at many of the private companies, but I think I have a reason so to be, because as an individual I have watched the operation of these private mining companies for a long time, and I think that they are interested in just one thing and that is to get a hold of valuable mining property and then hold on to it just as long as it is possible for them to do so. Now such is not, I submit, in the interests of the people of this province. The only time you will see a mine producing is when there is a demand for a particular mineral or the market is profitable, otherwise they sit back and do nothing.

Then another attitude they take is to try to pay as little back to the people of the wealth as it is possible for them to do, and I am going to illustrate that today. First of all let us picture this situation in Manitoba: the Sherritt-Gordon Mine I think commenced about 1930, and the Manitoba Government I know collected very little or no royalties whatsoever. True, the people working in that mine had jobs; they blasted ore, hewed wood, carried water, but as far as the citizens of Manitoba were concerned they got nothing. Well, they did get something; they have a deep hole in the ground after the wealth has all gone. I think they are starting the same story all over again up at Lynn Lake. It is not only in Manitoba that it is that way. I was checking up in the Canada Year Book (1951) just the other day and here's what it tells – I will quote from page 500:

“In the case of Newfoundland, the provincial mining tax had been modified since Confederation on March 31, 1949, to conform with the provincial obligation under the Dominion-Provincial Tax Agreement, but no other form of taxation or royalty exists.”

There again the only tax, I presume, that is paid is the income tax to the Dominion, but as far as the people of Newfoundland are concerned they are not getting any royalties out of the mines in their province. Probably, Mr. Speaker, the most glaring example of what is being done in the mining industry is what is generally known as the Ungava “steal” in Quebec and by steal, I mean “steal”. The Hollinger interests obtained by staking or other wise from prospectors, an area of about half a billion tons of iron ore – I can give you the exact figure, of approved reserves; and an agreement was entered into with the Quebec Government by which agreement they were to pay the Government \$80,000 a year as royalties, but not to exceed in any year, no matter how large the production, the amount of \$100,000. In other words, Mr. Speaker, if the companies that are going to produce – and I think it is Little Steel of Canada – ore in that area, if they produce 20 million tons in a year all that Hollinger will pay is one-half cent per ton royalty. Now, that may not mean anything to the members of this House, but the Hollinger interests made a deal with Little Steel and they are getting, Mr. Speaker, 7 cents a ton royalty. Now, if there ever has been a betrayal of the interests of the people of a province, there you have it.

But again people will argue, this will develop the province and give people jobs – they are building a railway there for 360 miles. Sure! The people will hew wood, carry water, mine, and after so many years, what will the people of Quebec have had – the miserly payment of \$80,000 or \$100,000 a year to have a deep hole left in the ground.

In bringing these facts to your attention, Mr. Speaker, I do so because I feel that we should be proud that in this province we have considered the rights of the citizens of Saskatchewan, although I do not suggest for a minute that the royalties are high enough that we are charging. The Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company which, I believe, is the only company operating at the moment in Flin Flon pays a 5-percent royalty and it brings to the treasury of this province some-

where in the vicinity of \$1 ½ million a year – not \$80,000. I think the people of this province should take note of that. Then I am going to suggest to this Government that 5 per cent is insufficient, and I have reasons, I believe, in making this representation. I believe that, where a mining operation is profitable, we should obtain a fair share of the wealth which belongs, as we agree, to the people of this province. Just to quote some figures which I have here before me – I picked up what is known as the “Pre-Cambrian”, issued in December, 1952. I have not got the particulars for the province of Saskatchewan, but I believe it will give the information to this House that I want to put over. Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company Ltd. production, 1951, \$53 millions worth of wealth in that one mine; and if you want to know the total production since 1930 it has been \$453 millions worth of wealth. The net profit the Company made last year was \$17,710,000. The two provinces – Manitoba, I do not know what the rate is now; at one time, as I said, they did not charge anything or very little; in Saskatchewan (I think we got about \$1 ½ million, or very close to that) but in the two provinces they paid in royalties \$2,241,000. The income tax and excess profits tax was paid to the Dominion in the sum of \$9,052,000. I suggest to this House that we could easily raise the royalty from 5 to 10 per cent and obtain another million and a half dollars. It is not going to cost the company much. If we feel sorry for the company or feel that they are going to begrudge that amount they are not going to be hurt more than possibly to the extent of about a third of that, about a half a million dollars. The other million would necessarily come from the income tax which is being paid today and the reason I say that is because my electorate of Cumberland, particularly in the Flin Flon area, have been demanding for a long time and urging this Government for the completion of Highway 35 and this is one way to get the funds.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear, hear! It was promised four years ago.

Mr. Berezowsky: — At least I am glad I have some support.

Mr. Tucker: — You need it over there; that is where it will do some good.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Now, my people, Mr. Speaker, were very pleased in 1946 when the Government of the day, the C.C.F. Government by the way, commenced the construction of Highway No. 35.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — And I believe they built about 40 miles from White fox towards the northeast, and some part of it was built southward from Flin Flon. We were also very pleased at that time when some dedication was made, and we believed that that road would go through.

Hon. Member: — With some Federal aid.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Pardon? Yes, I know. Well, Mr. Speaker, we knew at that time that there had been some commitment from the Federal Government that

50 per cent of the cost would be paid.

Mr. Tucker: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Berezowsky: — My people have been very, very patient. They recognize the situation. They are supporters of this Government, and they have been urging, and they have been hoping, that in the near future it may be possible for the Federal Government, seeing elections are coming along, to find some money to give this province a grant for the partial cost of the completion of this highway. They further suggest that nevertheless we can go ahead and put another 5 per cent on the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company. It will cost the Company about half a million dollars, and the Dominion, whether they like it or not, would have to contribute the other million dollars, and that is all we need to complete the road, and it can come out of the income tax.

Mr. Tucker: — The Provincial Treasurer is listening.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, I have one or two other matters that I would like to bring to the attention of this House, and it is a matter which was mentioned by the Premier. I refer to the land reclamation up in my part of the country. I believe that part of the Carrot River Triangle, at least part of the valley, is in my constituency, and I would like to say that, as far as my people are concerned, they are quite happy, as a matter of fact very much satisfied, with the method of obtaining land under the 33-year lease agreement. They are quite satisfied that if they had to go ahead and commence farming today, they could not do it under any other plan and they certainly are in favour of our plan. They are also aware that in this area some attempt was made at reclamation sometime in the 'thirties — I do not know the exact year. And they do not like the idea or the method used then for the settlement when one man (I believe his name was a Mr. Robbins) was able to obtain 28 quarters of land for himself. That kind of plan they do not like.

Hon. Member: — He was a Liberal.

Mr. Berezowsky: — I do not suggest that he was a Liberal or that he had Liberal friends, but in any event he obtained this land somehow or other to the exclusion of many of the people of the area and of other parts of the province who probably needed it more than he did.

Mr. Tucker: — Probably lost money on it, too.

Mr. Berezowsky: — We also know as has been mentioned in the Legislature today, that considerable work has been done in that area by the C.C.F. Government. There has been the surveying and draining of considerable lands. Some of my own neighbours have been allocated parcels and are beginning to build homes. We know it is an expensive undertaking, but we believe it is well advised. I trust that this Government will, whether they get Federal grants or not, continue with the project. As a matter of fact, I was glad to read in the 'Leader-Post' the Minister of Agriculture's statement that three townships will be surveyed in the near future to the east of Avon-

February 18, 1953

dale to Kennedy Creek, and that bulldozing and draining will proceed following the survey of that part of the delta.

Now I repeat again, Mr. Speaker, and suggest to this Government that a few Million dollars spent there will be worthwhile. We will be settling a number of people; maybe a thousand people. I don't know what the area will contain, but I believe there is about half a million across, and we will be settling quite a number of people in there who will be able to establish homes and make a living, and it is an area that definitely has possibilities.

I have a number of matters but, Mr. Speaker, if I may be forgiven, I am not in the mood to speak today. I have a very bad cold and am having some difficulty so I hope I will have another opportunity another time.

I do wish to bring to the attention of this House, a matter which I think is very important. I refer to the rights of our native Indians in the north. I have had quite a number of representations from northern settlements urging that we do something to encourage the Federal Government to emancipate them and give them full freedom. I believe these people have the same right of individual liberty as I have, and if we believe, as Thomas Jefferson believed, that "we are made in the same degree as others, yet in greater degree we are made for ourselves, that it were contrary to feeling and indeed ridiculous to suppose that a man has less right in himself than one of his neighbours or indeed all of them put together. This would be slavery and not that Liberty which the Bill of Rights has made invaluable and for the preservation of which our Government has been charged."

And again Jefferson said: "These are rights which it is useless to surrender. These are rights of thinking and publishing the thoughts by speaking or writing. The right of personal freedom," and I stress personal freedom.

Now if we accept this concept of a great man who believed that all men were created equal, then I believe it is time that we do something to see that our native brothers, who are men such as we are, should have the same rights, the same liberties and freedom as we have, even to the extent of entering beer parlours. I say, Mr. Speaker, that to the extent that we fail our fellowman, to that extent we fail ourselves, and I therefore urge upon the Government that we do whatever is possible to help our Indian brothers in the north.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I must congratulate the C.C.F. Government for the establishment of a few trading stores in the north. I could spend considerable time pointing out the value and the work that has been done, and what it has meant for the natives of the north – maybe I should.

Only three years ago, up at Stanley, before we had a Government Trading Store, I wanted a gallon of gasoline and it cost me \$1.25. Since the Government Trading Store came in it is 75 – there is a 50¢ savings. Now this is just an illustration of what has happened all along the line. The Government Trading Stores have meant considerable to the people there who are trying to make a living and when you listen to speakers here,

in this great city of Regina, mentioning housing and mentioning a better standard of living, I would like the members in this Legislative Assembly to go up into the north and see how the native Indian lives. Not only that, I would like to see the missionaries do a little work among our native Indians, and see that they are brought up to a better standard.

The Government Trading Stores have done a great deal in bringing to the people more food and more clothing, because of the cheaper cost. I find that the prices charged are very similar, in most of the areas where you find these stores, to what they are in the cities of this province, I don't know whether I should say this, but there is some thought now, by many of the people in those northern communities, to take over if at all possible and operate these stores as a co-operative stores, and this probably will be the next step.

Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:25 o'clock p.m.