

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**First Session — Twelfth Legislature**  
**6th Day**

**Thursday, February 19, 1953.**

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

**DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY**

The House resumed, from Wednesday, February 18, 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. I.C. Nollet** (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join at once with the preceding speakers in offering my congratulations to the gracious lady to my immediate right, the honourable lady member for the city of Regina, for the most excellent contribution she gave in moving that an humble address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor. I am certain that all who heard the lady member's recommendation that more women should be elected to the legislatures and parliament of Canada will agree with her that, if we can elect personages of her outstanding qualities, it will certainly be to the good.

I wish, also to extend my congratulations to the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. C.G. Willis) who, despite the fact that this was his 'maiden' speech, gave an excellently prepared address and an address crammed full of down-to-earth material to bolster his ideas on promoting the general well being of Saskatchewan.

I can well appreciate the reasons why the hon. Leader of the Opposition found it necessary to go far beyond the borders of Saskatchewan for political consolation. Distant fields, under present political circumstances, certainly must look much greener to him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan, as a result of nature's bounty, from the past two years has harvested crops that were equal to the average crop for a five-year period. Last year was a particularly ideal year when the largest cereal grain crop in Saskatchewan's agricultural history was harvested; 1952 will be a year talked about for a good many years to come by both farmers and businessmen in Saskatchewan, because, in 1952, we harvested 435 million bushels of wheat, with an average yield of 26.5 bushels per acre, the largest in our history. We should, however, not be lulled into a false sense of security because of nature's unusual bounty. We must remember that the long-term average yield will, in the final analysis, prevail. We should not forget either that, in 1937, our wheat yield then amounted to a paltry 36 million bushels, with an average per acre yield of 2 ½ bushels per acre. We should remind ourselves that our long-term average for the province is 163 million bushels of wheat and that our average acreage yield is 15 bushel over a long-term period of years.

**February 19, 1953**

It is most fortunate indeed, that the total value of the cereal grain crops for 1952 will amount to approximately \$929 million. The great value of this crop will be because it will cushion the blow of disastrous price declines for livestock, dairy and poultry products. The value of the 1952 field crop production will also afford a temporary respite against the tremendously increased farm production costs that have occurred over the past few years. We should not forget that the net income of our farmers becomes less and less with every decrease in price for farm products and that, conversely, every increase in price for the many commodities and services that the farmers require results in a decrease in his net income.

It should be remembered that agriculture operates, today, in a different environment than it did even 10 years ago. It is well for us to remember that agriculture now is completely mechanized. We should remember, too, that farmers, today, quite rightly demand better rural living conditions and demand better rural services: rural electrification, better roads, better educational facilities and better health services. It goes without saying that with all of those increased services it will mean, in the final analysis, that the farmer must have an increased income in order to sustain those services and to raise his general standard of living.

In this regard quite a few have made reference to the fact that grain prices have been good. Our grain prices have been stable; we have not had the same disastrous breaks in our cereal grain prices as we did at the end of World War 1. After many years of effort the organized farm movement was able to convince the government at Ottawa that we should have a Wheat Board to handle our wheat, and later, our coarse grain crops. It is well for us to remember, too, that when the Conservative Government was in power at Ottawa and introduced the Wheat Board legislation under an existing national emergency, when we had so much crop we didn't know what to do with it, when prices were ruinously low, it was the Liberal opposition, Mr. Speaker, at that time, that opposed a hundred per cent Wheat Board marketing agency; and, subsequently, it was the Liberal Government, when they came to power, who took out of the Wheat Board Act that section permitting the marketing of coarse gains under the Wheat Board.

We are fortunate that we have a Wheat Board at this time, and I wish to point out that, where the price is set to the farmer, it is also necessary to control the price of the things which the farmer must buy, or, in the final analysis, that set price cannot mean very much. It is well for us now to remind ourselves that we can go back to 1917 and 1918, Mr. Speaker, and find higher prices for wheat and other grains than we have today, despite all of the increased demand for rural services that I referred to, a moment ago.

So our wheat prices are not exceptionally high today, in relationship to the farmer's purchasing dollar. The farmer's purchasing dollar was of far greater value in 1917 and 1918 and 1919 than it is at the present time. Just to remind you of the prices prevailing at that time, I might suggest to the hon. members that they can refer to the Statistics Division report in the Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture, and you will find that, in 1917, the price of wheat was

\$1.95 per bushel; in 1918, it was \$1.99; and in 1919, the price was \$2.32 per bushel. The point I want to make at this time is that farmers are entitled to even better prices than they are receiving at the present time, not only for their grain, which is much more favourable than other farm commodities, but more particularly for other farm commodities.

I should like to remind the House too, Mr. Speaker, that the C.C.F. in this province found its origin in the struggles of Saskatchewan farmers for economic and social justice. That fact cannot be blinked aside. I can recall my early days in the farm movement in this province, when we repeatedly went to the governments, whether they were Conservative or whether they were Liberal governments, asking for redress so that many economic handicaps under which western agriculture laboured in those days could be remedied. We were received, but the promises made were never fulfilled and, as a result of that situation, the farmers finally determined, in desperation, to form their own political organization – and that political organization, Mr. Speaker, was the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation. The reason it was a Co-operative Commonwealth Federation was because the farmers realized that they had a common interest with labour, that they had a common interest with the professional groups and other such sections of society. In other words, if the interests of agriculture were to be advanced the interests of all of these other groups would have to be similarly advanced.

Now, in regard to cattle prices. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) left the impression, when he was speaking, that the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease was the cause of the present prices we are receiving for livestock. Mr. Speaker, that is not the case. Certainly, the foot-and-mouth disease outbreak hastened the drastic drop in prices, but when one reviews the market situation one can readily see, in early 1952 and in the latter part of 1951, an accumulation of surplus meats, both in the United States and Canada. And as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we had, prior to that time, surpluses of other meat and other farm products in Canada. We had the export market available to us for beef or live cattle in the United States, and it is well for us to remember, too, that, in 1948, cattle prices in Canada were on the decline. We cannot overlook the fact that the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico made it possible to have the American market for Canadian cattle, and we were certainly fortunate in this, and I congratulate the Federal Minister of Agriculture in making that market available to the Canadian cattlemen.

For at least two years, we enjoyed very good prices for cattle. As a matter of fact we could say that the prices were excessively high. Farmers have never been interested in excessively high prices and they, similarly, have resisted excessively low prices. The principal concern of the farmer is in respect to the drastic fluctuation in prices, Mr. Speaker. The farmer has always declared that he wishes to have stable prices that bear some relationship to his cost of production. We should not overlook, neither, that when foot-and-mouth broke out in Canada, in all likelihood cattle prices would have remained relatively good for a few months, had it not broken out.

A resolution was unanimously endorsed in this Legislature asking the Government at Ottawa to maintain a floor price of just over 28 cents a pound for good steers, at Toronto. That resolution was ignored, and

**February 19, 1953**

the floor price decided on, finally, was 25 cents a pound for good steers at Toronto. I pleaded with the Federal Minister at that time not to set such a ridiculously unjustifiable low price, because it would throw the whole livestock industry into panic conditions; and that is exactly what happened, Mr. Speaker.

The situation was aggravated because the Federal Government refused to assume its responsibility to take full control over the marketing and pricing of livestock during that emergency period. So we had the additional confusion created by provincial embargoes in that situation. We may have been satisfied had the 25 cents per pound, good steers, Toronto, floor price been maintained, but, Mr. Speaker, that floor price was not maintained at all; and similarly, despite the fact that the price of beef went down very drastically, the price of meat to the consumer, for the biggest part of 1952, remained high and in some instances actually higher than in 1951.

The cattleman lost, as a result of floor prices being placed at that level, an estimated \$30 million in the province of Saskatchewan. This is based on our average yearly marketing over the past couple of years. I should mention that, in relation to prices to consumers, when beef fell by 36 per cent in May 1952, compared to May 1951, the retail price to the consumer only dropped by 15 per cent, and in the Regina area in May 1952 as compared to 1951, the retail price of beef was actually higher than it was in 1951. One wonders who made the in-between profits.

The most surpluses, Mr. Speaker, were not something that occurred as a result of foot-and-mouth disease, but these surpluses existed for everything but beef, before the foot-and-mouth outbreak in Saskatchewan. This was due entirely because Canada's export markets were not maintained by the Government at Ottawa. As the export of our meat products declined in the markets of the world, particularly to Great Britain, and as prices declined for livestock, the number of livestock produced in Saskatchewan declined correspondingly.

I would like to quote to the House figures again taken from the Statistics Division in the Annual Report of the Saskatchewan Department of Agriculture, and I think it would interest members to know that we had as many cattle, as many milk cows, in Saskatchewan in 1917 as we have at the present time. We had as many total livestock, both dairy cattle and beef cattle, in 1921 as we did in 1951, despite the fact that about 600,000 horses have disappeared from the prairies of Saskatchewan. The difference was not made up in increased livestock numbers.

It is interesting to note, too, Mr. Speaker, that we had nearly 2 million head of cattle in Saskatchewan during the more favourable years when we had a good balanced production programme in 1943 and 1944. At the present time we have 1¼ million cattle left in Saskatchewan. We had 1,754,000 hogs in Saskatchewan in 1944; in our low year, 1948, we had only 396,000 hogs, and at the present time we have in the neighbourhood of 400,000 hogs, and that number will go down very drastically because of the fact that the floor price on hogs was again reduced by \$3 a hundredweight on January 1, 1952.

Mr. Speaker, the decreased production that took place made it possible for Mr. Gardiner to get up at our Production Conference and blandly state to us that we Canadians could consume pretty well all of our meat products; but with the denial of the beef market in the United States, we have had some accumulation of meat surpluses in Canada, and Mr. Gardiner tried to make good that statement by endeavouring to dump back on the Canadian market again, surplus pork products at a loss, and at a subsidized price to the consumer. By that action, Mr. Gardiner thereby put more pressure on the already low price of hogs which was \$26 a hundredweight at the time and, later on, he achieved the desired result of forcing the floor price down and then reduced that floor price by another \$3 a hundredweight. There was no justification whatever, Mr. Speaker, for that action.

Canadian purchasing power and Canadian employment is at the highest level in Canadian history and still...

**Mr. Loptsom** (Saltcoats): — I would like to ask the hon. gentleman...

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — If the hon. gentleman wishes to ask any questions, he can wait until I am finished with my address. I intend to take the short amount of airtime that is available to me, and he will have full opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to make reply and to answer any of these matters on the hustings. I can assure hon. members opposite that they are not going to be disappointed. We are going to talk about Federal matters because they very seriously affect the economy of this province.

Now Mr. Gardiner ought to know that there is a limit to the amount of meat and pork that a person can consume in Canada, without trying to stuff it down our necks.

Mr. Speaker, we only have at the present time, a paltry surplus of some 53 million pounds of meat. Surely a market for that that small quantity of meat can be found. In the war years, when we had these high production records that I just spoke about, we were sending, in bacon alone, to Britain over 600 million pounds. Surely markets can be found.

I want to say something about the principle of floor prices, Mr. Speaker. The floor prices legislation was brought down in the expectation that we would have an agricultural depression. The Rt. Hon. Mr. King, then Prime Minister, stated that it would be in compensation for the fact that the farmers' prices had been kept down during the war years and he said, because of that, we have some obligation to the farmer to see to it that he had floor prices in consideration of this. But, Mr. Speaker, that recession or depression did not take place. We got into an extraordinary defence programme, and national prosperity increased by leaps and bounds, with employment at levels never before existing in the history of this country. In that situation, Mr. Speaker, we have the Federal Government at Ottawa talking about floor prices to farmers. It is positively ridiculous. Because of this situation, our farm people now, although they represent over 20 per cent of the population, get only 12 ½ per cent of the national income. That is not good enough. The principle of floor prices is all right if you want to put a minimum price on our agricultural products but, in a period of great national prosperity, it is ridiculous for any government to even talk about floor prices, to say nothing about farmers

**February 19, 1953**

being expected to accept them.

The fact, Mr. Speaker, that we have had one of the largest wheat crops, or two of the largest wheat crops, in the past two seasons, and the fact that we have had a marketing agency established to sell that grain in the export markets of the world and in the domestic market itself, certainly has demonstrated the value of the Wheat Board system of marketing.

As I said at the outset of my address, we have got stable prices at least. We have not done very much about stabilizing the price of the things the farmers buy though. We still have to do that. At any rate, this great production of grain could have been a national headache not only to the Government at Ottawa but to everyone in the country, but instead of that it is a great national blessing. What more proof do we need, Mr. Speaker, of the value of a government assuming the responsibility for pricing and marketing agricultural commodities?

It is not good enough, Mr. Speaker, that we just have a wheat Board to market our grain. We also need a similar board to market livestock, dairy and poultry products. And I want to say in this connection, that, if our Government at Ottawa will assume a similar responsibility for the marketing of other agricultural commodities, we will not have any constitutional difficulties. We will be able to expeditiously set up practical marketing schemes. But when you see a government at Ottawa abdicating its responsibilities for marketing other agricultural commodities, as it did under Bill No. 82, we can never set up practical marketing schemes for such agricultural commodities.

I, therefore, call on the Federal Government at Ottawa to call a conference of the provincial governments and farm organizations, in order that we can settle this whole matter of marketing legislation and marketing schemes. It seems to me that the Wheat Board principle of marketing offers the best and most practical way in which provincial governments and a Federal Government can co-operate in the marketing of agricultural commodities.

Whether we like it or not, Mr. Speaker, whether the Liberal Government likes it, or a Conservative Government or any other government likes it or not, governments are going to have to assume responsibility for the pricing of agricultural commodities. This can no longer be left to this vague and nebulous personality called "supply and demand" – that nebulous creature that has been the scapegoat for free-enterprise systems of marketing. When prices went down, our free-enterprise friends, who have assumed an almost God-given right to set a farmer's income, said it was because of supply and demand. Well, they know it is a hard thing for anyone to find 'supply and demand'; it is like looking for a ghost to find out where the trouble is.

But we do know, Mr. Speaker, as a result of the statistical services that have been developed by the Dominion Government over the years the general levels of prosperity, general levels of employment, and we know, too, that our agricultural industry is not getting its fair share of the national income; and if the Government does not want to control prices

of the things that the farmer purchases, they could at least adopt a formula under which agricultural prices would rise, in accord with the index of our general national prosperity and employment. That can be done, Mr. Speaker, and it can be done very handily. There are no difficulties in the way, other than the obstinacy of some people. Should this be done, Mr. Speaker, every citizen of Canada can look forward to assured stability in the economy, and assured prosperity and continued increases in standard of living, both urban and rural. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, it is a national necessity.

It means that municipal governments and, similarly, provincial governments could plan provincial and municipal services, with assurance, because I am certain that the only great economic difficulty in extending rural electrification and better services generally to rural areas, lies in the fact as to whether or not the farmer will have sufficient income to maintain those services, and I believe it is high time that we adopt such economic philosophies, if you like, Sir, plans that will give to our people the opportunity of ever-improving their own living standards and also the quality and quantity of their public services, too.

Many have expressed a fear that if we had good prices for agricultural products, we might produce too much. We should not be afraid of overproduction. The thing, Mr. Speaker, that we should be afraid of is world hunger.

We have recently received information from the Food and Agricultural Organization of the World which indicates that, despite ever-increasing world population, the world has not yet caught up to pre-war agricultural food production levels. There is a great field for expanding our total agricultural production, and I thought that, at the conclusion of World War 11, we would go all-out in producing food commodities of all kinds, in order to feed the hungry people of the world. This has not been done, and in that lies my chief criticism of our Government in Ottawa for not making these markets available, and for not bringing influence to bear in the councils of the United Nations. More emphasis should have been placed on food as an instrument, not only a humanitarian instrument, of assisting people in the hungry parts of the world, but also as a means of renewing confidence in our own democratic way of life.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, for a moment, to give some indication to the House as to how increased farm costs reflect in reduced net income to farmers. I mentioned, a moment ago, that the farmers of this province, last year, lost very nearly \$30 million in the marketings of livestock as a result of price reduction as compared to the previous year, 1951. Similarly, I have been looking over some figures in regard to increased prices for farm machinery since 1945, and I find that the price increases since 1945 to the present time are costing farmers \$35 million a year more now than the equivalent machinery purchased in 1945.

Freight rate increases are getting to be a monotonous story now, Mr. Speaker. Freight rate increases since 1945 I should say, are costing the farmers of Saskatchewan \$50 million more at the present time. Combining

**February 19, 1953**

those two together, on two items alone the farmer is paying nearly \$89 million more, and when you take the item of \$30 million loss on livestock in conjunction with the amount of money we lost since the two currencies came together and the Canadian currency went higher than the American dollar, you could very easily add another \$20- million loss on the price of our wheat, which would make on two items, a \$50-million loss of income and \$89 million more to pay for just two items of services. That means, Mr. Speaker, a net loss in income to the farmers of this province of \$144 million. It is something not to sneeze at, and the hon. member for Cannington would not be smiling if we had even just had an average crop this year. Some of the businessmen in such towns as Carlyle and others would be wondering who was going to pay the bills, Mr. Speaker. We were lucky we had a big crop. We may not be so lucky another year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words about general irrigation development, drainage and reclamation work in our province. A good deal has been said about it; some has been said at Ottawa. It was even suggested that the administration here was not too interested in reclamation and drainage activities. I would like to tell the House that we set up a new Branch in the Department of Agriculture in 1949. I do not think there is another province – at least there is not another province in Western Canada – that has a similar organization set up to do the physical job of providing irrigation development, drainage development and general reclamation work, together with an engineering staff and equipment to do the job.

This Conservation and Development Branch, last year, had an appropriation of \$1,300,000 in order that it could discharge its function. Without going into very much detail, Mr. Speaker, I just want to mention to the House that, this year, in the northeast part of Saskatchewan, ditches have been provided for 312,000 acres of land, which were benefited by the construction of 100 miles of drainage ditch, plus 53 structures and 37 miles of colonization roads built within new settlement areas, last year.

I would like to say to the House, too, that even though the delta area of the South Saskatchewan River is not developed in the next year or so, or the next three or four years, this Department will be very busily occupied with the drainage and development of other areas lying adjacent to what is known as the Carrot River Triangle.

At the present time, Mr. Speaker, and all winter, our engineers have been operating in an area extending eastward from Ravendale to what is known as Kennedy Creek. Kennedy Creek is in the delta area of the triangle, and is far as we can go eastward until the main structures are put in that will contain the Saskatchewan River in that area.

The area we are surveying at the present time contains approximately 168,000 acres, and the total area involves about five townships of land. So, let it never be said, Mr. Speaker, that this Government is not interested in drainage and reclamation work. I think I can say that we are farther ahead than the province to the east of us.



The impression has been left that all the flood conditions exist on our side of the border. I wish some of the hon. members for the northeast would go over to the Pasqua area in Manitoba and observe the flood conditions there where thousands of acres of Wheatland were flooded, and it was necessary at one time to employ the R.C.A.F. to keep the ducks off the wheat.

These drainage problems are a result of the heavy run-off and the rainy season of the past two years, and were most difficult, no matter where the land was located. I should like to mention to the House, too, that this administration has spent \$715,000 in actual land clearance operations, in the clearing of some 26,700 acres of land for new settlement, and this administration has made available 1,684 new settlement farm units, a good many of which are located in the northeast of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in regard to northern reclamation generally, I just want to say a few words. There have been a good many exaggerated statements made in respect to the area known as the Carrot River Triangle. Some of the press statements have even suggested that there were 4 million acres there; some people have said that there are 1½ million acres; but the greatest acreage that we can find, Mr. Speaker, is around 600,000 acres of land. The soil surveys are now complete on that acreage or are sufficiently advanced to indicate the agricultural possibilities are all right.

The next step is the necessary engineering services to determine the practicability, the nature and design of the structures and also the ultimate cost of the project. When engineering surveys are complete, we will be prepared to go ahead with it. As a matter of fact, I have submitted to the Dominion Government definite proposals outlining the principles under which we might enter into a possible agreement for the development of this area.

I would like to point out to the House too, Mr. Speaker, that a lot of our Liberal members, who are always very anxious to get on with things when they are out of office but do very little when they are in office, are suggesting that we are dragging our feet a little. I would like to remind hon. members that over half a million acres of the land I have just referred to, was placed in a fur conservation block by an agreement of the previous administration in 1942, under which that area was turned over to the Dominion Government for fur conservation. Apparently it was the intention of the then Liberal Government that this land would never be developed for agricultural purposes, and that it should be retained to raise muskrats and beavers.

I wish now to say just a few words in regard to the South Saskatchewan River development project. I agree, Mr. Speaker, with the Leader of the Opposition that the South Saskatchewan project should not be a political issue; but this comes strangely from a former member of the Liberal Party at Ottawa that has been holding this project out as a vote getter for a good many years. Even in the by-election in Rosthern, Mr. Speaker, I can recall – and have the press clippings of various statements made – they even had irrigation water running up into that constituency during that by-election, and we were assured that if Mr. Boucher was elected it would go a long ways to assuring us that we would

have the South Saskatchewan River project.

Now it was never suggested to the electorate then, that the Provincial Government should bear one-third of the cost of this project. We only found that out, later. Some time later, Mr. Gardiner came to us here and he said to us "Now, if you could just give us a little support, if you could just indicate to us, by correspondence, that you fellows were willing to come in to the project, it might help me out a little bit." We accommodated Mr. Gardiner very willingly. As the Premier stated, yesterday, he wrote a letter to the Prime Minister, or to Mr. Gardiner, setting out the subject matter of our interview and the terms of our participation in that project.

Well next, Mr. Speaker, Leader of the Opposition and behold, we get a Royal Commission on the South Saskatchewan River development project, and what a Royal Commission that was! I do not intend to go into the report of the Royal Commission except to say that Saskatchewan has submitted two briefs to that royal Commission, and we have now submitted a further reply to the report of the Royal Commission, which is going forward to Ottawa. We insisted, and we had to insist, that public hearings be held in Saskatchewan. We were able to have three public hearings held – one in Regina, one in Saskatoon and one at Outlook – in order to give Saskatchewan people and Saskatchewan organizations, particularly the S.R.D.A., an opportunity to present briefs to the Royal Commission. And, Mr. Speaker, our approach to this matter has been unbiased and non-political. We engaged a legal counsel, who is recognized as an outstanding supporter and proponent of irrigation in Saskatchewan, Mr. Harold Pope, of Moose Jaw. We invited other prominent people to make submissions to the Royal Commission. We had an excellent brief submitted to them by Mr. George Spence who, similarly, is very much interested in irrigation and reclamation development in Saskatchewan. We have been open-minded in regard to the matter, and now I would advise the hon. Leader of the Opposition that, if he is concerned about political implications or political repercussions, there is one solution to the problem and that is that the Liberal Government at Ottawa decide to ignore the report of this Royal Commission and proceed with the development of the project, and all the hon. Leader of the Opposition's problems will be solved, and we will cheer with him, Mr. Speaker, in those results.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that is a pretty fair offer. I would be very glad to settle for the south Saskatchewan project even if it meant one or two more Liberals returned to power in Ottawa; it would be worthwhile. And I said the same thing, Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Boucher was elected. I said if the election of Mr. Boucher will bring the irrigation project, it will be well worthwhile.

Now, Mr. Speaker, many will say – and the argument has been presented – that a combination of good prices to farmers, better prices to farmers, plus bringing into irrigation productive new acreages, our production might increase and that we will again be embarrassed by surpluses of foods and lower prices. As mentioned a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, we will never have enough food to feed the teeming millions of the world and that is the primary problem facing the world today.

I fully concur in the viewpoints expressed by the Premier, yesterday, that it is high time that we get a positive and constructive policy in our international relationships and to that end, Mr. Speaker, to make my points, I think I could do no better than refer to a few quotations.

I first wish to quote from a radio address given by Father Robert C. Hartnett, S.J., Editor-in-Chief of "America", a New York religious publication. Father Hartnett was broadcasting in a radio programme entitled "A Christian In Action", and I quote as follows:

"What we must do," Father Hartnett says, "I think, and what we are trying to do, is to build up a wall of military defence around the yet unconquered peoples of the world. Why? So that behind that wall we can safely and securely co-operate in substituting large-scale and long-range reform, for the short-term, deceptive methods of violent revolution.

"The danger and deception that we ourselves must avoid lies in believing that our towering military might will somehow frighten the world into peace. It will not. At best, all that military power can do is insure to us the time and opportunity to supply the really effective remedies.

"The only plan for peace I know is God's plan. That will call for almost as big a revolution in our thinking, as the profound social and political revolution we are trying to channel."

And the Premier suggested, yesterday, that we could channel this great revolution that takes place, and let us not forget millions of people understand the Sermon on the Mount.

And in closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from another very prominent gentleman – from Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, for years president of a great American university, who had this to say: —

"If profits, and profits alone, be the end sought by human effort, then society must reconcile itself to steady disintegration, increasing conflict between individual groups and nations, and eventual destruction.

"It is only when we rise above the profit motive and learn to subordinate profit to service, that social, economic and political order begin to come within sight of a firm foundation and a continuing existence with peace and happiness assured to the great mass of mankind."

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion, and vote against the amendment.

**February 19, 1953**

**Mr. H. Begrand** (Kinistino): — Monsieur Le Président, Honorables membres de la Législature. Je suis à la foi très honoré et très touché de l'honneur qui m'imcombe de prendre la parole au sein d'une Assemblée composee d'aussi distingués orateurs.

Mon emotion cependant atteint son comble lorsque je réalise que je suis le premier membre de la Législature, qui prend la parole en Francais. Il serait par contre injuste de ma part d'abuser d'un tel honneur.

Il me fait plaisir de salver tous mes concitoyens de la Province, merci a mes concitoyens du comte electoral de Kinistino, de votre bon support.

Je ferai tout mon possible comme votre représentant à la Législature, pour continuer à mériter et justifier votre confiance dans le futur. Le people de la Saskatchewan, qu'il soit de langue anglaise ou francaise réalise plainement les progrès gigantes ques accomplish par le Gouvernement C.C.F. depuis 1944.

Les faits parlent et le Gouvernement à le droit d'être fier des progrès accomplis en co-opération avec la population de la Saskatchewan. C'est pourquoi en terminant, je me permet de souhaiter longue vie au mouvement C.C.F., pour le plus grand bien de tous les citoyens de la Saskatchewan.

Je sais aussi que toutes les dames de la province de la Saskatchewan se joignent a moi act pour féliciter Madame Cooper, représentant le siège electoral de Régina. La seule dame qui siege actuellement à la Législature et je souhaite qu'a la prochaine election vous en enverrez une autre demi-douzaine du côté du Gouvernement.

### **Translation**

Mr. Speaker, I am very honoured and flattered to be able to take part in this Legislature with so many distinguished members and I am grateful for the honour which has been bestowed upon me by my constituents. I am also grateful to be the first member who has had the privilege of addressing the Legislature in French and I do not want to abuse such an honour.

It is a pleasure to greet all the people of the province and I want, especially, to thank the citizens of Kinistino constituency for the wonderful support I received at the last election. I will do everything possible to continue to merit your support and justify your confidence in me.

I know the people of Saskatchewan, whether they speak French or English, realize fully the extraordinary progress which has been accomplished in this province since the C.C.F. Government took office, in 1944; facts speak for themselves, and the Government may rightly be proud of this progress which will continue with the co-operation of the population of Saskatchewan. I am going to permit myself to wish long life to the C.C.F. Government which is working so ably for the best welfare of the people of Saskatchewan.

I know all the ladies of the province join with me in congratulating Mrs. Cooper, the only lady member in the Legislature. She represents a seat of Regina and I hope that, after the next election, we will have at least half-dozen ladies on this side of the House.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I wish to join myself with all the other speakers in congratulating very deeply indeed both the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. They both discharged their responsibility splendidly, bringing distinction not only to themselves but to their respective constituencies.

I also wish to congratulate the city of Regina on having elected the hon. lady junior member for that city. I am sure that the hon. junior member for Regina will not only make a real contribution to this Legislature and to the public life and welfare of this province, but will also keep to the fore the viewpoints and the problems of all the ladies of this province.

Regarding the hon. member from Melfort-Tisdale, he also did a very good job, a splendid job, and I noticed at the same time he was making his speech, this little booklet on my desk donated by the member from Melfort. I can assure the hon. member that next year at this time there is going to be another booklet on all of your desks entitled "Kinistino."

I am greatly honoured, Mr. Speaker, to represent the Kinistino Constituency in this Legislature, and I wish at this time to extend my thanks and appreciation to all the people of the Kinistino Constituency who have conferred on me the honour to represent their interests in this Legislature. I hope that I will deserve their trust by working for the interests of my constituency and for the well being and the welfare of the people of this province as a whole.

I also wish to congratulate the people of my Constituency of Kinistino on another point, — for having turned out, on election day, the largest percentage of voters of any constituency in the province of Saskatchewan — 92.29.

**February 19, 1953**

There were several factors, Mr. Speaker, which were probably responsible for that – one factor for sure, that the people of my constituency wanted to make doubly sure they didn't make the same mistake as they did in 1948. There is also another factor, a smaller one of course, that enters into the picture, and I am sure that the hon. member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson), who spent several days in my constituency during the election, also contributed to a small extent, and I would like to say that at our next election, whether it be Federal or Provincial, I will welcome him back again to that constituency.

I am going to say a few words now in connection with my constituency. Kinistino Constituency, as you all know, is a very good constituency. It is a highly productive constituency, both grain on a large scale and mixed farming. As a matter of fact, I understand it rates with the first five in the province of Saskatchewan in productivity.

It is highly populated and, fortunately, not too many of our people are moving away in the wintertime. They are remaining on the farm which, I believe, is a very healthy situation for the economy of our province and the country as a whole.

In the line of public services, we have three union hospitals, one at Wakaw, one at Birch Hills, and we have one at Kinistino, with an approximate bed capacity of 44 or 45, pretty well taking care of the medical requirements of the constituency.

As to summer resorts, we have one at Wakaw – Wakaw Lake which, by the way, is one of the nicest lakes, close to the highway, I would say from the border to Waskesiu. I mentioned close to the highway because I did not want to get tangled up with Regina Beach. It is a splendid resort; there are many beaches on the lake, one in particular, the popular beach which is coming along very nicely during the last few years, and with a little more help from the department in charge in Regina, in the near future we are going to be able to make it one of the nicest beaches between the border and Waskesiu Lake, and I am sure that is going to come along all right.

We have another problem in summer resorts more to the east of the constituency, what we call the 'Fishing Lake' summer resort. It is a beautiful spot but it is pretty hard to get there; it has never been pushed forward. That would take care of the problems of the recreations of the people more to the east of the Constituency of Kinistino. There is a very bad road to get in there, and we need a little co-operation and a little help from probably the Minister of Highways – I haven't taken it up with him yet, but I know that he will be quite agreeable, in the near future, to do something along that line. It is only eight miles, Mr. Minister.

Regarding roads in the Kinistino Constituency, we are served by one highway east and west. No. 3 Highway which is more to the north of the constituency, approximately, I would say, 55 miles in the constituency, east and west to the north side. That highway, of course, was built in the old days under the partnership, I think, at the time, of the Liberals and Tories and, of course, you realize that it was not a very good one.

The Minister, last year, saw fit to rebuild a portion of that – the nine miles east on the western end of it, and the other portion of it was fixed up by re-gravelling. At the present time it is not too bad, but I would advise the Department of Highways that, in the near future, some rebuilding will have to be done on that road.

On the western part of the constituency, north and south, going through my constituency for 26 miles, we have the No. 2 Highway, and that one is completed – gravelled, and part of it is hardtop; that is at the extreme west part of the constituency.

We are faced, Mr. Speaker, with a problem in my constituency. All the livestock in my constituency goes to Prince Albert, and from Birch Hills going east, the people are using the shortcut to Prince Albert across the Benton Ferry and the Weldon Ferry. Those are two roads that we would like the Department of Highways to give consideration to in the way of assistance in the near future, to help the situation there. I am sure – as a matter of fact, I know – that the Government is working on plans for the province as a whole regarding main marketing roads, at the present time. So I hope that the gentlemen on the opposite side do not look too happy some time when I make a statement that may sound critical of this Government because, I am going to be very frank, it is not appreciated.

The hospital situation, of course, as has been brought up here before in different speeches, requires also some attention to some special roads to give the people access to their medical centres. We are not too badly off in Kinistino right now, and I know, with the plans that are underway and the work that the Department is doing in conjunction with the municipalities and, I would like to say at this time, the turning over to the municipalities of the Public Revenue Tax in 1953, is going to be a great help to all the municipalities, enabling them to improve, to a certain extent, the road situation. But that does not mean that the Department will not have to give a little more attention and more help as time and financial conditions permit.

I am not going to take too much time, Mr. Speaker. This is my first speech in the House, and I am not going to go over all the wonderful things this Government has done since 1944; it would take too long. It has been well covered already, and I am just going to mention a few of them.

I was very amazed, yesterday, when I heard the Leader of the Opposition stating that he had been urging this Government, these last years, to bring more power to more farmers in the province of Saskatchewan. An amazing statement! When we realize, Mr. Speaker, that, during the term of the Liberal Government in this province for 40 years, all they had been able to connect on the power line were 137 farms, it makes that statement all the more amazing. And now he says, “I have been urging the Government to bring more power to the farmers of this province.” We have brought 12,000 in eight years time, and they brought 137 in 35 years! Quite a difference. I haven’t added up how many years it would take us at the rate of 13 a year (and that is about what they accomplished) to connect those 12,000 farms. I haven’t figured that out.

**February 19, 1953**

The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that the people of the province of Saskatchewan are enjoying, for the first time, electrification on their farms on a large scale – 12,000 farmers are connected up since this Government came into office, and we are pledging we are going to connect 40,000 in the next five years, including last year. What a wonderful achievement! I am not going to go into details because the people of the province are well acquainted with them and the confidence they gave this Government, last summer, shows they are satisfied and know this Government keeps its promises.

With regard to cost: I heard some remarks from the opposite side and through the press and through speeches in the country that we were charging exorbitant prices to the people for power. At least, Mr. Speaker, they have something; before, they had nothing! A quarter of a cent per kilowatt or less is what it costs them. The people of this province are paying half the cost of bringing power to their farms. I was told on good authority, two weeks ago, that the Power Corporation was building up the Lloydminster area, where the line came right on the boundary of the province. There were two farmers from Alberta sitting just across the line and they begged the Corporation to hook them up for power, and the men in charge told them it could not be done because we could not keep up with the demand of the people of our own province. He asked these two farmers why they could not get power from the Province of Alberta and they said, “Yes, sure, we can get power, but it will cost us \$1,400 each to get power from Alberta.” That was from the Canadian Utility – private enterprise – the baby of the Liberal Party here, after we took power into the province of Saskatchewan.

The oil is another story, and I want to say a few words about oil. I am not going to take time to go into the details, but we have all heard the comments and the propaganda from the hon. Leader of the Opposition during the last election campaign and before, “that oil would never be found in the province of Saskatchewan as long as we had a C.C.F. Government.” Those statements were given out all over this province. Well, Mr. Speaker, the picture is very simple. In 1944, when this Government took office there was not enough oil produced in the province of Saskatchewan to grease the shoes of all the members of the Opposition; there was not even enough to grease the shoes of the Leader of the Opposition. Now, in 1952, under this Government and their policies, we have produced 1,600,000 barrels of oil.

We heard the Leader of the Opposition making statements throughout the province, “what about Alberta? They have been developing oil long before this Government.” Sure, that is true enough. The province of Alberta began to develop the Turner Valley field away back in 1920. Those boys were awake to the situation; they were looking for oil in 1920, and they got it too! But who did we have in Saskatchewan for a government? The Liberals were sitting in the province here. They were sitting here doing nothing! The same economic conditions were existing across the west at that time, but in Alberta the government of the time started to form their policy and look for oil, away back in 1920. We had a Liberal Government sitting here from that time until 1944, and over all that time we didn’t get anything – no expansion, no development, except they were looking after the interests of some large company, in case they would decide, sometime, to look for oil; but no oil was produced. That



is the oil story in short, Mr. Speaker. And I would venture to say that, if the people, in their wisdom in this province, had not elected a C.C.F. Government, this province still would have no oil.

There are many more things for which I wish to commend this Government, just briefly. For instance, the highway programme. When this Government came into power, what was the condition of the roads in this province? A worn-out, dilapidated highway system. This Government started with nothing, not even engineers, worn-out machines, no plans – nothing; around 100 miles of hardtop which was no good even at that...

**Mr. McCormack** (Souris-Estevan): — Tell us about 39 Highway?

**Mr. Begrand**: — It is true! What do we find today, after all these short eight years? Under the guidance of our Minister of Highways we find that we have one of the best operated highway systems and maintenance set-ups in Canada.

Education: I am not going to dwell on that for any length of time, but I am going to talk about conditions in the north. When this Government came into power they made a special investigation of the northern conditions and what did they find, in the north, under a Liberal Government? What was the set-up of education in the northern part of this province? They found that approximately 596 children were receiving some kind of an education, more or less! That was the set-up in the great northern part of Saskatchewan under a Liberal Government, which had been sitting here for 33 or 34 years. What do we find, today, in the northland, under this Government? Thirteen new schools have been built with an enrolment of somewhere around 1,600 children, 39 teachers. This Government has carried out its pledge to make education available to all children of this province, but, under a Liberal government, the north was entirely ignored; there might have been some good reason for it too. However, it was a drastic situation, Mr. Speaker, existing in the northern part of this province, as far as education was concerned.

Bus transportation: It is a wonderful bus system that this Government has started in this province, providing service to over approximately 4,500 passengers daily, providing service for this province which they never could have hoped to get under the Greyhound system protected by the Liberal government of the time. It is a bus service that we cannot realize, individually, what it means to the people all over this province, owned and operated by the Government for the benefit of the people of the province.

Timber Board: This is something on which it would take too long for me to deal with all the details, but some members will be taking it up during this debate.

Hospitalization: I am not going to dwell on that for any length of time either. It is well known to all the people of this province and was strongly endorsed again in the last June election. It is the first hospitalization set-up of this nature on the North American continent and it had to be brought about by a C.C.F. Government. I commend the Government very much for that as well. It has relieved distress in many homes for people who could not afford to go to the hospital for medical care,

**February 19, 1953**

and under this system it is there for them, shared by every person in this province, by all the people. Your medical card is good in any part of the world outside of the 'Iron Curtain'; it is respected and accepted in any approved hospital. That is a wonderful achievement, started by a C.C.F. Government. The Liberals were sitting here before us for over 33 years and they talked about it for all that time – Federal Government even; but it was never implemented; and I will add to that, Mr. Speaker, that under a Liberal Government at Ottawa it would never be implemented.

Air Ambulance: Another first with the C.C.F. Government for the people of this province. This is another service which is bringing relief and saving lots of lives in this province every year. We cannot measure it; we do not know the lives it has saved, but we know that it does save lives every year, relieving that worry and anxiety in the case of accident or sickness in remote parts of the province. By telephoning, they can have a plane landing in their yard in very quick order.

I would like to say a few words, Mr. Speaker, regarding the Federal field. I think we will agree, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Government has often broken its promises to the people of the west, very consistently. I remember so well, in the 1945 election particularly and in the 1949 election, the promises which were made by the Liberals, by the Leader of the Opposition sitting across from us, by Mr. Gardiner and many more. They said that if we, in 1949, saw fit to send them a dozen Liberals to Ottawa they could go to bat for the Saskatchewan people and see that we got what was coming to us – the South Saskatchewan River Dam and so on. Well, the people of Saskatchewan were very generous in 1949, so we sent them 14, I think, two more than they asked us to do, and those 14 have cost us a lot of money, I think, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact the south Saskatchewan dam, since we elected those 14 members, has been raised, I think, by \$150 million; the first estimate was \$100 million which, I believe, is still the right estimate, or pretty close. There was no indication at that time that this province was going to be asked to contribute any portion of the cost either; but when we were told that if we sent more members from Saskatchewan, the people of Saskatchewan thought it might be a good idea, so, in 1949, we sent 14 of them and since that time the cost of this project has risen from \$100 million to \$250 million. Not only that, but the project is not economically sound any more. No!

Just briefly, I would like to say a few words in connection with the winding up of the payment under the five-year agreement with Great Britain. That is a pretty good one, too! All the farmer members who are sitting here and all the farmers of the province of Saskatchewan will know the sad story, the financial tragedy of the deal. When a motion was brought before the House of Commons for a 25-cent final payment on the winding up of this five-year pool, how did the hon. members of the Liberal Party of this province vote? One of them voted for it but, by the way, since that time he has signified his intention that he is not going to stand in this next Federal election. He is a good man. I know him well; he is a good friend of mine and I know it. He is not going to run any more. He voted for the 25 cents, and the other 13 boys thought it was too much money coming to the farmers of this province, so they turned it down, voted against it. Then, on the dictates of their remorseful conscience, they decided they would give us a payment of 8.3 cents for the final winding up of that five-year pool, and it was a heavy sacrifice on the part of the Government to do that. You know all the details of that and, of course,

the 14 members backed that up at that time, and you know what it has cost the farmers of western Canada. That tragedy, Mr. Speaker, has cost the farmers of western Canada hundreds of millions of dollars.

They also turned down \$2.00 wheat and, of course, they were all in favour of lifting price controls. In other words, price controls have not been maintained as was promised to the people of this country. They have been removed, but price control has remained on the agricultural commodities of the people of western Canada. That is the economy under which we are operating at the present time, Mr. Speaker, and I can assure you the economy of the farmers of western Canada, at the present time, is not very healthy.

The Premier, yesterday, in his wonderful address, quoted some prices of hogs in 1951 and 1952 — \$48 in 1951; \$37 in 1952, and I am going to add 1953 to that, as at January 1 — \$31. That is what they are now — \$31.

Mr. Speaker, I am warning the people of the province of Saskatchewan now that, if the Liberal Government at Ottawa is not removed from office in 1953, we will very likely find ourselves in the same position as a few years ago when I sold, myself, 15 head of cattle, in 1936, for \$80.90. The cattle prices have dropped tremendously since last year. Your hogs are going; your poultry, your eggs and your dairy products are going; everything is slipping. No attempt has been made by the Federal Government to readjust and to stop that decline.

I was very pleased, yesterday, when an hon. member from the other side announced, “wheat payment increased 20 cents in the early part of March, and barley payment by 15 cents.” You would think, Mr. Speaker, that when the Liberals are announcing this, that it is a gift from the Liberal Party! Surely that 20 cents and that 15 cents is coming to the farmers of this country, Mr. Speaker. I am amazed that it was not announced before, but since then I have found the reason why it was not announced before. As a rule those payment those payments are announced in the early part of February, but I was told some little time ago that they would not be announced until not too long before the Federal election would be announced. And, Mr. Speaker, in view of the announcement made yesterday, I would venture to say that a Federal election announcement is not too far off. You will recollect the election of 1949 when, a short time before voting day, I got a couple of cheques at one time – inside of a week. Twenty cents a bushel! And shortly after that the Liberal Party was returned to power. It worked that time all right; but shortly after that we found out that money had been borrowed in order to try to bribe the people of western Canada to vote for the Liberal Party.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to warn the hon. gentlemen on the other side that these tactics are not going to work any more on the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, having been a neighbour of the hon. Leader of the Opposition for a long, long time, I realize that, sometimes, it is difficult for a man to say some good things about himself. It doesn't particularly look right, and so I think that I should avail myself of the opportunity and render a service to the hon. member for

**February 19, 1953**

Rosthern. I was very pleased when I saw the announcement in the paper, last fall, that the hon. member for Rosthern was going to run in the Federal field again when he was told that he could render better service to the people in the Federal field than in provincial; and I was really pleased that he had decided to go back into the Federal field in his own constituency of Rosthern. The hon. member for Rosthern, of course, had been a member of the House of Commons for a long time before he came into the leadership of the Liberal Party of this province of Saskatchewan and he happened to be sitting down there while we were having this terrible depression in Saskatchewan – not only Saskatchewan, but, of course, the whole of Canada and other parts of the world. Of course we have heard a lot of his speeches and read about them, but when it came to voting on it, I have yet to find anywhere where he backed his speech by his vote in the House of Commons. It would be interesting to know – maybe on a few; but there were few major occasions when he spoke in Ottawa that he followed through with a vote.

On the co-operatives, for instance, he talked against the taxation of co-operatives; he talked for hours – but he voted for the taxation (Hansard, August 20, 1946).

On the question of giving a clear title of land to the returned soldiers of the first world war, he talked the motion out; he didn't want to vote on it, so he talked it out (Hansard, June 25, 1946).

He also opposed generous grants to the veteran attending university, first world war (Hansard, August 8, 1946).

The hon. member for Rosthern defended the government policy of sending war materials to Japan (February 8, 1943).

When the hon. Premier of this province, in 1942, brought in a motion for an amendment before the House of Commons asking for \$1.00 wheat under request from the great Wheat Pool delegation from Saskatchewan, the hon. member for Rosthern voted against that too. So I can assure the hon. member from Rosthern...

**Mr. Tucker:** — I do not like to interrupt the hon. member...

**Mr. Begrand:** — I can assure the hon. member from Rosthern...

**Mr. Tucker:** — I have let the hon. member go on with several statements, but he has got on to something now that he has seen fit to say before, and I have shown him the Hansard wherein it is set out. What was moved there, Mr. Speaker, in the first place, was a motion for Second Reading that the price be raised from 70 to 90 cents. The Premier of this province moved an amendment that the Bill be not now read the second time but that he expressed the opinion that the price be \$1.00. I pointed out at that time that if that motion carried, Second Reading would be defeated and the price would be left at 70 cents, and so I voted to raise the price to 90 cents. When it is persistently misrepresented that I voted against \$1.00 wheat, I pointed that out to the hon. member; I sent him Hansard which contained even a statement from Mr. Coldwell that my statement was correct; and yet he has seen fit, over and over again, to repeat his misrepresentation.

**Mr. Begrand:** — I am sorry that the hon. member from Rosthern takes it that hard. I can assure him that when he gets the nomination (he hasn't got it yet but I guess he will) in Rosthern Federal, that this is nothing to what we will have to tell him later on. I am very disappointed; I certainly do not mean to hurt the hon. member at all...

**Mr. Tucker:** — If you are going to continue to lie...

**Mr. Begrand:** — So in concluding, Mr. Speaker...

**Premier Douglas:** — The word 'lie' should be withdrawn, Mr. Speaker, by the hon. friend.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member realizes that this is unparliamentary.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I withdraw it, but certainly he should know better if he doesn't.

**Mr. McCormack:** — I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member also referred to the fact that the Leader of the Opposition had been told where he had to go...

**Mr. Begrand:** — Mr. Speaker, I am not familiar with the rules and if I have offended the hon. member from Rosthern, I am very sorry, because I know I will get even with him later on when we get on the hustings.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I am certainly going to vote against the amendment, and I wish, again, to commend this Government for all the wonderful achievements they have accomplished in all fields for the people of this province.

**Mr. McCormack:** — If the hon. member will permit a question, I wonder if he would tell the House how many C.C.F. members were in the House at the time the vote was taken for the \$65 million which was paid as the final payment on the five-year pool?

**Mr. Begrand:** — Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell the hon. member that, as I haven't got it here, but I am going home tomorrow night, and I can assure you I will have that information for you on Monday morning.

**Mr. T.R. MacNutt (Nipawin):** — Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that I am not going to take up much of your time this afternoon, but I would like to say a few words during this debate.

When I took my seat in this Assembly on the opening day, I could not help but think back to the year 1906 when my father took his seat in the First Session of the First Legislature of the Province of Saskatchewan. He had the honour at that time, Mr. Speaker, of occupying that high position which you now have. It was then the custom, when the speaker retired from his position, that the province presented him with the chair in which he sat. That chair now has a very honoured position in my house. Many of the hon. members present have seen that chair and they have sat in it.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. MacNutt:** — In fact my very good friend, the Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank), when he comes to visit me (and he does that occasionally and is always welcome – and by the way he happens to be my representative in this House although I did not give him much help in getting here), will sit in no other chair in that house although I have a few that are probably a little more comfortable.

I think it is a pity that that custom has been done away with because when the Speaker retires from that position he has something to remind him of the very many happy and unhappy hours that he has spent in the chair.

I only hope that, during my term in the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, I can do as much for my constituents in the constituency of Nipawin as my father did for his, in the old constituency of Saltcoats.

I would like, at this time, to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. The junior member for Regina (Mrs. Cooper) did a marvellous job, and I am sure it is very nice for us all to have a lady in our midst. I only wish that we had another lady in our midst, and if Mrs. Caldwell had been elected from Saskatoon I am sure it would have added a certain amount of dignity as we have at the present time with the addition of the junior member from Regina.

I would also like to congratulate the seconder, my good friend and neighbour, the member for Melfort-Tisdale (Mr. C.G. Willis). He did a very good job with the material he had to work on, and I am sure that some of his constituents at least, will be very proud of his very fine effort.

When I look at the sea of faces on your right, Mr. Speaker, I see two hon. gentlemen whom I have had something to do with in the past. I refer particularly to the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. Russ Brown) and the hon. member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Buchanan). These two hon. members served with me in the King's Own Rifles of Canada. I do not know just how they happened to stray over to that side of the House. It might have been that my instruction at that time was not too good; but, however, while I do feel they have strayed a little in politics, I can assure you that they are both excellent soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take up any more of your time in the House this afternoon, because I know there is other work to do and I would ask leave to move that this debate be adjourned.

### UNIFORMITY OF TIME

Moved by Mr. Walker (Hanley), seconded by Mr. Buchanan:

“That in the opinion of this Assembly a Select Special Committee should be appointed at this Session to study the problem of time differences

with a view to finding some basis for uniformity of time in the Province of Saskatchewan; the personnel of the said Committee is to be named at a later date.”

**Mr. R.A. Walker** (Hanley): — In moving motion No. 4 I propose to keep my remarks as brief as possible, and I propose also to approach this problem in an entirely non-partisan way.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that all members of the Legislature have been plagued by these differences in time from one community to another, from one season to another; they have been plagued by voluminous representations from their constituents to the effect that something ought to be done about it.

In days gone by – 50 or 60 or 70 years ago – there was no serious problem about standardization of time either in North America or in Europe. In those days, of course, transportation facilities were much more limited and much less efficient than they are today. The result was that it was not an uncommon thing for a man to be born, live out his life span and die, never having moved more than a few miles from one point during that entire period. It, therefore, mattered very little to most people whether their community was on one time while a neighbouring community only 10 or 20 miles away was on some different time. And so, in those days, it was the common thing for variations in time between one community and another of 5 minutes, or 10 minutes, or 20 or 25 minutes. The natural thing was for each community – at least each community that was able to boast of a town clock – to have its clock set on sun time or local time as it existed in that community, without any regard to the time of the neighbouring community. They set their clock so that 12 o’clock was the time when the sun was at its zenith. Then a community further to the west would have their clock 5 or 6 minutes different from the first one.

Along about the middle of the 19th Century, when the steam railway was introduced in England and North America, the question of drawing railway timetables perplexed those who were confronted with these time variations, and it was a problem – not a problem of earth-shaking importance perhaps but a problem of the general convenience of mankind, that some kind of uniformity should be adopted. It was adopted in England that all of England should go on the same time, and that that time should be the Greenwich mean time, which means the sun-time at the Greenwich observatory. Then, of course, only Greenwich was on the exact sun-time. Other communities east and west would have their clocks a few minutes earlier or later than the true sun-time. Then when you got as far west as Ireland they had another time which prevailed over the entire island, which was some 25 minutes different from Greenwich mean time. I do not know how successful they were in Ireland in standardizing the time; from my knowledge of Irishmen I rather imagine it would be a difficult problem to get them to agree on a standardized time.

**Premier Douglas:** — They have a ‘mean time’ themselves.

**Mr. Walker:** — The Premier suggests that they have their own mean time in Ireland.

**February 19, 1953**

The agitation for standardization of time was led by Sir Sandford Fleming, a man about whose other accomplishments I know absolutely nothing. I do not know whether he was knighted for his efforts in standardizing the time or not. I do not know what else he did, but he advocated the setting up of a time zone system and, in 1878, he was successful in having it adopted at a world conference in Washington. That time zone system consisted of dividing the perimeter of the earth at the Equator into 24 equal segments and taking the first one as evenly divided by the Greenwich meridian. When the sun is at the meridian, the zero line of longitude, it is taken to be 12 o'clock noon at that point for a distance of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  degrees of longitude on each side of that principal meridian. Then, stepping out to the westward, every 15 degrees represents another change in time of one hour. The result is that the 105th line of longitude, which passes between Regina and Moose Jaw, is the centre of the 7th zone west of Greenwich. The 105th line of longitude is, therefore, the centre of the mountain standard time zone if the time zones were as recommended, or as adopted, at that world conference in Washington in 1878. That would mean that the Mountain Standard Time Zone would extend west of that meridian a distance of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  degrees and east of that meridian a distance of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  degrees; from  $97\frac{1}{2}$  degrees on the east to  $112\frac{1}{2}$  degrees on the west. Those two lines of longitude, the eastern and western lines bounding the Mountain Standard Time Zone, pass through Manitoba and Alberta respectively, the eastern boundary passing just west of Winnipeg and the western boundary passing just this side of Calgary.

That would mean, of course, that Manitoba and Alberta would be in two different time zones; so, by convention, the boundaries have been altered somewhat to correspond with the political boundaries of the province. The boundary between the Mountain Standard Time Zone and the Pacific Time Zone has been pushed westward to pass down along the border of British Columbia and Alberta, and it follows that border throughout. The boundary between the Mountain Standard Time Zone and the Central Time Zone was pushed westward to be in a line with the Manitoba and Saskatchewan boundary. Then it was pushed westward at the south end a little bit more beyond that; it was pushed westward in the south-east part of this province to include the judicial districts of Estevan, Arcola, Moosomin, Melville and Yorkton, I believe – those five judicial districts.

The Mountain Standard Time Zone is something that was not inspired by the Divine Creator. It is something which is man made; it is something which was made for the convenience of man. It does not follow an absolutely pure pattern of perfection in following the lines of longitude; the boundaries can be pushed wherever they suit the general convenience of the most people. That has been done in the past, and I do not think anybody would suggest that the general convenience of mankind should not be the determining consideration in this matter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the legal basis for these time zones? What legal enforceability have they? I cannot say which heading of the British North America Act they come under. I suppose they come under the heading of Property and Civil Rights, though I cannot say.



But I know that the only Legislatures which have had any extensive legislation on the matter of time are provincial Legislatures. The Provincial Legislatures have, in their Interpretation Act, defined the time as it applies to their particular province. In Saskatchewan, the Interpretation Act states that time, where it is used in any statute or order-in-council or regulation or any contract or proclamation or agreement, shall be Mountain Standard Time, and that Mountain Standard Time shall be seven hours behind Greenwich mean time.

That, of course, is subject to exceptions; there are exceptions. One of them is set out in The Interpretation Act and that is "except in those communities where they have by by-law adopted Daylight Saving Time". That is one of the exceptions. Then, there are other exceptions where Mountain Standard Time does not prevail automatically, and those are provided in other statutes. For instance, The Court Officials Act provides that in the judicial districts which I mentioned a moment ago, any reference to time in those judicial districts shall be Central Standard Time. There are other exceptions. I believe there are exceptions provided in The School Act; minor exceptions. Otherwise it is provided by the law of Saskatchewan that Mountain Standard Time shall be the time. But the exceptions have created some confusion, because you have a situation where individual communities are on different times from their neighbours, from their adjoining communities, and so the exceptions are creating some problems that result in representation being made to, I think, most of the members of this Legislature, from time to time.

There has only been one instance that I can call to mind where Federal enactment has superimposed itself upon provincial law so far as times are concerned, and that was the daylight saving time measures adopted by order-in-council at the time of the first Great War and at the time of the second Great War. That order-in-council, of course, was based upon the War Emergency Powers Act of those times and, with the expiry of the emergency, the Acts lapsed and the special powers contained in those Acts lapsed with them, and so the jurisdiction was restored to the province. The only jurisdiction which the municipalities have is that which is conferred by the province upon the municipalities. The jurisdiction is still with the province even though the province may have delegated the exercise of it to the municipalities concerned.

My own feeling in bringing forward this resolution was not that I had cooked up or invented some solution to this problem of time differences, but that the people of Saskatchewan are sufficiently anxious to have the time standardized, that most of them are willing to forgo the right to have their own kind of time just for the sake of uniformity. In order to have uniformity they were willing to concede that perhaps they would not have their own particular kind of time adopted over the province.

I do not suppose it is possible, or that any one of us want to say that a particular time, either Mountain Standard Time or Central Standard Time or Daylight Saving Times should be enforced over the province of Saskatchewan. That is a decision which I, for one, hesitate to make. But we are confronted with the public demand that there be uniformity, and I think some good can come from a legislative committee to consider the ways and means of bringing about uniformity. It may very well be that,

**February 19, 1953**

when a committee of Legislature has considered the matter and has set down just what can be accomplished in this direction, the people of Saskatchewan will say "We do not want to have any of it; we do not want it; we would rather have it the way it is." But I think some good can come out of setting the problem down in black and white and setting down the possible solutions to the problem.

You see, one of the difficulties is that in the minds of many people they are not entirely clear on just what they want to accomplish in this time question. I have scores of letters from people in Saskatchewan who assure me that they want standard time imposed upon the province of Saskatchewan. I look at the letter, the place where it is postmarked, and if it comes from somewhere in the eastern part of Saskatchewan there is no way of knowing which is standard time in that locality. It may be Central Standard Time and it may be Mountain Standard Time, and they neglect to say in the letter. I think that signifies that many people have not really thought about the fact that there are by custom in this province now two standard times, Central Standard Time and Mountain Standard Time. There are probably many people in Saskatchewan, in the western part, who do not realize that fully a quarter of the people of Saskatchewan are on Central Standard Time, and will not have it any other way. Therefore I say that public thinking on the part of some people who have made representations in this matter, may not have taken into account all the factors involved.

That is why I say that a legislative committee can render some service by hearing representations from all interested persons, by giving some serious thought to the possible solutions that offer themselves to this problem. As I say, when those solutions and those remedies are tabulated, when they are set down, it may be that the people will overwhelmingly say "we would rather have it as it is". And if they do, of course that is their privilege. At least, if they continue to advocate standardization of time in Saskatchewan then they will know what the remedy involves. I believe there are several remedies. I believe that those remedies should be posed to the public so that they can be appraised.

As far as I am concerned I do not propose to take sides on those possible solutions. I do not believe that it is the job of the committee to take sides on the possible solutions to this problem. It is the job of the committee to define the problem, show how it can be solved, and then put it up to the public in some fashion to choose or to indicate their choice, whether they want to solve this problem or whether they want to go on in their present way, and if they do want to solve it, to indicate what kind of remedy they wish to adopt. For my part I do not believe that you can run into impossible obstacles in eliminating these time differences. The kind of time differences which I think are particularly obnoxious are the time differences between two communities, one of which is on Daylight Saving Time and the other which stays on Standard Time. That is a particularly obnoxious kind of situation because it results in unfairness to merchants who are compelled to keep the time of their local community by local by-law. It results in special problems to the Provincial Treasurer's highway traffic enforcement because it results in people flitting from one village to another in time to get there before 10 o'clock in

the evening. That is one of the most aggravating drawbacks to this present hodge-podge system. I think something might be done to solve that problem without too great inconvenience.

Another kind of time difference to which I think this committee ought to direct itself is the time difference between the Mountain Standard Time Zone and the Central Standard Time Zone. I am told that, as you travel along that artificial line between the two time zones, you will, on occasion, find the village you are in to be on Mountain Standard Time and another village to the westward to be on Central Standard Time. Obviously it should be the other way around in order to be in any sense logical. Now, if that causes difficulty to people in those areas, then that is a problem toward which the committee ought to direct itself.

Then, of course, there is some complaint about the change in time in the spring and in the Fall. I know people who are quite convinced that they lose an hour of their rest in the spring and they do not get it back until the Fall, and that their activities all Summer are jeopardized thereby.

Then there is the problem of giving some degree of conformity...

**Mr. Tucker:** — Are those your constituency officials who have those strange ideas?

**Mr. Walker:** — As a matter of fact I do travel sometimes up into the Rosthern constituency, and I have heard more strange ideas there than I have in Hanley constituency.

**Hon. Member:** — Ideas have legs, too.

**Mr. Walker:** — Another aspect to this problem is the difference in time between what the communities themselves follow and what the transportation systems follow. I realize that it is not possible for a provincial legislature to do anything mandatory about the kind of time which the railway companies keep; nor, I suppose, the kind of time which the broadcasting companies keep. I am inclined to think that the broadcasting companies, so far as local programmes are concerned, are anxious to comply with the local situation. I am sure, too, that the railway companies, if any constructive effort is made in this province, will try to oblige by conforming to our standard time, whatever it may be, in the future. You have got to remember, Mr. Speaker, that the railway companies have always been completely in the dark as to what kind of time the local inhabitants prefer. After all, it has been done up to now on a local option basis, village by village, and there is no degree of permanence about that kind of decision and the railway companies have, therefore, had no direction from the local residents of any substantial kind to show what the local residents prefer. It has been suggested that the railway companies have carried Central Time to the next divisional point inside the Mountain Time Zone. The fact of the matter is that most of them have carried it to the second divisional point inside the Mountain Zone, and the result is that you have railways operating on schedules based upon Central Standard Time as far west as Watrous. That is the second

divisional point inside the Mountain Standard Time Zone. Whether they would continue to do that, of course, after the province had signified its desire to have a particular kind of time, is a matter which nobody can say. We cannot do anything about it. We cannot now and we could not in the future.

So, I suggest that this committee, if it is set up, might very well hear representations from municipal associations, boards of trade, chambers of commerce, from the agricultural organizations, farmer's union, the trustees association, and so on. It may be that out of those consultations some kind of a solution to this perennial problem might evolve. I suppose that the reluctance on the part of many people to look for a solution to this thing is probably understandable.

I suppose that, since I have raised it for the second time in this Legislature, it is proof of the adage that fools rush in where angels fear to tread. For my part, while I do not think it is a matter of fundamental or revolutionary character, I think it is a matter of seeking to serve the general convenience of the people of Saskatchewan and as such, I think it is worthy of our consideration and our study.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that other members will take part in debate upon this resolution and that, in doing so, they will endeavour to hasten the conclusion of the debate so that action might be taken to set up such a committee at an early date, so that the committee could have ample time to consider the problem before the Session rises.

Therefore, I move the above motion, seconded by the member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Buchanan).

**Mr. Niles L. Buchanan** (Notukeu-Willowbunch): — Mr. Speaker, in speaking in support of this motion, as seconder, I just wish to add to what the member for Hanley has already said, and that is that myself, along with, I imagine a number of other members, have received a considerable number of representations from individuals, from organizations such as Wheat Pool Committees, Church organizations, boards of trade, and municipal councils, during the past few years. Some of them were uniform requests; as you go further west it is only natural that demands would be more uniform. They would all be in agreement that what they want is Mountain Standard Time; but when it gets to the eastern side of my particular constituency, the resolutions and the requests were not so uniform.

Incidentally, I just have a number of letters here regarding standardization of time. It has got so that all I do is write a form letter to answer the numerous requests. Naturally I, representing a constituency most of which is west of the 3rd meridian, west of the central part of the Mountain Standard Time Zone, incline towards the idea of Mountain Standard Time for the province. However, I do not believe that that is the subject that we are debating at this time. We are just simply discussing a resolution that will set up a committee to bring in a recommendation to this House in support of some time which appears to be agreeable to the majority of the people in Saskatchewan, and for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this resolution.

**Hon. T.C. Douglas** (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I think the House is indebted to the member for Hanley and also to the member for Notukeu-Willowbunch for bringing this matter to the attention of the Assembly. I think the member for Hanley has set out the situation in a most admirable form in a statement which is filled with very useful information, and I do not think there is anything which needs to be added to what he has said. I merely want to say on behalf of the Government that we certainly would be in favour of the setting up of such a committee, and would be prepared to bring in a resolution in the near future providing for the setting up of such a committee, naming the personnel from persons suggested by the Whips from both sides of the House.

This is not a new problem, and this is not a problem which has in it any political philosophy or any particular political point of view. Long before we took office and ever since we took office, the Association of rural Municipalities has been meeting each successive government, each successive year, asking that Mountain Standard Time be mandatory throughout the province throughout the year. Without fail, each year, within two or three weeks of the Association of Rural Municipalities appearing before the Government, the Association of Urban Municipalities appear and ask that Daylight Saving Time be made mandatory throughout the province for a given period of time each year. Then, in addition, of course, there are all the local situations which have already been described by the mover and the seconder of the resolution, and it may be that there isn't any solution. It may be that, situated as we are with three-quarters of the province in the Mountain Time Zone and one-quarter of the province in the Central Time Zone, we cannot work out any solution that would be acceptable to everybody. In that case, it may be better to leave the matter to local option.

In the province of Alberta, legislation has been passed making Standard Time mandatory throughout the year. I do not know whether we would want to follow an example like that or not. Certainly no harm can be done, and a good deal of good might come, from at least getting the points of view of the various groups of people in the province. When they are set down, the members could discuss them with a view to seeing whether or not there isn't some point on which there would be fairly general agreement or some middle ground that would meet at least the convenience of the majority. No one, I am sure, is foolhardy enough to think that there will be any solution that will be acceptable to everybody. But there may be something which will be more acceptable than the present system which results in a hodge-podge which is, of course, causing considerable inconvenience and in some cases considerable dissatisfaction among some of the people in the province.

Therefore, I want to say on behalf of the Government that we would certainly welcome the setting up of such a committee. If the members of the Legislature support this motion, we would be prepared to have the appropriate Minister bring in a resolution for the appointment of the committee just as soon as the Whips could agree on the personnel.

The question being put, it was agreed to unanimously.

## SECOND READINGS

### **Bill No. 1 – An Act to amend The Credit Union Act, 1948.**

**Hon. T.C. Douglas** (Premier): — Most of the amendments are of a minor character and have to do with improving the procedures under which the Credit Unions of the province operate. I think all of these amendments have been proposed to the Government by the Credit Union League of Saskatchewan. There is no vital principle involved, with the possible exception of the amendment which has to do with setting up the Mutual Aid Board to manage the Mutual Aid Fund.

Hon. members will remember that, last year, we brought in legislation at the request of the Credit Union League for the setting up of a Mutual Aid Fund to which the various Credit Unions would contribute, and the fund would be managed by a board, and that board would be charged with the responsibility of using that fund to assist any Credit Union that got into difficulties in order to tide them over any period of financial stringency. The hon. members of the House will be glad to know that a plebiscite was taken of the Credit Unions of the province and, quoting from memory and I think it is correct, the vote showed 76 per cent of the Credit Unions, representing 79 per cent of the membership, as being in favour of the setting up of this Mutual Aid Fund. The board to manage this fund, as set out in the Act, provided for one appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, one appointed by the Credit Society and one appointed by the Credit Union League. The Credit Union League have since pointed out, I think quite properly, that they only have one representative on a board of three, and yet all the money belongs to them. So the principle involved in the amendment is that we propose to change the basis of representation on that board so as to have one appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, one by the Credit Society and three by the Credit Union League, so that there will be five, and the Credit Union League, whose money it is that is being administered and managed, will have three of the five members of the board. I think that is the only principle involved; the other amendments are, in the main, routine. I would move second reading of this Bill.

(Motion agreed to)

### **Bill No. 2 – An Act to amend The Trade Services Act, 1946.**

**Premier Douglas**: — Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment to clarify the practice which now exists regarding the administration and operation of the overseas service, the Saskatchewan House in London. The Department of the Attorney General have suggested that the operation, as it is being carried on, be set out more specifically and clearly in legislation. There is no proposed change in the method of operating but the Attorney General's Department question whether or not our powers are set forth as clearly as they ought to be. I move second reading of the Bill.

(Motion agreed to)

**Bill No. 3 – An Act to amend The Education and Hospitalization Tax Act, 1950.**

**Hon. C.M. Fines** (Provincial Treasurer):—Mr. Speaker, the only change in the actual revenue in the Education and Hospitalization Tax is in amending the Act to provide for exempting tax on natural gas, on propane gas and domestic fuel oil. These amendments have been necessary because of the development of the gas industry and, in order to place natural gas in a competitive position with other fuels such as coal and wood, it was felt advisable to include it here.

I might say that, at the present time, there is an exemption on domestic fuel oil, but it is not specifically set out in the Act; so, to make it abundantly clear, we have included it also.

The other sections refer to matters of administration. We find, for example, that when the tax has become 3 per cent instead of 2 per cent there is a greater tendency towards delinquency. We feel that one way to get the delinquents to get their reports in on time would be for them to pay a penalty on the amount of the tax which they are withholding. So that is being provided for also.

Those, Mr. Speaker, are the principal things we have in the Bill.

I do propose, however, to bring in a House amendment to the Bill. After listening to the very eloquent address made the other day by the member for Regina, the new member (Mrs. Cooper), appealing to the Government to consider removing the tax on hearing aids, we have given this some consideration. And, not only because of the eloquence of her appeal, but also because of the justice of it, Mr. Speaker, I propose to bring in a House amendment to give effect to what she has asked for.

May I say that I think there is a good moral in that, Mr. Speaker, that members should be more eloquent in their appeals when they want these taxes removed. Not only do we feel that we should remove the taxes on hearing aids, but also allied things, such as artificial limbs, orthopaedic appliances and equipment designed solely for cripples and invalids. At the present time we have been going through a very severe epidemic of poliomyelitis and, as a result, there are many people who are wearing appliances and using appliances in order that they may be restored to health. The Act does provide exemption for drugs and prescriptions, so that we feel that this is in line with that, and so we will bring in a House Amendment to give effect to these other things, the one of which was asked for – and I am sure the hon. member for Regina will agree that we extend it to include these others. I will move second reading.

**Mr. G.H. Danielson** (Arm River):— Mr. Speaker, I am cordially accepting the invitation handed out by the Provincial Treasurer for us to suggest more improvements. I did not think he would be so generous; but maybe, seeing he is in that frame of mind, he might do a little more than he has done here. I would certainly ask

him, when this Bill gets into Committee to be amended, that he give serious consideration to removing the tax on fuel oil and greases for farm use. This tax is a tax on farm production. We have heard in this House condemnation and criticism of the Federal Government time and time again for having certain taxes on production. I think this Government could show, for once, that they are willing to affect this compromise, and remove this tax on farmers' cost of production. I think it would be welcomed by every farmer in the province of Saskatchewan. I see no reason in the world why it is even necessary today, with the tremendous amount of revenue that this Government is getting from other sources, including the Dominion Government. I would again ask him to give very serious consideration to this proposal, because certainly he has received demands from this side of the House, and I think the demands of the 183,000 farmers in Saskatchewan.

I might go a little farther. I listened to the junior member for Regina, and I commend her for all the suggestions she made. She made a wonderful address, and she spoke about certain things which have been accepted by the Provincial Treasurer. Right now he has announced to this House that he is going to do something that the junior member for Regina suggested should be done. I was also interested when she spoke about housing. Housing is a very serious problem in the province of Saskatchewan, particularly in the urban areas, and the cost of housing today, Mr. Speaker, you know as well as I do, is beyond any price that any ordinary family with an ordinary income can pay. Various governments, particularly the Dominion Government, have gone a long way towards assisting in financing housing, provided by local authorities see fit to accept the conditions which are attached. Now, if I am right, we, as a Provincial Government under C.C.F. leadership, are collecting sales tax on education or hospital tax on building materials. What would be more natural for this 'Humanity First' Government to come out now and say that they are willing to do what the Dominion Government did in 1947 and remove all sales tax from building materials? Do the same thing here. It would reduce the cost to the average working man in this province by \$200 or \$300. There is paint, there is hardware, there is linoleum, glass, cement, and all the things that go into a building. Why do not these broadminded and generous men come out and tell the people now that they have more revenue from liquor profits, more revenue from Dominion subsidies, and more revenue from every other source than they ever had in the history of this province. Let them now come out and say so here. And I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the greatest benefit of the removal of this tax on building materials will come to the urban centres of this province, to the working man who works for wages, and there is no one in more need of proper housing than the working people of this province.

**Hon. Member:** — What about the farmers?

**Mr. Danielson:** — As a matter of fact, I am not pleading so very much for them, because they are not so much affected by it. I state again, in spite of the swan song and the hardship that has been set before us, this afternoon, by the Minister of Agriculture; I state again that the farmers of this province are reasonably well off. I think that there is no one in my constituency that will deny that fact. But the working man with a family, who lives in a rented house and pays the rent and tries to live on the salary he gets today, has nothing to put into a



house. Let us be broadminded now, and as a Provincial Government say to him, "We will do our part. The Dominion Government removed their tax in 1947, and this Government removed theirs in 1953."

**Hon. Mr. Fines** (Closing the debate): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to assure the hon. gentleman that we have given this very serious consideration. We have had representations made to us by the Farmers' Union on two or three occasions. We have given this consideration, but we have decided against it for a very obvious reason, and that is that it amounts to a very substantial amount of revenue; and if we are going to continue to spend as much money as we are on agriculture and in ways that are of benefit to agriculture, then we have got to have the revenue from somewhere.

Now, he is talking about something that would amount to a million dollars a year. The hon. gentleman is very good at suggesting ways of cutting revenue, but he never seems to know where he could cut down the expenses in order to balance his budget. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that last year — oh, sure! — he would abolish the Bureau of publications and two or three little things like that. No doubt we will hear all about that in a couple of weeks' time. But, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has been talking about this particular thing as though that was what was the cause of the farmers' misfortune. The average amount which is spent by the farmer today, the small farmer, for the cost of the Education Tax on his farm fuel, since the average cost of farm fuel is about 25 cents per gallon, at 3 per cent the tax on that amounts to three-quarters of a cent per gallon. The amount that we get from the average small farmer is very, very little in a year. It does mean a great deal for the big farmer, however, and that is the one that my hon. friend is speaking for this afternoon.

The same, too, when he talks about exempting building materials. You know, those tears that were just dropping soundlessly onto the carpet in front of him when he talked about the amount of money that the poor little fellow is spending when building a house — Well, in the first place, it is very questionable if he is going to be able to build one, the little fellow that he is so worried about. Is he more concerned with the corporation that is building a \$2-million building? They are the ones who are really going to benefit by this exemption that my hon. friend speaks of; not the little fellow. Again, Mr. Speaker, it shows the mentality, it shows whom he is really interested in. What a difference in what he is suggesting, this afternoon, and what the hon. member for Regina suggested the other day! Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree.

I may say that we told the people very frankly, before the election, that we could not abolish this tax on farm fuel. We made the statement in this Legislature last year, and the year before. The hon. gentleman knows it. And, Mr. Speaker, you know what happened, last year. The hon. gentleman just got here by the skin of his teeth and by the fact that we changed his constituency in redistribution, otherwise he would not be here today.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**February 19, 1953**

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — That is all that it is. And yet to hear him agitate for helping the farmers, and yet the farmers almost left him at home.

**Premier Douglas:** — He has completely justified the redistribution Bill.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

(The motion for second reading was agreed to.)

**Bill No. 4 – An Act to amend the Fuel Petroleum Products Act, 1946**

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — There is just a little matter in regard to this amendment to The Fuel Petroleum Products Act. Each year a number of travelling shows come into the province. They usually have their own electric generators operated by diesel engines to furnish power and, as the Act now says, they can use purple fuel, but it is recommended that they be required to purchase a taxable fuel.

Then there are one or two other amendments for purposes of clarification, and another amendment which will allow purple fuel to be used on coalmining premises, except in motor vehicles and such transporting coal. It is felt only fair to do this as we allow the competitive fuels to be used to be produced with tax-free gasolines; that is, in drilling wells we allow them to use the tax-free gasolines, and feel the same privilege should be extended to the coalmines.

These are the amendments – we can discuss them better in committee. I will move the second reading.

**Mr. J.E. McCormack** (Souris-Estevan): — I see you have “consumption and equipment other than motor vehicle.” I wonder if the Minister has had a look at any of the coalmines in the province. A big portion of the fuel that is used is consumed in the motor vehicles. There would not be very much fuel consumed in anything else except motor vehicles in the operation of the average coal mine.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Mr. Speaker, I have not got my notes here, unfortunately, on that particular part. I think we could probably deal with it in committee. Actually, where there is a motor vehicle hauling coal today within the property of the mine, it can use the tax-free gasoline. It can go that today. But this is for the other equipment that moves the coal above. I understand that they do use other equipment than motor vehicles for excavating the coal, and that is what it is. I will be glad to check on that point before we go into Committee.

(The motion for second reading was agreed to.)

**Bill No. 5 – An Act respecting the Certified Public Accountants Association of Saskatchewan**

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — This Bill was before the House, last year, and I say at the

outset, that while I have introduced the Bill, I am doing so not as a member of the Government, but because we were asked a year ago by the Law Amendments committee to try and get the different groups together and bring in our proposals, this year. This is the result. We have had them together, and it has been impossible to get them to go into one organization. We have taken it up also with the University. We have discussed it with the University officials, and they are prepared to provide the necessary course and provide the tests. You will recall that, last year, a Bill came in just at the tail end of the Session and we did not have time to give it proper consideration.

Now we have the Bill before you, and I have suggested that it be referred to the Law Amendments Committee. I would like all hon. members to feel free to vote on it as they see fit. The Government would not, if the Bill is defeated, consider it a want of confidence or anything like that; but we do feel that we should proceed with this. There is no reason why these people should be denied the opportunity of forming their organization. All the safeguards are provided to ensure that they will have to pass certain prescribed tests, tests that will be administered by the University. I think when we get it to the Law Amendments Committee there will be undoubtedly representatives of other organizations who will present the other side of the question, and I think it can best be considered there. I would move second reading of the Bill.

(Motion agreed to.)

The Assembly adjourned at 5:50 p.m.