

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Twelfth Legislature
10th Day

Wednesday, February 25, 1953

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

DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The House resumed, from Tuesday, February 24, 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.

Mr. J. Walter Erb (Milestone): — Mr. Speaker, to continue from where I left off yesterday: In speaking about my constituency, Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the hon. Ministers, this afternoon, there is one exception. I want to ask of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Darling) that he have another clothes-hanger put in the members' room, because, when we get an overflow audience here when our important speakers are up, I have to drape my coat over another one, if I am not here on time.

I want to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to thank the good people of Milestone constituency for the trust and confidence they have again placed in me. I want to assure them I shall endeavour, as I have in the past four years, to warrant their trust and confidence.

Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to us on this side of the House to know that the record of achievement by this C.C.F. Government, during the past four years, has merited another mandate from the people of Saskatchewan. It is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the confidence expressed in the Government by the people of the province, last June, is an indication that the implementation of the C.C.F. programme was on schedule, and according to the promises made. It must indeed be a refreshing thought for the people of Saskatchewan to know that their Provincial Government has kept faith with them through the years, when, for years, the Federal Government has, time and again, made certain promises that have, over the years, proved to be mere political expedients during election campaigns.

It is an irrefutable fact, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal Party strategists have, during elections, campaigned on those issues which could secure for them the greatest number of votes. For example, we might cite national housing, national health insurance, and the Saskatchewan River dam. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is high time that the Liberal Party, in the interests of decency and political integrity, desisted from making the hopes and aspirations of the people of Saskatchewan and the people of Canada in general for their security, the pawn for their political aggrandisement. Such tactics, over the past three decades, makes more than justifiable a national crusade under the banner: "It is time for a change"; and, Mr. Speaker, let no one be misled or deluded that the C.C.F. cannot form

February 25, 1953

a national government. It can. The C.C.F. has a great reservoir of spiritual and intellectual resources in its membership, and it can provide for Canada, as it has for Saskatchewan, the best government it has ever had. I might say, in the vernacular of modern advertising, that it is smart to vote C.C.F. in the coming election.

To my mind, Mr. Speaker, the prerequisites of government that is truly responsible are breadth of vision and the ability to do long-term planning to the related economies of the nation for the common welfare. I believe it has been eminently demonstrated by this Government that, as a result of vision and careful planning, we can proudly point to some of the greatest pieces of legislation ever enacted by a provincial government in the history of Canada.

We can recall the early days of C.C.F. administration, when its critics gloomily predicted that the planners of the government "will never be able to extricate ourselves; that private enterprise would go by the boards; that the farmers would lose their land, and so on. Well, Mr. Speaker, what has happened in Saskatchewan under a C.C.F. Government is history. A rebirth of the social and economic life of this province has taken place such as we have never known. And then what did the critics say? Well, they said that due to buoyant revenues this Government was able to accomplish what it did. Well, Mr. Speaker, the revenues of this province also were buoyant under a Liberal government during their 30-odd years of administration; and their legacy to this province was almost exactly what the critics gloomily predicted would happen under the caprices of a C.C.F. Government.

We were, indeed, involved in a staggering financial debt. On April 30, 1944, the net debt of this province was \$214,253,120. Since that date to December 31, through the policies of this Government, there has resulted an improvement in the financial position of some \$140,684,958, or nearly \$20 million a year. In other words, our net debt as at December 31, 1951, was only \$151,639,999. A further improvement in Saskatchewan's debt position is reflected in the lower rates of interest on provincial bonds. In 1945, the average interest rate on bonds was 5.63% in 1951, Saskatchewan was able to borrow \$29,525,000 at an average rate of interest of 3.55 per cent – the second lowest rate of any province in Canada during that period.

I should also like to draw to the attention of the members of this House a recent article in 'Time Magazine' of January 19, on Saskatchewan. It is very good reading, and I want to say how happy I am to find such information of Saskatchewan in 'Time Magazine'. Very often Saskatchewan is passed by the boards in favour of more startling news than what we can produce in this province, although we think it is very startling sometimes. It is also interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the farm mortgage debt was reduced to \$16,377,000 in 1951, compared with \$93,326,000 in 1941. If ever the farmers were in danger of losing their land, Mr. Speaker, it was under a Liberal government and the mortgage companies.

Another step towards the financial progress of the province was the debt cancellation by the Government of the municipalities, and that was one of the first problems that faced the Government when it went into office, in 1944. An enormous debt burden had been accumulated by the municipalities on the part of the farmers, and until this onerous load could be lifted from the backs of the municipalities, our agricultural economy could

not look forward to getting on a stable base. This Government cancelled approximately \$75 million of direct relief and seed grain debt. That is indeed a remarkable accomplishment.

One can only conclude, Mr. Speaker, that this picture of robust financial health has been the result of careful planning and judicious appropriation. I believe it is axiomatic that a sound financial basis must precede expansion, particularly in those fields wherein government is responsible either wholly or in part. The realization of this objective by the Government enabled it to present to the people of Saskatchewan, last June, a planned programme for expansion. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, there are still some people who, at the mention of the phrase 'planned economy', see all the colours of the spectrum, with red predominating. And it is doubly unfortunate, I believe, when such people are the policy-makers of government, because of their aversion to planned economy, millions of men and women must resign themselves to a perpetual state of insecurity, and to the inevitable situations of boom and bust.

It is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of this province has, within its constitutional limits, through a planned economy, provided a measure of security for the people of Saskatchewan such as was never believed possible. The Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan is a stellar example of the construction planning that went into the initiation and development of such a programme.

When the C.C.F. was elected, in 1944, one of its major commitments, Mr. Speaker, was hospital insurance. It was obvious that such an ambitious programme could not be initiated overnight, for the simple reason that the Government had not sufficient knowledge of the existing hospital facilities; nor did they know what the minimum facilities could be to enable such a programme as this to be a success in its first stages. As is well known, the Government made a survey of this province, under the direction of Dr. Sigerist, renowned hospital authority of Johns Hopkins University. On the basis of that survey, the Government launched a hospital expansion programme and that, through a policy of making grants and loans in assisting planned hospital construction, especially in those areas that were in financial need.

The Government decided, during its first term, to provide assistance to small communities which otherwise might have limited or no hospital services at all. Incidentally, this aid was in effect for three years before Federal grants came into being.

Now in connection with Federal hospital grants, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that, during the 1948 campaign, Mr. Hubert Staines, that great architect of Liberal Party strategy, speaking in my home town of Lange, made the statement, I am told, that the Saskatchewan Government was unable to avail itself of the Federal grants by being unable to match them, as a result of having become insolvent by the losses it had sustained in its Crown corporations. Well, Mr. Speaker, my people at Lange knew, and Mr. Hubert Staines knew (or did he?) that Federal hospital grants, in 1948, were not as emergent as they were in 1944, at which time this Government would have appreciated the assistance of a Federal grant, because in 1948 the number of hospital beds in Saskatchewan was at that time considered adequate. But I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it would have been a magnanimous number of hospital beds in Saskatchewan was at that time considered adequate. But I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it would have been a magnanimous gesture on the part of the Federal Government had they allowed the transfer

February 25, 1953

of these grants to our Department of Highways. Mr. Staines, I believe, would have served his mission much better had he suggested just that.

The provincial allotments for assistance to hospital construction, during the period 1948-49, were \$300,000 and for 1949-50, it was \$400,000, and from 1944 to date, a total of \$2,300,333 has been voted by this legislature for grants and loans to hospitals and health centres. This policy of assistance, Mr. Speaker, has enabled the number of hospital beds in Saskatchewan to be increased from 3.8 beds in 1944 to 7.5 beds in 1952 and that, incidentally, is the highest ratio of hospital beds per 1,000-population on the continent.

It was not until 1947 that the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan finally went into operation, but when it did, Mr. Speaker, it became immediately the finest hospital insurance anywhere on the continent. And I submit that the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan is an example of what vision, courage and constructive planning can accomplish, and I believe it shall always remain a monumental expression of the faith, courage and imagination of the builders of social democracy in Saskatchewan, whose aspirations for humanity first are welded to the highest concepts of co-operation.

Our friends in the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, lament that the C.C.F. has repudiated Socialism. Now, is it that they do not understand what social democracy is? Or is it that they do understand and appreciate it, but act like Joachim Ribbentrop, Hitler's one-time foreign minister, who had a jealous dislike for the English for the simple reason he could not be an Englishman himself? But if our friends in the Opposition, by this time, have not learned what social democracy is, I am afraid that the prognosis for the recovery from their political malnutrition is not a favourable one.

It has always been the philosophy of the C.C.F. that in a social democracy there is room and opportunity for public enterprise, private enterprise and co-operative enterprise. But our friends in the Opposition espouse only one kind of enterprise, and that is free enterprise. We on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, have no quarrel with free enterprise on private enterprise. Indeed, the confidence that private enterprise has in this Government is clearly expressed by the vast sums of money that have been spent by the oil companies and mining companies, in exploration developments, and also by other large capital investments in the province of Saskatchewan. What we do object to, Mr. Speaker, is when private enterprise, through mergers, constitute a monopoly, thereby forcing out of existence the smaller and weaker competitors – for example, the milling combine, the glass combine and the match cartel; or when, by collusion, similar private enterprises enter into price-fixing agreements. The real tragedy, however, is I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Government, knowing all this, has done very little about it. The so-called teeth in their anti-combines legislation evidently are false, judging from their ineffectiveness.

We have heard the argument that what is taking place in the coming into being of monopolies and such, is the logical evolution of private enterprise. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is evolution all right, but it is evolution by conspiracy, and as such, is even now sowing the seeds of its evolution by conspiracy, and as such, is even now sowing the seeds of its own destruction, because it is destroying the truly free competitive system of enterprise. I believe that it has been clearly shown, here in Saskatchewan, that the three systems of enterprise can work side by side in mutual

respect and understanding; and I believe that we can point with pride to what has been done and achieved in these spheres of enterprise.

The expansion of public, private and co-operative enterprise has been a phenomenal one, when one considers that, just a few short years ago, these three sphere of enterprise were virtually at a standstill in Saskatchewan. Shortly after the C.C.F. Government was elected to office in 1944, Mr. Speaker, (and I want now, specifically, to talk about public enterprise, in dealing with the three different enterprises in the province) it began setting up the Crown Corporations which are enjoying such outstanding success today. They are, as most everyone knows: the Power Corporation, the Government Insurance office, the Saskatchewan Minerals, the subdivisions of which are clay products and sodium sulphate; the Saskatchewan Forest Products, subdivisions of which are the Box Factory, Timber Board and the Big River Mill; the Saskatchewan Transportation Company; Wool Products; Saskatchewan Government Airways; Government Printing Company; Saskatchewan Government Telephones; Saskatchewan Guarantee & Fidelity Company; Saskatchewan Marketing Services, the subdivisions of which are the Fish Marketing Services, the Fur Marketing Services and Saskatchewan Government Trading.

Over a six-year period beginning 1946, Mr. Speaker, these Crown Corporations have earned for the people of Saskatchewan a total of more than \$20 million. They have provided total goods and services valued at more than \$130 million, and provided wages and salaries in excess of \$33 million. Through these corporations the people of Saskatchewan, today, possess both fixed and current assets valued at more than \$75 million, and these assets, incidentally, represent a potential, first, for the earning of public revenue; second, for an increasing output of goods and services, and third, for providing employment and payrolls. And all this, Mr. Speaker, I am sure will continue in greater measure as our province continues to grown.

I want to give a breakdown of private enterprise as to capital investment, business incorporations and business registrations. Capital investment in Saskatchewan has, indeed, been impressive. Investment in food processing, oil refining, textiles, wood products, chemical and metal fabrication, attained an estimated \$17 million in 1951, surpassing 1950 by approximately 50 per cent. And all together, Mr. Speaker, it is estimated that in the four-year period beginning in 1948, manufacturing and processing facilities to the value of \$50 million have been added to the productive complement of our cities and towns. There were at least 90 new plants and 15 entirely new manufacturing activities established since 1945.

Under business incorporations, we find that, in 1944, there were 78 Saskatchewan companies incorporated, with an authorized capital of only \$2,894,000. But in 1952, Mr. Speaker, this number had increased from 78 to 188 companies incorporated, with an authorized capital of \$31,481,000. Our business registrations show similar expansion. In 1944, there were only 16 companies registered to do business in Saskatchewan with authorized capitalization of only \$6,080,000, but in 1951, there were 190 companies registered, with an authorized capital of \$467,336,000. In addition, partnerships increased from 201 in 1944 to 448 in 1952. This remarkable expansion of private enterprise in Saskatchewan is a testimony of their faith in Saskatchewan, in its people and in its Government.

February 25, 1953

Co-operative expansion has been equally outstanding, Mr. Speaker, and I also would like to give a break-down of the co-operative associations as regards number, total business and memberships. In 1944, the number of co-operative associations in Saskatchewan was 698; in 1951 it had increased to 1,100, or an overall increase of 402 associations. The total business conducted in 1944 was \$199 million; in 1951, \$359 million, or an overall increase of \$160 million. Individual memberships, in 1944, stood at 278,408; in 1951 they had increased to 482,989, or an increase of 204,581 members. In 1951, the total assets of the co-operative associations totalled \$133 million, or an increase of 90 per cent over the 1944-45 total.

Our credit unions in Saskatchewan showed similar expansion, Mr. Speaker. The number of credit unions in 1944 was 163; by 1950 they had increased in number to 245, an increase of 82. Memberships in 1944 were 20,988; by 1950, they had increased to 48,193. The number of loans in 1944 was 7,581 which, in 1950, had increased to 19,772 loans. The value of loans in 1944 stood at \$1,631,859, which also increased in 1950 to \$8,769,573.

Saskatchewan has now the distinction, Mr. Speaker, of being the greatest co-operative province in Canada. In 1949 to 1950 it transacted 26 per cent of all the co-operative business in the Dominion of Canada. This phenomenal growth of co-operatives I believe is due, largely, to the establishment in 1944 of the Department of Co-operation and Co-operative Development. This recognition of the importance of the co-operative movement in Saskatchewan resulted in the development of further services which would help the people of the co-operatives in self-help methods. Saskatchewan, we might say, has indeed become a Co-operative Commonwealth.

This brief outline, Mr. Speaker, shows the vast expansion that has taken place, of public enterprise, private enterprise and co-operative enterprise under the C.C.F. Government, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that just so long as we have a C.C.F. Government in this province, just so long shall public enterprise, private enterprise and co-operative enterprise flourish in this province to the end that all our people may have a more abundant life.

As a representative of an agricultural constituency, Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in voicing my concern over the loss of the traditional markets for our surpluses, that is, agricultural surpluses. What has happened is an indication, once again, that the Federal Government has no agricultural policy. Most of the help that has been given to agriculture by the Federal Government has been under the directive of political expediency and without regard to a policy that would stabilize this most important economy. The trade policies of the Liberal Government are such that they are, indirectly, a hostile act against western agriculture. As a matter of fact, the Federal Government, in setting up trade barriers of dumping duties and tariffs is, in effect, largely responsible for the loss of our traditional markets. Much has been written and said, Mr. Speaker, about the necessity of free nations working together in order that peace and prosperity might be the common lot of all. I submit that in no other conceivable way can this objective be achieved but through free flow of trade among the nations of the world.

At a time when outstanding men in government and business stress the importance of a world community, it becomes a strange interpretation of free enterprise when the leaders of the industrial business world, through an acquiescent government, render free-flowing trade impotent by the imposition of trade barriers such as dumping duties and tariffs on industrial products from overseas countries, particularly those products of the United Kingdom.

It is evident, Mr. Speaker, that the industrial boom in eastern Canada, largely the result of the defence preparations in Canada and in the United States, overshadows this serious problem facing agriculture. And one is reminded of two lines from Dr. Oliver Goldsmith's poem, "The Deserted Village":

"Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates, and man decay."

That, Mr. Speaker, can be the picture of Canada. As the hon. Premier declared in his speech, it is quite conceivable to find ourselves in an agricultural depression amidst an industrial boom. If such a situation materializes, it is also quite conceivable that a major collapse of the entire economy of Canada could follow, because the agricultural economy is basic to all the economies of this great country. And I submit that the very industries which have tried to find protection from overseas competition behind trade barriers and so on, will, in the final analysis, become the victim of their own folly.

Either the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, realizes the situation of western agriculture and is not concerned, or else it has become so mesmerized by the industrial successes of eastern Canada that it lies in utter oblivion to what is taking place in western Canada. Whichever is the case, the Federal Government has a responsibility insofar as it is responsible for the marketing of our surpluses overseas, and I believe that it is, indeed, a responsibility that today it is clearly shirking. The Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, have the power and (if I am not too presumptuous) the brains to do something about this situation, if it wants to. Failing to do that, Mr. Speaker, I reiterate, that it is indeed more than ever time for a change in the administration of Canada.

Mr. Abbott's recent rhetorical statement, in his budget address, saying that the tax cuts represent a national dividend, is, as far as the majority of the farmers are concerned, a nebulous beneficence. What the farmers want, Mr. Speaker, are fair and just prices for their agricultural commodities and for their surpluses. The farmers were not asking for a national dividend as a handout. The farmers, I contend, are willing to pay their Federal taxes, excises and duties. They may be even willing to pay, or help pay, for the freight subsidy on feed grains for the 'horses' at Petawawa but, Mr. Speaker, they want the wherewithal to pay for this through a stabilized agricultural economy, with guaranteed markets and prices.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the welfare of the people of Saskatchewan shall always remain the first concern of this Government. The past eight years have proved beyond all doubt that a programme of constructive planning, dedicated to the highest concepts of human

February 25, 1953

welfare, can achieve for the people that measure of social and economic well being to which the human race aspires. It is on this basis, Mr. Speaker, that we shall continue to build. But we build not alone with mortal hands, but also with the heritage of the spirit of our pioneers, to whom it was not given to see “the promised land”, but who toiled onward through their span of years, and whose greatest reward was only the vision, wrought by their faith, of a great Saskatchewan. This then, Mr. Speaker, is our challenge, and to that end we shall build, with the help of Providence and the faith of our fathers, a great Saskatchewan!

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure at this time to rise and take part in this debate. A lot has already been said in this debate and a lot will likely be said before the debate closes and, as you see, I am suffering to some extent with a cold at this time, and shall try to keep my remarks very brief today. I hope, however, at a later time in this Session to have more to say on some points which I will not cover this afternoon.

First I would like, as is customary, to extend my congratulations to the mover and seconder of this Address. They did a marvellous job. I have sat in this Legislature now for a few years and they did one of the best jobs of any mover and seconder. I would like also, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate you on your reappointment to the Chair for the third term in this Legislature. You have now the record of being the Speaker of this Assembly for the longest number of years of any Speaker. I am sure that it is your fair play, your honesty and impartiality that has given you that distinction of being chosen the speaker for the third successive time.

A lot of records are being set in this House at this time. I have no doubt that there are records being established by some of the cabinet ministers for the number of years to be the Minister of a certain portfolio. I did not take the time to check all the statistics. The Premier of this province has almost got a record for being the longest premier in office. He is only beaten by one former Premier, that was the first Premier this province had, Sir Walter Scott, who was the only Premier with a longer record of office than our present Premier, and I am sure that this province has no intention of changing Premiers for a good time to come, so the present Premier will establish a record for a few years, because I hope to see him in this position for another 20 years yet.

You know, the Premier of our province gets lots of credit for the things he has done; sometimes he gets credit for the things he has not done. A school teacher friend of mine, last summer, was telling me that she was giving her pupils their exams in June and she said that one of the questions she asked her pupils was “Who was the leader of the Saskatchewan Rebellion?” The answer came back on the pupil’s book: ‘Tommy’ Douglas. I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that our friends across the way think, as far as they are concerned, it was a rebellion, because they have been rebelling ever since trying to get back in and cannot quite make it.

The Leader of the Opposition was speaking, the other day, in his swan song, and he inferred that this Government had carried on tactics which were very low, in order to maintain power. There were several reasons why we were returned to office, last June, and the actions of the Opposition had a lot to do with it. These are some of the things which returned this Government to office. I have here in my hand a copy of a letter which was

dated at Kamsack, April 23, 1951. This letter was addressed to Mr. G.N. Long, of Wishart, and it said:

“Dear Sir:

This will confirm your appointment as census enumerator for District No. 35 being as follows:

No. 35, Township 28 & 29 in Range 15 West of the Second Meridian.

The population of Wynott and Westmoor are to be shown separately. Further information will be sent to you in the near future.”

Well, further information, Mr. Speaker, was sent in the near future. That letter from Kamsack was signed by George Van De’Sompel, the census Commissioner for that area. Well, further information did come before very long. On May 7th there was another letter which was signed by Mr. George Van De’Sompel. It read:

“Dear Mr. Long:

Re: District No. 35

I regret to advise you that it has been necessary to cancel your appointment as enumerator in this district.”

That was his ‘further instructions’. Now, why was it necessary, Mr. Speaker, to cancel that appointment? Well, it so happens that between April 23rd and May 7th none other than Carl Stewart, the M.P. for Yorkton, visited Wishart and he had wanted to know from his local boys who they had recommended to be the census enumerator in that district. When they told him the fat was in the fire good and proper, and consequently, Mr. George Van De’Sompel had to tell Mr. Long regretfully that his appointment was cancelled. Mr. Long had the time, the transportation to get about and had the ability to do the job, but for political reasons he was not given the job. Those are the things, Mr. Speaker, which help to keep this Government in power.

I would like at this time, too, to congratulate the Opposition on coming to my constituency, last June. You will recall that on a former occasion I thanked the Leader of the Opposition in this House for speaking in the town of Wadena. Prior to the 1948 election in the town of Wadena, the C.C.F. had never had a majority. The Leader of the Opposition did us a great service by speaking in Wadena. When the election came in 1948, we had the majority in the town of Wadena.

But there were a few other towns in which we did not have the majority. Among those was Rose Valley. We never had a majority at Rose Valley. I invited the Leader of the Opposition to come back and speak in my area again. Unfortunately, he was not able to get there. They sent his right-hand man, the member for Arm River. Mr. Danielson spoke in Rose Valley; he also spoke in Wadena, and, Mr. Speaker, we have for the first time,

February 25, 1953

in the last election, a C.C.F. majority in Rose Valley, and we maintained our majority in Wadena.

I am going to extend at this time to the Leader of the Opposition or the member for Arm River an invitation to come and speak in the town of Wishart. You know, the town of Wishart is the only town in my constituency where I did not have a majority. I spoke there myself, but it was to no avail. There is one poll just outside of Wishart. Some years ago it was definitely predominately Liberal. It was the time when the Anderson Government was in power and they could not get scrutineers in that poll. So they had to send two outsiders into that poll to be scrutineers for the conservatives. And, lo and behold! When the voting was over, the ballots were counted, the scrutineers voted in this poll, but there was only one Conservative vote. So one Conservative scrutineer looked at the other one, and said: "Well, I don't know which of us it was. I don't know whether it was you or whether it was me, but one of us never voted for our man." Every other vote except that one was a Liberal vote. But last June we had a majority in that same poll. So it showed that the people are not being fooled like they were in years gone by.

Wadena is a constituency which is made up of a number of different races or race origins. The people there are from various parts of Europe. They do get along very well together, and we do have a very good constituency, and I am proud of the constituency of Wadena; I am proud to be here and represent them. I will once again, as I did on the night of the election, pledge myself to serve them to the best of my ability.

In Wadena constituency, the first part of this month, they had at Elfros the opening of a rink there. That was a very nice occasion, the opening of that rink. I could not help but think of the wonderful work those people of Elfros and district had done and all credit is due to them. The Minister of Natural Resources was to be there for the official opening, but due to the icy conditions of the road he was not able to go by car and air conditions were so bad that a plane was not able to make the trip; so he was not able to attend that opening. When you see buildings like that it shows, Mr. Speaker, that the people of that district are thinking of the youngsters. They are building the rink that the youngsters may grow up physically and mentally sound. Districts like that will never be much of a burden on society for delinquency, when they give a little time, thought and energy to provide recreation for the young people. Those are the things, Mr. Speaker, which go to make and build a contented nation. We are hoping that more and more districts will be in a position to provide facilities for the young, because no nation is any better than the people who live in it. Our greatest natural resource is our young people. Our human resource is our greatest resource.

I could, Mr. Speaker, spend a lot of time talking about our schools, because the school grants, as we know, have increased since 1944 to \$47.00 per pupil. I could spend time discussing the social welfare programme, or insurance, or highways. Our highways in this province have greatly been increased this last eight years. Greater number of miles of road have been built. The municipalities and the L.I.D's have built more roads this past eight years than in any comparable period before. There is a lot of things that one could talk on, but time will not permit.

It is so gratifying to note, as was mentioned by the Minister of Natural Resources before the Orders of the Day, that the oil production of this province, on December basis, was being produced at over 2 million barrels a year. So we have some from no production at all, in 1944, taking December for an average, to over 2 million barrels per year. We are going places in oil production in this province.

The Leader of the Opposition was speaking the other day, and he had something to say on power. It rather amused me the way he worded it, Mr. Speaker. I have here – it is taken right from his speech as recorded on the Dictaphone – and he said:

“Mr. Speaker, you will remember that Session after Session I have pleaded with the Government to get busy on the farm electrification programme. They did not take it seriously until they were almost beaten in the 1948 election. Then they began to get busy on the farm electrification programme.”

How could he plead with us Session after Session when he was not here prior to 1948? He admits that after 1948 something was done; so he was pleading for something that was already being done, and he will continually get up and say that nothing has been done for power. And his own statements prove that after 1948 things were being done. And last year, Mr. Speaker, we in this province put up more miles of power line than any other province in Canada. We may not have the greatest number of the farmers, on percentage basis, hooked up or the greatest number of city dwellers hooked up; but on the miles of line constructed, last year, we put up more miles than any other province in Canada. When you consider the progress that has been made this last few years, it is no wonder that the people, last June, rejected the Leader of the Opposition's plea for the chance to put power in for them when he would let them pay half of it over a 25-year mortgage – they could pay it monthly on a monthly instalment basis for the next 25 years. That is what he called free power: the province pay half, he said, and the other half would be put as a 25-year burden on their backs where they would pay interest on it for 25 years. People have had enough of Liberal freedom with a mortgage on their backs. They want no more of it.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Nipawin (Mr. MacNutt) mentioned the Carrot River Triangle. I would have liked to have had time to comment at some length on that Carrot River Triangle, because I have some knowledge of that area as I have travelled that country on foot on several occasions while hunting when there was an open season on big game, a few years ago. I agree with what the member for Nipawin said that there is a lot of good land in there, but I think the one point that he failed to mention – I am not saying that he did it deliberately to try and mislead, because I do not think he did; but the one point he failed to mention is that, in addition to the drainage needed in that area, there has to be flood-control facilities built, and the dam on the Saskatchewan River would help to prevent the flood waters from flooding that area. Also, if we could have the Fort a la Corne dam built for a power project there, it would help to prevent the floodwaters. All the ditches we could possibly put in there would not prevent the flooding if we cannot control the rivers. Those are things which have to be done before that area can be developed. I agree with the member for Nipawin, it is an area of good rich productive land. It is subject to a certain amount of frost; there will be frost hazards, but we must above all make sure that

February 25, 1953

we never put settlement in there to be drowned out like a bunch of rats, because we did not see first that that area would not be flooded in the future as it has been many times in the past.

Before taking my seat, I would like to refer to this wheat situation for a few moments. It is quite serious, Mr. Speaker. In the northern part of the province a lot of the 1950 crop was lost because of frost damage, a lot of it was not harvested. The 1951 crop was a more serious disaster. In my own particular area when the snowstorm hit in October, 1951, there was eight inches of wet snow came and put the crops down flat. A lot of those crops never were harvested. There are people on the municipal tax list, this year, whose land has been put up on the tax notice for tax sale if they do not pay their taxes, who for years have consistently been able to get the discount on paying their taxes. The secretary of one of the R.M.'s there told me that there were a number of people (he said, "I could give you a whole list of them") who have always been in here in July to pay their taxes, and now they are in arrears for two or three years because they had suffered a hazard in 1950 and again in 1951. In 1952, we had a good crop but by the time the crop year had gone three months on the way, by the first of November, we had not handled a 5-bushel quota throughout the whole of the province.

In 1928, we had one of the heaviest crops this province had ever produced. It was for a good many years an all-time record. I worked out on the prairie in that Fall and I helped to haul grain to the elevators from the threshing machines. You would see them lined up a quarter of a mile long at every elevator, getting into the elevator, hauling grain. It is true that they did not have the 400 or 500-bushel trucks like they have now, but at no time did you have it so that they could not deliver. At the end of the first three months of the crop year there was not one farmer in the province, I do not believe, who wanted to deliver grain and could not because there was not room. Everybody had had the chance to deliver all the grain they wanted to. But this year, at the end of the first three months of the crop year, we find that we were not able to deliver a five-bushel quota. Consequently, store bills were not paid, oil bills were not paid, the merchants were put into a tough plight and the small businessman and the municipalities and the school districts cannot carry on because the taxes cannot come in and the farmers are being penalized with penalties on their taxes because they cannot meet their obligations.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, there is a deliberate hold-up on the part of those responsible for our transportation. Surely if we can, in this modern day and age, improve our productivity so we can produce more, surely the brains behind planning transportation and the new type of transportation should be able to move, in the first three months of the past crop year, at least a five-bushel quota!

We have no assurance that we can sell it all. What does that mean, Mr. Speaker? If we have grain piled up in our bins here on the prairie, or piled on the ground, it means that we here are suffering because we have got too much while other places in the world are suffering because of the lack of that food. Mr. Speaker, if you take the approximate population of the entire world and give every man, woman and child in the world today standing-room only, they can have standing room in one of our 9 township municipalities; all the population of this world could be fitted into one municipality. Well, surely, if we could put all the people of the world

into one municipality we could organize the rest of the world so that we could feed, clothe or shelter them. It is just a matter of giving up this 'Profit-first' motive and getting busy and doing something about it. We can produce enough to feed the world! Let's get busy and do it. But until those things are done we will never eliminate the trouble and disasters with which we have been plagued in history throughout the past, of wars and rumours of wars, and race hatred and all the rest of it.

It gives me great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in voting on this amendment, to vote that down, to stand behind the Regina Manifesto, and to support the Motion.

Mr. Arthur T. Stone (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I take my place once again in this Legislature, and I wish to thank (and I think I speak for my running-mate, the Minister of Social Welfare) the people of my constituency, the City of Saskatoon, for the overwhelming support and the confidence placed in us and in this Government of which we are members. I want also to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, for once again taking that honourable position which you hold.

I only wish that I could make the contribution that the only other urban member so far to take part in this debate has made, and I refer to the lady member from the City of Regina who gave such a capable, clear and concise speech, stating the case of the people not only in the urban centres, but also of the rural districts before this House. I can quite understand the disappointment of the members opposite in not having a lady member with them at this time. I might say that that lady referred to by the Leader of the Opposition was a very capable candidate. She had charm and she had plenty of ability, but unfortunately, the ammunition which her Party gave her gave out nothing but blanks at the last election, and it was rather too much of a handicap, even with such a capable candidate, to overcome at the last election.

Before I left the last Session, I was told in the corridors here that I was the candidate to be taken out at the next election, that the lady would be taking my place here, and I warned the members opposite at that time that they did not know very much about the city of Saskatoon, and I also told them that they did not know any more about the problems of an urban centre, today, than they did 20 years ago. Saskatoon never has been a Liberal stronghold, and there have been good reasons for that. It has never been the desire or the wish of the Liberal Party to pay much attention to urban cities. They have always had plenty of a majority, plenty of seats, in the rural districts and, therefore, they were not too anxious to win urban seats. One would never see a worker, for instance, in overalls taking part amongst the bigwigs of the Liberal Party and formulating policy. The problems of the urban centres were usually left to a prominent lawyer or a prominent businessman who was supposed to know all the problems and ills pertaining to a large urban centre. But we, in our Party, encourage all sections of society to join our Party and form policies.

I am going to say that the people in my constituency are well satisfied with what has been done to alleviate the problems in the northern centre, and they have given security to the worker, they have assisted the people in health security, and they have done a lot of things to help the urban people in their problems.

Now, in 1952, I believe the city of Saskatoon was more in the limelight than any other centre in the province of Saskatchewan, and I am sure that I can understand why some citizens of Regina, at least, were alarmed and tried to move the spotlight off the city of Saskatoon. In case there were some people who listened to a nation-wide hook-up and have the opinion that the only great athletes of this province emanate from Regina and the southern part of the province I want to dispel that idea right now, Mr. Speaker, and say that we in the north also have some very fine athletes. I think the member for Biggar (Hon. Mr. Lloyd), the other day, pointed out to this House the fine contribution that the town of Delisle had made in the world of sport, and the member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) also mentioned the wonderful baseball team they have from North Battleford. We, in Saskatoon, are still talking about the technical High School curling team who won the Dominion championship for two years in a row, surely a feat which will take a considerable amount for any other rink to equal. We also had a good professional hockey team which won for the first time of asking the western Canada professional hockey championship with an assist from Delisle. We were also proud to send three of our native sons on the Olympic team over to Helsinki to take part in those Olympic games: Craig McKay, who made a very creditable showing in the skating and though he did not win any honours he did make a very fine showing, and there was also Bob Adams in very difficult decathlon events. He also did not bring any honours back, but we are sure that Bob gave a good account of himself over there.

But there was one young athlete, a young lad of 17 years of age, who brought back to Canada, and great honour to Saskatchewan, the only gold medal from the Olympic games. I could go on to point out the many honours that George Genereux has brought to this province, and I want to say at this time that many have expressed the appreciation of this Government in making it possible for a small group of athletes in this province to take part in the Olympic trials at Hamilton, in 1952. We also had another honour come our way when Pat Fletcher won the Canadian Open Professional Golf Championship and brought that honour to Saskatchewan.

In 1952, the city of Saskatoon celebrated the 70th anniversary of the foundation of the site and name for the city of Saskatoon. It was a pretty good show, Mr. Speaker, and those pioneers who are with us today were able to take part and renew acquaintanceships and take pleasure in what is now the city of Saskatoon through their hard work and some of the joys which they remember in the days gone by. It was also an opportunity for the people of Saskatoon, today, to appreciate the work that was done by the pioneers, and the understanding of the work that they would have in the future to maintain those standards and to make Saskatoon even a better city than it is at the present time.

That brings us down to one other item which received considerable notice, and that was the matter of natural gas which was not completed until the early part of this year. Natural gas has had a varied experience in Saskatoon. Some twenty-odd years, I think it has been, that Saskatoon has been trying, one way or another, to get natural gas into that city. I think it was in the early 'thirties when one of the late mayors went out and stumped-speeched successfully and defeated the franchise which might have come in at that time. However, the question was again brought up a few years later, and the people gave the City Council the green light to go ahead just before the last Great War. I might state that, at that time, there were very few arguments put up. A free enterprise concern wished to bring in the

natural gas. There were very few questions asked as to the price. The contract was signed, I think, by a firm of lawyers in Winnipeg. The City Council and some members of the Board of Trade went out and viewed the site at Unity, and I understand they had a very good time and everything was in good order for gas to be installed in Saskatoon.

I do not need to say that we never got the gas, whether it was because of the War, or because of other reasons, I do not know. However, many of our people had more or less given up the idea of our ever getting natural gas into Saskatoon, and many of our people, today, have changed over to oil. I think more than 50 per cent of our people today are burning oil. And again, Mr. Speaker, it is quite noteworthy that no protection was given the consumer when oil-burners were brought into our homes. In fact, anybody who had a business of any kind or a store could get an opportunity to install oil-burners whether he knew anything about the installation of oil-burners or the servicing of those oil-burners afterwards; and much to the sorrow of many of our people who changed to oil-burning, they found the initial cost was considerably above that which they thought it would be in the first place.

It is rather noteworthy, too, that we in Saskatoon have to pay some 4 cents or 5 cents a gallon more for our furnace fuel oil than do the people in Regina, and I venture to say that once there is a chance of gas being turned on in Saskatoon we will have our fuel oil as cheap and maybe cheaper than the people in Regina.

The contract for natural gas was finally signed after much beating around by the press. After all, we do have some very fine citizens in Saskatoon, people who do not let their prejudice and their emotions spoil their proper judgment, and these people – many of them – are not altogether friendly to this Government, but they have stated quite openly to me that they are very pleased that Saskatoon was going to be the first city to be coupled with natural gas. And that has meant an awful lot to us, Mr. Speaker. It will mean a savings of hundreds of dollars to our people in keeping our homes warm and, after all, that is the big part of our budget in this very frigid weather of ours. It means a saving to our industry there, and it also is another very good talking point into bringing further industry to our city.

I want to thank the Minister of Highways for the completion of No. 11 from Saskatoon to Regina. I can remember when it used to be a matter of planning for a week to go from Saskatoon to Regina and it took the best part of a day – if you got there – around by Moose Jaw. I have travelled this Highway two or three times, and it is certainly a pleasure; there is no work at all to it, and you can get there in 3 ½ to 4 hours quite comfortably. All we want now, Mr. Minister, is the other northern city of Prince Albert hooked up by blacktop, and the little jog from Moose Jaw to No. 11 and then the rest of the cities can come to Saskatoon quite easily and enjoy the wonderful city of Saskatoon.

I am very pleased to see that provisions are going to be made for the committee on highway safety. I have had many representations from people in Saskatoon who are alarmed at the number of accidents on our highways. They are very keen on our automobile accident insurance. They are also very keen to keep the cost of that insurance a plan down, and I am sure some of these people have some very good suggestions to offer. I hope they will be here when the committee is set up to present their case on this

all-important question. I might mention, too, that last Fall we had a plebiscite on daylight saving. As a committee is being set up on that in the House, it may quite possibly be that representations will be made from my city to this committee of the House. I do not know whether the holding of a plebiscite will help, or whether it will confuse the situation.

I am not going to say a great deal more. I have on my desk several pieces of correspondence from different places about a 40-hour week, Mr. Speaker. I have read them with considerable interest. I see no different arguments in the briefs presented than have been presented on every other occasion that the worker was asked for some better conditions. The same arguments were presented when we went from the 12 to 10 hours and from 10 to 9 and 9 to 8, when we asked for holidays with pay and so on. This time I see our employers are hiding behind the skirts of our farmers, — if farmers have skirts they are hiding behind the skirts of our farmers. It is the old story that the economy will be wrecked, and I say that is ridiculous. We heard the story when the railroad workers went on strike that the railways would have to fold up if 40-hour work was given to the railroad workers. I think the railroads are getting along very nicely now. They were able to put up a pretty nice case to win the sentiment not only of the people of Canada but also of the Parliament of Canada, and they not only got enough to cover the changeover, but a considerable amount more besides.

I do not want to dwell too much on that 40-hour week. I am very sorry, but I was supposed to leave a little time for the hon. member for Lumsden (Mr. Thair). Fortunately, we in the urban centres can quite often get on the air, and it would be nice if all rural members could have an opportunity to say what they want to their constituencies in the rural districts. And so, Mr. Speaker, with those few words I want to say that I will oppose the amendment and support the motion.

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

THIRD READING

BILL NO. 6

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. fines:

“That Bill No. 6 – An Act to amend the automobile Accident Insurance Act, 1952 – be now read the third time.”

Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, I want to say at the outset that I am not opposed to the automobile insurance plan. I do not think it is right in every respect, but I have endorsed the principle and I endorse it again today. No person, nor any government, who is responsible for the business and conduct, for security of the public in any province should permit any person in this day and age to operate a motor vehicle without having a licence and protection for himself and those that he many menace on the highways. I want to make that clear before I go ahead and say what I want to say.

Mr. Speaker, I was sitting in the House, I think you will remember, in 1946, when this Bill was brought into the House by the Hon. Mr. Valleau. It took some time before it passed through the House. Many sections were held over and some sections were changed, some at the suggestion

of Mr. Proctor who was sitting on the Opposition side of the House at that time. There was also a question about surplus revenue earned through the operation of this Act, and I want to say, before I express this thought, in taking part in this debate, that the Provincial Treasurer has assured us that there never has been one nickel or dime taken out of the insurance fund and used for other purposes. I believe he is absolutely honest and I think that is correct. But at the time the discussion took place, in 1946, that may not have been the settled policy of this Government, because I distinctly remember the Hon. Mr. Valleau saying that if there was any surplus it could be used for social services. Now I say again that I do not believe that has been done.

During the first three years of the operation of this Act there was very little value given for the amount of money taken in. Then, after three years, there had been built up a surplus in the funds of this insurance plan of approximately \$1,300,000. That brought us up to 1949, Mr. Speaker. Since that time, by the extension of the coverage which the Provincial Treasurer brought in and which I think is right, we found that from that time on, it commenced to decrease very rapidly, and it isn't any use for him to say now that this is a new experience or something that has come on very suddenly. The average loss, over a period of three years, is over \$1,200,000, approximately. They have paid out every year, since 1949, more revenue than they have taken in.

Two years ago, on January 23, 1951, the Provincial Treasurer said, at that time, that even if there were any losses, an increase of \$1.00 a car would fix up the whole thing. That is what he said in 1951, not in 1952, Mr. Speaker! So he knew then that there was a deficit. We on this side of the House pointed out, in 1951 and 1952, that something should have been done. Any good businessman or any government who wanted to put anything they had established of a permanent nature on a sound foundation, would have done something about it at that time, instead of, today, a doubling of the insurance rates – an increase from \$10 to \$20 for a car that is four years old, Mr. Speaker. I have one myself. This would not be necessary if something had been done at the time it should have been done. It could have been very well looked after by increasing the rates by a small amount at that time. Instead of that, facing an election, this Government has for three years squeezed through denying the fact that there was anything to worry about. As a matter of fact, a year ago, the Provincial Treasurer, again on March 1, right in this Legislature, assured us that it was nothing to worry about, and that a \$1.00 increase on each car would fix up the whole thing. He repeated the same thing here two or three days ago when he gave Second Reading to the Bill, but he added something else, Mr. Speaker, that he never added before, and that was also 100 per cent increase in the motor operator's licence. An increase of 100 per cent! That also goes into the motor insurance premium fund.

I want to point out to the House that this was kept very quiet before the election, just as before the 1948 election we did not hear anything about the hospital insurance premium being increased; but it was increased – after the 1948 election. They knew before the election that the rates were going to be increased, that they had to be increased. Now I think it is dishonest, Mr. Speaker, for any public official or any government who are looking after the public interests, not to keep the people informed who are paying the taxes, because, after all, it is a tax and not an insurance premium – not by any means, Mr. Speaker. I think those people should be told what the situation is. For three years there was a deficit in this scheme

February 25, 1953

of approximately \$1,200,000, and no admission of this was ever given to the people of the province by this Government. On the other hand, it was denied in two sessions of this House that there was anything to worry about. Then after we had obtained these figures and went out and told the people, during the last election campaign, and we said there would have to be an increase in rates, but oh no! the C.C.F. resented that reflection on them, and began going around frightening the people, trying to make them believe that a Liberal Government would do away with or ruin the insurance that had been implemented by the C.C.F.

Now what are the facts? Only on July 21, after the election was over, did the Provincial Treasurer put out a new speech; but more than that, in a speech delivered by the Premier of this province in the neighbouring province of Alberta, and it says here:

“Premier T.C. Douglas of Saskatchewan said here last night”...(that would be August 21, Mr. Speaker, 10 days after the Provincial Treasurer admitted that there was a drastic deficit and a drastic increase would have to be made in this plan)...”the re-election of this Government in the province has proved to Canada that the C.C.F. had been carrying out the programme the citizens want.”

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Danielson: — That’s all right; I am not quarrelling with that at all. But he said something else – and you won’t like this – and I would like an explanation, if he is so ill informed about the affairs of his own government. This is what he said:

“Mr. Douglas said Saskatchewan farmers are protected from seizure and that this government, after taking over rent control, had held rents to an increase of four-fifths of one point, and rents had increased by 10 points elsewhere in Canada.”

e also said:

“That the compulsory car insurance scheme in Saskatchewan was losing money is untrue.”

That was 11 days after the Provincial Treasurer notified the press of this province, or made it known in some mysterious way, on July 21, that this very lamentable thing which he spoke of so seriously on the radio a few weeks ago, was happening. It proved that what he had said before was not true, and he had to confess to the people of the province. I sat at home and I listened very carefully and patiently to this gentleman from the city of Regina speaking in that wailing voice and if I had not known that that radio broadcast was coming from the city of Regina I would have said that it came from the ‘weeping walls of Jerusalem’ itself because I think that is where he came from himself. He did his level best to convince the people of the province that they would be far better off by paying \$20 for their insurance than they had been by paying \$10, and he didn’t make a bad job of it! But I will ask him now – what was the secret? Why have they

kept the people of this province in ignorance about this situation which is the concern of every man and woman that drives a motorcar in this province? This is a fact, Mr. Speaker.

I might say another thing in connection with this, and it is that the surplus that has built up in this province has been built up at the expense of the farmers in this province since this Government has been in power. Ninety per cent of the second-hand cars are sold to and driven by the farmers, and yet every one of the C.C.F.'ers over there have been wailing and bemoaning the terrible position that the farmers of this province are in. Now, surely, they have no money to spend four or five thousand dollars for some of the fancy cars; they are buying the second-hand cars.

The Provincial Treasurer admitted himself that the farmers had been paying far more, over the years, than what was rightfully their share. And he is still perpetuating that; perhaps he is not increasing it as much, but he is still increasing it.

There is another thing that I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, and that knocks out some of the pomposity and the extravagance, when they are rising and talking about the activities of this organization in regard to motor car insurance, and it is that this organization that we have in the province of Saskatchewan is forcing excess insurance and that means private ins which is carried by the motor car owner himself that he is called upon to pay for.

I will tell you another thing: the farmer in this province has been charged an excessive amount during all these years so far as insurance on motor cars is concerned – the farmers' trucks, but nobody else's trucks. There are thousands of farmers' trucks in this province that have never seen a highway; there are thousands and thousands of farmers' cars that have never been driven on a highway in this province.

These are some of the things, and I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I believe firmly in the principle of protection; but I want to point out to you that we object, and very strenuously so, that a plan of this kind should enter into politics in any way, by this Party and this Government, and that they should use it for political purposes to win the last election. When I said, before the election, that there was a deficit and that the rates must be increased, it was denied by this Government and people came to me and said the C.C.F. told them that what I was saying was untrue. Well, that is not going to work too often, because the people of this province are able to see now what has taken place.

Just before I left to come down to this Session, three men walked into my house. It was bonspiel time in my town and two of them were from my seat and one gentleman was from the seat north of Arm River. This gentleman said, "You tell this Government that they might pull my Legislature once but they are not going to do it twice." He said: "If they are going to soak me \$20 on my car, why don't they sell me a package policy and be done with it and cover the whole thing? Why should I have to pay \$20 to this Government and have a package policy as well in order to have adequate protection?" I could not answer that question. It might be worthwhile for the hon. gentleman, who thinks he knows everything in this world and nobody else knows anything – he might call us "upstarts" on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker; I would like him to come over a little closer and talk to us sometime. He

February 25, 1953

tries to throw his weight around but it doesn't stick, and this isn't going to stick either, because we want to know a bout that speech of the Premier's in Alberta, after he had made a confession, when the people of Alberta were told that there were no losses in this insurance scheme and that if anyone said so they were not telling the truth.

That is the situation: "That the compulsory insurance scheme in Saskatchewan was losing money was untrue", Mr. Douglas said. That was on August 1, in the city of Edmonton – and this is what the press says. Didn't he know about it? Well, I think they should get together and tell the same story, Mr. Speaker. It looks better anyhow, and it wouldn't be quite as embarrassing for some of our C.C.F. friends when they were asked questions out in the country.

I am going to support third reading of this Bill for the reasons that I told you. I have said what I had to say, and it was badly needed. He has used distortion, make-believe, and anything to bolster their ends and to smooth things over and fool the people. Sometime we will have a wind that will blow the lid off, and then we will see the C.C.F. as they really are.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of speaking on the Third Reading, but my hon. friend has pretty well put me in a position where I have to.

May I say at the outset, after what we have just listened to, I am convinced of one thing and that is that my hon. friend doesn't know everything in the world there is to know, either.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that a great many statements were made, this afternoon, by the member who has just taken his seat that are not in accordance with the facts at all. He stands up here and makes these statements as though they were gospel truth, with nothing whatsoever to back them up. For example, he starts out: "Mr. Speaker, I want, first of all, to make it clear that I am not against the automobile insurance; I have always been in favour it and have supported it." Well, I have here the official records of the House, in 1946, and on Monday, February 25, we asked the hon. gentlemen to stand up and be counted, and what happened? On the motion that the word 'now' be struck out (that is for Second Reading) and "that the Bill be read this day six months" (that is to defeat it), moved by Mr. Proctor, seconded by Mr. Hooge, the vote on the said amendment was negatives on the following division: Patterson, Proctor, Danielson, Hooge, Marion. And yet he has just told us that he has always been in favour of it.

Then in 1949, Mr. Speaker, again we introduced some amendment to the Bill which made it what it is today. That is, it added certain protection, certain benefits. On that occasion: "The debate continuing, the question being put, it was agreed to on the following division." And again I see in the very first row, under his leader's name (Mr. Tucker) – Mr. Loptson, Culliton, Patterson, Danielson, again voting against it.

Well, that is twice in this House when there has been a recorded vote when he has voted against it.

Mr. Tucker: — On a point of privilege. I am sure that the Provincial Treasurer would not want to mislead the House. The purpose of that deal in 1949 was to add fire and theft, and we said we did not think that that was part of a proper scheme to protect the people against being injured

on the highway. That was forcing them to insure their own property...

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, what is the point of privilege. I have said all the hon. gentleman is saying...

Mr. Tucker: — The hon. member for Arm River said he is in favour of the people who are using the highway being protected against somebody operating a motorcar. Now this second vote that he referred to doesn't relate to that view at all...

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, I made it very clear that, in 1949, it was adding certain benefits to the Bill and the hon. gentleman opposed it. May I say though, that he was clearly on record, in 1946, when we established the principle of protection for people who might be injured on the highways, and that was when he voted against it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the member for Arm River again referred to a statement that I made in January, of 1951. I would remind the members of the House that that is 25 months ago today, on which occasion I said that, even if there were losses, an increase of \$1.00 a car would look after them. That statement was made in 1951. Now what is the result, Mr. Speaker? Here I have the last fiscal year that there was prior to that time — the loss for that fiscal year, 1949-50, was actually \$85,568. The loss for the fiscal year 1950-51, which did not end for some 10 weeks after I am alleged to have made that statement, was \$326,000. Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we have registered in this province approximately 300,000 cars, then I think you will agree that the \$1.00 per car was certainly a very accurate estimate at that time. In fact it was almost right on the nose.

Mr. Speaker, I tried the other day — I do not know whether the hon. gentleman was not listening or whether he did not want to listen; but I did try to point out that the great increase in the automobile accidents and in costs had taken place during this past year or 15 months. During 1952 we had a particularly bad year; we had hoped — and I might say that even in 1951, I had hoped — that the rising increased rate of accidents would level off. May I say right here, today, that if the number of automobile accidents continues to grow in 1953 and 1954 at the rate they have in 1952, and if the inflationary trend that has been exhibited in that period continues, then we shall have to be coming back in another couple of years to increase rates again. But we have evidence that it is falling off, and I feel confident that the rates we have set now will look after everything.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the member for Arm River, as is usual with him, tries to impute motives constantly, imputing the motive for instance that we were interested in the election. What a though, Mr. Speaker!

Mr. Tucker: — Of course, you weren't!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — You know it has always been the same. He referred to some other statements made, and I shall refer to one. When we introduced a Redistribution Bill, the hon. members opposite though that it was in order that we would eliminate them, and goodness gracious! The result of it is that some of them are here, today, who would not have been otherwise.

Mr. Danielson: — On a point of privilege. That goes with all the other statements he makes. I was not on my feet once when the Redistribution Bill was being passed, and any story he tells about that is false...

February 25, 1953

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman made a statement that this was a tax that had been imposed...

Mr. Danielson: — It is a tax, yes, just like the hospital tax.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — May I say, first of all, that if it is a tax it is one that certainly does not get into the provincial Treasury. We have not received a single five-cent piece from the time this Bill was introduced, when my hon. friend voted against it, in 1946. We have never had a single five-cent piece come into the revenues of this Government, even though we did have over a million dollar surplus; that surplus remained with the Insurance Office, and we have never collected a single five-cent piece from it.

He made another statement. He said the farmers' trucks had been paying too great an amount. They had been charged an excessive amount – and he shakes his head up and down! How does he know: Just simply because he thinks that is so, Mr. Speaker! I happen to have here some figures that show that the farm trucks – that some of them actually were very unprofitable from the point of view of insurance. The small trucks, the farm trucks not exceeding one ton, have been one of the most costly parts of the whole Act. Take them all, they have been average, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, the loss ratio of farm trucks is higher than that for commercial trucks. And yet, here is my friend again trying to stir up this strife between the rural and the urban population. He is constantly trying to stir up that strife by saying that the people in the rural areas are paying for the people living in the city. Well, I just want to tell him that again he is all-wrong and the statistics show that he is wrong. In fact I think statistics could be produced to show that practically everything he said today was wrong, just as I was able to produce evidence to show that his very first statement was wrong. He has always been against this Bill, and I imagine he always will be against it.

Mr. Speaker, he is just like the 'Leader-Post'. I have here an editorial, February 27, 1946, when the Bill was introduced, and what did the 'Leader-Post' say at that time? –

“The Douglas Government can call it social insurance, accident insurance or simple compensation from now till doomsday, but to the motorist who will be compelled to pay the shot the new Automobile Accident Fund measure now before the Legislature can hardly be regarded as otherwise than a straight boost in taxation.

“As a result of this week's debate on the Second Reading of the Bill, it is clear as crystal that while the taxation Bill has been cleverly sugar-coated by incorporating a limited public liability provision, underneath it is made of the same bitter stuff which is the ingredient of every increase in taxation, and in this case the pill is rendered all the more unpalatable because it is being administered on a discriminatory basis. Only the motorist is being called

upon to pay; to the rest of the population it is lolly-pops for free.”

That is the attitude they took all through this editorial, criticizing it and condemning it, just as the Liberal speakers did when the then member for Moosomin referred to it as being the greatest “hoax ever perpetrated on the people of any province under the guise of an insurance measure.” And yet, in 1949, we go back to the ‘Leader-Post’, which again adopted exactly the same tactics as my hon. friend from Arm River. At that time, in an editorial on February 28, the ‘Leader-Post’ said:

‘The first step of the compulsory plan merely provided that if a person were killed or injured by a Saskatchewan car that person was automatically insured. A case can be made out for this type of insurance coming as it does under the heading of protecting the public.’

Some Hon. Member: — Not a bitter pill then!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — No, it wasn’t a bitter pill at all. You see, after the thing had been in effect for three years and had been accepted by the general public, then the ‘Leader-Post’ wants to get on the bandwagon just like my hon. friend from Arm River who wants to get on the bandwagon today!

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take any more time of the House. I do want to answer just one further statement.

The hon. member for Arm River said that we had, in #1946, stated we were going to use the proceeds for social welfare. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that that statement was denied, most emphatically, by the Premier of this province, standing right here. The Premier got up and made the statement in this House that any profit that was made from the insurance would be used in one of two ways: either to provide additional benefits for the automobile users, or, secondly, to reduce the premiums, but that it would not go into the Treasury. That statement was made here; the hon. gentleman was here and he must have heard it.

Mr. Danielson: — I was sitting right here and Valleau was sitting over there, and he said he had no doubt that any profits could very well be used for social services; but he said (the Premier) I don’t know. I sat here and I took the remarks down and I said in my speech, Mr. Speaker, that it had not been done. I believe what the Provincial Treasurer has told us – that not one cent has been taken out of that surplus. I believed that and I told him so, but I am not retracting one word of what I said in regard to the Minister. I do not know anything about what the Premier said afterwards.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I will accept what the hon. gentleman says, but if we have records we can certainly look the records up. The Premier certainly placed the Government on record and that statement that he made has been lived up to; not one nickel has been taken out, in spite of the impression...

February 25, 1953

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, since my name has been brought into this debate. In the course of the discussion on that Bill, in 1946, the statement which my hon. friend has made was being attributed by certain Liberal speakers and in the press, and I rose, in the course of the debate on the Bill, and publicly declared (that particular part of the proceedings were broadcast) that the surpluses would be kept in a fund to be used either to reduce the premiums or to increase the benefits, and not one dollar of the car insurance money would ever be taken into the Provincial Treasury. That undertaking was given to the people of this province and to this Legislature in the debate itself, and has been lived up to.

Mr. Danielson: — I want to say this; I am not contradicting what the Premier said...

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, there is only one thing further that I want to say. The member who is carrying on this speech at the present time, from the other side, when he got up to speak first, said that he had always been in favour of this. I would just like to quote from the 'Leader-Post'. Now I am not going to say it is gospel, because they sometimes misquote, but here it is:

“Mr. Danielson complained that the committee which studied the matter had never called in witnesses as far as the public knows nor had it submitted a report to the Legislature. This automobile insurance Bill is going to take not less than a million dollars from the people, 90 per cent of whom are opposed to it.”

And so not only he was opposed to it, but 90 per cent of the people were, and yet, today, he is all for it. Mr. Speaker, I think we have a right to know just how the hon. gentleman really feels about it. When he is on record, and when he made the statement that 90 per cent of the people were opposed to it, and when he voted against it, what are we going to believe – what he is telling us today as a death-bed repentance, or shall we judge him by his actions?

The question being put, it was agreed to unanimously.

The Assembly adjourned at 6:00 o'clock p.m.