

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Twelfth Legislature
11th Day

Thursday, February 26, 1953

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

On the Orders of the Day:

RE GRAIN ELEVATOR STRIKE – PACIFIC COAST

Hon. T.C. Douglas (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to place on the records a wire which I received from the Grain Workers' Union and also my reply to them. First, the wire addressed to me, dated Vancouver, B.C., February 16, 1953, and it says:

“Vancouver-New Westminster grain workers wish to assure the farmers of Saskatchewan, through you, that we desire as early as possible termination of the present strike. Flat refusal of elevator companies to negotiate forced walkouts. We are ready to negotiate any time. It is in the national interest to keep record wheat crop moving to world markets. Sincerely, H.S. Martin, Chairman Local 333, Grain Workers' Union.”

And my reply, dated February 19, 53, addressed to H.S. Martin, Chairman Local 333, Grain Workers' Union, Vancouver, B.C.:

“Thanks for telegram February 16 and for assurance Union is desirous of terminating strike at as early as possible date. Farmers of this province will appreciate having this information and on their behalf would like to express hope that this suit will soon be settled and movement of grain resumed.”

I will just table these two wires now.

DEATH OF VICTOR SIFTON, SASKATOON

Hon. J.H. Sturdy (Minister of Social Welfare): — It is with deep regret that the members of the Saskatchewan Legislature, in session, have learned of the death of Clifford Sifton of Saskatoon.

He was a member of the Sifton family so long associated with important daily newspapers of western Canada. Mr. Sifton was a public-spirited and highly respected citizen. His tragic death at the early age

February 26, 1953

of 34 constitutes a great loss to Saskatoon, the province and the nation. I am sure it is the wish of the members that you, Mr. Speaker, express our sincere sympathy to Mr. Sifton's widow and children in the great and irreparable loss they have sustained.

Mr. W.A. Tucker (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Opposition, I would like to express our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Sifton and her young family. I have visited their home and I know what a happy family they were, how beloved he was by his wife and children, and I am sure that in this time of terrible bereavement which struck them so suddenly, our hearts will go out to them in deepest sympathy.

I think we can say that Saskatchewan has lost one of its finest young citizens in Mr. Sifton. He was in a position to serve the public welfare. He was a man, I think, of great vision and great wisdom, in spite of the fact that he was not more than nicely started in his life. He was a man of great devotion to the public welfare and to our country, and was particularly interested in the people who were not so fortunate and he was so placed in his position that he gave great service in all the fields — the humanitarian field, the field of civic service, the field of national service and other fields in which he took an interest, a helpful interest. A young man of his great promise, his great devotion to the public welfare, brings to mind the great contribution he might have made had he been spared to his fellowmen, and we must deeply regret that Divine Providence has seen fit to take him from our midst.

I realize that words of mine, spoken like this, would not begin to do justice to the memory of as fine a man, as fine a Christian and such an outstanding and devoted citizen as Clifford Sifton.

Premier Douglas: —Mr. Speaker, it is always a tragedy when a man is cut down in the prime of his life, and it is particularly tragic when it is a man with very high capabilities and a brilliant future before him.

I would like to say how grateful the Government has been for the co-operation we have had from Mr. Sifton when we have called upon and asked for his services. It is only two or three weeks ago when he met here in Regina with the Golden Jubilee Celebration Committee, and his contribution to that committee and to the deliberations and discussions of that committee were outstanding, and we were looking forward to having him as the chairman of the working committee on publicity and advertising for the Golden Jubilee. His loss will be a great one not only for the city of Saskatoon, but for the entire province.

I am sure there is nothing I can add to what has already been said but I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that without any formal motion I am sure it would express the sentiments of all the members of the House if you, Sir, were to convey to his family by letter or telegram the deep regrets of the Legislative Assembly now in session.

(Agreed)

On the Orders of the Day (Cont): —

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, in connection with the telegrams which the Premier tabled, I was wondering if he had thought of bringing the suggestion of the Labour Union to the attention of the employers so that they would know this had been stated to him. I do not know, but it might do some good in helping to bring the strike to an end.

Premier Douglas: — I take it the hon. Leader of the Opposition is suggesting that we might bring to the attention of the employers the statement by the employees that the former had refused to negotiate, and ask them to get together. I should be very glad to do that, Mr. Speaker. I believe that the president of the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union has offered to mediate in the matter. I do not know what response he has had from either side, but I shall certainly be glad to accede to the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition.

DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The House resumed, from Wednesday, February 25, 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. A. Lopton (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to join with the rest of the speakers in expressing my congratulations to the previous speakers, particularly those who have made their 'maiden' speech. I want to mention particularly the three new members on this side of the House. I think even you, Mr. Speaker, will appreciate that they have done a very good job. I would like to make special mention of my old friend, 'Russ' MacNutt, who sits just behind me here, who is a son of the first Speaker of this Legislature. He is the son of the late Hon. Mr. Thomas MacNutt, who was an honoured and respected pioneer in the Saltcoats district. He served as Speaker in the Legislature of Saskatchewan from 1906 to 1908, when he resigned to have a position as a member of the Federal House, a position which he occupied until the election after the First World War. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you will hear some more from Mr. MacNutt before this Session is over.

I would like to make special mention of the fair junior member for Regina. I was very proud of her presentation and I think she did a very handsome and a good job considering that she was trying to build up a regime that I rather think is foreign to her conscience. I was rather surprised at her making such an attack on the Government for the slum conditions prevailing in the city of Regina, and especially in view of the fact that the C.C.F. Government was going to provide houses for everybody that needed houses when they were campaigning in the election of 1944.

Now I would like to give the junior member a little information that might be of value to her. There is very little reason for that condition prevailing in Regina, as far as houses are concerned. This Government has spent enough and lost enough in its socialistic experiments during the last eight years, to provide the material — and I say that advisedly, because I have investigated the cost of the material — to provide a thousand cottages

February 26, 1953

for the money they have lost already in their socialistic experiments.

Furthermore, there is the School for Boys here in Regina – which really they did not need to build, because they had a building for that purpose at Moosomin – the cost of which would have provided the material for another three or four hundred cottages.

They are spending enough in wages and expenses for political employees – men and women who are really doing nothing throughout the country except exploring support for the C.C.F. ideology – that would provide the material for 1,000 houses every year.

Now these are not just theories. I can give the hon. member from Regina the facts to substantiate those statements. True, if you want to build the houses larger you may have to reduce the number in proportion to the extra cost of a four- or five-room house, and I would say that, if she really is sincere to clean up the housing situation in Regina, she might consult the Minister of Social Welfare and see what can be done about it.

Now then, I sat here with great interest listening to the Premier. I always like to listen to the Premier. I thought to myself what a tragedy it was that a man of such fluent vocal ability and such social standings should lend that talent to the promotion of an ideology that he himself knows is foreign to the people of this province. In view of that position he has to make such inconsistent statements which very often get him into difficulties.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that if I had that talent, I could put it to much better use. Of course, there is no reason why he should not be fluent. They tell me that he has been talking ever since he left the womb of his mother, and the latest rumour I have heard is that he even rehearses his speeches in his sleep. Now, whether that is true or not, I really do not know; but I want to make some comment on the things that he said in reply to the speech by the Leader of the Opposition.

First of all, it is rather inconsistent for him to say that the people of this province choose the policy of the Government. He naturally was jubilant over the success of the Party at the polls. I do not blame him for being jubilant for its success, but the success of a Party is something the same as the success of an individual in his business. If it is obtained honestly and fairly then not only the one who makes that success will rejoice in it, but others will rejoice with him. Now, if the C.C.F. Government obtained their success at the polls as fairly as he has told us that they did, then they have every reason to be jubilant. But I happened to be in the campaign and I question this very much.

If we go back a little bit through the history of elections and take up his suggestion that people vote wisely, then we may judge from past experience to what extent he is right, and whether the Leader of the Opposition was wrong when he suggested that the people may have been misled during the campaign. Mistakes at the polls by the people in our democratic countries is not uncommon, and it does not apply only to the province of Saskatchewan. I think if we view the history of recent years, that is, in our own time, we will find that the people have erred in casting their ballots at election time. No one will dispute the fact that the defeat of

Woodrow Wilson following the first World War has resulted in grave consequences as far as the world was concerned. Woodrow Wilson appealed to the people of the United States to re-elect him in order that he might strengthen the League of Nations, which was then set up in order to keep peace in the world and meet any aggressor that might crop up. The people of the United States, whether they were misled to do so, or not, voted against that appeal. I do not think that anyone will argue that the result of his defeat was the second World War.

Italy invaded Ethiopia: Had the League of nations then been strong enough, had the United States been a member of the League of nations at that time, I do not think that Italy would have attempted to invade Ethiopia. I do not think that Japan would have attempted to invade Manchuria and later, I do not think that Hitler would have started his tirade on nations and cause the second World War.

The second calamity at the hands of the people at the polls I think can well be said in the defeat of Winston Churchill in 1945. I do not think anyone will dispute the fact that if he had been re-elected we would not be facing the third World War. I am not saying that the Party that they put into power was all to blame, but commonsense would tell us that that time was no time for experiment. The Labour Party may have done its best, but it was full of theory that coincided much with that of the aggressor at the present time. While they were opposing them, the other fellow got hold and refused to do anything that the free nations or the free countries suggested in the way of settling up the affairs of the last war.

Then we come back home here in Canada. I do not think that the people gained very much by defeating the Reciprocity Act in the Federal election of 1911. The farmers of Canada and every western farmer organization had worked for years to get free entry into the United States for our surplus agricultural products. The Liberal Government of the day, led by Sir Wilfred Laurier, obtained that agreement whereby all agricultural products could go to the United States free of tariff in return for the free entry of agricultural implements back into Canada. All of that agreement was particularly in favour of agriculture. Well, why did the people vote against that? I think it is very fair to say that many of the people went to the polls at that time and they were persuaded to poll a vote for something that they did not want, and we have suffered ever since as a result of the defeat of that election.

I do not think that anyone will dispute the fact that when they voted for R.B. Bennett in 1930, the people did the wise thing even with the policy of keeping the Canadian trade for the Canadian workman and the idea of blasting his way into the market with our surplus without buying anything back.

Then let us come back home to Saskatchewan when the people elected the C.C.F. Government in Saskatchewan. I think that that has been a very, very costly experience too. During the eight years they have sat here, they have been crowing about the things that they have been doing, what they have accomplished. Well, we heard of their accomplishments voiced by the junior member for Regina when she said that the slum conditions in Regina were terrible, which conditions should not prevail.

February 26, 1953

Then we hear of the vast oil development; as a matter of fact, the Premier, in his speech, told us about the tremendous expansion of the mineral products. Now, I do not think the Premier wanted to be unfair to the province of Manitoba when he cited that the production of minerals in Manitoba had gone down 30 per cent, while our production had gone up approximately the same amount; but he did not tell you that we, in Saskatchewan, have only one producing mine. Isn't it rather peculiar, too, to say that we have only one producing mine, since they are talking about such mineral expansion? That mine was in operation when the C.C.F. came into power, and while the increase in the dollar production of that mine, which produces practically all copper, is much higher than it was before, their physical production is actually down, according to the last report we have. In Manitoba, their production is largely gold. Well, everybody knows that the price of gold has been kept down. It is the same price now as it was before the war, and, through the unfair demand of labour, over half of the gold mines in Manitoba and all across Canada have been closed down these last two or three years, according to the records, and that is why the production of the mines in Manitoba has gone down.

Now then, let me take some of these statements in respect to the production of oil. Well, before I go any further – he said something about other mining development throughout this province. In spite of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that we have a large number of very promising claims – copper, silver, gold and, to some extent, nickel in this province – I have yet to hear of one of these projects being under development. The only mineral development that we have is in the uranium field. Why? Well, I can tell you why. It is simply because those who are promoting or exploring for uranium in the uranium field know very well that, if they find a producing mine there, they can turn it over to the Federal Government at a reasonable profit, and they are not afraid of being socialized by this Government because this Government could not touch them.

Now let us get back to the oil development which has been a matter of debate in this House before. When this Government came into power in 1944, we had companies in here exploring for oil. When the companies found out the lease terms of this Government – and these terms, of course, have now been changed – they just pulled up their drill and moved over to Alberta, with the result that, in 1947, they discovered what is known as the Leduc field in Alberta. I want to quote you some of the wealth that has come as a result of that, and I would say, in all fairness, I think we could use the figures that are now being received as a result of oil in Alberta, in comparison to the figures that we are receiving here in Saskatchewan which could, and would have been reversed if this Government had not been elected in 1944. Now that we have discovered oil in this province and now that we have discovered gas in this province, we do know what we have lost as a result of eight years with practically no development going on.

The Premier gloated over the fact that we were producing some 1,600,000 barrels of crude oil in Saskatchewan per year. Well, now, do you want to know what Alberta is doing? Their production is no less than 58,915,000 barrels – a lot more than Saskatchewan. He gloats over having 307 producing wells; Alberta has 3,660. And I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the reverse could have been true if this Government had not been elected in 1944.

Let me then say re dollars of revenue – I think we have an answer to a question in the House already; I think it was something in the neighbourhood of \$118,000 since 1947. Compare that with some \$150 million that has come into the Treasury of the Province of Alberta. I am going to be fair in this respect, because they had some revenue coming out of a field that they already had established before 1947; that is, the Turner Valley field. However, it is small; but allow a generous deduction from that \$150 million, and you can see what the Province of Saskatchewan has lost as a result of the people electing this Government in 1944.

Now then, we come to the industrial development. I venture to say that when the hon. Provincial Treasurer brings down his budget, he will have something to say about the tremendous amount that is being invested in industrial development in this province. I am going to compare his figures, now, with what has been going on in Alberta, and I am only going to give you the figures for two and one-half years. In 1950, there was \$135,878,000 spent in industrial development in Alberta; in 1951, no less than \$183,075,000, and in six months of 1952 there was \$145,000,000 invested in industrial development in that province because of the oil discovery.

The increase in the population of Alberta alone was in the neighbourhood of 25,000 in less than thirty months. Just imagine if Saskatoon had been in the same position as the city of Edmonton, which it could have been if it had not been for the C.C.F. election of 1944. I am sure the hon. Minister of Social Welfare must feel proud that he should have been the one that stood in the way of Saskatoon becoming that large city, and enjoying the industrial development that Edmonton is getting. I am sure he must feel proud of it. But those are the facts, Mr. Speaker.

Now that is what it cost this province because of people casting their ballot for the wrong party in 1944.

Now then we come to 1948, and with a great deal of boasts and tremendous glamour, they did win the election in 1948, but they became scared. They had lost a lot of their majority, and as a result of that, what I have mentioned in the way of oil development has come about since the election of 1948, Mr. Speaker.

Now then, we will have to go into what happened in this election. I stood on the floor of this House and did accuse this Government of preparing the way for an election in 1951. The C.C.F. Party in Canada has done well up to 1948. They had elected a lot of members in Ontario; quite a number in Manitoba. They had elected quite a number in British Columbia, and the odd one in the Maritimes. But, in the last election in Ontario, they lost favour; they practically were obliterated – only two left. The planners saw the writing on the wall, and it was absolutely necessary, in order to save the C.C.F. Party, to see that the Party in Saskatchewan was elected. If the Saskatchewan Government was defeated, well then there was no longer any C.C.F. Party in Canada. Had the C.C.F. lost the election on the 11th of June, there would not have been a corporal's guard of the C.C.F. elected in British Columbia; and they knew it. So, with this desperate condition prevailing, desperate action had to be taken in order to save the Party.

The planners at the head of the Party knew very well that, in view of the failure of the ad here, they had nothing to appeal

February 26, 1953

to the people on to get re-elected. So something else had to be found and the only thing they really could find was to attack the Federal Government in one way or another, and in their desperation, they set out to do just that. Then the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs was chosen to do the job, — and what was it?

At that time we were negotiating an increased payment on the “have regard” clause in the five-year wheat agreement with the United Kingdom. If that came about as we expected it would, then, of course, the Federal Government would have been very popular; so it was very essential, in order to be able to attack the Government at Ottawa, to undermine and do what was possible to see that there was no further payment coming on the “have regard” clause. And that was done in the 1951 session of this House. And how was it done? Let me just read to you...

Some Hon. Member: — You did not even vote for it.

Mr. Loptson: — Let me just read to you from the speech of the Minister of Municipal Affairs in the House here, and let the people judge for themselves. On no provocation whatsoever; there did not seem to be any reason for the hon. Minister to get up on the floor of this House and say, —

The people of Britain have paid in the neighbourhood of \$182 million more, already, than what they needed to pay under the Agreement.”

Later on he corrected that statement and apologized for having made the amount too low. He said that the real amount was \$260 million. This statement was made from the floor of this House when the Federal Minister of Agriculture and the President of the Wheat Pool were on their way to England to meet with the Premier of the United Kingdom, to negotiate for that further payment which had been previously arranged between him and the Premier of Canada.

Well, when he arrived in Great Britain, there was nothing the Premier of Britain could do but say ‘we will consider it no more.’ Even my hon. friend, the Premier of Saskatchewan, if he had been in the same position, would not have dared to pay any more, under that circumstance on the wheat agreement. When a Minister of this province, representing the people who provided most of the wheat that was shipped under that contract, said that we have already received \$182 million more than we were entitled to, then surely there was no reason why the Premier of the United Kingdom should pay any more. Well, there was no further payment, of course, coming, and these strategists — the Premier of this province; the Provincial Treasurer, all the ‘big shots’ in the first row of the benches here — went out to the people and told them what a terrible thing had happened; they had been robbed of some \$150 or \$200 million. They fought the election at Gravelbourg on that issue; but they were so disappointed with the majority they received in that election for their candidate, they decided they would not hold a general election that year. Then some other issue would have to be found.

Now, I am not going to blame this Government for the drastic thing that happened, but I am going to say that there are members supporting this Party who are drastic enough to plant the foot-and-mouth disease virus

in this province, in order to hit at the basic livestock industry. I am not hesitating to say that there was even a man who stood on the floor of this House and said that the sooner the economy of this country would crash the better it would suit him. If that is the position, if you have people like that in your Party, supporting your Party, then we are never safe from an attack of a similar nature, if an emergency rolls around. And who was to benefit...

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. I do not want to interrupt my hon. friend, but did I understand him to say that there were supporters of this Government who had planted the virus so as to cause the foot-and-mouth disease?

Mr. Loptson: — No I said I was not blaming this Government; I was not blaming this Party. I was blaming supporters of the Party that were radical enough – and that is the Communist Party, which is very much in favour of the C.C.F. movement.

Some Hon. Members: — Pretty weak, pretty weak!

Mr. Loptson: — That is what they are here for; to do just those things. No, I would not say that anyone on the C.C.F. that I know, would go to that extent, but I would not put it past any of the members of the Communist Party doing that.

Government Member: — That is what you call ‘foot and mouth’ – opening your mouth and putting your foot in.

Mr. Loptson: — But let us just see what use the C.C.F. Government made of the conditions that came about after this disease was planted in this province. After we lost our American market, after we found no place for our beef, when we could not ship either eggs, pork or cattle out of this province, who took advantage of it? Nobody was worse than the Premier of this province; he made it a political issue. My hon. friend came to my constituency on four occasions; that is a real honour to me. As a matter of fact, he had the fifth meeting right on the edge of it. So he did me quite an honour when he came so often. Naturally it helped his candidate, but he was really anxious to get rid of the member for Saltcoats, apparently.

But what did he say at those meetings? I think, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, it is unfortunate that a man of that calibre, with the talent he has and the social standing, should have to say things like he said at those meetings. One of the things that he made capital out of was the price support of agriculture, such as beef, eggs, hides, etc. He proceeded, at a meeting at Saltcoats, a sales slip, supposed to be original. Then Premier said that it was a sales slip from a reputable hide-buying firm and he said, “Ladies and gentlemen, there are two perfectly good hides that were sold, and this is the returns for them” – and he was very emphatic in impressing on the people that they were two perfectly good hides – and the return was 18 cents. Then he said, “Go to your store and see how much shoe leather you can get for 18 cents.” Well, he could have asked to answer that question himself, since he was in the tannery business, and he should know what shoe leather would be worth.

February 26, 1953

Now there were some people at that meeting who were rather interested in the Premier's statements. Among them was a man who was in the butcher business, who had been sending some hides to some of these hide buyers, and he had received considerably more money. So he went to the trouble of wiring three reputable firms with whom he had done business, one at Winnipeg, one in Regina and one in Saskatoon, and asked them what was the lowest price that had been paid for hides during the last year, and the lowest quotation at shipping points was 5 cents a pound, and the highest I think was 7 or 7½ cents a pound. Well, the average weight of a hide runs from 50 to 60 pounds, so that was from \$2 ½ to \$3 – the least a man could get for a perfectly good hide. I rather think the Premier was a little inconsistent when he made that statement in order to get votes. Surely, Mr. Speaker, he thought somebody in that audience would believe him, or else he would not have made that statement.

Another meeting of his reported was at Atwater. In addition to the hide story, he had a sales slip for, as he said, a perfectly good hog, and a goodly number of the people who live in that quarter were at the meeting and they asked me: "Have you ever heard of hogs being sold for 2 or 3 cents a pound?" I said, "I do not know. We are selling hogs about every week, and we are getting around 20 to 24 cents." And yet the Premier comes and he shows a sales slip of a perfectly good hog that the shipper got, I think he said about 2 cents a pound – but it was a ridiculously low price.

Well, now, those are the tactics that this Party used in order to obtain votes to get into power. Then I found, after the election, that they had a number of very aggressive canvassers and everybody knows who knows anything about politics, that you do not have to get the switch of very many voters in a poll, in order to win an election. You take a constituency of 60 pools; if you can steal a half-a-dozen votes from your opponent in a poll, you are pretty sure of winning the election, and that is about what it runs in these rural seats.

After the election, I had a young man come to me and he said to me, "I voted against you!" "Well," I said, "I am rather surprised you did" – because he was a friend of mine. "Well, he said, "I'll just tell you what happened." He said, "That lying so-and-so came to me before the polling date, and he said that the C.C.F. Government was paying my family allowance." He said, "Well, I have never taken any trouble to see where it came from, but I know now because I read the next cheque I got, and I saw that it came from the Liberal Government at Ottawa."

On another occasion – it is all right your laughing – you got his vote. On another occasion, an elderly couple, very good friends of mine whom I have known for forty years, had been trying to get a pension from this Government for three years, before the Federal Government took it over. I am not blaming this Government for not giving them the pension, because they had disqualified themselves under the Act by transferring their land to their son; but a government political worker said that it was because of the Liberal Government at Ottawa having put this regulation on the Statute Book that it was impossible for them to give it to them. As a matter of fact, it was not the Liberal Government that put it on at all. The regulation was put on the Statute Book by the Anderson Government in 1932, but neither the Liberal Government nor this Government saw fit to take it off the Statute Book. But, lo and behold! Mr. Speaker, when they did get their cheques after the Federal Government took it over, the canvasser went up and told them, "Just see what the

C.C.F. Government did for you; they are paying the old-age pensions; we really got it through.” And the couple voted against me. Now the old gentleman tells me, “I know now who pays it, because I took notice of the cheque when it came the next time.” And these are the tactics, and that is the way that this Government got elected on June 11 last year.

Now I say to you, Mr. Speaker, if that is the character of the Government, then what kind of an administration can the people expect? I am sorry to say that many of our friends do support this Government in confidence, with every faith in its leader. They vote for him just because they like him, and they think that he is very truthful, but I submit to you that he is as truthful as he is made out to be.

Now leaving that, Mr. Speaker, I want to take up another matter...

Premier Douglas: —Mr. Speaker, I do not want to stop my hon. friend’s flights of fancy; I am rising on a question of privilege. I think no member can make the statement that the statements which I made in the election prove that I am not as truthful as I might be. I made no statement in the election which cannot be substantiated. My hon. friend cannot do that under the rules of the House: Not that it pains me at all because, coming from my hon. friend, it means absolutely nothing to me; but under the rules of the House, I think the decorum and dignity of the House should be complied with. I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw.

Mr. Lopton: — Well, if that statement about the hides is untrue then I must naturally withdraw it; but would you ask me to withdraw it if those statements you made about the hides and the hogs were true?

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman wants to debate the question, the fact is that I produced the sales slips which showed, in the case of the hides, that after the freight was paid, the man was left with 18 cents and that overweight hogs were sold at 7 cents a pound. I produced the sales slips and the hon. gentleman has produced nothing here except his own exaggerated imagination to prove to the contrary. I am rising on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, and I am asking that the hon. gentleman withdraw his statement regarding the fact that anything that I said was not true. He cannot impugn my integrity in this House. If the hon. gentleman wants to discuss prices, I shall bring plenty of slips in here to prove even worse conditions than there were at that time. I would ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw that statement.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think the hon. gentleman did make a direct statement that the statements of the Premier, during the election, were untrue, and I think you should withdraw that because...

Mr. Lopton: — The Premier, however, did not interpret my remarks truly. He made it emphatically clear that they were perfectly good hides. He also made it emphatically clear that that hog was a perfectly good hog. I know lots of hides are sold that are not worth anything; I also know that the hog that he refers to was not for human...

February 26, 1953

Mr. Speaker: — Order! You made a categorical statement that the statement the Premier made was untrue, and I think you should withdraw that because the Premier has said that he submitted these statements. Now it is just one word against the other, whether you consider it was untrue or not, but I do not think you should categorically accuse...

Mr. Tucker: — Mr. Speaker, it is beyond the question that my hon. friend should withdraw the statement. The Premier made untrue statements during the election campaign. Now we are entitled to our opinion that he made untrue statements, and you have no right to tell us that everything the C.C.F. said in the campaign was true and correct. My hon. friend said that these statements were not true; now surely we are not going to be told in this House that we cannot say that statements made by the C.C.F., including the Premier, in the last campaign were untrue, because, to my knowledge, many of the statements made by the Premier were untrue.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. member who is speaking could say that it is his opinion the statement was untrue, but he made a categorical charge that the statements were untrue, which is a direct accusation.

Mr. Loptson: — I am not doubting the fact that he could use the sale slip for two hides for 18 cents; I am not denying the fact that he produced a perfectly true statement for a hog for 7 cents – but the fact that he said they were two perfectly good hides is what disqualifies his statement.

Mr. Speaker: — In your opinion.

Mr. Loptson: — Yes, I have...

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, at no time did I say whether they were good hides or not. I did not see the hides, and I could not say. I said that the hides were sold, and I gave the price the man got for the hides, and I want to say that even at 5 cents a pound, which is the price hides were being sold at, they were ridiculously low.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Loptson: — I would just like to have one word from the Premier. Does he prefer to get up on the floor of the House and say to the public that he never said they were perfectly good hides, and I will accept his statement.

Premier Douglas: — I most certainly will, Mr. Speaker. I did not pretend to know what the state of the hides was at all. I produced sales slips showing that people had sold hides for a variety of figures and in one case, the slip showed the man was left, from the sale of two hides after all expenses were paid and freight, with 18 cents. Those were sent to me by farmers. I could not vouch as to the state of the hides as I never saw the hides. I could only go by what the slips said, and in no place did the slips say whether the hides were low-grade or high-grade. It did say what the man got, and that what he got was a ridiculously low figure.

Mr. Speaker: — The Minister has made a categorical statement...

Mr. Loptson: — I am not questioning this thing at all, but he has already

stated that he never said that they were perfectly good hides, and that satisfies me. There were hundreds of people listening to him. If I have quoted wrongly then I have done so because I was informed by many people who were at the meeting. But now he has stated in this House that he never said that they were perfectly good hides...

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member must accept...

Mr. Lopton: — ...they were perfectly good hides, so I will withdraw my statement.

The Premier, in his speech, was quite concerned about the loss of the British market. Now I agree with him in that respect. We are concerned about losing any market, especially when we are so vulnerable in our exports; but, as a matter of fact, we have not been depending on the British market for our meat or our pork until we got into this system of long-term marketing during the last war, and, for that reason, I am not so concerned as long as we have a market for our livestock in the United States. Previous to this last war we had always depended on the market quotations at Chicago and St. Paul for our livestock, and a lot of our dairy products went to the United States. I think the records will show that we never did ship much beef or pork to the United Kingdom before this second World War, but that is not saying we are not concerned about losing the market we established during the war. But how does he hope, or what would he suggest the Federal Government should do in order to obtain long-term contracts from the British Isles, when they are buying all they need and all they want of these products from Denmark, New Zealand, and Argentina at prices which are about 10 cents a pound less than we are getting for our beef and our pork in this country? What method would he suggest we take?

I am just going to give you a quotation of the existing market at the present time as announced by the Federal Minister of Agriculture before the Canadian Federation of Agriculture. Let me quote for instance, United Kingdom, 1952, Canadian prices are in brackets: Carcass beef from Argentina at 16 cents, (44 cents in Canada); bacon from Denmark at 31 ½ cents, (42 cents in Canada); butter from New Zealand at 36.47 cents, (58½ cents in Canada); cheese from New Zealand at 21.8 cents, (48½ cents in Canada); eggs from Denmark at 46½ cents, (61 cents in Canada). Now while these prices prevail there is not much chance of us selling any bacon or eggs or cheese in the United Kingdom.

He told us that the supply in the United Kingdom was very scarce; he said that eggs there are very high-priced. Why should they be high-priced if they can buy them for 46½ cents? They are actually cheaper in the United Kingdom now than they are in Canada – 61 cents a dozen in Canada. I heard the Premier say that he bought an egg and paid a shilling for it; well we have a letter from the British Minister of Food stating that the price is not so very high and an egg could sell for approximately 4½ pence, if you bought it in a legitimate way. Of course the Premier might have got his on the 'black market' and in that case he would be breaking the law. I would say that it is not very consistent with the facts to say that an egg in the United Kingdom is costing a shilling when the U.K. Minister of Food says that it only costs 4½ pence. Now you are more familiar with the value of money in the United Kingdom than I am, but these are facts and we have got the proof to show them.

February 26, 1953

In respect to tariff, I can go 100 per cent with the Premier in that regard. We have fought for free trade between Great Britain and Canada for the last 50 years as far as I know, and it has been the Liberal Government that has tried to bring this about. We have come a long way in getting reduction in tariffs. There was a time when we were paying as high as 25 per cent on agricultural implements. They are now free, along with all other tools of production. The tariff on goods from Great Britain is not so very high; for instance, there is no tariff on cars coming from England. That is what I am informed, and I think that is right, and Great Britain is working on a preferential tariff which runs all the way from 2 ½ to 20 per cent under the American tariff.

The real reason why Britain is not selling goods here is that her goods are too high in price. Labour is likely responsible for that condition. It may be the same reason that Britain is not buying our beef and bacon and eggs from us. Our price is too high for them, and Britain is going to buy from us when we are prepared to sell our goods for the same price as she can get them elsewhere.

Then my friend is very concerned about collective security. It is rather peculiar that he should be so concerned about collective security at this Session, when he wanted collective security split at the last Session – he wanted to set up a ‘third force.’ Well, of course, there was an election coming up and his suggestion of setting up a third force, Mr. Speaker, brought him praise from coast to coast from all the Communists and all the Peace Council members and even the people in the Kremlin had a smile on their faces. But this Session, he is quite prepared to join in collective security. We on this side of the House are 100 per cent behind the system of collective security, and let me tell you, if there is any break in it we will be in a bad way. That is all the Kremlin is looking for now – to get disagreement among us in order that they may strike.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Bunk!

Mr. Tucker: — What did the Minister of Agriculture say to that?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — He said “Bunk”.

Mr. Lopton: — Then we come to this great Manifesto, this famous Manifesto, this mysterious document. After all, the Manifesto of the C.C.F. Party is no different to a manifesto of any other political party; it sets out the aims and objectives of the Party. But there is a little difference in its application here to what it is with other Parties. I have yet to meet one supporter of the C.C.F. Party who will admit that they ever saw the Regina Manifesto. I have not yet seen a candidate who will admit that he had read that manifesto. It must be a very mysterious document when it isn’t publicized more; and I am going to say right now that the quicker the people who are supporting the C.C.F. Party get a copy of the Manifesto and read it for themselves, the quicker they will know what they are voting for when they vote for the C.C.F.

What is the explanation and interpretation of the Manifesto? I am sure there is no use of me telling you or telling the people of this province what it is, because they would not believe me; but surely they will

believe its leader, they will believe its founder, and I am going to read the interpretation of its leader and founder. Here is a definition made by Mr. Woodsworth, who was the founder of the C.C.F., and what does he say? He stated, on April 3, 1935, before an audience of a thousand people in the central United States and Winnipeg:

“The Socialist stands for the abolition of capitalism. Our ultimate objective is collective ownership and operation of all wealth production.”

Now what is the interpretation of Mr. Woodsworth. He goes further, and I quote:

“The doctrine of the C.C.F. is the doctrine of the united front or Communist.”

J.S. Woodsworth, the founder of the C.C.F., makes this definition of the Regina Manifesto...

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member what he is quoting from?

Mr. Loptson: — ...and that is what...

Premier Douglas: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I...

Mr. Speaker: — Order! On a point of privilege the hon. member has asked if you will tell what you are quoting from.

Mr. Loptson: — I am quoting from a paper...

Premier Douglas: — What paper and what date?

Mr. Loptson: — The ‘Tribune’, of April 23, 1935. Now then, let us take the Premier’s own definition – the Premier of Saskatchewan...

Premier Douglas: — Will the hon. member table that quotation from the ‘Tribune’? He has quoted from it, and under the rules of the House he must, if he has quoted from it.

Mr. Loptson: — Do you want me to table your own quotation here? This is what you said:

“When challenged in the Legislature, in 1947, to state the difference between Socialism and Communism, Premier Douglas replied: ‘Socialism differs from Communism in four ways – first, C.C.F. Socialists do not believe in resorting to violence to overthrow the government in its capitalistic economic system; second, C.C.F. Socialists believe in God, and Communists do not; third, C.C.F. Socialists do not believe in one-party government; fourth, C.C.F. Socialists believe in freedom of speech and freedom of press.’”

All other factors are the same as the Communists.

February 26, 1953

Some Hon. Member: — Did he say that?

Premier Douglas: — On a question of privilege...

Mr. Loptson: — The only difference...

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Premier Douglas: — On a question of privilege, my hon. friend didn't stop quoting when he said, "All other factors are the same as the communists". That is not in the quotation. That is my friend's statement, not mine.

Mr. Loptson: — Let me read the other. He says here....

Mr. Speaker: — If the hon. member is quoting, kindly quote, and end his quotation.

Mr. Loptson: — Here it is:

“Premier Douglas defines Socialism as being different from Communism in four ways...”

That is, the only way it differs from Communism is in these four ways, and he makes it definite here that that is the only difference.

Now then, here is another one. Here we have a quotation from Provincial Treasurer Hon. C.M. Fines. He said this is a quotation of my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition):

“Provincial Treasurer Fines had indicated in a recent speech to the oil men that socialism was not secure and that while the Regina Manifesto might have been consistent with needs of the 'thirties, the situation was now different. Mr. Fines objected that he had made it 'abundantly clear that I stand behind the manifesto and will not be content until capitalism is eradicated!”

That is the Provincial Treasurer! Let me quote you another one from the Federal leader, Mr. Coldwell is quoted in 'Outlook', a responsible enterprise, and this is what he has to say, before the young people belonging to the C.C.F. and I quote:

In a speech at Toronto, in August, to the C.C.F. Youth Conference, Mr. M.J. Coldwell, the national leader of the C.C.F. said he preferred feudalism to capitalism.”

He said he preferred feudalism to our present capitalistic system. It would be interesting to the parents who send these young people to the C.C.F. conferences to know the character of the education that they are getting at these organized meetings, where they are taught that feudalism is preferable to our present capitalistic system.

I can quote you many more, but I want to come to the amendment, where the Premier made a beautiful oration, saying that by accepting the C.C.F. policy, you could have peace in the world and no more war. I agree with him 100 per cent – but in that case, the Kremlin would be your master! He goes further and says that the manifesto allows for free and private enterprise, free co-operation and public ownership to work together in harmony. I say, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in the Manifesto that allows for private enterprise in this country under the manifesto; and I say that, if the Premier honestly believes that that is a true interpretation of the manifesto, then his mental condition has deteriorated to the state where he is no longer fit to be at the head of this Province and he should resign.

I am supporting the amendment.

Mr. R.A. McCarthy (Cannington): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I wish to express my appreciation to the people of Cannington for the confidence they have placed in me in again electing me to this position. It is an honour that I appreciate, and I hope that I will be able to live up to their expectations.

I would like to thank those Liberal workers who worked so hard to assure my election, and they worked under a very great pressure because there was a very great pressure in that constituency to defeat me on this occasion. I do not believe in performing political post mortems and I do not intend to indulge in it, but I do just want to say, and I say it sincerely, that there were things said and done in the Cannington election by the C.C.F. Party and their workers that did not add to the dignity of the political life of this province. I am going to leave it there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the constituency of Cannington is an old, historical constituency. It is in what we call the park area of this province, a very fine farming community. It is a community where the people in the main live on their farms, and I think you will agree with me that that is the finest type of farmer we can have in this province – the man who lives on his farm. We have in that constituency a great number of farms that are being farmed by the third and sometimes the fourth generation of the people who originally lived on that farm. The people of Cannington are not just a people; they are a family – they are a family of people. We have in that district some of the finest farm homes within the province of Saskatchewan. We have in that constituency people of almost every race and creed, and they are all good Canadians. These people appreciate this Saskatchewan of ours, and they appreciate this Dominion of ours. I have never heard any of them sponsor a Communist thought in that constituency – it is not that sort of a constituency. These people from foreign lands tell me that they think that Canada, today, is the best place in the world in which to live, and I agree with them. It is the best in which to live, not because we have a C.C.F. Government, but in spite of that fact, it is still the best place to live.

Every year we send to Toronto, from our constituency, livestock to compete in the Toronto Exhibition and the Chicago Exhibition and up until now we have always been “in the money.” Some of those herds are being managed

by sons of the men who originally started them, and they are under their management now.

We also have, in the Constituency of Cannington, the distinction of having what is probably the best oil well in Saskatchewan; that is the oil well at Forget. It has not been proven, has not been tested for flow, but, according to the indications, people who know tell me that it is probably the best well in Saskatchewan. It certainly is, I believe, the best grade of oil that we have found so far in Saskatchewan. Unfortunately, owing to this infamous 3-cent mineral tax which this Government saw fit to put on the farmers' minerals, very few of those people, today, retain the mineral rights. Facing the risk of losing their mineral rights they rented them (or a great majority of them did) for 10 cents an acre. The result of putting on that three cents an acre has cost the farmers of that district many hundreds of thousands of dollars, and that is one thing that this Government will have to answer to those farmers for.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we also have, in the Constituency of Cannington, one of the finest summer resorts that I have seen in Saskatchewan. Through the heart of the Moose Mountain provincial forest reserve we have two lakes, Kenosee and Carlyle, and they are really first-rate. They are well patronized, and there is almost every facility there for pleasure that can be found in any other summer resort that I know of. I would like to suggest to the members, more especially the new members, who have not visited that place, that they endeavour to do so. I think that we can all serve our constituencies better, the more we move around Saskatchewan, the more we see of it and the better we become acquainted with it; and I can assure you that you will not be disappointed if you take a trip down to Kenosee this summer.

We had in Cannington, this year, one of the best yields of grain crops that we have ever had in that district. It was a good yield, a good quality of grain, and we got a good price for it, and I have not heard anyone, not even the good C.C.F.'ers, bemoaning the plight of the farmers in that district. I have not heard anyone say anything like that; but since I have come into the House here, I have heard more 'blue-ruin' talk in connection with the plight of the farmer than I ever heard in the dirty 'thirties. when there was some justification for pessimism. I do not hear anything like that down there, but you hear it here. We have sat here for days and like that down there, but you hear it here. We have sat for days and listened to it – strictly blue-ruin talk. I believe the crocodile tears shed by the Government about the plight of the farmers are shed for political purposes. I am quite sure they are. And they are doing this at a time when our people are in a better financial position than they ever have been in the history of this province. They are better off financially than they have ever been. They are not fooling me, and I do not think they are fooling very many people in Saskatchewan =, today, by those tactics.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to do what I probably should have done to start with. I would like to compliment the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I thought they did a wonderful job. I envied them their poise and composure when they were on their feet; I wish I had half of it. I would especially like to compliment the junior member for Regina on the fine job she did. I agree with her that it would be a good thing for this House if we had more ladies in it. The women of this province can, and are, making a great contribution to the political life of this province, and I, for one, would welcome more here, especially if they were on the right side of the House, which would be this side, of course.

Having said that, I would like to make some comments on some of the things that have been said in this debate up to now. I never saw a bunch of fellows that had such terrifically long right arms as the members of the Government have. They are continually reaching around putting themselves on the back with their right hand. They have enormously long right arms, and they do an awfully nice job of it, but I can tell you it gets a little monotonous at time.

Premier Douglas: — That's better than kicking yourself in the seat of the pants!

Mr. McCarthy: — Mr. Speaker, I don't mind them taking credit for the things they have done, and they have done some things for which they are entitled to take credit. Any government that was in power in this province for eight years, with the highest revenues that the province has ever produced, if it did not do something for the province would be remiss in its duties. But when they try to make out that everything since 1944 has been good and everything previous to 1944 was no good, I am going to take issue with them. And that is very close to what they do.

There are three things that this Government does and if you took those three things away, they would not have had any speeches over there. First, they start out by saying, "In 1934 the Liberal Government spent so much money on certain services – then in 1952 look what we did." Well, Mr. Speaker, anyone knows that that is an unfair comparison. They still continue to do it; I think they get a lot of satisfaction out of it. I wonder how many people are fooled by it, because most of us were broke in 1934 – at least I was. I did not have sense enough to admit it, but I was. And when the people of the province are in that condition, governments are also in that condition. The only money that governments have to spend is what they collect from the people of the province. They don't create any revenue, any money, any wealth; they simply levy taxes and spend it for service. You would think that they were some magicians that made all this money – governments do not create wealth. Another thing they do – no matter what goes wrong or what happens, it is Ottawa! Ottawa did this; Ottawa should have done this; Ottawa didn't do this, or something along that line.

The next thing they based their talks on was the press: "(Oh, that awful press! They never give us a break!" They used to have another straw man that they stuck up and knocked down. That was the capitalistic system, but they have forgotten about the capitalistic system, and I have not heard it mentioned this Session...

Mr. Loptson: — They are all capitalists now!

Mr. McCarthy: — That is just what I was going to say. I think we have a new brand of Socialism over there...

Mr. Loptson: — They welcome private enterprise now!

Mr. McCarthy: — I have heard of all kinds of different Socialists, but I think we can now say, without fear of contradiction, that over there we have the capitalistic socialists, because there are members on that side of the House who are capitalists by any measure you want to make. There are also some Socialists – and I have every respect for good Socialists; but there

February 26, 1953

are members on that side of the House who are just as much a capitalist as I am, and they are no more Socialist than I am, and yet they sit there and probably will vote for the 'Regina Manifesto' which is a Socialist document. That is all right, that is their privilege; but I still say that we have a capitalistic socialist government opposite.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, I do not individual them taking credit for things they have done, and I am prepared to give them credit where credit is due; but I do object to them starting out, and either by a direct statement or by implication, presuming or trying to put it over that they are responsible for a great number of things in this province which were here when they took office, and I am going to enumerate some of them.

They have, either by statement or implication, said that we have the finest T.B. set-up in the world. Well, that is fine; we have. We also had it long before the C.C.F. were thought of, and it was running. All they did was carry it along. They did a good job of carrying it along, certainly, but why not have a little political honesty and say that 'we carried along the T.B. set-up'? That is all they did do. They say we are operating the finest sanatoriums; but sure they were there, they were built by a previous government.

That is also true of a great many other things. A few things come to my mind and one of them is our Normal Schools. There were three Normal Schools in this province when this Government took office, and they were all in operation. We had some 900 pupils at them; and what have we got today? We have two Normal Schools operating. They found it necessary to take over the other one for some other department. It was never built for that purpose. It was built for the purpose which it still should be used for; but they never say anything about that.

What about our Telephone system? The telephone system in this province was built and was operating long before the C.C.F. was ever thought of. It was in operation and in good shape when they took it over. In fact I am not too sure that it wasn't operating more efficiently in some respects in 1944, and previously, than it is now. The operators tell me that. Certainly they have added some to it. They are entitled to credit for that addition.

What about our Power corporation? The Power corporation was set up and it compared very favourably (Interruption) Oh, I can go into Power, and I can tell you all about it. I was here, and I saw it. It compared very favourably with the power set-ups in the other prairie provinces at that time. If you want to debate it, I will debate it with you anytime.

What about our university? We have the university buildings there. They were built by a previous government, and they were a credit to this province. This Government has added to them, but they were there before 1944, except for the buildings they built, and they are entitled to the credit for the ones they did build.

What about hospitals, schools, land titles offices, bridges? All these things were here, built by a previous government, with a net income

of less than one-third of what this Government has, today – a lot less than one-third of what they have today.

The other day, one of the speakers over there mentioned the Old Folks' Home at Wolseley in cataloguing the wonderful things this Government was doing. Well I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the Old Folks' Home at Wolseley was built and operated before the C.C.F. was in the incubating stage, and it was a good home when it was built and it was well run.

The only thing I know of that this Government has neglected to take credit for is these buildings we are sitting in, and I think probably that was a little too big a mouthful for them; probably later on, they may take credit for it, I don't know. But I would like, Mr. Speaker, to recall to your mind, and I won't have to recall it because you know it yourself, the conditions of farmers and the prices that the people on the farms received at that time. After all, this is an agricultural province and the only money that any Government has to spend, or practically the only money (I think probably at that time, the only money) was what came from agriculture or what they borrowed. I am not sure if the figures I have are quite correct; they are from memory and not far off. But I would like to recall to you that about that time, wheat was worth 50 to 60 cents a bushel; that is if it was good wheat, and we did not always have good wheat, we were frozen very often. But the wheat in that period was worth from 50 to 60 cents a bushel; oats were worth about 25 to 30 cents a bushel; barley was probably worth 40 to 50 cents a bushel; a good steer was worth \$40 to \$50, and so on down the line. And yet, these people put up more buildings and laid this firm foundation for this province on much less revenue than this present Government, and they did not go around patting themselves on the back about it either. Out of those returns these people made their payments on their land, built their homes and educated their families. They didn't go running to any senior government every time they stubbed their toe; it was never heard of in those days. They were the pioneers who believed in themselves and their own efforts.

Mr. Speaker, it ill behoves the Government speakers to cry blue-ruin today when Saskatchewan is enjoying the greatest total income for farm products in her history. I want to give credit where credit is due to the farmers of this province for the great progress they have made since 1941. They have, by improved methods of tillage, aided by good weather and marketing aids by the Dominion Government, produced enormous wealth. Now I say marketing aids by the Dominion Government advisedly, because our Wheat Board is a marketing aid from the Dominion Government. We went to the Dominion Government and asked them to set up a marketing board and the result is that, today, we have almost exactly what we asked for. We asked them to set up a board, sell our wheat to the best advantage, take the expenses out of it, the handling charges, and return the rest of it to the farmers over the years as funds that, and that has added to this prosperity, because we have had a stabilized price all through these heavy-producing years. I said before, and I am going to say again, that it should never be forgotten that governments do not create wealth. It is not their province to create wealth. They simply collect levies, and any advance that we have in this province, today, means credit to the farmers of the province, because they produced 90 per cent of the wealth in this province over that period.

February 26, 1953

Let us now take a look at some of the things they have been blowing about in their speeches. Let us take meat products. My friend from Yorkton here mentioned it. I didn't know he was going to mention it, but it won't hurt to mention it a little more. We have heard a lot about it from over there. I think every speaker, including the Minister of Agriculture, got up and spoke about it, and some of his remarks surprised me, coming from the Minister of Agriculture. And the Premier said – and it was repeated by the Minister of Agriculture – that we had lost our British market for meat products. They said that and two or three more repeated it; but, Mr. Speaker, that cannot establish the facts. The British market is still there! The British market is still there, but...

Government Member: — Where is it? We've lost bacon, eggs...

Mr. McCarthy: — Just a minute now. Don't get excited. I will tell you all about it. The British market is still there. Why don't we go into it? Simply because our farmers will not take that price for their products. That is the reason. The British market is still there; it isn't lost. We have in this province, Mr. Speaker, some of the finest farmers you will find anywhere in the world. They are intelligent farmers; they know the score, and they are abreast of the times. Pork products did not start to go down just all at once. They have been going down for the last (I would say) four or five years at least, and our farmers, following the trend of that, were gradually going out of pork. The records show that; and if you look up 1944 and see the number of hogs, or the amount of pork there was in this country at that time when prices were high, markets were good and the balance between the price of pork and the price of wheat was in favour of pork, then the farmers produced pork. Today, it is the other way about. The balance is in favour of wheat, so why should our farmers, why should any farmer, produce pork when he can, with the same amount of exertion, grow wheat and make more money? After all, whether you are a C.C.F. or a Liberal or a good Tory, you are farming to make money...

Mr. Loptson: — No, they are Socialists.

Mr. McCarthy: — I said before that we have some of the finest farmers in this province or anywhere in the world; they don't need to be told by anybody what they should do. They know. And I venture to say that, next year, there will be less pork. I venture to say there will, and then the myth that the Minister of Agriculture talks about, of supply and demand, will start to rectify itself. This isn't the first time that it has not been profitable to raise pork in proportion to wheat – not by a long way! It has happened many times before – and what happens? The farmers in this country, when they find that the price of pork or any other commodity is out of proportion to some other product, they simply quit producing that product, and then the method of supply and demand starts to work and it gets back to where it levels itself out. It is no myth at all...

Premier Douglas: — May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. McCarthy: — If you will just sit down until I am through I will talk to you.

Premier Douglas: — If my friend doesn't want to answer he doesn't have to.

Mr. McCarthy: — Mr. Speaker, when I came into this House there was a nice little booklet put on my desk, and in some of those paragraphs it said

that no member should rise and interrupt a member when he is speaking. I would thank you to see the Premier observes it.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I was merely rising to ask the hon. gentleman to answer a question. If he doesn't want to he doesn't have to.

Mr. McCarthy: — No I don't want to. Sit down!

Premier Douglas: — At least he could have good manners about it!

Mr. McCarthy: — Well, that's all right, you haven't...

Premier Douglas: — Even if you are a Liberal you could have some manners.

Mr. McCarthy: — That's all right. The Premier is very good at handing it out, but it is different when he is on the other end.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. McCarthy: — Before the Premier interrupted me, I was going to say that there was a sudden drop in pork products during the last year owing to an unfortunate circumstance over which we had no control. That was an unfortunate circumstance, and I am referring to foot-and-mouth disease. And while I am on that, I am going to say that we had members on the other side of the House, just about a year ago now, standing up in their places and saying everything possible about the Dominion Government with regard to what they were doing about the foot-and-mouth disease. I want to say, today, that the record is that the Government of this country stamped that disease out quicker and better and more efficiently than has ever been done anywhere in the world, and we have had foot-and-mouth disease for centuries in the older countries. Well, we had this foot-and-mouth disease; pork prices fell very suddenly, and what did the Dominion Government do? They stepped in and bought an enormous amount of pork and canned it. What did they pay for it? The export price? No. They paid 26 cents a pound for it, and they lost a good many millions of dollars in the transaction. But that is the purpose of floor prices — for emergencies. They are not there to carry any industry that cannot carry itself on a non-economical basis.

I want to read to you just a short piece here that Dr. Hannan, who is the President of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, wrote. He is probably a man who knows more about farm conditions, farm practices, and farm prices than any other man in Canada, today. He is head of a Dominion-wide organization, and he has the respect, I think, of every farmer in Canada. This is what he says, in his presidential address, discussing farm stabilization:

“Would it not be best for us to recognize the limitations of price floor provinces and, using it wisely, have its permanence more firmly established. Then use other means and explore new methods to achieve balanced returns and stability. Progress in this direction will largely determine whether or not Canadian farmers can afford to produce to capacity.”

I agree wholeheartedly with that gentleman. That is the purpose of floor prices – not to subsidize a non-economical industry. We are fortunate in this province as far as our farm economy is concerned. We are not obliged to produce pork; we are not obliged to produce beef; we are not obliged to have chickens if we don't want to. We have other lines of revenue. Presently, wheat is the best paying product in the world. We don't have to have these things, and there is no use crying to the Dominion government about all this. Let's use our heads. Let's be men and look after ourselves like the pioneers of this province did.

I would like just for a minute, to look at these wheat prices. Just before I leave that, I was going to say that the price of beef is in a little different category from the price of those things I mentioned that is pork and dairy products and poultry and those things. The price of beef is in a different category for this reason. We hope, within the next few days, to be able to enter the United States market. I do not hope that we are going to get any more money out of that United States market than we have got for the last three or four months, but I cannot agree with the Minister of Agriculture when he says 23 cents a pound for live beef is a ruinously low price. It is no such a thing by any standard you want to take. I am a farmer and have been in the cattle game all my life, and I still have cattle; and I can make a nice profit, a good profit, raising cattle at 23 cents a pound, live weight on the hoof.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I would like to correct the member. I made no statement that \$23 a cwt. was not a good price, or even a compensating price; but I pointed out that the price has constantly been below that. That was my complaint.

Mr. McCarthy: — I will accept that. I haven't got your speech here, but that isn't the way I read it. I don't care if it is 20 cents, it still applies.

I want to talk for a few minutes on the subject of wheat. We have heard a lot about wheat. We heard a lot more, one or two years ago. It is a peculiar thing but the gentlemen over on that side have changed their tune since two years ago. They are whistling a different tune altogether. As my friend said here, they won the by-election in Gravelbourg on misinformation of the operation of the Wheat Board. Well that is all right. Before Christmas, the Premier, speaking to the Wheat Pool convention in Regina, is reported to have said it is the finest system of marketing in the world; it has stabilized our economy during the recent years of heavy production. I agree with him wholeheartedly. I think that is right, and I think that is the position that he should always have taken; but I want to read to you what he said in this House, not too long ago. He was talking about wheat, and had gone through a long tirade about wheat, and I am just going to read you one full paragraph:

“This time they are going to hold back some of the farmers' money – about 28 cents a bushel – now that they have raised the initial price to \$1.60. This is going to accumulate into a magnificent political pork-barrel for the next election.”

Mr. Speaker, can you imagine a more damaging statement that could be made about the Wheat Board than that – and he cannot wiggle out of that one because it is right in the records.

Premier Douglas: — That is exactly what was done in 1949, exactly!

Mr. McCarthy: — Oh, you still think that?

Premier Douglas: — You between.

Mr. McCarthy: — Well, that's fine. I am glad to have you on record. Why not tell the Pool that, when you go over there?

Premier Douglas: — Because they know it. Everybody else in Canada knows it.

Mr. McCarthy: — You are blowing hot and then blowing cold! The Minister of Agriculture...

Premier Douglas: — You are just blowing!

Mr. McCarthy: — The Minister of Agriculture made a statement that was equally damaging to the Wheat Pool and our Wheat Pool system of marketing. In the fall of 1951 when we had the frozen crop, when we got out 84 cents, the word went out from the Minister "You have had it. You'll never get any more." Now that was a poor crop; it was a poor grade and it was low yield, and the farmers in this province were in quite a quandary as to what to do. And the Minister of Agriculture went right out and put it in the newspaper that 'you have had it'. Well what happened? In January or February of that year they paid another 20 cents a bushel. That brought that very poor frozen wheat that weighed about 30 or 35 lbs. a bushel, up to \$1.04, and at the final payment we got 25 cents. That brought that poor wheat up to \$1.29 and a fraction, and yet the Minister of Agriculture said 'you have had it', trying to create dissension on the Wheat Board.

Hon. Mr. Nollet:— Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. The hon. member, I know, doesn't want to misinterpret anything that I said, or my intentions. It wasn't for the purpose of discrediting the Wheat Board and when I made that observation, it was based on the authority of statements made by the Federal Minister of Agriculture...

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, who's making the speech?

Hon. Mr. Nollet:— My only mistake was I followed the advice of the Federal Minister.

Mr. McCarthy: — Well, whether it was intentional or not, it had the effect of undermining the Wheat Board. I am not going to say anything more, but it had that effect.

Premier Douglas: — Who was undermining the Wheat Board when you fellows were all supporting the Grain Exchange?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. McCarthy: — Mr. Speaker, in connection with this wheat I want to say this: I said before that we have the finest bunch of farmers in this province that you can find anywhere in the world and I repeat it. That is shown very evidently by their actions throughout the last few years. They are cultivating an acre of land, today, cheaper than they have ever cultivated an acre of land in the history of this province, bar none. In spite of all our high prices, in spite of all the bemoaning over there, you can cultivate an acre of land cheaper, today, than they ever could in the history of the province. You can put a bushel of wheat in your granary cheaper than you ever could in the history of this province. Why? Because our farmers are progressive. They looked at these old horses and they said, “Now... Just to give you an illustration of it, and I don’t want to be personal about it, but on my farm I used to keep 20 or 21 horses and three men. Those horses consumed anywhere from 1,500 to 2,000 bushels of oats each year and we spent a lot of time putting up hay for them and all that. We kept two men, and myself, and had to feed them. Today, one man does all that work with one tractor and has a better time than I did, and he is doing it cheaper per acre. Similarly with the combine. If you use a self-propelled combine. I will admit they are a pretty expensive machine; but, all right, you can buy a machine, pay the interest on it, depreciate it, take off your crop, and, in comparison with what the old machine cost, it can be done for a little less than half. I just want to tell you that in answer to your wide assertion that everything the farmer sells is going down and everything he buys is going up.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken longer than I had intended, and I am not going to take up any more of your time except to say that I hope, at some future time in this Session, to be able to discuss with you some of the things I am very much interested in – municipalities, schools, roads, oil and other things. In the meantime, I would say, let us have the vision and the courage and the faith of the pioneers that made this province so great. We have one of the finest provinces in the Dominion, so let us have the courage to stand up for what we believe, without fear of the future, and if we administer the affairs of this province properly, this province will not let us down.

Mr. W.M.S. Thair (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, and hon. members of this Assembly, I should like to associate myself with those members who have preceded me in this debate, in extending congratulations to the junior member for Regina city, and the hon. member for Melfort-Tisdale who so ably moved and seconded the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Just about one year ago, Mr. Speaker, in the Throne Speech Debate, I referred to the sudden outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Saskatchewan. This is of particular importance, probably, to my own constituency as from 80 to 90 per cent of the animals affected and destroyed were almost entirely within the boundaries of my own constituency of Lumsden. It seems almost a miracle, Mr. Speaker, that up to the present time, this disease seems to have been entirely eradicated. No new cases have been reported since last April, and I trust there will be no further occurrences of this dreaded scourge.

I might say that it was a costly thing for my neighbours and for most of those within my constituency, and I believe it cost the Federal Government, according to a return submitted to Mr. Diefenbaker during the April Session of the House of Commons, the sum of one-half million dollars at least. Some, 10,061 head of cattle were destroyed; 127 swine; 97 sheep and one goat belonging to the Regina Roughrider Rugby team. This goat that was destroyed was possibly the means of them losing nearly all their games in the last season, and I think perhaps it would be well for Regina City to buy another goat for the coming year.

In a sense Mr. Speaker, it was a national catastrophe, and it caused some great losses to the cattle industry not only throughout Saskatchewan but throughout the whole of Canada. The United States embargo against Canadian cattle, as well as the provincial embargoes against Canadian cattle and the previous accompanying surplus of cattle that was appearing at that time, caused a drastic decline in prices. Because of the lack of co-operation between the Dominion Department of Agriculture, the Health of Animals Branch at Ottawa and the Animal Disease laboratory at Hull, Quebec, there was a delay of exactly ninety days between the outbreak of the disease in this constituency on November 26, 1951, and its final diagnosis on February 25, 1952.

The Saskatchewan Cattle Breeders' Association, at its recent meeting at Saskatoon, passed a resolution, I believe, asking for a guarantee "against any future delays in diagnosis of the foot-and-mouth disease." It asked the Dominion Government to reunite the Health of Animals Branch and the Pathology Animal Division, including the virus laboratory at Hull, Quebec, so that in future nothing of this sort could happen – delay of ninety days.

In spite of this delay, Mr. Speaker, the Dominion Veterinary Service became very active, and along with the active co-operation of the Saskatchewan Veterinary Services, and the setting up of rigid controls, establishment of a strict quarantine, and the buffer zone areas established all through the Lumsden constituency, the disease was confined to a comparatively small area of the province, for which we are truly thankful.

But the loss to the cattle industry alone, in this province, I suppose, when you think of the prevailing price before, would be upwards of \$80 to \$100 millions. The compensation to my neighbours and the people in my constituency seems more adequate today than it did one year ago. At that time, a great many of them were not satisfied with the compensation; but with the drop in prices, possibly they are getting used to it.

We are glad to learn, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. J.G. Gardiner, Minister of Agriculture, has announced in a recent statement that the United States would lift the embargo against our Canadian cattle on March 1st; but, as has been pointed out by the previous speaker, because of the prices down there at the present time, it is not likely to have perhaps very much effect on cattle business in Saskatchewan or in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the farmers of Saskatchewan will not forget, for many years, the terrible harvest weather, unprecedented probably in history, of 1951, and the many problems of damp and spoiled grain. Over 160 million bushel of crop was harvested in April and May of 1952, in

February 26, 1953

a very dry condition, due to extraordinary weather and, in spite of very much low-grade wheat, and damp and tough grain, a fair price was realized by the Canada Wheat Board for the 1951 crop. I would add that I am a strong supporter of the Canada Wheat Board, as are all the members on this side of the House.

In 1952, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan, Canada's wheat growing province, produced the greatest crop of wheat in its history, and I believe (and this is taking a big area) it is correct to say that no province or state in the world, has ever produced as much wheat as has Saskatchewan during the crop year of 1952. The 1952 crop has been estimated at from 435 to 440 million bushel, or an average of between 26 to 27 bushel per acre over a total wheat acreage of 16 ½ million acres, which will grade, most of it, No. 2 and No. 3. The total figures of Saskatchewan crop show that Saskatchewan has produced almost twice as much wheat as the total combined production of Alberta and Manitoba, this past year. In addition to that, Saskatchewan produced some 260 million bushels of oats, barley, rye and flax. Mr. Evans, of the Statistics Branch of the Saskatchewan Department of Agriculture, has estimated that the total cash value, at present-day prices, of all forms of agriculture production in Saskatchewan, in 1952, which includes all grain, livestock, dairy, poultry, would reach the colossal sum of \$1,059,414,00.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, because of the large carryover of the 1951 crop, Saskatchewan farmers have been unable to market more than 8 or 10, and, in a few cases, some 12 bushels per acre, at the present time. The Hon. C.D. Howe has intimated, I believe, that they will at least take, if possible, some 15 bushels per acre quota from each farmer in Western Canada, up to the end of the crop year, July 31, 1953. This would leave on the farms and in elevators in Saskatchewan, some 165 million bushels of wheat, next August 1. Because of the inability of the farmers to market their grain, particularly wheat (and I am a wheat farmer), unfortunately many farmers are actually short of cash at this season of the year. I believe, and this opinion has been endorsed by the Farmers' Union and other farm organizations, that some satisfactory system should be devised of advancing money to farmers for grain in storage on their farms.

The farmers, today, are much concerned about the markets for farm products. To me it is a simple question that, unless the Dominion of Canada takes goods from Britain, we shall, sooner or later, lose all our markets for farm products. Britain wants our products; she has not got the dollars to buy them, unless we take goods from Britain.

The Farmers' union, this past fall, made a study of comparison of exports to Britain today with former years, and I believe they have been based on the Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures and have been checked as to accuracy. I have before me, a list comparing exports to Britain in the past years with our exports today:

In Barley, we supplied, in 1948, some 25 per cent of her requirements; oats, up to 90 per cent; beef, 43 per cent. In 1952, of those three commodities, we supplied none.

In bacon, in 1948, 600 million pounds; today, a small amount – something less than 5 per cent.

In poultry, 18 per cent in 1947; eggs, 56 per cent. Today, none.

Only wheat remains, Mr. Speaker, and we are sadly in danger, I believe, of losing our market for wheat within the next five years, unless there is some form of reciprocal trade with Great Britain. Only recently, Britain was forced to purchase some 600,000 tons of wheat from Russia, not to mention large quantities of other grains.

As I pointed out, Britain in the past has been Canada's greatest customer for our surplus farm products and, particularly, Saskatchewan wheat. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the privilege of adjourning the debate.

The Assembly adjourned at 6:00 p.m.