

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Twelfth Legislature**  
**10th Day**

**Wednesday, February 24, 1954**

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

On the Orders of the Day:

**Hon. T. C. Douglas (Premier):** — Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some slight misunderstanding concerning the meeting tonight, and I think there should be some clarification so that other organizations will not misunderstand. Therefore, I should like to make one point clear. Radio and press statements are being made to the effect that the delegation of the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union are meeting the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, and I notice the brief which has been sent to members is called "The Presentation to the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan." Now all members, of course, are aware of the fact that this is a law-making body, and that the Assembly, as such, does not meet delegations. From time to time the Legislative Assembly appoints committees of the Legislature who have authority to meet groups or even to call groups before them for the purpose of getting their views, but the Legislative Assembly as such does not meet delegations, and I want to make sure that we do not set any precedent now by which organizations will think that from time to time they can petition to meet the Legislature.

What is taking place tonight, as I understand it, is that the Caucuses (both the Government caucus and the Opposition caucus) have been asked by the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union to meet with them, and it was decided to have a joint caucus in this case, and the members of this side and the members on the opposite side are meeting with the S.F.U. informally as caucuses, and not the Legislative Assembly as such. It is not an important distinction, but it is important if we set a precedent by which we might get innumerable organizations asking for permission to come and appeal before the Legislature. I think it should be clearly understood by the press and the radio and the Farmers' Union themselves that the meeting is purely an informal one of private members as such, and not of this Assembly.

**Mr. Speaker:** — It is understood then that the House will not be in session tonight.

**DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY**

The House resumed, from Tuesday, February 23, 1954, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Wooff for the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

**Mr. Wm. S. Thair (Lumsden):** — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate last evening, I was dealing with some of the farm problems in Saskatchewan.

I might say that almost all prices of farm products in Saskatchewan depend to a very large extent on tariff and trade relations with the rest of the world. Thus the Federal Government at Ottawa has almost complete control over the agricultural economy of Saskatchewan in the matter of income taxes, freight rates, excise and customs duties, all trade and tariffs and dumping duties, farm storage of grain, boxcar allocation and the sale of grain.

**February 24, 1954**

It is rather interesting to know how the Saskatchewan Liberal members of the House of Commons voted on a number of questions regarding tariffs, wheat storage, boxcar allocation and other matters. The Hansard of 1953 reveals that on November 23, Mr. Victor Quelch of Acadia, supported by Hazen Argue, moved to amend the Canada Wheat Board Act with regard to the payment of farm storage. I might say that no vote was taken. It was talked out, and adjourned by Mr. Studer, the Liberal member for Maple Creek and it went down to the bottom of the Order Paper where it will rest until the next session of the House of Commons.

I might say, also, the Hansard of 1953, which I have here reveals that again on December 8, 1954, page 1169, an amendment to the Canada Grain Act was proposed by Hazen Argue re the allocation of boxcars at shipping points. The four Liberals from Saskatchewan voted against it. The votes for this resolution were 29 and the votes against it were 111.

Again, on December 16, 1953, Hansard reveals that the Liberal Government introduced an amendment to the Customs Act, permitting great increases in tariff protection to Canadian industries. Mr. Cameron, the C.C.F. member for Nanaimo, moved an amendment that the proposed motion would cease to have effect after March, 1955. The resulting vote was that not a single Saskatchewan Liberal supported this amendment while the C.C.F. all supported it.

Farm costs have made tremendous increases during the past four or five years in farm machinery, cars and trucks, also in the price of our fertilizer (which has advanced from \$60 to \$123 per ton), all the chemicals used in spraying, hardware, gas and oil, building costs and many other commodities used in farm operations, not to mention rubber tires and anti-freeze. A recent investigation by the Combines Investigation Committee of the House of Commons revealed that eight of Canada's major rubber companies had combined to 'fleece' the Canadian public on the price of rubber goods, particularly tires. The Rubber Association has confessed to this crime. The amount of the penalty was some \$10,000 of a fine for each company. Even so, this venture would still be a highly profitable one because the value of the rubber goods sold by these companies during the period within which the charge was made was to the value of \$645 million. That was the sales during that time. I leave to your imagination what the extra amount of profit was throughout that long period. A mere fine of \$10,000 does not mean anything to great monopolies doing this amount of business.

With regard to anti-freeze, after the Government of Canada had removed the protective tariff, anti-freeze immediately dropped, last fall, \$1.00 to \$1.50 per gallon; but the public would like to know why the Government did not take this action some two years before.

According to statistics available from D.B.S. for 1938, the operating costs of Saskatchewan farmers were \$88 million, plus new machinery, bringing the total to \$97 million. In 1952, D.B.S. says, the operating costs of Saskatchewan farmers were \$270 million, plus some \$93 million for the purchase of new equipment, or a total of \$363 million. The estimated operating cost for farmers, in 1953, would be \$300 million, plus the purchase of new machinery upwards of \$100 million, or a total of \$400 million operating costs as compared to 1938 when it was some \$97 million. This is according to D.B.S. – except 1953 which is an estimate. It is believed that the operating cost of Saskatchewan farms this past year would be four to five times greater than in 1938. In addition to this, we have the capital cost of land which is purchased at high prices, new buildings and other

things that have risen comparatively. An actual case of a farmer in Saskatchewan (it is not myself) with some 400 acres of fallow wheat, 400 acres of bare fallow, listed something like this: for six items only. These were seed, oil and gas, taxes, labour and fertilizer, and spraying the crop by air, and it came to nearly \$4,500. That was in 1953. In addition to this there was the cost of repairs, depreciation of machinery and truck, the cost of living, interest on investment and half a hundred other things which are not included.

A recent estimate shows that the farmers who represent some 40 per cent of the population actually receive only some 10 or 12 per cent of the gross national income. If one considers the cost of producing this actual amount of some 10 or 12 per cent, it does not leave very much of a margin for net farm income.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to quote from Professor Van Vleet, the head of the farm management department at the University of Saskatchewan, who made a statement recently as follows:

“High operating costs and high capital that are necessary to operate a farm today has made the farmer’s position extremely vulnerable in spite of the fact that he is enjoying the highest gross income in agricultural history.”

Professor Van Vleet also went on to say that he believed the heavy capital outlay required by the farmer today left him in a more precarious position than in the early 'thirties.

I would like now to say a word about the co-operative movement in this province which has made such tremendous progress in the last few years. In 1953, the co-operatives in Saskatchewan had 500,000 members and did nearly \$500 million of business. The Federated Co-ops, in 25 years of operations, had sold goods to the amount of \$168 million and has made savings to the Co-op members of nearly \$8 million during that period. In 1953, the Federated Co-ops had sales of \$29 million and savings of nearly \$2 million. The Sherwood Co-op, with headquarters at Regina, is by far the largest retail co-operative in Canada with a total of nearly 17,000 members, and it did a business, in 1953, of over \$4 million.

At this time, I would like to draw the attention of the House to a recent establishment in Regina of the Lumsden Vegetable Co-op Limited. It is the first of its kind in the province. It will carry on the business of warehousing, processing and marketing the root and vegetable crops for some 12 growers in the Qu’Appelle valley near Lumsden. I might add that it is now in the process of grading and packaging potatoes for the city trade here at Regina. The total output of the growers of potatoes in the Lumsden valley this past year was 4 million lbs. From three to four hundred acres are planted to potatoes.

Rapid progress continues in the programme of electrification in Saskatchewan. In 1939-44 only some 30 farm homes were electrified. I am one of the fortunate ones and have had power for 27 years; it went right past my door for two years, and I did not know enough to get on and they did not want farmers in those days. In 1939-44 only 30 farm homes were electrified, while, in 1953, power was served to 5,500 farms, or a total to date of 18,000 farms. I believe the objective of this Government is to

**February 24, 1954**

reach 6,500 farms in 1954, and I understand that \$60 million has been spent in generation, distribution and transmission of farm lines in Saskatchewan. It is interesting to note that in the province of Alberta, during the past six years, the profits of the private power companies have exceeded \$18 million. In Saskatchewan, the 'People's Government' owns the entire system. In Alberta, the private companies own most of the system, but farm organizations in Alberta at the present time, including the municipalities, have condemned the present plan of private monopoly and are asking for public ownership of the power lines.

The Saskatchewan Automobile Insurance, in spite of rate increases for 1954, continues to be the cheapest and the most satisfactory automobile insurance in America. I believe actually, for the same protection, the Government Auto Insurance costs less than one-half of the cost of private companies. Auto insurance is cheaper in Saskatchewan companies because of the competition of Saskatchewan Automobile Insurance which has forced the private companies to lower their rates in Saskatchewan. In other Canadian provinces insurance rates are at least double Saskatchewan rates. The private insurance companies would be glad indeed to get rid of the Government Automobile Insurance, then they could really 'go to town' on their rates. Saskatchewan Automobile Insurance, compared to United States and other Canadian provinces, has saved Saskatchewan motorists hundreds of thousands of dollars in insurance premiums – in fact I was going to say millions but maybe that would be a slight overstatement.

Increased oil and gas development has also taken place during this past year, as was outlined in the Speech from the Throne. Oil companies have spent more than \$150 million in the past four years. Over 450 oil and gas wells were completed. Exploration of oil and gas may total \$68 million in 1954.

I believe the Hospital Services plan in Saskatchewan is the most important health service ever granted to the people. During each of the five years, one person in five has received hospital care under this plan. In other words, over 1,100,000 people have received hospitalization since the plan went into effect in 1947. It is the considered opinion of many persons who visit this province of Saskatchewan that we have in this province the finest health services and other lines of social services in health and mental treatment of anywhere in the Dominion of Canada. We are still waiting of complete health service as promised by the Liberal Party at Ottawa and yet, when a national health service plan was voted on in the House of Commons on November 16, 1953, it was opposed by Mr. Studer, M.P. in the vote which was taken which I have here before me, in Hansard. The other Saskatchewan Liberals slipped out behind the curtain and were not to be caught.

I was gratified to learn from the Speech from the Throne that a Bureau of Alcoholism is to be set up for the purpose of studying ways and means by which the large increase in drinking and alcoholism could be curbed. This whole question seems to be one of the worst evils facing any government today, in all sincerity, whether from the standpoint of health or morals or economic security. A recent survey reported in the 'Leader-Post' shows that Canada's rate of alcoholism has risen by 1950 to 810 per 100,000 population, and it places Canada in the sixth place among the world's countries in alcoholism. Statistics show that a higher percentage of Canadians drink liquor than Americans. Canada spends over \$2 million a day, or \$735 million per year on liquor. If we face up to these figures honestly must we not ask ourselves, are we becoming a nation of drunkards? And while we believe that

temperance will be advanced by improving the social and economic conditions, as is noted from a quotation in the 'Montreal Gazette' of February, 1953:

"In Montreal alcoholics are found chiefly not in 'skid row' but in the industries, professions and homes of the great metropolis."

To those who would advocate an increase in outlets and a relaxation of the laws, I would like to quote from a report by Dr. Jellinek of the World Health Organization:

"The ravages of alcohol are least felt in the countries where liquor laws are most severe."

The methods of reducing drunkenness used in Britain are by reducing outlets, reducing hours of sale, increasing the taxes on beer, wine and spirits. At the present time the tax in Britain on alcoholic beverages is three times what it is in Canada. A drunken driver in Britain may be fined up to \$500 or a year in jail, and ruled off the road for life if he is in a motor accident.

In the 28th annual report of the Board of Evangelism of the United Church of Canada this statement occurs:

"The United Church believes that nationalization is the first step to temperance policy."

It also points out the fantastic profits of the liquor trade. For example, gin, which is immatured neutral grain spirits, is made for 9 cents a quart at the distillery. A quart of gin will make over 20 cocktails, so I am told, and that is \$8.00 selling price for a 9 cent product. Now while penalties, controls and rehabilitation must play its part, the other answer to this problem must surely be found in the education of the young people. I congratulate the Minister of Education for the copy of the manual which has been placed on our desks and which will be used in the schools of Saskatchewan. We feel the people of Saskatchewan have the courage to co-operate with one another and share the vision of one world. However, a word of warning: let us guard against complacency.

In the past reports of actions of so-called totalitarian states in purges and persecutions seem far away. Our attitude has been simply 'it can't happen here'. Even when McCarthyism reared its ugly head in the United States, we said, "this is Canada; it can never happen here." But just recently a member of the House of Commons from Alberta rose to extol McCarthy and to recommend his methods for Canada. In Quebec, a new Act – Bill 38 – has recently been passed. This Act forbids books, speeches or broadcasts which are, and I quote: "abusive or insulting." Also an informer can declare that he believes that an offence ingoing to be committed and an injunction will be issued at once. That actually has McCarthy beaten; it is only matched by Russian Communism.

In Victoria, B.C., we learn of consideration being given to the burning of books in public libraries which might be considered subversive . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** – Who said that? Tell us who said that.

February 24, 1954

**Mr. Speaker:** – Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** – That hasn't been proved.

**Mr. Thair:** – And yet in spite of so much talk of freedom in debates in the House of Commons where the Liberals are greatly in the majority we find that, on December 7, 1953, Alistair Stuart, C.C.F. member in the House of Commons, introduced a motion approving the Declaration of Human Rights as adopted by the United Nations. The House divided on the motion of Mr. Harris to adjourn it and the following vote is interesting. All the Liberals voted to adjourn the debate and the C.C.F. and a lot of the Conservatives voted to have the debate carried on. The vote was 86 in favour of the adjournment, with some 55 against. I might say, to give credit, that Mr. Drew and Mr. Diefenbaker voted along with the C.C.F. on this motion – not in favour of the adjournment but of adopting the motion. It was opposed by the four Liberals from Saskatchewan, the fifth Liberal being absent.

One thing all totalitarian movements have in common, whether it is communism or pacifism or Nazism or McCarthyism or plain old-fashioned dictatorship, is the necessity to eliminate all opposition. Surely the political implications – because the province of Quebec is slightly involved – might be forgotten when one of our basic freedoms is at stake.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the House of the words of our Premier in reference to hysteria and suspicion – to keep that sort of thing out of Saskatchewan and make it an island of tolerance and goodwill and a haven of neighbourliness.

I shall support the motion.

**Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords):** – Mr. Speaker, I might say at the outset that I support the motion. I want to add my congratulations to all those who have spoken before me. I particularly want to congratulate my neighbour, the member for Turtleford (Mr. Wooff). I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Turtleford, along with others, and the member for Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs) did a marvellous job; but I particularly want to congratulate the hon. member for Turtleford. I believe that the hon. member is the personification of the spirit that built the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation in the first place, and I think his speech indicates that spirit. It also indicated the spirit that is going to continue to build this movement throughout Canada and throughout the world. It was that spirit, without any doubt in my mind, that imbued our great leader, J. S. Woodsworth, to his untiring work in pioneering this movement when the going was tough – a man of unlimited courage, Mr. Speaker, a man who was not afraid even to be jailed for his convictions; and he was. When some of the smug people say that it cannot happen here, I say it did happen here, not so long ago, during the lifetime of most of the people in this House. I think that this imbues our present leader here in Saskatchewan to his untiring work.

I was rather disappointed to notice the lack of interest on the other side of the House when the Premier made his statement of policy regarding the four freedoms. I also was quite happy to see that some – especially the younger members – were quite in accord with them and applauded him roundly. These things are important. It is no use laughing them off and shrugging your shoulders and saying that you're just borrowing trouble. They are happening. If you read, you will find that people are trying to tear down

the very foundation of this democracy of ours. Surveys south of the line show that people refuse to think. I would like to recommend a report – I shall not quote from it – on the editorial page of ‘The Commonwealth’, of a survey taken in the high schools of the United States. I would like to recommend that survey and I would like you to peruse it. It showed briefly that 49 per cent of the students in the United States are doing a lot of totalitarian thinking and are not very democratic. That is not very far from here. A lot of us are doing a lot of worrying about what is going on the other side of the puddle, but I think we had better tend to our washing at home, and see to it that it does not happen here.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to say no more about the various speeches that have been made in here. I probably ought to spend just a moment on what was said, or some of the things probably that were not said, by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. Apparently he was not too pleased with the Speech from the Throne and chose the same old ground to fight his battles on. I think the public of Saskatchewan have had quite enough of that, and I do not think we need say anything further.

I was a bit alarmed, however – going back to what I said originally – that a statement credited to him, apparently made publicly or in this House, in which he said that the Communists had organized the Wheat Pool. I would like to quote from a booklet here entitled ‘Co-operation: History and Philosophy’ and it is written by L. J. Bright. There is a quotation by a famous Canadian statesman in here in which it says:

“Co-operation retains all the benefits of free enterprise; add thereto the benefits of social ownership. It removes the evils of capitalism without substituting therefor the evils of political dictatorship.”

Now, it wasn't J. S. Woodsworth who said that. The Rt. Hon. MacKenzie King made that statement. I would recommend this booklet for reading to the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about the constituency I represent. I said last year that we are the gateway to the playground of Saskatchewan and also the gateway to some of the best farming communities, livestock areas and so on. I said that if you wished to spend a holiday to good advantage, we welcome you to The Battlefords. It is not only an historic area, but its scenery is equal to anything that you would find, I believe, anywhere in Saskatchewan.

I would like to say, too, I hope that for the time you come up on your holiday, we have not the water threat. While the City of North Battleford has a filtration system that is not being affected at the present moment by this polluted water from Edmonton, we are still afraid that even though the river sands are taking this out through the filtration into our wells, these sands may reach the filtration saturation point and they may be completely ruined. The story is different, however, with the Saskatchewan hospital and I believe the town of Battleford, which is in a bad way. I think that the Premier has made a statement to the Premier of Alberta which says that if nothing is done, an ultimatum will be given to these companies to close up. I would like to say that I am perfectly in accord and I think that one of the most sensible solutions made in the House of Commons and offered in the House of Commons, was made by the hon. federal member for The Battlefords, Mr. Max Campbell, who said that the easiest way to find

out what and where the source was, was to close these plants up for 24 hours and take progressive tests; then we would know. It is just as simple as that. But, apparently they are sitting back and are not wanting to take decisive action. It seems that there is a difference as to just who is committing the offence. I wonder who these people are who think they can pollute our water and get away with it.

I would like to say further that The Battlefords' people will be, and are, quite happy to know that No. 5 Highway between Fielding and Radisson will be completed this coming year. Construction on that will be completed; the contract has been let. I am also busy now twisting the hon. Minister of Highway's arm to get a little black-topping done at least as far as Denholm out of North Battleford, and I hope he gives in easily.

I am sorry to say that the housing situation in the city of North Battleford is still precarious. Temporary housing set up by the Department of Social Welfare at the Airport Apartments is still well filled, but there is still a need for a real housing programme in the city of North Battleford and I hope that one is undertaken in the near future. I believe present plans offered by national-provincial authorities open the gate to that type of a housing scheme. I also hope that this gas development that is going on about the province brings gas to North Battleford before too long. There are people of the opinion that there is enough up there right now, but I think that the people would like the real thing.

We also could use an old peoples' home in that area; that is my belief. The Salvation Army are doing a marvellous job of taking care of both women and men, but something further than that must be done. The population is going up in that area, especially the aged population, and I think that our old pioneers are entitled to good, comfortable housing in their old age where they can live among their old friends and enjoy themselves in their retiring years.

At this time I add my congratulation to other members on the advent of two new members, namely, the member for Rosthern (Mr. Carr) and the hon. member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Kohaly). I was rather taken aback with some of the things that the hon. member for Rosthern said in his talk, and I thought immediately of what the hon. member for Swift Current had said in his seconding speech on the motion for the Address in Reply. He said, "I suppose we can look forward to the same old cracked record." Well, it seems in this case that it was the same old record with more cracks. Regarding the contribution of the member for Souris-Estevan, I think we should note that this is an historical event. It is the rebirth of an old party in this Legislature, even though some people regard the parentage with a raised eyebrow. The member made a very able contribution and we congratulate him for it. I think that he has a future in political life in this country. There was one statement that I would like him to go a little further on, however. It is all very well, Mr. Speaker, to stand up and say 'I unequivocally stand for private enterprise'. Too many of us have not too much argument with a statement like this. But where does he stand with regard to some of these people who are conspiring to undermine the very foundations of our economic system?

**Mr. McDonald:** – Socialistic monopoly?

**Mr. Lopton:** – The Socialists are the monopolists.

**Mr. Kramer:** – That is what we want to know. We also want to know where the rest of the hon. members on the other side of the House stand in regard to some of these things. There is a curious silence when it comes to challenging the right of some of these monopolies to conspire to milk the



public of Canada for various articles that they need in order to keep the production of Canada on an even keel.

There was also an attack made on our increased insurance rates. Well, as far as I am concerned, I am no happier than you are about having to pay more money; but I want to suggest that it is in the hands of all the public of Saskatchewan to do something about it to reduce the accident rates. As far as considering this a failure, Mr. Speaker, I wonder just what they wish to do. Will they stand up and say they want this automobile insurance Act thrown out? Will they go on record? Some of them did when it was brought in.

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** – All of them.

**Mr. Kramer:** – Yes, all of them. I wouldn't be surprised if that is the way they feel about it. I would just like to compare what happens in other provinces, and I have here an article from the 'Canadian Underwriter' entitled 'Family of Hit-and-Run Victim awarded \$5,250 from the Fund':

“Mrs. Henry Corban, Peterboro, and her three sons were awarded a total of \$5,250 and costs in their suit against the Ontario registrar of motor vehicles recently. The money which must come out of the unsatisfied judgment fund was a damage award to the widow and her children following the death of 36-year-old Henry Corban, struck down and fatally injured by an unidentified motorist while walking along an avenue in Peterboro Christmas Eve, 1952. Mrs. Corban was awarded (in 1954) \$3,000 and \$2,000 is to be paid into court on behalf of the three children. The total of \$5,000 is the maximum that can be paid out of the fund for the death or accident of any one person. The extra \$250 was statutory grant to cover funeral expenses.”

Note the delay of over a year in making payment; and the fact that Mrs. Corban had to sue in order to obtain judgment. Possibly that would suit some of the legal practitioners. Under the Saskatchewan Plan without any necessity to incur any legal costs, Mrs. Corban would have received \$8,175 within a few weeks of the accident. The payment would be made up as follows: \$5,000 for Mrs. Corban, principal dependant, \$1,000 each for each of the three children and \$175 funeral expenses. Apparently it does not cost as much to bury them in Saskatchewan. The maximum payable under the Ontario Unsatisfied Judgment Fund for death of one person is \$5,000. The maximum payable in Saskatchewan is \$10,000. Some owners of older cars are grumbling that the \$200 deductible brings their premium rates of \$6 and \$10 out of line.

**Mr. Cameron:** – Oh, I did not think anyone grumbled about your insurance.

**Mr. Kramer:** – Last year in Ontario, a young immigrant woman was driving an uninsured jalopy which was involved in an accident. A judgment for \$16,000 was awarded against the immigrant couple. The Unsatisfied Judgment Fund made a partial payment to the victim. The young owners of this old car have to pay the balance outstanding to the victim and then pay the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund the amount advanced to the victim. They will be saddled with a debt for the rest of their lives. If that car had been registered in Saskatchewan the whole amount would have been paid due to the fact that more than one was injured.

I might go further. Most of us will remember that there was a multiple accident in which four heads of families were killed in an accident not too far away, in Alberta. Again the same thing would have held true.

**February 24, 1954**

There would have been \$40,000 spent and available on those four heads of families under the plan. I would like to refer again to 'The Commonwealth' and I'll refer it again for reading not only to the hon. members opposite, but anyone within reach of my voice. In the editorial here, it says:

"One of the most disgraceful exhibitions of treachery to the interests of the Saskatchewan people by the 'Daily Blatt'; in its comments upon the revision in rates for Saskatchewan government auto insurance. It stated that the new rates would make the insurance cost about the same as that offered by private companies. This is a disgusting lie, and 'Daily Blatt' editors must know it."

It goes on to compare policies:

"In the first place the policies offered by private companies do not include the personal injury coverage such as is provided by Saskatchewan public insurance. But even so, the private company rates are so much higher than the public insurance rates that no private company has any hope of selling any amount of auto insurance in Saskatchewan even to the people who are the bitterest enemies of public enterprise.

"Total coverage for the oldest model cars under public insurance costs \$33. Similar coverage from a private company is Saskatchewan (minus the personal injury coverage) would cost \$50.

"Total coverage for a new car under public insurance costs \$57. Similar coverage from a private company in Saskatchewan (minus personal injury coverage) would cost \$177.

"It is to be noted also that the private companies in Saskatchewan substantially reduced their rates after the public insurance plan was started. So the private companies in Saskatchewan offer far cheaper auto-insurance than the private companies in other provinces. But they still can't sell it because they are so far out of line with public insurance.

"A glance at the rates in other provinces shows what would have happened in Saskatchewan if private enterprise had been allowed to continue without competition (again, I'll repeat, without competition) from the public plan:

"In Alberta, the owner of an old car pays \$55 for the coverage which the Saskatchewan owner gets for \$33. In Manitoba the rate is \$50.

"In Alberta the owner of a new car pays up to \$298 for the coverage which the Saskatchewan owner gets for \$57. In Manitoba the rates run up to \$208. (Take some notes, gentlemen!)

“Of course the amounts vary from the lowest to the highest according to the car to be insured. It is easiest to see the entire picture if we speak in terms of averages. In Manitoba the average car owner must pay \$130 for complete coverage; in Alberta he must pay \$170; but in Saskatchewan he pays less than \$50 and gets personal injury coverage besides.

“The ‘Daily Blatt’ says the rates for public and private insurance are about the same! What enormous dishonesty!”

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to dwell too long, but some of the statements that were made I think need challenging. As I say, and as I have said before, none of us are too happy about having to increase this, but if we stop to think of it, the amount of money that is paid out today when a car is wrecked, or even when people are injured, compared to what was paid at the outset of the plan, these costs are out of the hands of a provincial government. We have no responsibility whatever for risking costs, and they are still going up. As long as our national economy is such that our costs are going up and up, we are going to be carried along with it provincially and there is nothing you can do about it, outside of doing the best you can. I am sure that that is what the Government Insurance office is doing and what The Automobile Insurance Act supervisors are doing in the administration of this Act. So much for insurance.

I would also like to say a few words about the agricultural picture. It was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne that it was believed (and we are convinced) that a livestock marketing board on a national level is necessary today. In fact, it is overdue. The hon. Leader of the Opposition stated that we had the opportunity to go ahead provincially. That is just why Bill 82 was passed and introduced by the hon. Minister of Agriculture at Ottawa, in a vain endeavour to throw the monkey on the backs of the provinces, and again in order to refuse the responsibility for national leadership. This question affects all of us. The whole national economy is affected by this livestock picture, and anyone who is foolish enough to think that we can put a little patch on a pair of trousers here in Saskatchewan, is just doing so much wishful thinking.

In the first place we have no jurisdiction for setting prices of any kind. We have no jurisdiction over the national economy. We cannot stop the packers from going outside of the country even if we refuse to deal with them. The whole thing is in exactly the same category as the wheat, and our Wheat Board has worked marvellously well. We have a complete parallel. Certainly there are a few different problems to meet in the livestock picture, but if there is a will, there is a way. So far we have not been able to convince the Federal Government that they should take the bull by the horns, and a few hogs and one thing and another by the ears, and get busy and protect the farmers of western Canada especially, who are right behind the ‘eight-ball’ financially with their livestock.

Livestock prices have suffered some pretty rough going lately. I quote a few pertinent facts concerning our picture today: hogs, the average price per cwt. dressed, of hogs sold on the Edmonton livestock market went down by 12 per cent; Saskatchewan hog marketing in 1953 went down

**February 24, 1954**

by 21.5 per cent compared with marketings in 1952. In cattle the weighted average monthly price per cwt. of all grades of cattle sold on the Winnipeg livestock market in 1953 represented a decline of more than 46 per cent from the 1951 level. The price to the producer has gone down more than 50 per cent since 1951, if the increased freight and handling costs are taken into account. Similarly with sheep and lambs – down more than 40 per cent this past years and now wheat prices.

We hear that the price of No. 1 Northern at the Lakehead has been cut to \$1.79. This represents a drop in the selling price of 24 cents a bushel since August of 1953. Saskatchewan farmers are now selling their wheat more cheaply than they did in the final years of the 1946-1950 bilateral agreements with the United Kingdom, despite the fact that farm costs have gone up by 22.6 per cent. And just mark this – in terms of purchasing power, the farmer today is getting only about \$1.39 per bushel for his wheat, basis No. 1 Northern at the Lakehead compared with \$2.00 a bushel in 1948. Similarly with other prices: rye, down by 71 cents a bushel and it was already low; flax, down 73 cents a bushel. And coupled with this, Canada has lost her export market for everything but wheat.

Some of these things do not seem to worry certain people too much. As far as I am concerned, they worry me. Most of us present here attended an agrologists' meeting in the basement of this building not so long ago, and the need for conservation was brought out there, the conservation of our resources here, especially our farm resources. Certain things we need in conserving those resources. One of the main things is fertilizer; and yet we allow a monopoly to continue to flourish in the fertilizer field. I would like to quote again but it isn't necessary. I will cover it more briefly. There was \$174 million profit made by the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company last year, the company that has the monopoly on the ammonium phosphate. Not only that, Mr. Speaker. Immediately after the war, we owned two munitions plants that had been built by the taxpayers of Canada, manufacturing nitrates, one at Niagara Falls and one at Lethbridge, Alberta. The Federation of Agriculture advised the Government to hold on to at least one of these plants which could easily have been converted into a fertilizer plant. They did not take that advice. They sold them for 20 per cent of their cost to United States interests, and today they are standing idle while a monopoly flourishes in the fertilizer industry. The costs have doubled and tripled in fertilizer since 1938, in spite of the increase of 130 per cent in the use of fertilizer.

Now, if we are going to conserve our resources – after all we are only here and in the farming business for a short while; we are only the custodians of these resources. Other people are going to follow us; and if we are going to mine out all the fertility and leave a desert for generations to come, the responsibility is going to be ours. Again a monopoly.

Today we are also a nation on wheels and those wheels require rubber, tires and what-have-you. And what do we find in the rubber field – again another monopoly! The present anti-combine legislation is evidently unsatisfactory to take care of the situation. Sure we investigated them and fined them \$10,000 each; but what did they make? The investigation showed that they extracted illegally \$19,500,000 during the years they operated the combine: \$19,500,000 – and for that offence we fined them \$10,000 each. I would like to hear a word from some of the gentlemen opposite on that question. Is that free enterprise? If it is, we want none of it.

We could go on and on. I am going to be followed, I understand, by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, so I am sure that his message will interest you far more than mine.

I was questioned not so long ago by one who said, "I am surprised at the ability (he was a stranger to Saskatchewan, apparently) of some of the Cabinet Ministers and some of the private members you have in your legislatures. I cannot understand why these men are fooling around with Socialism, or talking about co-operation. They could do far better if they took a job with a private business and made a name for themselves and make three or four times the money." No doubt they could, Mr. Speaker, no doubt they could.

I would like to read, in closing, again from 'The Commonwealth' – which is a pretty good paper.

**Mr. McDonald:** – Oh, no, no again!

**Mr. Kramer:** – It is entitled "Progress" and it is contributed by E. H. Tudor.

**Mr. McDonald:** – Who is he?

**Mr. Kramer:** – I think it could be dedicated again to our erstwhile leader, J. S. Woodsworth:

“And old man going along the highway  
Came at the evening, cold and gray  
to a chasm vast and deep and wide  
The old man crossed in the twilight dim –  
The sullen stream had no fears for him,  
But he turned when safe on the other side,  
And built a bridge to span the tide.  
““Old man,’ said a fellow pilgrim near,  
‘You are wasting your time building here.  
You never again will pass this way,  
Your journey will end with the closing day.  
You have crossed the chasm deep and wide  
Why build you this bridge at evening tide?’  
“The builder lifted his old gray head,  
‘Good friend, in the way I’ve come’ he said  
‘There followeth after me today  
A youth whose feet must pass this way.  
this stream that has been as naught to me  
To the fair-haired youth might a pitfall be.  
He, too, must cross in the twilight dim.  
Good friend, I am building a bridge for him.”

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I will support the Motion.

**Hon. I. C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** – Mr. Speaker, I first of all wish to observe and hope that some of the Socialist members on this side of the House will have a bit more regard to the division of air time.

I wish to join immediately with all of those who preceded me in this debate in proffering my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the

**February 24, 1954**

Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, particularly the mover of the motion who, by his speech, indicated his own high quality and personal integrity. The seconder of the motion lived up to his working-man reputation as a boilermaker and went into his speech wholeheartedly, directly, and in a manner that we knew meant perfect straightforward honesty coming, as it should, from a labour man.

I would also like to congratulate the newly-appointed Leader of the Opposition and I hope that Divine Providence will assist him in carrying out and discharging his duties to the full extent of his native abilities.

I want particularly to congratulate the two new members in the Legislature for the very fine addresses given by both of them. I hope that the level of their contribution to the House will improve, as I know it will, and I am certain that they will give a good contribution and a good account of themselves in this Legislature. The two new members started out very well in their speeches and they ended their speeches very well. Similarly, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition started out very well, but here all the similarity ceased. The hon. Leader of the Opposition's speech material progressively deteriorated as his speech went on, and I regret very much that the constructive intention mentioned at the outset of his speech was so soon forgotten and that he reverted to the age old political device of casting doubt on the character of public personalities, a practice common to the Saskatchewan Liberal party.

The Leader of the Opposition made a feeble attempt to salvage something out of the political garbage-can that had already gone to the nuisance grounds where it properly belonged. The Leader of the Opposition ought to learn and know that the 'kickbacks' to date have only been against the Liberal party.

**Mr. Loptson:** – That's what you think!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** – The Leader of the Opposition spent considerable time in giving his interpretation as to why the C.C.F. was elected as the government of this province. I would suggest to him that he re-evaluate, re-appraise or re-analyze some of the conclusions that he arrived at. The hon. member from Saltcoats, the Leader of the Opposition, also mentioned and endorsed a few of the good things the Government had already done and intended to do; but instead of giving credit to the Government, as he stated he would, he proceeded to take credit unto himself and the Opposition for these good things. That is not exactly giving credit where credit is rightly due. However, it is at least a truly Liberal concession.

The Leader of the Opposition then went on to proffer some advice to the Government. One of the first suggestions was that the hospitalization tax should be removed, apparently secure in the knowledge that any suggestion of this kind would be politically popular. Like the Leader of the Opposition, the Government also knows that such a step would be politically popular; but unlike the Leader of the Opposition the Government has the immediate responsibility of providing services which the Leader of the Opposition perhaps never hopes to assume. He can, therefore, take more liberties with suggestions of this kind than the Government can.

**Mr. Loptson:** – A good sound suggestion anyway, wasn't it?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** – He did not suggest how the hospitalization plan would be continued if the tax were removed. He did not explain how the other services, improved services and new services that he suggested would be financed if this particular tax were abolished.

I was quite interested in the observation made by the hon. member for Swift Current when he suggested that the new Leader of the Opposition might introduce a new flavour in the House. As everyone knows, the hon. Leader of the Opposition has a nickname – a very flavoury nickname ‘Minty’; and when the hon. member for Swift Current mentioned that new flavour I immediately began thinking about first-grade roast lamb, because it is usually served up with a ‘minty’ flavour. I expected something new, but to my great disappointment and dismay it was not long in the course of the hon. Leader’s address when I realized that it was the same old Liberal mutton stew that was being served up, with the same old stains on the tablecloth. The hon. member for Saltcoats said that the Throne Speech, although not one of the lengthiest, was one of the most barren Throne Speeches that this Government had brought into this Legislature.

Let us, Mr. Speaker, examine the contents of the Throne Speech to determine whether this statement is correct or not. I propose to do that in a most unique way, if I may. I want, first of all, to make a comparison between the 10-point programme upon which this Government was elected, then refer to appropriate passages within the Throne Speech itself, and the people of this province can determine themselves whether or not there is material in this Throne Speech that is meaningful to them. Despite all of the talk that is usually the order of the day during an election time, the people will support the government that has fulfilled its commitments. In June, 1952, we said:

1. A \$75 million highway and market road programme.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I turn to the Speech from the Throne in order to appraise the progress made in that particular direction. The Speech says:

“Unfavourable weather conditions hampered both highway construction and maintenance operations, but despite those conditions 495 miles of grading, 1,100 miles of gravel surfacing and 219 miles of bituminous surfacing were completed.”

And it goes on. It mentioned that the grade construction on the Trans-Canada Highway was now 64 per cent completed. Is that of no significance? Is that unimportant? The people of this province, understanding the meaning behind this particular progress report contained in the Throne Speech, fully realize that we are on the way to the completion of that \$75 million highway programme. And another quotation with reference to highways:

“Increased attention will be paid to the important problem of market roads. Engineering staff of the Department of Highways has been assigned to design a grid of main market roads for submission to the rural municipalities. This work is being done in conjunction with the Municipal Advisory Commission which is studying the financial implications of such a system.”

This will be good news to the municipal people and the farm people who so

**February 24, 1954**

badly need better roads in rural areas.

Pledge number two given at the 1952 election:

2. Power to 40,000 farms and all towns and villages in Saskatchewan.

What is contained in the Throne Speech with reference to this? Here is what I find:

“During the past year, a gas pipe line was constructed from the Brock gas field to the City of Saskatoon. The Saskatchewan Power Corporation is supplying gas to over 5,000 customers in the City of Saskatoon and in six communities in the vicinity of the pipe line. Since the early construction of the Trans-Canada Gas Pipe Line is now assured, our public gas utility is laying plans to make gas available to other communities in the Province.”

And No. 4 in our election pledge said: “Natural Gas in larger cities and intermediate points.” Is that of no significance or importance in the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker?

And the rural electrification programme is also mentioned in the Throne Speech, a progress report that is reassuring to the people of the province and an indication that these 40,000 farmers and all towns and villages in Saskatchewan will be receiving electricity at the end of this Government’s term of office.

3. Continued development of Saskatchewan’s oil and mineral resources.

What does the Throne Speech say in reference to that? I read here:

“A new record was achieved in 1953 when nearly 700 wells were drilled for oil and gas and three hundred of these will likely prove capable of commercial production. Expenditures on petroleum exploration and development during 1953 broke all records. A number of new discoveries were made, of which the Smiley light oil field is undoubtedly the most outstanding. Production of oil in 1953 increased 60 per cent over 1952 to reach 2,700,000 barrels.”

And it is estimated that that production will at least reach 5 million barrels next year. Is that of no significance, is that a barren Throne Speech? It contains so much, Mr. Speaker, and this Government has a reputation of implementation of programmes and promises so well carried out that it is beginning to be a matter of course, and the Opposition seems to overlook the progress that is being made.

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



The Throne Speech says – you know it is getting so that we are almost afraid to talk to the Federal Government about the South Saskatchewan Dam because every time we do it costs us more money. Here is what the Throne Speech says:

“During the past year, the Government of Saskatchewan has continued to urge the Government of Canada to proceed with the South Saskatchewan River Development Project. Further demands of the Federal Government for Saskatchewan to assume greater financial responsibility for this project have been met. At the present time a joint committee is meeting to draft an agreement for submission to both Governments. It is our hope that the Government of Canada will give favourable consideration to proceeding with this important irrigation project during the present year.”

If there is any criticism to be directed I would suggest to the hon. members opposite that they direct it to the Federal Government; and perhaps in their own minds and to their own satisfaction determine how much cost should be imposed on the people of Saskatchewan for this very valuable project which will contribute so much to the national wealth and the general economic well-being of Canada as a whole.

#### 6. Reclamation and settlement of new Northern areas.

The Throne Speech says:

“Significant progress has been made in this direction despite very adverse weather conditions.”

I do not propose, Mr. Speaker, at this time to dwell in any detail with matters pertaining directly to my Department. That can better be done when the budget is before the House and when Estimates are under consideration

I would, however, like to make one observation in connection with new settlement and drainage activities in the northern part of the province. As hon. members know, the Government tabled an interim report by the Royal Commission in regard to northern settlement, and I congratulate the Government on its straightforward honesty in tabling a report when they probably could have waited until the final report was completed. The report is critical in places and is in accord with much of the thinking that we have been doing in regard to policies affecting northern settlement and reclamation projects. I would, however, like to refer to some of the press statements that came out as a result of the tabling of that report.

Again, as is usually the fashion with our Liberal dailies, they must ‘slant’ the news to the best possible political effect. Now they have left the impression, with these kind of headlines, that land settlement in new areas was to be discontinued, when they said: “Agro Commission calls for land settlement halt.” I want to say, Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no intention to halt land settlement. It is our intention to proceed with land settlement in new areas.

**February 24, 1954**

The next one says: "Land settlement probe is asked." There was no probe asked. The inquiry and the study has been made by the Royal Commission. The recommendations have been submitted. Many of those recommendations will meet with the complete approval of our people, perhaps not to the same broad extent because we do have practical budget limitations; but already some of the recommendations of the Commission in this regard are being implemented as is indicated in the Throne Speech when it says:

"Provision will be made for making cash payment of earned clearing and breaking credits to settlers occupying Crown land in northern Saskatchewan."

Number 9 of our pledge to the people in the 1952 election:

9. Extension of medical care programme.

I need not refer to it – that has been done by other speakers who have spoken of the number of patients who have been assisted through the Saskatchewan Hospitalization plan. I can, however, refer to the statement in the Throne Speech which indicates that the University hospital will be completed in the coming year and possibly patients will be admitted; and that the medical college is already getting under way. Someone on the other side of the House mentioned that we hadn't given the former administration credit for building this Legislative building. Well, knowing their propensity to debate, naturally they would have to have some place to carry on debate, and it is to the credit of the former administration that we have this fine Legislative building; but I think it is more to the credit of this administration that we have taken the bold step – and it was indeed a mighty step, Mr. Speaker – of providing a University hospital and medical college at the University in Saskatoon.

10. Extension of Social Welfare benefits.

I look about in the Throne Speech for some indication in that regard and I find statements like this:

"Additional accommodations for aged persons is being provided at the Melfort Nursing Home which will be in operation in April, and construction of the Regina Nursing Home will commence in the present year."

Why on that one bit of progress alone, the old administration would have probably gone out and tried to win an election! And here is another one:

"Communities and organizations are showing keen interest in the provision of housing projects for the care of the ambulatory aged pioneers of their districts. Since the announcement of the Government's policy offering capital and maintenance grants for this purpose, six agreements have been completed and fourteen are in various stages of negotiation."

That will give our aged shelter and accommodation close to their neighbours.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, but I think I have given sufficient to the House that would indicate that this is a government that gets things

done; and we look at the bottom of our platform card used in the 1952 election and it says: "Get things done! Vote CCF!" Well, we are getting things done, and the people of this province know it, and as long as we fulfil those commitments, no matter how much talk we get from the Opposition, this Government will be back in power again. I wish I could say as much for the Federal Government at Ottawa.

**Mr. Loptson:** – Wishful thinking!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** – Now I wish to turn to other matters.

**Mr. McDonald:** – Nice Dream!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** – Mr. Speaker, as everyone knows, the general economic conditions of agriculture have been steadily growing worse in the past years. It is recognized on good authority that our basic industry is caught in an ever-tightening cost-price squeeze and that the cost of goods and services required by farmers is increasing steadily in contrast to steadily declining prices for the produce of the farm. In the case of livestock, as was mentioned by the hon. member for The Battlefords, it went down with bumps.

First, I wish to deal with farm costs. In the light of the situation just mentioned, I was amazed to hear the Leader of the Opposition coming to the defence of the farm implement companies and stating that the farmers were not hard up financially because they had a large surplus of grain on hand. Whether this surplus of grain is an asset will depend on the price the farmer will eventually receive for the grain that is now stored on his farm. I will, therefore, a little later on, after I deal with increasing farm costs, deal with farm prices and tendencies in that particular regard. Let us first of all refer to the position of the implement companies that the Leader of the Opposition so enthusiastically defended. How well have they done in the past few years? It is necessary, Mr. Speaker, when you manufacture an implement to have steel. So first let us look at the steel companies. The net profits after taxes of the three main steel companies in Canada increased from 1945 to 1952 as follows: they made about \$6½ million profit in 1945, and \$20¼ million profit in 1952, an increase of 210 per cent in profits.

Let us now look at the poor implement companies our hon. member from Saltcoats wishes to defend. What were their profits like, after taxes again? In 1945, the three major companies – Massey Harris, International and Cockshutt – had a net profit of \$3¼ million approximately. In 1952, they had a net profit of \$17,882,000, or an increase in percentage of 447 per cent. And still the hon. Leader of the Opposition tried to convince this House that the Cockshutt Farm Implement Company had not made much profit, and one of the reasons he gave was that labour costs had gone up in the manufacture of farm implements. Let us take a look at this labour cost matter. These figures are those obtained from the report of the Select Committee that inquired into the price, sale and distribution of farm implements of this Legislature, which indicated that, in 1949, salaries and wages made up 42.4 per cent of the manufacturing costs per dollar for the factory value of farm machinery; but in 1950, labour and salaries only represented 28.9 per cent of the total per dollar gross selling value at the factory.

Now let us take a look at another angle. The hon. member said he had some shares in the Cockshutt Implement company – he must have got short-changed someplace along the road in view of these favourable reports that

**February 24, 1954**

we have. A shareholder of the Cockshutt Farm Equipment Limited, who bought a share of common stock in 1943 at \$9.25, now holds two shares worth a total of \$32 and has collected \$8.55 in dividends since he bought the shares, receiving an annual interest rate of 9.2 per cent. Working capital of the Cockshutt Company jumped from \$4,894,000 in 1943 to \$22,728,000 in 1952, and reserves increased from \$1,000,000 to \$2,500,000. Now that indicates a pretty healthy condition in the farm implement business. We know that if the agricultural situation deteriorates, perhaps they, like other industries, won't do so well in the future.

Now I wish to say something about the increase in freight rates, and I am doing this to indicate to members of this Legislature the tremendous added burdens of cost that have been progressively placed on the shoulders of agriculture during the post-war period. In 1948 we had the 21 per cent increase in freight rates; in 1950 we had another 20 per cent, which made a cumulative increase of 45 per cent to that time, and then a succession of freight rate increases culminating in 98.1 per cent increase.

I would like to translate that into terms of what it would really mean to a livestock producer for example. In our Department we base our schedule of lease fees on the average price of all cattle and the classes of cattle on the Winnipeg market, less freight, from the highest shipping point in Saskatchewan to Winnipeg, and the shipping point that was picked happened to be up in my country, north of Lloydminster. In February 1943, the freight rate from that point to Winnipeg was 48 cents and it went up progressively until in March 1953, the freight rate from that point was \$1.06 per cwt. or an increase of over 100 per cent in freight rates.

The hon. member for The Battlefords indicated the drop in cattle prices, and I am going to refer to them too. Anyone who tells me or anyone else that there aren't trouble clouds on the horizon for agriculture is just talking through his hat. We are living on a little borrowed time because we have had wonderful and abundant crops. I hope this honeymoon continues, because I don't like to face adverse circumstances and the Government doesn't. No one does. But anyone would be foolish not to evaluate the present economic situation and then proffer some suggestion to the government at Ottawa as to what should be done about it; and that is the purpose of my reference to these figures this afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

What about rail rates – I have mentioned them, but wish to mention one more thing in that connection, and it is that in the past 40 years, the railways earned more than twice as much in western Canada (that is, Canada west of Fort William) than in eastern Canada, despite a heavier volume of freight in eastern Canada where the rates are, of course, competitive. Therefore, the bulk of these freight rate increases were applied to western Canada, and I want to make this observation, Mr. Speaker: a nation economically divided will have great difficulty in remaining politically united, and I hope that the Federal Government will take speedy and early action to equalize these freight rates so that all sections of this great nation can share equitably in the economic benefits of our transportation system. It is something that is long and far overdue.

Sometimes I think it is unfortunate that we do not have a government at Ottawa that can go out to the people with a pledge like that, and an equal record of fulfilment, and I want to suggest to the hon. member for Saltcoats that if he wants to abolish the C.C.F. by one means or another, ballot or otherwise (I don't know what he had in mind – but knowing the workings of his mind I think he had other means) I can tell him how he can do it.

Let the government at Ottawa do something towards the fulfilment of some of their pledges. I don't like political activity. I would rather be back on my ranch attending to my own occupation, and I would be very glad to have someone else do this job if they would do it. The reason I find myself here, Mr. Speaker, is because we have had governments in this province and we have had governments in Ottawa that have not moved in response to the needs of a situation, nor even in response to the demands of popular opinion until they found themselves 'out on their ear' like they did back in 1944. And believe me, if this government at Ottawa does not wake up it will be out on its ear too. I am not suggesting what political party will take its place, but there will be a political party take its place unless they get a move on.

**Mr. Lopton:** – It won't be the C.C.F. anyway.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** – I wouldn't be a bit surprised but that it might be the C.C.F. I can say this much, Mr. Speaker, if there was a C.C.F. government in Ottawa at the present time we would have equalization of freight rates –

**Mr. McDonald:** – Just a dream!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** – For the benefit of the hon. members I just might read to them the platform on which the C.C.F. went to the country in the last Federal election campaign –

**Mr. Lopston:** – They knew they wouldn't need it.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** – I would suggest to them that they urge their particular political party to adopt this programme, because I think it is an excellent programme and everyone in this House will agree with it:

1. Canadian leadership for peace; to eliminate the hunger and poverty on which Communism thrives; to build collective security and support of the U.N. and its principles.
2. Immediate nation-wide health insurance.
3. A social security programme to include sickness benefits, old age pensions, family allowances at adequate rates.
4. One hundred thousand new homes a year; marketing agencies to handle farm and fish products in inter-provincial and export trade.

The hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Ripley) suggested that we should abolish the Fish Marketing Service. The hon. members opposite are going to have an opportunity to vote on a motion in a support of a livestock marketing board. I am looking forward with interest as to how they are going to vote, and if the hon. member for Athabasca is consistent he will vote against a livestock marketing board as well.

6. Guaranteed forward prices based on parity for primary producer.
7. Regain and expand overseas markets through co-operative, economic arrangements with

Commonwealth and other non-dollar countries

Let us take a look at this export market situation and see what has happened under a Liberal administration. There was reference made to it in the Throne Speech debate; concern was felt over the fact that our trade relations with other countries were deteriorating and that our export markets had, to all practical intents and purposes with the exception of wheat, vanished completely. The Government at Ottawa has been consistently saying that we are not losing the U.K markets. In 1949, total agricultural exports to the U.K. were \$413.4 million in value; in 1951, \$292.4 million in value – a drop in that 3-year period of time of 30 per cent and a much greater drop at the present time. Take pork products: in 1944 we exported 700 million pounds of pork to Britain; in 1952, four million pounds.

**Mr. Loptson:** – Why don't you ship your hogs to Britain?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** – And cheese: exports to the U.K dropped from 135 million in 1945 to a mere trickle in 1952 – the lowest in 60 years, in 1952.

**Mr. Loptson:** – There is nothing to stop you yet from sending them over.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** – Not losing our markets? There is the evidence, and it comes from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

**Mr. Danielson:** – How much did you buy?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** – The same story can be told of beef. I would rather the hon. members would answer some of my arguments with similar facts, and that is the reason I have deliberately adopted the practice of giving these hon. members some figures to bolster the arguments. Let them come forward with figures to bolster some of the statements that they make in this House.

**Mr. Danielson:** – We will.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** – They make random statements, unsupported statements, hoping that someone who is not well acquainted with the situation will believe them. What about beef? In 1945 our exports of beef were 200 million pounds; in 1952, 17 million pounds.

**Mr. McDonald:** – To whom?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** – Now, I want to say something about prices in connection with this. Our beef prices in the past few years have fallen very drastically. As I have mentioned to the House, we calculate the basis of our lease rentals on Crown lands on the price of cattle at the Winnipeg market; that is the last six months of the calendar year on the Winnipeg market. Let us look at them. In 1948, the average price, less freight in every case, for all cattle on the Winnipeg market was \$15.05 per cwt.; in 1949 it was \$14.34 per cwt.; 1950, \$20.79; 1951 (that was a high year), \$26.24 per cwt.; 1952, \$15.62 per cwt.; and 1953, \$11.21 per cwt.

**Mr. Loptson:** – What were they in Great Britain?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** – And still the farmer I mentioned at Greenstreet, Saskatchewan, pays for over 100 per cent more freight. We do not need it percentagewise or otherwise. And there is every prospect on the

best authority from the senior officials of the Dominion Government at Ottawa that next year will see another drop in livestock prices. So our daily press and the hon. Leader of the Opposition say we are prophets of gloom, that everything is all right.

Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps there is an offset, as I mentioned. We have had bountiful crops the past three years and the drop in price in dairy, poultry and livestock products has not been felt to such a great extent. But, not having the livestock, in the event of getting back to normal crops (as in every probability we will in this province) or maybe short crops, we will not have this livestock production. First of all you will not have the livestock production to fall back on because as our market outlets to Great Britain deteriorated our livestock farm population dropped in Saskatchewan. It might interest hon. members of this House to know that we have got less livestock (I am talking about cattle, hogs and sheep) in Saskatchewan right now than we did in 1921; and, of course, we have far fewer horses. We must have nearly 774,000 fewer horses at the present time, which just simply indicates that the reduced horse population was not even made up by other livestock. So we are in a vulnerable position in the event of crop failure. We are particularly vulnerable with a combination of price failure and crop failure.

I agree with the hon. member for Wilkie (Mr. Horsman) when he said that even if prices remained up, if we had a crop failure in this province, there would be quite a few farmers, and municipalities too, looking in vain for a means by which to meet operating costs and to meet the costs of providing municipal services.

I do not think it is necessary for me to give any further indication that there is every possibility, with present price trends, that we will have to take very drastic action in the economic field if present tendencies are to be arrested. There is very little hope that I can see of any possibilities of trade relations with the United States, where they have their own agricultural problems.

I should mention, too, that everyone has been depending on the ability of the Wheat Board to maintain the price of wheat. They have done a heroic job in marketing our wheat, and it is the only farm commodity in the history of this country being marketed through that kind of agency that has provided the farmers with the kind of price stability that they want. It is the only government agency that has exercised the power to fix prices and the farmers appreciate the efforts of the Wheat Board.

**Mr. Loptson:** – Why try to undermine it?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** – I am somewhat alarmed, though, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the new policies that are being adopted in connection with the marketing of our wheat. The recent announcement of the Hon. C. D. Howe that the price of wheat at Fort William would be arbitrarily dropped by 7 cents a bushel was of very great concern to me, because it seems to me it indicates already a concession to the buyer to make it easier for the buyer to buy the wheat in the East and to get rid of our surplus in that way. I hope it will not resolve itself into a selling war between this country and the United States. We in Canada have been living under the protection, especially in wheat, of the American Price Support ‘umbrella’, but that protection may be removed if a selling war takes place. We would be in a very vulnerable position to defend ourselves. A lot of the credit that has been

February 24, 1954

taken by the Liberal Government at Ottawa for maintaining the price of grain can be attributed to the supports in the United States . . .

**Mr. Lopton:** – You wouldn't give the United States credit for anything, would you?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** – . . . much as we appreciate the good work that has been done by the Wheat Board in connection with marketing. Now some say, "Well, how does the price of wheat stack up?" I took the trouble of getting a few figures. In 1948, 1949 and 1950, the domestic price of wheat was \$2.00. In those two years the International Wheat Agreement price was \$2.00 a bushel. Now, the price of our domestic wheat and our wheat under I.W.A. is \$1.79 per bushel, a very considerable drop. Class 2 wheat in 1948-49 and 1949-50: in 1948-49 it was \$2.26 a bushel; in 1949-50, a little less. Now for class 2 wheat the price is \$1.79 a bushel.

I can remember one time when the Tories were in power at Ottawa, when we got that 5 cents a bushel from R. B. Bennett during the 'thirties and we thought it was manna from heaven. But the Hon. C. D. Howe takes 7 cents off the Fort William price just like that! I hope it does not continue, or this great surplus of grain that we prefer to call a reserve could really turn into a tremendous liability as far as the farm people and the economy of this province is concerned.

**Mr. McDonald:** – Finish the statement.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** – Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one thing that we are all aware of. We are all aware that there is not an abundance of food in the world. We do not need to fear overproduction. It is a matter of distribution. It is a matter of building up the kind of trade relations that will bring the abundance of food production that Canada is so greatly endowed with to the needy areas of the world. I was hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that that would be done at the conclusion of World War II. I was looking forward with great hopes that our farm people would be called upon to produce food to the limit, if the 'four freedoms' meant anything. We were hopeful then that F.A.O., the world Food and Agriculture Organization, would have a free hand in meeting the tremendous food emergency situations that were occurring in all parts of the world. Nothing was done. F.A.O. proposed an international commodity exchange. I regret that the Government at Ottawa turned that plan down. We need more of that. We need more commendable plans of this kind because I am certain as I stand here and talk to this House this afternoon, that world problems will never be solved – the problems of world peace, the problems of developing international trade and creating better relationships of good will – unless we feed these hungry people.

I see the hon. Leader of the Opposition smile. He does not think of those things; they are not concerned with them. All he thinks about is this free-enterprise philosophy. I often wonder if he has any concept of social responsibility at all in his entire makeup. It is funny I have never heard one member on the opposite side of the House express any opinion or an idea that has some constructive social thought behind it. They seem to think it is a joke; but one day, when their colleagues are 'out' at Ottawa, they will know it is not a joke; and if they continue the present policies of building up profits for their free-enterprise friends on the basis of defending ourselves with armaments, they may wake up on a place something like that little island on the Pacific ocean where they dropped a hydrogen bomb and the whole thing disappeared – an island 10 miles long and 5 miles across.



There is a potential danger there, Mr. Speaker. and I believe that the best way to meet this situation is to expend some energy and do some financing in the direction of bringing, first of all, food to meet the immediate requirements of the people of India and China or Korea or whatever side of the fence or the curtain they might be on.

This week, Mr. Speaker, is 'Brotherhood Week' and I want to say that I am in an amiable mood today. There is only one thing, Mr. Speaker, that I am intolerant of. I am intolerant of prejudices and narrow viewpoints. I like to see people raise their eyes a bit, and I think it is time that we raised the general level of this debate a little bit in this House and say some purposeful things, things that will mean something to the people. When I think of agricultural problems here, quite naturally my mind goes out to the hungry people of the world, because the entire purpose of producing food is to feed people. So I would like to see an organization set up that would implement the spirit that is implied in Brotherhood Week. This is Brotherhood Week, and this Brotherhood Week extends not only to the outer boundaries of our country, but beyond them . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** – Over to the Opposition?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** – . . . to people elsewhere.

**Mr. Loptson:** – Would you say over to the Opposition?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** – Oh, yes, if the hon. Leader of the Opposition wishes me to extend my brotherly love, if he will reciprocate with some similar idea, we will have a whole lot in common, and I can go down the street arm-in-arm with him singing 'Hallelujah – another reformed Liberal'.

Canada, Mr. Speaker, is in an enviable position to make a tremendous contribution to stabilizing the food needs of people in other parts of the world. If we embark on a programme of that kind I am sure that we will make a far greater contribution towards stopping the spread of totalitarianism than we can in any other manner. I hope, too, that we can follow up such a programme with rehabilitation assistance in order to build the economy of those underdeveloped countries, so that those people can gradually improve their living standards. The peon in Mexico, and a peasant in India or China is a mighty poor customer. It is to our advantage to build up their general living standards and thereby build up permanent export markets. I am looking hopefully forward to the day when the many prevailing orthodox trading difficulties can be overcome, that we can place our trade relationships on the basis of actual need, and finally, in the final analysis, implement that spirit of Brotherhood Week.

I think following this direction is merely following the direction pointed to us by Him who taught us our Christian philosophy. As I see it, there is no other course. If we follow that course, "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you" – implement in a practical, scientific way the story of the Good Samaritan; if we do that, Mr. Speaker, we will not only be solving problems here, but we will be solving social problems elsewhere, and we will eventually bring about that most desirable objective, the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God. I hope that I may live to see tangible progress made in that direction in my day, Mr. Speaker. I will support the motion.

**Mr. T. R. MacNutt (Nipawin):** – Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate Adjourned)

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