

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session — Twelfth Legislature**  
**24th Day**

**Tuesday, March 16, 1954.**

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

**BUDGET DEBATE**

The House resumed from Monday, March 15, 1954, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer: That Mr. Speaker, do now leave the Chair. (The Assembly to go into a Committee of Supply).

**Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin):** — Mr. Speaker, it seems to be the custom to congratulate someone, and I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Carr) who adjourned the debate, last night, and then relinquished his time to me, today.

At the beginning, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to several things that have been said by the members opposite during this debate. First of all I want to refer to a remark made by the hon. member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Wellbelove), from the records of February 19, 1954.

**Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. It is against the rules of this House, I believe, to refer to another debate, a previous debate during this Session.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Is it from this debate?

**Mr. McDonald:** — No, Mr. Speaker, it isn't; but I will give it as I remember it. Maybe it was not made in this debate, maybe it was made in an earlier debate; maybe it was made last year, I am not sure. However, it was said in this House at some time by the member for Kerrobert-Kindersley that it seemed that the Liberal party and the Liberal members of this House were prepared to 'scuttle' this province for the betterment of themselves or their Party. then he went on to say that that was as true, today, as it ever was. Well, that was the only true part, because it never was true.

I want to say at this time that when we have read in the paper, last night and again this morning, the glowing prospects of a new oil field (at least we have a new well and prospects of a major oil find in this province at Frobisher), I think that that has glowing promises both in the amount of oil this well would appear to yield and in the gravity of that oil. I think I speak not only for myself, but for the Liberal members of the Opposition, the Liberal Party as a whole and the people of the province of Saskatchewan, when I say that we are all more than pleased on every occasion when we have some development in this province in our natural resources which will produce a revenue that probably, some day, this Government, if they ever wake up, will use in a manner so that the burden of taxation can be decreased. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I say again that we are more than pleased to see this development, and I hope that well will develop into a field. It is intimated by some of our oil friends that it could be comparable to Redwater or Leduc, and I think you realize as much as anyone, Mr. Speaker, what that would mean to this province.

**March 16, 1954**

Another thing I wish to refer to – and this was during this debate – is that, when the Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Sturdy) was speaking, he mentioned two things. First of all, he mentioned that probably it would be a good thing if our penal institution in Prince Albert (that is, the women's gaol) was moved away from that scene and a separate institution set up. I am in full accord with the Minister on this and at this time I would like to ask him, when he builds this new institution, to put it in Moosomin. He closed up the little institution we had there, and I sincerely hope that he will give us every consideration when he starts to build this new institution for women of this province.

Also, the members for Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs) said, in a speech in this House, that he sincerely hoped that some time the Minister of Social Welfare would see fit to build an old-age institution in Swift Current. I sincerely hope that the hon. member gets that request, and I certainly hope that we have one down in our end of the province as well. I believe, as has been said by many members during this Session, that it would be better to have smaller homes. It may be a little more costly I will admit that; but I believe we would be better to put our aged people who want to go to an institution close to their homes, their friends and their relatives, rather than take them to large institutions a long way from their local environment.

I recall that, during the speech of the Minister of Social Welfare, when he was going on at great length about what his department has done for underprivileged people of this province, he had a lot to say about a 'racket' in the trade babies; but I think that, before he spouts all his words on us in the Opposition – and I think he included all the Liberals in the province – that he ought probably to cast some of his words of wisdom upon other C.C.F. members of the C.C.F. party and members of other Legislatures who are C.C.F. members. I want, at this time, to read, Mr. Speaker, from the Vancouver 'Daily Sun' of January 25, 1954. This is a reprint, apparently, from the Ottawa paper, and it says this:

“Some rather startling opinions are being attributed to members of the Ontario Select Committee on reform institutions. If they carry much weight the committee report will, in certain respects, fail to give constructive guidance towards the more effective treatment of offenders against the laws. Mr. W.J. Grummett, House leader of the C.C.F. group, seems particularly prone to come up with various motions for dealing with these people. He advocated the sterilization of unmarried mothers and the strapping of unruly youngsters by parents and magistrates.”

I think probably our own Minister of Social Welfare could give a very worthwhile and good lecture to the hon. gentleman.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Maybe he believes in that policy.

**Mr. McDonald:** — There are one or two questions that came to my mind during the remarks of the members opposite in the course of this debate, and I hope at some time that the Ministers concerned will answer these questions, either on the floor of the House or possibly when their Estimates are before us.

One question entered my mind when the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Darling) who is also Minister in charge of the Power Corporation and gas utility was speaking. I was wondering, when he told us of the number of oilfields or oil sites that had been electrified, if the same policy was used there as is used in regard to rural electrification. That is: do the oil companies concerned have to pay for a part of the capital cost of that installation? I was also wondering, if and when the gas utility gets around to serving a few farms in the province of Saskatchewan, will the farmers again have to pay a portion of the cost of the capital expenditure in putting that utility in the farm homes? I certainly hope that is not the case; but looking at the record of this Government with regard to rural electrification, sometimes I wonder.

I also want to mention one or two things with regard to what the Minister of Telephones (Hon. Mr. Kuziak) had to say during this debate. First of all, he tried to leave the impression with this Assembly that there had been no general increase in the telephone rates since 1919. Then he went on and tried to justify an overall increase of 13 per cent. Those were his remarks, Mr. Speaker: first of all, there wasn't any increase, and then he tried to justify a 13 per cent rise. But he failed to point out to this Legislature and to the people of this province that the raise is much greater than that.

I have here in my hand an answer to a question (and the answer comes from the Minister himself) with regard to what was the schedule of rural telephone connecting fees in 1945 and what is the present schedule. If we go through this answer we can find that in some instances we have a raise of 100 per cent, and it goes all the way down to an increase of about 33 per cent. This is what the rural people of Saskatchewan are having to pay, and they are not happy about it. I think that the Government of this province, who are in charge of the Telephone Corporation, ought to try to lift this burden from the shoulders of the people who are paying the most and receiving the least. I refer to those people now who have to be under small exchanges and have limited service.

The Minister also, at the same time, tried to justify this overall increase in telephone rates by comparing it with the increase of rates for postage which have been laid down by our Federal Government. He said that when the rate was increased from three to four cents that was an increase of  $33 \frac{1}{3}$  per cent; I think that is true. then he went on to say that the proposed increase from four to five cents, which is to take place I think on the 1st of April, is another increase of  $33 \frac{1}{3}$  per cent, or a total increase of  $66 \frac{2}{3}$  per cent. I think he ought to go down to the Department of Education and have a lesson or two in elementary arithmetic, Mr. Speaker.

I cannot help at this time but relate something that was said by the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Burton) when he spoke in this House. Towards the end of his remarks he said of you, Sir, that you were getting weary. Well, I have no doubt that you were, and I have no doubt that you were not the only one who was weary when the hon. Minister finished speaking. I think most members on both sides of the House were very weary.

There has also been considerable said in this House, and reported in the newspapers, as to the attention that has been paid by the members of the Opposition when certain people on your right are addressing you, during this Session, Mr. Speaker. I think it was when the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Heming) was speaking in this House that the 'Commonwealth' came out with

**March 16, 1954**

a remark about how the Opposition had treated him; some of them were sitting with their friends talking and some just weren't paying any attention. I wonder if the 'Commonwealth' was watching what was going on when the Minister of Public Works was speaking. I could not help but watch it, it was so obvious. Out of 14 Cabinet Ministers in this House, four were sitting in their places when the hon. Minister was speaking. Apart from the absence of Cabinet Ministers there were ten other members out of the House, and on top of that, the hon. Minister of Natural Resources was sound asleep; I think he woke up once, took a little look around and then just decided to go right back to sleep again.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — He was dreaming about oil wells!

**Mr. McDonald:** — Then somebody made the remark . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I remember that occasion well and I wish to state that I wasn't asleep.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Well of course, Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to tell when the hon. Minister is asleep or awake.

**Premier Douglas:** — At least you can tell when he's conscious.

**Mr. McDonald:** — I cannot help but recall that at the time the hon. Minister of Public Works and of the Power Corporation was speaking, someone over there (I didn't catch just who it was) made some remark about the lights going out in Regina. I think we all remember an occasion here a while ago when it got fairly large type in the 'Leader-Post' about the lights going out in Regina. I think it was two years ago that I brought to the attention of the Minister the conditions of lights in certain towns in this province, towns that are served not by a private or a municipal corporation, but by the Provincial Power Corporation, and I refer to the town in which I live. If we got headlines every time the lights went out, they would be in there every day, because they are out every day; and when they are not out, you need to take a match to go around and find out whether they are on or off. It is terrible, Mr. Speaker.

I brought this to the attention of the hon. Minister, as I said, I think two years ago, and at that time we did get some action. The Corporation came down and put in a few new poles and we are thankful for that; but I sincerely hope that he will see fit to look into this situation. I am no electrician. I don't know what the trouble is; but I sincerely hope that his department and the men who work in that department will be given the responsibility, this coming season, to rectify that particular problem.

Yesterday, I think we were all very interested when the Minister of Highways (Hon. J.T. Douglas) spoke in this House. I, for one, was pleased to note the large expenditure of money on highways, as I am sure everyone in and outside this House was pleased. I could not agree too much with the allocation of this money, but surely it will come around to our turn sooner or later. We have been waiting ten years, and I think maybe in another ten we will get some highways.

**Mr. Lopton:** — You'll get them before that.

**Mr. McDonald:** — I was interested to note that the R.M.s have asked for further financial help from the Provincial Government, which I seriously think the municipalities of this province are entitled to, especially when the

revenues have risen to their present height, I think that we could pass on some further assistance to the municipalities. I notice they have asked for \$5 million, and I do not believe that that is too much to ask in light of what they are receiving today and the amount of our total budget.

The Minister went on to say there was a certain amount of criticism of the high standard of highways that he was building in this province today. Well, Mr. Speaker, I shall never be accused of doing that, because, if I could ever criticize this Government, it would be for the type of highways they are building. The highways in this province are not standing up, as has been obvious the last few years; and I think we are going to find that some of the highways he is building today are not standing up, and I think he is going to find that in some sections of the Trans-Canada in the very near future.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — they are built to Federal specifications.

**Mr. McDonald:** — I think I can recall, back in 1949, when the Minister started out on his Trans-Canada programme, that at that time I pointed out to him that I thought it would be very wise if we were to follow a similar method of construction, or a similar type of construction, to that used in Manitoba. I find, today, that is what we are attempting to do, but still and all, Mr. Speaker, they are not putting the work into the roads that Manitoba have put into them, and I think anyone who travels from here east . . .

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — That's rubbish!

**Mr. McDonald:** — . . . will confirm that remark, because in the province of Manitoba, just over the boundary from where I happen to live, there is part of the Trans-Canada Highway that has been completed for some three years, and is in excellent condition. Some of the road that has been completed between here and the Manitoba boundary on the Trans-Canada is beginning, I notice to crumble along the edge.

The Minister also made a statement about bridges. There seems to be a lot of argument about bridges; but I am not going to enter into that argument. I am just going to say that, yesterday, the Minister told us that, in 1953, his Department had built as many bridges in this province as they had built in the two years 1951 and 1952. In an answer to a question asked in this House, I think by the hon. member for Cannington, we were told that there were 51 bridges constructed in the year 1953. I think it would be fair for me to say that in my constituency . . .

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. We could not give him an answer for this year because the 1953-54 season has not been completed.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, it is obvious what I meant thee; it is the fiscal year 1952-53, the last year we have any report on in this House on any Department or any corporation. As I was saying, I think it would be fair for me to say, Mr. Minister, that in the seat I happen to represent we could have utilized 50 per cent of the total number of bridges that were built. We could have used 25 bridges in that seat. So, when the Minister has the audacity to tell the people of this province and the members of this House that, by building 51 bridges, he can see a solution, he can see an end to the problem, I would say he is very short-sighted.

**March 16, 1954**

Now I am not going to say that we have that many bridges of the large type, 20-feet and over, that need replacing; but we have a problem in our area and in many areas of this province, a bridge problem which does not constitute 20-foot spans and over. It constitutes the small bridge over a ravine, and I would like to bring to the Minister's attention that when he hands over that portion of the Trans-Canada Highway which lies in my municipality, the rural Municipality of Maryfield, he is handing back to us seven bridges in seven miles, and not one of them is safe to travel over. Those bridges were built, I think it was, in 1929 or 1930; every one of them, today, is in a state of collapse . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Who built them?

**Mr. McDonald:** — They were built by the provincial government of that day. Our municipality need . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — The Liberal government!

**Mr. McDonald:** — Admittedly those bridges will only take maybe \$700 or \$800, I don't know, but I would estimate around that to replace them. But in any municipality that has seven bridges in seven miles, it is humanly impossible with the revenues the municipalities have at their disposal, to keep up this bridge building programme.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — We likely just paid for those now.

**Mr. McDonald:** — I was also very interested, yesterday, when the Minister was reading out his highway programme for the coming season. I listened to what he had to say about No. 1 — that went through part of my seat; and the next number I was directly interested in was No. 8, and I did not quite catch what the Minister said, nor did I catch what he said about No. 9. So I sent a note over to him afterwards and he answered my note and this is the answer to my query about what he was going to do on No. 8 and No. 9 Highways. On No. 8, as hon. members know, the proposal is to build some sub-grade at a bridge site north of Moosomin and to gravel this; and on No. 9, minor sub-grade construction south of the Qu'Appelle river bridge.

We are grateful, naturally, to have an approach to the bridge, Mr. Speaker; but Nos. 8 and 9 Highways are in dreadful condition, both of them, but especially No. 8 from Moosomin south; where they have drawn a tremendous tonnage of gravel out for the Trans-Canada Highway. I don't think there is a road in this province that is in worse condition than No. 8 Highway from Moosomin south to the turnoff, where they go in to the gravel pit. I sincerely hope that at least by next year the Minister will see fit to build this road. There may have been method in his madness, I would say, in not putting any more work on this road this season, because I understand there is a lot of tonnage of gravel to be drawn up there again this summer, and it might be unwise to build a new road and have it completely disintegrate in one season's travel by the tremendous loads carried by the truckers today.

I was also very disappointed that the Minister did not have something to offer us on No. 47 Highway. It has been a contention for many years that this highway ought to be, in some places, completed. The highway never was completed, but it should be completed now, and those portions of it that have been built ought to be brought up to the highway standard of the other roads in the highway system of this province. I could not help

but think when he wound up his remarks that there seemed to be some sort of a competition between the Ministers, this Session, as to who could 'blow his horn' the loudest. I don't know what the prize is going to be, but I often wonder just which one is going to get it.

I am pleased to note that, in our area now, we are having a new high-tension power line being brought in from Estevan to serve that district. I sincerely hope that when that is completed, this Government will see fit to carry on and expand their rural electrification programme in that area.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a word or two about the automobile insurance. You know it is rather amazing to me how any government who are in business, a private corporation or anybody else, could handle a business affair the way this insurance scheme has been handled. What is the story? Back in 1952 and 1953 we suffered losses under the Automobile Insurance plan, but if you remember, Mr. Speaker, I think there was an election about that time. Maybe that had something to do with the reason that we had a loss; that we didn't increase the rates. But then, when the C.C.F.ers were safely sitting behind the results of that election, they came out with a terrific loss under the Automobile Accident Insurance plan, so they say: "Boys, lift up the rate! We will wipe off the deficit, make a little capital so that by the time the next election rolls around we can decrease the rates again." Mr. Speaker, why didn't this Government use the same method in dealing with this, why didn't they increase the rates 10, 15 or even 25 per cent, and pay off a portion of that debt and leave the rate there until they have paid it off, and then set the rate to cover the expenditures in each year as that year comes along?

I think there is one thing I ought to deal with before leaving the few criticisms of speeches made during this Session, and that is to deal with a letter or two that I happened to have read written by people outside this province, dealing with conditions of our highway system in Saskatchewan. I want to read a letter which appeared in the 'Leader-Post', and it is under the heading 'Disgusted'. It is addressed "To the Editor", and it says this:

"We are tourists from the United States. I want to let you people in Saskatchewan know what we think of your roads. They are in horrible shape at the best, but when you cannot even put up a 50-cent detour sign when a road is under construction, that is the last straw. From Edmonton to Regina we went 150 miles out of our way because of detours without signs. Why, in this rich wheat country, you have such deplorable highways is something I'll never understand. If we ever come back to Canada it will be to western Alberta. We would only recommend your highways to people with horse-drawn wagons."

I could not help but think of one or two instances that I noticed last season when I read this letter, especially about the 50-cent sign. I have noticed in Saskatchewan during the construction of the Trans-Canada, which happens to be the road that I travel most, that when a portion of that highway is fenced off because it is under construction, either for gravel or for blacktop or something else, they have never a sufficient warning that there is a detour. In many instances, as this lady said, there is nothing but a 50-cent sign, and the sign is about that long and

**March 16, 1954**

that wide and covered with mud. Anyone who even knows the road, is a local resident, must drive with caution or he will find himself in trouble. How many tourists or outsiders travelling this road at night – why there aren't more accidents, I don't know; but I, personally, have seen two cars upside down in the ditch at one of these particular detours, where they had a 50-cent sign and a \$5.00 snow fence across the road. It costs very little to put up a good sign, probably bigger in feet than their signs are in inches, to warn the people travelling our highways that there is a detour. I sincerely hope that the Minister will see fit either to have his Department directly, or through his Department have the contractors responsible for the job, put up proper warnings to the travelling public.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. gentleman wouldn't want to leave a wrong impression . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Are you rising on a point of privilege?

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — Yes. The contractors in that area had a very difficult time to keep the signs up; they were constantly broken down, signs taken and pitched out on the road. Maybe the hon. member can tell us who is responsible.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, of all the foolish statements I ever heard in my life, that is the most foolish.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — Well, it's true, nevertheless.

**Mr. McDonald:** — I have lived beside that highway since the day it was started, and I still do. There is an odd sign, I will admit, that a contractor put up advertising his construction company; but as for highway signs advertising that the road is blocked off and there is a detour, they are non-existent, and I don't think there is anybody in my constituency . . .

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — Oh, that is not right.

**Mr. McDonald:** — . . . who would tear down a highway sign. Mr. Speaker, that just reminds me of what this Department did in my constituency this summer. Right down on the Manitoba border where you are coming into Saskatchewan they have more signs than they have roads. There are about a dozen of them, telling everything about Saskatchewan; on the Manitoba side they have one sign which says "Speed Limit 60 miles an hour for cars, and 50 for trucks." What happens to our signs in Saskatchewan? Do you know what they did, last summer, Mr. Speaker? They came down there, took their steel post with their signs bolted on, took the sign off the post, bolted another post to that one and put their sign up higher so you could see it over the weeds. Now that is as true as I stand here. That is the condition of the sign there. I notice that we have an amendment to The Noxious Weed Act come in during this Session, and I was very interested to read it. I thought maybe the Minister of Agriculture was going to get after the Minister of Highways about not cutting these weeds; but there was no such luck.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to come to the budget itself, I am going to tell you right now that I am not going to support this budget and I am going to tell you why. The reason I am not going to support it is because this Government has made many promises; as a matter of fact, a great many, that they have never kept. There is no provision in this budget to implement those promises, and there has never been any provision in any budget brought down by this Government



since they came into power ten years ago, to provide for these services which they promised to the people of Saskatchewan. What are these services? Well, I am not going to tell you what they are myself. I am going to read them to you, as they read them to the people of this province, ten years ago. What are they?

First of all this Government said they were going to be responsible for financing education. And what did they say in this regard? In a speech by Mr. T.C. Douglas (who is now Premier Douglas), February 16, 1943, he said this:

“The first thing which a C.C.F. government would do would be to recognize education as a responsibility of the provincial government. There has been a tendency on the part of provincial governments to ‘pass the buck’ to the municipalities and local school boards for maintaining educational facilities. The time has come when we must recognize that Canada’s constitution places the responsibility for teaching our children squarely upon the provincial governments and it cannot be passed on to any other body.”

That is what they said in 1943, Mr. Speaker. I think we ought to go on and read another one which came out of the ‘Commonwealth’ of May 17, 1944. There was a headline “Programme for Saskatchewan” and it said this:

“The British North America Act” – no less – they didn’t say ‘no less’, I said that; but they said:

“ . . . which is Canada’s constitution makes education a provincial, not a municipal or a local responsibility. All along the provincial government has been evading its duty; it has made grants to schools, outlined courses of study and provided for inspection of schools; but it has left the main burden of maintaining school services upon the municipality and the local school boards. The main burden does not belong there. A C.C.F. government will accept the responsibility laid on it by our constitution and take steps to provide adequate schooling for all children, irrespective of the part of the province they may happen to live in.”

Those were brave promises; but there is no provision in this budget for that, Mr. Speaker, none whatever. This Government . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — One million dollars more.

**Mr. McDonald:** — This Government are more responsible for ‘passing the buck’ than any other government that ever sat in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker. the only difference today is that it is a bigger buck than the one that was passed by a former government.

What has happened to the municipal tax rate since this Government came into office? – that is the municipal tax rate to pay for our educational system. I think the hon. member for Maple Creek used these figures (I hope

**March 16, 1954**

they are the same, I haven't checked them, but I hope they are) during his remarks in this debate, when he told this House that the municipal tax rate for school purposes had risen by 116 per cent in the rural municipalities, 134 per cent in the villages, 191 per cent in the towns and 110 per cent in the cities. After the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) had made that statement, the Minister of Education (Hon. Mr. Lloyd), when he spoke, endeavoured to pick out choice bits and pieces of this province to show that the amount of grant paid by the Provincial Government.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder why the Minister of Education would do that? I am sure that the local school boards and the local taxpayers know the position. I am not going to pick out any choice school, that is choice to suit my particular argument. I am going to take my own home school, the one I went to, the one my father went to and my children are going to now. That is Fairfield School District No. 46. As you can see by the number, it is an old school. Now, what is the case in regard to this school? In 1944, Mr. Speaker, we had a mill rate for education of 6 ½ mills.

**Premier Douglas:** — And \$300 teachers.

**Mr. McDonald:** — In 1952 we had a mill rate of 12.6; in 1953 we had a mill rate of 14. It is estimated that our mill rate for 1954 will be 20. You can see, Mr. Speaker, that in 10 years the municipal tax rate has increased by 300 per cent, a little better. What is the story in regard to the load carried by the Provincial Government? In 1944, our grant from the Provincial Government was \$1.50 a day, with a maximum of \$300 per year. In 1953, that was increased to \$2 per day or a maximum of \$400 per year. I haven't the figures for 1954, but I understand they are to be raised by another 41.00 a year; I hope that is right. In other words, we have an increase in the contributions of the Provincial Government of 150 per cent whereas we have an increase inland taxation of 300 per cent. I ought to remind the House that this mill rate is on the same assessment; there is no change in assessment.

What were some of the other things that were said in regard to this brave policy of going to finance education? There are some provinces in Canada today, Mr. Speaker, that are paying as high as 50 per cent of the total cost of education. This Government is paying about 20 per cent of the total cost, and I think it is time that we brought education onto a sound financial basis and that is to finance it out of the general revenues of the province. That was the promise of this Government, and until they are prepared to fulfil that promise, by putting their promise into money and bringing it down in the budget in this province, then that is one of the reasons I could never support a budget of this kind.

But that is only one of the promises they made in regard to education. They were also going to provide free textbooks throughout the school system. That was a promise – and what was said at that time in regard to this promise? Again, Mr. Douglas said in a broadcast on February 16, 1953:

“The second step which a C.C.F. government would take to provide a greater measure of equal education opportunities for all would be to provide free textbooks and supplies throughout our school system. No pupil should be hindered or debarred from gaining an education merely because he or she cannot buy the books and supplies necessary to attend school. The C.C.F. government would therefore

take steps to make these available to all school children in Saskatchewan.”

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier says ‘books and supplies’. Before his Government came into office, if I remember rightly, the readers in the public schools were supplied by the Department of Education. They still are; and I think, to give credit where credit is due, today there are a few other exercise books that are provided by the Department of Education. but today, just as it was in 1944, the majority of the school supplies are still either supplied by the local school board, or by the parents of the child going to school.

There are other quotations that I could read in regard to that, but I am not going to read them. There are other promises made by the C.C.F. Party at that time in regard to education. They promised that the rural schools and the children attending rural schools in this province were going to be given an equal opportunity with those children who attended the city schools. In other words, the same qualifications, the same material, the same courses would be available to the children in the rural areas that were available to the children in the city areas at that time. What is the case, Mr. Speaker? How many ‘sitters’ are teaching school in Regina, Moose Jaw, Saskatoon? How many are teaching school out in the rural areas? Is that an equal opposite, Mr. Speaker, that because someone happens to live in the city of Regina he should have fully-qualified teachers to teach his children and because someone lives in the rural areas his children must have a sitter? Some of the sitters are doing a good job, Mr. Speaker; others I am not so sure of. But, after all, it was the promise of this Government to provide equal educational opportunities regardless of where the child lived.

There were other promises. They were going to set up junior colleges scattered about Saskatchewan so that any children, or young men or young women who wanted to go on and take an academic course, or vocational training, could do that without having to go to our universities. I don’t know of any junior colleges that are sitting around Saskatchewan that were not here in 1944. I don’t think there are any.

They also promised, in regard to education, that they were going to have a provincial salary schedule for teachers. I don’t think that has ever been brought into effect. I believe that your teachers still have to bargain with the local board as to what salaries they are to be paid. This teacher problem, Mr. Speaker, is a problem that rests entirely on the shoulders of this Government. They were going to be responsible for education; therefore, it is their responsibility that we have the teacher shortage in the province of Saskatchewan today. I believe that when the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) said that he figured it would help some if they re-opened the Normal School in Regina, I think that is true. I know that there are people in our area of the province who quite possibly would go to Normal if there were a Normal School in this city. I have no doubt that there are other children in this city that would also do so.

Today, when this Government are competing with industry and with private business in the labour field (that is for teachers) they must be prepared to pay a similar wage to what any young woman or young man can get in the industrial or in the business field, and I don’t think that is being done.

There is one other promise in regard to education, Mr. Speaker, and that is this old bogey of an education tax. I wonder what the Minister of Natural Resources had to say when he spoke, in regard to this, during this debate.

**March 16, 1954**

He said this:

“I notice that the hon. member for Nipawin made something – or tried to make something – of the claim that the C.C.F. promised to do away with the Education Tax. I would agree that it would be very pleasant for everybody concerned to do away with that tax, and I am sure my hon. friends opposite will agree with me. Of course, the actual promise that was made was a conditional one – that the money would not be needed on account of other revenues taking its place.’

“That the money would not be needed on account of other revenues taking its place.” Now, Mr. Speaker, I don’t know whether they had in the back of their mind that they were going to do what they have done when they made that promise or not. I don’t think so, because the promise goes much further than the hon. Minister of Natural Resources would lead us to believe it did. What does the record say? The record says this; again, the hon. Mr. Douglas (at that time, Mr. T.C. Douglas), at a press conference in June, 1944, said this:

“Mr. Douglas said his Party believed that the present Education Tax levied on purchases in Saskatchewan can be eliminated when new sources of revenue are developed.’

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that new sources of revenue have been developed; but I want to go on further. I want to refer, or at least to quote from a broadcast from the now Attorney General (Hon. Mr. Corman) on June 13, 1944, when he said this:

“Just one word about the Education Tax.” (That’s where he should have quit). “The C.C.F. is the only Party that will abolish it.” (Oh yes! They have increased it). “We have always been against it in principle and are pledged to work as fast as possible for its removal.”

Not very fast workers!

**Premier Douglas:** — Half of it is gone now.

**Mr. McDonald:** —

“We are honest . . . ” (take note of that) “however, and won’t promise anything that cannot be done. No Party can abolish the Education Tax in its entirety in the first session.”

This is in 1944, Mr. Speaker. He said they were not going to abolish it in its entirety in the first session of the Legislature . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — You promised.

**Mr. Gibson:** — We didn’t

**Mr. McDonald:** — . . . if something is found to take its place. We won’t try to buy your vote with any such promise. “The Education or Sales

Tax is going however and it will be a C.C.F. government that speeds it on its way, and most of us will say good riddance!”

**Hon. Mr. Corman:** — It was a good speech, wasn't it?

**Mr. McDonald:** — then there is another statement and the gentleman who made this statement is now a member sitting in this House, a C.C.F. member, the hon. member for Kinistino (Mr. Begrand) – he's asleep right now, but he may wake up. What did he say, speaking in St. Louis on June 2, 1944? The hon. member for Kinistino said this:

“A C.C.F. government would abolish the Education Tax in twelve months.”

I don't think that is a misprint; I am sure that is months, not years.

That is the record of this Government in regard to this terrible, terrible tax that they were going to abolish. Some of them were going to abolish it in 12 months; others were going to get it done in the first session; others, well, I guess they are going to take 12 years, and I have doubts if they will even take it off then.

When these people came into power, the revenue from the Education Tax in this province was \$4 ¼ million, and that is all the money they had to find in order to abolish this terrible tax. What has happened to this \$4 ¼ million, Mr. Speaker? Today, under the Education and Hospitalization Tax we are collecting about \$15 ½ million. But what has happened to the other revenues of our province? By 1952-53 the other sources of net revenue, not including the Education-Hospitalization Tax, had increased over 1944 by \$30 million. that is far in excess of \$4 ¼ million, or \$15 ½ million, Mr. Speaker. I think that in the budget itself there are several items of money which could be used to do away with the tax today, and I would turn to page 11 of the Budget Speech, and this is what it says:

“The surplus of current revenues over current expenditures amounts to \$14,890,000.”

There is some revenue that could be used to replace that tax. Again, on the next page, page 12, there is this:

“I can confidently predict the same healthy trends in our finances for the current fiscal year. I believe that current revenues, plus liquor profits, will this year exceed current expenditures by roughly \$18,000,000.”

There's another \$18 million that could be used. Then on the next page, page 13, it says this:

“If one adds estimated liquor profits to the estimated surplus on Revenue Account, it is apparent that we are planning a surplus of current revenues over current expenditures of nearly \$10,300,000. This will be possible, Mr. Speaker, without any new taxes or any increases in the existing taxes.

**March 16, 1954**

What is the matter with taking that? You could take it out of there. We can go to the back page of the budget, and here is some more money that we did not have back in 1945: the subsidy paid to this province by the Dominion of Canada. In 1945 that was \$7,300,000; in 1953 it was \$22,279,000. There is ample evidence of plenty of revenue to replace this 'terrible' tax that this Government promised to do away with 10 years ago.

I would like now, Mr. Speaker, to turn to health and to read into the record of this House some of the promises that were made 10 years ago by this Government in regard to health services for this province. I want, first, again to refer to a broadcast of February 9, 1943, by Mr. T.C. Douglas now Premier Douglas. You know, he used to make a lot of broadcasts in those days, but he doesn't have to make so many any more, because he has got a whole bureau set up in this Government, paid for out of the people's pockets, to spread this same gossip and propaganda that he had to spread himself, and he also had many crown corporations and departmental subjects which are not only broadcast but they are broadcasting all the sports events of this province. Even between the periods of the hockey games, the Provincial Treasurer goes down to the rink and, instead of advertising the corporation that he is supposed to be advertising, it is sheer political propaganda and anybody who heard the last broadcast of the hon. Provincial Treasurer – well, goodness me, it's ridiculous, Mr. Speaker!

What did Mr. Douglas say at this time, and I quote:

“Just as we have made education available to all . . .” (They have made it by the time they got to this speech.) “. . . the time has come when we must make all the benefits of medical science available to all without money and with our price. By supporting the C.C.F. you can make this right of health and happiness the lot of every man, woman and child in Saskatchewan.”

Then he went on in another address in Chaplin on December 14, 1942, and he said this:

“State medicine and hospitalization could be furnished for slightly more than \$8.00 per head per annum.”

Mr. Speaker, “state medicine and hospitalization could be furnished for slightly more than \$8.00.”

Then there was a pamphlet that was issued by the C.C.F. and it was entitled, “Let there be no Blackout in Health” and what did that say? It said this:

“And because the C.C.F. stands for humanity first, the C.C.F. will provide every resident of Saskatchewan with all necessary medical and hospital care regardless of his or her ability to pay.”

What is the position today – “without regard for his or her ability to pay”? Mr. Speaker, what happens today if you don't pay your Hospitalization Tax? They fine you because you didn't pay the tax, and if you don't pay the fine they put you in jail . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — No, that's false.

**Mr. McDonald:** — . . . without even considering their ability to pay. There is some difference. This article goes on to say this:

“The C.C.F. will therefore set up a complete system of socialized health services with special emphasis on preventative diseases so that you and every other resident of Saskatchewan will receive adequate medical, surgical, dental, nursing, hospital care without charge.”

Mr. Speaker, I want to give credit where credit is due. This Government did set up in this province a hospitalization scheme. I believe that a vast majority of the people of this province want a hospital scheme in this province, and I want to give this Government credit for bringing that scheme into being. But what is the history of that scheme? In 1944, when this Government came into power, what is one of the first things they did in this regard? They brought a gentleman by the name of Dr. Sigerist into this province to investigate the conditions in Saskatchewan and to see if it were possible to set up a prepaid medical scheme for all the people of this province. And what did Dr. Sigerist say in that report? As reported in the Saskatoon ‘Star-Phoenix’ he said this:

“He praised the present facilities and standard of health in Saskatchewan, stating that the province already had a superb record and a splendid set-up which had been built up in years of gradual work. It was not only a question of extending those facilities.”

This report, Mr. Speaker, was written by a doctor whom these people brought into this province when they were first elected to power. They are not responsible for anything that was in this report or any of the work that is reported by Dr. Sigerist. I want to give my congratulations to this Government for implementing that hospitalization plan. At the same time I also want to give my congratulations to former governments of this province and to the municipalities of this province who, in many cases, had prepaid hospitalization and in some other cases had doctor or medical services. I think there is a lot of credit due all these people concerned. But to get back to the promise, Mr. Speaker.

We were to have all these services for \$8.00. What is the picture today? When the hospitalization scheme was first introduced, we were paying on an individual basis, \$5.00, for this service. At that time I thought that was pretty good service for \$5.00, and I think most of the people of this province thought that. But what is the picture today? What are we paying for this hospitalization service today? We are paying, on the individual, \$15.00 for this direct charge, but that is only part of the story, because, on top of this \$15.00, we have the Hospitalization Tax which it is expected will yield around \$8 million this coming year; there is another \$5 million produced by the 1 cent tax on retail sales. On a program rata basis, when you break it down this means that each individual is paying about \$9 more under this 1 cent tax, and that brings his personal and direct tax up to \$24 per annum. On top of that, Mr. Speaker, if the usual procedure is followed that has been followed over the past few years, the general revenues or the consolidated fund of this province, are going to have to ‘kick in’ about another \$5 million into this

**March 16, 1954**

hospital insurance scheme. On a per capita basis that means another \$8 or \$9 per individual. Therefore, the individual in receiving hospitalization today is paying approximately \$32 for it on a promise of receiving complete health services for \$8.

**Premier Douglas:** — No such promise was ever made.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Four times eight is thirty-two. The Premier says, “No such promise was ever made.” I want to reply to that, Mr. Speaker, and I refer to an address that the Premier delivered in Chaplin on December 14, 1942, when he said this:

“State medicine and hospitalization could be furnished for slightly more than \$8 per head per annum.”

**Premier Douglas:** — On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, may I ask what my hon. friend is quoting from?

**Mr. McDonald:** — This is taken from a newspaper account of your speech in Chaplin on December 14, 1942.

**Premier Douglas:** — What newspaper and what date?

**Mr. McDonald:** — It is December 14, 1942 and I think it is the ‘Star-Phoenix’. I am not sure about that, but I could get it for you.

**Premier Douglas:** — It might be a good idea before quoting . . .

**Mr. Lopton:** — We’ll get it for you.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Yes, I can get the paper for you.

**Premier Douglas:** — The ‘Star-Phoenix’ would hardly be reporting a meeting in Chaplin. At that time, as a matter of fact . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — I’ll get the paper for the Premier, Mr. Speaker. If he wants to make a speech he can get up after I am finished.

**Premier Douglas:** — Well the figure of \$21.90 was used in the Heagerty report, the federal part of it, and my friend ought to know that by this time.

**Mr. McDonald:** — The next thing I wanted to go to, Mr. Speaker, was that this Government also promised . . . We’ll bring you the paper. These aren’t my promises I am trying to back up; they’re yours!

**Premier Douglas:** — We have taken care of our own promises.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I know this hurts, because when any body made as many rash and foolish promises as these people made when they were a Party trying to see office in this province, it must be a bitter pill to try and swallow after ten years in office.

**Premier Douglas:** — The people liked it.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, there are fuller health services provided to some



people in this province; part of that I can agree with, part I cannot. but I want to say this in regard to those fuller health services: what is the position of our old-age pensioners in this province? We are paying them a supplementary allowance of \$2.50 – that is the maximum.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — What is Manitoba paying?

**Mr. McDonald:** — Alberta are paying \$15.00.

**Premier Douglas:** — And Manitoba?

**Mr. McDonald:** — British Columbia – you keep going; I've got lots more. British Columbia are paying \$10.00. But these people say, "Ah, there's a bug in the rug"; they say, "We're paying the hospitalization for them." Now, isn't that wonderful, Mr. Speaker! In these other provinces they are paying them \$10 and \$15 a month of a supplementary allowance. These people are paying them (to use their figures) \$15 a year when they buy their hospitalization for them, or \$32 a year in my figures, and then on top of that, when one of these pensioners goes into the hospital, after he has been there for a certain number of days, they take his pension cheque away from him to pay his hospitalization. Mr. Speaker, I ask you – and then they try to back up . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — What do they do in Manitoba?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. McDonald:** — You just sit still. I am just going to start on you now.

**Government Member:** — What about the other Liberal provinces?

**Mr. McDonald:** — I am going to go from . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — The Liberals in Manitoba spend it all on highways.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. McDonald:** — I am going to go from that health plan to one of the Premier's. I don't know what it was, because I looked it up in three dictionaries and it wasn't in them; but anyway, he called it 'chemurgy'. I know it must have something to do with chemistry, but where he got the 'urgy' from I don't know. But this is 'chemurgy' and, as I say, I looked this up in three well-known English dictionaries . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — He must have had a haemorrhage.

**Mr. McDonald:** — . . . at least I tried to find the word. I looked in Webster's Standard, New English . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — You have to be able to understand them.

**Mr. McDonald:** — . . . and I couldn't find the word.

**Premier Douglas:** — I can believe that

**Mr. McDonald:** — So, I was kind of baffled. But, anyway, I went on looking up some of the promises that were made with regard to this new —

**March 16, 1954**

I guess it is some kind of an industry – and I found where the Premier rooted this word out, and I want to red it to you. You'll probably remember this one better: this was a broadcast on January 27, 1944, and the Premier said this:

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — You're going a long way back, aren't you?

**Mr. McDonald:** — At least he was the Rev. T.C. Douglas at that time, and he said this:

“Not only can the war factories be converted to civilian use, but there are new industries to be developed.”

We're had an example of that. We buried one, this morning, in Crown Corporations committee.

**Hon. Member:** — Nice funeral too.

**Mr. McDonald:** —

“This is especially true here in the west where the use of agricultural products for industrial purposes opens up a new area of possibilities . . . The use of low grade wheat in the manufacture of grain alcohol for tractor fuel and synthetic rubber.”

Low-grade wheat; we have got some high grade wheat now.

“The manufacture of plastics and building materials from wheat straw; in the introduction of new crops for the production of rubber, oils and fabrics, are all possible avenues for development here on the prairies. Already chemurgy, that is the use of farm products in industrial processes, has revolutionized both agriculture and industry in some parts of the United States and Soviet Russia.”

That is where I found the meaning of the word `chemurgy`. I rooted out an American dictionary, `New Century` and it is listed in that dictionary. I tried to find a Russian one, but I don't think we have one in the Library.

You know there were a lot of promises made about this chemurgy, Mr. Speaker. It was a thing we were going to use to build up the revenues of this province; a wonderful thing. And I think I ought to read a little more, taken from an editorial in the `Commonwealth`, written on May 24, 1943, by the then editor, Mr. F.G. Williams, and he said this – and Mr. Speaker, hang onto your chair:

“It may sound fantastic to you when I say that last year's straw stacks could become this year's house, barn and chicken coop.”

Some coop!

“Do you realize that the day is not far off when the grain lands of the west will be measured in terms of rubber tires, automobile bodies, aeroplane wings, prefabricated houses, radios, silk

stockings, clothing, dishes and furniture. This transformation will be a welcome change from the overflowing bins of unsaleable and unwanted grain.”

We have some unsaleable-grain-today, but I don't think it is unwanted. I don't think the grain referred to at this time was unwanted. I would hate to tell some of my neighbours that their wheat was unwanted. But you could go on with this thing – there is a whole editorial on it. Most of it is more ridiculous than what I have read you, so I am not going to waste the time. It even goes on to say that if you are tired of the style of your plastic house you could take it down to the factory and they would melt it down and blow it up in another style. Did you ever hear anything more ridiculous, Mr. Speaker?

There is nothing in this budget providing any of the money to set up these industries. And what is the record of this administration in regard to certain industries that they did undertake in this province? They had a tannery, one time; I think it burned up. They had a shoe factory; I just don't remember what distribution was made of that; I think they charged it up to Public Works or something. Then they had the woollen mill; I don't know whether it was Speers, or who had the funeral for that, this morning. These are the shining examples of these revenue-producing enterprises that were going to build up the revenues . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — We gave it a respectful funeral.

**Mr. McDonald:** — . . . of this province and provide all these free services. Mr. Speaker, what is the record of this Government when it got into – I don't know whether it got into chemurgy or not; but what was the record in regard to this tannery? This Government had an operating loss of \$73,000 on the tannery. What is the record of the shoe factory? An operating loss of \$82,727. The Fish Board? A loss of \$364,000. And the Woollen mill, \$830,000. That is just an operating loss, Mr. Speaker.

On top of that you have got the interest on those found industries which amounts to \$402,000; you have got the advances from the Provincial Treasurer that went into those Corporations – something like \$2,249,000. Then you have got what they were disposed of to different departments when they were finally buried.

Mr. Speaker, if these people are serious about the promises they made in 1943 and 1944, why don't they go into the meat packing industry in competition with private enterprise? They are always telling the people of this province the tremendous profit that the meat packing industries are making at the expense of the producer. I say, “Get into the business, then. There's a lot of profit to be made; maybe you can make some for yourselves and some for the farmers.”

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — There's a plant at Moose Jaw, if it's not . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — And if they are really interested in this type of business, why don't they go out and socialize the breweries in this province? They make about \$12 million a year out of liquor profits already.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — What!

**Mr. McDonald:** — Why don't you get into that business? Go out and socialize the breweries. The only reason you haven't done it already, I think,

**March 16, 1954**

is fairly obvious, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — What is the reason?

**Mr. Danielson:** — Don't you know?

**Mr. McDonald:** — To go on, Mr. Speaker, this Government . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — What is the obvious reason? Don't keep it to yourself. Give us the reason!

**Mr. McDonald:** — If this Government were going to save a lot of money, why doesn't the Government . . . The Premier has just given me an idea. I'll promise him that, if he will socialize what I have suggested to him, I'll give him another list after that.

What about saving their money in government printing, Mr. Speaker? These people were going to save a lot of money. What has happened? The Bureau of Publications, in 1944, spent \$32,000; in the last fiscal year they spent \$183,000. That's a great saving! In that department you can go into this radio broadcasting to which I referred previously.

Another promise they made to the people of this province was to pay off the public debt. What is happening with regard to the public debt, Mr. Speaker? Perhaps first of all, I should read you a few lines from an address delivered by the Hon. Mr. Brockelbank in the Legislature in March, 1944, in which he said:

“The Liberal system of financing – the Liberal economic system has no prospects of doing anything else but continuing the burden of public debt on the people. The people of the province are convinced that debt in total cannot be paid off under this system. The C.C.F. government in Saskatchewan can liquidate the provincial debt.”

All right. Let us turn to the provincial debt for one moment, Mr. Speaker. You will find it on page 23 of the budget address, and we find our gross debt in 1944 was \$238,172,000; in 1953, \$198,714,000, or a decrease of almost \$39 ½ million.

**Premier Douglas:** — Pretty good, eh?

**Mr. McDonald:** — Good! It's ridiculous; Mr. Speaker! Who is responsible for that reduction in the public debt? This Government has not reduced the public debt of this province by one 5-cent piece. This Government has increased the public debt of this province. The people who deserve the credit for the reduction of that public debt were companies, co-ops, and I can think of the Pool as a wonderful example. They are the people who paid off this public debt. This province of Saskatchewan had backed their loans and they have paid their loans back to this Government. It runs in my mind that the figure that has been paid back by these different groups is around \$70 million – now, I am not sure about that, but it is around that figure. And these people are boasting about a reduction of \$39 million. Where did the difference go? The difference is in public debt.

**Premier Douglas:** — You had better not trust your mind. You had better look up

the records before you make a speech next time.

**Mr. McDonald:** —Your mind is getting refreshed today, and you don't like it; just don't both me. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have spoken a little longer than I intended to, but I do want to say a word about patronage before I leave this subject. This Government Party said, "Why if we ever get into power this thing of patronage is really going to be a thing of the past." Well, now, I want to read to you a copy of a letter which was written by the Director of Staff Training, and it is "re: Field Officer" and marked August 9, 1949, and it says this:

"Would you please supply me with the names of all the field Officers in your department, together with their addresses, in the areas in which they work, by constituencies if possible."

**Premier Douglas:** — On a question of privilege, is that a letter? Will the hon. member table it?

**Mr. McDonald:** — Yes, sure. Now, Mr. Speaker, political patronage is more rampant in this province than it has ever been in the history of the Dominion of Canada today. Why, a few days after this Government came into power, every C.C.F. 'Heeler' in this province who had a brief case was streaming into Regina to pick out a job. These people were going to take the Civil Service out of politics. When I look across and see the Cabinet Ministers and members of this House who are ex-civil servants, it is astounding. The C.C.F. were going to finance all this programme of theirs that I have outlined here, Mr. Speaker, first of all by taking the civil service out of politics. The Government was going to engage in revenue-producing business. There were going to be commodity boards set up to handle goods that were now sold by monopolies. They were going to tax the interest payments to corporations outside of the province; Establishment of secondary industries such as grain alcohol, synthetic rubbers, plastics and anti-freezes; Doing away with the 'political machine' in Saskatchewan and reducing government printing.

Mr. Speaker, I have dealt with most of those except the second last one – doing away with the 'political machine' in Saskatchewan. Why, Mr. Speaker, any political machine that ever existed in this province prior to this Government coming into office looks like a baby carriage with two wheels on it compared to this well-oiled monstrosity machine that is tramping up and down this province today.

In conclusion, and until a budget can be brought down in this province which provides the money to implement the promises that were made by the C.C.F. Party, I am afraid I cannot support the budget.

**Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River):** — Mr. Speaker, that was a pretty good hand; I can assure you I hope they will give as good a hand by the time I finish up. If they do, I will be pleased.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Don't make it too long.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Just another hour and a half. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) who delivered an address as budget critic in this House. He did a very good job. I think he did a little too good a job. I was observing the

**March 16, 1954**

countenance of the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. fines) over there and I am sure, when he gets up to reply, he will perform his usual stunt – not reply to any argument, but try to ridicule and belittle the speaker who made the criticism. He has done that year after year. I was the victim of it myself for two years, and we do not expect anything else from him on this budget.

This budget, Mr. Speaker, is the vehicle by which the Government is putting into operation and carrying out the principles of this administration and as such, I am sure you would not expect me to vote for that budget. So, if I should forget to tell you when I sit down, I have already indicated that I shall not support this budget, because by doing so I will be accepting all the socialistic principles they possess and all the wasteful extravagance of public money that has been poured down in the rat-holes of their Crown Corporations. I certainly am not going to be a party to that.

I want to call your attention to what the C.C.F. have attempted, during this debate – I am not referring to any other debate. When the member from Mr. Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) was speaking, the other day, he made some reference to some service rendered by the Department of Education which was started back in 1942 by the Liberal government, namely, student aid. He spoke about that, and he made the statement that this was carried out by the Liberal government as well, and immediately the Provincial Treasurer jumped out of his seat, ran over here, picked up one of the statutes, and he came back and proudly handed it around to some of our members over here to prove that the member from Cannington was wrong.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this was started back in 1942. It was carried on for three years by the Liberal government, or money was voted for three years, and they handed it out as well. When the C.C.F. came in here – not in 1944 but in 1949 – they did not have anything they could capitalize on in the way of publicity to let the people think it was a new innovation on their part, so they passed an Act, incorporating into the Act the very services that had been rendered under the Departments rules and regulations for years before that time. I remember the former member for Redberry sitting here – he was a school teacher, he knew what he was talking about . . .

**Hon. J. T. Douglas:** — You don't want our opinion of him, do you?

**Mr. Danielson:** — . . . and he got up and he accused the Minister of Education of passing that Act for nothing else than political propaganda. You all remember that.

Let us see what has been taking place. This is the amount that was spent in 1942 for this particular service — \$42,213; in 1943-44, \$41,800, and in 1944-45 – the budget that was passed by the Liberal government, but the money was spent by this administration; they came in around the 10th or 11th of July in 1944 – they spent \$34,000. It was \$42,000 the first year, \$41,000 the next year and this third year, they spent \$34,649. But there was \$60,000 voted in the last Liberal budget to cover this expenditure, and they only spent, as I said, \$34,649. Then in 1945-46, there was \$56,000 spent; in 1947, \$58,000; in 1947-48, \$56,000, and so on. I haven't the figures from then on as this is just a memorandum I happened to run across a while ago, so the last year I have here is 1947-48.

They thought they had something on the member from Cannington, the other day, Mr. Speaker, but that is the typical attitude and the typical practice of the C.C.F. They try to discredit somebody else and they will do anything in the world, they will not hesitate to do anything in the world, to

accomplish that purpose. And that is not a new thing. They do it on the floor of this House every day. I just wanted to draw your attention to that before I go on.

I was very much interested, Mr. Speaker, in the report the Minister of Education (Hon. Mr. Lloyd) gave of his Department. He is a very good speaker, a fluent speaker and he knows what he is talking about. He is a very clever man with figures . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — He does it wilfully!

**Mr. Danielson:** — . . . because he will apply one principle to one thing so long as it suits his purpose, and then he will immediately abandon that principle when it is to his disadvantage. He is a very clever man in that respect.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Do you mean me?

**Mr. Danielson:** — As a matter of fact, I just want to draw your attention to one thing; it is very significant. This Government is paying out lots more money; but why shouldn't they pay out more money? Where we had \$24 or \$28-million budgets, these fellows have \$78-million ones, and when they have spent all that they intend to spend, they will have \$112 million in this fiscal year that we will be in at the end of this month — \$112 million where we had \$34 million, at the outside, to spend. So why shouldn't they spend more money? They have so much money that they are throwing away millions of dollars that they haven't even got a postage stamp to show for, and I am going to prove that, if time will permit me, between now and six o'clock . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Don't try to threaten us!

**Mr. Danielson:** — The Minister of Education . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — It's against the rules of the House to threaten.

**Mr. Danielson:** — The Minister of Education talks about the tremendous amount of money he has spent; but it is a peculiar thing that when you go back to 1943-44, the last Liberal budget, 16.7 per cent was spent for Education. And in the 1954-55 budget, the amount he is going to spend, this year, is 17.6 per cent — only decimal 9 per cent more of the total amount of this budget. After all, any Government's expenditure is limited to the funds they have to spend. They are limited to the amount of money they can pull out of the people to spend, because no government ever spent a dollar without taking it away from the people before they spent it, or else run into debt and let future generations pay for it. And if you realize this, there is no particular credit coming to any government for spending larger sums of money.

That is the situation: You are spending just decimal 9 per cent more of the money available in this budget than we spent of the amount available in 1944, for Education. What are you bragging about? Why, if they took a look at themselves instead of being so busy trying to size up their enemies on this side of the House — they haven't got time to see how they appear to somebody else.

When the Minister of Education, the other day, spoke about his amount of money and the past and future activities of his Department, he tried to persuade this House that the farmer or property holder who pays double and

**March 16, 1954**

three times as much in taxes for education as he did ten years ago, is not paying any more actually than he paid ten years ago. He is right in some respects, but I want to show you where his logic is weak. He said that when you consider the price of a bushel of wheat and the price level on which we are operating today; what you are paying is actually not any more than what we paid years ago. That may be true – it is not altogether true, but partly true; but when he commenced to tell us of all the money he has spent, all the grants he gave out and everything he has done, then he forgets that, and he speaks of the money value as having the same purchasing power as ten year ago. If he does that all the way through (which he should do if he is consistent in his reasoning), then he isn't spending any more money than we did a few years ago, because prices have gone up, salaries have gone people, everything you buy today and every service of any kind had doubled and trebled since 1944-45. She he has nothing to brag about at all.

He has increased the grants, and we welcome that. I am sure every school will welcome that. At the same time, he never said a word about the thousands and thousands of rural schools that have been closed in this province, and whenever he closes a rural school he does away with a basic grant which used to be \$300 and which is now \$400, and which, I understand, is gong to be increased by another \$100 for this coming fiscal year. In the Davidson district – I didn't ask the Minister this year, but I know – I think 60 or 65 per cent of all the rural schools in that unit have closed now and have been closed for one or two years, and many of them have been closed four or five years. And every time he closes a school, as I said, he saves the grant. I am not speaking of equalization grants, I am speaking of the basic school grant; and last year he said it was 400 which he would save on a closed school, and this year it will be \$500 when he closes a rural school. Sure, that will give him more money to hand out in equalization grants and other expenses in connection probably with renovating or building new schools or something of that kind.

I want to say to him that the education system in the province of Saskatchewan, particularly as it applies to rural population, is a very serious problem. I am not saying that in a political sense at all. The fact of the matter is that something will have to be done. Your village schools and your town schools are getting overcrowded; the people who used to live on the farm are now living in the towns and villages, and they have to stay there in order to give their children an education. For one thing, in winter time, there is the matter of transportation facilities. Another thing, more serious than that, is the lack of someone to teach school in the rural areas. You haven't got the teachers. There has been no serious attempt by this Government to try to remedy that situation. Let me repeat, there has been no serious attempt made to try to remedy that situation.

There was another thing that the Minister said before he sat down, and that was a repeat performance of what has been done by practically every member over there, including the Ministers in particular. He gave us, on this side of the House, a lecture on civil liberty and economic democracy and he did his best, as others have done repeatedly, to try to tie members on this side of the House up to some of the things which they refer to as 'McCarthyism' in the United States. I am going to tell him that I am not going to sit in this House and accept any lecture from that gentleman on civil liberty and democracy. He is the man who brought in that well-known communist Mountebank, Watson Thomson, here a few years ago, to fertilize Saskatchewan with the communist ideology which he was trying to introduce here. He brought him in, and even one of the members of his own Party said it was a very unfortunate experience, and that Mr. Thomson was not very well fitted for the task which he was



supposed to carry out. that is something that comes from a real stalwart of the C.C.F. Party, like the member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Wellbelove).

He has probably forgotten that he brought Watson Thomson here to do a certain job for him, but the people of the province of Saskatchewan haven't forgotten about it, even if he thinks they have. That still rankles in their minds. they all remember the 'Radio College' and the 'Living Newspapers'. They remember the Dyson Carter textbook, 'The Atomic Future', and the 'World of Today' and they remember also the Provincial Treasurer's remarks, when he went to Alberta and told some C.C.F. convention up there that 95 per cent of the schoolteachers in Saskatchewan were supporting the Government and that made the problem of getting Socialism spread about this province that much more simple. I can read the statement to you . . .

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — Read it then!

**Mr. Danielson:** —Yes, I am going to read it to you.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — We know you can read.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Yes, you youngsters over there should read some of the history of this, and maybe you wouldn't feel so proud as you do today.

**Mr. Loptson:** — No wonder they are objecting to McCarthyism.

**Mr. Danielson:** — This is taken from the 'Calgary herald':

“The occasion was a meeting of the socialist Forum in Calgary, conducted under the auspices of the Alberta section of the C.C.F., October 28, 1946.

“The report of the 'Calgary Herald' on Mr. Fines' reply to a question asked from the audience about the possibility of extending Socialist doctrine among the youth. He replied that at least 95 per cent of Saskatchewan teachers were supporters of the Government and it made out problem that much easier. The 'Herald' report does not prescribe to the accuracy of Mr. Fines' statement but it must be considered a very smart retort.”

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** —What are you reading from?

**Mr. Danielson:** — I am reading an excerpt from the 'Regina Leader-Post', taken from the 'Calgary Herald'.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — An editorial?

**Mr. Loptson:** — No, a report.

**Mr. Danielson:** — No, what is in quotation marks is not an editorial; it comes from the 'Calgary Herald'. And there we have it. These things are not forgotten, Mr. Speaker, and the Minister of Education shipped in this Watson Thomson until the thing got so hot that he had to get rid of him. He paid him \$6,354 and then he paid him \$1,528 to get him out of here – he paid his travelling expenses to Vancouver.

**March 16, 1954**

**Mr. Cameron:** — After he became so hot.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Yes. And he had a whole staff for this gentleman. I think I have some of them here. He had this Watson Thomson, and then he had another gentleman who was his chief lieutenant — ‘Red Nosey’ Parker, and he kept him here for about three months after Watson Thomson had gone . . .

**Mr. Lopton:** — He liked the red nose!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Edward ‘Red Nosey’ Parker, that was his name, and he had a gentleman by the name of R.D. Henderson, G.C. Caulfield, and the editor of the newspaper, Edward Parker, Bill Harding, I. Leman, Stu Harvey and Hilda Buckley. They were all here to fertilize Saskatchewan for the socialistic party, so they could put over their triumph, a planned economy. Then, when that was proven to be a failure, we found that the schools were flooded with publications from Dyson Carter. By the way, Mr. Speaker, that same gentleman, Dyson Carter, was in Moscow, this past summer or fall, and he received a decorations there . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — He finally went home, eh?

**Mr. Danielson:** — . . . a decoration from the ‘powers that be’ in that high and mighty nation of communistic Russia. The last effort he made here in an effort to get a sort of a ‘dossier’ on the young people of the province of Saskatchewan was by this accumulative record — I think that is what it was called. That is the gentleman who sits here and tries to lecture us on civil liberty and economic democracy, but he is the last man that I can think of in the province of Saskatchewan to lecture us on that subject. I wouldn’t think it would be any more surprising if Nelson Clarke and Tim Buck came in here and tried to give us a lecture. I would feel just about the same as when I hear the Minister of Education try. But there is a meaning back of this, Mr. Speaker. There is a purpose back of it and that is to smear us on this side of the House. Well, I am handing it right back to him now. Wash your own ears before you ask somebody else to wash theirs!

He said, on that occasion:

“The Liberal opposition scoff and scorn when danger to the spirit of liberty is pointed out. Where is that great spirit of liberalism which was once an impelling force of a worthwhile movement? It is entirely absent from the Liberal Party of Saskatchewan.”

Did he mean the type of civil liberty and economic democracy that he stands for? If he did, then he is correct; but if he means free individualism, the freedom of the individual to choose his life and do as he sees fit and believe what he likes and refuse to believe what he doesn’t like, then he is entirely wrong.

I have a matter here, Mr. Speaker, that I want to bring up on the floor of this House. I asked a question on the floor of the House and it was turned over to the Crown Corporations Committee. The question was this:

“What is the amount of the mortgage loan paid by the Saskatchewan Government Insurance office on the property situated on Lots 1 to 4, Block 310, Plan old No. 33 on 11th Avenue, Regina?”

That was the first question. The second question was:

“Who is the registered owner of this property?”

The Third was:

“What is the value of this property?”

I got this answer, and the Provincial Treasurer read it before he handed it over to me, and in the exchange of words at the time, he accused me of having approached Mr. Allan Embury . . .

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — I did no such a thing!

**Mr. Danielson:** — You did; you did, in the Committee.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — I said . . .

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Just a minute, on a point of privilege. The hon. gentleman is entirely misrepresenting what I said. What I said in the Committee meeting was that the hon. gentleman had received wrong information from Mr. Embury. I didn't say that he approached him at all.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I like getting this explanation . . .

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — I'll stick to the truth.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Of course, if he can find any distinction between what I said and what he said, then he is welcome to it. He mentioned his name and at that time I hadn't seen Mr. Embury for three months.

The first question he answer as follows:

“The Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office has no mortgage on this property.”

Well I think that is correct, but he has something else; and we will come to that later. The answer to the second question, as to who are the registered owners of this property, was: “No record.”

The third question, as to what the value of this property is, he answered: “No record.”

He did admit, however, that while there was no mortgage given in favour of the Insurance office, he had a security bond given on that property to a gentleman by the name of Mr. Smith (I think it is) for \$350,000. Now I want to ask him on the floor of this House, is it possible that a person in business in Regina, and being the Provincial Treasurer in charge of that office, did not know the value of the property before he gave an insurance bond on that property for \$350,000? Is that a possibility? Or is it possible that he gave this \$350,000 insurance bond on this property without knowing what that property was worth? And he said, “We have no record.”

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Do you want me to answer that now?

**March 16, 1954**

**Mr. Danielson:** — Yes, I surely do.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, when questions are submitted, the questions must be answered as they are asked. The hon. gentleman asked a question about a mortgage loan on, I believe four lots. Then he wanted to know the value of these four lots. We had no record whatsoever because the property for which we had a mortgage to protect the Insurance office bond did not cover the four lots. It only covered a very small portion of them. He was asking about four lots; he was asking about the property that belongs to Culic Cycle & Motor and several other people away down the street.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Oh, no!

**Mr. Cameron:** — It wasn't covering that at all.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, I will read the question to you again to see if he is right; you can judge for yourself. The question is this:

“What amount of mortgage loan placed by the Saskatchewan Government Insurance office on that property situated on Lots 1 to 4, Block 310, Plan old No. 33 on 11th Avenue, Regina?”

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Lots one to four.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That is a building. There is a new building on that block, and it is on the property, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — It is not on all the property; it is only on a part of the property.

**Mr. Danielson:** — He's splitting hairs, Mr. Speaker. He is splitting hairs, that's all.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Neither one of you have many to split!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, I though a few years ago, I would be away ahead of the Provincial Treasurer, but he is going to beat me. Because he worries about his office and all the other things, and it is taking the hair off the top of his head.

**Premier Douglas:** — You had better start worrying about the baldness inside, never mind the outside!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, the Provincial Treasurer hasn't got any too much inside either, and you have less.

**Premier Douglas:** — And you have none.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — After going around the country and telling stories, such as the member from Moosomin read, I wouldn't give that individual credit for having any brains.

**Premier Douglas:** — You're not an authority on brains; you probably know less about brains than anybody in the House.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, I don't mind the Premier at all. Let him go to it. I can handle him any time.

But in spite of any explanation on the Provincial Treasurer's part, the fact remains—that this deal, involving an obligation on the Insurance office of \$35,000 was given, and the Provincial Treasurer told me in this answer that he did-not-know the value of the property, and he did not know who was the registered owner. Well, as a matter of fact, I think he must have seen this document, which is an abstract of Title. Surely the Insurance Office handing out a policy which would involve them in \$350,000 obligations, would have checked the title of the property, wouldn't they? Or, if that is the way he runs the Insurance business then I agree with the Premier that there is very little inside.

**Premier Douglas:** — You've hit the spot — just the spot I had in mind!

**Mr. Danielson:** — What little there is inside is getting less every day.

The thing is this. So far as this loan is concerned this gentleman, the Provincial Treasurer, might just as well have let him have the money because he has obligated himself for that money. If he had let him have the money, he would have got the interest. Now he only got the premium, a small premium, and the interest is paid to somebody else whose loan he guaranteed.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Mr. Speaker, might I ask the hon. gentleman if he knows that we have hundreds of similar loans of this type out, at least guarantee bonds of this type, hundreds of them, involving tens of millions of dollars! It is a very common thing, these performance bonds . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — I hope he has . . .

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — May I say, too that I had never heard of this one until he raised the question on the Order paper.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Oh, everybody believes you, everybody believes you when you say that!

**Mr. Loptson:** — You'd better check up your Insurance Office then, your management.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — There is nothing wrong with the officials of the Insurance Office.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Sure, they turn out a \$350,000 risk without you knowing it? It isn't logical.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, this Government is priding itself on giving great services. They have extended social services in this province; they have done that because they have more money to do it with. They have millions of dollars where we had thousands for that purpose, and they, of course, have been able to do things that we were not able to do. But in proportion to the amount of money they have to work with and the proportion of the money that we had to work with, this Government has not done any great things, because they have been in a position to get money from the Federal Government and from other sources which amounts to sums we could not even dream of in the days gone by. As a matter of fact, the Dominion grant, today, the subsidy from the Dominion government, coming in a cash cheque from the Dominion to

**March 16, 1954**

this Government pays every dollar that these fellows have paid out for social services and health services as well.

I have the amounts here, taken from the Public Accounts and from the Estimates, and when you exclude the administration costs, the subsidy will pay every dollar and leave \$2 million besides.

In 1952 and 1953, the items listed under Public Health totalled \$16,319,000 and those listed under Social Welfare totalled \$3,889,000; together, you have \$20,209,000. For 1952 and 1953 the subsidy paid by the Dominion Government to this Province was \$22,279,000. This pays for all the social services and leaves a balance of over \$2 million; and as I said, Mr. Speaker, this does not include the administration costs; otherwise, it includes every dollar.

That comes from the Dominion Government, but that is not all we get from the Dominion Government. We get health grants of \$1,702,000; old-age pensions, 65 to 69, \$992,000; old-age pension over 70, \$19,061,000; blind pension, \$123,500; family allowances, \$19,743,000, or a total of \$41,621,000. Add the subsidy to that and you have the total sum of \$63,901,000 of Federal Government money coming into the province of Saskatchewan every year. Who couldn't spend money?

**Premier Douglas:** — And \$136 million going out.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Why shouldn't they brag about these things? And that is not all, Mr. Speaker. There are a few other things that come into Saskatchewan, that we seldom hear about. That does not include anything under the P.F.A.A.; that does not include anything that is spent under the P.F.R.A. In the last year the Dominion Government spent over \$6 million in hog premiums and \$1 million or more of that came into Saskatchewan.

So there you have it. What are they bragging about? We would have our hospitalization and we would have our social welfare if you never put up one penny of it. Absolutely — because you have \$2 million over, to pay for that, from the subsidy, and I am sure that, extravagant as they are and the big 'brief-case brigade' they have travelling over Saskatchewan all the time, if would not cost them more than \$2 million a year, for public health and social welfare. There you have it. This whole thing is paid for by the Dominion Government . . .

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — That is the most foolish thing I ever heard.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well if they want to be men, now, and if they want to ask me any questions I can go back to the Public Accounts and Estimates and show you the pages. Ask me, will you? And prove me wrong. No, you can't do it!

**Premier Douglas:** — If my friend wants to do it now, will he start out by telling us how much the Federal Government takes out of this province in excise tax and corporation tax and income tax and security tax? Will he give those figures to the House?

**Mr. Danielson:** — When you figure up what the Dominion Government takes out of this province . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — They take \$136 million a year.

**Mr. Danielson:** — . . . and what they put back into this province, you will find

there is a less amount taken out of the province of Saskatchewan to help pay for the national defence and the conduct of the Dominion affairs than in any other province, except some of the small provinces along the Atlantic seacoast. Everybody knows that.

**Premier Douglas:** — No, a lot of people don't know it, because it's not true.

**Opposition Member:** — Order!

**Premier Douglas:** — Have you a Speaker over there?

**Mr. Danielson:** — You prove that it isn't true. The fact that he says it isn't true makes me absolutely sure that it is true, because when he says something isn't true, then I know it is true.

**Premier Douglas:** — That's logical.

**Mr. Danielson:** — But for the sake of the hon. gentlemen I will pretend you . . .

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Wonderful logic!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — There is \$63 million – it lacks only about \$90,000 to make it \$64 million – of Dominion money coming into this province every year . . . .

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Less than half of what they take out.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, you're wrong. I haven't got the figures here but I will say on my own responsibility that you are wrong.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — That's an assertion all right. It is something like many other things about which there has been an assertion made.

But that is the picture, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the social services. You have nothing to brag about; you don't pay for it at all. The Dominion Government is handling the money to them to pay for it.

My friend over here said something about Crown Corporations but I want to say a few things more and I want to see if I can't take the smile off their faces . . .

**Government Member:** — We sure smile when we see you!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — You know when I looked through some of my old files I found something in the 'Votes and Proceedings', on the Speech from the Throne of 1947. And I want to read you this paragraph, it is the last paragraph on this page – and the Premier (this is his pet hobby) says:

“Industrial development programme of the last two years has resulted in the establishment of

**March 16, 1954**

provincial owned and operated industry, including a brick factory, ceramic works, a woollen mill, shoe factory, a tannery, two fish filleting plants, a timber marketing agency, a printing plant and a fur marketing service. Work is proceeding on a new publicly-owned and operated sodium sulphate plant, the manufacture of rock wool . . . ”

Did you ever hear of that before? Rock wool?

“ . . . will commence this year, . . . ”

In 1947, Mr. Speaker, where is it?

**Mr. Loptson:** — I guess it died at birth.

**Mr. Danielson:** — This is the speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — It was stillborn.

**Mr. Danielson:** — This is the Speech from the Throne, put in the mouth of the Lieutenant-Governor.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, that nowhere said . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Investigation . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — . . . of the utilization of . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, that nowhere said that the Government was starting a rock wool factory.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I was just reading what . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — It was a private company. I am just straightening my friend out. My friend was trying to leave the impression that I said, or the speech from the Throne said, it was the Government who was starting it. It was a firm in Moose Jaw who was starting it, and they did start it. Now I am anxious to keep my friend to the facts, that is all. I love to see him wander around but every once in a while I like to get him back to the facts. The fact is that that company was started in the city of Moose Jaw.

**Mr. Loptson:** — You wouldn't deny that it was started?

**Mr. Danielson:** — Who found out? Did you sell it out, or what happened?

**Premier Douglas:** — We never owned it; it wasn't started by the Government.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, you're talking about your business here, your Crown Corporations:  
“ . . . Work is proceeding on a new publicly owned and operated sodium sulphate plant, the



manufacture of rock wool to commence this year. Investigations are proceeding for the utilization of wood and wood waste, lignite, and other natural resources.”

Now these are some of the – well, he was looking into the future, you see, and he was visualizing what was to come.

Four of those mentioned on the list here are all dead; we had the funeral services, this morning, for one of them. That was one of his problem children, the first one. He has another one that is almost ready for the undertaker. Sometimes I think the Minister they brought in from Canora is the undertaker for all these Crown Corporations. I think they gave him an awful mean job. I don't think 'undertaker' is a proper name for it – it should be something entirely different. Anyhow of these Crown Corporations, four are dead now; and one has been dead for some time but they are still spoon-feeding it and that is the brick plant; that is gong just for sure, and I am sure that salt plant will rust away.

**Premier Douglas:** — that's what you hope.

**Mr. Danielson:** — There is nothing left except a few bricks and stones down there; all the tin and steel has rusted away, so we will see that one go the same way. The only thing that this Government can run is something where they can get their clutches on the producer and the consumer both. The Timber Board makes them a lot of money, because they say to the fellow who cuts the logs, “If you cut those logs and saw that timber, the only way you can sell it is to us” – well, as a matter of fact, I am all wrong here again – because . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Yes, again.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Premier Douglas:** — That's nothing unusual!

**Mr. Danielson:** — I want to tell how Socialism works, you see. Mr. Phelps, the 'king of the north', when he was sitting over here I asked him a question one evening, and, you know, every time he got a chance he got up and made a speech, and he said, “The member from Arm River doesn't understand”; he said, “these men don't own anything; we give them a permit to cut the logs, and they just perform that function of cutting the logs and sawing them up and bring them to us; they don't own that lumber at all.” That is Socialism for you! It is true in that respect. And that is what happens here – the man who gets a permit to cut the logs, saws the logs, hauls them into the Timber Board and they pay him a small price, sometimes as low as \$30 and \$32, and I think a few years ago as low as \$28 or \$24 a thousand – I think probably it is a little more now, but it doesn't make any difference. But when that goes out from there after you dry and plane it on one side, it sells all the way from \$70 to \$90 and \$100 a thousand. You see, no matter how expensive or wasteful you are, and how incompetent you are to operate a business, all you have to do is put up the price and you don't lose any money on the Timber Board.

It is the same with the Fur Marketing agency. The fur shippers pay all the costs, and a little profit besides, no matter what . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I think the hon.

**March 16, 1954**

member is giving a wrong impression of the Timber Board when he said all you to do is put up the price. We are selling in a competitive market where you cannot put up the price and sell . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — But you can always put the price down for the producer.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — But what he said is all we do is put up the price.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, he has an excellent opportunity to help out in the housing problem . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — And there is a competitive market to get the cutting done, too.

**Mr. Loptson:** — You put the price down for the operators who cut it.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Shouldn't you be able to sell it away below the B.C. lumber that comes in here?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Does the hon. member object to the Timber Board making money for the province of Saskatchewan?

**Mr. Danielson:** — No, I didn't say that. I pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that if you go over this list of Crown Corporations the only ones they have been able to make pay are those corporations where they can soak the producer on the one hand and the consumer on the other.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I just pointed out that we don't do that in the Timber Board.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — That's the whole thing. They cannot do that in the brick plant; they couldn't do it in the woollen mill; they haven't been able to do it in any other plants and that is why they have been dying gradually . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — May I ask the hon. member a question, please, Mr. Speaker, — and I promise it will be a question.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Will the hon. member permit a question?

**Mr. Danielson:** — Sure.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — If we can't get what prices we want in bricks and wool, how is it we can get what prices we want in lumber?

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, besides that . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — "I'm all wrong again."

**Mr. Danielson:** — That is very simple; it is a very simple thing. There are brickyards in Alberta, brickyards in Manitoba — the make brick all over . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — And there are lumberyards in Alberta . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — But you have to go into B.C. and ship lumber in here, at a

high rate, to compete with you fellows, which is thousands of miles away, with high transportation costs. Laugh all you like, but you haul all the lumber from B.C. across the mountains.

**Mr. Erb:** — Oh, nonsense!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Oh, you're a wise man; you think you know something.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I do know something. I know more when I'm asleep than you do when you're awake.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That's all right; you can't argue me down on this thing. You have no competition except from the B.C. lumber market . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — And Alberta and Manitoba.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, Manitoba, there is no competition . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — And Alberta.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Will the hon. members kindly refrain from this crossfire and let the hon. member make his speech.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, any time he quits, I'm willing to quit; but what have his Crown Corporations done? We can run over them very quickly and get practically a dollar-and-cent picture now of what they have cost this province — the Tannery, Shoe Factory, Fish Board and Woollen Mill. According to the returns we have here today with regard to property turned over to some of the departments of the government, and another answer given to a question a few days ago, it would seem my statement is not high enough on this. The Tannery, Shoe Factory, Fish Board and Woollen Mill show the loss of \$1,350,000. Now this is operating loss only. Then we add to that, so far as the fish Board is concerned, \$39,880 grant which was paid to cover the losses, and you have a total operating loss of \$1,390,000. Then you have advances to these corporations from the Government Finance Office, which is from the taxpayers of Saskatchewan; you have \$2,249,000 in cash money advanced to them. Now the interest on these advances totals, at 4 per cent; \$402,516. There is a total sum of money, Mr. Speaker, — and don't forget that these are all 'dead', they are gone; the total loss is \$4,042,463, and all you have to show for that, today, is a sort of a mythical figure of \$406,000 value of property which has been turned over from the Corporations to different departments of the Government, and we know that practically all of that is a loss. I don't think that \$25,000 can be salvaged out of that \$406,000, so you can add that to your \$4,042,000 loss on operation and interest.

Now what do you think, Mr. Speaker? You know, after all . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — What he thinks wouldn't be fit to print.

**Mr. Danielson:** — . . . if this had all happened in one year, if it had come about through some reason that could not be avoided — but this has gone on for years and years and yeas and we have been pointing these things out in the Crown Corporations committee consistently, every year, and every year they have accused us of trying to 'kill' the Crown Corporations.

**Premier Douglas:** — Hear! Hear!

**March 16, 1954**

**Mr. Danielson:** — They have been pleading, and the Premier, just the other day, made a grandstand performance in the Crown Corporations Committee, accusing us of being out to kill off his problem children. Well, it would have been a blessing if they had been chloroformed before they ever were born.

**Premier Douglas:** — You tried hard enough!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker; and I am going to say that by the time you clean up this mess of the woollen mill you will have in the remnants of that corporation enough to make this amount reach \$6 million.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Ah, rubbish!

**Mr. Danielson:** — You cannot dispute one figure I have given and you can't get out of it either by saying that some profit has come back in paid interest, because there has never been one penny from these corporations come into the Treasury to pay interest on the money advanced.

When you bring the brick plant in here, you will have it worse still. That is where the money goes! And when we have been pointing this thing out, they whine, and they think that we are doing something we have no reason for doing. Well, I don't think any of us who sit on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, would be doing our duty, if we didn't try to inform and convince the people of the province of Saskatchewan of the disastrous results of this socialistic experiment that this group here set out to accomplish.

I could go on for quite a while here, take every one separately and show you exactly how things are set up. I could show you the amount of money that has been paid back into these, through the different departments of the Government, to cover up the losses that have never appeared in the Crown Corporations' statements.

These are things that I think will be interesting and when we consider that the province of Saskatchewan is paying \$2.50 supplementary old-age pension, with a means test – of course, you must have a means test, and I am not criticizing that; but I think it is a tragedy to see this money going down the drain, year after year, when it could have been used for purposes which would have been a blessing to the people who need it; and it could well have been used for that purpose.

The Provincial Treasurer, in his budget speech, tried these tactics. You know, he is quite an artist when he gets on those gymnastics of his. He tried to convince us that he has reduced the public debt of this province; and why he insists, year after year, I cannot understand, because three years ago he got up on his feet and confessed that he had increased the public debt of this province.

There are many things that indicate that the public debt has gone up. In 1947, in the last page of his budget address of 1954, it shows there the per capita debt charges for the past six year. The low point so far as the debt charges per capita are concerned, was in 1947 and the debt charge – that means carrying charges on the public debt – was \$6.88; and at March 31, 1953, it had risen to \$11.94. If that doesn't indicate an increase in the public debt, I must confess that I am pretty dense indeed.

**Government Member:** — You can't even add or read figures.

**Mr. Danielson:** —and you wise men over there – can you get anything else out of it? Can you? You have almost doubled it – from \$6.88 to \$11.94 per capita.

There is another thing that indicates, also, an increase, and that is the debt charge in millions. At March 31, 1947, in millions of dollars, the amount per fiscal year was \$5,730,000; at March 31, 1953, it had risen to \$10,285,000; indicating exactly what I talked about a few moments ago when I pointed it out on a per capita basis. From \$5  $\frac{3}{4}$  million to \$10  $\frac{1}{4}$  million is the increase from 1947 to 1953.

That is the situation. There is one thing here, and I know the Provincial Treasurer is going to question me on this and therefore, I am going to be absolutely fair with him . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — That's as good a reason as any.

**Mr. Danielson:** — You wouldn't do this . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Well, I wouldn't admit I was just going to do it for fear I'd get caught.

**Mr. Danielson:** — If you did a thing like this when you were up on your feet, I would know immediately that it was by mistake; it wasn't because you wanted to be honest about it.

In this figure, Mr. Speaker, of \$10,285,000, there is an item included that might not be included in the first figure of \$5,730,000, in 1947; and it is right here – it includes repayment of debentures and temporary loans amounting to \$1,963,000. It may be unfair to include that but it has been included in this table. I don't think it should be there. The interest for that current year, of \$1,963,000, should be in there, but not the repayment. If you deduct that, Mr. Speaker, you still have an increase of \$4,555,000 in carrying charges of the public debt between 1947 and 1953; so when he gets on his feet to tear me and all the rest of us here to pieces, he can't get me on that one.

The Premier, a year or two ago, said that if the C.C.F. remained in office the total public debt would be wiped out in ten years. This Government has, so far, done nothing to reduce it at all; but he said it was going to be wiped out in ten years. And you know I believe, Mr. Speaker, that he actually believed that when he said it. I think he believed it, but it wasn't worked out that way for the simple reason that it hasn't been done. And I am going to re-emphasize what the member for Moosomin said. He said there has been a reduction of some \$69  $\frac{1}{4}$  million in the public debt between 1944 and 1948, but not one penny of that debt was paid by this Government. Every dollar of it was paid by other agencies, and the Government had nothing whatever to do with that reduction in the public debt. Came 1948. When we want the public debt, Mr. Speaker, and this is the practice that has been followed by every provincial treasury in the province from the beginning and followed practically in all the provinces of Canada and it is followed by the Dominion bureau of Statistics which compiles the debt of the different provinces and publishes it in their records. They simply take the gross debt, deduct the sinking fund, and then you have the net debt of any province. That has been the practice of every provincial treasurer up until three years ago; but when this one saw that everything was going in the wrong direction he tried another stunt to get away from that.

**March 16, 1954**

In 1948, the gross debt was \$188,561,000; he had a sinking fund to apply of \$43,934,000, and that left a net debt of \$144,627,000, which is the low point in the last ten years.

Now then, come down to 1953 — \$198,713,000 is the gross debt; there was \$19,208,000 in the sinking fund; deduct that, and you have the figure of \$179,504,000 and that is an increase, between 1948 and 1953, of \$35 million; and there is no juggling or changing headings on these figures, or anything else, that can eliminate that fact. It is there. As a matter of fact, the Provincial Treasurer, in his own budget speech, admitted, because the figure is there, on page 23.

There is no mystery about this at all; that is in the records. Yes, direct and indirect debt after deducting the \$144,627,370 sinking fund — \$144,627,370 in 1948; \$179,504,000 in 1953, as at April 30 in 1944 and as at December 31 in 1953. So there is nothing mysterious about this thing. Not at all.

Mr. Speaker, after what I have said, I don't think I need to tell you that I shall not support this budget.

**Mr. A.L.S. Brown (Bengough):** — Mr. Speaker, I hadn't supposed that I would be able to get on this afternoon, because I was waiting patiently for the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) to make the point which he suggested he was going to make when he started out. At the rate he was going I did not think it was possible for him to get to the point before 6 o'clock, but apparently he decided it wasn't even worthwhile attempting to get to the point.

**Premier Douglas:** — Next time.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — Yes, possibly we'll leave that for next session. I happened to notice a little item in the paper which I think is rather germane to the discussion here, this afternoon, an item in which a woman is reported to have stated:

“I am not prejudiced at all; I am going with a perfectly open and unbiased mind to listen to what I am convinced is pure rubbish.”

Had I said that to myself before I entered this House, this afternoon, I don't think I would have been mistaken in my analysis of what we were going to hear this afternoon.

I was rather amused at the member for Arm River. He apparently undertakes to make a relatively loud noise at least, and I think it is rather peculiar that he does make such a loud noise when we realize that he sits in his seat by the grace of his friend, and my friend, the candidate who ran as an Independent against him in the last election.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Why didn't you run against me?

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — No, I don't think I would want that pleasure. I am not entirely convinced as to what the member for Arm River and the member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) were attempting to do when they undertook to discuss the public debt. I could not help but think that possibly they were attempting to talk long enough and loud enough so that they would get

themselves confused to the point where some of that confusion might come over to this side of the House.

**Mr. Danielson:** — No confusion here.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — Both of them attempted to prove that the public debt in this province is increased, and both of them by their own figures proved that that statement was entirely false, for they both used as part of their evidence the tables which were in the budget address given by the hon. Provincial Treasurer. They both used the figures on page 25, and I cannot for the life of me see how, based upon using those figures, they could argue that in any way, under any circumstances, the public debt in this province has increased since 1944.

**Mr. McDonald:** — You're on the wrong page.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — For, whether we take it on the basis of the 'dead-weight debt' as referred to in this table, or whether we take it on the gross total debt, there is still a reduction, as the member for Moosomin finally conceded, of some \$39 million.

**Mr. McDonald:** — No credit to you.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — It is certainly a credit to any government which undertakes to reduce the public debt in the manner in which it has been reduced, and it is to the credit of this Government that they were able to create the economy within this province by which it was possible to reduce those debts. I think that any Government within this province deserves credit when they can create that type of economy here in this province, when we realize the economic factors with which we here in this province have had to content ourselves.

Both of my friends suggested that no serious attempt was being made by this Government to alleviate the financial burdens — and I will concede that there are financial burdens — at the moment being placed upon those who are responsible for paying the cost of education in this province. They are suggesting — at least the member for Moosomin suggested — that the taxes in this province have gone up by some 150 per cent — I think that was the figure he used relative to rural areas.

**Mr. McDonald:** — You're just 100 per cent wrong.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — Well, that was in the cities, when you said the 250 per cent.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Three hundred per cent.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — Well, if we do take even the 200 per cent figure as an average — and I suggest that that would be an unduly high average because we certainly have more rural property in this province than we have urban property, at least in relation to value; but even if we assume that the burden of taxation that goes to education at the present moment, from land and real property in this province has increased by 200 per cent, the contribution which this Government has made towards education has increased by 300 per cent. It has increased from some \$4 million in 1944 up to the estimates which indicate for this year, some \$16,636,000, which means over 300 per cent increase that we, as a provincial government, are making available for

**March 16, 1954**

educational purposes. I will agree with anyone who suggests that that is not sufficient, that we as a province should be assuming even a greater amount of that share. But, if we are able to increase our contributions by 300 per cent in the last 10 years and we are able to continue the same trend in the next 10 years, we may then be in a position where we will be able to assume even a greater proportionate share of the cost of education than at the present time.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Twenty years at least.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — Twenty years away my hon. friend suggested. Yet, after 34 years of Liberal administration in this province all that they were able to contribute to education was some \$4 million. So, it ill becomes that side of the House to suggest that they cannot support this budget on the ground that we are not doing as much for education as they would like to see us doing, while at the same time we are providing 300 per cent more than they were able to provide.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Unfortunately your total is wrong.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — My hon. friend from Arm River undertook to criticize the Minister of Education in respect to the remarks which he made about civic liberties and civic rights. Well, I suggest, that instead of criticizing the Minister of Education, he should have applauded him for his defence of civil liberties and civil rights which he, as an individual and as a member of this Government, has undertaken to defend in this province. Civil liberties and civil rights are based upon the principle that we shall give to all the right of freedom of speech and freedom of expression. The citizens of this province and of Canada should have the right not only to hear one side of the story, but to hear all sides of the story, and then, on the basis of their own intelligence, make their decisions. It is along that line that the Minister of Education, as an individual, has attempted to conduct himself and has attempted to bring that philosophy and belief into our educational system. For them to suggest that when we talk about civil liberties and civil rights, our purpose is to 'smear' the Opposition, I can assure them that I am prepared at any time to talk about civil liberties and civil rights; but when I do that it is not my intention to smear the Opposition, it is rather to point out to them and to ourselves the dangers that face us if we are not at all times prepared to defend those rights and those liberties which, in many cases, were obtained for us at a high cost, and, indeed, at a cost of blood.

My friends suggest that, in this budget, we have a lot of money to spend because it comes from the Federal Government, that the Federal Government is giving us (shall I use the term?) a generous 'handout'. I think it should be pointed out, as it has been pointed out, that the Federal Government is putting money into this province but nothing in relationship, as the Premier has shown, to the amount that they are taking out, and the subsidies (if they wish to use that word 'subsidies') are paid by virtue of an agreement. In return for the moneys which come into this province from the Federal Government, we have in return given them complete jurisdiction of taxation in certain fields.

**Mr. Lopton:** — Would you suggest that they should withdraw from the tax agreement?

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — I am not making any suggestion such as that, because I believe that a Federal Government which, by virtue of its power, has the right of uniform taxation across the Dominion of Canada, is



the government that should be in that field of taxation. I agree with the principle.

**Mr. Loptson:** — that is what they are doing.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — but for anyone to suggest that the Federal Government are giving us a handout in respect to this so-called subsidy, is creating an impression which is not justified or based upon the facts.

I would also like to point out that, in addition to the direct revenues which go to the Federal Government out of this province, out of this province there is an enormous amount of wealth and new wealth produced, which is of benefit to the entire Canadian economy, and in many cases the Federal Government can and should get this revenue from that new wealth in places other than the province of Saskatchewan.

My hon. friends undertook to criticize the Crown Corporations on the basis that through them we are throwing money down the drain. I said in this House not so long ago, that I was more than ever convinced, after our experiment in socially-owned enterprises, that that was the type of enterprise which we should continue to advocate and should continue to expand; that is, socially-owned enterprises, co-operatively and publicly owned. I think if my hon. friends would attempt to study the experience and the operations of the Crown Corporations with a rational mind, that they would come to exactly the same conclusion. They try to create the impression that our experiment in Crown Corporations has cost the taxpayers of the province money. There is nothing farther from the truth than that. If you had not had a government with the courage and the vision to go into such enterprises as Saskatchewan Government Insurance, you would not have had the revenue coming in. The revenue from these profitable — if I may use the word ‘profitable’, though I do not like that word ‘profitable’ . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — You don’t like it.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — . . . these corporations which on the balance sheet have created a savings for the people of the province.

**Mr. McDonald:** — How much?

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — They more than offset the deficit which has been created by those Crown Corporations which, we realize today, were not possibly as successful as we would like to have seen them. But I want to point out that it was not entirely the fault of the people of this province that these Crown Corporations were not a success. That was due in many instances to economic factors beyond our control and in many cases due to economic factors which could have been controlled by the fiscal policy of a Federal Government which my hon. friends adhere to, at least the political party to which they adhere.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Do you want the tariff raised? He wants to raise the tariff, and the other fellow wants to take it off.

**Mr. McDonald:** — You’d better talk to Mr. Erb.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — My friend from Moosomin was questioning the allocation which the Department of Highways, as outlined by the

**March 16, 1954**

Minister yesterday, was making as they affected his constituency. He was trying to create the impression in this House that possibly the constituency of Moosomin had been discriminated against in respect to highway construction work. Yet a little later on he conceded and admitted that the Trans-Canada Highway went clean through his constituency. Any constituency which has had the amount of money which must have been spent – and I would point out that it was provincial money in part, at least, that was spent in that – to build the Trans-Canada Highway in that constituency, received far above what any other average constituency could possibly expect.

He suggested that the Ministers on this side of the House were attempting to compete with ‘blowing their own horn’; he was wondering who was going to get the prize. Well, I have listened to a goodly number of speeches coming from the Opposition and they each apparently attempt to blow their own horn with respect to their own constituency, and I don’t blame them for doing so. It is their job as representing their constituencies, to attempt to – of I may use the term which he used, ‘blow their horn’. That is equally true of Cabinet Ministers in regard to their departments. They have to explain the working of their departments and the situations in there, the same as any other private member has to do in respect to his constituency. So I guess that puts us all in the same category. We are all attempting to blow our own horn at times.

I am like the hon. member for Moosomin – I don’t know who is going to get the first prize; but after listening to him, this afternoon, I think I know who is going to get the ‘booby’ prize.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Better than no prize at all.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — On the one hand, Mr. Speaker, he was criticizing the fact that we were not making more money available for local work, such as for bridges and maybe municipal roads, and at the same time he was criticizing the fact that we were not here building a higher standard of roads. He even went so far as to suggest that we should be building the same standard of roads as they are in Manitoba. I can assure him that, based upon the experience that we have had in the last one or two years, we are building a higher standard of roads than they are in Manitoba.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Nuts!

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — And my hon. friend is well aware of the fact that the experiences in Manitoba have not been entirely pleasant, where they have had, right on the trans-continental highway near his constituency, to replace the blacktop after it had been laid down for one year. Or the grade, pardon me!

**Mr. McDonald:** — On a question of privilege. The hon. gentleman has made a statement in this House that is not true. He claims that they had to replace pavement on the highway someplace in Manitoba near my constituency.

**Premier Douglas:** — . . . but he said grade.

**Opposition Member:** — Sit down!

**Mr. McDonald:** — There has been one place between my constituency and 100 miles east that has been repaired once along that stretch of highway.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — No, I . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — The hon. member ought to read the rules.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Well, you've been yapping all afternoon. What are you talking about?

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — I realize I did say pavement, but I corrected myself before you got to your feet. It was in respect to the grade that had to be repaired.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Well, if you would do the same thing you would be a lot better off; you can't keep . . .

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — He was criticizing the fact that we weren't building as high a standard of road on our side as they were on the Manitoba side, and yet in spite of the fact that he claimed that Manitoba were building a higher standard of road than we are, their road has stood up less favourably than the road that we in this province are building.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Oh, that's the most ridiculous statement ever made in this House.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. McDonald:** — Too bad you aren't on the air.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — If my hon. friend wants to criticize the standard of highways which we are presently building in this province, I think he should undertake to compare them with the highways which his friends were building previous to 1944, and then you certainly would get a true comparison . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Yes, No. 1 Highway to Moose Jaw.

**Government Member:** — And one-quarter the miles of road, too.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — I think I also should point out to the hon. member that he was criticizing because the Department of Highways apparently this year has not announced any work on No. 8 and No. 9 within his constituency, and suggests that they are the worst roads in the province of Saskatchewan. Well, maybe they are.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — They're Liberal roads.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — Maybe they are, but they are Liberal roads and no doubt that was the highest standard of road there was in the province in 1944. If my hon. friend wants to be fair I think he will realize that that is true.

**Mr. McDonald:** — And they are more than 30 years old.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — The Liberal never built any roads for the last 16 years they were in power, and you can't expect us to catch up 30-years backlog in 10 years and build them to the standard which we are presently undertaking to build.

**March 16, 1954**

He has also suggested that the Government had made many promises which have not been implemented. He undertakes to illustrate his point by referring to education. My hon. friend from Arm River did exactly the same. I would suggest to him that once again he study the records, because the cost of education has gone up, as my hon. friends have pointed out and so has been pointed out many times in this House. It just could not avoid going up due to the increased cost of living and due to the fact that we are today attempting to inject into our education system something which was lacking previous to 1944. We have undertaken to make the teaching profession a profession of which we can be proud. So, naturally, the costs have gone up and that has meant an increase in taxation dollar-wise on our land.

What have we done which the Liberals have not had the courage to do? At least we undertook to spread that burden across a larger number of people through the implementation of the larger school unit and as such make it possible for districts and children to get an education today of a higher standard than they would have got previous to 1944, if we had remained on that same un-economic base upon which they were operating at that time. Whether my friends like it or not, anything that relieves the tax burden in respect to land in other fields increases that land taxation ability as far as education is concerned. When this Government undertook to relieve the land of the burden of seed grain debt which it had on it in 1944, it increased the tax-paying ability of the land whether it was for education or whether it was for any other purposes.

They attempt to criticize the Government because they say we have not implemented our promise to remove the Education Tax. The Education Tax had been reduced by one-half since we came into power as far as the amount of revenue this province would have obtained if it had kept the tax on those goods from which we have so far seen fit to remove it.

**Mr. McDonald:** — One half? Yet you get five times the revenue.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — I would point out to my hon. friend that this is a sales tax. Yet, in the province of British Columbia they have just announced that they are increasing their sales tax, on a much wider range of goods than ours, from not 3 per cent, but raising it up to 5 per cent. If they can be critical of the fact that we have a 3 per cent Education and Hospitalization tax, what criticism must they level against the Government of B.C. which has at its disposal much greater (at the moment) developed resources than we have in the province of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Tell us what taxes have been taken off in B.C.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — What taxes have been taken off? In B.C. or in the province of Saskatchewan?

**Mr. Danielson:** — In B.C.

**Mr. McDonald:** — They haven't taken any off here.

**Premier Douglas:** — They have taken off the premium, insurance premium, on the hospitalization tax.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — Yes, that's right. They have removed the premium, but my hon. friend . . .

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** —Do they adhere to that?

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — I was just going to ask my friends that. Are they in favour of us doing here in this province what the province of B.C. has done in attempts to finance the hospitalization scheme? We, on this side of the House, are naturally not happy that we have to retain that sales tax; but if my hon. friends are going to suggest that we should remove this sales tax which is presently imposed upon certain articles and in return reduce the contribution which we are presently making towards education and towards our hospitalization, then I suggest that they stand on their feet and say so.

My hon. friends suggested that all we had to find was \$4 ½ million. If we were going to maintain the same meagre services in respect to social services, the same meagre services in respect to health, the same meagre contribution towards education that they were making back in 1944 when they were collecting \$4 ½ million, I could assure you, Mr. Speaker, that we could have removed it in the first session. I suggest to my hon. friends that as long as I am on this side of the House – and I think I speak for everyone on this side of the House – that, if we have to maintain a sales tax to preserve the level of social services that we presently enjoy in this province, I will certainly support the retention of that tax to provide those services.

My hon. friend from Moosomin also suggested that we had not completely implemented the remark which was attributed to the Premier that he made previous to 1944, when he suggested that it would be possible in this province to set up industrial plants to manufacture some of our products into useful goods which could be used in this province or put upon the markets of Canada or of the world. And he referred to a suggested process by which we could take some of this grain which we grow in this country and convert it into these articles. He suggested that there might be, or that some are construing that there is ‘unwanted’ grain in this province. Based upon the fiscal policy which we are presently enjoying in the Dominion of Canada, it apparently appears that there is unwanted grain. But I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that, if and when the hungry people of the world are fed and there is still grain left, we shall have a right and should be obligated to undertake to process this grain which then would be unwanted grain, into these goods which the Premier suggested could be made. That is still a feasible project that can be undertaken, given the right economic conditions and given conditions upon which we could have no other use for the grain.

**Mr. Speaker:** — It is now 6 o’clock. I shall leave the chair until 8 o’clock.

After recess:

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — Mr. Speaker, when we called it six o’clock, I was attempting to reply to some of the criticisms which members of the Opposition had levelled at the budget. I felt at that time that I had more or less completed my reply, at least as far as I was concerned, to the remarks which the hon. gentlemen had made. However, I do feel that I cannot leave unanswered the remark which the hon. member for Arm River made when he was attempting to read from the Speech from the Throne which was given at the commencement of the session of 1947. He attempted to quote from the speech from the Throne at that time with the idea in mind of creating the impression that the Government in that Speech from the Throne had committed itself to engage in the manufacturing of rock wool. He quoted from the speech from the throne, and I have before me a copy of that speech. This is the portion

**March 16, 1954**

which he quoted:

“Work is proceeding on a new publicly-owned and operated sodium sulphate plant. the manufacture of rock wool will commence this year.”

He read it in that tone of voice, but he forgot one very important part – true, it was a minor detail; but he forgot the period which separated the two things. One is entirely separated from the other. It is true that in the Speech from the Throne the government indicated, at that time, that work was proceeding on a new publicly-owned and operated sodium sulphate plant. That was the plant at Chaplin. And then there is a period, when we commence a new thought entirely.

**Mr. Danielson:** — No, no!

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — My hon. friend says ‘no’. What does a period in a paragraph mean anyway?

**Mr. Danielson:** — He’s making a falsehood and he’s taking that and putting an entirely uncalled for interpretation on what I said. It’s not true.

**Mr. Speaker:** —The hon. member should look and see if the period is there.

**Mr. Danielson:** — As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, that was the Government’s printing.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — But, nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, the period is there, and then following the period it says this:

“The manufacture of rock wool will commence this year.”

And it did . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — That’s what I said.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — And it did commence the year following the announcement made in the Speech from the Throne. But my hon. friend attempted to create the impression that rock wool manufacturing would be under a publicly-owned enterprise. There was no intimation in the speech from the Throne that that would be the case. But I presume that is a typical tactic which my hon. friend is prepared to use, and seeing the bankruptcy of the policies of the Party to which he adheres, I don’t blame him for using any tactics he might think would be of some advantage to him.

**Mr. Danielson:** — You didn’t like it, did you?

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — Certainly, I liked it; I liked the commencement of the rock wool industry in this province. The only thing that I don’t like about it was that this particular industry was forced to go out of business due to no fault of this Government.

The hon. member for Moosomin also, in his remarks, referred to his own school district, and obviously attempted to create the impression that, based upon the experience of his own school district, we had not increased the assistance to local school districts in respect to education. I think that it

is obvious, since the increase to which he referred was only in respect to basic grants, that his district must have been one of the most fortunate districts in the province. His district must have been one of those school districts that had an assessment of over \$125,000, which, I suggest, is one of the more fortunate ones in the province, because an analysis of the school districts in this province will indicate (at least on the basis in which they were before they went into a larger school unit) that the majority of the districts had assessments less than \$125,000.

Had his assessment been (shall we say) \$75,000 in the year 1944, he would have received a basic grant of \$300, plus an equalization grant of \$100, or a total in the fiscal year for that school district in 1944 of \$400. Now, assuming the same assessment in 1954, what would that same school district receive in the form of assistance from this Government? They would receive in basic grants, "\$500; an equalization grant of \$715, or a total of \$1,215, which means that they would receive over 300 per cent of an increase over what they were receiving in 1944. Even if his school district had been a little more fortunate than in the category of \$75,000; if it had been in the category of an assessment of \$100,000 in 1944 it would have received a basic grant of \$300, plus no equalization grant, or a total of \$300. In 1954, it would receive a basic grant of \$500, plus an equalization grant of \$390, or a total of \$890. Or, once again, a school district in that category would receive in 1954, as compared with 1944, an increase of 300 per cent, approximately.

Apparently my hon. friend from Moosomin is complaining that the more fortunate districts in this province have not received the proportionate increase that the less fortunate ones have received. Apparently he believes in the old theory that 'to those who have shall be given; and to those who have not shall be taken even that what they have'. Now, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that that is not the philosophy of the Government on this side of the House, and it is certainly not the philosophy of those people who joined the socialist movement to alleviate human suffering and human privation.

**Mr. McDonald:** — I'll use that in the campaign.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — What campaign? Now, for a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to turn to somewhat of a different matter and attempt to give my analysis and my interpretation of the budget. As I do so, Mr. Speaker, I think I must express in my own words my own opinion of what does determine a budget.

We have heard criticisms that the budget is too large. We have heard criticisms that we are not placing the emphasis on the portions of that which is our responsibility to the extent that we should. But I think before we can give a proper analysis of any budget, we must realize what determines the budget. What determines the money, the purchasing power that we, as a society, can put into a budget. I think the three factors that determine the size and the purchasing power of a budget can be given in these three points: First, is the amount of wealth that we as a society produce; second, the amount of wealth that we can retain for ourselves and for our own use; and third, what amount of that wealth we are prepared to take co-operatively to provide services for ourselves.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is in the terms of the wealth we can produce that in the final analysis determines what we can spend for ourselves. The other two, while important in themselves, are more or less a question of administration and of policy. The first thing we have to have is the wealth to

**March 16, 1954**

spend for ourselves, and that can only be obtained by increased development of the natural resources that are within this province; increased development, not only of mineral resources but also of our land resource which is the main resource in this province. Once we get that production, then we come to the other two points, and to the amount of wealth that we can retain for ourselves.

I think it is the policies of this Government in that respect that have determined the fact that we are able to have such a large budget as we have at the present time. I was rather interested in the remarks which the member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Kohaly) made the other night. I don't wish to be unfair to him, so I'll attempt to quote what I thought he said at that time, when he was to some extent questioning the advisability of the 'farmout' deal which this Government had entered into with the Co-op Refinery. He suggested that it might – I am not saying that he said it would; but he suggested that it might result in a curtailment of wildcat exploration in this province, and pointed out the dangers that might result from that. I feel that the entry of this Government into that farmout deal with the Co-op with respect to the Crown reserves in the Smiley field, indicates a means by which we can retain for ourselves a greater proportion of the wealth which is produced in this province, wealth that is properly ours.

My hon. friend from Souris-Estevan is not the only one who has undertaken to create a doubt, if not by direct implication, at least by innuendo, that this deal between the Government and the Co-op Refinery may not be in the best interest of the province and people of Saskatchewan and in the interests of further development of oil research in this province. I can refer you to the 'Leader-Post' of Tuesday, March 9th, in which Mr. Carl Nickle, the Conservative M.P. for Calgary south, raised the same doubt or attempted to raise the same doubt – not by direct implication, but by innuendo. For he says, as reported in the 'Leader-Post':

“In an interview with the 'Leader-Post', Mr. Nickle said, If this agreement (referring to the agreement which the Co-op and the Government has entered into) set a precedent, it might react very much to the detriment of Saskatchewan as far as oil development is concerned'.”

And he goes on further:

“The only fair way to dispose of Crown reserves was on a tender basis to the highest bidder, Mr. Nickle said. There should be no dealing limited to one company only and the government.”

They are attempting to create the impression that this might curtail further development of oil in this province. I can also refer you to an editorial in the 'Leader-Post' of Saturday, March 13th, in which the same suggestion is made. I trust that the Government will not pay too much heed to the suggestion which is being made through the medium of the 'Leader-Post' editorial and by men such as Carl Nickle, the M.P. for Calgary south, who, in addition to being an M.P. is also a well-known Alberta oil man in that province.

The C.P.A. – the Canadian Petroleum Association – has also gone out on the same line. In my opinion, what they are attempting to do is, in their way, what the Liberal Party has failed to do in their efforts; that is, to keep the oil development out of this province. I might go on a little further in the remarks which Carl Nickle makes in his interview with the 'Leader-Post'.



He goes on to say:

“The Consumers’ Co-op Refineries, being owned by a group of farmers’ co-operatives, did not pay corporation taxes, he said, so by direct negotiation a non-tax-paying company has been given rights on land whose value has been proven up by tax-paying companies.”

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, the Co-op Refinery, along with every other co-operative organization in the province of Saskatchewan, is paying every corporation tax that by law is levied against them. The action which the Government took in its farmout deal with the Co-operative Refineries has not given special privilege to people who are not paying corporation taxes. Any oil company operating in this province can do exactly what the Co-ops are doing if they are prepared to do, as such not be required to pay any more taxes than the Co-operatives are paying in this province. That is, if they are prepared to give back to the consumers of their product in this province as does the Co-op by virtue of its set-up, then they will not be liable to any more taxes than the Co-op refinery in this province.

I am indeed encouraged by the action which the Government has taken in respect to its arrangement and its negotiations with the Co-op Refinery. It does indeed give me courage, as it should give courage to every citizen of this province; rather than question the action which the Government have taken in this respect, they should encourage it.

The true test of any government is how it treats its own people, the people to whom it is directly responsible. The Crown reserves were set up for the purpose of protecting the interests of the people of this province, and how a government places those Crown reserves in respect to protecting the interests of the people, is a true test of the government, and it will indicate in the future the amount that we will be able to put into our budget to provide ourselves with increased social services.

I say that how a government treats its own people is the true test of any government. If a government betrays the confidence of the people who have given it the responsibility of leading them, it is only a matter of time until it will betray the confidence of anybody else who places confidence in that government. The action which the Government has taken in its efforts to protect the people of this province should encourage people to come into this province and continue its exploration. They must realize (as I realize) that this Government, by its action, has shown that it respects the confidence the people have placed in it, and it will equally respect the agreement that it has entered into with other companies.

If there is any oil company which pulls out of this province as a result of this agreement between the Co-op Refinery and the Government, as indicated may happen by Carl Nickle, when he says:

“Unless assurance is given the consumers’ agreement is not a precedent, there could be a repetition of 1945-46 on a much larger scale”;

indicating that the oil companies may pull out of this province. If they pull out of this province, Mr. Speaker, to paraphrase a phrase which I have heard, it will ‘separate the wolves from the men’. It will separate those people who are in this province for the sole purpose of exploiting our resources and as

**March 16, 1954**

such, getting control of our economy. I have often heard it said, "Give me the purse-strings of a nation, and I care not who its government is." And that is equally true in respect to our natural resources. Give unto the oil companies the control and complete control of our natural resources, particularly in respect to oil at the moment, and they care not who our government is. but those oil companies who are in here for the purpose of developing our country to get our natural resources out for the benefit of the people of this province and also for the benefit of other people, have nothing to fear from this Government for the commitment has been made and will be kept that risk capital has no danger in this province. On the other hand, we in the C.C.F., by virtue of our political makeup, have made our commitment to the people that there will be no exploitation of the rights of the people of this province, particularly in respect to our natural resources. So if there are any repercussions from the farmout deal between the Government and the Co-op it will be in the interest of the people of this province, rather than contrary, as some of the innuendoes made by such people as the C.P.A. and Carl Nickle, the M.P. for Calgary South, or the 'Leader-Post' have suggested.

Also, Mr. Speaker, in respect to what determines a budget, the amount of wealth we are prepared to retain in our province. That is one way in which we can bring wealth into this province which will determine the size of our budget. I have said on many occasions, and I think it has been endorsed at least by most members on this side of the House, if not the members on both sides of the House, that in the final analysis our economic welfare depends upon the welfare of our agricultural economy, our agricultural industry. The size of our budget depends upon the purchasing power of our agricultural products.

In spite of the fact that we are able to bring in such a large budget at this time, the largest that this Government or any government in the province has ever brought in, the Provincial Treasurer in his budget address warned us that there were storm –clouds on the horizon; and they are indeed real storm-clouds. but in spite of those storm-clouds, I am pleased to see that the Government has the courage to go forward and bring in a budget of this size in spite of the fact that in the last few years the purchasing power of a bushel of wheat has dropped by 40 per cent, the purchasing power of a pound of pork has dropped by over 30 per cent, the purchasing power of our diary products has dropped by 20 to 50 per cent. The impact of the falling of the purchasing powers of those respective agricultural commodities may indeed reflect upon the size of the budget which we may be able to bring in in ensuing years.

It is true that we have had a large production of our grain products in the last few years, but we cannot hope that that situation will continue. If we are going to continue to bring in a budget of the same purchasing power that presently we have before us, if we are going to bring in a budget that will purchase more social services than the one we presently have, we must not only stop the trend in respect to our agricultural products, but we must reverse it. We must, through the medium of a national fiscal policy, undertake to bring back to the point where it was at one time, the purchasing power of our agricultural products. It is true that at the moment we have a large wheat surplus on hand, but I am going to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the large wheat surplus we have at the present time could be a liability and not an asset, not only as far as the people of western Canada and the people of the province of Saskatchewan are concerned, not only insofar as the farmers are concerned, but could indeed be a liability as far as the hungry peoples of the world are concerned.

We are finding, even among some farm leaders, an agitation and a trend to reduce production. Across the line, we are already seeing them advocating and actually putting into practice a means by which they can curtail the production of wheat. What does that mean, Mr. Speaker? If we undertake in a hungry world at this moment to start to curtail the production of food stuffs, it means that in the aggregate we are going to have less food stuffs to provide them with. In that respect, our present wheat surplus could be a liability in our efforts to provide more food stuffs for these people. At the same time, even here in Canada, the fact that we have this large surplus here in western Canada (and there is naturally a demand among the farmers of western Canada to have it disposed of), those who are in control of the marketing of our wheat today might use this as an excuse to undermine even that price which we have at the present time, and you will note that it is already happening insofar as there has been a steady decline in the dollar value of our products. So the fact that we have a large crop in our granaries can indeed be a liability to us and then, indeed, result in a situation where one year from now, in spite of the fact that we may have just as big a production as we had last year, it may be necessary for us to curtail our expenditures through our budget simply because the fiscal policy of the Federal Government has made it impossible for us to retain the purchasing power of our agricultural products.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, the first thing that determines a budget is that amount which we are prepared to use co-operatively for our own benefit. Once we have this wealth within the province, then it becomes a question of what are we going to give to the individual as an individual, and secondly, what are we going to use for the purpose of co-operatively providing those services which we need and which we have a right to expect whether we get them individually, or whether we get them co-operatively.

I think that the point which was made by one of the members of the Opposition (I think it was the member for Souris-Estevan) is indeed well taken. I think it clearly indicates that once you have got that wealth in the province, what this Government is prepared to do with it, when he indicated that we are spending 40 per cent of it on social welfare, education and these types of welfare services. That indicates and determines what a budget can do, and what this Government is prepared to do with the purchasing power of a budget once it is in their hands.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that before we can have a stabilized budget – and I am not scared of a \$200 million budget; I am not scared of how high the budget goes, because as long as we have a government of the type and philosophy of that which is presently in power here, I can feel satisfied that that money will be spent in the interests of the people and spent in providing services on a co-operative scale in increased measures.

I would also suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if we are going to go along the trail of the welfare state – and I suggest that as that is basic philosophy in the social aspect of our philosophy in the C.C.F. that is the trail upon which we are going – we cannot do it entirely within the province of Saskatchewan, because there is so much of our economy that is controlled by forces outside our jurisdiction. This Government, reflecting the philosophy of our movement, has indicated that it is prepared within the limitations of a provincial economy to undertake to build that welfare state. I realize also that you cannot build a welfare state unless you have a sound economic base under it, and I suggest, in the development of our natural resources, in our attitude

**March 16, 1954**

towards the agricultural economy in this province, that we are, within the limitations of our means, attempting to build an economic base under it.

For a moment or two I wish to turn to a question that is indeed close to me and one on which I feel very keenly, namely, the development of a transportation system in this province. I realize that under our constitution as it was originally drafted, the building of a transportation system and its respective highways and roads relative to a highway system, is within the jurisdiction of a provincial government. But transportation today has reached the stage where railway, airplane and highway traffic have become integrated, and it is hard to distinguish one from the other as it affects our economy, and because we have reached that stage in which the highways have come into the same category as our railways and our airlines, I think that we have reached the stage where we must undertake to have a readjustment of responsibility, even much further than has been done.

It is true that, to a minor degree, the Federal Government has recognized that it has some responsibility in respect to a highway transportation system in this province. But I suggest that as our economy in Canada has developed, the Federal Government has a much greater responsibility than it has so far indicated it is prepared to accept. If we are going to have this readjustment – and I suggest this readjustment of responsibility is long overdue – then it also means that we must readjust here in this province our own responsibility. In the readjustment of our own responsibility I think that we must undertake to assume a greater responsibility with respect to that transportation system which will directly affect the agricultural industry of this province.

It is true that when you build such roads as the Trans-Canada Highway, that does have some effect on our agricultural economy; but the greatest contribution it makes is not to the agricultural economy, but to the national economy. I think that we in this province as an agricultural province, have a right to assume that a road such as that, a highway such as that, should be a national responsibility and that we should not have to bear any of the burden of building those roads that are in that category.

I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that we can excuse ourselves as a government – or at least those sitting on this side of the House – for not being able at the moment to assume our responsibility in respect to roads which will more directly serve the agricultural industry, excuse ourselves on the fact that we have had to assume a federal responsibility. You will note from the Estimates which are laid before us at this time, that we are assuming once again an enormous burden in respect to the Trans-Canada Highway, money which, in my opinion, could be much better spent as far as the province is concerned in improving the transportation system in the outlying area.

I realize that this Government has recognized the importance of the problem as a transportation system affects the agricultural system, for they have undertaken to study and draft a system of market road grid in this province, which in the ultimate end would meet the purpose which I advocate. I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot wait one year; we cannot wait 10 years. Now is the time in which we must undertake to inaugurate a market road grid system which will adequately serve our agricultural industry, even if it is done at the expense of our continuation of the building of our Trans-Canada Highway, which I maintain is not our responsibility, and I cannot justify the fact that we cannot spend more in respect to these market roads because of that fact.

I am not suggesting that we should necessarily give increased aid to municipalities, hocus-pocus, but that assistance will be given to the need of the market roads and not necessarily give assistance to the municipality. I am not arguing that land taxation in this province is too high. I am not arguing that in certain areas it may be true, that in other areas the landowners in their respective communities could raise the funds by which to build this market road grid; but nevertheless the fact remains that they are not doing it, and if they are not going to do it, the onus and the responsibility is upon us as a provincial government to create the transportation system by which we can increase the efficiency and the effectiveness of our governmental production.

I said a few moments ago that I did not suggest that the land taxation was too high in this province and, as an overall picture, I say that is true. While it may be true that there has not yet been created a means by which we can have the proper equalization of our land tax throughout the province, the fact that the municipalities, as they are presently constituted have not recognized the importance of that problem, it may be, of necessity at some future date, that we as a province, for the purpose of economic justice, may be forced back into the real property taxation field. I am not suggesting that that is a desirable thing, but I am suggesting that, unless the local governing bodies of this province realize the importance of getting equalization of land taxation, we may be forced back into it for the purpose not only of providing equalization, but also for the purpose of providing the revenue by which we may continue to build this market road grid. However, I am suggesting at this time that the onus is upon this Government to undertake now to provide, and to start to build, and to build in an effective way, a transportation system which will directly affect and directly improve the agricultural economy of this province.

I do not wish my hon. friends to think that I am criticizing the Government at the moment because they haven't done anything in this respect. When I compare it with the record of the Liberal government I am put to shame that I should offer any criticism whatsoever, because the effort that has been put forward in the last 10 years in an attempt to improve the transportation system as it directly affects the agricultural industry, puts to shame the record of the Liberal government for the 34 years that they were in office.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that, even in a comparison which is weighted heavily on the side of the Government, that is not good enough. We have to do even more, even if it does mean that we must curtail some of our other transportation works. I think that, if we do this, we will be doing what the Minister of Highways pointed out here yesterday, when he said that a portion of our transportation system should be paid by those who use it and a portion by those who benefit from it. As he so clearly indicated, yesterday, we cannot collect much as a province from those who benefit from roads such as a Trans-Canada Highway. We can collect from those who benefit from the money which we, as a province, invest in an improved market road grid system in this province, and I hope that we will be able, in considering the Estimates, to reach the point where we will be able to make available a larger portion of the moneys that are presently being made available for a transportation system, to be spent not necessarily through municipalities, but spent on those roads which I consider to be more in the interests of the agricultural industry.

I notice the member for Arm River is clapping. I wonder if his friend from the constituency of Moosomin would do likewise: if he realized that the member for Moosomin was criticizing the Government for the fact that they weren't

**March 16, 1954**

spending enough money on the Trans-Canada Highway! You can't have your cake and eat it.

**Mr. Danielson:** — When did you discover that?

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — I certainly didn't discover it, my friend, from listening to you.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it is very obvious from my remarks that I will support the budget, but I do say in closing that I trust that I will be associated with the socialist movement and with a people's government at the day on which we will be able to see presented before us a budget which will provide for economic security for all the people of this province, and will bring us to the stage where we will have, in its complete detail, a welfare state in this province.

**Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland):** — Mr. Speaker, I intended to be silent in this debate, but I thought I would do as H.D. Lawrence, the writer, said that "One should be silent, but when he is silent and speaks, he should speak hot."

I would not have got up except for the fact that there are two or three things that I think should be said in reply to some of the hon. members opposite. Also, I think I should make a few suggestions to the Government on this side of the House, for the simple reason that the Opposition to date in this debate, has completely failed to suggest anything to the Government. As a matter of fact, I have noticed in the last few days that all we have had is 'witch-hunting' and it has continued on to date, including the hon. member from Moosomin speaking today. He made very much of a letter in which the word 'constituency' was mentioned, and I think, Mr. Speaker, it was filed in this House. It just so happened that I was going through a book that was on my desk at the time he was speaking. It is the Journals for the Saskatchewan Legislature for the 1945 session, and I would like to quote answers to questions that were asked by the then member, Mr. Daniels. He asked the Government the following question, which was answered by the Hon. Mr. Corman. This is on page 158, and I suggest the hon. members opposite take a look at it:

Question: "Were special constables appointed for the general election for the years 1929, 1934 and 1938?"

Answer: "Yes, in 1929; and yes, in 1938; in 1934, no."

Question: "If so, how many were appointed in each of these years? Give addresses and amounts paid to each."

The answer is, according to the records of the Department of the Attorney General: "Fifty-five were appointed in 1929 and ten in 1938."

I would like to make note that during the time the Conservatives were in office there were no special constables appointed.

The remarkable thing is that out of these 65 special constables required to conduct an election in this free and democratic country – we talk about dictatorships and police forces in other countries and here we had to appoint, in Saskatchewan, 65 special constables . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — That was the Gestapo, the Liberal Gestapo!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — And just to carry through an election, these special constables were paid anywhere from a few dollars to as high as \$322; one or two of them came from my own constituency. I am very happy to say that one or two from my constituency refused to accept any remuneration, but I find that out of 65, there was 12 per cent that were honest and refused to accept any money.

Now if the hon. member from Moosomin wants to go in for ‘witch-hunting’, all he has to do is to go back into the records of the Liberal administration in the province and he will find plenty. According to my knowledge, we had what they called an ‘inspector of northern rights’ who was on the payroll of the then Liberal government – a man who could not read or write, drawing monthly cheques. And now the Opposition have the audacity to come to this House and try to witch-hunt, and try to make something out of the statement that somebody in staff training asked for the names of certain officers and the constituencies in which they resided for purposes of public relations.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would permit a question at this point? I was going to ask him as to what position this person held that you just mentioned, who could not read or write?

**Mr. Danielson:** — He was a game warden and his job was to sit in a beer parlour, spend the money and watch the Conservatives and the C.C.F.ers and report on them to the Liberal party in Regina.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Moosomin constituency, on the other side, happens to have been in the Air Force, the same as I was; but I think he used to fly considerably while I had my feet on the ground. I think, today, when he was speaking in this House he was still up high, floating in the air. I would like to point out to him that this Government has ideals. It has made promises and to the ability that the public treasury will permit, it has carried out those promises.

He made considerable ado about education in Saskatchewan. It is quite true that this Government promised a policy that would give equal opportunities for education of the children of this province, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this Government has done just that.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Oh, oh!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I come from the north and I lived in the north when the people from the south were coming up into that country economy of drought and hard times. I remember the days, too, when if you wanted to get a little relief, if you were a good Liberal you got a little

**March 16, 1954**

more than if you were Conservative – at that time there weren't too many C.C.F.ers up in the north. I know what I am talking about. I want to point out that at that time during the Liberal administrations, we had young boys and girls up to 14 years of age chasing around the country looking for gophers, and ducks, because there were no schools for their instruction. Such were the opportunities the former administration gave to the future citizens of Saskatchewan and of Canada.

This Government came in, in 1944, and immediately proceeded to get schools and put teachers into those schools all across the north; everyone is aware of that. There were places like Candle Lake, where those children, as I said, ran around after ducks; places like La Ronge and Montreal Lake and all across the north. In all 18 schools were opened, and since that time there have been many more. I take pride that I am associated with a government that has carried out this commitment.

The hon. members opposite also make much ado about the highways and the roads. Now they may have had better roads out here on the prairie, than we had in the north, but if they had gone over Highway No. 2 (as it is called now) before this administration took over, they would have been lucky if they could get from my hometown of Meath Park to Prince Albert without being shaken to pieces. We haven't got blacktop all over. I am not happy about the road situation in my constituency, and I will have something to say about it later on, and I intend to take the Minister of Highways to task, if I may. but I am going to say that the roads have improved 1,000 per cent over what they used to be under Liberal Administrations.

Let me just point out that, at the little settlement of Honeymoon, where we first homesteaded and where I lived for a matter of maybe twenty or twenty-five years, when we wanted to get a bit of road built – and we had about 20 miles to go to the city of Prince Albert; we used to go through what we call 'The Pines' and I think the Minister is aware of the Jackpine road – he has heard plenty about it. But when we went to the powers that be and asked for a grant, they would give us \$50 or \$100 once in about three years – at election time – and we would cut out a few stumps and that is how they built the main market road into Honeymoon.

Since this Government has come in and carried out its programmes in those northern communities – and I say we are not satisfied with the market roads or the road system; but we have at least some roads that you can get in and out on, and they are fair roads. We have in Cumberland constituency, as is generally known, one highway, No. 55, and then No. 2 that goes up to the Park, and a little bit of No. 35 up in the north around Flin Flon projected towards Torch River, which is in Nipawin constituency.

While talking about roads, Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the hon. member from Nipawin, who voted against the budget, last year, that if it had not been for members who believed in the ideology of the C.C.F., he would not have had the Smoky Burn roads, last year. He should remember that there was an appropriation and that the money was not spent and we all know that at the end of the fiscal year, the accounts are closed out in the Department; and it was only because of pressure – yes, I spoke for that road because we have returned men, and it did not make



any difference to me whether they lived in my constituency or in the Nipawin constituency, they are people of Saskatchewan. The Minister will bear me out that I spoke on a number of occasions and requested that something be done, and he was kind and considerate and on his recommendation, I presume, the Cabinet decided that they would be able to give a special grant; but the hon. member from Nipawin did not point that out. The municipalities concerned in that area got their equalization grant, but this grant that they got to complete the Smoky Burn road was a special grant that was kindly made by the Government of Saskatchewan to help those men on the farms out in that area to have an access road. And yet, this same member, the hon. member from Nipawin, will vote against the budget, this year.

I would like to point out to the hon. member from Meadow lake (Mr. Dunfield) that the Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank), I believe, mentioned in this House not long ago that there was an intention to build a road up towards Beauval in his constituency, and yet he has suggested that he is going to vote against the budget. Now I am going to suggest to the Minister of Natural Resources and to the Minister of Highways that if the members on the other side of the House refuse to support, for political reasons, a good budget, which is going to benefit their constituencies, then I am sure I would be very happy to see some of that money spent in other constituencies, such as Cumberland and Shellbrook where we need roads just as badly as they do in Meadow lake, and let the hon. members be responsible to their own people for the loss.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — They are doing that now.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Referring to the budget, I overheard someone say something, today. One chap said, “You know that is as good a budget as you can get.” The other fellow turned around and said, “No, it is horrid.” It reminded me of the little story — “if it is good, it is very, very good, and if it is bad it is horrid.” I notice, on the Opposition, that on one side they consider it is very, very good; on the other side they consider it is horrid.

I think the budget is as fair a budget as we have been able to put up. It meets the policies and the needs of this Government. The government has programmes; it intends to carry those programmes out, and I must congratulate the Provincial Treasurer that he is as optimistic as he is to bring in a budget of that size. Now I am not quite as optimistic, and I would like to point out some of the things that I have found out lately and that I know.

In the first place, if we look at the world situation we find that in the country to the south, they are worried about the recession that they have there; it isn't just coming on, they have a recession. And if you refer to the United States News and world report of the 12th of March, you find this on page 26: “Ike's plan to end recession.” They are worried. They have a depression there right now, and if anybody has studied the history of these depressions, he knows that this is what happens. It starts out in the States where the large heavy industry is located; it comes to eastern Canada and eventually develops here in the west — and it may come sooner than we expect. As a matter of fact, I would suggest, today, that we already have a depression just as they have

**March 16, 1954**

there. And I would like to quote one or two paragraphs from this periodical. It says:

“Here is the first inside view of what the administration is going to do if the recession gets worse.”

(They have a recession and they are afraid it is going to get worse.)

“Behind scenes the plans – lower taxes, more lending and spending, are being laid. Officials hope the steps need not be taken, that the business dip will soon end. May, not March, is expected to be the decisive month.”

You see they are going to know whether they are really going to have a depression by May, or whether they will be able to crawl out of this recession (as they call it) by that time.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the situation is not too different here, and notwithstanding the optimism of the Provincial Treasurer, if he should go up into the north and in the east where you have the quarter-section farmers and where you have the small businessmen, not down here where you have farmers that own many sections of land and have been able to set aside savings for a rainy day; but when you get up there and see that the storekeepers are refusing to extend credit and you find that these people cannot borrow money from the banks, and can see that there is hardship all around because of the Federal policies, you begin to realize what has happened because of the lack of currency which the farmer has not got, which he cannot pass on to the merchant or to the implement dealer or to the oil men. Because the money is not there it cannot be passed on to the labourer, cannot be passed on to the wholesalers. I was talking to a merchant, the other day, in my home community who has never had any difficulty financing his store; but today he cannot buy any more goods; he is finished. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that if we got the true statistics we would find that, today, all across Canada, not only in Saskatchewan but elsewhere, merchants and businessmen are going bankrupt.

I think we are nicely getting into a depression, and so I say, I do not agree fully with what was mentioned in the budget, but I think that governments can do something about a situation of this kind. We already have, I think, intimated to the Federal Government that we would like to see them, through the Wheat Board, pass some money on to the farmers to start the crank going again, to keep the money moving, because under a capitalistic system that is the only way you can survive. Once you stop cranking the economic machine and let the money circulate, you are finished; you are in a depression.

The Provincial Government can also do a few things. The Provincial Government, I think, at this time should not wait until we are in a full depression, but probably should outline some kind of programmes and projects under which they can put a little extra money into circulation, particularly in those areas where we have a difficult

situation today. It could be road building, for example. It could be – as in the case of some of the communities in the north – that we could hire some of these local people to go out and, say, trap wolves, or whatever jobs could be found. The Government no doubt would decide, through its advisers, the projects or programmes where a little bit of money could be spent. It would not help very much, but it would help to some extent to alleviate hardship.

I am somewhat concerned about my constituency, Mr. Speaker. I feel that I am like an envelope and there is a space for a postage stamp and sometimes they put a stamp on and sometimes they forget to put the stamp on; and sometimes they put a stamp on and then they take it off. I am in just about such a position in Cumberland constituency. Last year, in listening to the hon. Minister of Highways, he made the following statement – and I am referring to proposed highway projects, on No. 35. On page 14, March 9, 1953, in his speech, the hon. Minister said this:

“No. 35 Highway, we will grade and gravel from Flin Flon to Denare Beach. I might say that negotiations are presently under way with the Federal Government on this project. You will recall that, a year ago, Mr. Winters sent a telegram to the Board of Trade in Flin Flon advising them that they were interested in this work, and at the moment I have been corresponding with Mr. Winters on this matter.”

What I notice here particularly is that the programme would be carried out – the road would be built. Now, the hon. Minister knows that both myself, as a representative of that constituency, and the people of Creighton, which is a village there of over 2,000 people (it is the only village in Saskatchewan, the biggest village in Saskatchewan which has not got a road out of it), have been making representations to get that little bit of work done at least. Now I do not blame him; he probably has done the best he could under the circumstances; but what worried me were two things. In the first place, there was a statement made by the hon. Minister of Natural Resources, a few days ago, in which he indicated that he was not too enthused over Highway No. 35. I recall, back in 1948, when the hon. Minister of municipal Affairs was up at Lac la Ronge and he was asked a direct question, whether Highway No. 35 would be completed, the Minister said yes. This would indicate that at least some work would be done on Highway No. 35. This year, the hon. Minister of Highways comes out with just about an identical statement: that we are going to do grading and so forth on this bit of Highway No. 35.

**Mr. Danielson:** — There’s going to be another election!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — But after listening to the Minister of Natural Resources, I am worried. I don’t know who is right. The Minister of Natural Resources indicated to the House that this Government is not going to do anything with Highway No. 35, thus I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that of all people I at least should be advised of the Government’s intentions, because I am not going to go back to Creighton or to the people in my constituency and patch political fences. If the Government has

**March 16, 1954**

decided that this road is not feasible, or that maybe some other route is more feasible, then I think I should be advised so that I can tell my people the facts, and then they can make their decision, two years from now, whether they want me to come back to this House or whether they don't. And I suggest that at least I should be informed of these programmes.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Stand by your Government!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I intend to.

**Premier Douglas:** — Keep your powder dry.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** —I do not intend to take up too much time, Mr. Speaker. I notice I have been speaking almost 25 minutes, but I would just like to say one or two more things in this House, because, as I said on a former occasion, there is a lot of misconception about what the north contributes and what the north doesn't contribute. We, of course, know that we handle some social welfare moneys to aid our people in the north. The other day, in Public Accounts Committee when we were discussing the Department of Social Welfare, I find that in the whole two-fifths of northern Saskatchewan all that was paid in different kinds of help or aid in social welfare was only \$22,612.63.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is less than the Department of Social Welfare gave to the Salvation Army in Saskatoon, and I wanted to stress the point. I do not want the members of this House to feel that the people in the north are just waiting to get a handout. When you consider there are about 14,000 people there and all that was spent by this Government in social welfare – that is mothers' allowances and straight social welfare and assistance – was \$22,000, then I think this House can realize that it is not a very heavy contribution. On the other hand, there is, of course, money being spent for education and hospitalization – other assistance; but I want to point out to this House that if you took an ordinary trapper, not one that got a great number of peltries but one that got, say, 200 muskrats on which he would pay a royalty of \$20; 20 beaver would be \$20; 10 mink, \$2.50; probably 300 squirrels would be \$3.00; 2 fisher, \$2.00; 50 weasel, \$2.50; that man, by obtaining just a small catch like that, will pay to the Government \$50 in royalties. There is no other way that a government can tax the people in the north except by royalties. In the south they pay municipal taxes to carry on education and pay for hospitals and so forth; but the people in the north must pay in that way, although they are also charged, I think, in the villages, a small tax. It appears that an average individual would pay at least \$50 in royalties to the Saskatchewan Government in the northern area.

I am going to take one community in Pelican Narrows where there are about 800 people, and about 200 trappers in that district. Using that figure which I think is very fair, a \$50 royalty paid to the Government by each one would mean that that one community is contributing to the general revenue of this province the sum of \$10,000. Multiply that by the other communities of trappers and hunters, and you can arrive pretty well at what the province is getting. I would just like to point out that I do not think the people of Saskatchewan have to put out too much for the education, for the social welfare and other services for the people in the north.

**Mr. Ripley (Athabasca):** — What about the Fur Marketing Service?

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — The Fur Marketing Service? I have no objection to them getting 5-per cent commission, because that is certainly much better than paying the private dealers, such as my hon. friend from Athabasca would like to be: he stated in the, I think, that he was a fur dealer. I was a fur dealer, too, Mr. Speaker. I am glad to bring that point out, and I was one of the reasonable ones. When I bought fur I made sure I only made about 25 per cent on the peltry, and then I took the furs down to the Hudson's Bay Company and they made about 25 per cent on me, which meant the trapper lost 50 per cent; and then it went to the auction sales and they again made a profit. Today, the only thing that the trapper has to pay is the royalty and the commission for the sale of his furs; he gets the highest possible price. I am going to tell my hon. friend from Athabasca right now just what that means to the trapper.

**Mr. Loptson:** — It gets better every time it's told.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — At the time when the hon. member was in Cumberland constituency (election time), he stayed for three days there, trying to defeat me – and I might as well mention that I intend to go back up there to Athabasca in the next election – not to help him. When I was there I stopped off at The Pas, in Manitoba, and I did this for a purpose. I wanted to know what the trappers were getting on the open market, and at that time the average price for muskrat, in Manitoba at The Pas – the average price, and that is the way the fur dealers buy them, they pay so much on the average – was 70 cents a muskrat. I came down to Cumberland House and, of course, my friends from the Opposition had been in and worked these people up and told what a terrible system we had in this Fur Marketing Service – we were beating them and we were robbing them. I came into a meeting. They are very fine boys in that area, and they treated me very nicely too. We got talking, and I asked them what they got, after they were complaining about the prices they were getting, as an initial payment on their muskrats. One of the boys got up and said 75 cents was the average initial payment. Well, I asked him if that wasn't better than having to sell it on the open market at 70 cents. They didn't think of that, they said; so I told them they had better think of that when these fellows come in and tell them all kinds of stories that have no basis or foundation. And I said, "Don't forget that you are getting probably another 70 cents as a final payment." It is the same story as the fish, the sturgeon.

**Premier Douglas:** — Fifty cents and it turned out to be \$1.00.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Yes. The people are told in Saskatchewan that all the fishermen up there at Sandy Bay got was only 50 cents a lb, and the hon. member knows better; I couldn't challenge him because I wasn't sure – it is \$1.00 a lb f.o.b. at the lake. It is the same story as with the fur marketing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say many more things – some nice things about the Government and some things not so nice. I do support the C.C.F. movement. I am not a very idealistic person; I am, to some extent, a realist; and that is why I have to speak the way I do. I want to be able to go back to my people and I want to tell them that I fought

**March 16, 1954**

for market roads; I want to tell them that I fought for Highway No. 35, or any other highway that is going to join the people of Saskatchewan to the large community of Flin Flon. I am going to do my best, as long as I am here, to fight for those things that I think are in the best interests of the people, whether they are in Cumberland constituency or elsewhere.

I am going to point out one more thing before I sit down that I am not happy about, pertaining to the policy of this Government, and that is in connection with the treatment of the people, say at Cumberland House or at Dechambeau, in connection with the social benefits. Throughout the province here, when we have a widow she goes on a mothers' allowance, a widow's allowance; but why, in the north do they have to be put on what we used to call 'relief'? The only she can get it is to get social aid assistance and I cannot understand it. I have been fighting (as the House knows) for some time to try to see that the Metis and the Indians have the same rights, the same privileges, that we have; and why there should be any discrimination I would like to know. I would like the Minister of Social Welfare, some time, to get up and explain to this House; and if there is no good reason for it, then I would suggest to the Government that the people in my constituency and, yes, in the constituency of the hon. member for Athabasca, that they be treated . . .

**Mr. Ripley (Athabasca):** — Come one over here and I will help you.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — . . . the same way when it comes down to mothers' allowances as the people are treated in the south, because I do not like getting letters telling me that here in the south somebody gets \$45 or \$55 and at Cumberland House all they get is \$25. They are citizens of Saskatchewan just as good, just as deserving, as the people around Regina or say around Moosomin.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that is all I would say, and as you see, I will support the Government on this motion.

**Hon. T.J. Bentley (Minister of Public Health):** — Mr. Speaker, I am going to take a little part in the debate, Sir, because I have enjoyed it very much, particularly this afternoon. I often wonder if our friends across the way think our memories are very short. I have been in this province for a long while, nearly as long, probably, as anybody over there, and longer than some of them; and I know about something of the schools through the history of this country, and can remember quite well when the people up on the fringe of the Porcupine reserve, in the 'thirties, were building their schoolhouses out of logs and hewing with double-bitted axes, not even broad axes, the desks and the seats the children had to sit in . . .

**Mr. Lopton:** — We had to do that.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Do you think I don't remember those things?

**Mr. Lopton:** — Sure, I went to a log schoolhouse.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — The hon. member says he remembers, too, and then their speakers get up and say what remissness the C.C.F. is guilty

of, when they had all the time in the world. All our friends over there lacked when they sat on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, was the courage and the brains to do the things that should have been done.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell my hon. friend the only schoolhouse I went to was a log schoolhouse.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** —The school no doubt did the best job it could with him, Mr. Speaker. then I remember, also, the highways in this country. I would guess that I have travelled as many miles of highway in Saskatchewan as any hon. member over there, or possibly over here, in this province. I know the conditions of the highways. Again I will go back to their term of office. On the highways that they used to brag about – their blacktop between here and McLean – in the late ‘thirties I broke two springs on two different occasions on that blacktop. And then my friend from Moosomin gets up and talks about what happened on No. 39. They think I can’t remember, or that the rest of us can’t remember, these things, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — How many springs did you break on No. 39?

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Mr. Speaker, I also remember the system of giving road grants to municipalities. If the councillor of a division had the car of the ‘right people’ here he got a nice little sum to go back with after a visit in here, and took it to his division and spent it among his friends where he thought he could get the most support at the next election, so that he would be safe for another grant when the next year rolled around.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Who told you that fairy tale?

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — I remember those things, too. These are not fairy tales, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Loptson:** —Give us the names.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** —These were things that actually happened in this province. I just thought I would remind my friends that some of us have memories better than theirs.

**Mr. Loptson:** — You’re slipping now.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** —And I wish they would be consistent, Mr. Speaker. The member for Moosomin, this afternoon, dealt with what he called the ‘horn-blowing’ of the Ministers on this side of the House. A few days previous to that another speaker over there criticized the Ministers over here for not speaking on their departments, so if you don’t speak on your department you are wrong, according to them; and if we do speak on our departments, then we are blowing our horns according to them. Well, I blew my horn and it was a good horn and I like it, because I have a dandy department, doing more than all the efforts of our hon. friends over there ever did in their term of office.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Broken promises.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — . . . and he mentioned the few things that Dr. Sigerist said

**March 16, 1954**

about the health services in this province, when he came here to make his survey. Why, of course, Dr. Sigerist made a polite statement; nobody comes in and makes impolite statements.

**Mr. Lopton:** —Do you mean that it wasn't true?

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** —He said the nicest things he could, the same as if I were going to introduce one of my friends to somebody from Argentine I would say as nice things as I could about him, much nicer than I am going to say tonight, out of ordinary courtesy; but Dr. Sigerist went on you see, and that is always the word; he said, "Yes, Saskatchewan has a nice bunch of health services, but . . ." and then he mentioned ten things. I mentioned them in another debate so I cannot quote him, but I will mention them again tonight, briefly. He said we should have health regions — we never had health regions before. We have eight now and more in prospect. Let the hon. member for Moosomin remember that.

The most important part of any health programme is the provision of preventive services. Dr. Sigerist recommended, as the first thing to be done, the giving, at public expense, medical and hospital care to the most helpless groups in our community — the old-age pensioners, those on mothers' allowance, blind pensioners and social aid recipients. Those services were not there when the members opposite sat on this side of Mr. Speaker, they are here now, and Dr. Sigerist would not have had to recommend them had they been in existence before he came here.

Then he recommended that there should be a hospital services plan here. There wasn't one before; there is one now. Had there been one before he would not have required to recommend it. It is here now, and I am going to deal with the costs of that as they have risen, in a few moments.

Then he recommended a medical school, Mr. Speaker, as his fourth recommendation. It wasn't here when he made his survey; it is in prospect now. As a matter of fact, the medical school exists now and will continue and be developed as soon as the University hospital is opened. These are things my friends across the way should remember.

Then he made another recommendation, and he wouldn't make any recommendations unless they were needed. He recommended, fifth, that we separate the mentally retarded people from the mentally ill people. That has been done; it had never been done before. The only separation of the mentally retarded from the rest of the people was when the people across there were separated from the rest of society over here and that was the extent of their separation of the mentally retarded.

**Mr. Lopton:** — Who is going to divide them up over there?

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — He recommended, again, something that wasn't in existence — a vastly improved mental health programme and the care and treatment of the people suffering from mental illness. And, having separated the mentally retarded from those people, the programme with regard to the care and treatment of mentally ill people is so far above anything that ever existed in this province before that my hon. friends wouldn't understand it; but people in that field who come here to visit us do understand it, and pass very complimentary remarks from time to time on that type of care.

He recommended rehabilitation services for disabled people, something that never existed under a Liberal government in the 34 years they sat



on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker. That is now being done and has been, in a variety of ways, been done by the Department of Social Welfare of this province, and is being expanded as rapidly as facilities and personnel can be provided.

Eighth, he recommended improved preventive services, so that we have now the health regions and a vastly improved public health preventive service in this province.

He recommended that more doctors were needed. At the time this Government took power there were 408 doctors operating in Saskatchewan. Last year, 1953, there were 722, attracted here because the health programme of this government makes it interesting and worthwhile for doctors to come here.

**Mr. Danielson:** — How many doctors were over at the war in 1944, from Saskatchewan?

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Quite a lot. Mr. Speaker, that question is just about the intelligent chap who asked a lumber scaler how many feet of lumber there would be from a tree that was two feet across the bottom and a heck of a length. The answer was a heck of a lot of lumber.

Now, tenth, Dr. Sigerist recommended more and better hospitals. Had we had enough hospitals he would not have had to make that recommendation. We had less than four beds per 1,000 population, in 1944. Today, we have over seven beds per 1,000 population; I have said it before and will repeat it again now, more than any other place on the continent. Those were ten of his recommendations.

**Mr. Lopton:** — The C.C.F. is making a lot of people sick.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Therefore, Dr. Sigerist was not satisfied with the things he found here or he would not have recommended these; but I can think, in the history of this province since my advent in 1907, when a great many recommendations were made to the Liberal government that sat over here, and I can only think of one, offhand, that they carried out. That was a recommendation of the Jacoby Commission to put on a sales tax of 2 per cent and call it the 'Education Tax'. I never objected to it; I haven't from that day to this; but that is the only recommendation I can remember that they carried out. They haven't even carried out the recommendation for the building of the South Saskatchewan dam.

I want to mention, also, another thing that the hon. member for Moosomin spoke about. He talked about the rising cost of hospitalization. Of course the prices have gone up; certainly it costs more. At the time when this Government came to power medical services could have been provided — a long and a careful search by the State hospital and medical league of voluntary organizations which existed right through the 'thirties and on up into the 'forties did indicate, after careful analysis, that the medical services recommended by them could have been carried out for approximately \$8.00 a head at that time, or a little over \$8.00. In those days it was true; in those days you could buy a car for \$1,200.

**Mr. Danielson:** — You started out with \$5.00.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — That was hospital services. I will come to that in a minute. In those days you could buy a pair of shoes for \$3.75; in those days you could buy a dress for your little daughter or a pair of

**March 16, 1954**

overalls for your little boy for about 95 cents. Try it today; you compare it and see where you get off.

**Premier Douglas:** — You could buy a Liberal for \$2.00.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — You could buy seven of them for a glass of beer, and somebody else could buy them back for two glasses.

**Mr. McDonald:** — You ought to know.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — However, costs have gone up. Now then, I would like our friends to refer to the report I tabled a short time ago on the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan for 1953, and if they will turn over to page 27, at the top of the page they will see a table there called Table 24, and they will see the years listed from 1948 to 1953 on the left hand column; and they will see that there has been an increase in the cost of hospitalization in every single year, ranging from \$1,669,000 down to, in the last year, up \$1,051,000. Then if you look in the middle column you will see the reasons for that, and the same in the last. The middle column and the right hand column show the reasons and the reasons were: In the year 1948, an increase of \$1,669,000, \$780,000 of which was caused by an increase in days of care — about half of it; and \$889,000 was caused by the increase in the cost of everything that a hospital has to buy if it is going to be of service to its people. and so it goes on down the line on both those columns, with the increased costs for increased days of care gradually diminishing until you see a minus sign down opposite the figures 1952 and 1953; but you see that the increased costs, because of the increase in the prices of goods and services that hospitals have to buy, has gone up from \$889,000 to as high, in one year, as \$1,601,000, and in the year under review here up \$1,131,000 solely because of the increase in the prices. Who had any influence on prices? Certainly not this Government.

**Mr. Loptson:** — The C.C.F.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend hasn't said one sensible word since he came to this Session of the Legislature as leader, except the other day in Crown Corporations when I think he did make a recommendation which might, by some stretch of the imagination, have had some sense to it; and now he says the C.C.F. caused the increase in the prices.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Advocating higher wages all the time. That causes high prices.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — My hon. friend never belonged to a labour union, doesn't know anything about it, has no sympathy with any working class organization farm or labour, has never exhibited any sympathy with anything worthwhile for rank and file humanity. All he is interested in, as he indicated in his address on the Speech from the Throne, is what he gets on his dividends from the companies he has investments in.

**Mr. Loptson:** — I had to earn it the hard way, boy.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — The reason prices have gone up . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — Not in any short hours, either.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — . . . is because his friends in Ottawa broke their promise in 1945, given in that election, to hold the price line and

retain price controls. Only the C.C.F. tried to keep that government from following that course, but they were so determined to be subservient to the people that they always serve, 'big business', that they allowed it to go. They could not stand seeing money in the way of war savings unspent in the hands of the people, in the way of gratuities and other emoluments and benefits given to the returned veterans, nearly a million strong, unspent purchasing power, which meant, if they could raise their prices, beautiful profits for the people that make frigidaires and clothes, children's shoes and baby carriages and building materials and all those things that people require for the maintenance of a family. That was the reason these prices went up, Mr. Speaker, because price controls were released . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker . . .

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — My hon. friend from Arm River knows that very well.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Yes, I know you are just talking through your hat.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Now I will come to my friend from Arm River. I don't know what he is talking about; I wish he'd cut his beard so I could hear . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — I asked you a question and you didn't answer.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — I still didn't hear but I am perfectly willing to listen if he doesn't make it too long.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I asked you if the C.C.F. were in favour of holding the wages ceiling also and holding the price, both at the same time?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! If the hon. member wants to ask a question will he kindly rise and not ask his questions sitting down.

**Mr. Danielson:** — The next time I will.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — I mustn't answer that, then, Mr. Speaker, according to your ruling.

But I want to come to just one thing the hon. member mentioned, this afternoon. He mentioned what he called a 'subsidy' paid to the Provincial Government by the Federal Government. Mr. Speaker, let me make a categorical statement. It is no subsidy; it has no relation to a subsidy; it is an agreement made between the Federal and the Provincial governments for certain rights in Saskatchewan and they pay a rental for that, and if that amount of money can be called 'paying for our health services', then I would say that the hon. member himself might say that the money he spent on his supper tonight could have been spent on his breakfast tomorrow morning, and there would be just as much sense in it.

**Mr. Lopton:** — It's dollars anyway, whatever you call it.

**Mr. Danielson:** — You can better correct the Provincial Treasurer then, that is what he calls it — a subsidy.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — And even though the \$22 million he mentioned — and I believe it has risen since that time; even if it were a subsidy,

**March 16, 1954**

Mr. Speaker, it is a long way from paying the 760 per cent of the health services his friends at Ottawa promised to pay in the green books during the Federal-Provincial conferences of 1945 and 1946.

**Mr. McDonald:** — They call it a subsidy here.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — However, Mr. Speaker, I only said those things incidentally. I just have one or two matters I want to deal with; I am sorry the hon. member for Maple Creek is not in his seat because I wanted him to know about this matter he raised.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — We'll tell him.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Yes, you'll tell him; but you will tell him something different and he will believe you. In his criticism of the budget, the member for Maple Creek mentioned a letter he had received from a constituent and the constituent had suggested to him in the letter, according to the hon. member from maple Creek, that because the hon. Provincial Treasurer had stated that there would be a surplus for the present fiscal year, the Minister of Health should have rushed over to the Provincial Treasurer and made a raid on the surplus in order to get \$20,000, or some amount similar to that as a grant for their dental programme in Swift Current. Now with regard to that dental programme, I hope my friends will tell the hon. member from Maple Creek that any kind of a programme undertaken by any organized area of the province which seeks a government grant will receive that grant by virtue of the authority given to the Department under The Health Services Act, not by virtue of a raid by the Minister of the Department on the Treasury; and so far as that programme is concerned, there has been no finality to it. The matter is under negotiation, and when agreement is reached between the Region board of directors and the Department of Health, then a decision will be made as to how much, if any, grant is given. I want to repeat again, these grants are not given by raids on the Treasury or surpluses; they are made available to organized areas when a programme that the Department approves of, and is eligible for a grant under The Health Services Act, has finally been agreed on by the parties concerned.

There has been some mention of dental programmes several times during the sittings of this House. I want to mention one or two other matters with regard to it, partly to dispel some of the misinformation that has intentionally or inadvertently (I don't know which) found its way into the press both here and at Saskatoon. We are suffering from a shortage of dentists and we are suffering from very bad dental health. I won't go into a lot of statistics tonight, because the time is not available; but the fact remains that nobody knows it better than I, for I receive the reports that indicate that. The whole North American continent is short of dental personnel and Saskatchewan suffers, along with the rest of the continent, in that shortage.

We have had discussions with representatives from the other three western provinces in an endeavour to discover a way of improving the supply of dentists. We find, first, that teaching facilities are not yet available, second, that even if they were available the faculty, the teaching staff, is not available because they have to be drawn from dentists and there is a shortage of dentists at the present time; and, third, which is equally as important as the other two, the applications for training in the dental colleges in dental surgery are not as great as they used to be, and it is going to be some years before we can expect an increase in the supply of dentists. Consequently, we are endeavouring to find some other way to overcome at least some of that

difficulty, and one way is in the engaging and training of the dental hygienists who engage in a purely preventive programme; they are assigned to the regions which undertake a dental preventive programme.

We hope to strengthen it also by an arrangement which we think might be possible though we have no definite assurance yet that it will be. We are hoping an arrangement might be made with the Council of the College of Dental Surgeons of Saskatchewan to bring a dental nurse from New Zealand to Saskatchewan to see if she could assist us in developing a 'pilot' scheme which would be applicable to Saskatchewan conditions, similar in results to the scheme which they have in New Zealand. That is a different thing from that mentioned in some of the papers, and I want to put that straight. That is, as I say, still in the hoping stage, and I think it is the way I answered a question in that connection asked by the hon. member for Souris-Estevan in Public Accounts Committee.

One other thing I want to mention before I conclude this short talk, Mr. Speaker, is the reference that has been made to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics' figures with regard to the amount of mental ill health in Saskatchewan as compared with the other provinces. I have read the D.B.S. figures, and I don't put the same interpretation on them as some others. As I pointed out to the hon. Leader of the Opposition in Public Accounts Committee when he asked a question if the C.C.F. had made more people crazy than should normally have been, I said: "No, but we had inherited what we had, probably from the old Liberal regime." The construction I put on D.B.S. figures is entirely different. I don't think that anyone can infer, from those figures, that Saskatchewan suffers more mental illness than any other province; but what the report does show is how many cases we are looking after in our mental hospitals; and to some extent, how well we are looking after them; in which case, D.B.S. figures are complimentary, I believe, to the province of Saskatchewan.

Again, when you try to compare the amount of mental illness (or as we used to say in the old days 'insanity') in one area as against another, there has never been any objective criteria by which you can measure or make those comparisons. So many things are different: attitudes are different, and there have been no standards set by which you can make that measurement or that comparison. There have been many attempts to do it, but it just has not worked. And there are many reasons why that is so, Mr. Speaker. For example, the attitude of one area as compared with the attitude of another area toward the disoriented childish old man or woman, may vary greatly from area to area. Here we regard that seriously, and do our utmost to see that those people get the kind of treatment we think they should.

I think what the figures show is this: I listed what I believe those figures shows:

- (a) That we have more mental patients in hospital than any other province, per capita.

That is true. One of the big reasons for the high rate of in-patients is the fact that we house more mental defectives in institutions than any other province does.

**Mr. Loptson:** — You wouldn't say the C.C.F. are making more people sick?

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — No, I wouldn't say that. If we weren't pretty strong headed here, I would say that kind of talk would make a lot of

**March 16, 1954**

people over here very much that way, Mr. Speaker, but the question and the statement are inane. They mean nothing. The C.C.F. have made nobody sick, but we are caring for the mental defectives in institutions which was not done properly under a Liberal regime, and because we have those people in our institutions it brings the population of the mental institutions higher, per capita, than it might be in some of the other provinces. I think that is one of the things D.B.S. figures point out.

Then it also points out that we are admitting patients for the first time at a rate second to B.C. Now that has some reasons for it, too, and that figure will depend, in any given instance, on (1) the beds available, and (2) the diagnostic criteria used for admission. Because we use diagnostic criteria properly, and because when they indicate that the person is not mentally ill, but deficient or defective or retarded, then that diagnosis means the person goes to a separate institution rather than into the place for the treatment of mentally ill.

Our re-admission rate is low; that is true. Now re-admission refers to those people who have been in once and have been sent out and pronounced cured. Our re-admission rate is low for the reason that we have a better 'follow-up'. We don't send them out, in the first place, until we are reasonably sure that they are cured and ready to go back to their communities, and then they are followed up by social workers to be sure that they have become readjusted in their communities. So, obviously, our re-admission rate is low, and the lower our re-admission rate gets, provided it is coupled with cures of those who are discharged, then the better we are going to like it.

Our discharge rate is low for very much the same reason. We do not discharge until we are reasonably sure, as sure as the psychiatric professional people in the Branch of our psychiatric services can be. I don't think anyone on this continent will question the statement that we have as competent a bunch of psychiatrists in our mental institutions as in any political area on the continent. I use that phrase quite often, and I mean it every time. And so our discharge rate is low because they are not discharged until competent psychiatrists in the hospitals indicate that they should be discharged.

Again, our discharge rate would be low in comparison for this reason. The very fact that we house more mental defectives or retarded people would mean that our discharge rate would be low because they are not discharged. You do not cure mental defectives, particularly of the low grade; they always need institutional care. So, when you have a population of 800 of those kinds of people, many of whom cannot be discharged, obviously your overall discharge rate is low. I wanted those points straightened out for the benefit of the House, Mr. Speaker; otherwise I would not have taken part in this debate.

I am going to conclude by saying this. I am probably, humbly, one-fourteenth responsible for the budget. In other words, I made my little contribution to its preparation as a member of the Government. I think it is a good budget. I think it is ready to produce, has made available the things in this province that the people want; the indications are there. My friends opposite must remember they had the opportunity to do all the things they say we are not doing now. This Government said it would do things. It has started those things; we are doing them now. We have improved the educational system; we have improved the highway system; we have vastly improved the health and welfare services of this province, which they could have done if they had what it took and had the desire to do it. They may have had what it took, but they never showed any desire to do it.

**Mr. Loptson;** — You should do something with \$50 million extra, every year.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Mr. Speaker, when they had \$13 or \$14 million, at the same time I only had 13 or 14 cents in my pocket and I could buy as much for that then as I can now under their Federal Government's fiscal policy if I have \$1.80. They could have done the things. They had men and food; they had everything but the courage and the vision and the brains. They hadn't it then, and I do not think they have it now.

I say this budget is a good budget. I look forward, like my friend from Bengough, to a time when we can have an increased budget, and that the increase, or a lot of it, can be used, again, to extend the services that result in producing a better life, a more contented life, and a healthier life, physically and mentally, for the people of this province. A budget that can do that earns the support of any well-thinking and humanitarian person. If any of those people on your left, Mr. Speaker, subscribe to any of those virtues or any part of them, they can't honestly vote against this budget; and if they vote against it, they are saying to the people of this province, "Rather than you having good health services, we would rather see the C.C.F. defeated; rather than you have better educational services, rather than you have better highways or anything else, we would rather see the C.C.F. defeated."

**Mr. Loptson;** — Did you know we had a funeral this morning?

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Well, I hope we have another one tomorrow morning.

**Mr. Loptson;** — We buried \$1,400,000

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — I'll go to it. I won't do anything to help it along, but I won't shed too many tears if it happens.

I am going to say, Mr. Speaker, with these few words, that I will support the budget.

**Mr. Harry Gibbs (Swift Current):** — Mr. Speaker, it isn't my intention to speak very long tonight. As a matter of fact, I hope to be very brief; but I have enjoyed what I have heard tonight in the House and this afternoon too, and I can see it is the same old thing as far as the Opposition members are concerned. They want a lot of things but they don't want to vote for them. Of course, that is their privilege; but I think, sometimes, that some of them could have the intestinal fortitude and courage to do some of the things they would like to do, besides being behind the Liberal Party.

We have been accused, you know, over on this side of the House, of being sheep and not voting for anything, only what our Premier and the Government brought in. Well, that has not been so. We have had members on this side of the House who have had the fortitude to vote against government measures when they didn't suit them . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — When did that happen?

**Mr. Gibbs:** — . . . and as far as I am concerned, as long as I am in this House . . .

**Mr. Danielson;** — 'Jake' Benson!

**March 16, 1954**

**Mr. Gibbs:** — . . . if there are government measures come out that do not satisfy or suit me, I have that prerogative, and I have the principle and the courage to vote against them.

**Mr. Loptson:** — That will never happen!

**Mr. Gibbs:** — I might say, Mr. Speaker, that this is the tenth budget which has been brought down by this Government. Now I find nothing wrong with this budget. Like the member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. Kohaly), I cannot find anything to criticize in the budget. They are trying to do things. Those of us who have been in the C.C.F. movement since it was inaugurated and since the C.C.F. have been in office in this province, know that we have done tremendous things from what we knew in days gone by. We have come through a lot of bitter experience and I have seen it, not only in this country, but in the country from which I came, back in the old country. I saw the days, and so did you, Mr. Speaker, when we had Liberal regimes and Conservative regimes in the motherland, and it was always the suppression of the worker and the common man. We had to get rid of that system.

**Mr. Danielson:** —They are keeping it.

**Mr. Gibbs:** — Well, they used to tell me, my hon. friend from Arm River, that you would never see a Labour Government in the old country, but they day came when you did see a Labour government, and you are going to see another one.

**Mr. Loptson:** — They soon kicked it out.

**Mr. Gibbs:** — Mr. Speaker, we, as Canadian citizens, Britishers, or whatever we like to call ourselves, when the time was here (and it has come) when we had to go out and defend our countries, fight for them, give our blood and spill our blood all over Europe and different parts of the world, we were never found wanting.

Now I know my friends on the other side do not like to hear the word 'Socialism' or 'Socialist'. Once again I am going to inform them that I have been a Socialist all my life, and proud of it. I am going to tell them, also, that Socialists, hundreds of thousands of Socialists, have fought and bled and died for democracy and the country they loved and lived in . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — Why don't you make the Government practise what you preach?

**Mr. Gibbs:** — . . . and they will do it again. As I say, it does not matter where we come from or what we think, when we are in a movement that we think is progressive and going along, from which I believe Socialism emanates, then I say you cannot retard it. We must go on; we must go ahead. We cannot go back to those old-fashioned, outdated ideas of Liberalism and conservatism. We can't do it in this day and age; it is impossible.

**Mr. Loptson:** — We'd like to.

**Mr. Gibbs:** —I know my friends, when they hear the name of Karl Marx or Engels spoken about, they shake and they shiver; it is something terrible. Well, Mr. Speaker, you know and I know that even the origination of Socialism came from the despotism and poverty which was happening in those days — right from the ground; not from the top but from the bottom. You have different kinds of Socialism now. You have the Christian Socialism, Scientific



Socialism, Fabian Socialism, Democratic socialism; you have a lot of them. I don't know whether my friends have ever read any socialist books or not, but I am going to ask them – can they give me any books about Liberalism, or about Conservatism?

**Mr. Loptson:** — Sure.

**Mr. Gibbs:** — You can go in our libraries throughout the width and breadth of the world, Mr. Speaker, and you know I am speaking the truth when I say you have got a library of socialistic works on political science work and you cannot say that about the Conservatives or the Liberals.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Sure you can. You're in the wrong libraries.

**Mr. Gibbs:** — And when we have had such men as Bernard Shaw, Robert Blatchford, Glynes, Arthur Henderson, Sidney Webb, Philip Snowden, Ernie Bevin, and Nye Bevan – yes, and Eugene Debs, you know that the powers-that-be threw him in jail and ran him for president at the same time.

**Mr. Loptson:** — And Harry Gibbs!

**Mr. Gibbs:** — They are people to admire, Mr. Speaker. They are the people I admire because I know those people have fought for the common man and the 'bottom dog', and have been fighting all their lives. And we have to have society that is going to fight. We have had a struggle for existence since we have been born. We have heard hon. speakers in this House talk about what they have gone through. What we went through under Liberal regime I know, and my hon. friend, the Minister of Health was speaking the truth when he mentioned some of the things that the Liberals did to our people back there in the 'hungry 'thirties', and before the hungry 'thirties. We have been fighting that oppression; we are probably fighting it yet; and we come down now – they say, "We can't have socialism." Look, Mr. Speaker, the late leader of our movement, the first leader of the C.C.F. movement in Canada, J.S. Woodsworth, he was sent to prison. What for? He wasn't sent to prison because he didn't build roads, or he didn't make highways, or he didn't put up a power plant. He went to prison and so did Cavanaugh and John Queen, and all the lot of them – why? Because they were fighting the fight of the working and the common man of this country. That is why they went to prison!

**Mr. Loptson:** — They wanted a six-hour day.

**Mr. Gibbs:** — I will say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, can you point out to me any of the Liberals, and you can go back in history as far as you want, who ever went to jail for fighting for the cause of the working man?

**Mr. Loptson:** — They did it the right way.

**Mr. Gibbs:** — You can't do it.

**Mr. Loptson:** — They worked for the poor man.

**Mr. Gibbs:** — And the very essence of our name, Mr. Speaker, — I know, because I belonged to the socialist Party of Canada long before the C.C.F. was thought of; sure, I was one of their 'marked' men. We were marked – and who marked up? We know who marked us. It was the powers-that-be in those days, Mr. Speaker. they knew that we were gong, some day, to usurp these

**March 16, 1954**

people who had oppressed us. We had to do it in Saskatchewan, and we happened to do it. I hope to see the day when we can usurp the Liberal and Conservative governments all over the world.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That will lead in the wrong direction.

**Mr. Gibbs:** — The name founded: the C.C.F., ‘Co-operative Commonwealth Federation’ – co-operate for the common need and the common good, the federation of man. You couldn’t do anything finer, Mr. Speaker. You couldn’t do any thing finer.

What does it say in our social theory – what does Socialism mean? What is there to be scared of? What is there to be timid about? Every basis of Socialism is intelligent, and you can think a lot about it. According to Webster’s dictionary it is a theory of social organization based on government ownership, management or control of means of production, distribution and exchange. Is there anything wrong with that?

**Mr. Lopton:** —You mention Webster’s dictionary and socialism, isn’t the definition that it is Communism?

**Mr. Gibbs:** — Oh no, I am quoting, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Lopton:** — That is Webster’s dictionary . . .

**Mr. Wahl:** — You’re wrong. It says social justice, too.

**Mr. Gibbs:** — And then the democrats, according to the English dictionary, ‘Democrats – A class of people who have no hereditary or special rank or privilege’. So we become, Mr. Speaker, in the vernacular and common sense of the word “social democrats” or Democratic Socialists.

Now I know, Mr. Speaker, that this Government has done some wonderful work, and I agree 100 per cent in what our Government has done. Sure, they have done things that I do not like; but I have had to tell them, and I have told them, and I still have the courage to tell them, and as long as I am here I am going to tell them. That is what I get the mandate from the people in my constituency of Swift Current for. These people down here don’t give the mandate. I just come down here to sit and help out with the government and legislation and all that goes with it. But it is the people in my constituency who send me down here and I have to work; as my friend from Cumberland said – you have to work for these people. sometimes they ask for things that we cannot get; and sometimes we have to tell them. Nevertheless, on the whole, I believe they only ask for what is half-decent anyway, and they know we have a government, and I honestly believe that the C.C.F. Government, if it keeps on the programme it is going on, trying to do a little bit more if they can, will never be ‘usurped’ out of office in this province. Never! Not after the history or the regimes that this province has had to go through.

I want just to touch a little on what I would like to see done. We are coming into the oil and the gas and the mineral wealth of this country, Mr. Speaker. To me that is new-found wealth, that is ‘found’ money; and I have said and I still say on the platform and off, that when we started to receive revenues and benefits from our natural resources, then some day it would be plowed back to the people, and I think that is the way it should be. I know that we have, up to the present, derived a few million dollars from natural resources, and I want to know where that is going, or I would like to.

Now this is the point, Mr. Speaker. Mine you, I know the overall picture is good, it is 100 per cent; but I have always had a soft spot in my heart for our senior citizens of this province, or any other province for that matter. They have been the pioneers who have worked. Their day is past. Today, they are a little 'over the hill' and going down the grade, in the ebb-tide of life. It is true, our Government came to their aid a little more when they gave them a supplementation of \$2.50 a month over the ordinary pension. That was done, and don't forget it. Our old-age citizens thoroughly liked that; they admired it, and they think a lot about it. But owing to the increase and inflation of costs that has gone on not only in this province, but all over the world, especially on the North American continent, don't forget that these old people have still got to buy and pay for their pound of butter and their bread just like I have, and just like you have, and some of us probably have lucrative jobs. And when wages have been going up and when every other thing has been going up in our economy, theirs never went up. Now it is true, I know it is a federal responsibility, and I heard the Minister of Social Welfare talking, yesterday. He remarked to one of the members on the opposite side, "Well, what does Manitoba do?" What has Manitoba done? What has Alberta done? What has B.C. done? Mr. Speaker, I don't give a damn what Manitoba has done, and I don't give a damn what B.C. has done. Listen, if we are a Socialist government here, let us set the way.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That's right.

**Mr. Gibbs:** — We are the people to do those sorts of things and make those other provinces take notice. I don't expect a Liberal government to do those things for the old people.

**Mr. Loptson:** — They're doing it.

**Mr. Gibbs:** — That is why your Federal Government is not doing those things for the old people, because they are not a Socialist government . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — They are the only ones doing anything for the old people.

**Mr. Gibbs:** — My hon. friend, I believe from Souris-Estevan, asked, the other day, "Well, what is going to happen down in Estevan?", addressing the Minister of Power. "Don't forget the miners." Well, it is only a matter of progress, my friend, only a matter of progress. We are all now wanting gas and oil and different other things, which are going to come in, there is no doubt about it in the world. We are going to use it; and you know, my friend, that is going to throw out of employment hundreds of thousands of miners throughout the Dominion of Canada, just like any other revolutionary method has done — and who has to take the brunt of it? The poor old working man again. That is why I tell you, my hon. friend, you have to start thinking on other political lines besides Conservatism. We have to face the facts. There is no getting away from it. It is all right; we can see, and I admire you for protecting or trying to protect those people who, some day, are going to be out of employment; but you can't stop progress. The same thing occurred on the railroad. I served my trade and have been a boilermaker for over 40 years. I can see right now, my friend, where my trade is practically extinct outside of the big construction shops. Locomotives will be going out in a few years; the diesel is here. I might not like it; thousands of other boilermakers might not like it, because we can see our trade going, vanishing; but can we retard progress? What are we going to do about it? We have to find some solution, my friend. We have to use our noodles and find some political solution for it.

**March 16, 1954**

**Mr. Kohaly:**—Come on over here and maybe we can work it out.

**Mr. Gibbs:**—All right. Because, don't forget, my hon. friend, the industrialists, the capitalists of this country or any other country, don't give a damn about your wife or your children as long as they can make profits, and they have done that; it has been the same all the way through. So we have to converge on a system that is going to protect the future generations of this country and every other country. We have done everything they ask when war starts; and when everything else starts, who do they ask? The common lad and working people to come out and fight their wars, and we do it. We have never let them down! But don't forget, my friend, they have let us down – and plenty!

My hon. friend from Souris-Estevan, also my hon. friend from Moosomin, I know you have been in the services, the same as my hon. friend from Rosthern – I guess you are a bit younger than I am, but don't forget I saw V.C.s, Victoria Cross men and soldiers, after the first war, on the breadline – a national disgrace to any country. It could happen again, my friends. It could happen again. I don't want to see it.

May I say once again, in conclusion, I would like to see some of these revenues – I know we have to put some in capital, it has to go to school land funds and all this; but I say it should not all be allocated for this purpose. Surely we can set some aside to plow back, and if at all possible, give our senior citizens, our old-age pensioners, a little more to get on with, to carry them on. We might possibly, too, Mr. Speaker, use some of it for the lowering of taxation. I say that very seriously, because I know people in my constituency (and I guess it is the same in your), those of the working class in the lower brackets as far as wages are concerned, for whom it is quite an effort to keep up even now. As you know we have a health region there, and then our provincial health system, and it is quite a struggle for them to make ends meet sometimes. Now if we could plow some of the millions back to give the benefits before a lot of our old people die off, it would be a good thing. Look, we are doing plenty for you and I'm all for it – higher education and what have you; but sometimes I think maybe we are doing a little too much and neglecting our old pioneers who have done the spade work in the past, and should have some return before they finally go out on their last mission. I am appealing for those people, because I know what some of them have gone through, and I believe it was my hon. friend from Nipawin (Mr. MacNutt), yesterday, who made some such remark as I am making now.

Now that is my sincere personal thought, because, Mr. Speaker, as we go on (and we hope we are going to go on) from year to year, as we are bringing in more oil, more mineral wealth, then we are going to receive more benefits, and it is going to run into the millions, if we can take cognizance of the reports of even that man from Calgary of this new well that has just come in down there at Estevan. There is no doubt about it, we are going to go ahead. We are going to get a lot of new wealth in this province; and I say that if that comes about, I think and I hope that we give our old-age citizens more of a pension than they are getting at the present time. And never mind what Manitoba does; never mind what the Federal Government does – that is up to us. As it says under socialism – sure, we believe in distribution. Well, I'm willing to distribute it if I can get hold of it and I will do it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have just about said enough, and, as I said before, I have no criticism to find whatsoever with the budget, but I only hope that our Government can see their way clear to put some of this new wealth

and new money back into the things I have been talking about. I am sure it will not only strengthen our Government, it will strengthen our movement, and it will make a lot of people very, very happy and comfortable if they could get a little more as far as their pension is concerned. Not only that, I say we could use some of this money for building up old-age homes throughout the country. I believe my friend from Moosomin said something about that, and I think it is a good thing to have old-age homes centralized all over the province so our people won't have too far to travel. I think we could use some of the new-found wealth in some of the things I have spoken of. I know that our Government will give it serious consideration, and I know they know I shall support the budget.

**Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** —I want to utilize the time at my disposal this evening, Mr. Speaker, to give a review of the activities of my department and also make reference to the policies of the department and indicate to hon. members the reasons why we have adopted the policies and programme we are at present endeavouring to implement. I should like again, in doing so to mention that Saskatchewan is more seriously affected by adverse natural hazards than any other province in the Dominion of Canada. We are a province famous for fluctuating yields of production. We have experienced three very good years. It is not likely (although it could happen) that we may have another good year, but in all likelihood, basing my reasoning on long-term precipitation and production records, we will return again to normal, and in all probability we may return to years of subnormal yields again. I should mention that in this province those conditions will always prevail. They are natural conditions. We will always work on a very narrow margin of moisture. In many years one-half an inch of moisture at the right time will make the difference between a reasonably good crop or a crop failure. This has been emphasized particularly in the 1930's when in a period of time this province accumulated a relief bill of \$187 million. Reference was made to the discharge of that obligation by the province and the Dominion government by way of write-offs. That experience, coming to a head as it did, has certainly led to the development of changing policies and up to the present when we have endeavoured to devise policies to overcome, at least to a measure, some of the natural problems involved.

Everyone recalls that the early settlement that took place in western Canada certainly was haphazard and disorganized. Most of the land in the province was taken up by homestead entry on a quarter-section basis. People located in areas of this province that were not suited to grain production, with the result that very early on, there was a very great shift in our agricultural population from those areas. I can mention what is known as a special area in the eastern part of Alberta and the west-central part of our province, where great masses of people left their homesteads completely and went to other more suitable land farther north in Alberta. That shift went on, but gradually we reached the limit of new suitable agricultural land resources. Those limits were reached very rapidly during the 1930's when again we saw an exodus of people from the problem areas of the province to other areas where they could make a living.

As a result of that experience there were developed such things as the P.F.R.A., when the Dominion Government recognized that they had some responsibility for the pattern of settlement because this province was settled under dominion settlement policies. It is because of that factor, Mr. Speaker, that P.F.R.A. is engaged in rehabilitation activities in this province and it is a right; they do so by right, and it is not a gift from the Dominion Government. They were responsible for the original settlement of this

**March 16, 1954**

province, as they were responsible for the lands and natural resources in western Canada. When those resources were turned over to the province, as one of the commitments the Federal Government undertook the responsibility of endeavouring to re-establish the agricultural settlement pattern here. So, we began to take lands out of production and put them into P.F.R.A. pastures.

I should mention, in passing, that there are approximately 1 ½ million acres of land in P.F.R.A. pasture. All too little credit has been given to the Provincial Government in making that land available to the Dominion Government by exchanges and otherwise, and by obtaining titles from the rural municipalities. The Land Utilization Board has played a tremendous role in this particular activity.

When I took over the portfolio of Agriculture, I thought of those past problems. I had some experience with relief as a reeve in my own municipality, and I knew that we should prepare for the future, that those conditions would no doubt return again and that we should endeavour to prepare ourselves for a series of subnormal years again. To that end we devised policies in the Department of Agriculture that I can indicate very briefly, the basic objectives being to bring about greater agricultural stability and then, by proper land use practices and the encouragement of them, to utilize to the optimum our total land resources in accordance with good land use practices, and thereby at the same time increase our overall agricultural production.

In devising those policies, we realized that it was necessary to enlarge the operational units of many farm holdings in this province. That was done through many devices: by means of utilizing Crown lands for community pasture purposes, either P.F.R.A. pastures, provincial pastures or cooperative pastures, and then furthermore, by the disposition of other Crown lands on an individual lease basis for the purpose of rounding out as many individual economic farm units as we possibly could. These, basically, are the policies of the Department of Agriculture.

In order to make implementation possible, certain very fundamental changes were made in respect to reorganizing the Department of Agriculture in this province. Very significant moves were made. In 1947 all agricultural lands were placed under the administration of the Department of Agriculture in order that Crown lands would be under the administration of the Department that had the major interest in these particular problems.

In addition to turning over to the Department of Agriculture the administration of lands, other scattered activities relating to agriculture located in various other departments of government were centralized in the Department of Agriculture, such as drainage activities, and the water rights division. When that reorganization was completed, we found it necessary to organize still another department, a Conservation and Development Branch of the Department of Agriculture. Then, when that organization was complete, we took a look at the administrative set-up in the Department having in mind the type of administrative or that could best discharge the particular policies that we had in mind.

We had some 12 branches in the Department of Agriculture. The next move was to consolidate those branches. We consolidated about three branches in what is now known as the Animal Industries Branch. We then took several other branches and incorporated them into what is now known as the Plan Industries Branch. And then of course, the Lands Branch was set up; the Conservation and Development Branch was set up; and then the Agricultural Representative

Service was completely reorganized, and set up as another branch, with a director in charge. In short, we then had five directors who were responsible directly to the Deputy Minister and the Minister, instead of 12 scattered branches; all of which went towards a more efficient administrative set-up.

I wish now to review, Mr. Speaker, the activities of some of these branches. I wish, first of all, to give a progress report to the House on the activities of the Plant Industries and Animal Industries Branches, which are made up of the former Field Crops Branch and Apiary Division, the Veterinary Division, the Livestock Division and the Dairy Branch.

One of the major programmes of the Plant Industries Branch is the forage crop programme. It is a programme under which we supply at cost grass seed mixtures to farmers, with the Department paying for the re-bagging and the local freight and supplying it to the farmer at cost. The purpose of this policy is to improve the overall quantity and quality of our hay in Saskatchewan. In addition, it ties in with our overall land-use programme, because our land classifications tell us that although we have about 35 million acres of cultivated land in Saskatchewan, about 27 million acres of that land will require a balanced type of agriculture; not a mixed type, but a balanced type of agriculture, incorporating forage crop and livestock production, with a cereal grain rotation in the interest of preserving the fertility of the soil and retaining the fibre in the soil to protect it against erosion by wind or water.

So our forage crop programme fits well into this picture. We are trying to tie all of these branches in to the overall objective we have in mind, namely, greater stability plus increasing the quality and quantity of our pod.

In the years the forage crop programme has been in operation, we have supplied sufficient seed for 275,000 acres which would produce, in an ordinary year, some 300,000 tons of good quality hay. In addition to that, we supplied last year alone over 25,000 pounds of grass seed mixtures for some 224 forage crop demonstrations free of charge. Those forage crop demonstrations were of several different kinds. There were pasture demonstrations, hay demonstrations, involving an acreage of from 5 to 20 acres per plot, thus demonstrating the possibility of growing certain types of forage crops on different soil types. Other types of demonstration were also fostered, which revealed the rate of gain of an animal on an acre of good grass. There were some seven different types of demonstrations in the 224 demonstrations initiated throughout the province of Saskatchewan. As a result of the activities of this particular branch in the administration of this policy, where forage crop production was unknown throughout large areas of the province, we now see fields all over the province producing forage crops.

In addition to this particular activity, the Plant Industries Branch employs specialists, who carry on extension work in association with the Agricultural Representatives Branch, and they have held numerous field days and demonstrations on weed control, soil erosion, etc., throughout the province. We have made assistance available to municipalities for the control of perennial noxious weeds by making chemicals available to them at half-cost. Our expenditure in this particular activity over the past five years has amounted to \$187,000. The expenditure towards the purchase of high pressure sprays to R.M.s has amounted to \$31,000 and assistance has been received by some 91 municipalities in the province.

I should mention something about the Apiary Division. Last year, we produced about three million pounds of high quality white honey. As I often

**March 16, 1954**

remarked to the former Minister of Natural Resources, when we were comparing notes, if this one particular branch of agricultural production in the province had a few more beehives, we could produce just about as much wealth as we have in the fish and fur industries of northern Saskatchewan.

Before moving on, I just want to give this illustration as to the importance of forage crop production in the Dominion of Canada. I happened to have some statistics the other day, Mr. Speaker, and I looked over the average value of the production of gold in Canada in the 7-year period 1944 to 1951, and I found that the average yearly production of gold in Canada in that period of time was \$128,000,000; but in that same period of time the value of forage crops production in Canada was \$233,000,000 per year, which indicates the important part forage crop production plays in the economy of Canada. The need for encouraging forage production is very pronounced in the province of Saskatchewan.

I would like now to say something about the Ag-Rep Service. When I took over the administration of this Department, we had 21 agricultural representatives, many of whom were living in the three large cities of the province. Since then we have re-organized the branch and employ at the present time 37 agricultural representatives, each one of whom is living within his district. We realize that the districts are still large. Each one of these men endeavours to service and bring extension to some 3,100 farm families. Each district has from 9 to 10 municipalities. However, we have endeavoured to overcome the handicap by working in close association with agricultural committees in each municipality and L.I.D. in Saskatchewan.

Hon. members may say, "Well, what are you accomplishing as a result of the agricultural representative service?" Again, we are endeavouring to tie in this particular branch (and it is a most important branch in the Department) in the matter of bringing extension to farmers, also bringing the need for good land-use practice right to the farmer himself, more particularly the need for building up feed and fodder reserves against lean years that are bound to come. The ag-reps to this end, have, through the local committees, completed 86 land-use surveys in 86 R.M.s and, at the present time, have 22 surveys nearly completed and another 30 land-use surveys in progress. These land-use surveys take the greater part of a summer, and call for the co-operation not only of the agricultural committee men, but many farmers in the area in which the survey is undertaken.

I move on, Mr. Speaker, to the Animal Industries Branch. As I mentioned previously, this represents a consolidation of the former Dairy Branch, the Veterinary Branch, the Livestock Branch and the Poultry Division incorporated into one branch. The responsibilities of this branch are general livestock improvement. In the years 1951-1953, this branch carried on a bull-grading policy under which there is paid \$35 for a grade 'B' and \$50 for a grade 'A' bull. It might interest hon. members to know that, in 1951, there were 1,962 sires that qualified for this bonus and in 1953, 3,700 bulls were qualified for the bonus. The grading is done very strictly. Only 10 per cent of the bulls grade, graded 'A' and the balance graded 'B' with 10 per cent rejections.

To give you an indication of the results achieved, these figures may be of interest. The registration of pure-bred beef cattle in Saskatchewan in 1943 was 7,876 head, but in 1952 it had doubled to 15,546 head, so that during the fall sales, last fall, when 35 breeders offered pure-bred livestock for sale, we attracted buyers from many other provinces in Canada, which is an



indication of the improved high quality of our livestock. It was the first time in the history of this province that we attracted so many outside buyers to our pure-bred cattle sales in this province.

Now, regarding the Dairy Division. This division is responsible for herd improvement work. At the moment there were some 11 herd improvement associations with a membership of some 240. These are the people who furnish the good breeding stock for the other dairy producers in the province of Saskatchewan. I should like to give you some indication of the improvements that have been made in this particular field of activity.

In 1953, the annual pounds of milk production per cow in Saskatchewan was 7,872; today, it is 9,682. So old bossy's production can be improved upon, Mr. Speaker, but I am afraid possibly not sufficiently to overcome the effect of the cheap vegetable oils that are being offered to the public at the present time.

The average pounds of butterfat per animal and the quality of the product have also improved. In 1935, the average was 285 per animal; in 1952, 341 pounds, which is a remarkable increase. In terms of average production of milk for all dairy cattle in Saskatchewan, in 1935, the average production was 3,115 pounds of milk; in 1951, it was 5,150 – a very decided increase.

Now, in regard to the Veterinary Division. In 1944, there was practically no inspection done for Bangs' disease or for calfhood vaccination. There was no such thing as a veterinary service district. When I took over the Department of Agriculture I found that we had some 52 practising veterinarians in the province of whom many were advanced in years. Something had to be done. We first of all, in 1954, passed The Veterinary Service Districts Act under which assistance is given to co-operating municipalities to engage a veterinarian and, in addition to that, we encouraged Saskatchewan students to practise veterinary medicine by making scholarship grants available. The grants are still available. This year, a student entering the Veterinary College at Guelph, Ontario, can earn scholarships each year up to \$900 for the five-year course

To say something about the extent of our Bangs' control programme – I mentioned that there was practically no testing done in 1944. In 1950, there were 55,000 cows tested for Bangs' disease and in 1951, the following year, 74,000 cows were tested for Bangs' disease; last year (1952), 61,000 head of cattle were tested for Bangs' disease. And calfhood vaccination: there were practically none vaccinated in 1944; last year, 17,381, and in our banner year of 1951 over 29,000 calves were vaccinated for Bangs' disease.

**Mr. Loptson:** — The C.C.F. must have had effect on the cows, too.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — In T.B. inspection work, in December, 1953, there 123 municipalities fully accredited, and 77 under test, and I ought to say something about it. When we came to power natural gas 1944, as a result of the absence of veterinarians many of the herds that were accredited hers and in T.B. free areas, had not been tested for many years. All of this backlog of re-testing had to be accomplished again until, at the present time, we have 123 municipalities that are fully accredited and 77 municipalities at the present time under test, making 200 in all.

Well, Mr. Speaker, even the chickens began laying more eggs since the C.C.F. Government came into power and adopted more up-to-date methods of

**March 16, 1954**

improvement. In 1940, the average hen laid 102 eggs; in 1950 the average hen laid 122 eggs, an increase of 12 per cent, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Loptson:** — The C.C.F. didn't make them sick, eh?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — So, we are making very considerable progress.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — That's not counting the 'eggs' the Liberals laid.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — They would be of doubtful quality, I think, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Loptson:** — The C.C.F. Government make a lot of sickness in the country, even among the cows.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, I wish now to say a few words about the Lands Branch, and again this is one of the important branches in the department in the matter of implementing our overall programme. This branch is charged with the administration and allocation of land. Their functions are to acquire land for projects, either community pastures or fodder projects, and to dispose of land on an individual lease basis. We have under administration in the Lands Branch approximately 9,600,000 acres of land. These figures may be of interest in order to indicate the stabilizing influence that rational administration of lands has, in relationship to stabilizing our farm settlement pattern. The hon. members opposite have often objected and stated that we should sell these lands; but I hope that when I am through with my explanation we won't hear any more talk about the sale of land. When I talk generally about Crown lands in Saskatchewan, I am not talking about good lands. There are relatively few acres under the administration of the Lands Branch that are suitable for cultivation.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Isn't that Carrot River land all right?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — That's very suitable; I'll come to that and you'll hear enough about it, when I am through. I'm in an amiable mood tonight, a tolerant mood, and I may not be so tolerable later on.

We have 1,835 veteran leases under disposition with a cultivated acreage of some 472,000 acres; other cultivation leases, including new settlement farms, some 300 units; and partial units, 3,500, making a total of 5,635 individual leases utilized for cultivation or for a combination of cultivation and grazing purposes. There are 10,000 grazing leases and hay leases involving some 5 ½ million acres of land. In addition to this, including cultivation and combination leases, we have a total of around 15,000 lessees of Crown land in Saskatchewan involving in the neighbourhood of 6 ¼ million acres of land.

In addition to that, as I mentioned at the outset, we have nearly a million and a half acres of land in P.F.R.A. pastures, and we have 215,000 acres in 12 provincial pastures. We have 49,000 acres in 12 municipal pastures; and 293,000 in 46 co-operative pastures. I can say, Mr. Speaker, that there are approximately 20,000 farmers in Saskatchewan who have either received the benefit of the facilities of community pastures or by having Crown land allocated to them received the benefit of a larger operational farm unit. As everyone knows, if we are to farm in accord with the dictates of nature and by this device overcome some of the natural hazards, we must have a sound operational unit. It must be large enough to farm or ranch in accord with the dictates of nature. So we are trying to overcome the pattern of settlement that developed in the early days when we had scattered parcels of quarter-section farms all

over this province on which people could not make a living. Furthermore, the need for economic farm units has been emphasized with the advent of mechanized agriculture. So we feel that we are utilizing land by leasing to the best possible purpose.

I want to mention one more thing, Mr. Speaker. Everyone is talking about rising farm production costs and lower farm prices. Someone mentioned, not long ago, that cattle prices dropped about 50 per cent, but the only item in the rancher's or stockman's production cost that has gone down is his lease fees. His lease fees have been reduced, this year, by about 40 per cent, because our lease fees are based upon the average price of all classes of livestock, less freight, on the Winnipeg market. This year, our livestock growers had the benefit of this particular policy.

We are not a revenue branch. We endeavour to encourage a balanced type of agricultural programme or policy, knowing that the economic benefits will redound to the whole province. If our farmers have a better income, greater economic stability, we know the Provincial Treasurer will collect more revenue with quite a bit coming from what is consumed in the beer parlours . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — In other words, you are operating for use and not for profit.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Now, I want to make some reference to the Conservation and Development Branch, again a very important branch. I want to emphasize that this branch has only been in existence for four years. We began as a division in 1948, when an appropriation of \$50,000 was allocated to this division. The next year we organized as a branch and we gradually acquired a competent staff of engineers. However, we worked throughout this four-year period understaffed as far as engineers are concerned. I want to say to the House that there was not a single drainage area in this province that was properly designed to meet the present circumstances of rapid run-off and all the rest of it. There was a terrific job of engineering to be done.

I should first indicate the overall expenditures, and then I will point to some of the accomplishments of this branch, lest anyone should say that we spent a lot of money and that we have not accomplished very much. In 1949-50, we spent in this branch for irrigation development, and dry land fodder project development and for drainage development some \$800,000; in 1952-53, we spent \$1,306,000. Last year, we spent \$1 ½ million and expenditures will be about the same this year. When I took over the Department, I believe we had an appropriation of around \$800,000 for the whole Department. This gives some indication of the expansion that has taken place, Mr. Speaker.

Now, what have the engineers done? In this four-year period of time they have made topographic surveys of 225,000 acres of land, and 3,250 miles of strip-topography surveys were completed by this branch. I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, I'll let any competent engineer that knows, come in and examine the work of the engineering staff and determine as to whether or not that isn't a sizeable accomplishment, and in many cases, despite most adverse weather conditions. The engineers are in the field all winter. They are working now in the Hudson Bay area taking levels in order that a proper drainage design in that area can be completed by spring. I would like to tell the members of this House that the responsibility for drainage activities is not confined to the northern part of the province, nor the north-east part of the province; it extends over the entire province of Saskatchewan. We had as great a drainage problem in the Regina plains area and the Souris River valley

**March 16, 1954**

as we have had anywhere else in Saskatchewan. We have had problems in the west-central part of the province as well, as a result of the heavy precipitation in the past few years. You cannot have it both ways. If we have good crops with a lot of rain, we also have flooding of land and drainage problems, too.

We first had to go to the old drainage districts in the northern part of Saskatchewan and re-design these drainage districts. We had very extensive veterans' co-operative farms in the Carrot River area. I intend tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, to deal specifically with the particular problem in the Carrot River area, and lay before the House some of the conditions that we had had to contend with. I hope the hon. member for maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) is in his seat; perhaps he won't be so quick to repeat some of the random and wild statements he made based on information of one man without making any examination whatever as to the real facts.

In the past four years of operation, this branch has moved 3 ½ million cubic yards of earth for irrigation and drainage purposes. This involved 650 miles of ditch, about 125 miles of road and 1,300 structures, some of which aren't small structures. Drop structures in ditches are constructed to regulate the flow of water; if this isn't done the ditch will erode. Water can only drop so many feet per mile, or per half-mile, and the rapidity of the water flow has to be kept at a certain speed or serious erosion will develop. Drop structures can be costly; some of them cost up to \$3,000 or more.

In this period of time, this Branch has cleared 2,000 acres of land, principally in the veterans' settlement area. We have also reclaimed and seeded to grass – that is on projects that were too large for a local co-operative group to take care of – 40,000 acres to perennial crops, and built 354 miles of fences for provincial community pastures; 280,000 bushels of grain were harvested from the projects that we had under development; 17,500 tons of hay were harvested from these projects; and 1,418,000 acres of land were organized into 11 conservation areas. If we are to have proper drainage, we must have a local drainage authority. We have organized conservation areas on the basis of a complete drainage basin area as this is the most practical way drainage problems can be dealt with. Each one of these districts requires the services of an engineer, and we had only 17 engineers at any one time. We have 19 approved positions for engineers at the moment, and I should say that there are three more conservation areas coming into operation very, very shortly.

Now, how well did we spend the money? Time will not permit a breakdown, for the benefit of the House, to inform members how much of the earth was moved and how much of the survey work was done for drainage or for irrigation separately, only to say that the largest percentage was on the side of drainage. We have been placing increasing emphasis on drainage development in the last year, because of exceptional climatic conditions. To give you an indication – for drainage purposes in 1950, we spent \$104,000; that went up step by step every year until, last year, we spent \$518,000 for drainage and we will spend, this year, \$572,000 for that purpose.

How well have we spent money for fodder production? Have these fodder projects paid off? I will give you a few examples, Mr. Speaker. We have 20 reclamation projects, some of which are irrigation projects and some of which are dry-land projects, and some of them are also drainage projects; for example the Mortlach, a very large dry-land reclamation project just west

of Moose Jaw. The development of this project has cost \$177,000; the total produce stored and sold from this project since we undertook its development, amounts to \$174,000.

To look at another project, in the Souris valley, this project has cost us, to date, \$45,000 for development, and we either sold or have produce in storage amounting to \$79,000. I could also mention the Spangler irrigation project which was quite expensive — \$157,000 expenditure; and we have produce there, either sold or in storage, to the amount of nearly \$50,000. On the average, I find that the produce that we raised either in cereal grains or forage crops has more than half-paid for the development of these projects. Last year was our banner year for harvesting as a Department. We harvested well over 6,000 tons of hay on the project at Mortlach, and local settler co-operative organizations put up an additional 4,900 tons of hay on this project.

I wish the hon. members of this House could have seen that deserted area when we first began development work. It was sand dunes; it was at one time considered a pretty good farming area in the early days, until the 'thirties came and the settlers had to abandon the farms because of soil erosion. The wind had blown soil along fence lines to a terrific height. We had to use blade equipment to level down the hummocks before we were able to bring the land under production. Strip cultivation had to be done very carefully to prevent further soil drifting. We had to strip cultivate the project a bit at a time. I would like some hon. members to go out there; I wish they had gone out there this summer, and seen the stacks of hay grown in this particular area.

We are trying to set a good example to the farmers of this province to encourage them to provide their own fodder reserves. We also encourage cooperative groups to do likewise, and through the extensive services of our agricultural representatives farmers generally are constantly reminded of the value of fodder reserves.

With another quick reference I am through for tonight. A good deal has been said in this House, Mr. Speaker, about northern settlement. I took the trouble to review the development of settlement policies over the years. Originally, Mr. Speaker, settlers located under a homestead policy, with an axe, and endeavoured to hew out a few acres of land to make their living. In the 1930's there was some assistance given under what was known as the Northern Settlers' Re-establishment Branch. I suppose at the time the policy was considered generous, and I rather get a kick out of reading some of these old records after listening to the hon. member for Maple Creek. He suggested that the policies of this administration have been inadequate. The Liberal Government of that day gave the handsome sum, in those days, of a \$90-advance to a settler for the erection of a dwelling on his acreage. The development of cultivated acreage was very slow, tediously slow. I have here in my hand an economic study that was made by professors Hope and R.A. Stutt in respect to land settlement in the Albertville – Garrick district. Just to give some idea of the conclusions arrived at based on the experience of the settlers who went into this area particularly in the 1920s and up to and including the 1930s, they cleared and broke about 5 ½ acres a year, so that, at the end of 14 years, they had about 70 acres under cultivation, just about enough for subsistence.

I will not very quickly Mr. Speaker, give a few random examples of the settlers on Crown lands who obtained a V.L.A. grant, lands similar to what is found in the Connell Creek and the Smoky Burn area. I have one unit here that is pretty close to Nipawin – if the hon. member for Nipawin were in his seat he would know where it is. This veteran took his land in 1946. He broke

**March 16, 1954**

17 acres that year; the following year he broke 30 acres, the next year, 33, then 20, and 20, and 35, until he had 185 acres broken. He received rental returns to him, by way of retention of our share of the crop, in the amount of \$2,310 over that period of time; and he also received, in 1952, \$800, when we made a pay-out on clearing and breaking accounts. But what is of interest is that, over this period of time, this veteran lessee's gross share of crop, not including the 1953 crop, was \$16,175. On this same list I have another veteran in the same period of time, and this veteran is located just on the other side of the Saskatchewan River from Nipawin, at Love, and this veteran did still better. At the end of seven years – half the length of time that it took other settlers to develop 70 acres in the Albertville district – this veteran had 209 acres broken. What was his share of gross return on crop, not counting 1953 crop? It was \$29,789, or over \$4,000 a year. All these veterans received the V.L.A. grant.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, but I will not weary the House. I just used these examples to indicate that in a similar area a veteran can become established with a limited amount of pioneering and even with limited credit, and he can become successfully established.

The first veteran I mentioned also had several very wet years when he could not cultivate all his land. I am stating this to make the point, first of all, that we have endeavoured to cut down the period of time for re-establishment by the utilization of modern machinery. A good deal of money has been spent in the veterans' settlement area in the Carrot River and Smoky Burn area. The veterans in this area, in addition to their \$2,320 grant, also had 100 acres of land broken for them. They also received generous assistance through the Credit Society under Provincial Government guarantee, and I shall dwell on this matter a little more tomorrow; comparatively, they had a much better 'break' than I realized, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Is the hon. member at a point where he is able to adjourn; if so I will call it 11 o'clock.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the difference in the Connell Creek and Smoky Burn areas is that these veterans had very unfortunate luck. The weather conditions were such that they could not cultivate their land; but I want to say that nothing has been lost. When drainage is completed these veterans will have some of the best land in the province of Saskatchewan.

With these remarks, I wish to move the adjournment of the debate, Mr. Speaker.

(Debate adjourned)

The Assembly then adjourned at 11 o'clock p.m.