

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Second Session – Twelfth Legislature**  
**36th Day**

**Thursday, April 1, 1954**

The House met at eleven o'clock a.m.

On the Orders of the Day:

**HISTORY OF LEGISLATURE**

**Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Minister of Education):**

Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to say a few words about a matter that came up in Committee of Supply relating to a History of the Legislature.

I have here the manuscript of some work which the Archives Board has been preparing for some time. It is a directory of Saskatchewan ministries, members of the Assembly and elections from 1905 until 1953. It is not a history so much as it is just a directory. I thought the members would be interested in knowing just what actually was happening. It is about to go to the printers, and we will see that copies are distributed within the course of the next two or three months.

**CONDOLENCES**

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I am sure that all hon. members will want to join with me in expressing our deep sympathy to the junior member for Regina (Mrs. Cooper) in the loss of her father, Mr. H.L. Lovering, who passed away last night. He has been ill for quite a few days and for some days has not been expected to live very long.

I would therefore like to move, seconded by Mr. Loptson:

“That this Assembly learns with profound regret of the loss suffered by the Hon. Junior Member for Regina City (Mrs. Cooper) in the death of her father, Mr. H.L. Lovering, and extends to her its sincere condolences, praying that Divine Providence will assuage her grief.”

**Mr. Loptson (Leader of the Opposition):**

Mr. Speaker, I wish, on behalf on the group on this side to concur in the motion moved by the Premier, in extending our sympathy to the junior member for Regina and to the family.

I do not know if Mrs. Cooper's mother is still living. If she is, we want to extend sympathy to her as well, and any other relatives who may be left to mourn. I understand Mr. Lovering ahs been an old-timer in this city and played his part in society and the building up of the city of Regina.

(The motion was carried unanimously.)

**April 1, 1954**

## **COMPLETION OF RAILWAY LINES**

Moved by Mr. Zipchen, seconded by Mr. Kramer:

“That this Assembly request the Government to make representations to the Federal Department of Transport, the Canadian National and Canadian Pacific Railways urging (a) favourable consideration by the railway companies of completion of present gaps in existing railway lines in Saskatchewan in order that better services may be given to many well-established communities, and (b) that greater use be made of existing Branch lines to satisfy the transportation needs of people who have access to such Branch lines.”

**Mr. Zipchen (Redberry):**

Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to assure hon. members of this House that I am not going to elaborate too long on this resolution. This resolution is very explicit and speaks for itself.

I wish to submit that there are a number of railroads in the northwestern part of this province with very poor train service at many points. Especially there is a line from North Battleford about 35 miles in my constituency. It runs through Whitkow and Redfield, and the train service is only once a month. Not only that, it is a mixed train, and any of us who had the opportunity to travel in one of these mixed trains would realize what comforts you get; there is no comparison to a passenger train. I would be pleased to show anyone who would like to see it, this railroad map I have here showing the gaps which should be filled in in the northwestern portion of this province, to serve the north. There are so many gaps that people are isolated, having no railway. I hope that something will be done in the future.

The railway companies, as we all know, received special land concessions from the Federal Government and were supposed to build railroads and give better service to the people; but so far we have not accomplished very much from the railway companies.

There are a great number of well-established communities in the north, densely populated; but they are completely isolated, especially during the winter months. I recall that the air ambulance had to fly to the north to pick up some sick people and fly them to North Battleford, Saskatoon or Prince Albert, to hospital. That has been done in the past, and the same thing is done at the present time. Those people are deprived of transportation needs and other conveniences, and I hope that something will be done to see that those people have better train service and better roads.

The people of this province are putting the pressure on this Government requesting this Government to build better roads in this province, especially in the north. I think this Government had done everything they could in regard to the roads. They have spent a lot of money, and they are spending much more money to develop the north; but it is impossible to do it in a short time. And we have the railroad built for the last 25 years in the north, but yet only one train a month; I think that is the minimum according to their statues on the books. I wish they would run a train there at

least once a week, not once a month; and I think we should do something about it.

The people of the north, as I mentioned, have potential products of farm commodities, such as grain, livestock, poultry. We have products of the forest, we have minerals, we have furs, we have fisheries, to mention a few of the natural attributes of this northern part of the province. Many were settled in this country 5 years ago and the settlement is still going on. More and more young people are going and will continue to go north as suggested by our Premier in the 'Saskatchewan Mining News' of March 1954:

"Premier Douglas says, 'Go north, young man' in an address at the annual meeting of the Hudson Bay Route Association at Moose Jaw.

Premier T.C. Douglas talked in glowing terms of the opportunities and possibilities in the north."

There is another writeup here and it is very important. I hope that some of the hon. members will read this paragraph. I will read just a small part of it:

"Today the advice to the man with the pioneering spirit is 'Go north, young man, go north!' But this advice must also be accepted by our Government. They must accept their responsibility of encouraging the young men to go north to tap the mineral wealth by setting their sights north and providing roads and railroads into the upper half of the province. Opening up this vast area would not only bring millions of dollars of new wealth to the province but would provide work for thousands of the population of this province, and could be doubled within a decade or two."

Now this is very important – this last part:

"To those who are predicting the coming of a depression we have the answer and the answer is 'go north, young man, go north!' and urge your Government to go north with roads and railways."

That is something very important.

Mr. Speaker, in summarizing the present existing conditions throughout the province, and in trying to point out some more important reasons why we should get consideration, I sincerely hope that the unanimous support of this House will be given to this resolution.

Let us consider for a moment the pioneers who have come to this country for the last 50 years and travelled those isolated areas; and still

**April 1, 1954**

are living there. I agree with what the hon. member from Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs) had to say the other day – some of them are ‘over the hill’, and we hear every day of some of them who are passing away. I hope that we can do something for them in these days. The time is very short. Those pioneers have contributed much to the development of this country. They gave their best and worked hard for the future, for themselves and for their children and generations to come. I hope that we can improve those conditions in order that they would be able to live in comfort and enjoy their life.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I move this resolution, seconded by the hon. member for The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer).

**Mr. R.A. McCarthy (Cannington):**

Mr. Speaker, I just want to speak for a very short time. I sympathize with the member for Redberry (Mr. Zipchen). I have driven through his country, and talked about the north country, but there are also some uncompleted lines in the south country that are in exactly the same position as his are. I think possibly that the settlement those lines serves is older than his settlement, as a matter of fact.

The line I have in mind is the line that runs from Peebles and was supposed to go to Lampman. Along about 1921, when we had a depression and unemployment, they built that line down as far as Handsworth. The intention was that it would go to the Estevan coal fields or move coal north. At the present time it has to go around by Regina or Maryfield to get out.

We have a very fertile country, a very thickly settled country there. The line now goes from Peebles to Handsworth; a train runs down there once a week and comes back. I can go along with the hon. member in his needs, and I think that ours are equally important.

It is true that trucks have taken a great deal of the traffic that railroads used to take, and it makes it that much more difficult to induce the railway companies to extend these lines, because of truck competition. Some people try to tell us that, before too long, some of the branch lines we have will be done away with and goods will be trucked to the main lines. Be that as it may, I have every sympathy with the gentleman. I think I can go along with him and would like to add my few words to it. I would like to see that line completed; we have done a lot of work on it, but have not been able to convince them that it should be finished.

Just in passing I might say that those people are not served with either a highway or a railway. There is a section of people there who have been there for 50 years and they are still 20 to 25 miles from either a railway or a highway. I just wanted to add those few words to the hon. member’s submissions.

**Mr. H.C. Dunfield (Meadow Lake):**

I agree with the member for Redberry that we have a very interesting development in the northern part of the province, from Prince Albert to Prince Rupert, and there is only some 600 miles of gaps that would give us almost a new trans-continental line. Of course, we have worked at that for many

years, trying to get it. I was talking to a member of the Railway Commission in the House of Commons some time ago, and in bringing up this matter again, he said, "There is no hope of any new railroad construction unless you can show that it is in the defence needs of the country." I would like to bring to the attention of the House the thought that our railroads are the very basis of our economic life, and yet we seem to be doing everything possible to cut their throats. They are so important in the life of our country, as consumers of goods, suppliers of employment and transportation for all our own goods; and yet we are doing everything possible, with new forms of air transportation, with our cars and trucks and now, with our great transports to compete with them. I do hope that we will use every resource possible to maintain and strengthen our railroad because no other form of transportation can possibly make up for it.

One of the interesting things of the north is this. Some twenty years or more ago, I met a C.P.R. engineer who had come down from Athabasca Lake by dog-team to Meadow Lake, and he was even then scouting a road across the far north of the western provinces. He told me at that time that a road from Stewart's Inlet to Churchill would be the shortest route across the continent (that is, railroad route) by 3½-days' time; and that some day in the future it would be built.

I agree very much with the sentiments of the hon. member for Redberry.

**Hon. J.H. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural Resources):**

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the privilege of saying just a few words on this resolution.

We had a lot of railway construction going on in the province in the late 'twenties, and then all of a sudden it came to a very sudden stop; and there are a lot of obvious gaps. I know it will be difficult to persuade the railways to complete some of those. I would like to mention one or two others.

Going through my constituency are two branch lines of the C.N.R. One from Melfort, cutting through my constituency, terminates at Carrot River; the other from Crooked River goes through my constituency for its whole length until it terminates at Arborfield. Obviously, when you look at the map, an extension of one of these lines or a connection of the two of them, and then an extension to The Pas, would give to a lot of that country good access to the Hudson Bay railway. I think that is one that should certainly not be forgotten.

There is, of course, the other possibility. The C.P.R. is now at Gronlid and at Nipawin, and if the C.N.R. would not do the job it might be possible to talk to the C.P.R. about putting a connection through to The Pas in a direct line off C.P.R. lines into the Hudson Bay railway – from the C.P.R. in the Nipawin-Tisdale area.

I would also like to mention the question of extension of railways into some areas of the north. It may be that we will have to wait until there is good reason; but I don't think we should wait too long. I don't think the railways will build too fast even though we do put pressure on them. There are two places in the north where I think rail transportation would certainly be of assistance in developing the area. I don't think there

**April 1, 1954**

is much risk about the ultimate use of a line if it were constructed to Lac la Ronge. The area north of Lac la Ronge is in the pre-Cambrian and is a mineralized area, and there are ore deposits in that area which might prove to make mines, provided transportation was closer to them. The other area is the northwest corner. Perhaps the member from Meadow Lake mentioned it. That is, the question of extension either from Big River or from Meadow Lake into the Buffalo Narrow area.

Transportation will not solve all the problems of these areas, but if the people there are going to make full use of the resources of the areas they must have transportation. We still haven't got to the place where I think we can bank altogether on road transportation. Rail has still a part to play.

I am very pleased to see this resolution urging that this be brought again to the attention of the Board of Transportation Commissioners and of the Railways, and I certainly will support the motion.

**Mr. A.L.S. Brown (Bengough):**

Mr. Speaker, you have heard from the northwest, the northeast and the southeast, and you might as well hear from the southwest and have the circle complete.

This is a problem that is not peculiar to any one particular section of the province of Saskatchewan. In the vicinity in which I live there are four uncompleted gaps of railway, sections which started, as the Minister of Natural Resources indicated, in the 'twenties and came to an abrupt end about 1929. There is the gap between Big Beaver and Minton, the gap between Mankota and Valmarie, the gap between Willow Bunch and Assiniboia, and the gap between Cardross and Mitchellton. I realize that those names may mean nothing to this Legislature, but they do indicate that there is a problem of extending the services to those people in those respective areas by virtue of the fact that these gaps have been uncompleted.

These uncompleted gaps have meant that there has been a greater length of haul of the freight and the express going out of these areas, resulting in an increase in cost to the consumer of the goods which are brought in, and an increase in cost to the producer of the goods which are brought in, and an increase in cost to the producer of the goods which are shipped out. It has further resulted in the point where, today, we are seeing the services, even meager as they were, being curtailed on these lines. I do not know whether we have any in the category to which the member for Redberry referred, where they have service once a month, but I do know of one or two lines on which they have tri-monthly service; they go down one month and try to get back the next, with the net result that it has been an inconvenience and a detriment to the people living in these areas. What is possibly more important has been the fact that the lack of service on the part of the railway has forced the necessity of us, as a province, and ourselves, as local communities, spending a greater amount of our wealth on our roads and highways for the purpose of taking care of the transportation needs which might have been better served by these railways if they had been in a position to provide the services.

I think you will note from this resolution that the member is also asking for greater use to be made of the existing lines for the transportation needs of the people living in the respective communities. I suggested, a moment or two ago, that we are seeing curtailment of these services, and when I think of the lack of services provided and the curtailment of those present

services, it indicates to me that we are not making the proper use of the railways as an integral part of the transportation needs of this province. Unless we are prepared, and unless the railway as a company is prepared, to offer and provide improved services over that which they have provided in the past, I am afraid we are going to see in this province, in particular, with our scattered population, a transportation system that is neither integrated nor does it meet our economic needs, even though we extend our highways to the point much beyond where they are at the present time. I think the onus is upon those who have been by special concession given the right to build these railways, that they continue to extend their services and at least maintain those that they are presently providing.

**Hon. C.C. Williams (Minister of Labour):**

Mr. Speaker, some of the statements that have been made remind me something of the man who goes into the restaurant, unwraps his own sandwich, orders a cup of coffee and then calls the head waiter over to complain because the music isn't on. Some of the branch lines referred to are in the same position as some of the provincial bus lines – they don't operate at a profit, and they may be on a weekly service on these lines, or tri-weekly, or tri-monthly, or, as the member for Redberry (Mr. Zipchen) says, once a month. That is all the traffic that there is offering on those particular lines, and there is not very much use running trains in there any oftener, running up and down with empty boxcars or empty coaches. It is an expensive business.

However, I know that we all would like to see all communities taken care of regardless of whether they are isolated or not; but as to whether or not any railway will build into the points that have been mentioned today, I doubt it very much. Certainly private enterprise would never build in because they would never get any return. It would be a total loss from the day the line was opened; not a total loss, but I would say a very heaving loss from the day the line was opened. It is possible the road owned by the Government of Canada may build some of these roads. It is quite possible and, I think, probable that lines will be built in that will assure the road of a fair amount of traffic. I am referring at the moment to the one that goes up into Lynn Lake, a rich ore deposit north of Flin Flon, but I don't know exactly where it is. However, I have my doubts whether or not railways will go in just to fill up gaps. That, I think, would be most uneconomic. That's all I have to say on the subject, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Mr. Speaker, as seconder of the motion, I want to say just a word or two. I am very well acquainted with the situation that the hon. member for Redberry pointed out, as well as the member for Meadow Lake, but I think there are a few things that we must bear in mind when we are thinking about our railroad problem. One is that I don't think that the gaps in the northwest Saskatchewan were by accident altogether. Those gaps, when you look at it from a trading standpoint, are almost obvious. I have good reason to believe that the city of Edmonton and the influence of the city of Edmonton and the people in business there, have a good deal to do with the discontinuance of the railroad up into the northwestern part, up beyond St. Walburg, Frenchman's Butte, on into the Cold Lake area. If that was completed it would automatically funnel a great deal of trade through into North Battleford, in the way of cattle and various other things, that now is being taken down into Edmonton, and there seems an obvious reason that that particular line was not continued.

**April 1, 1954**

I don't want to go into that, but there is another matter to consider. I think what the hon. Minister of Labour has said is very apropos, and when we are discussing the extension of railway lines, we should remember that we are asking for continued service when we are apparently not in a position to use it adequately. The saw cuts both ways, Mr. Speaker. The man going to the restaurant with a sandwich and ordering a cup of coffee might appear a bit ridiculous, but when steak is \$3.50 and it could be sold for probably \$1.50, I think he may have a good excuse for walking in with his modest sandwich. It seems a bit ridiculous in this day and age, to be going along the highway and seeing the traffic that belongs to the railroad companies and should be so routed. It seems a bit ridiculous for us to be subsidizing railroads in this country and, at the same time, building roads that cost millions of dollars throughout the country and further subsidizing the trucking industry. It is like taking it out of one pocket, putting it in another, then taking it out of both pockets and throwing the money away.

That is a problem I think we are going to have to face, and I think that a further recommendation to the Board of Transport should be that a further effort be made to introduce more flexibility to meet obvious situations throughout the country so that they can claim these traffic loads that rightly belong to them and meet the competition and take those loads off the highways that we cannot bear out here in western Canada. That's all I have to say, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. J.W. Berezowsky (Cumberland):**

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a few words in connecting with this matter, because I think probably they have been left out. I thought perhaps somebody else would cover them.

In looking over the map of railways in Saskatchewan, I find that, in many cases, these gaps are costing the people of the west considerable money. For example, I am thinking of the Hudson Bay route to Churchill. If some of these gaps were completed, much of the freight, incoming and outgoing, could be diverted to the Churchill route, which would mean less cost to the producers and consumers of this province. That is one thing. What I am trying to say there is that it seems that some of the railways as they have been planned, and because the gaps have not been completed, are causing freight to move into eastern Canada instead of gradually being diverted into the area and route where it would cost us less money.

Another point that I would like to make is that we have in Saskatchewan, as we have in other parts of Canada, large natural resources. A lot of these resources, such as timber, are to some extent going to waste because they are not accessible. Anybody interested in natural resources knows that it is a profitable business for the railways. If a railway were built across the north and some of those gaps completed, there would be a steady movement of freight, and the money is there for the railway companies.

That is another reason why I think we should support the motion – and I think probably everybody will be supporting the motion; but the railway companies apparently have a policy that unless they can go into a field where there is a tremendous resource that they can keep shipping out from one particular spot, then they are not interested. The history has



apparently changed, the ideas have changed. I can only think of something I mentioned sometime back – I think it was last year – where they had built a railway 300 miles into Labrador, into that area, that is the Labrador boundary between Quebec, where they have tremendous iron ore deposits. The natural resource is there all in one spot and the railway company can afford to build a 300 mile line.

I think that the money is here also in these gaps, but not to the same extent, and probably, instead of building the railways where they are needed to serve the people of Canada, the railways are building into those areas where they can make huge profits. I think we should speak our minds and tell the people who are responsible, and we feel that we should be given the necessary consideration.

I think that is all that I wanted to add to the discussion, Mr. Speaker.

The question being put, it was agreed to unanimously.

### **REMOVAL OF TRADE BARRIERS**

The House resumed from Thursday, March 11, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Erb re removal of Trade Barriers:

“That this Assembly respectfully requests the Government of Canada to take immediate steps to free trade channels by removal of all restrictive trade policies such as tariffs and anti-dumping duties which contribute, directly or indirectly, to the accumulation of alarming surpluses of agricultural commodities, in order that these commodities may move to those areas of the world which urgently need them.”

**Mr. A.H. McDonald (Moosomin):**

Mr. Speaker, when I prepared a few lines to say in regard to this motion it was about three weeks ago, and I had considerable prepared; but as we have had eight speakers this morning in a matter of 30 minutes, I think maybe I will just deal with the first page of my notes.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that, in my opinion at least, this is a very strange motion to be moved in this House by a member of the C.C.F. Party in view of their record in Ottawa when the Federal Government were dealing with anti-dumping legislation in this present session, and I will be dealing with that a little later on.

I believe that we, as western Canadians regardless of what political party we happen to belong to, are naturally free traders, I think the reason for that is that the majority of our produce from western Canada is sold on the free market, and we would like to have the privilege of buying a goodly portion of our necessities of life also from a free market. Nevertheless, I think we must realize that in Canada we

**April 1, 1954**

have certain industries which, by their very nature, demand some sort of protection, and I cannot help but think of the textile industries in eastern Canada, I am sure all members who happened to be in the Crown Corporations Committee when we were discussing the woollen mill will remember the words of the Provincial Treasurer at that time when he referred to the difficulties of the woollen mills and told us at that time that the woollen industry and the textile industry of Canada as a whole were facing the products of cheap labour from Japan. If I remember correctly, he informed us that Japanese labour was about nine cents an hour, and I am sure that we don't want our employees in the factories of eastern Canada to work for nine cents an hour. First of all, it is not a living wage for them, and it will not provide them with the necessary money to buy the foodstuffs which we produce here in the west.

On that topic, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read from the 'Leader-Post' of Friday, January 29th, dealing with a radio address made by Mr. Walter Tucker when he was talking about this anti-dumping legislation which was being discussed in Ottawa just prior to this date;

"Before the Bill was brought in the Government had assured us that they were as strongly against increased protection as ever and that this measure was designed to meet a weakness in the law whereby foreign textile mills, and particularly Japan and United States textile mills, could dump the end-of-season surpluses of textile goods into Canada at below cost of production and by doing so put our Canadian textile plants out of business. They could do this so-called dumping as long as they were selling such end-of-season surpluses at the same price in the exporting countries. To meet this situation the amendment provided that a special value for duty purposes based upon the average selling price for the previous six months in the exporting countries could be set. The argument that this was fair to those engaged in the textile industry was so convincing that we found all other parties in the House, Progressive Conservative, Social Credit, and C.C.F. were prepared to accept the Bill."

That is the record of the different political parties in Ottawa and I have taken the trouble to dig up the Hansards in regard to debate on this motion at Ottawa. I am not going to take the time of the House to read all the debates, but I am going to read two short paragraphs, one from Mr. Coldwell's remarks and one from Mr. Solon Low's to point out the attitude of these two different political parties on this question when the debate was held in Ottawa.

First I want to quote from Mr. Coldwell's speech. This is in Hansard, December 10, 1953, page 805. Mr. Coldwell said this:

"Mr. Speaker, insofar as this measure is intended to prevent unfair practices we will of course support it. We realize that at the present time great pressure is being brought on members of the House, particularly by working men

and women who are feeling the impact of the present conditions, to do something to prevent unfair practices and the onset of difficulties for this. With that point of view we have every sympathy and we are prepared to go along with other members of the House in endeavouring to do everything we can to rectify such a situation.”

Then again, under the same date, on page 809 we have the remarks of Mr. Solon Low when he said this:

“I do support this principle of the Bill because, regardless of the quality of some of the producers of textiles to whom my hon. friend from Rosetown-Biggarr referred, if we are going to have a textile industry in Canada, and if it is going to be of any value to this country, it will have to be protected. We might as well face it. What we have got to decide is whether we want the textile industry here. We also have to broaden our minds about it and decide whether we are going to have several other industries in this country which are struggling – one of which is the sugar industry – and some others I have mentioned.”

Mr. Speaker, I can agree both with the remarks of Mr. Coldwell and the remarks of Mr. Solon Low on this topic because I think all hon. members realize that, if we are going to have certain industries in this country – and the textile industry is one of them in the east and the sugar industry in the west – then they must have some protection in order to survive and compete with the product of cheap labour in other countries where the standard of living is not quite so high as it is in Canada.

I was rather hoping that the mover of the motion would have been in his place today, because it is my intention to move an amendment to the original motion. Before I do that, however, I just want to refer to something the Premier said a few days ago, when we were debating the wheat issue and the marketing problem in western Canada, and I can recall one statement he made and I think I have it word for word:

“We are not going to sell our wheat at fire-sale prices, and we are certainly not going to dump it.”

I agree with the Premier on that, and I will agree that we should not have free trade in the country to the point where, for instance, the United States now having a surplus of wheat are giving this wheat to many countries of the world as a gift. I wonder how the farmers of western Canada would feel if the United States gave a quantity of wheat to our industrial workers in the east. I don't think it is free trade that we want, though probably we would, if we could have free trade all over the world; but when we have not, when we are living in a world of protection, I believe that all our people of Canada must have a certain amount of protection. I would like to say now that I believe our government in Ottawa has gone a long way in decreasing barriers and anti-dumping duties, not only in Canada, but throughout the world due

**April 1, 1954**

to their activities through conferences that have been held throughout the world, a good many of which have been held in England.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I do want to move, seconded by Mr. Lopton:

“That the words ‘anti-dumping duties’ in the third line be deleted.”

I believe that, if the House would give this their consideration all hon. members do support it. As I said, I certainly stand for free trade as far as it is humanly possible for us to go in that direction, but as far as anti-dumping legislation is concerned, I am afraid that it would be detrimental to all the people of Canada if we were to pull off all anti-dumping legislation and allow countries to dump the product of cheap labour on the markets of Canada. Therefore, I sincerely hope that members on both sides of the House will give serious consideration to this amendment.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The debate is now on the amendment.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):**

Mr. Speaker, the member for Moosomin referred to the fact that the mover of the resolution was out of the House this afternoon, and as I have the privilege of seconding the motion and have not so far spoken to it, I would like to take this opportunity of saying a word or two. However, in view of the fact that he has moved his amendment, I will attempt to confine my remarks to the amendment which he has moved which would strike out the words ‘anti-dumping duties’ in the resolution and leave the resolution where it would pass for simply the removal of those policies such as tariffs and makes no reference to anti-dumping duty.

I cannot agree with my friend from Moosomin that the removal of these words would place this resolution in a position in which we could all support it. I rather think that the removal of those words would indeed weaken the sentiments which were expressed in the resolution. I think, if he would read the resolution carefully, he would realize that what is asked for in this resolution does not necessarily have any relationship to the case which he raised in respect to the textile industry. In this we are asking the removal of those trade policies, such as tariffs and anti-dumping duties “which contribute directly or indirectly to the surpluses of agricultural commodities.” It is those tariffs and anti-dumping duties which are resulting in the accumulation of these agricultural surpluses that we are asking to be removed. It is anti-dumping duties such as have been imposed against British imports into this country, British imports which would not only give us an opportunity to sell our agricultural products in Great Britain, but at the same time, would be providing the necessary means of production for those agricultural products in this country. It is those types of anti-dumping duties and that type anti-dumping duty legislation to which we here in western Canada are opposed, because we feel that it has been policies such as anti-dumping duties imposed against goods of that type that have resulted in the alarming surpluses of agricultural products in this country.

I think we appreciate, particularly after discussion which has taken place in this House, that there are surpluses and mounting

surpluses, particularly in respect to grain, in western Canada. We feel (I think justifiably so) that if we remove the anti-dumping duties on these types of goods, it would create conditions by which there could be freer exchange of goods which we here in western Canada need and of the products which we here in western Canada produce go to those countries.

I don't think we could logically argue that the imposition of the anti-dumping duties to which my friend referred (and which, it is true, the C.C.F. members at Ottawa supported with the request of certain limitations to those anti-dumping duty laws), would have any great effect upon the surpluses which we are producing in this country. I think that, in view of agreements which have been entered into in the last few days between Japan and the Canadian government with respect to the sale of wheat and the fact that we have had greater sales of wheat to that country in the last year than we have had in the immediately preceding few years, indicate that that particular type of anti-dumping duty legislation has not been a detriment to the sale of our agricultural products, which is certainly not true with respect to many other anti-dumping duties. And it is that type of duties that we are asking, in this resolution, to be removed. For that reason, I cannot support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Moosomin.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):**

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments in regard to the suggestion that the words 'anti-dumping duty' should be deleted.

I think we have been making the mistake in Saskatchewan of going on record as even suggesting that limited anti-dumping duties are a good thing. I think the members at Ottawa supported the anti-dumping duties as an emergency measure for a short-term period against surplus goods from the United States, some of those that were not readily saleable there and were outmoded. To that extent, and as a temporary means, they may have had some justification. But I don't think we should go on record as putting ourselves in favour of anti-dumping duties. If we are, then I would suggest that we should also have the anti-dumping duty on New Zealand butter that comes into Canada occasionally.

I think the thing that inspires most of us in this regard is the fact that there has been no tariff protection as far as agricultural commodities are concerned. Still vegetable oil products find their way into Canada to go into the manufacture of margarine to sell in competition with our dairy products., and those products come in free; and still New Zealand butter can come in free in competition with our butter, and we find now that we cannot sell our dairy products to the United States because of that arrangement under which we endeavour to discourage trade by means of tariffs, whether it is temporary as an anti-dumping duty, or what-have-you. I am definitely against tariffs either in the form of anti-dumping duties or anything else. But, before we can have a solution to the problem, it certainly will take many nations by agreement deciding that surplus commodities, either shirts from Japan or shirts from the United States or Canada, should go to countries where they need shirts and not to countries where they already have a huge quantity of shirts.

Orthodox trade practices have developed these peculiar situations, so the solution to the problem lies in agreement between many nations. It is for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that I suggest to the House and deplore the fact that the International Commodity Exchange idea has been

**April 1, 1954**

turned down by our Canadian government at Ottawa. That definitely was a step in the right direction and would have paved a way eventually for the removal of tariff trade barriers.

I regret, too, that this motion does not make any mention of currency barriers. Tariff barriers are almost an outmoded instrument by which people or nations, in their competitive struggle for markets, attempt to keep out a competitor's goods. Currency barriers are just as effective, and I thought some mention should have been made in that regard, too; and again, to solve that problem, agreement between many anti-dumping duties as an intermediate measure, I think is a retrograde step. It certainly is as far as a province like Saskatchewan is concerned, where we have exportable agricultural commodities in huge quantities that want to find their way to the world market. I don't think there is any harm in the warning being in there.

We know that anti-dumping duties were used against British cars. We are trying to develop two-way trade with Britain, and I never was one who believed that we could solve our problems by buying enough from Britain to enable her to buy all our wheat. It was just ridiculous on the surface. It could not be accomplished in finality, because Britain was bound to buy so much more from us than we would ever buy from her. Again, why should we be expected to buy huge quantities of agricultural machinery that we are already making in Canada suited to our needs. There were certain things, tools and such, that we could have bought. We could have bought cars, too, that would have helped to some extent. But surely it was not the complete solution. We are travelling along on the false notion that we can trade amongst a few select nations, between ourselves and Britain and Europe, ignoring entirely the Asiatic countries and the areas where there is a huge population and a ready market for many of our manufactured goods and, more particularly, our food commodities.

I do not see anything wrong with the wording being in there. At least it puts us on record in western Canada; our historic attitude is re-affirmed that we don't believe in tariffs of any kind, Mr. Speaker. For those reason I would oppose the amendment.

**Mr. Loptson (Leader of the Opposition):**

Mr. Speaker, we in Saskatchewan particularly are naturally free traders since we have to export all our goods to the outside world, particularly as the cities of Saskatchewan have no industry to extend the consumption of our products, and we have no reason to have a tariff to protect what is produced by industrial labour. But anti-dumping duty can be just as injurious to us as it is to the manufacturing industry. You open the shores to take care of butter; you can open the boundaries to the south to vegetables, to pork and other agricultural products that may come over the line from the United States and undersell our commodities here. There have been times when they have been much cheaper in the United States than they have been here. Now, if you want to take the dumping duty out, you will have to assume the responsibility of the consequences that they may have on our basic producer, that is, the farmer. As far as the industrial end of it is concerned, they can dump all the stuff in here than my hon. friend likes them to dump in, and take the consequences of the Party's future in eastern Canada.

That is about all I want to say. If the C.C.F. want to vote against this amendment, it is all well and good. We have given them our stand, and I believe the anti-dumping duty is just as much a concern of the agriculturist here in Saskatchewan as it is of the manufacturer in eastern Canada.

**Mr. Danielson (Arm River):**

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take up very much of the time of this House; but there is something I would like to draw attention to and it is that this anti-dumping provision seems to be a little bit misunderstood. I do not think there is a country in the world, today, without anti-dumping legislation on their statute books. It is not operating at all times, by any means. It only comes into operation when goods come in to flood the country receiving the imports, and if it is sold in that country at less than the home product sells for. That is the only time that the importing nation uses that provision. But that is not altogether the case at the present time, and I think that is the reason, as far as I can see, why this Bill that has been mentioned was put through the House of Commons.

I see here that Mr. Fleming – I think we have all heard about Mr. Fleming, a very prominent Conservative member from eastern Canada. As quoted in Hansard, page 801, December 10, 1953, he said this:

“Whenever any duty ad valorem is imposed on any goods imported into Canada, the value for duty shall be the fair market value of such or the like goods when sold for home consumption in the ordinary course of trade under fully competitive conditions, in like quantities and under comparable conditions of sale at the time when and place whence such goods were exported by the vendor abroad to the purchaser in Canada; or, except as otherwise provided in this Act, the price at which the goods were sold by the vendor abroad to the purchaser in Canada, exclusive of all charges thereon after their shipment from the place whence exported direct to Canada, whichever may be the greater.”

Now that is one thing. He goes on later, and says this:

“When neither the fair market value nor the equivalent of such value can be ascertained, the value for duty shall be the actual cost of production of similar goods at date of shipment to Canada, plus a reasonable addition for administration, selling cost and profit.”

Then he goes on again, later in this speech, and says:

“The question as to the meaning of the word ‘fair’ in the phrase ‘fair market value’ which appears in section 35(1) of the Customs Act, and section 6(1) of the Customs Tariff Act, has been considered. There is an understandable feeling that to be ‘fair’ a ‘fair market value’ should represent at least the cost of production of the goods with a reasonable addition for administrative expense, selling cost and profit. In the opinion of the Department of Justice, to whom this question was referred, a ‘fair market value’ may bear no necessary relationship to production cost. A market value which is consistent, and not the result of temporary panic selling under extraordinary

**April 1, 1954**

circumstances, may be a 'fair market value' within the meaning of sections 35(1) and 6(1) although such value may be less than the production cost."

This Bill was an Act passed temporarily (I think that was the intention of the House) to meet a particular problem. There is always the danger, of course, when you have legislation of this kind, that it may be used in cases where it was never intended to be used by the House of Commons when it was passed. It may be extended, and I think perhaps we are facing that problem now; but so far as dumping duties are concerned, the anti-dumping duty Act is on the statute books of Canada and on the statute books of every nation that has any industrial development at all; and it is only used under special circumstances.

I would like to say that I do not think this particular circumstance, or this particular Bill which we have reference to, and which probably was the reason for this resolution, has any real relationship to the anti-dumping duty provisions of Canada at the present time. It has not changed them one iota; they are still there. They will still be there when this Bill No. 29 is taken off the statute books, if it is taken off.

Three is another thing, Mr. Speaker. I am not a person who favors tariffs or impositions, because we in western Canada have probably suffered more from the policy of protection than any other part of Canada. We who came here in the early days have had more experience, perhaps, in regard to that than the younger generation has had during the last 10 or 15 years because, in that period, there has been a gradual lowering of the tariffs particularly on goods that you and I as farmers must buy, Mr. Speaker. For that reason perhaps, we are not suffering to any extent today, compared to what we did in days gone by. I am not talking politics. This is a matter of history. But today it is a matter that neither the member for Gravelbourg (Mr. E.H. Walker) or I have anything to do about. However, as the member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) has said, I do not think this nation can survive without anti-dumping legislation so far as the industrial part of the country is concerned, and it is getting to be a more important part of our national life every year. The time has come, indeed it is now past when the agricultural production of Canada tops the list. The industrial production of Canada as a whole now is of greater value than the agricultural production. We are second in regard to this matter, and I do not think that we can take very great exception when we know that there are millions and millions of families today who are depending for their work and welfare on industrial plants throughout the nation. There are millions of them; but these duties should be used with moderation and with extreme care.

I was rather surprised when the member for Milestone (Mr. Erb) moved this resolution, and I said to my friend here, "This is a new breed of C.C.F." We have, of course, at election time heard talk about tariffs and all that, blaming the Government of the day in the Federal House for the tariff protection that is accorded; but I have not seen or heard Mr. Coldwell or any of his followers in the House of Commons, taking a decided stand against protection for the industrial part of Canada. I have not heard that, and it is certainly clear that, so far as this Bill 29 is concerned, which probably is the reason for this resolution, he certainly did not take any exception of that Bill when it passed through the House. He guarded himself very cautiously and said he hoped it would not be of very long duration and that it would be used with discretion – and I think that is quite proper. Mr. Tucker did the same thing. He said he would



like to see it confined to one year. However, that was not done. The Government would not consider that, and there may be reasons why they could not. So I see no reason why we should mix this resolution up with the anti-dumping clauses in the tariff structure of Canada. They are there; this won't take them out, because no nation I know of is without that particular safeguard in their customs tariffs. That is all I have to say, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Can the member for Moosomin close the debate on the amendment?

**Mr. Speaker:** — No. The mover of an amendment has no right of reply, closing the debate on an amendment.

The question being put on the proposed amendment, it was negatived on recorded division by 28 votes against 11.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The debate is now on the main motion moved by Mr. Erb.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Mr. Speaker, speaking on the main motion, it would appear that my hon. friends on the other side of the House have moved this motion for one purpose and one purpose only, and that is to try to play politics. I could vote for the motion as it is if it were not for the danger that might befall our agricultural industry, as I mentioned before. So, in order to prove their sincerity, I want to move another amendment in the form of an addition to the motion. Without any further words about it, I move, seconded by Mr. Danielson:

That the following words be added to the motion:

“And that this Assembly respectfully requests the C.C.F. Members of Parliament move the above motion in the House of Commons.”

Now we will see how sincere they are.

**Mr. Speaker:** — This is not a proper amendment, and it is out of order.

**Premier Douglas:** — This Assembly can only express its opinion. This Assembly has no authority to start suggesting to any particular Party or any particular group of members in the House what they ought to do. All this Assembly can do is express its opinion on any given issue. The motion here expresses an opinion and requests the Government of Canada to do certain things. I do not think the Assembly can exceed its authority by starting to issue instructions to members of Parliament. We are not suggesting what the Liberal members should do, or the C.C.F. members. What we are suggesting is that the members of this Assembly express their opinion, and apparently the gentlemen opposite are reluctant to do so.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I have ruled this amendment out of order.

**Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek):**

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I thought the Assembly had passed motions before urging the western members to take a stand. I haven't anything on record, but

**April 1, 1954**

I thought we have done that before – urged our western members to take a stand on a particular issue, by resolution in this House.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order. We can't debate further on this. I have made my ruling.

**Mr. Loptson:** — We can challenge your ruling.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Absolutely, yes.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Well, we challenge your ruling, and we will have a standing recorded vote on it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The Clerk has just drawn to my attention that you cannot use the word 'challenge'; you can appeal from my ruling.

**Mr. Loptson:** — We appeal then, okay.

The question being put by Mr. Speaker: "Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained? – it was agreed to, on recorded division, by 31 votes against 10.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask the hon. member for Bengough (Mr. A.L.S. Brown) one question. I did not want to interrupt him when he was speaking earlier . . .

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I want to point out that the hon. member for Bengough is not on his feet, and he cannot be asked a question.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — He can't get up and answer it, having already spoken in this debate.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — I don't know what the question was . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — This motion looks like some of the questions.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Is the House ready for the question?

The question being put on the motion of Mr. Erb, it was agreed to unanimously, by voice vote.

### **BOND ISSUE ANNOUNCED**

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — I announced some days ago that, at 12 o'clock today, we were calling for tenders on the basis of 3¼ per cent bonds payable in 1972. I have just opened the tenders from six syndicates representing 45 investment dealers and banking groups in Canada. Yesterday morning, I wired to ask for alternative bids on the basis of 3¼ per cent coupons, and we have received some very excellent

bids. The bond has been awarded to a firm headed by Harris and Partners, Toronto, at a price of 97.287 on the basis of 3¼ per cent coupons, which gives a cost to the province of 3.44. This, Mr. Speaker, is the lowest rate at which the Dominion Government, the Canadian National Railway or any province of Canada has been able to borrow money, since 1950.

I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the investors and investment dealers for these wonderful bids. It overwhelms me, I might say, Mr. Speaker; it is far beyond what we anticipated receiving. I think, too, it is a sign of the confidence the investing public has in Saskatchewan.

## HOUSING

The House resumed from Thursday, March 18, the adjourned debate on the motion of Mrs. Cooper respecting more adequate housing for residents of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Mr. Speaker, I had intended to make a fairly extensive speech on this particular motion, but in view of the fact that we debated a similar motion here two years ago, I don't think that will be necessary. The motion on that previous occasion was moved by the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Heming), and he was more moderate in his demands for houses than the hon. Junior member for Regina (Mrs. Cooper) in the resolution before us. In view of the circumstances surrounding the hon. member in the recent death of her father, I want to disregard my notes at this time. I will probably use them at a later date as no doubt a similar motion will be moved another year.

I want to take the main points in the motion. In the first place, the motion is asking for an increase in the price of houses to be built under the National Housing scheme.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — An increase?

**Mr. Loptson:** — Yes, increasing it from \$8,000, as I understand it is now, to \$12,000.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — That has been done; \$12,800 is now the price.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Well then, the real purpose of the motion is to reduce the interest rate from the customary cost of borrowing money, to 2 per cent. I want to draw your attention to the position of the people who are going to pay this bonus. I think in her speech the hon. member for Regina estimated that this concession in interest would cost the country approximately \$5,000 for a \$12,000 home. I am going to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that these \$12,000 homes for people who have to borrow all the money to obtain it, are not the kind of homes that most of the people who will pay that bonus live in. People in the country, people in the villages, people in the towns — yes — and I say thousands of workers in this city of Regina do not live in \$12,000 houses. They live in houses that are only worth about \$4,000, and this resolution is asking all these

**April 1, 1954**

people to contribute their share to bonus the \$12,000 houses for the few lucky ones who would get the \$5,000 per house . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Would the member mind explaining how they will be bonusing it? In what way?

**Mr. Loptson:** — They will be bonusing it through taxes. They pay their share of the bonus in the difference between 2 per cent and what the money costs. Ordinarily it would cost 5½ per cent, but the resolution says it should be loaned for these houses for only 2 per cent. That means that somebody is going to pay the difference of 3½ per cent. I haven't figured out what the bonus comes to, but according to the mover of the resolution it would amount to about \$5,000 by the time the house was paid for.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that you and I have never lived in a \$12,000 house, and I doubt if any member of this side of the House lives in a \$12,000 house. I don't know how many of the 'aristocrats' on the other side of this House have, but I guess they are all looking for a \$12,000 house and they are not prepared to pay for it themselves. I have nothing against people living in \$12,000 houses; they can live in \$50,000 houses. But I say it is not up to my children or grandchildren to pay a bonus on these houses for them. Let them pay for it themselves.

I see in this motion that the low income tax man is absolutely forgotten; and the man who wants to build his own house, and wants two or three thousand dollars to put into it, he cannot borrow any money. As I understand it, the minimum under the National Housing scheme is about \$8,000. And I want to tell you something, Mr. Speaker; it may be sooner than we wish that these \$12,000 houses of today may be the \$8,000 houses of tomorrow. These houses are something like our cars; not only will they depreciate in value, but economic conditions will depreciate their value as well.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Have you no faith in your system?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Loptson:** — I have no faith as long as this Government is in power, and piling taxes on the farmers. Agriculture is the basis of the economy of this province, and if the city worker is going to insist on a higher income than the basic producer is getting, then he just isn't going to get it; and there isn't any worker who can maintain a \$12,000 house and make payments on it unless he is earning a fair-sized salary. I venture to say that a man who can afford to make the payments on a \$12,000 house, today, is not the man who is doing pick-and-shovel work in Regina. He is not the man who is driving nails, through the summer, and is out of work in the winter. He is not the man who is climbing the telephone poles; nor is he the man who is doing the chore jobs of this city. It is the man who is drawing a big salary who can afford this kind of house. The upkeep of them alone is high; and I say it is about time that we helped the people who are doing this spade-work in our economy, and assist the man who is prepared to build himself a home at a reasonable cost, and help him to pay for it. I am going to make a suggestion as to the homes that I think this Government and the National Housing scheme should assist in.

I took the trouble of getting a picture of a cottage here in Regina, built by a man almost as old as I am. He built it after hours in the summer time. Instead of playing golf or going fishing, he goes and drives nails in his house. Here it is – and this house is typical of the houses in which 50 per cent of our people of Saskatchewan are living. It is as good as the one I was raised in. I was going to have a picture of the story-and-a-half house which would not cost over \$3,500 . . .

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Aw, phooey!

**Mr. Loptson:** — . . . that I was raised in, I raised my children in, my grandchildren are being raised in it; and they are asked to bonus the aristocrats so that they can live in a \$12,000 house. I will send this picture over to my hon. friend. To appreciate this cottage you would have to go inside it, because it is a small mansion. There is just about as much room in this little cottage as there would be in one of those \$12,000 houses. The only difference is that it has not got running water; it hasn't got sewerage. Well, I never had running water and I never had sewerage . . .

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — You didn't live in the city.

**Mr. Loptson:** — That is exactly it; but I was one of those who milked the cows and tilled the fields so that you could have the city. It is just about time, Mr. Speaker, that we were informing the basic producer of what is going on here. This Government is spending millions and millions of dollars to build copious buildings in the city, but they cannot spend a few thousand dollars on the main market roads. They cannot supply the farmer with his electric hook-up; the city dweller gets that for nothing, whereas the poor farmer has to pay \$500 or \$600 to get hooked-up with electric lights. And then I don't know what the rates are. Maybe they are the same; maybe they are not. I am going to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is about time the people of this province woke up, and I am going to say the people of Canada should look into this housing scheme, even the National Housing policies. There isn't a public scheme in Canada where money is advanced that is going to lose as much money as this housing scheme. I know buildings, and I know some of these houses that are being built, approved by the cities, approved by the Government, approved by even the Federal Government, at a value of \$12,000, and I would not give you \$8,000 for them today – and what are they going to be worth if we have a recession?

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, what did he say the houses were valued at?

**Mr. Loptson:** — Value? It isn't their value; it is what they are worth.

**Premier Douglas:** — But what figure did my friend give in terms of value?

**Mr. Loptson:** — I said they were \$12,000 and I wouldn't give you \$8,000 for them, and that is all they are going to be worth sooner than you will like. No, Mr. Speaker. If you are going to keep on taxing the farmer, denying him electric lights at a reasonable figure, making it difficult for him to get his children to school, making it impossible for him to get to town as a result of poor roads, he is going to come into the city to enjoy these fancy houses and lights, and then what is going to become of the cities? You have thousands of farmers who used to be on

**April 1, 1954**

farms, in the city of Regina today, and I venture to say that, when this building boom is over, half of them will be walking the streets looking for a job. It is the farmer who lives on the farm who keeps the economy of the city going.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am going to move an amendment to this motion, and I am going to cut the motion out up to the word "Act".

**Mr. Cameron:** — Will someone inform me where this motion is?

**Premier Douglas:** — Somebody has been playing 'April Fool' with it; you have to look at yesterday's Order Paper.

**Mr. Loptson:** — This amendment is purported to make it possible for those to get money who want to build a home for themselves, and are not particular as to whether they have running water or sewerage; those who are willing to carry their water to the house and their slop out, the same as the people are doing out in the country; and make it possible for them to own their homes, even if their salaries are not very high. So I would move, seconded by Mr. Dunfield (Meadow Lake):

"That all the words after the word 'Act' be deleted, and the following substituted therefore:

The building of four-room, low-cost houses and the inclusion of the value of the labour of the prospective owner be considered a part or all of this cash payment;

And that the Government of Saskatchewan be asked to give consideration to supplying the prospective home owners, resident in Saskatchewan, with building materials at cost through the Saskatchewan Timber Board and Saskatchewan Clay Products."

The reason why I am including the labour is this: — The actual cost of the material of these four-roomed houses is about \$2,000; you can buy it in any lumber yard; and the men doing the labour himself should get credit for that as being part of the value of that house. Now if that man can get the \$2,000 to pay for his material, he can go to the outskirts of this city and build a home for himself . . .

**Mr. Cameron:** — Is this a farm home?

**Mr. Loptson:** — A city home, but there are lots of farm homes even smaller than that . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — In the city of Regina?

**Mr. Loptson:** — It is on the outskirts.

**Premier Douglas:** — It is outside the city of Regina.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Yes, outside the city.

**Premier Douglas:** — I take it that the sanitation laws wouldn't

allow it to be inside the city.

**Mr. Loptson:** — If my hon. friend thinks that everybody has got to be on the inside of the city of Regina, and would have to have running water and sewer, then I would say it is about time that people in the country and in the towns and villages should wonder why they should be paying bonuses for these cities.

**Premier Douglas:** — Nobody asked them to pay a bonus.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Well, they will, according to this resolution.

**Premier Douglas:** — No, no!

**Mr. Loptson:** — And will my hon. friend say that the man in the city is too good to live on the outskirts of the city? Is he so superior to the people out in the country . . .

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — That is ridiculous!

**Mr. Loptson:** — Well, that is exactly what he is implying.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — What kind of a city are you going to build up?

**Mr. Loptson:** — City? Here is a three-roomed house for \$1,500 material.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Biggar and better slums by Loptson.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Of course then, if they are slums, every town and village is slums as far as my hon. friends are concerned. There are hundreds of them around Regina, old ones and new ones; and there are all kinds of houses in this city that you can build — storey-and-a-half houses, three bedrooms, little sitting room and dining room and kitchen, with a basement for around \$3,500 or \$4,000, doing the work yourself.

**Gov't Member:** — Oh, no!

**Mr. Loptson:** — Of course you can't do it if you are going to pay somebody \$1.50 or \$2.00 an hour for sitting around half the time when they are building it. I can go out myself, old as I am, and get a good helper and build one of those house sin less than a week.

**Gov't Member:** — Ah!

**Mr. Loptson:** — My hon. friends says, 'ah' — well, I know because I have done it. When I got married, a friend of mine and I built our first home in two days. We weren't begging the government to assist us in getting a \$12,000 house in those days. It was a shanty, 18 x 24; a mighty comfortable one, too.

And here my friend says they are living in basements at \$90 a month. Why, they could build themselves a place for six-months' rent, if they wanted to do it.

**April 1, 1954**

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is all I am going to say; perhaps someone else wants to say a few words. I want, again, to impress on this House that it is about time this government or any other government helped the fellow who is doing the rough work to build a home for himself, and I don't mean that he needs to have running water any more than I did, and any more than these thousands of people who are living out in the country, and in the villages and towns do. I do not believe they should have modern houses any more than we have out in the country until they can pay for them.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Mr. Speaker, this is the most amazing retrograde suggestion contained in this amendment that I have ever heard uttered by a public man. To have a fine city such as Regina cluttered up with unmodern, unhealthy, unhygienic homes, such as he proposes — I really cannot credit the Leader of the Opposition as being so divested of progressive ideas, or even humane ideas, as to suggest that kind of a solution to our housing problem . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — Aristocrats.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — . . . that exists in this city possibly as bad as anywhere in Canada. I wonder if the hon. member realizes just what health hazards his amendment entails. I, too, was born on a farm, and we had outdoor plumbing . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — You look very healthy.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — . . . although it is modern now. It did not entail a very great health hazard then; but where there is congestion of population such as you have in a crowded city like Regina, to talk of unmodern houses, without sewage disposal in a modern way, simply reveals that you do not know what you are talking about in the light of modern housing.

This is what Dr. Walton, the Health Officer for this city has to say about unmodern homes that exist in the city now. He says:

“Definite dangers to health exist in building non-modern homes in the outlying parts of the city.”

Do you know more about this problem than does the Health Officer of this city? I don't think you do.

**Mr. Loptson:** — You could spread them outside the city.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — . . . To go on, Dr. Walton . . . warned:

**Mr. Loptson:** — You could put them on half-acre lots.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — . . . Regina's medical Health Officer, warned:

“The danger is illustrated by 76 cases of infectious hepatitis, a disease of the liver, reported in 1952. Dr. Walton said these mostly occurred in those parts of the city which are not served by sewer and water.”



He goes on to state:

“The danger of all intestinal infections is greatly increased by non-modern housing in cities. Non-modern housing is no solution to the housing problem in an urban centre.”

The hon. Leader of the Opposition has just revealed his profound ignorance of the problem facing the people in this or any other city of Canada.

“The Medical Health officer reported that housing continued to be a major health problem in Regina. There are far too many families housed in dwelling units which should have never been occupied because they are unmodern.”

**Mr. Cameron:** — They blame you, too.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I would remind this House that the owner of the ‘Leader-Post’ is a millionaire. He owns one of the finest homes in Winnipeg . . .

**Mr. Lopton:** — He paid for it himself, didn’t he?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — . . . And yet his daily paper in this city is advocating unmodern, unhygienic, unhealthy homes for the people of this city. I don’t think that is good enough, and moreover, I don’t think that Mr. Sifton realizes the implications of the editorial policy of the ‘Leader-Post’ of this city.

**Mr. Speaker:** — It being one o’clock, I shall leave this Chair until 3 p.m.

3 o’clock p.m.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Mr. Speaker, before recess I was dealing with the type of housing that the hon. Leader of the Opposition recommended for the people of Saskatchewan in this twentieth century atomic age. He is recommending the unmodern home, which is extremely bad as I have pointed out, and I have given the opinion of the Health Officer of Regina that it is bad for the health and general welfare of the people of any urban centre.

It might be that unmodern housing, where there is a lack of sewage disposal, would not cause serious harm in rural areas, or in smaller communities, but may I assure you, in all seriousness, that it is the unanimous opinion of every health authority on the continent that unmodern homes in an urban area is an extremely bad thing for the health of the people.

Dealing now with another section of the proposed amendment equally as ridiculous as the first section — this may be April Fool’s day, but I do think that the Leader of the Opposition is carrying it too far entirely:

**April 1, 1954**

two sections of the amendment, and neither one has any relevancy whatsoever to the housing situation. When the hon. Leader of the Opposition moves an amendment such as this, and then speaks to it, he demonstrates all the finesse of the big bad wolf posing as the gentle grandmother. The second section: "That the Government of Saskatchewan be asked to give consideration to supplying the prospective home-owners, resident in Saskatchewan, with building materials at cost through the Saskatchewan Timber Board and Saskatchewan Clay Products."

Well, this conforms to his attitude regarding a statement that he made not long ago, when he advocated practical Socialism and now he is advocating that the Timber Board go into the retail business . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — They are in it.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — . . . Wait until the Saskatoon 'Star-Phoenix' gets hold of this. He is advocating that we put all the lumber merchants out of business in this province and I presume, since he is dealing with building supplies, that the electric suppliers and the plumbing men and the hardware stores will all be put out of business by the Saskatchewan Timber Board.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Mr. Dunfield here isn't worrying.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — . . . My goodness, you do stick your neck out, just as you did not a matter which I am referring to the House now. I am quoting from the Saskatoon 'Star-Phoenix':

"Practical Socialism favoured by Loptson. Asmundur (Minty) Loptson, Leader of the Liberal Opposition in the Saskatchewan Legislature, stunned members of the Legislative Crown Corporations Committee, Tuesday, by speaking in favor of practical Socialism in connection with the Government Power utility in which he recommended that the cities of this province subsidize all the rest of Saskatchewan in providing cheap electricity."

And then he was assailed by his friends and by the Saskatoon 'Star-Phoenix' editorially, and this appears as an editorial comment:

"For Mr. Loptson was clearly advocating that the Government – the Saskatchewan Power Corporation – should take over electrical distribution facilities throughout the province. The Liberal leader described this as a policy of practical socialism."

But a couple of days afterwards, this appeared in the Saskatoon 'Star-Phoenix':

"'Minty' only fooling. Asmundur" (with emphasis on the first syllable), 'Minty' Loptson, Liberal leader in the Saskatchewan Legislature, has told friends here that he was merely having a bit of fun with the C.C.F. and was chiding them when he made the comment, Tuesday, that it would be practical Socialism for the Saskatchewan Power Corporation to take over city-owned power systems."

I don't think that the Leader of the Opposition really, in his heart, advocates that this Government should enter into the retail business and put . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — You're there now.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — . . . and put businesses of various sorts out of business in this province.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I am sure the Minister does not want to quote things that are not facts. The Timber Board is in the retail business and he says they are not. But the Timber Board is in the retail business. They have yards, and they are selling from those yards. They are already in it.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I didn't see a point of order there, Mr. Speaker; but the fact remains that he is advocating the extension of the activities of the Timber Board to provide all kinds of the materials and equipment that go into a home — the plumbing and electrical and glassware and hardwood and flooring and wall boards and hardware and so on . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — You can supply all that.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Well, wait till the merchants of this province get a hold of this amendment of yours. You have been speaking out of turn on several occasions recently, and I would advocate some caution. As far as the lumber provided by the Timber Board is concerned, I venture to state that less than 8 per cent of the cost of materials going into the construction of a home is provided by the Timber Board. They provide dimensional material and rough lumber; but I have enumerated all the things that enter into the construction of a home, very few of which can be provided by the Timber Board.

Frankly, I am not taking this amendment seriously and I do not propose to waste much time on it, because to me it is just as mean as was the Prime Minister's statement immediately before the election in 1949, when Prime Minister St. Laurent heralded right across Canada this statement: This was his housing policy, and he said those exact words:

“This Liberal government will not rest content until every Canadian family is provided with a good home.”

**Some Hon. Member:** — Was he fooling too?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — The fact of the matter is that housing, although he got elected, was scuttled by Mr. St. Laurent. There is no question about that because so many Canadian people were desperate for homes, they voted for the Liberals, only, of course, to be disappointed because the housing situation in Canada, today, is worse than it has ever been. It would require a million homes to catch up with the backlog, to provide for increased population, and to provide for immigration that is taking place and has taken place during the past three years.

Does the National Housing Act, which has just been amended at

**April 1, 1954**

Ottawa, provide any solution? Well, frankly, I don't think so. I just received an outline of the new National Housing Act loans for home-owners – this is one section of it – and I find that an application fee of \$35, or \$70 in the case of a duplex, is required, and then the applicant must own the lot before construction is started; so he would have to buy that, and then the maximum loan will be calculated as 90 per cent of the first \$8,000 of the lending value, and 70 per cent of the balance. Thus a \$10,000 home would require \$1,400, plus \$35 for the application, plus the insurance of the mortgage which the prospective home-owner must put up and that would be \$172; and then he is charged at the rate of 5½ per cent, compounded half-yearly. It says here: “At 5½ per cent convertible semi-annually.” I interpret that ‘convertible’ to mean compounded half-yearly. Therefore, at least \$1,700 or \$1,800 will be required; and then I find that the rental or the annual payment on a \$10,000 house is \$61.00 a month. Besides that the home-owner would have to put up \$15 at least in taxes; that would be \$76.00. Besides that he would have the upkeep of his home, and moreover he cannot expend in monthly payments more than 23 per cent of his income, and that means that no one with an income of less than \$3,800 a year can possibly get a home under these revisions of the National Housing Act. Seventy-five to 80 per cent of our people have incomes of less than \$3,800 a year, which certainly means that this National Housing Act does not apply as far as 80 per cent of our people are concerned.

Why is there a lag in housing? I will tell you. In 1945 the Liberals were elected on the promise that they would ‘hold the line’ as far as prices were concerned; and as an indication as to how they held the line in building costs in this country, on the basis of 100 for 1939, construction costs of housing increased to 290 per cent by 1951. The cost of living has gone up by a hundred and eighty-some by that time. In 1950 alone, the building construction costs in this country increased by 18 per cent – that is the cost of materials increased by 18 per cent – and the cost of labour increased by only 9 per cent. That demonstrates to my hon. friend from Arm River (Mr. Danielson), surely, that it has been the increased cost of living, the increased cost of construction, the increased costs of everything that the worker has to buy, and that his wages have always lagged far behind the increases of materials, supplies and everything else.

I have demonstrated to you that the construction costs increased by 290 per cent since 1939. In one year alone the cost of materials increased by 18 per cent, and labour costs had only increased by 9 per cent. So don't go around blaming labour for the condition of the cost of living in this province and throughout Canada today. That fallacious argument will not stand up and won't impress anybody.

Again, these inordinately high interest rates on housing – 5½ per cent compounded semi-annually. How in the world can any prospective home-owner, over a period of 20 or 30 years, possibly pay that rate of interest? These interest rates have been increased from about 4 per cent by Ottawa until they are now a minimum of 5½ per cent.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Do I understand the Minister is dealing with both the motion and the amendment?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — That's right. Everything I say, every word I utter, is relevant to housing . . .

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — And true.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — That's what you hope.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — . . . except when I take a little time off for the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr. Lopton:** — I am sorry I had to be absent for a little while.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I want to point out that between 1951 and 1952, the interest rate increase in that year alone raised the cost of building of homes in this country by 7 per cent. You need a \$1,700 down payment . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Could I ask the Minister a question: What was the increase in the interest rate?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — It is now 5½ per cent.

**Mr. Danielson:** — But I am asking you now what the increase in the interest rate was? The thing is absolutely ridiculous.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Well, nevertheless that is so. Because you call a thing ridiculous doesn't have much meaning.

**Mr. Danielson:** — The Minister hasn't told us . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — My information is taken from releases by the National Housing Act or Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

Now, instead of a down-payment such as we require in this country (an absolute minimum of \$1,800 at the present time), the United States has a down-payment as low as \$250, and the rate of interest at 4 per cent; and in 1949, they voted for 810,000 low rental housing units in the United States, and President Eisenhower has stated that, this year, the United States will build one million low rental housing units for the people of that country.

**Mr. Danielson:** — They have 165 million people.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — The only solution to the problem is low-rental housing. In Britain, since the war, nine out of every ten houses built in that country – and there have been more than twice the number built there than there has been in Canada – nine out of every ten of those houses are public housing low-rental that my friends are so very much afraid of; and they are all modern homes too, provided with running water and sewage disposal. In spite of the fact that Britain, after the war, was 'broke' financially and had a million homes to repair that were partially destroyed by bombs, she has done more; in spite of the fact, too, that there was a great scarcity of building materials over there, Britain has put to shame this country which has an abundant supply of every type of building material for home construction. In Sweden, since the war, eight out every ten homes built over there are public or low-rental housing.

It does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that we have to re-think our whole attitude toward decent homes for our people. The type of home advocated by the Leader of the Opposition isn't good enough.

**April 1, 1954**

**Mr. Loptson:** — It's good enough for the towns and the villages and the farmers though.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Loptson:** — We can live in the slums.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — My hon. friend, you see, evidently wasn't happy about his home in Saltcoats . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — Sure I was happy.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — . . so he moves to the city of Yorkton where he can enjoy all the amenities of modern living . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — My grandchildren are being raised in that home.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — . . with running water and sewage disposal. or was it because your wife compelled you to recognize that you are living in a modern age, and the time had come when you were entitled to enjoy those amenities?

You know, it is a strange attitude towards housing, and I don't know of anything that is more vital to the welfare of the people of our country. What is the use of talking about improved education, improved health services, when you have homes where health conditions are not possible. Unmodern slum-home conditions are responsible for broken homes, for juvenile delinquency, for adult delinquency too; they are responsible for more social problems than any other factor. That real estate wishes to control the real estate of our cities and our communities, is no reason why we should not have decent housing. Ottawa has consistently placed the responsibility for housing for low-income groups and every other type of group on private enterprise, and private enterprise has never solved the problem of housing in this or any other country, in this or any other age of history. I am not blaming the real estate people; they must operate in this economy under a profit.

**Mr. Loptson:** — It's the C.C.F. government that's the trouble.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — But surely they must permit a system to operate whereby low-income people can have access to decent homes.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Do you think the low-income people can afford \$12,000 homes?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — They cannot be interested in low-rental housing, and that is why I say they would not be opposed, or should not be opposed, to low-rental housing in this province.

Here is a letter that I just received this morning.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Take it as read.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — You will take it the way I give it. I have received phone calls and letters by the hundreds, pleading for housing and decent conditions for families. I have received phone calls from

employees in the City Hall in this city, and these people are on relatively low salaries; and if they cannot afford to buy homes, build homes, then they should be given decent homes for moderate rental which they can afford.

This is the situation in the city of Regina. This is a letter received from a business man, and I will only quote a short portion of it. He said:

“So bad is the situation . . .”

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I was compelled to table a letter that I quoted from, yesterday or the day before. is the same rule going to prevail today?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — This is a personal letter and . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — I say that he should table that letter.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Oh, no, no!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Yes, he should. He is quoting from it. If there is not one rule for one side of the House . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — . . . and another rule for the other.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — This is a personal letter, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member for Arm River is rising on a point of order and quoting a previous decision of this House . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Your ruling.

**Mr. Speaker:** — . . . but it is different. I understand the member is quoting from a private letter, and he will accept responsibility.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I accept responsibility.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The letter which I ruled upon was not a letter to the individual who was quoting from it, which is different thing entirely.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Is it a private letter to you personally, or to you as Minister of Social Welfare?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — No, it is a private letter.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I had a private letter, too, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — If the muttering will cease over there, I will proceed, Mr. Speaker. I quote:

**April 1, 1954**

“So bad is the situation in housing in Regina that I feel that the development of Regina industrially and otherwise is being definitely prejudiced. We have received several communications from companies engaged in oil exploration and development, pointing out the virtual impossibility finding any rental accommodation for many employees whom they are transferring from Calgary and from the United States. Due to the lack of rental housing and the complete absence of untenanted homes many employees are required to purchase homes at exorbitant prices.”

The situation in Regina has become so bad that it is now generally recognized that Regina is in worse position than any other city in Canada.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Who signed that letter?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — On my responsibility I have given you excerpts from a personal letter.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That isn't the point. I took my own responsibility for what I read too, Mr. Speaker, and it wasn't good enough.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Tell us who wrote that letter.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — The Government has been criticized for passing legislation amending the Housing Act – there is a long editorial in the ‘Leader-Post’ about it; and the gist of that legislation is to enable Council, with the approval of the Local Government Board, to examine the finances of a community to see if it is in a financial position to proceed, and with the approval of the Local Government Board that Council can enter into a housing agreement with the two senior governments. Now, I did not pass the National Housing Act. Neither did this Government; but this Government has done . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — You wouldn't pass anything.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — . . . everything possible to try to make the National Housing Act work in this province. We have spent days and weeks in negotiating with councils, in going to Ottawa and persuading them to permit housing under Section 35 of the National Housing Act. I got permission from Mr. Winters for 130 houses for the city of Saskatoon and 200 houses for Regina. The National Housing Act says that the municipality must initiate and approach the senior government if they want this housing. They had approached us; we had secured permission to go ahead with this housing and they were turned down.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Who turned them down?

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — They were turned down in Saskatoon by the voters, and I will tell you why.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Do you blame the Federal Government for that?



**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I am not blaming the Federal Government; I am blaming Saskatoon . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — The voters.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — That's all right . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — The city turned it down; tell them the truth.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Thanks for emphasizing it.

**Mr. Danielson:** — You just emphasized it good enough.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Just before the vote on this by-law was taken in Saskatoon; as a matter of fact it was within 24 hours of the vote being taken, the chief executive of that city — he is no longer mayor of the city of Saskatoon . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I think the hon. member is digressing quite a little from the resolution.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I am explaining why we are not getting housing . . .

**Mr. Cameron:** — Blaming a city.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — . . . and that is what this resolution has to do with.

**Mr. Danielson:** — You are accusing the mayor of Saskatoon.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — The mayor of Saskatoon gave a long broadcast (I have it here, word for word) in which he misrepresented completely the whole by-law and Section 35 of the National Housing Act, and put it in such a distorted form to the ratepayers that naturally they voted against it. And this is what he said, among other things:

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! I think the hon. member must keep to the resolution.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Well, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Attacking a man who isn't here!

**Mr. Loptson:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order . . .

**Mr. Cameron:** — That was 'contemptible', the other day.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — This is most . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think that the hon. Minister should speak to the amendment to the resolution, unless he has declared that he is speaking on both.

**Mr. Speaker:** — It has been the custom to allow you to speak on both.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Well then, I submit that he should comply with your ruling and keep to the motion.

**April 1, 1954**

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Mr. Speaker, I must make it clear as to why we are not getting housing, and I am dealing specifically with this matter of housing. I merely wish to point out why the people of Saskatoon did not vote for this by-law.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! No, it is not relevant to the resolution at all, or to the amendment. You are simply dealing now with municipal questions.

**Mr. Danielson:** — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned a certain man who wasn't sitting in this House, the other night, and the Premier got up and called me everything he could think of for . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — . . . what he called a 'dastardly attack' upon a person who wasn't here.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — I think you should call the Minister to order now.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! There has been another episode since that, and I think I dealt with that before.

**Mr. Danielson:** — You can hang yourself all you like.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, on the question of privilege. This is a statement by a public man, the chief magistrate of the city, affecting a by-law and affecting a proposed agreement between the Government of Canada, the Government of Saskatchewan and the City of Saskatoon; and the statement made by a public man on that occasion is certainly a matter of urgent public importance.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I am quite prepared to table this Mr. Speaker; but it is most relevant, because the people of this province are asking why they aren't getting housing. Here is the reason, and if I cannot present that to this Legislature, then the . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — I cannot see anything in the resolution relating to a controversy between municipal groups.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I think if it has to do with housing, Mr. Speaker, and I, as a government member, negotiated with the Council of Saskatoon and they made application, now the people are entitled to know why Saskatoon did not get housing under Section 35 of the National Housing Act.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I think if the hon. member will recall, he has already dealt with that in this Chamber before.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — No, I haven't deal with it. I haven't dealt with it at all, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Danielson:** — You have lost your place.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — This is the statement:

“In my opinion,” (the mayor said), “no person has any right to ask the State or any fellow citizen to provide him with residential accommodation at less than full cost. There is no inherent right in the individual to demand sacrifice from others for his own private benefit. Furthermore, no individual or group of individuals should be compelled to subsidize any other group.

To charge rents below cost is the common strain of argument that runs through all communistic thinking, and this is the type of thinking that the free people of Canada should not encourage.”

After all, this Government did not pass the National Housing Act. We did not pass Section 35. We were trying to carry out Section 35; then to be accused in those terms, because we supported it we were communistic – well, this is what the Canadian Council of Churches had to say regarding the housing situation in this country:

“Be it resolved that the Canadian Council of Churches, in the name of Christ and for the sake of the health and morale of our people, urge upon all levels of Canadian government, Federal, Provincial and Municipal, the necessity and the urgency of providing decent housing for people earning moderate or low wages and salaries, through an effective public housing programme which will produce low-cost, low-rental dwelling units;

And be it further resolved that we urge the Federal Government to establish the proper system of priorities for building materials.”

Now who is right? Is the Canadian Council of Churches, comprising some 60 or more church denominations, right; or is the chief executive of the city of Saskatoon right? And then to make such a ridiculous statement as this, which is entirely untrue, it means that the taxpayers will be paying \$2,600 a month or \$31,200 a year. He didn't say the taxpayers; but he left it to be inferred that it was the taxpayers of Saskatoon. As a matter of fact, we have a housing project in Moose Jaw operating under this same section, and it cost something less than 8 cents a day for Moose Jaw subsidy on each house in that city. Well, if 8 cents a day cannot be paid by a municipality to provide decent housing, good housing, modern housing for young Canadian families, there is something the matter with society. And this is what the ex-mayor went on to state, also:

“Over a period of 40 years the alarming sum of \$1,248,000 would be paid by the people.”

He found objection to the subsidization when the whole pattern of Canadian life is based on subsidization.

It is all right for the people of Canada to pay tens of millions of dollars to the owners of gold mines to dig gold out of one hole in Canada and put it in another hole down in Fort Knox, Tennessee. That is fine – pay the owners of gold mines a subsidy. It is all right to subsidize the owners of textile industries of eastern Canada, by imposing import duties of 20 to 30 per cent on goods coming into this country; that is a subsidy if ever there was one. It is all right to subsidize the Ford Company, Chrysler Corporation, to

**April 1, 1954**

the tune of \$400 for each automobile up to probably \$1,200. That is done by the imposition of import duties on automotive equipment coming from the United States into Canada. In other words, I can get cars that much cheaper in the United States than I can in Canada. But in order to protect these corporations, to 'subsidize' them, we impose these import duties.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Get the C.C.F. to move a motion to take off the tariffs.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — And yet when it comes to subsidization to provide people with decent homes in which to live, the Opposition and their ilk appeal to the basest instincts of mankind. As long as that sort of thing continues . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — You are asking for homes for privileged people.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — . . . then, of course, there will be opposition to public housing. But if Ottawa had the courage, and if it carried out the Prime Minister's promise of 1949, to provide people of every family of Canada with a decent home, then we would not be fighting this problem of housing, today. If Ottawa had the courage to follow the other progressive nations of the world — Britain and the Scandinavian countries, yes, and even the United States, we would not have the appalling housing situation that exists in this country.

The solution is to get councils in our communities who are progressive, who recognize the value of decent homes for the health and welfare of the families of this province, to make it possible for these families to live decent, well-adjusted, normal lives. We prate a lot about the sanctity of the home, when many thousands of homes in this province are unfit for human habitation where decent normal life, family life, Christian life, is quite impossible. So I say, Mr. Speaker, that we have to re-think our attitude towards housing in this province, and the responsibility is on the Federal Government, the Provincial Government and the Municipal Government. Let us all work together so that we can do a job in providing the homes which are necessary so that we can take pride in our communities. Believe me, you will save in health costs and in many other ways by providing decent homes for our people. You will have a province in which you can take pride.

**Mr. H.C. Dunfield (Meadow Lake):**

Mr. Speaker, I apologize for prolonging this debate, but my whole life-training has been so contrary to some of the theories propounded by the Minister that I am compelled to say something on the matter of housing, because I, too, feel very deeply about this question of housing and have had some experience in it.

We have heard a great deal about the \$12,000 house and the necessity for a \$3,800 income. We have also heard the hon. Leader of the Opposition speak about the \$3,500 house. Well, I cannot afford the \$12,000 house, but I would certainly try to put a foundation under 'Minty's' house.

I take exception to the Minister's remarks to this, I think, very important factor or aspect and that is he was speaking mostly about rented houses, or houses to rent. I think more of the home-owners, because I think the very basis of stability, personal life and of government life lies among those who own their own homes. There is far more security in the home that you own than in the one that you rent, and I would much prefer to live in even a \$4,000 home that was my own, than I would in a \$12,000 home, or greater, rented.

Under the National Housing Act commercial loans for housebuilding have been made primarily through insurance companies. Lately there have been amendments to that Act under which money can be borrowed through the banks also. Now, in both of these sources of supply of the money necessary for building, this money comes from the savings of those who are fortunate enough to have money on deposit in the banks or in insurance policies, and these people who have saved this money expect first, absolute security of their funds and second, a reasonable dividend on their savings – and I do not think that anybody can quarrel with that. So when we talk of loans for houses at 2 per cent and lending up to 90 per cent of the value of a house, Mr. Speaker, I don't think it is realistic. I don't think that any member of this House would wish to have his savings loaned out under such circumstances and I, therefore, say that that is not a sound economic proposition. Unless these personal savings can earn a reasonable dividend, with security, this source of funds is going to dry up. There is no question about it; it simply will dry up and you will have no funds under any circumstances.

What other procedure have we, what other course have we, from a practical standpoint to secure some new housing for that class of people who need it so greatly? Before asking anybody else to carry part of the load in the way subsidy by either governments or any other source, I would say – what can we do ourselves about this matter? I say that seriously because, in a new pioneering country, when you go through the whole era from the beginning to when it is highly developed, you see all types of business management. You see the way people get along under most difficult circumstances, and the same knowledge can be applied elsewhere.

I would say that the main things on the prime factors in connection with housing would be first, low down cash payment and the lowest possible construction costs and the completed value that would withstand any possible recession or recessions which might occur; and finally, that that housing must be within the capacity of the individual to pay because, as I said once before in this House, there is certainly nowhere you can get anything for nothing.

I am not speaking of the whole question of housing; it's too big a problem. But it just came to my mind – I remember the Rt. Hon. Sir Winston Churchill speaking about world problems, particularly with regard to Russia, saying, "We can't solve all of our difficulties, but let us tackle those that we can solve and reach agreement on." I think in housing it is the same thing. We cannot immediately give cheap housing to all the people who need it, but there are certainly some who can have cheaper housing, or housing which is within their capacity to pay and very easily.

While in eastern Canada some several years ago, I met a great many young people who were building their own homes. I have in mind a boy from next-door to my place in Meadow Lake, the son of the principal of our school he is a mechanical engineer, working now for Ford in Windsor, and he and his wife built their home and it's a lovely home. He told me that it cost him less than 60 per cent of the cost of building had he purchased it outright. They had put a great deal into it, and the mere fact that they worked at that home made that home of inestimable more value to them than one they could have purchased outright.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Did you build yours?

**Mr. Dunfield:** — Many years before that, in Winnipeg, when I

**April 1, 1954**

was still going to school, the principal of our schools was the first one I ever knew who did such a thing. We thought it was an astounding thing for him to do. It took him nearly two years to build that house in his spare time, but he also built it and paid for it within his own means, and I think this Government and various organizations could give leadership.

While I was in Detroit some years ago, another friend of mine was building his own home there. He knew nothing about carpentry. A great many young couples in the United States are building their own homes, and it has become such an industry that the sale of small tools, power tools and so on has today risen to over \$200 million. It is just sweeping the whole of the United States, this idea of building your own home, and they have gone so far that you can pick any one of their plans and they will not only supply you with the plans and all of the building material, but you will also have tissue patterns for every cut in that house, from the ridgeboard to the baseboard, so that any novice at all can build.

Another means by which young people are building their own homes is they build what they can at first, but the whole master plan is made for expansion and it is not impossible. It is very reasonable and can be done because we have done it continuously in my own town of Meadow Lake. We started with what we could years ago and have expanded them until today we have some very lovely homes that were started in a very moderate way. And that is not impossible.

The Minister speaks of sewer and water. It is very necessary. We had hoped to have that in our town in Meadow Lake. As I said the other day, our mill rate is 81 mills – or it was a year or so ago; I haven't my tax bill for this year yet. If we put in sewer and water it would cost an additional 11 mills, making it 92 mills, and that would certainly be the highest-taxed property in the Dominion of Canada. Nevertheless, we are building and putting in, roughing in the plumbing that is necessary, for the day when we do get sewer and water – and we can do that in the city of Regina, or close to it and many other cities and towns. You can build and, at a very low cost, do the roughing in of the additions which you wish to put in later, of plumbing and so on.

I think that we, as a people, and particularly the Government, can make a very direct contribution to the matter of home building in Saskatchewan. I think the Government, with its monopoly of native timber supplies of this province, can make a very material contribution; and I am not speaking this idly, nor with political intent, because I think it is practical. I know it is practical, because I have had some interest in lumbering business before. I do not think it could be done under the present setup of the Timber Board; not as the Timber Board, but I do believe it could be done under a timber sales organization similar to that of the Fur and Fish Marketing Boards today. But the process of getting out that lumber would certainly have to be in the hands of private industry, because I know it cannot be done at nearly as low a cost by the Timber Board.

**Premier Douglas:** — These boys are going to talk themselves right out of private industry.

**Mr. Dunfield:** — If I can remember correctly the report of the Timber Board a year ago, I think the net profit was

somewhere between \$4 and \$4.20 per thousand, and I know quite well that a great deal of that lumber was sold at very high prices, somewhere between \$80 a thousand and up. I do not know what the maximum price was, because it is impossible to obtain this information from the Government; but there is a wide margin there for direct savings to the public.

Right today there is lumber coming in from the bombing range at Primrose Lake. It is being landed at the planing mill at Meadow Lake – \$39 a thousand, I believe, to the Timber Board. That is exceptionally low price; all of them are going to go broke or suffer heavy losses. But for those areas that are closer to the railhead, it could be delivered at that price or somewhere around \$45, we'll say. Many timber men have told me, and will tell me today, that they can take these small areas of timber, mill them, plane them and if they had the chance to sell them at \$50 a thousand, or \$55 a thousand at railhead, they would make a very nice profit. I am quite sure the Timber Board cannot do that, not because the Timber Board belongs to this Government, but I know that no government can operate as efficiently as can private individuals.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that if we concentrated on part of this problem by a government committee, or by some means, with practical men on it, as well as theoreticians, we could knock quite a hole in the housing problem.

The Minister, speaking a little while ago, twitted the hon. Leader of the Opposition about the Government going into all forms of merchandising. We have a lumber yard in Meadow Lake belonging to the Timber Board. It is quite an asset to the community, and I know something about it because when Frank Eliason held a meeting in Meadow Lake, some years ago, regarding the setting up of a Timber Board, I presented a brief for the Board of Trade. At that time they were only going to handle the native lumber, and I said, "That is not fair; if you monopolize the native lumber, how can you expect the opposition, the Beaver Lumber Company, to bring in all the high cost stuff, while you handle the bulk of the low-cost dimension stuff?" I suggested then, "Why not go into the whole thing so that you can give all the services of a lumber yard? That's not fair competition at all just using the cheap product that you can get locally. Go into the whole business." And they did. I don't know if they did because I said so; however that is what they did and at that lumber yard we can buy all the supplies, and it is a very good thing, a very good thing indeed, good opposition.

I do believe that with leadership from this Government we can make a very real contribution to the housing of this province, not only through lumber supplies, but through the initiatives informing and teaching people how they can build their own homes at a great deal lower cost than in the ordinary manner. Again I assert, Mr. Speaker, that the rental system is not the final system. If we are to have stability in the life of our province we have got to have home-owners and not renters.

I would like to make one more remark in connection with what the hon. Minister said a few minutes ago about government merchandising. I very much wanted to get more information on government merchandising in the Crown Corporations Committee, but I was denied that information, absolutely denied it; because I would very much like to know . . .

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege; Has this got anything to do with the amendment?

**April 1, 1954**

**Mr. Dunfield:** — This has to do with housing. I would very much like to know just how some of our Crown Corporation stores in the north operate because, from the reports I have, they are certainly not operating very successfully, and I don't think any government at any time can operate on an economically sound basis as compared to what private individuals can do.

Again, I would recommend on the question of housing that we have a committee of some kind, composed of the best brains we can get – contractors, private citizens who are interested in building homes, and all of the practical people we can get; and I do think we can make a real contribution to the housing question in Regina and the province of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek):**

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few observations on the resolution and the amendment as presented, this afternoon. The resolution, as I understand it, was asking for an extension of the rights and privileges under the National Housing Act to raise it up so that you could build \$12,000 homes, to have the interest reduced to 2 per cent, and to be able to borrow up to 90 per cent of the cost of the home.

These all ask for amendments to the National Housing Act and yet, listening to the Minister of Social Welfare, I was rather led to the conclusion that it was not the result of the Act that was holding up the construction of houses in the city of Regina and in Saskatoon, but rather that he made (and I presume he did, and it appeared quite evident that he did) a great deal of effort in Ottawa and elsewhere to negotiate for 200 homes in the city of Regina and 120 homes in the city of Saskatoon. All arrangements were made under the Act, as I understand it, where Ottawa would put up 75 per cent, the province 15 per cent and the municipalities 10 per cent.

As I understood from the discussion, the reason that we didn't proceed with the construction of 200 homes in the city of Regina was that it had been put to a vote of the people and the condition of voting was that they tied the council's hands, so to speak, to the fact that they could negotiate provided they didn't have to come in under the clause of having to subsidize an uneconomic rent. The vote carried under that condition and the Council then did not feel free to proceed, being obliged to sign a contract which said in the event of charging uneconomic rent, that they then would have to pay their portion of that cost.

Then he turned to the city of Saskatoon and said there was a crying need for houses – and I believe there is; and he said that the city of Saskatoon didn't enter this plan to construct homes because of the unfair tactics and misrepresentation of the Chief Executive of that city at that time, in a radio broadcast some 24 hours before the vote was taken, and thus the blame of Saskatoon rests upon the shoulders of the chief Executive there. But I would point out that the people of Saskatoon voted, and thinking of comment made in this House after the provincial election, we were rather led to believe that once the people and spoken we must abide by their decision. The people of Saskatoon spoke; the council abided by their decision, and so we are not proceeding to construct the homes in the city of Saskatoon.

Perhaps the Minister of social Welfare is correct – I wouldn't know;



but it would appear from the discussion of yesterday and today, that the bottleneck is at the local city level. He suggested then, and I think the Provincial Treasurer did likewise, that something should be done to correct the bottleneck at the municipal level, and thus an amendment was made to the Municipal Act whereby it would not have to be submitted to a vote, but that on the decision of the council, the city together with the Local Government Board, could arrange to enter into a housing programme, to get around the position of having to submit it to a vote, in the hopes of speaking it up. Then if the councils are reactionary, as suggested here, then the Provincial Treasurer, I think, said, and the Minister of Social Welfare said today, that the solution was to remove from office these reactionary councils and place in office people who are more progressive and more up in their thought on this whole problem of housing.

That is the situation as we understand it. The Minister of Social Welfare went on to point out that a \$10,000 home under the terms and conditions of payment would be out of the reach of 75 per cent of the people because they couldn't afford it. They would have to be earning \$3,800 a year or more to pay for it, and 75 per cent of them are not earning that amount. Therefore the \$10,000 home is not within their reach to build, much less a \$12,000 home as suggested in the resolution. So, if they cannot pay for a \$10,000 home it is not much use of us asking for a \$12,000 home from Ottawa in one breath and then saying in the next breath that the reason we haven't homes in these cities rests with the local government of the particular city.

So I would say that to pass a resolution such as this, asking Ottawa to further extend the Housing Act, won't accomplish a great deal if you cannot induce the local councils to take action under the Act.

**Premier Douglas:** — Two different things. But go ahead.

**Mr. Cameron:** — I would say to the Minister of Social Welfare that rather than speaking so forcefully to the House here and giving such a dressing-down to the Leader of the Opposition, and to the former mayor of Saskatoon, for all the things that weren't accomplished . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — Doesn't register here.

**Mr. Cameron:** — . . . that he would use his office and that of the Government to appeal to the local cities and their councils and persuade them, if possible, to come in under the National Housing Act . . .

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I've done that.

**Mr. Cameron:** — . . . rather than place all the blame for all that has happened back at the door of Ottawa. In view of that, then, I don't believe that the Leader of the Opposition was fooling quite as much as we perhaps thought at the beginning. When we re faced with this dead-end, so to speak, he suggested then that we encourage the building of four-room, low-cost houses, and the inclusion of the value of the work done on the house by the prospective owners be accepted as part of his cash payment, and that the Government of Saskatchewan be asked to give consideration to supplying prospective home-owners resident in Saskatchewan with building materials at cost through the Saskatchewan Timber Board and the Saskatchewan Clay Products.

**April 1, 1954**

I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that if the Minister of Social Welfare and the Government are as concerned about the housing situation as they profess to be, then in place of a petition or resolution such as this to Ottawa asking for extension under the Act, they should proceed to persuade the city councils to come in with them under the plan; and if they cannot succeed in doing that, they should institute some system of their own in order to give to the low-wage earner and the groups who cannot afford to buy their homes, some assistance in establishing a low-cost house of their own. If they do that, then I think we will get a great deal farther than by attempting to gain political capital with these people desperately in need of homes, by saying that we are asking Ottawa to increase the amount of the home and to reduce the interest in order to bring down the cost of the payment to you.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Anything wrong with that?

**Mr. Cameron:** — I think there lies the action whereby we can accomplish something in our effort to get more homes built. I don't think anyone will deny the need; the need is great in these cities. But in spite of the great need, the thing that confounds me is why the Government has not been able to prevail upon the municipal councils to enter into the plan under the National Housing Act to construct these homes. There's where you should put your appeal; not in useless resolutions to Ottawa.

**Mr. Feusi:** — Useless is right!

**Mr. Cameron:** — You have the Act. You have agreed to act under it. The province is prepared to do its share, so we are told, and the Dominion Government is prepared to make its contribution, if the local government boards will make their contribution. Then you can solve the housing situation. So I say, make your appeal to where your bottleneck is, rather than send things like this to Ottawa. For that reason I think that the suggestion made by the Leader of the Opposition in this amendment is a constructive suggestion; that while we are working at municipal level, let us likewise work in a manner in which we can do something to construct low-rental housing homes, if you like, or low-cost homes to the homeowner himself. I am going to support the amendment.

**Mr. Berezowsky (Cumberland):**

Mr. Speaker, it seems that the opposition who have brought in the amendment are making a detour. If they faced the situation as it should be faced, I think it is a matter more of philosophy than trying to suggest devious ways of handling the situation of housing.

I would just like to bring to the attention of the House here that in Denmark, for example, where the government there recognizes the responsibility for housing, they are doing something about it. They have a plan in that country where they provide that need by lending 95 per cent of the principal, and all that a prospective house-owner needs is 5 per cent. Now that speaks words. The interest rate is from 2.2 to 3 per cent. Compare that with the interest rate here in Canada. That is way, in Denmark, they have housing, while in Canada we have not. They are given 20-years' time to pay, with no taxes. There again the government assumes a responsibility towards the need of housing.

The only reason why we can't have an Act of that nature here in Canada is because of the philosophy of the Dominion Government. It's backing up private enterprise. It doesn't want it to interfere with the business of the mortgage companies who have money to lend out, and I can quite understand the members of the opposite side of the House taking the stand that they do – "let the people build any kind of a house but let them do it themselves." They have not answered the problem 'where is the money coming from.'

We are trying to answer that problem in the resolution: The Dominion Government's responsibility to see to it that this money is made available at a low rate of interest; that sufficient money is made available so that the people will be able to put up their small contribution, and a long enough period of time to repay so that eventually the house will belong to the person that needs it.

Their solution is leave it off till tomorrow. Let the fellow build whatever he can – if it is a mud hut or a log shack, that should be satisfactory. That is the philosophy that the Opposition has always followed, but that is not the philosophy of this side of the House. And the purpose I am speaking to this resolution is, to put the responsibility where it is, and not try to plan these detours. The Provincial Government, or the Municipal Governments, are not in a position to solve that large problem.

They can probably enter into some kind of a programme, and they have tried to enter into these programmes. In some cases, because of reactionary thinking, we have not been able to achieve what we are trying to do. But this whole problem can be solved, and I think this House should go on record unanimously to advise Ottawa that it is their responsibility, and they can do the things we are asking in this resolution.

**Mr. R.A. McCarthy (Cannington):**

Mr. Speaker, I just want to take a minute or two. Apparently the member for Cumberland still doesn't realize that Ottawa is there with its money but that it is the local people who are turning it down. The gentlemen opposite are threshing the straw at the wrong door.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, may I point out to my hon. friend that in the building of houses, where there are loans, neither the Provincial Government or the Municipal Government come into it, only on rental housing.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Well, that's what I am . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — But under this motion, we are talking about loaning money directly by Ottawa.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — He was taking in the whole field: The Dominion Government wouldn't do this and the Dominion Government wouldn't do that. That's one place where the Dominion Government had its money there and the local people didn't accept. Now I don't intend . . .

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: I did not go into the intricacies of the National Housing Act. I mentioned general principle and I stay by that principle. The member there is trying to suggest something entirely different.

**April 1, 1954**

**Mr. McCarthy:** — What's his point of order?

**Mr. Speaker:** — That's not a point of order.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — I still say I am right. He was going over general housing. I just want to say a word or two about this clause (b) in the original motion, the clause that has to do with amortization of loans. I don't know how many people in this House have had experience with that sort of loan, but I have, and I got rather a surprise when I found out how it worked. It is a very nice system. You get this \$8,000 – and as a matter of fact I think the \$12,000 is out if you are talking about housing for low income people because, as it has been pointed out here at different times, without somebody subsidizing it, it is absolutely impossible to pay the interest on that and carry insurance and light and water and everything else. If we are talking about housing for working people, let's talk about housing that they can reasonably expect to handle.

What I wanted to talk about was this particular system of loaning money. It is a very nice system. They will work it all out for you in a nice table and say that you are going to pay so much a month, or so much a year, as the case may be. But it its worked out on compound interest, no doubt, and the danger, as I see it, is that these people who are going in for that sort of thing naturally are going to start paying it that way and they have a small equity in it. Your first year's payment carries a very small percentage of principal. As your payments go along your principal payment becomes larger and your interest payment becomes smaller; but for the first few years of that payment, if you take what is actually owing on the house, it is reduced very little. True when you get down to your last payment (and this is suggesting 30 years), it is nearly wholly principal, just the same as your first payment is nearly all interest. When you get into the middle, you are starting to break 50-50, and when you go the other way, your principal payment goes up and the interest payment goes down.

Suppose some of these people took over these houses and held them for 5, 6 or 7 years and wanted to sell them, and we had a slight recession – what would happen? They wouldn't have any equity in it, if that house went down very, very little in its value. They would have no equity because they would find that nearly all their first payments would constitute interest with a very small portion of principal. So I think we should be a little realistic about this thing, and for various reasons these people will, no doubt, want to sell houses. The first payment is very small – I was going to work it out, but I didn't. However, it is a very very small amount of the first payment that makes any last payment, of course, is nearly all capital; but your first bunch of payments is nearly all interest, a great big proportion of them. If you found that, through any cause at all, the price had receded even a little, you would have no equity in your house, because the very small recession in the price would take up all the capital payment you had made even if you had made payments for 10 years. That is just one point that I would like to point out.

**Premier Douglas:** — May I ask the hon. member a question? Wouldn't you have more equity with 2 per cent interest than you would with 5½ per cent?

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Oh, certainly, certainly; but that is foolishness.

**Premier Douglas:** — That's what we are paying now, 5½.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — I didn't even consider the 2 per cent. The Provincial Treasurer just told us here today that he was borrowing money for – what was it?

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — 3.44 per cent.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Almost 3½. Well, anybody who is going to loan money on any project – I don't care what it is, and if you loan it on this it is very risky; but you have got to add some interest to carry it along, or you are going to lose money to loan money. So why talk about 2 per cent? It is absolute foolishness, absolutely. It isn't practical; that's some of your theoretical stuff. Let's get down to a practical business basis.

What does the province charge the people who borrow power money for instance – what does the province charge for that? Do they charge 2 per cent? No, they can't do it. What does the province charge on any money that they loan the people?

**Mr. Cameron:** — The Provincial Treasurer can't even loan it at 2.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — The Provincial Treasurer will tell you, I am quite sure, that he couldn't loan the money he is borrowing today unless he had quite a considerable amount to pay for his losses, unless he was in a very protected good field. So let's not talk about 2 per cent; let's be practical.

**Premier Douglas:** — May I ask the hon. member another question. Is he aware that the Bank of Canada does lend money to the Federal Government at 2 per cent?

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Well no, I am not aware of that; but I am aware of the fact that you know as well as I do that you wouldn't loan money at 2 per cent, so why ask?

The question being put on the amendment, it was negatived on division by 31 votes against 9.

The question being put on the main motion, it was agreed to on division by 33 votes against 9.

April 1, 1954

## FINANCIAL AID TO YOUNG FARMERS

The House resumed from Thursday, March 18th, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Swallow, respecting the setting up of a loaning agency to provide financial assistance to young farmers.

**Mr. Loptson (Leader of the Opposition):**

Mr. Speaker, they seem to be working me a little hard today. However, since we have got to clean up the Order Paper today, we might as well go ahead with this motion. I am not going to prolong discussion, I assure you.

This resolution is typical of all the other resolutions that have been moved from the other side of the House. Those fellows, you know, can't do anything themselves, so they must ask somebody else to do it for them.

**Mr. Cameron:** — That's 'Uncle Joe'.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Yes, sure. They have got to go to 'Uncle Joe' for everything that has to be done, and this is a typical instance.

This isn't the first time that this question has come before the House. A good many years ago, during the 'thirties', a similar resolution was debated in this House. The reason then put forward was the fact that the ordinary resources for a young man to get started farming had disappeared; that is, his father or those who customarily set young men up in farming had no funds. But the condition is quite different now. At that time there was not any money available. Now there is plenty of money available, and the reason that we should look for now is why isn't a young man able to borrow money, at this time, as he was in the earlier days when money was less available? I think that this resolution brings forward the idea that something has happened, and I think it deserves a review of farm credit in the past.

I think, Mr. Speaker, you will agree with me. You have been long enough in this country to observe what happened in the early days. I remember when we were young, we were able to buy land; we were able to buy implements.

**Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):**

What did you use for money?

**Mr. Loptson:** — We bought it without any money. We bought it on your reputation, and there were all kinds of people read to trust us.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — You can't do that now.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Well, something has happened. We had a democratic government in power at that time. We had a government in power that would not interfere with me making a deal with somebody for the loan of money. We had a government that was not concerned

about what kind of a deal I made on a quarter-section. I could buy implements, I could buy a team of horses on terms made between you and me, Mr. Speaker, and it was our business. If I failed to pay, you came and took the team away, didn't you? If one of them died you were just out of luck. Of course, as a result of this, interest rates became pretty high, because, in spite of the fact that most of the people paid as they promised, there were considerable losses and the interest rates had to take care of the losses of this credit system.

In spite of that, Mr. Speaker, there was never any hesitation about men taking a chance on a piece of machinery, or even on a piece of land. I myself sold land and I bought land without any money down; bought it on a bushel-basis; bought it on crop shares, and the man that I sold to has paid me, and the man I bought from I paid, too. But you cannot do that now – why? Simply because something has happened.

Before I tell you what has happened I am going to tell you something that the governments of this province have done to help farmers when they got into trouble in the past, because after all, there was a time when we did get into difficulties. The credit was abused, as most good things are abused, and particularly during the first war farmers did get into an ambitious mood. Many of them borrowed money on their home quarter, which they had then clear title for, to buy adjoining quarters at a very high price. At that time wheat was selling at \$2.00 to \$2.50 a bushel. Cattle were about the price that they are today; not as high as they have been, but they were about as high as they are today, with the result that many people figured they could buy the adjoining quarter that, with a crop or two, they would pay it off. But the slump came in 1921.

I want to draw the attention of this House, that, previous to that, the government of Saskatchewan realized that demand for credit had become to buoyant, to the extent that interest rates became very high. The demand was so great that it was possible for the mortgage companies to hold up the borrowers. I know mortgages that drew as high as 12 per cent – all the way from 8, 9, 10, 11, as high as 12 per cent. As a matter of fact I appraised for one company at that time and they were charging 8 per cent, but they were one of the more moderate ones.

The government of Saskatchewan, in 1917, saw the necessity for doing something in order to bring down the interest rate. That was the first time that a government in this province entered into any financial Farm Loan Board. Through that Farm Loan Board there was something in the neighborhood of \$17 million loaned to the farmers at 6½ per cent. Some people say that the Liberal government are always working for the 'big fellows'. I don't think that there was any mortgage company that asked the Liberal government of that day to set up a mortgage company in order to reduce the rate of interest; but the result was that the interest rate on the average went down to 7 and 8 percent from the mortgage companies, while the government was loaning it for 6½ per cent.

After the slump in 1921 and 1922 there was still a great deal of difficulty among the farmers. The first interference with collections by the government was made during the session of 1928-29, according to the records. That's when the Debt Adjustment Board was set up, and everybody

**April 1, 1954**

in this House knows that Provincial Debt Adjustment Board the, as it is today, had no power to adjust debts. All the power that a local board has is to put on a moratorium to extend the time of payment. Well, with the interest piling on mortgages, it was realized even by the Bennett government who were in power at Ottawa at that time, that owing to the drought and difficult period of the 'thirties', something had to be done in order to keep farmers on the land. By 1935, I think it is fair to say that, with the relief and with the interest piling on the mortgaged land, and with arrears of taxes, about 75 per cent of the farmers in Saskatchewan owed more money than their assets were worth, owed more money than their assets would have realized if sold.

Mr. Bennett set up what they called the Farmers' Creditors' Arrangement Act. Under that Act there was a Commissioner appointed, and he had the power to write down debts, cancel them if he wanted to. But, he apparently while he was operating – he only operated for about a year – he would not go any further than to reduce the interest on mortgages. But, when the Liberal government came into power in Ottawa, in 1935, they changed the system. They changed commissioners, and they started out to adjust debts on the basis of the earning power of the land.

As you all know, the price of farm products at that time was very low, and I think that during the time that most of the adjustment was made we may say that 90 cents was about as high as wheat went; cattle prices were very low. So, naturally, if you were going to base the adjustment on an average income of the last 5 or 10 years, that cut your earning power pretty low, and with that income to pay off your indebtedness on a third-share crop basis, basing it on the income of the average 10 year, it resulted in cutting some indebtedness a long way, and I don't know that it was altogether fair to some of the creditors.

I understand that, since times got better, some of the debtors did pay a little more than the Commissioner ordered them to. But while they operated, there was a lot indebtedness that was adjusted outside of the Board itself, based on the formula set up by the Board. Up until the year 1944, some \$243 million had been wiped off the farmers' backs through cancellation of farm indebtedness one way or another. The Board itself didn't adjust more than about \$63 million; but with cancellation of relief, cancellation of taxes, cancellation of indebtedness between individuals, it reduced the indebtedness of farmers some \$243 million.

In addition to that, the Liberal government has continued to assist farmers. It was obvious that, after they started to write down debts, no loaning company would continue loaning on farm land. So, in order to take up that slack, the Federal Government set up what they called the Canada Farm Loan Board, and they have been loaning, since 1935, to farmers who found it an advantage to borrow money and pay off the present mortgages; some have borrowed to buy land. The Board loaned in the neighborhood of \$17 million to the farmers of this province up to the end of 1952.

In addition to that, the Liberal government set up what they call the Farm Improvement Loan Act. Under it, you can borrow money now up to about \$4,000 per farm through the Bank, at a low rate of interest, to improve



your farm buildings – build granaries if you want to; buy cattle if you want to; clear scrub and break; even to electrify your homes. That is available to the farmers at the present time, young and old, and I understand something in the neighbourhood of \$123 million has been loaned in this province in that way. This is a loan which fits in between the bank loan and the land mortgage loan. You pay it, I understand, in about three years.

Now, that this much has been done not only by the provincial Liberal government, but by the Federal Liberal government, I submit is proof that the Liberal government has pretty well done its share. I would say, in addition to that, the Liberal government has advanced nearly \$40 million for the establishment of returned men in this province.

Now let's see what the C.C.F. Government has done; that's quite interesting. You will remember that the C.C.F. Party was organized in 1933. Their great hope, of course was to be able to 'socialize' the land, and they had great hopes of being able to do it in the first election. Having caught the farmer in these financial straits, they only had one thing to offer them, and that was the issue in the election of 1934. Now, I don't think I have to tell you what the issue was in 1934. The issue in my constituency was only one thing – the C.C.F. would take over their title . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Hear, hear!

**Mr. Loptson:** — . . . and would take over their liability . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — That's what you told them.

**Mr. Loptson:** — . . . so they would not have anything to worry about and that they would give them a use-lease in return. That was the issue in my constituency, and I think it was the issue all over the province.

What would have happened if the C.C.F. Government had got into power at that time? I may say, my own neighbour owed a lot of money; he worked his head off day and night, and even gave some money to support the C.C.F. I asked him, "What are you going out working for that crazy outfit for?" I was honest about it. And that is exactly what they are doing to some of them today. Well, anyway, he worked his head off and tried to get this C.C.F. government elected in 1934 so that he could give them his title, because he figures he owed more than his place was worth.

Had the C.C.F. got into power in 1934, I don't think I am wrong in saying that three out of every four farmers in this province would have released their title to the Crown. The way the financial position of the farmer was at that time, I don't think I am exaggerating when I say that three farmers out of every four in Saskatchewan would have released their titles and they would today be tenants of the government. That is the policy of the C.C.F. Party. Maybe they would have been better off; I question that. I can go to all of my friends in my own district who voted for the C.C.F. in 1934 to get rid of their title, and see where are they today. Not only do they own their land clear, but they have bought additional land; they have power machinery to work their land; many of the have government bonds set aside for a rainy day.

**April 1, 1954**

**Premier Douglas:** — They have done all right under the C.C.F. Government.

**Mr. Loptson:** — No, they have done all right under the Liberal Government.

**Premier Douglas:** — The C.C.F.

**Mr. Loptson:** — They did all right under the Liberal Government. Had the C.C.F. been elected, they would have been your tenants.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Do they still support the C.C.F.?

**Mr. Loptson:** — Some of them are crazy enough to do that. You would wonder at the mental condition of men who would vote against the very authority that saved them their farms, and I have told them so.

**Mr. Cameron:** — But a lot of them have lost theirs.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Fortunately, of course, the C.C.F. did not get elected that time. About 1944, credit of farmers was building up; stability was building up in agriculture. Mortgage companies were beginning to think that they should lend some money to farmers, particularly from 1939 up until 1944. Banks were beginning to lend money to farmers, and I believe that, had it not been for the C.C. F. getting elected in 1944, there would not have been any trouble for young farmers getting money and buying land on long terms to get started in farming. But when the C.C.F. Party got elected in 1944, mortgage companies immediately became frightened because of the statements that had been made by the different leaders of the C.C.F. Party during the campaign. Moreover, some of them went so far — I believe the Premier himself made the statement publicly, that no farmer would lose his home for a debt, as long as he was Premier. There you are, in spite of the fact many of them have lost them.

The effect of that was that a farmer could not get a loan; a farmer could not buy land unless he paid as much down as would cover the home quarter. That is the situation that has existed since. Today, I would not sell a man a quarter-section on long term as long as this Government is in power. I have sold land, and I have had to go around the possibility of these fellows stepping in, by renting it to the buyer on a bushel basis. I say, "When you give me so many bushels, I will give you title." But I wouldn't make an agreement with him. I would not sell him that land outright for the simple reason he might get cross with me some day and say, "Here, I'm not going to pay you any more." And the Premier gets up and says, "You don't have to pay any more because Loptson can't put you off." That is the situation.

**Premier Douglas:** — Does my hon. friend think that the legislation applies where there is an agreement for sale?

**Mr. Loptson:** — They all think it does.

**Premier Douglas:** — Do you think it does?

**Mr. Loptson:** — Yes, I do.

**Premier Douglas:** — Oh, that's fine.

**Mr. Loptson:** — That's why I am not taking any chances. Whether the legislation is that way or not, I wouldn't take any chances as long as this Government is in power.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — There are those who will.

**Mr. Loptson:** — There is another thing that has deteriorated the security of farmers' earnings, and that is quite effective when you are loaning money and when you are borrowing money, and that is the earning power of the borrowers. Since this Government came into power, what have they done to the earnings of the farmers? In spite of all the effort of the Federal Government to keep up prices and a high standard of return to the farmers, this Government has got them in a position where they can pile taxes on them, not only taxes on his land, but taxes on everything that he buys. They have increased the Gasoline Tax over 50 per cent.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — What?

**Premier Douglas:** — What per cent increase in the Gasoline Tax?

**Mr. Loptson:** — Fifty per cent – very near.

**Premier Douglas:** — Nonsense! Your arithmetic is not very good.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Well, from 7 to 11 cents – isn't that 50 per cent? At least they told me that when I went to school. As a matter of fact it is more than 50 per cent. That's the only thing you can complain about. They are taking over 200 per cent more Education Tax from the farmer than he was paying in 1944.

**Premier Douglas:** — You need to get your arithmetic polished up.

**Mr. Loptson:** — They increased the school tax nearly 200 per cent. My section of land paid \$200 in 1944, and \$660 was last year's assessment, or 300 per cent increase.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — Your price policy did that.

**Mr. Loptson:** — That is the C.C.F. Government. If it was not for the Liberal government in Ottawa, we simply could not pay these taxes, and this Government is now hoping that a depression will come along so that the effect of these taxes will make it possible for them to get hold of this land. That is what is making the loan companies scared.

**Premier Douglas:** — They were scared when you were in.

**Mr. Loptson:** — They will be scared as long as this Government is in power, afraid that they are going to pile taxes on the land until, if there is a recession, the municipality will get the land for taxes – and what use is it to the municipality? It's no good. So the next step will be that the C.C.F. will say, "We will take it over from you, and we'll administer the municipalities." That would be the next step.

**Premier Douglas:** — Even you can't keep your face straight on that one.

**April 1, 1954**

**Mr. Loptson:** — In view of these facts, Mr. Speaker, this Government is totally responsible for undermining the confidence that the loaning people had in farmers, particularly young farmers. They have to go to Manitoba to buy land on loan terms, or they have to go to Alberta to buy land on long terms; they cannot buy it here. The fellow who has the cash in the bank is buying up the available land now.

I wonder if my hon. friend (Mr. Wellbelove) over there, who is retired and wants to sell his land, wants to sell it to a young fellow now as we used to sell it, years ago, on a bushel basis, so much a year without any money down . . .

**Mr. Wellbelove:** — Just on a point of privilege: I have already sold my land to a young veteran on part cash down and the balance on crop payments.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Yes, you bet you got your cash.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Does that answer your questions?

**Mr. Loptson:** — Sure, he got his cash — and that is exactly what is going on.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — What cash? He said part cash. Keep your ears open!

**Mr. Loptson:** — In view of the fact that this Government is responsible for the position of the young farmer, I think it is only reasonable that they should agree to pay at least part, or put up part, of the money to get them started. They refuse to put it all up. So I am going to move an amendment to the motion:

That the words “Federal Government” in the first line be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

“Provincial and Federal Governments jointly.”

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Mr. Speaker, you have ruled that out of order once already.

**Mr. Loptson:** — You have not, Mr. Speaker. There was only one ‘s’ missing in the first amendment, and my hon. friend took advantage of that.

The question being put on Mr. Loptson’s amendment, it was negative on recorded division by 33 votes against 10.

The question being put on Mr. Swallow’s motion, it was agreed to unanimously by voice vote.

## **HEALTH INSURANCE**

The Assembly resumed from Thursday, March 25th, the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Carr respecting Health Insurance, and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Wellbelove, the debate continuing on the amendment.

**Mr. Carr (Rosthern):**

Mr. Speaker, this amendment moved by the hon. member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Wellbelove) has added considerably to the main motion, but the more important part of the amendment is that it takes out all the 'meat' from the main motion as moved. I have no objection to the part that is added, and there are three things added. The first is that this Assembly 'commends the Government': I don't object to that. The second is that a Dominion-Provincial Conference be called for the purpose of establishing the basis for a national health insurance programme. That is very good, also the idea expressed in the other part that, if the provinces fail to agree on a plan, the Federal Government assist those provinces that are willing to go into it.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned a minute ago, what I object to and why I think members should oppose this amendment, is because of the part that has been taken out of the main motion. That is the part which says that this Government should take steps to implement a plan of health insurance. I don't want to take very many minutes, but I would like just to point out three or four reasons why I think it is in the interests of the people of this province that the amendment should be defeated and that the Government should express its opinion on the main motion — I mean that the members should vote favourably on the main motion.

In the first place, I think all members will accept that there is a need for health insurance. The very fact that over one-third of the people of this province have taken advantage of health insurance plans would indicate that they think it is a necessary thing and that they want some plan of health insurance.

Another thing I think is important is that we in this province are able to pay for a plan of health insurance. The idea has been expressed that it would be much cheaper for us if the Federal Government financed 60 per cent of it. Well, it would be cheaper for us if we were the only province in it and all the people of Canada were paying 60 per cent of the cost. But if all the people of Canada were in the health insurance scheme today, it would cost the people of Saskatchewan more than it would if we put in a plan ourselves. I shall tell you why. The Federal Government would have to raise taxes to find the money, and the people of Saskatchewan would have to pay their share of those taxes. The people of Saskatchewan enjoy a standard of living quite a bit above the Canadian average. I believe the Provincial Treasurer said, in his budget address, that our per capita income was 12½ per cent higher than the national average. Now if that be true, we would have to pay 12½ per cent more per capita than the national average, and for that reason the people of Saskatchewan would have to pay 12½ per cent more tax than it would cost for a health insurance scheme in this province. So, as far as cost goes, it would be cheaper for us to put the plan in ourselves.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — That's a new one.

**Mr. Carr:** — Another point is that we have the facilities now. I believe that, of all Canadian provinces, Saskatchewan comes closest to having the necessary facilities. I said I admit we should commend the Government . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — That's something.

**Mr. Carr:** — . . . that we have those facilities. There's one other point.

**April 1, 1954**

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Come on across; we have a chair for you here.

**Mr. Carr:** — Three is another point. The people of Saskatchewan understand group health plans better than people in the other parts of the Dominion. We have our contribution to make to health services in Canada, and there is nothing wrong with us taking the lead in health insurance. We have the facilities. The people want it. We can afford to pay for it. What more do we want? In addition to that we have the promise of this Government that they will do it.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Some promise!

**Premier Douglas:** — The Federal Government promised it at the last election.

**Mr. Loptson:** — You promised it.

**Mr. Carr:** — I say then, because we all admit the need for health insurance, because of its social desirability, because of the capacity of our province to pay for it, and because this Government has promised it, I submit that this amendment should be defeated and that members should vote favourably on the main motion.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I will not delay the House long because this has been a day of oratorical marathons. I wish, therefore to make just a few comments regarding both the motion and the amendment.

I want to congratulate the members opposite on the homework they have been doing. I see that they have been going back and reading all the C.C.F. literature, and have done me the honour of reading some of my radio broadcasts over the years. I think that, if they keep on reading that kind of material, there is going to be quite a progressive change in the gentlemen opposite, and if, when the House prorogues, they would like some more material to take home to study, I would be very glad to supply them with it . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — We'll get it.

**Premier Douglas:** — . . .But I am sure by the time they come back for the next Session, they will have so completely changed from reading it that there will be no 'official' Opposition, and we will be in a very awkward position then, wondering what we should do.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Our conclusions won't be anything like yours.

**Premier Douglas:** — I want particularly to thank the member who moved this particular motion for doing me the honour of quoting from my various radio speeches quite frequently. I enjoyed listening to the quotations, first, because it brought back some very happy days. I had not realized some of the speeches were quite so good until I heard them being quoted.

**Mr. McDonald:** — That's your opinion.

**Premier Douglas:** — It also helped me to realize out of what Stygian blackness this province emerged 10 years ago. I had not

realized the province was quite in such bad shape with reference to health until we went back and realized that some of the things we had to be advocating at that time now are taken for granted as part of our provincial way of living.

All of these motions of the last few days have had to do with statements made by myself, or by someone else, in 1942, 1943 and 1944. That is interesting, because it indicates to me that the official Opposition are still fighting the election of 1944. They have never go past it. They are still living in the dim dark days of antiquity. The election of 1948 has been forgotten; the election of 1952 has been forgotten; they are still back in there shadow-boxing 1942, 1943 and 1944.

The other very significant thing is that none of these resolutions were put on while the Legislature was broadcasting its proceedings, and I can quite understand that. They would never have dared, never have tried to tell the people of the province how concerned they were about the Government's educational programme, about the Government's programme for health . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. If my hon. friend will give us air time, we will repeat all we have said this last few days on the air.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order. As a matter of fact, the radio time was available and all the hon. gentlemen had to do was to put the resolutions on. They were very careful to wait until the radio time was over and then they put the resolutions on, because I think they know the laugh that would have swept over the province of Saskatchewan would have swept them into the limbo of forgotten things.

Let us look at this Opposition motion which makes some criticism of the C.C.F. commitment to set up a complete system of socialized health service, with special emphasis on preventive medicine, to provide that every resident of Saskatchewan would receive medical, surgical, dental nursing and hospital care without charge.

My friend the member from Rosthern quoted from a statement which I made at Biggar. The Minister of Education and myself were just commenting, the other night, on that meeting. At that meeting I took time to point out to the audience, after having spent most of the evening discussion our health programme, that any government, before it could implement a complete system of health services, had first of all to provide facilities, secondly and even more difficult, had to train staff, and thirdly, had to build the kind of economic base that would enable the people to support a complete health programme. The people of this province were not so silly, and I don't think my friends opposite are so silly, as to think that a complete health programme was going to be put in the day after the Government took office.

What they did know, and what they do believe in, is that we have set ourselves a long-term goal towards which we are marching methodically and relentlessly. This is one in which complete health services will eventually be made available to every citizen of the province irrespective of their individual ability to pay. After listening to my friend the other day, I could not help but think how much further we were actually able to

**April 1, 1954**

go with that programme in a comparatively short time than we had hoped even in our fondest dreams.

I want at this time to pay tribute to a man who is often overlooked. We make mention of the various men like Dr. Sigerist and Dr. Mott and others who have made a marvelous contribution to our health programme. One of our own doctors, Dr. Hugh MacLean, who spent many years in this city and was a friend and good physician to all who knew him, came back to the province in 1944 because he knew the programme which the Government had and was interested in it. He was one of the men largely responsible, during my term as Minister of Public Health, in giving us advice as to where we could get the right kind of personnel, and in advising us of the kind of programme we could map out so that progressively we could go towards the goal which we had set for ourselves. I want at this time to pay tribute to Dr. Hugh MacLean and the part which he played in helping us get our feet along the path toward the goal of socialized health services.

We took office on July 10, 1944. By that fall, we had already appointed the Sigerist Commission and had received their report in a period of less than four months. By the end of December we had placed in the hands of every old-age pensioner, every mother's allowance case and their dependants, every blind person and their dependants (some 30,000 people) a card which entitled them to complete health services. That was accomplished within six months of having taken office. Gentlemen opposite had been in office for 34 years with the exception of a five-year break when the Anderson government was in. Here we were, less than six months in office. We had already brought in health services without money and without price for the aged, the sick, the blind, the widows and orphans of this province.

Within four months of taking office we faced up to the polio question. I was Minister of Public Health at the time, and one of the first problems I found was that, scattered throughout the province, were people lying in hospitals with poliomyelitis. Some of them were in iron lungs. In many cases the general practitioner had no facilities to treat that particular kind of case. We gathered them all into one centre. I sent a group of nurses, headed by a doctor, to study under Sister Kenny. They came back and began work on that group of patients, (I think there were 32), and by the end of March 1945, only three patients remained. The rest had been discharged. That was the first concerted attack on the rehabilitation of poliomyelitis cases.

Still within the first six months of taking office, one of the first things I found, as I said before, was that legislation had been placed on the statute book for free cancer. But no machinery had been set up, no arrangement had been made with the doctors, no provision at all had been made for paying for surgery and paying for care given by doctors outside of the clinic, and there was a completely inadequate staff in the clinic itself to provide the kind of care for which the legislation provided.

By the first of September we had worked out an arrangement with the doctors and began to pay accounts back to the first of May when the legislation became effective. By the end of December we had the clinics



working in full operation and providing the services which the Liberal Party had put on paper but which they had never put into practice.

In 1940 we provided free care for those who were mentally ill. Up until that time the Government had been charging back to the individual or to the municipality, or to anyone who could be found who could pay, the account of the person being treated in a hospital for mental illness. We felt that the fact that a person, particularly a breadwinner, was mentally ill placed a sufficient burden on the family without also adding to the family's burden the hospital bill which that person was incurring. So we passed legislation, within a year of taking office, saying that from now on, people who were mentally ill would be cared for without charge by the rest of the people of the province.

So we began to tackle the problem of general medical care throughout the province. We were the first government in the history of this province, the first government of any province of Canada that I know of, that began to pay grants to municipalities where they had a municipal doctor scheme, in order to encourage municipalities to go out and hire doctors on a salary basis or on a per capita basis, and to pay for his services by a tax rather than putting the burden on the individual who happened to be sick. And what is the result?

My friends opposite were in office for 34 years. They talk about municipal doctor plans; but when we came in there were only 38 municipalities that had municipal doctor plans. Today there are 91. The total number of plans of any sort, voluntary or municipal, was 58 in 1944. Today there are 165 towards which we give a grant. There are 210,000 people in this province who are covered by doctor plans to which the Provincial Government makes a contribution. We have, in Health Region No. 1, a medical care programme to which the Provincial Government makes a grant, which is giving complete medical and surgical care to something over 50,000 people, in addition to providing for preventive services.

For the first time in our history the province has been divided up into health regions. We have proceeded systematically year after year to staff those health regions. The Minister of Public Health has just announced that another health region is going to be added this present year. The estimates we considered, the other day, provided for a health building being put up in the city of Prince Albert. Today, more than half of the province is now covered by health regions providing preventive services. What has that meant? We have some idea of what it has meant in terms of nursing service, for instance, which is extremely important. In 1944, there were only 22 public health nurses to cover the entire province of Saskatchewan; now there are 90 – four times as many. We could use more, of course, if we could get them; but four times as many is an achievement. For the first time a basic preventive health programme is being carried on.

We were told in 1944 that, if we insisted on trying to put our programme into operation, we would frighten the doctors out of the province. I can remember the Opposition at that time getting up and saying, "The doctors will leave the province." In 1943, there were 408 doctors in Saskatchewan; today there are 722 doctors. This much we were able to do in the first two years, with the exception, of course, of the health regions, which is a progressive programme that will continue until we get the whole province blanketed with health regions.

**April 1, 1954**

We recognized; of course, that we had a basic job to do. As I said when I started, before you are going to have complete health services there are two things which must be done: you must get health facilities, and you must get trained staff to operate those facilities. I don't need to go into what has been done about trained staff. The Minister of Public Health has already told about that in his budget speech. In which he reported on the training of nurses, the trainings of physiotherapists, the training of specialists in cancer and mental illness, and the building of the medical school which will enable us to begin to train doctors in Saskatchewan who will fit into the Saskatchewan picture.

One of the most pressing problems was the problem of hospital accommodation. As I said to the Legislature as far back as 1945, it would be absurd for us to tell people we had health insurance and to charge them money for it if we did not have the facilities to take care of it. Consequently, for the first two and a half years that we were in office, we held back any general health programme over the entire province until we had facilities. We concentrated on increasing our hospital accommodation, acquiring X-ray equipment and laboratory technicians to operate those labs and that X-ray equipment. Long before the Federal Government got into the picture at all, we were the first Government in Canada to begin to give construction grants to communities to build hospitals. It was a shock, Mr. Speaker, to municipalities and Union Hospital districts to find a provincial government which was going to give them some money to build hospitals. They never had a dollar before. Nobody had ever given them a dime to build hospitals. They either built them or they did not have them. We started in and, within the first four years, spent nearly \$1,500,000 in giving grants to municipalities and union hospital districts. Of course that has continued throughout the years.

The rated bed capacity of this province about ten years ago was 3,209 beds. Our bed complement today is 6,200. Our rate per thousand population at that time was 3.9; our rate per thousand today is 7.2. We are in a better position in terms of bed capacity than any other province in Canada and, with perhaps two exceptions, of any state in the Union. That's not a record of which any government needs to be ashamed in ten short years.

The gentlemen opposite talk about the fact that they passed Union Hospital legislation. Certainly they did. But after all the years of the Union Hospital legislation, when we came into office, there were only 20 union hospital districts set up; twenty in all those years. Today there are 104. We set up four times as many in the last ten years as they had set up in the previous thirty years. The bed complement for union hospital districts when we took office was 505, and today it is 2,273. That's quite a difference.

Having got what we thought was an adequate number of beds, or nearly sufficient beds, we passed, in 1946, the legislation . . .

**Gov't Member:** — The Leader of the Opposition is going to the hospital.

**Premier Douglas:** — I hope I haven't driven the Leader of the Opposition into the hospital, because our hospitals are extremely crowded, particularly the ones to which the might have just gone.

We passed legislation in 1946 providing a complete hospital insurance plan to start on January 1, 1947. Mr. Speaker. I would ask the House to remember that we took office on July 10, 1944, and two and

a half years later we set up a plan to provide hospitalization on a prepaid basis to every man, woman and child in Saskatchewan. When I look back on it now and see what had to be done, I would hate to try to do it again in two and a half years. It is one of the most mammoth undertakings that was ever tackled by any group of people, and it was only done because of the admirable co-operation which we had from the hospital associations, the doctors, the nurses, municipalities and hospital districts and the people of the province generally. I don't need to tell the members of this House what that hospital insurance plan has meant for our people.

In 1946 for instance, the year before the plan started, 118,587 people went to the hospital. In 1953, 169,391, or over 50,000 more people were hospitalized under the plan than were hospitalized the year before the plan started. What does that mean, Mr. Speaker? It means that prior to the plan, when a person's capacity to get hospital care depended upon his financial position, there were 50,000 people who could not afford to go to hospital, and who last year, under the hospital plan, were able to go to hospital. In 1946, the year before the plan started, the number of days of care in hospital was 1,187,951. Last year it was 1,723,423 or in excess of half-a-million hospital days more care given to the people of this province. That is the story up to date. But, Mr. Speaker, it is a continuing story. We do not suggest that we have now reached the goal. We have made a very good start towards it.

We now have a medical school from which doctors and nurses will be graduating. We now have a completely free mental care programme, and a completely free rehabilitation for polio. We now cover our old people, blind, and mother's allowance cases. We now cover cancer. We now have, as I said, some 210,000 people cared for in the province through various kinds of municipal plans and other plans to which the Government contributes. We have more than half the province covered with preventive health programmes. We are steadily moving forward towards the goal from which we have never taken our eyes, which is that someday in this province there shall be a complete system of health services, irrespective of the individual's ability to pay. I want to say to my friend from Rosthern (Mr. Carr) and to anyone else, that he does not need to remind us of the goal we have set for ourselves.

**Mr. Lopton:** — It's short-lived.

**Premier Douglas:** — We have done more towards that goal than any province in Canada. We have health services in this province that cannot be equaled, let alone surpassed, in any province in Canada. We have made more progress in providing health services in the last 10 years than any government this province ever had, and more progress in 10 years than any provincial government in Canada has ever made. We don't need the Opposition to remind us. I made a pledge with myself long before I ever sat in this House in the years when I knew something about what it meant to get health service when you did not have the money to pay for it. I made a pledge with myself that some day, if I ever had anything to do with it, people would be able to get health services, just as they are able to get educational services, as an inalienable right of being a citizen of a Christian country.

I want to tell my friends that they won't need to remind us; that I shall live to see the day – and many others shall live to see the day – when a C.C.F. Government will provide complete health services

**April 1, 1954**

not only in Saskatchewan, but throughout Canada. That's the only way we will ever get them in Canada.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Wishful thinking.

**Premier Douglas:** — I want now to deal with the statement made by the member who moved the resolution in which he said that the people of Saskatchewan had been betrayed.

**Mr. Willis (Elrose):**

He didn't say by whom.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I take no umbrage at that statement because if I may in all kindness to my friend say that I don't think he has any authority to speak for the people of Saskatchewan themselves. The Party who made the pledge of ultimately setting up complete health services, went to the people in 1948 and said, "This is how much we have done; we want a mandate to do more." We got a bigger popular vote than we did in 1944 when we made the pledge. In 1952, we went back to them again and said, "We have made more progress. We want a mandate to continue this programme." We got an even bigger popular vote than we did in either 1948 or 1944.

**Mr. Loptson:** — What about the Estevan by-election?

**Premier Douglas:** — The Estevan by-election? The Liberals didn't even dare run in it, Mr. Speaker. When the Tory candidate was running, the Liberal Party were out behind the barns somewhere, shovelling hay.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Not hay!

**Premier Douglas:** — Well, there are ladies present. I want to say to my hon. friends that if at any time they think the people of Saskatchewan feel betrayed, we would be very glad to give them an opportunity to express their opinion.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Then try it. Try it this spring.

**Mr. Erb:** — That's what your predecessor said.

**Premier Douglas:** — I remember the Liberal Party saying that in 1952. Mr. Tucker got up and said, "Why, this Government has lost the confidence of the people." When we got through on June 11th, it was very apparent who had lost the confidence of the people . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — The people know more about the C.C.F. now than they did then.

**Premier Douglas:** — . . . and he vanished away and my friend will follow him, except that he will not follow him in such a comfortable berth.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about being betrayed, we think that the people of Saskatchewan rather than feeling betrayed, feel that this is the first government they have ever had that has carried out its pledge to provide adequate health services. By that record the Government is prepared to stand or fall. The gentlemen opposite have the unmitigated

audacity to talk about betrayal. Here is a party which in 1919, took into its national federal programme National Health Insurance. That was 35 years ago. Mr. MacKenzie King went up and down the country in every subsequent election and said, "Just one more try; give it to me once more and you'll get national health insurance."

**Mr. Wooff:** — Try again, Minty!

**Premier Douglas:** — And in 1945, when they got in by such a narrow majority (they only had seven of a majority in the House of Commons), Mr. King finally gave way and called the Federal-Provincial Conference. At that time he sat down with the provinces and said, "Yes, we'll have health insurance; we are prepared to pay up to 60 per cent of the complete costs of health services providing they are not more than \$21.96 per capita." What happened? Well, British Columbia and ourselves — we first and British Columbia a year or so later — came back and set up hospital insurance. We were told, "There's no doubt about it, if you set up hospital insurance the Federal Government will come in and pay 60 per cent of the cost up to a maximum figure, then you can go on with medical care and you can go on with dental care." Did they ever come in? No! In 1949 they went to the country and again they said, "We'll bring in health insurance." It hasn't come yet! They have given some grants; and they are to be commended for giving these grants. These grants have been most useful in Canada, but they are not a substitute for the national health insurance programme they promised to the people of Canada.

**Mr. Kramer:** — Get the rope, fellows!

**Premier Douglas:** — They still haven't brought in their national health insurance. Mr. Martin is now hiding behind the pretext that he cannot do it until all the provinces agree. He can't do it until most of them agree. He must have a majority of the provinces. That of course, Mr. Speaker, is pure subterfuge. There is nothing to prevent the Federal Government proceeding with national health insurance.

A few years ago they asked all the provinces to make a survey. We, in common with the other provinces, made one, which took two years. Our Survey Committee and the British Columbia Survey Committee both recommended national health insurance. Two provinces are already on record (I think Newfoundland has also joined in) as favouring national health insurance. With these three provinces — and others may indicate their willingness yet — there is nothing to prevent Ottawa from passing the legislation. It could be enabling legislation in which Ottawa would say, "We will pay 60 per cent of any part or all of a health insurance programme set up in any province, providing of course, they meet certain standards and come up to certain maximum figures." There is nothing to prevent them. If Quebec doesn't want to come in, they can stay out.

I want to remind the House that that is how the Old-Age Pension legislation came in. If the Federal Government had waited for all the provinces to agree, or even a majority to agree, about Old-Age pensions, we would never have got them. Ottawa put the legislation on the statute books and said, "We will pay 50 per cent of a pension in any province where the provincial government will pay the other 50 per cent." And they just left it at that. The first province to come in (if I remember correctly)

**April 1, 1954**

either Saskatchewan or one other province – Saskatchewan was either first or second. Quebec stayed out, New Brunswick stayed out and some others stayed out, but they came in eventually under the pressure of public opinion.

If the Liberal Government would simply take its courage in its hands and put that legislation on the Statute Books, I will guarantee that, inside of the first six months, Saskatchewan will have a health insurance programme set up under that legislation. I think it is safe to say that British Columbia would be inside within the first year, and probably Newfoundland also. And I would make bold to predict that, inside of five years, every province in Canada would come in under that legislation.

I was amazed a little while ago to hear the member for Rosthern say that if we had a national health insurance programme, it would cost us a lot more than if we just had one for ourselves. That is most fantastic reasoning, because all insurance risk is based on having a broad base. If two people (a husband and wife, say) have to pool their resources to pay their own hospital bills, they have a high risk. But if you take in 20 people, there is less risk. If you take in 2,000 people, the risk will be still less. If you can take in 2,000,000 people, of course it would reduce their rates. My hon. friend knows that all the insurance companies now are trying to sell employers on the idea of group insurance. One insurance company, I think, is trying to sell the Civil Service Association this idea right now. They have approached employees, saying, “We will give you a group health insurance policy with premiums which will go down as the number goes up, because we will be spreading your risk over a greater number of people.”

My friend argues that we have a higher per capita income in Saskatchewan in the last two or three years. Sure we have; but we also have had, at one time, one of the lowest. If there is any economy that has its ups and downs it is an agricultural economy dependent upon moisture and dependent upon world markets. A 60 per cent contribution by the Federal Government out of taxes which are collected all over Canada – corporation taxes, succession duties, income taxes, duties and tariff collections – would be a stable contribution irrespective of whether our provincial income went up and down and whether farmers’ private income went up and down.

Mr. Speaker, the only type of health insurance programme that is going to be economic and that is going to be cheap enough to make it convenient, is a health insurance programme in which the major part of the money comes from the senior government, some of it from the provincial government and, I hope, ultimately, just a minimum amount from the individuals themselves. I think the individual citizen ought to pay two or three dollars for his card, just because it is not good for people to get something for nothing. But apart from that it ought to be purely a nominal charge, and the health services ought to be paid by the provincial and federal governments. Of course the thing is that, frankly, I do not think the Liberal Party really believes in state-sponsored health insurance. The member for Rosthern talks about health insurance plans – blue Cross and individual plans. He does not talk about state-sponsored health insurance because I do not think the Liberal Party, at hear, believes in state-sponsored and state-supported health insurance.

**Mr. Carr:** — I was working for health insurance before you were.

**Premier Douglas:** — That's a dubious statement. I don't know when my friend started to work for health insurance, but I have been working for it for probably close to a quarter of a century. I want to say too, that his working to date within his own Party has not been very effective. The total contribution the Liberal Party has made to health insurance in this province and in Canada has been very, very small . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — If it wasn't for the Liberal Party in Ottawa there wouldn't be money enough in Saskatchewan to keep going.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, our hospital insurance plan is being carried on today without one five-cent piece from Ottawa, and my hon. friend knows it.

**Mr. Loptson:** — That is as untrue as if you . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Premier Douglas:** — Well, I do not propose to argue with my friend about untruths; I don't think he would know a truth if he met it in broad daylight with its tail sticking out.

**Mr. Loptson:** — My hon. friend gets \$27 million this year, and he can do anything at all with it. He can use it for health insurance or anything else.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, that is a spurious type of argument. The money for renting our income tax, corporation tax, and succession duties is income which we get, not as a gift from the Federal Government. We have rented tax fields just as other provinces have done, and we would receive those rents just as Manitoba receives them, even if we had no hospital insurance . . . You can say all you like afterwards; just keep quite while I'm talking. You will never get yourself into trouble by listening, but you have got yourself into a lot of trouble by talking the last few months . . . The only difference between ourselves and Manitoba is that we have taken some of that money and used it for the benefit of our people. That is the difference between a C.C.F. and a Liberal Government.

I want to say in closing, Mr. Speaker, that this amendment will give the gentlemen opposite a chance to rectify the mistakes of their Federal Party. Irrespective of their Federal Party's failure to implement its promise of national health insurance, they may save the day by getting up and voting for this amendment and declaring that at least the Liberal members in Saskatchewan are a little in advance of the Liberal members at Ottawa.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask the Minister a question. He intimated that he was only getting, in the \$27 million, a return of the subsidy from income tax and corporation taxes. Will he trade what he is getting from the Federal Government — this \$27 million now — and collect these things himself? I suggest that that is what the Federal Government should do, in view of his statement.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Premier Douglas:** — That is not a question, Mr. Speaker.

**April 1, 1954**

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Premier Douglas:** — That is not a question, Mr. Speaker. However, I will endeavour to answer it.

**Mr. Loptson:** — I am asking you. If you say that you are getting no more than the Federal Government gets from those taxes . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — I didn't say we were getting no more. I said that we were not being given a gift of \$27 million.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Oh no; but you said . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — You asked the question. Will you wait for the answer? If my friend would listen he would know a great deal more, but he is so busy talking he never gives himself a chance to listen. That is why his mind has become a complete blank in the last few weeks.

**Mr. Loptson:** — You listen too.

**Premier Douglas:** — The \$27 million which we get is not a gift, as I said. It is rental, which we get from the Federal Government in return for giving to them the fields of income tax, corporation tax and succession duties. What we do with that money is the business of the Provincial Government and the people of this province. The Federal Government is not giving us anything. If we did not use it for hospital insurance, there would not be any hospital insurance.

**Mr. Loptson:** — If you did not have that, there would not be hospital insurance.

**Premier Douglas:** — There would be that, whether we had that agreement or not.

The question being put on Mr. Wellbelove's amendment, it was agreed to, on division.

The question being put on the motion as amended, it was agreed to unanimously.

The Assembly then adjourned at 11 o'clock p.m.