

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

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

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

DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The House resumed, from Tuesday, February 22, 1955, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Dewhurst for the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. T.R. MacNutt (Nipawin): — Mr. Speaker, on speaking to the Assembly, this afternoon, I feel that I am a rather privileged person. This happens to be my wedding anniversary, and I can think of no better way to celebrate that event than by laying a few of my thoughts before this Assembly this afternoon. I can assure you, sir, that I am a model husband, and that I have not forgotten to let my good wife know that I appreciate the many years that she has put up with me.

I would like to add my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne. While much of the Speech is the usual patting the Government on the back, it is pleasant to note a few paragraphs that forecast the bringing down a certain legislation that we on this side of the House have asked for and sponsored for some time. I will deal with that a little later.

I take a great deal of pleasure and satisfaction in offering my congratulations, at this time, to the hon. member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) for being elevated to the leadership of the Saskatchewan Liberal Party and as Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition in this Legislature. We have in him a likeable young man with vision, coupled with intelligence, a farmer who knows the problems of the farmer through experience, a man with a clean character and an excellent war record. As you probably know, Mr. Speaker, our leader was a World War II fighter pilot, and while doing an excellent job which was recognized by the authorities, had the misfortune to come down twice in the English Channel. At this time I would like to correct my hon. friend, the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) who, when nominating the present Leader of the Opposition at our very large and enthusiastic convention in Saskatoon, last fall, suggested that he was the only man he knew who had swum the English Channel three times in a parachute. According to my information, Mr. Speaker, he only swam it twice. The first time it only took about an hour; the second time it took him about eight hours, and if he had come down the third time, as my hon. friend suggested, and he might not have made it according to the law of averages. Actually, the third time he came down I understand he came down in a swamp, and he didn't have to swim for it. I can assure you, sir, that he has my high regard and my steadfast loyalty.

The hon. member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst), during the course of his remarks, kidded us about having had four leaders during the last few years, and it appeared to me he was intimating that we were having trouble with our leadership problem. The only trouble that I can find with our leadership problem, Mr. Speaker, is that we have had such good leaders that we have lost them to what many people might say, higher positions.

February 23, 1955

You will all remember, of course, the Rt. Hon. J.G. Gardiner who was our leader and Premier of this province for quite some time. He was called to take the very important post of Minister of Agriculture in the Dominion Government. And while we hear many people opposite saying things about Mr. Gardiner that some of us do not agree with, I think all will agree that the Rt. Hon. Mr. Gardiner has done a tremendous job for Canada and especially for western Canada.

The Hon. W.J. Patterson was our leader and Premier of this province for some time and now he is the Lieutenant-Governor of this province, and I think that we all have a very high regard for him and what he has done in the past.

Mr. Tucker was called from Federal politics very much against the wishes of his own constituents, to take over the leadership of the party in this province. Unfortunately, we lost two elections when he was leader and, at that time, those constituents felt he could do a better job in Ottawa as their representative than he could as the Leader of the Opposition, and he is down there and now doing an excellent job as he did before he came from Federal politics into Provincial politics some time ago.

Now, we have my hon. friend, the member for Moosomin as our leader. It is to be hoped that he will be our leader for a long time, and as Premier of this province I am sure he will make a great name for himself.

I was rather surprised at my hon. friend, the Minister of Social Welfare (Mr. Sturdy), yesterday, when he was speaking about homes for the elderly people in this province and he looked across at our side of the House and he said, "None of the Liberals over there took any interest in these homes", or words to that effect. I might remind my hon. friend that, with regard to the home that Nipawin, I had several conversations with the hon. Minister about that home. I was up at that home on several occasions and we had some correspondence about it, and I do not think he could have included me in that lot. I still take an interest in that home, and I am very gratified with it and it is doing a good job up there.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — You were the exception.

Mr. MacNutt: — Concerning the Speech from the Throne, there are a few things that I can go along with, providing they go far enough. It is gratifying, indeed, to find that the Government is at least attempting to adopt some of the suggestions that have been made by the Opposition. It leads one to believe that this Socialist Government are beginning to see the error of their ways and to realize after many years that Liberal policies are the best for this province.

In my speech in this house on March 10, 1954, I suggested at that time that the supplementary allowance for the old-age pensioners was a miserly way to treat our elder citizens. The Minister of Natural Resources, in a later speech, suggested that I had shed a few crocodile tears on behalf of the old-age pensioners. Later my hon. friend and colleague, the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) introduced a resolution into this House asking the Government to give consideration to raising a pension to \$10 a month. This was voted down, by amendment, of course, by every C.C.F. member in this Legislature, with the exception of the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs), and I give him full credit for voting with us on that location. Every member on this side of the House voted for it. What happened, Mr. Speaker, to make the Government

change their mind? I believe I can tell you. The people of Saskatchewan who support this Government did not like the attitude of the Government on that occasion and, at their convention last summer (as I understand it from press reports), they told the Government to get back to the Legislature and bring down some legislation to conform with the resolution that we brought in during the last session. Mr. Speaker, when that comes down in the House, and if it will go far enough, I am prepared to support it.

It is encouraging to note that additional assistance will be given to rural municipalities to assist them in building main market roads, long overdue. Rural municipalities are struggling to make a decent showing and provide roads and bridges. Up in our part of the country, where we have a lot of streams and rivers, bridges have to come first and that is a big job. We have talked loudly in this Legislature asking the Government to take those bridges over and, finally, they have done something about it; but it is not enough. I am pleased indeed to see that the Speech from the Throne offer some assistance along those lines. The taxes have been increasing from year-to-year in these rural municipalities and the land, today, is paying more than its share for cost of roads and bridges and other things in the municipality. I feel, and I have always felt, that a certain portion of the gasoline tax should be turned back to the rural municipalities to assist them in their efforts there. In a lot of cases trucks and cars especially trucks that are used in rural municipalities, are very rarely used on the highways. Up in our part of the country you have to go too far to get to a highway to use it, and a lot of gasoline taxes being paid by these people is for gas being used on municipal roads. In my opinion there is no reason why a portion of that gasoline tax should not be returned to the rural municipalities for their use.

I am pleased to note, Mr. Speaker, that there will be more assistance given to school districts. I have said in this House before, and I say it again, that prior to the time this Government came into power there was a grant of \$1.50 per day given to each room in the schools. That was increased by this Government to \$2.00 a day and, at the last session of the House, it was an increase to \$2.50 per day for elementary schools only. Well, we hear a lot about our dollar being worth only 53 cents. If that is so (and I don't take exception to it), then this grant should have been raised to \$3.00 a day quite some considerable time ago. With the increasing cost of education, I feel that the grants should be higher than that. Education, as I understand it, under our Constitution is a provincial responsibility. With the larger school units — and I am not going to say anything about the larger school units; there are arguments for the larger school units and arguments against it; but there is one thing that we can be mighty sure of and that is that they cost us a lot more money. The fact that this Government has pushed the larger school units, and if they wish to do that it is all right; but because of the fact that they have pushed them, they should take a larger responsibility for the costs of education.

Farm electrification seems to be quite a subject in this Legislature and has been for some time, and I noticed in the Speech from the Throne that the Government are still bragging about what they have done in that regard and that they expect a larger expansion this year than ever. I want to see the farmers get electricity, but I want to see all the farmers get electricity. Under the present system that we have, only those who have a bit of money can get it. We must realize that, apart from paying \$500, or whatever the amount might be — I believe that varies from time to time; apart from paying that amount, they have to wire their buildings and they have to get the appliances, and before a farmer can get electricity to make any use of it on his farm, it

February 23, 1955

is going to cost him possibly \$1,000 to \$1,500. Up in our part of the country, farmers have not got \$1,000 or \$1,500 this year. They have not got any. In our system, which has been explained many, many times, in my opinion it is the system to use, and I believe that it is a really good business proposition.

Up in our part of the country this year we are in a bad way. I have come down here for the last couple of years now, and I have told you, sir, that we have the finest country in the province of Saskatchewan and I still think we have; but we have had adverse conditions. This year we have been flooded out. Many farmers did not thresh a bushel of grain; others threshed a few bushels of probably No. 5 or No. 6, and they had quite a struggle getting that. They would have been better off financially to have left their seed in the bins, last spring, and sat around all summer and done nothing. And we are not through with it yet. I know of farmers out there who were not able to get on their summer fallow at all, and their summer fallow has grown up at least three and four feet high. Even if we do have a dry spring and that land does dry out, that land is not going to produce anything this year worthwhile. I cannot see how, in 1955, that we are going to get a crop that is worth a great deal up in north-eastern Saskatchewan.

For the first time in our history we are receiving assistance from P.F.A.A. We don't want to receive that; but, this year, it is quite a boon to us and we are very, very glad indeed to get it.

Late last summer or early fall, when we found out what was going to happen in that part of the country, the reeve of the rural municipality of Moose Range (which is in my constituency) and I made a trip to Regina to see what could be done to relieve the situation up there. I found that the proper Minister to go to was the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, and I made arrangements to meet him on a certain day. We were very well received, as we always are, by the Minister of Municipal Affairs. We explained the situation to him, and we had quite a nice long chat with him, and when we left we felt that something was going to be done. At that time I suggested that, while we could clear road allowances, do a few repair jobs on roads and so on, nothing would suffice except a large gravelling programme in those rural municipalities. And the Minister appeared to feel that I had said something that was worth while. Later on, we had a meeting in Tisdale of various municipalities around there. I believe the hon. member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) mentioned that in his address, and I believe it was nine municipalities represented at that meeting. There were four Ministers of the Crown there, and I give them full credit for coming up there especially on that day which was a dirty, wet, miserable day.

I was asked to say a few words at that meeting and I suggested the gravelling programme again, and it seemed to meet with the approval of those present. Later on, I made a radio broadcast and I put that forth again. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have seen some of the cheques that have been coming in from the work-and-wages programme — and I am not saying anything against the work-and-wages programme; we were very glad to get what little we got; but, Mr. Speaker with the conditions up in that north-eastern part of the country, it is not enough. I still think a gravelling programme would be a good effort as it would put money in the hands of the farmers and would also give us some benefit for it.

Every farmer has some sort of a truck, it might be a ton truck or it might be a two-ton truck; but they could use those. I believe they have to have a permit, but that would not be very difficult to get. They could use those trucks and, as long as we have a loader to load those trucks, it would

not be too much trouble to unload them with a shovel. Mr. Speaker, you and I have used a shovel on gravel before today. And I think that we are none the worse for it. I feel quite positive that the people up in that part of the country would be glad to shovel off the loads of gravel in order to make a few dollars to put in their pocket, and at the same time give us something for it.

I am going to say a few words about the highway situation up in that part of the country. I always say something about that, and I have a lot to talk about actually; that is, when I talk about the lack of highways, because we haven't got very many. In my constituency of Nipawin, we have a short piece of No. 35 Highway running from the edge of the constituency up to White Fox and then a way off in the blue some place. Then we have part of No. 55 running from the junction of that one to the west of the constituency.

I noticed in Public Accounts for the last fiscal year under consideration, that, in the constituency of Nipawin, the Minister of Highways made a capital expenditure of \$8.52. Now, that surely is an enormous sum to spend in a very excellent constituency like that. One that really requires a lot of highway building, and I would implore them Minister to put a little more capital expenditure there, and perhaps he could double it, or maybe even triple it for another year, because I can assure him we need it.

A few weeks ago my hon. friend for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) came out in print and suggested that he was under the impression that No. 35 Highway would not be built on its present location, or continued. He suggested some alternate routes. I replied to that a little later on, and I am glad to say that my hon. friend took that quite seriously. Even had copies made, and I think he distributed them around on the other side of the House. I don't know why he didn't send some over here.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Just the promises.

Mr. MacNutt: — But, Mr. Speaker, he suggested that one alternative route might go up through the Candle Lake area, if I remember correctly. I don't blame him altogether for that; that is in his own constituency. I don't blame him at all for fighting for his own constituency. But, Mr. Speaker, the people of north-eastern Saskatchewan want that highway continued to Flin Flon where it is at the present time. We have a No. 35 Highway Association up there, and there are people in that association — Liberals, Conservatives, C.C.F. and Social Credit and what have you, and we all want that highway built. The Minister of Natural Resources suggested that I was making a political football of it. Well, I think that is rather weak. The people have sent me down here to fight for these things for them, and I am going to continue to do so. I don't think that that is making a political football out of anything, and if it is, then I am going to continue to do it because I am going to continue to scarp for No. 35 Highway to be built.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. MacNutt: — In my statement I said that I did not think that this highway would be built by this Government. That was made quite evident a year ago when the Minister of Natural Resources suggested that it would not be built. This year again, and during this Session and during this debate, the Minister of Natural Resources again said that it would not be built as far as he was concerned unless the Federal Government put up 50 per cent.

February 23, 1955

I do feel, sir, that that is the place for No. 35 Highway. It is going to open up Flin Flon to the people of that part of the country. I feel that that is where we have to go. The road is up there for some miles, and it would be quite a waste of money to let it end where it is. I am of the opinion that is just a good a road as we can get. As I said before, all the people of that north-eastern part of the province are in favour of it; they want it. They send delegations down here to the Government asking for it, but we don't seem to get anywhere.

Another alternative route that my hon. friend mentioned was the route from Carrot River to The Pas up in that vicinity. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not an alternative route; we want that highway, too. We want both those highways, and if you will take a look at the map of that part of the country, you will find that all north of the Nipawin area there, we haven't any highways at all; there are no red lines there at all, except No. 35 Highway going out into the blue. We have been putting on cavalcades from Carrot River to The Pas, and from The Pas to Carrot River, trying to impress the authorities with the idea that that is a good route and that it will open up a bunch of wonderful country out there which I have spoken of before in this House. Last year when I was speaking on the same question, my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture said that they were already endeavouring to get an agreement with the Federal Government and I said at that time that I was very pleased about that. Well, it is a year later, Mr. Speaker. Where is our agreement? We haven't heard very much about it. Why the agreement is being held up, I do not know. Perhaps the Minister of Agriculture will tell us when he gets on his feet to make a speech probably in this debate.

I can assure you, sir, that we are not going to be satisfied with alternative routes for No. 35 Highway. We want No. 35 Highway on the west side of the country, and we want that highway from Carrot River to The Pas. Then, my hon. friend, the Minister of Natural Resources suggested another alternative highway north and east of Hudson Bay.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — Now you're talking.

Mr. MacNutt: — Well, I took a look at the map there, and I can go along with him on that; but not as an alternative highway. I think that he struck a good chord there and he put another idea in my head. I think there is a lot of good country up there that can be opened up and now, instead of fighting for two highways there, I believe I am going to fight for three, and I wish to thank my hon. friend for his very timely suggestion.

Seriously, sir, we in north-eastern Saskatchewan need those highways. We need that country opened up, and the sooner we get down to it — we are not asking you to do it all in one year, or two years; but let's get down to it and make a start so that the people out there will have some hope. I feel that we are not going to get those highways there until the Government is changed. I am sorry to say that I feel we are not getting our fair share of the revenue, and that it would appear that we are not too interesting to the present Government that is in power in this province.

It is amusing to hear many of the hon. members on your right tender our leader quite a number of left-handed compliments. They make slurring remarks about his first speech as leader of the Opposition. I have heard many speeches, sir, and I think I can judge his speech, not as well, maybe, but nearly as well, as anybody in this Legislature. I am of the opinion that the speech that the Leader of the Opposition made soon after the opening of this

Session was an excellent one. He had good points, and he placed them before this Legislature very well. He was in no way dirty. His criticism was constructive. The hon. members opposite, too, like to twit him about leaving the Conservative party and coming over to the Liberals. Mr. Speaker, it is nice to know that in this country we have the opportunity to change our minds if we so desire. Every member sitting on your right, sir, changed his political mind at one time or another.

Some Government Members: — No. Name one!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. MacNutt: — I think, sir, that my hon. friend has every right to change his mind, or is that reserved only for those who change their politics to become C.C.F.ers?

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg): — He changed his mind to change his politics.

Mr. MacNutt: — The reason I believe that hon. members on the Government's side of the House, sir, are going after him is because they are just a little bit afraid of him, and well they might be, because, in my opinion, whether the next election comes in 1955, 1956 or 1957, there sits the next Premier of the province of Saskatchewan.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Ho. Mr. Fines: — That's what you said about Walter Tucker.

Mr. MacNutt: — I am fast coming to the conclusion that as long as this Government is in power we in north-eastern Saskatchewan will not get what I have been asking for and fighting for. It will not be until a Liberal government gets back in power and takes over the reins of government that north-eastern Saskatchewan will come into its own. When we in the north come into our own, all Saskatchewan will benefit, not only those of us in north-eastern Saskatchewan.

Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I have many things to discuss with you. After the things that have been taking place in this House in the last few days, as one of the members of the Opposition, I must reply to them, and if, in so doing, I shall tread on somebody's toes over on the other side of the House, I can assure you it is coming to them because they ask for it.

Some Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Danielson: — During this Session in particular — you have been here a long time, Mr. Speaker, and so have I — but I never came into this House for a session and had the feeling that is in this House today, and what is the reason for it? It seems to be a sense of urgency, bordering on panic, among the C.C.F. members over on the other side. There is a reason for it, of course, and they try to hide that reason and that is their future political life, Mr. Speaker. They cannot forget, I am sure, that the Liberal party, in 1952 in the provincial election, polled 41 per cent all of the people's votes in this province of Saskatchewan. I don't think they can forget that. They cannot forget, either, that the convention which was called in Saskatoon to select a new leader for this party in the latter part of 1954 drew to the city of Saskatoon 2,000 people and I can assure you that I saw C.C.F. people there from my

February 23, 1955

own constituency, people who were very active for the C.C.F. in 1952, and those people were at the Liberal convention either as delegates or alternative delegates to that convention.

Some Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Danielson: — I thought I would get you wakened up over there; you have been asleep long enough. Don't drink too much of that milk, or you will go to sleep again.

But, Mr. Speaker, after all, that is only as it should be because there is an old saying, and you have lived long enough to know what is true, that the Opposition never defeats any Government, the Government defeats itself. It is true that all the political barnacles, all the dead weight that is tied to the boots of those fellows sitting across the way here, are the biggest liability they have in this province of Saskatchewan, in a political sense. It is their friends; it is the big political machine that they have built up, and now have to keep oiled . . .

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Shades of Jimmy Gardiner!

Mr. Danielson: — . . . or else they will turn on them, and heaven help them when that happens! And you know it is true. The Premier has a kind of silly grin on his face, but I am sure it is very shallow.

Premier Douglas: — Just a reflection!

Mr. Danielson: — I want to congratulate the Leader of our party here. He is a farmer, a successful farmer, and he has a great record in the service of this country. Can you beat that in your leader? Oh, no, you can't match that. He has the advantage of being held in extremely high respect by all the people in the province of Saskatchewan, even the C.C.F. — in my district at least; and I predict for him a the successful political career. We have heard the left-handed compliment of the Premier when he said, a week ago today I think it was, that he hoped the Leader of the Opposition would long continue to be the Leader of the Opposition. Well, there is no hope of my Leader ever attaining the record, or establishing a record for leadership of the Opposition, because that record is held by Mr. M.J. Coldwell, and there is nobody going to live long enough to be able to duplicate the record that he has as the leader of an opposition; he never got any place. So you cannot hand us any back-handed compliments on that score. Today Mr. Caldwell has no opposition to lead, Mr. Speaker. There is a Canadian 'Bevan' in the C.C.F. at Ottawa, namely, a friend of our Premier, Mr. Knowles from Winnipeg. He is the left-winger 'Bevan' of Canada, and he leads the C.C.F. party in Ottawa, today. Everybody knows that, except probably the Premier of this province. I think the time will soon come when Mr. Coldwell will think perhaps he has had enough, when the little small group that is getting smaller every election will dwindle still more, because there are men in that group are not Socialists, and they are not going to subject themselves to the leadership of Mr. Knowles.

The Premier, when he spoke to the motion on the Speech from the Throne, pointed out many of the things in that Speech which were of wonderful importance to the people of the province of Saskatchewan. One of them, as I remember, was that he mentioned the Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life. Well, I have nothing against anything that can inform us about certain things about which we do not have information, if it helps the Government or any other body to regulate and control the machinery in such a way that we can

avoid mistakes, or rectify mistakes that have been made; but this Government, in 1942 and 1943, knew all that was wrong with agriculture in this province. There wasn't a solitary thing but what they had a remedy for it. "Put us into power and we will fix up the whole thing." Isn't that right?

Mr. McDonald: — That's right.

Mr. Danielson: — And you say that you didn't do that. You did that from town to town, from schoolhouse to schoolhouse, and you knew all the remedies for all the ills that beset the agricultural people of this province; and now that you have been in power for ten years or more, you are appointing a political Commission is going to cost you a quarter-million dollars, if it costs you one nickel, of the taxpayers' money, to find out what is wrong with what you told us you knew all about ten years ago. You told us the same thing in 1948 — you knew what was wrong and you were going to complete the great work of reconstruction that you had commenced in 1944. Now this is what we get from this C.C.F. Government — a government that is the biggest counterfeit that ever sat on the treasury benches in any province in the Dominion of Canada. Every platform, every word from every platform that they were elected on a 1944, has been scuffled and thrown out the window.

Some Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, that is what they have done! I find one particularly small paragraph in the Speech from the Throne which is very intriguing. It says here:

"Excellent interest is being shown in the province's potash resources. The Western Potash Company is continuing to sink its shaft at Unity. East of Saskatoon the Potash Company of America is presently drilling holes for freezing the shaft site and will begin its sinking operation, this summer."

I was astounded, Mr. Speaker, I have lived in this province the last ten years and I was scratching my head and wondering if I had been asleep all this time . . .

Mr. R.A. Walker: — You probably have!

Mr. Danielson: — . . . because I was under the impression that this was wrong. I have gone back to my file and I ran across a little item; the Premier was up at Raymore, in 1952 — of course that was an election year, wasn't it?

Mr. Cameron: — That accounts for it.

Mr. Danielson: — Raymore, Saskatchewan, May 23rd — the press despatch is dated May 26th, and it says here:

"Saskatchewan is to have the first potash factory in Canada and the finest brick plant in Canada."

And now, in 1955, they are starting to explore for potash! The Premier went out and told the people, in 1952, that they had a potash factory. Well, we learn as we go along. We learn a lot of things, Mr. Speaker, and one is not to take

February 23, 1955

things as they sounds sometimes; give them a little more attention than what they really sound like when the things are uttered.

Another item here that is very interesting — as a matter of fact, this whole Speech, Mr. Speaker, except probably two paragraphs, is nothing more than a political advertising sheet, because some of these things mentioned here have been written into contracts, in regard to veterans' land, since 1946 or 1947. But here is one in regard to the rural municipal grid system. You know that started here back in 1952. I know a gentleman came to my seat of Arm River, and he was up there talking grid system then, while the session was on here in Regina. Of course, after the election was over there wasn't any more interest in this grid system of roads in Arm River, so one day some of the reeves came down here to speak to the gentleman about the matter that had been discussed at this meeting during the winter. As a matter of fact, at that particular time the Minister had nothing to say, but he had his adviser, Mr. Cronkite, there who did all the talking. But I see here, in the beginning of 1955, that grid system is still in the blueprint stage. I don't think it has been blueprinted. I think it is just a rough pencil sketch, and it is all words — you know that story — words 'on the verge' being done. So that is all there is to that.

The Premier's speech was more notable for what it did not say than what it did say, because this was one time when the Premier didn't say a thing about Guatemala or Nicaragua, Korea, Russia, and all these things; and he even forgot to tell us how he was going to give the Saskatchewan farmers' wheat away. He didn't even say anything about that! Surely he hasn't worn out that topic! But there was a reason for that. He found a new 'whipping-boy' now, and that is Duplessis. They started that in Ottawa, and then they sent the secretary of the C.C.F. partly down to Quebec to apologize. When are you going down to apologize? You will have to go down and apologize to the Frenchmen down there, they are mighty fine fellows to meet. And you might learn something, too . . .

Premier Douglas: — I will probably have to apologize for you! For having let you run around loose for so long.

Mr. Danielson: — If I ever get so foolish that I get in that position, I will do the work myself. I certainly would not delegate anybody like you to do it for me, because I wouldn't be sure what you would say. You talk so much, and I couldn't believe you and I am sure they wouldn't.

These are things, Mr. Speaker, that people are asking questions about. Well, now we are told that we are going to have a so-and-so and so-and-so, and it is all going to cost money. Do you know that it was only a few weeks ago since the Premier said there wasn't any more money. When the civil servants wanted to have a little more money for what they did, last fall, he said, "We cannot give you what we haven't got." That is just what the farmer says sometimes when he is hard up. I am sure the Premier is not in that position. He has so much money. I have just been looking at the figures, and I see that, in 1943-44, we collected, in gasoline tax, a little over \$3 million; in 1953-54, they collected \$14 million. Now that is just an indication of what this Government has to play around with. Where we had 10 cents they now have 10 bucks! And they are still getting it, and they have nothing to show for it. Not a thing.

I was listening to the member for Last Mountain (Mr. R. Brown), the other day, and I never listen to a speech like that in my life.

Mr. Cameron: — You can say that again!

Mr. Danielson: — I never thought that a person could get so much of that stuff, or could harbour all that venom and abuse, within himself, and then spout it out on the floor of the House or anywhere else. And he didn't have one solitary fact to back up one statement that he made. He said that, in the P.F.R.A. offices, a certain individual had taken a job and the other fellow went out and took another job, and that was all there was to it. Well, I think that happens every day, and I just wonder, before I get through, if I am not going to convince even you, Mr. Speaker, that that happens in daily life. There was another thing he said, and I am surprised that he ever mentioned it, and that was about my dear old friend, Rawluk — Joe Rawluk. There is nothing bad about Rawluk; not a thing. He is a young man with a nice wife; I think a lot of people think that, anyway.

Hon Mr. Brockelbank: — You are going to stand again for nomination, eh, Herman?

Mr. Danielson: — Well, I wouldn't be surprised if you wouldn't be glad to have that. It would be a change for you.

But, Mr. Speaker, here is a man who was trying to make a success in life. Why did he get into the mess that he was in?

Premier Douglas: — You should know!

Mr. Danielson: — These men, these associates of the Government Insurance and personal adviser to this Government that was imported from Alberta, I think; and another one that was a business partner in the movie theatre business along with members of this Government, they found this boy was a very likeable fellow, and they called him in and said, "Here, if you come in with us, we will help you along." And then, when he got in there he discovered that they had a peculiar way of doing business and that, if he was scoring to do any business, he would have to do it the way they wanted it done, and that was to hand back part of his commission on insurance he sold, a 'kickback', or 'graft', to somebody. That was the whole thing, so there is nothing to pick on or degrade Mr. Rawluk for, because he was forced into that position; he had to do that or else not eat. Now, he has a job with the Dominion Government, and I think he does a good job there. There are hundreds of jobs in offices like that, as the Provincial Treasurer can tell us, with nothing to do except a routine type of work; and I think probably Rawluk is capable of doing that, and that is why he is there.

I would say to him and to all his colleagues over there, the sooner they forget the Rawluk case the better for them. That thing isn't asleep altogether yet. There are men who have died since that day, but they left their records behind them, and their papers behind them, and they are in the city of Regina, and don't you forget it. but they will say anything that throws dirt at the members on the side of a Hosts, reflecting on the Federal Government. It is the smallest thing I ever heard, and the member for Last Mountain thought he was doing a service to this C.C.F. Government! I think perhaps the less said by him or anybody else on that side of the House about that thing the better.

There was something else that he didn't say anything about, and the hon. member for Social Services (Hon. Mr. Sturdy) didn't say anything about it either. You know he told you what heaven on earth he had established for the old-age people in this province. Why, you would think, if you didn't know the conditions in this province, that every old-age pensioner was living in an

February 23, 1955

up-to-date house with all the modern equipment, and that all they have to do is press a button to get all the services that they need. That isn't so, Mr. Speaker! But he was projecting his mind into the future, and prophesying that he was going to do so-and-so and so-and-so, if he lives long enough. He didn't tell you anything but the good things, he didn't tell you anything about the mess that is in the gaol here, that he is responsible for.

Mr. McDonald: — He's out there today, fixing it up.

Mr. Danielson: — Maybe he went down there, this afternoon. You, Mr. Speaker, no doubt have read the report of the committee of the John Howard Society, who are doing that kind of work in this province, and I am going to read it to you. This was in a September issue of the 'Leader-Post', and it was also in the Saskatoon 'Star'; it was in two copies of the 'Leader-Post' as a matter of fact. Here is what they say:

"We were given full freedom to see all the aspects of the gaol in operation. We enjoyed the full confidence of the superintendent and his staff. Information we asked for was readily given, and we are granted a courteous and attentive hearing by the staff, the Director of Corrections and the Minister of Social Welfare under whom the gaol is administered.

"We were frankly appalled by the conditions he found in the gaol. We found a prison population of over 200 crowded into a building equipped to hold a maximum of 126. These men lived in cells, the auditorium, woodworking shop, and corridors and even in the room designated as the hospital. The kitchen facilities which would be taxed to feed a population of 126 were straining to provide a substantial dinner for nearly double this number and for the staff on duty. Prisoners as usual were to eat in their cells and rooms but the officers, because of lack of other space, had their tables set up on the square — the area onto which all corridors empty.

"We found the gaol very dirty and unsightly. The old and crumbling walls of the cell blocks were filthy and spattered. The walls of the auditorium, which housed about 20 prisoners and where a minor riot had occurred a week before, were chipped and broken. The locking system which never had been very good is now deteriorating. The whole atmosphere was dismal and crowded.

"Some of the staff were away on holidays. We were told that only 10 of the custodial staff were permanent employees and the remainder were 'green' or under training. Of the 201 prisoners held in the gaol on the day of our visit, 17 were awaiting trial, some for serious offences. Sixty were 'short-term men' with sentences of 30 days or under and were of all ages up to 65. The remainder were made up of boys under 25 who could be trained and those who might better have been sent to a security prison (where emphasis is on custody), but who could not now be transferred to Prince Albert gaol due to serious overcrowding there. Of these prisoners about 52 were idle.

“We would also like to call your attention again to our article on probation, a copy of which is enclosed, which we feel would, if implemented, tend in the long run to reduce the prison population. We respectfully submit this report and suggestions in the hope that they will prove a value in this crisis in your penal programme.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a report made and submitted by the John Howard Society, which Society is interested in and is giving their attention to such institutions and gaols as we have in the Regina area.

The condition in that gaol, as they said, was deplorable. I think people in the province had generally known that before. Now then, we have the money to build a Museum; we have the money to build big blocks to house more C.C.F. civil servants, costing two or three million dollars; we have the money for all the things we need. Now, in the name of heaven, why is there not enough money in this country to maintain a provincial gaol, so that the people who are unfortunate enough to be housed in that institution will be able to live like human beings?

Mr. McDonald: — They close them up.

Mr. Danielson: — Isn't that right?

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — No, it is not right.

Mr. McDonald: — They didn't expect gaols.

Mr. Wahl: — Talk about the Manitoba gaols.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Danielson: — Well, that is just your side. But, yesterday, as I said, when the Minister was speaking here, anybody who didn't know him would have believed that there was a heaven on earth in the province of Saskatchewan for all the people, and here is what takes place in the gaols. You have the same thing — I am not going to say the same condition, but you have an overcrowded condition in your mental hospitals. The report here is from one of your own departmental inspectors or supervisors. It is far away from being condemned, by any means, because there is no such suggestion in this report, except that there is a lack of space in the institutions to accommodate the patients who are in there; otherwise conditions there are no doubt all right.

These are things that these people should not forget, and the members of this House should not forget them, because there is always two sides to everything. I know that the Minister, when he gets up on his feet, always puts his best foot forward. I would say to him that he had better take a look around over the province of Saskatchewan as a whole and he will find that the people he spoke so glowingly of, yesterday, and painted such an excellent picture — he had a map over here showing the fine places he had in mind for them; but he hasn't taken care of more than a very small portion of the people of the province of Saskatchewan who need attention along the lines he suggested. It is all very well to look after Regina and Saskatoon and some of the other larger centres in this province, but do not forget, Mr. Speaker, that there are people living in other places in this province, in the small towns, on the farms, who pay taxes, and who have helped to build up this province as well as the people who live in the cities, and these are the men and women who deserve

attention as well as those the Minister mentioned yesterday. He will come back and say we have a lot of fellows here who don't come from the city of Regina or the city of Saskatoon. I know that. I admit that; but, as a matter of fact, the people he mentioned, yesterday, are only a small fraction of those who need and require attention and help in their old age.

I was listening to my friend, the member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Wellbelove), and as usual he was very enthusiastic about the Party to which he belongs. I am not criticizing him for being a C.C.F.er. That is his business; but he draws a sort of picture something like the Social Welfare Minister when he compares the record of this Government and the conditions that exist today. He then builds up a bogey man. In his mind he builds up what is going to happen if this C.C.F. Government should step out of office. Then he goes back to the days when we paid 50 cents per day per patient in our hospitals; that was the hospital grant. Well, you know, after all, I can remember a speech that the Premier made on the floor of a House, in 1945, and he said this:

“That speaks well for a previous government; that is one of the highest grants paid in any province in the Dominion of Canada.”

If he wants to question it I will take the time to read it to him; but after all, then he goes to work and he says, if you do so-and-so and you go back to a 50-cent per day grant for hospitals, you can save some money. Well, that is a very short-sighted statement to make, and it is very phoney statement to make, because, after all, whatever these fellows talk about, don't forget this: that the hospitalization plan you have today is paid for by the people of the province of Saskatchewan, and they are certainly paying for it. We paid nearly \$9 million in straight hospital taxes this last year. Approximately \$3,500,000 in the taxes on that one-percent hospitalization tax, and then I said \$6 million was taken out of the public treasury, and that is the taxes that people pay, too. That amount is a little large, because I remember in Public Accounts today that amount was a little less than that. But, after all, there is about \$19 million or \$19 1/2 million that we pay in there and pay ourselves. It doesn't come out of this Government at all. Before, when you and I went to the hospital, Mr. Speaker, we paid our own hospital bills, and you know it was hard to do it sometimes; but you and I paid it. If we were fortunate enough we might get by a year or two without paying any hospital bills, and then when it hit us, it was a pretty difficult pattern. This plan of hospitalization equalizes and levels out and, so to speak, averages up.

But, first of all, every person, when the time comes around, picks up and pays so much, and it has been increased. I think it has been more than doubled since we started. It was going to cost so-and-so. The Premier said there wasn't the money at that time but the biggest problem to face was that of trained staff. Well, after all, we were not so bankrupt in medical services when this Government came in, were we? We had two mental hospitals; have you got more than two today? Have you got any more?

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Two.

Mr. Danielson: — Good for you; you don't progress. You only progress like this province has done since 1904 when I came in. You have only done what we couldn't do because you had more money to do it with, and credit to you; but we had the two mental hospitals in this province, and you haven't got more than two now.

We had two tuberculosis sanatoria, the best equipped in doing the greatest work of any hospital on the American continent, probably in the whole world, because the death rate from T.B. in the province of Saskatchewan previous to 1944, was the lowest of any place in the Dominion of Canada.

We had the clinics for infantile paralysis, probably not as elaborate as my friends have today. I would not say that they were; but they were here nevertheless and they were functioning. We had free diagnostic treatment for venereal diseases. These services have been extended and improved on, a credit to you that they have, but they were here. Don't say there was nothing here.

We had a northern hospital outpost and there were 42 health nurses operating in the province of Saskatchewan in 1944. You probably have more today — credit to you if you have but don't stand and tell me or anybody else on this side of the House that there was nothing here. That is credit neither to you nor to the Government that you represent.

In regard to rural hospitalization, this Government has built on the foundation which was laid, not a year or two before 1944, but from the time the province commenced to grow up. The people themselves, through their elected representatives and through their municipalities, build this for themselves and this is no miracle created by a C.C.F. Socialistic government in this province. It gets under my skin, Mr. Speaker when I sit in this House and hear the Premier and the member for Milestone (Mr. Erb) yesterday, and the Minister of Social Welfare stand up there and cry tears and sermonize on the great contribution of the old-timers to this province. Yes, the old-timers of this province were all Conservatives and Liberals, and it was only through their efforts and on the legislation and the foundation that they made that the people have built the services you have today.

These fellows come out now and they are frantic, taking credit for everything. They are worse than the Russians, Mr. Speaker because they said they were the first in everything — you never read anything from Russia without there was a 'first'; but they are worse than that here now. But how a group like this can go out on the highways and byways in through their propaganda machine of publicity tell the people that they had nothing here 10 years ago, why the thing is absolutely silly, it's foolish, it's ridiculous. But, what can you expect from a group like that?

So, Mr. Speaker, before the C.C.F. Government took office in this House, the municipalities, the towns and villages had in operation plans for prepaid hospital and medical services in this province, and it was surprising to what large extent services were operating here. Of about 300 rural municipalities, 106 had the prepaid hospital services and 105 had the prepaid medical services; 29 towns and villages had the prepaid hospitalization, and 71 had the prepaid medical services. That was pretty good and, you know what Dr. Sigerist said when he came here. This man they hired (no doubt a good man) came here to condemn for political purposes, but he stayed here to praise and laud what had been done in this province, before he left. He disappointed you that time. That is the situation.

I would say to the Minister and his cohorts over there that they at least be decent about this thing, and then we won't have to spend half of our time, or all of our time, in this House refuting these charges. I suppose, next year, we will do the same thing again. We just ran through the same thing two years ago.

Then we come to pensions. I want to speak to you on pensions just for a few moments. I think there is no topic or issue in Canada that has been so much of a football as old-age pensions or supplementary assistance. That is the mainstay of motions and amendments to the Speech from the Throne in all of the last twenty years. If Mr. Coldwell and Mr. Knowles and his group over there in Ottawa hadn't had that thing, they would have been without a topic entirely; they wouldn't have anything to say. But, after all, pensions are not a new thing in this province, and I want to say that the people of this province don't trust this Government with this pension. Why don't you laugh when I say that? I am going to say that that is true, because everything you do or write establishes a record, and when you follow the trail of promising certain things, while then they look back and say, "Well, we had some problems and could not do it."

I'll go back a little way in order to lay the foundation for what I am going to say. On February 20, 1945, the Premier made a speech in this House in which he said:

"Consideration is being given to the matter of paying a cost-of-living bonus to old-age and blind pensioners. This, if we decide to pay, will be an additional amount of \$5.00 in each case."

Mr. McDonald: — Haven't paid it yet.

Mr. Danielson: — Oh yes, part of it. Not what he promised; but he said definitely that if he could pay it — he said, "is to pay it." It was to be \$5.00 and it was \$3.00. When they came through with that it was whittled down to \$3.00.

Then who doesn't remember the 1947 Session, Mr. Speaker, when this Government came out fairly and squarely to pay a \$5.00 supplementary old-age pension under the means test to the old-age pensioners of this province. You can't get away from this thing, because in the Gazette of March 20, 1948, paragraph 8 — here is the Order in Council, and it says this:

"The maximum supplementary allowances payable in the case of a married couple living together and who are both are in receipt of an old-age pension under the Old Age Pensions Act of Canada, shall be \$5.00 per month each, and such portion thereof so that the total joint income of the pensions including pension payments and supplementary allowance payment shall not exceed \$1,080."

This Government, Mr. Speaker, haven't gone so far as they decided in their budget for that year. That is when they were going to increase that supplementary allowance to \$5.00 a month. There weren't any 'ifs' or conditions about it. They paid that for just one month. The Dominion Government passed an Act increasing the Old Age Pension — I don't know exactly, but I am not going to go back; but when they increased that amount, the first payment came through about the first of September or the end of August; but when the Dominion Government submitted that payment they made it retroactive to the first day of May, 1947. In the meantime, this Government had continued to pay the \$5.00 allowance from the first of May until the last day of August — four months, from May to August and inclusive. When they got the \$675,000 cheque from Ottawa as the Dominion share of the increase of the basic pension, they took that \$675,000 and stuck it back into the treasury of this Government to recoup themselves for half

of the supplementary pension that had been paid from the first day of May until the end of August inclusive. That money was paid by the Dominion Government to this Government for transmitting and giving it to the old-age pensioners of this province of Saskatchewan. The Government copped that off and stuck it in their own pockets, and the old-age pensioners never got a penny of it.

The Minister at that time, Mr. Valleau, admitted that it was \$675,000; that that was the right amount. Is it any wonder then that I made the statement that the old-age pensioners of this province do not trust this Government? That was the most dastardly thing that any person or individual or government could do on the face of the earth. Yes, it was, because you were taking it from the old-age people to whom it rightfully belonged, and paid in here by the Government of Canada, not by you. That is the history of the old-age pension in this province, by this Government.

Something has happened here the last few weeks. On September 24, 1954, the Premier of this province, when one of his bosom friends (perhaps I shouldn't say that because I don't think they like Mr. Thatcher very well) started to tell the people of this province that this Government were going to provide an additional payment for the old-age pensioners on the basis of the supplementary pension, the Premier of this province comes out and says that he can hold out no immediate hope that the old-age supplementary allowances will be increased at the next Session of the Legislature. What in the world has happened, Mr. Speaker, in the meantime? Have they discovered some hidden treasure? What happened? He told you quite frankly, and he goes on and he repeats it in several places here, and says there is no hope for an expansion — that was September 24, 1954.

Mr. Cameron: — I guess Ross Thatcher forced his hand.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Thatcher said all Cabinet ministers had agreed to increase the supplementary pension, except Mr. Douglas, because he said there was no hope that you will get it.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on the question of privilege, my hon. friend will notice from his own quotation that I said there was no 'immediate hope'; I didn't say there was no hope.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, let me read this again:

“Premier T. C. Douglas said Thursday that he can hold out no immediate hope that the old-age supplementary pension will be increased in the next Session of the Legislature.”

Well, isn't this the Session of the Legislature, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Kramer: — It's in the Speech from the Throne this time.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to interrupt my friend, but he understands the English language. I did not say there would be no increase at the next Session of the legislature. I said I could offer no immediate hope at that time, and if my friend looks at the date he will see it was September when we didn't know if we were going to be able to take off any feed or what the financial condition would be. I said there was no immediate hope; I did not say there was no hope. I don't want my friend to distort my words.

February 23, 1955

Mr. Danielson: — Do you want to speak a little longer? There's lots of time here, you know.

Premier Douglas: — I know there is lots of time, but I don't want to improve my friend's speech, so if you will just go ahead.

Mr. Danielson: — Let me read this to you again:

“Premier T.C. Douglas said Thursday that he can hold out no immediate hope that the old-age supplementary pension will be increased at the next session of the Legislature.”

So this is the next Session of the Legislature, and you are increasing it. What did the Minister of Social Welfare state, yesterday? That is sort of a common thing in the C.C.F. Government that there is a leak in regard to the budget. I would suggest to the Provincial Treasurer that he straighten his colleagues up over there. That is the second or third time it has happened in the last four years in his house. But he said here:

“... will be increased at the next Session of the Legislature.”

There is no hope that it will be increased.

Premier Douglas: — I didn't say there was no hope. Mr. Speaker, I must insist that my hon. friend quote that correctly. I did not say there was no hope. I said at that particular time I could give no 'immediate' hope. I did not preclude the possibility of making a statement later, when the financial position was clearer, as to what would be done. Any my friend must not keep distorting my words. If he is going to say 'hope' he must add the adjective 'immediate'. I am not going to try to insist that my friend keep exactly to the truth. That would be asking too much; but I am asking him to keep reasonably close to it.

Mr. Danielson: — You stand judged on your own words right here.

Mr. Cameron: — Just double talk.

Mr. Danielson: — Your own words are right here. I will read them again.

Opposition Members: — Read it to him again. It will take several times.

Mr. Danielson: —

“Premier T.C. Douglas said Thursday that he can hold out no immediate hope that the old-age supplementary pension — or supplementary allowance — will be increased at the next Session of the Legislature.”

And what is this? Is this not the next Session of the Legislature?

Premier Douglas: — It's not September either.

Mr. Danielson: — You can't work yourself out of it that way. That's double talk, and you got away with that when you said it before, but not when I am here.

Now than, something has happened. And here was this gentleman yesterday, the Minister of Social Welfare, who last summer, at the C.C.F. convention was one of the hardest fighters against the resolutions that demanded

this thing be done. Yes, it was in the press; there was no secret of it. It's all over the province. This was in the daily press. I don't know if it is in the 'Commonwealth' or not, I don't read that.

You know, the other day in Public Accounts, Mr. Speaker, there was an item there for so much subscription rates to the Regina 'Leader-Post' and it was about \$1,800, wasn't it? I think it was. And I asked if you read the 'Commonwealth', and he said there was no bill. I said that they must have read that before they got up to that Battleford House or else they wouldn't be there. And I think that that is something like this.

Premier Douglas: — Probably listening to these speeches of yours.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, they might do that, too. Any time there is some hope in their breast, that is all right with me. But, after all, this man who fought tooth and nail to defeat the resolution to increase the pensions, or supplementary pension a few months ago, was lauding it to the skies yesterday, and he was criticizing us because we didn't have any "milk of human kindness"; it was not in us to appreciate and praise the plan. Shall I tell you, Mr. Speaker? I think he has drunk too much of that milk of human kindness; it must have been adulterated with some of that Bronfman gin or something, he has such a rosy glow, such a rosy colour all over his face.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — I must ask the hon. member to withdraw that statement.

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, I'll withdraw that statement.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — He knows perfectly well it is a lie.

Mr. Danielson: — Of course, I know all he drinks is milk anyway.

But that is the reason, Mr. Speaker, why the people of the province of Saskatchewan are not trusting this Government, when it comes to old-age pensions. They have failed them twice. They have withheld the money that was due, and rightly belongs to the old-age pensioners — \$675,000; and they admitted, the Minister of Social Welfare, the sanctimonious Valleau sure, he speaks like a Sunday School teacher any time; and he stood on the floor of this House . . .

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — What is wrong with the Sunday School teachers?

Mr. Danielson: — . . . and the Premier, if you will remember, he made that a question of confidence in this Government, and if it hadn't been for that I think my resolution would have carried. I had Mr. Benson from Last Mountain with me; I almost got the member from Swift Current.

Premier Douglas: — You almost went the same way he did!

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, but you sent your hatchet-men out to get him. I think my friend from Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs) will have to look out for who is coming around to see him, for these friends up there. You know a number of these men closely associated with this C.C.F. machine — we have a Dr. House at Gravelbourg; we have our friend, Burgess; we have one or two more that I am not going to mention just now. When they don't toe the mark with the C.C.F. Government, if they have a mind of their own and a heart of their own and speak up, like the member for Swift Current does sometimes, they don't stay here very long. Mr. Phelps was one of the first victims of that. You see, in

February 23, 1955

Russia, Mr. Speaker, up until very recently, they just disappeared; but they have become a little more civilized there in the last few months, and now they allow them to resign. Before, they just took them out and shot them. They don't dare do that in Saskatchewan, you know, but for some mysterious reason they don't come back.

Premier Douglas: — You put them in the P.F.R.A. in the Liberal party.

Mr. Danielson: — My friend has just called my attention to something that I had entirely forgotten, and I am going to hunt till I find it, no matter how long it takes, because it is very enlightening, very enlightening indeed.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Do you want the Winnipeg Tribune?

Mr. Danielson: — There is one thing about it, Mr. Speaker, if anybody doesn't want to sit and listen to me they can go out.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — I never saw him so eloquent as he is right now.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, there is another thing that I want to mention, and that is a matter that was brought up by the Minister of Public Health (Hon. Mr. Bentley), the other day, when he was on the rampage in regard to all the things that the Liberals hadn't done, and he brought up the subject of cancer treatment. He knows, and he has admitted in this House, that the Liberal government passed the free Cancer Treatment Act and voted the money to carry on in the fiscal year 1944-45. As a matter of fact, there is only one man who has seen fit to come out and deny that, and that is the member who now sits as Premier of his province, and he said, when he spoke in the House, February 20, 1945 — Mr. Proctor from Moosomin asked some questions, and this is what the present Premier said:

“Mr. Proctor, during the last session — (he was referring to the special session held in the fall of 1944) — he insisted, at the last session, that money had been voted in last year's estimates for surgery and cancer cases.”

And he said this — this is the Premier speaking:

“Well, no one in my Department can find it; it is true that \$5,000 was provided, but that was to set up a clinical . . . Five thousand would never begin to pay for surgical treatment.”

That was the Premier speaking.

In the Session of 1944, when Mr. Patterson was Premier, he provided in his budget for this cancer service. The year previous the cancer vote was \$76,760 — that was to provide for the clinical operations and everybody knows that, at that time, every person who went in there paid a flat rate of \$10 for any services rendered to the patient, and no person could go there unless he was sent there by a physician. Now then, when it was before the House in 1944-45, it was increased to \$215,000, and that was an increase, Mr. Speaker, of \$138,240. That was voted for the free cancer clinic — for the operation of the free cancer clinic. Now that was voted, and the best proof that that proved to be sufficient for that year is the fact that there was no supplement in the

1945-46 budget to augment that amount that was voted at the regular Session in the spring of 1944.

And here is what the present Provincial Treasurer said, when he introduced his budget in 1945:

“Patients suffering from cancer will now receive complete medical, surgical, hospital and nursing treatment. This will be provided at an additional cost of \$78,000 over last year.”

Well, as the things began to operate on a full basis, and as expenses started to go up (of course, everything was on the upgrade), it took more money; and all the Provincial Treasurer had to add to the 1945-46 estimate was an amount of \$78,000.

Another thing that I want to read to you, to prove to you that these services were operating from May, 1944, until this Government came here, and has been in operation ever since. Doctor Sigerist said something about this thing, and this is his report handed to the Premier on October 4, 1944. Here is what Dr. Sigerist says:

“While at present, examination, radiological treatment and hospitalization are provided without charge, cancer patients still have to pay for the cost of operations. This is undoubtedly against the intention of the Act, and the cost of operations should be defrayed by the province.”

This Government came into office on July 10th and this was written on October 4th. I am not criticizing, but what I am pointing out is that they were up against the same problem in paying the cancer medical bill as we were between May 1 in July 10. They had not yet been able to get a proper agreement with the Medical Association of this province in order to carry that out. The Minister admitted that two years ago, and I have a typed copy of his speech here.

But the present Minister here, a few days ago, said that we had made no attempt to implement that legislation. But, Mr. Speaker, Dr. Sigerist says another thing, and I am going to draw to the attention of this House. It is in paragraph 3:

“While it is true that a large percentage of all patients examined by the clinics is found to be suffering from other diseases than cancer, it would not be sound to make a charge in the case of negative diagnosis. This would act as a deterrent. Accurate diagnosis in all cases where the suspicion of cancer prevails, represents an available public service. The increasing load of work put upon the clinics must be met with an increasing number of personnel.”

Now he does not advocate or suggest that this Government should levy a charge of \$10 on everyone that goes to the clinic and is found not to be affected with cancer. Mr. Speaker, that is the only contribution that this Government has made, in legislation, for that service, and that was negative. They put a charge on a person who goes to that clinic, on the recommendation of his own medical doctor, because no person can pass through that clinic without

February 23, 1955

being sent there by his own physician. That was free, and it should be free today. I do not believe in any deterrence charge, when, if my doctor is suspicious or has grounds for thinking that I have something which might be cancer; if I had to go through that clinic, I should have the right to free treatment.

Mr. McDonald: — He's pretty quiet now.

Mr. Danielson: — Now, that is the situation. Here is another thing that indicates this strange attempt that is being made to misrepresent everything that was done before this Government came into power.

There was a meeting held in the city of Regina here, in the Federal election, in 1953, and Dr. McCusker was there and my dear old friend Oakland Valleau was there, and Dr. McCusker was asked a question and he told them what was actually the facts, the way the cancer clinic was operating, and he mentioned that this was done in the 1944 Session, or the last year that the Liberal government was in office. Mr. Valleau contended that no money was ever voted by the Liberal government for free cancer treatment. Well, Mr. Valleau was sitting here, and you were here, Mr. Speaker, when that money was voted. He was sitting here for six years — from 1938 to 1944 . . .

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Was any money spent by the Liberals?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Danielson: — Oh yes, what they hadn't spent when you came in here, you spent. That is about your size.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — You didn't spend a dollar on cancer treatment.

Mr. Danielson: — The Minister who is in charge of the Department up until 1948, Mr. Speaker, also sat here and discussed the voting of this money and all that sort of thing; then he goes out and says there was never any money spent. Well, I just wanted to refresh your memory, so don't bring it up again please.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — I probably will, Herman.

Mr. Danielson: — I see my friend from Last Mountain (Mr. R. Brown) is in here, and I am glad I found a little document that I couldn't find a while ago. I would have been very disappointed, Mr. Speaker, if I hadn't found it, because it is very important. It is important for several reasons, because you know the biggest part of his speech was devoted to trying to convince this House what a sink of iniquity the Liberal party is, what a terrible group they are, and how they have abused the civil service, how they had converted the civil service, during their term of office, into a political machine. Well, if we were a political machine, Mr. Speaker, we were certainly new beginners compared to the machine you have now, and I think if he had taken the trouble to look up the history and the record of this Government along that line, he would have never said a word. And I am going to tell you something about this. Before the C.C.F. party was elected in the province of Saskatchewan they had many things to say about political partisanship and many things they promised to abolish. In a radio address, recorded in the 'Saskatchewan Commonwealth' December 10, 1943, T.C. Douglas, the then leader of the C.C.F. party in Saskatchewan, said:

“Many all of these civil servants, after years of loyal service, find themselves defeated — find themselves that some defeated candidate of the faithful has replaced all of them at a much higher salary. This usually means that the underpaid civil servant does the work while the political appointee draws the salary. The result is that many civil servants feel that they are in a blind alley; they have gone as far as they can without political pull and there is no further opportunity for advancement.”

That was the Premier of this province. You know he was going to clean this up. There was going to be equity and sweetness and light and no such a sink of iniquity which he pictured the other day. And the Premier said this:

“We intend to set up a non-political civil service commission, free from interference by either politicians or local patronage committees.”

M.J. Coldwell helped him out, and he is reported in the ‘Leader-Post’ of June 9, 1944. He said, at a political meeting in Saskatoon:

“The day of the political heeler in Saskatchewan would be at an end if the C.C.F. was elected.

“I would sever my connections with the C.C.F. if it were not so.”

Mr. Loptson: — It’s a different story now!

Mr. Danielson: — What a tremendously high and lofty ideal. Of course, when you think back, Mr. Speaker, it is astounding; but even before this Premier took office he handed out political patronage. He started to get all his friends, what are called ‘party heelers’ now; if they were on the Liberal side he would call them ‘party heelers’; but they are friends if they are over there.

Mr. Loptson: — Comrades.

Mr. Danielson: — And so he could get the appointment or nomination at Weyburn he got Mr. Stinson to step out, and then he made him chairman of the Purchasing Board. I think that was the first thing that happened.

Mr. McDonald: — No political patronage!

Mr. Danielson: — No political patronage there, that’s a cinch. Mr. Stinson got a very handsome salary. Another point was that of T.H. McLeod to the position of economic adviser . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Yes, even the kids know that!

Mr. Danielson: — T.H. McLeod; he was appointed deputy Provincial Treasurer, at a big salary. He was in charge of a committee roaming through the city of Weyburn during the Premier’s election. No patronage there, Mr. Speaker! There couldn’t be!

Mr. Loptson: — He was just a comrade.

February 23, 1955

Mr. Danielson: — And we have a Mr. W.K. Bryden who was brought in from Ottawa and made a Minister of Labour. He was put over the heads of many other fellows, who had more experience and more training and were better men than he was . . .

Premier Douglas: — There wasn't any Department of Labour.

Mr. Danielson: — We had a commissioner of labour.

Hon. Mr. Williams: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I would like to correct the member's statement. Mr. Bryden was not brought in as the Minister of Labour. I am only too glad to correct the member.

Mr. Danielson: — Deputy Minister of Labour. And then they even gave Mrs. Bryden a job. He had been working for the C.C.F. in Ontario, all he could do; but there was no political patronage there! There couldn't be.

And then there was Mr. C.A. Hogg, who was an active C.C.F. worker in Montréal, and he was brought in here and given the job of Deputy Minister of Natural Resources. There was no political patronage there! Now you listen, I am not through with you yet. I will bring in some more, Mr. Speaker, when you talk about the budget

Then we have a Mr. A.M. McCallum, appointed Deputy Minister of Education, and a salary of \$6,640, back in 1950 sometime . . .

Premier Douglas: — A good man.

Mr. Danielson: — He was a defeated C.C.F. candidate in 1945. There is no political patronage there, is there, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Cameron: — He came right up from the ranks!

Mr. Danielson: — You couldn't do a thing like that! Your conscience would not permit it!

Premier Douglas: — He's a good man.

Mr. Danielson: — Oh, you are way above all these things; there must be somebody else working on this thing. Then we come down to Mr. W.H. Warren. Everyone will remember Herman Warren. The only thing about it, he has the same name as I have; but he sat in this House and I do not know whether he was a Social Credit — I think he was everything, but he was just making his way around; he was Social Credit and C.C.F. and a Conservative . . .

Mr. Loptson: — And a comrade.

Premier Douglas: — Oh, you are mixed up on that.

Mr. Danielson: — But that was just the same with Herman Warren; he was all things to all men, the same as you . . .

Premier Douglas: — I could never get down to being a Liberal, thank Heaven!

Mr. McDonald: — They wouldn't have you.

Mr. Danielson: — No, we have to draw the line some place.

Premier Douglas: — They only drew the line after you got in Herman.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, anyhow, Mr. Warren was elected to the Legislature in 1938, as a Unity candidate — now we have him spotted; and he was rewarded, because a couple of weeks before the Session was over, in 1944, he politely walked over, away from Carl Stewart (who, I think was sitting over here), and he went over to the C.C.F., because he was promised a job — and you didn't let him down either.

Premier Douglas: — Who promised him a job?

Mr. Danielson: — Well, I am not going to tell you.

Premier Douglas: — No, you don't know.

Mr. Danielson: — Because I don't think I have to tell you. Everybody knows it. I don't blame Mr. Warren, because his political career was gone anyhow, and it was the only place he could go because he had been every darned place else. If a man jumps from one place to another, finally he finds himself in a position where he has no place to go — and then they go to the C.C.F. That is always a home for that type of individual . . .

Premier Douglas: — That's not where the member for Moosomin went.

Mr. Danielson: — Of course not, Mr. Premier, don't misunderstand me. There was no politics in this thing; there couldn't be.

Well anyhow, then we had another gentleman here, Mr. J.A. Young; he was the member for Biggar when he sat in this House. In 1944 he stepped aside for Mr. W.S. Lloyd, the present Minister of Education . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Did he get a job, too?

Mr. Danielson: — Well, I believe he did. I don't know what they did with him. He just disappeared all at once, but he was here for many years, and I think he was insurance commissioner, wasn't he? Of course, Mr. Premier, there was not any politics in that! Surely you would not use your position for that purpose! But that is the peculiar thing about this. How does it happen that all these men were given a little lift the public expense, through your civil service commission, which was above politics?

We have a Mr. P.E. Makaroff, in Saskatoon, chairman of the Labour Relations Board. He ran in Saskatoon at one time, didn't he?

Premier Douglas: — When?

Mr. Danielson: — My information is to that effect.

Some Hon. Member: — You had better check on that.

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, I'll check on that. If he didn't run in Saskatoon it is absolutely certain that he worked for you, and did everything he could do. He was a good friend of yours, anyhow.

Mr. Cameron: — They keep track of their friends.

Premier Douglas: — We have lots of them.

February 23, 1955

Mr. Danielson: — Not only that, he has a very wide reputation. And there is another gentleman by the name of Mr. McKay. He was employed as a member of the Local Government Board. He was another one of your friends. There were no politics in that, was there? Then we have J.O. Probe. Of course, there couldn't be any politics in that. He is a Civil Defence Officer and he has another job or two, I do not know how many; and then we have a Minister in his House — Mr. Burton. He was in the House, went to Ottawa with a creditable record, too, and he doesn't belong to my party; but nevertheless immediately he missed out so he couldn't go back to Ottawa he was picked up by this Government and put on the payroll of this province.

Mr. McDonald: — No patronage, was there?

Mr. Danielson: — No, no! And he was made a Public Relations Officer. Do you know what that means, Mr. Premier? Surely you should be able to find a better expression than that.

Mr. Cameron: — What about the Minister of Public Health?

Mr. Danielson: — He's coming down the line. We have Mr. Bentley, and I have a great respect for Mr. Bentley and I mean it. I have more respect for him and the Minister of Highways (Hon. J.T. Douglas) than for others sitting on that side of the House. There is reason for that, Mr. Speaker, and I don't care who knows it either.

Premier Douglas: — You're breaking our hearts!

Mr. Danielson: — Well, I know you are not jealous; I am sure about that.

Premier Douglas: — That's right. Who you like and do not like does not bother any of us.

Mr. Danielson: — I don't like anything better than standing here looking at you.

Anyhow, Mr. Bentley took over Mr. Burton's job — staff training — no, I don't think that was it. It was Public Relations Officer — I know what it was now. Well, he wanted the job and, of course . . .

Mr. Cameron: — He was defeated in Swift Current.

Mr. Danielson: — If I had been offered that job I would have taken it, too.

Premier Douglas: — You wouldn't have been offered it.

Mr. Danielson: — I don't expect I would.

Premier Douglas: — We were looking for ability.

Mr. Danielson: — Oh, I'm sure you were — because you needed it awfully badly.

Mr. Lopton: — To clean up the mess you left.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Danielson: — I would say this: when you picked up the Minister of Public Health, I think you got some ability . . .

Premier Douglas: — That's right.

Mr. Danielson: — . . . that you needed so badly.

Premier Douglas: — That's right.

Mr. Danielson: — Well anyhow, when Mr. Bentley got in, he started to run the business his own way and he sent out and wanted to get all the names of the field officers and all the men working for them; of course, he knew the reason why himself. I am not going to try to interpret that; but of course there was no politics in this, Mr. Speaker.

And then, we have a gentleman by the name of Cuming, he was appointed clerk of the Court at Estevan. I sat in the House with him. There was no politics in that, of course. And we have our well-known friend, Mr. Oakland Valleau. He was appointed to the Workmen's Compensation Board at a nice salary; and then you even hired his son, too. Don't you remember that fellow that used to sit up there and bung up all the transcripts. Don't you remember him? He was working for that side of the House himself. We used to get the transcript handed back to us all mixed up in such a way that you could not tell — it was not mine at all — some of the things he had written down. He was working for you up there and he got to be such a liability to you that you had to fire him. You see.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I don't want to stop my friend's entertaining talk, but the gentleman was not fired.

Mr. Danielson: — You laid him off.

Premier Douglas: — No, we didn't lay him off. As a matter of fact, his own arrangements with reference to the winter meant that he couldn't come back here, couldn't spend winter here, and he asked to be relieved of that responsibility. I don't want it to go on the record that the gentleman either was fired or was let out.

Mr. Danielson: — There is more than one way to get rid of a man you don't want.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I think the hon. member knows very well that I was the culprit there. I hired Mr. Valleau.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether to compliment you or not. But there is one thing about it, just as soon as he left, all the trouble vanished.

Premier Douglas: — Your speech is so muddled up, no matter who looks after the switchboard it cannot help but be muddled.

Mr. Danielson: — These are just a few, Mr. Speaker. I could go on and on. I want to point out to my friend up in the corner there, from Last Mountain, that when he gets through with this Session, maybe before — he is a big husky fellow — he talked about the scoop shovels and all that sort of thing, to clean out the dirty mess, the other day; he should go down to the gaol and get his muscles working and clean out that gaol out there, that we spoke of when he was out of the House. I wish he had been in here. You can put

your strong shoulder to that, and then when you get through cleaning that pen out, you get out of there because the sooner you get out the sooner the air will get fresh and sweet in that gaol. I am sure of that.

Premier Douglas: — You must have been weaned on vinegar.

Mr. Danielson: — And let me tell you, and all the rest of them, that if there ever was a government that is saturated with political pull and political patronage, that is this Government because there has never been any government in the province that has come within a thousand miles of you in that regard. And that very thing is going to defeat you, and I will tell you why. There are barnacles that have been tied on to you, and they are going to drag you down, and that time is approaching; and your actions in the House, this Session, the sense of panic that possesses every member in this House, and every Minister, indicates that you fellows realize it.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not support the motion

Mr. A.L.S. Brown (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, I am not entirely aware how I am going to justify making a speech here, this afternoon. The member who is just taken his seat has not inspired me to any desire for any great oratorical exhibition. I cannot, like my friend from Nipawin (Mr. McNutt), use the excuse that this is my wedding anniversary and justify a speech on that basis. One of the members of the House informed me a few moments ago that he become a proud father — I don't know whether I can use to justify that as a reason for me making a speech. I think, Mr. Speaker, I will settle for the fact that it is my birthday, today. At least I think one point on which the member for Nipawin and I will agree is that, years ago, apparently great things happened on the 23rd of February.

There might be one other justifiable reason for my making a contribution to this debate today. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that on Monday last we heard this debate from the member for Last Mountain (Mr. R. Brown). Yesterday we heard from the member for Melville (Mr. A.P. Brown). And in an endeavour to maintain that continuity I felt that I was compelled to get into the debate today. There is some advantage in having more than one member of the same name in the House. It gives you the opportunity of taking credit for anything good that the other one might say, and at the same time gives you the opportunity for laying the blame on the other person, if you do not wish to assume the responsibility for it.

I was interested in the remarks that the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) was making; that is, when I was in a position to understand what he was driving at. But, he apparently was taking considerable enjoyment out of the fact that the Liberal party in 1952 in the province of Saskatchewan had obtained 41 per cent of the votes, and he was suggesting that there was panic among the Government benches by virtue of the fact that some 2,000 people, or reportedly 2,000 people, attended the Liberal convention in the city of Saskatoon. I would point out to my friend that the 41 per cent the Liberals received in 1952 is a decrease from what they received in 1948. If my hon. friend wishes to take his own majority is an indication of the trends of the times, he can go back to 1948. My hon. friend then did have a majority of approximately 1,100 votes, and in 1952 he succeeded in reducing that amount to 57. So, I think that fairly indicates the trend that my hon. friend was trying to indicate. Not only did they succeed in getting only 41 per cent of

the votes in 1952, you will also recall, Mr. Speaker, and my hon. friends will certainly recall, that we had also an election in 1953 and the Liberal party got pretty nearly wiped off the map.

The other to which I referred was the 2,000 people they had at their convention in Saskatoon. Well, the Campbells here at the city of Regina got dog-gone near that many at their games, and I don't doubt they put on a better show than the Liberals did in Saskatoon.

I also understand that, at the wrestling matches which they hold, they are able to draw fairly large crowds, and, Mr. Speaker, I am in no position or am no judge to say which is the greater farce, a wrestling match or a Liberal convention.

Premier Douglas: — More rigid rules — no hitting below the belt.

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — There may be some different rules in respect to a wrestling match which is somewhat more favourable to the contest and than the rules and regulations at a Liberal nominating convention.

I also noted in the press respecting this convention that it was noticeable the number of P.F.R.A. and P.F.A.A. labels that delegates were wearing. Apparently it is not too difficult to get a large crowd to a convention when you are prepared to undertake to pay the expenses of the largest number which can go.

My hon. friend from Arm River made reference to some of the remarks which the member for Last Mountain made here, the other day, in the House. I had not intended to refer to this, but insofar as he has once again raised the question of political patronage, I felt the onus upon me to draw the attention of this House to an item on this Return to which the member for Last Mountain referred in his speech. He was referring to a Return which was asked for by Mr. Diefenbaker, the Member of Parliament in the House of Commons, asking in respect to payments made out to P.F.A.A. employees during the year 1953-54. My friend from Last Mountain referred to one of them, a Mr. A.A. Brown (no kith or kin) who was employed during the season of 1953-54, a man who had been at one time the president of the Liberal organization in this province.

I want to draw the attention of the House to the name which immediately follows that of Mr. A.A. Brown — to Mr. M.F. Carpenter. Mr. M.F. Carpenter drew a salary during that year of some \$3,480. What he lacked in salary he certainly made up in expenses. He drew an expense account in that same year of \$3,424.96, or approximately the same expense account as his salary for that year.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I will draw your attention that these expenses were incurred during the year 1953-54, during which period there was a Federal election. We have had some experience with this Mr. Carpenter, who was, during that period, stationed in the city of Weyburn. I wonder if some of the expenses incurred in this item are attributable to the fact that he used a government car, with a government licence on it, travelling in the middle of the night, at full speed, posting over top of the posters that the C.C.F. had put up in an attempt to discredit the C.C.F. candidate in that election in that constituency.

Mr. Cameron: — Were you with him there? Did you see him do that?

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — My friend, if you happen to know this Mr. Carpenter you can ask him. You can ask him if he remembers the night at Ogema when he was accused by two people of placing up these posters sometime after the hour of 12 o'clock. I am satisfied that he will have to admit it, because the licence number was plain. They spoke with Mr. Carpenter; they identified him, and had the evidence which indicates that he was the one who put up these posters over the top of the C.C.F. posters. He made a fairly good success of it, Mr. Speaker, for in the next three or four days we were able to take down approximately 300 of these posters which he had succeeded in placing over top of our posters.

I think that House might be interested in the type of propaganda and the extent to which they were prepared to lower themselves in that campaign. The piece of paper they were posting below the posters that we, the C.C.F. had put up on behalf of our candidates, a poster which contained the picture of Hazen Argue, the M.P. and the candidate in that election — they pasted under them the words "Where Was He When the War was on"; and exactly the same kind of an attempt which the member for Arm River was attempting to make in respect of the Premier, this afternoon, without attempting to find out the facts and to find out the reasons. I am going to suggest to the hon. member for Arm River, and I am going to suggest to those who might be associated with these people in the P.F.R.A. and P.F.A.A. who are prepared to use their position to use government funds in an attempt to discredit and vilify persons, that they undertake to obtain the facts of the case before they do it, because in both of these cases these two men (I refer to the Premier of this province and to Mr. Hazen Argue, M.P.) have given greater service to humanity, I suggest, than have any other two people to province of Saskatchewan in their own respective ways.

Mr. Danielson: — Setting up straw men, just building up a bunch of straw men.

Mr. Brown: — My hon. friend is suggesting that I am putting up straw men and then knocking them down. He was putting up a mighty lot of straw men, this afternoon, and he wasn't even able to succeed in knocking down his straw men. And it wasn't very pleasant straw that he was attempting to build them up with.

No, Mr. Speaker, we cannot justify actions such as were taken by this gentleman or by the member for Arm River on the basis that we belong to different political parties, and as such that we can undertake this in the interest of our own respective political parties. I suggest to you that in this province, or in the Dominion of Canada, we cannot allow government of society to be decided by people who are prepared to undertake that type of campaign. It is not sufficient simply to say that, because we are of different political stripes, we can undertake this. There is much more involved than simply being of different political stripes or faith in this battle in which we are engaged. It is a battle that is going to continue for a goodly number of years, a battle which many of us started, years ago, in an endeavour to bring economic security and social justice to all of the people, and we cannot be diverted or hindered in our efforts to reach that end by having actions such as this undertaken.

I do wish to take this opportunity of congratulating the mover in the seconder on their contributions to this debate. I do this, Mr. Speaker, because, as has been pointed out in this House many times before, there has been an attempt to place a wedge between farmer and labour in this province, a wedge that is being placed there not for the purpose that one group or the other

group might obtain some benefit from it, but rather it is being put in there for exactly the same reason that it has been attempted in the past, which is that those people who have exploited both farmer and labourer may continue that exploitation. They are attempting to recreate the old theory of divide and ruin.

It is not only being done between farmer and labour; it is being done in other ways as well. It is being done in an endeavour to drive a wedge between the East and the West. Premier St. Laurent has undertaken to put into effect at least part of the wedge, and maybe is giving it a mighty good blow in his endeavour to divide the east and the west. Not that either the east or the west will benefit as a result of his actions or as a result of his proposals, but rather that he will be able to divide the east and the west and once again continue the rule of those who have in the past exploited us, and hope by this means that they will be able to continue their exploitations in the future.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, to make brief reference to one item which my friend from Arm River referred to. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald) also made reference to it, and I believe my friend from Nipawin (Mr. MacNutt) made reference to it. It is this question of establishing a main market road grid in this province. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition when he suggested that this question of building up a main market road system in this province is a big undertaking, and I am going to suggest that it is possibly even bigger than he appreciates. It is something that cannot be done by simply taking and voting a few hundred thousand or a few million dollars even to our municipalities and expecting them to undertake a job. It is a job, I think, that we have to approach in a realistic manner with the realization that the building up of a transportation system to meet the economic and social needs of the people of this province is not only desirable but it is an absolute necessity. If we are going to maintain agriculture on the sound economic base, then I am going to suggest that we have to have a transportation system that does meet the economic and social needs. I am going to suggest that, as long as the agricultural industry, by virtue of its price structure, is kept in the economic position that it is at the present time, it is very doubtful if the agricultural industry can do it by itself. I am going to suggest that if we had had a parity price and a parity relationship for our products, we could have maybe done the job ourselves.

Comment is often made in respect to the greatly improved transportation system that we see across the line. Comparison is sometimes made with the State of Montana as compared with the province of Saskatchewan. I think, and this has been pointed out many times before, that it is a difference that we must appreciate even in considering this question of a market road grid. You cannot spend your money twice in the State of Montana they have, for instance, their federal highways of which the Federal Government assumes the entire responsibility. They have their state highways for which the Federal Government assume some responsibility. There is not a main market road (as we know them here in the province) in the State of Montana that hasn't got federal money in it. The question of federal contribution to its transportation system is essential even when you are considering this building of main market roads.

If the Federal Government had assumed its true responsibility in respect of the Trans-Canada Highway, we would have been in a position to use the funds which we have had to invest in that Trans-Canada Highway and would have been able to invest it in the main market road grid. The amount of money

February 23, 1955

which we have invested in the Trans-Canada Highway, if we had been able to have invested it in a main market road system during the past four or five years, we could have been well on the way to establishing a market road grid system in this province.

I am going to suggest, in spite of the fact that the Federal Government has refused to accept the responsibility even in respect of the Trans-Canada, and certainly has never given any indication, or is prepared to give any, in respect to the main market road grid; I am going to suggest that we as a province have got to look at this problem in a very realistic manner. No western province to my knowledge has given or undertaken the problem in a really realistic manner.

The member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) in his speech referred to what they were doing in the province of Manitoba, and I quote from his remarks:

“I notice that in the province of Manitoba the provincial government has given the municipalities (and here is the interesting part) the right to build certain provincial roads up to a standard of a Class B highway. Then they are taken over by the provincial government relieving the municipalities of that road from that time on.”

He quotes and goes on further to say:

“I don't know if that is the solution we need in Saskatchewan or not.”

But Manitoba, being the type of government and having a philosophy which it has, indicates, I think, pretty well the philosophy of the Liberal party here in Saskatchewan as well, when it states they have given to the municipalities the right to build certain roads. Well, the Liberal government in the province of Saskatchewan gave municipalities the right to build roads a goodly number of years ago. So, giving municipalities the right to build the roads is not going to solve much of the problem. I think that in the very near future we have got to be prepared to make increasingly greater investment in the transportation system that will fit into this market road grid.

My friend from Moosomin held up a map of the 1926 highway programme, and indicated that there were lines in the map which would indicate highways. Well, it was in 1926 when that map was prepared. In 1944, some 18 years later, there was nothing more than lines even on the ground. If we adopt the same attitude towards this market road grid as the Liberal party in this province adopted towards the highway programme, I can assure you that I will be far from satisfied. I expect to see, in the very near future, a good start made on this market road grid, either by the Department of Highways or by the Department in co-operation with local governing authorities.

I do not think that we can excuse ourselves on the grounds that the municipalities are in no financial position to undertake this at the present time. They are not set up on the basis upon which they can do the work most effectively. Changes must be made in the constitution and the setup of municipalities, or in the local government authorities, to undertake this very important job, and I suggest that we have to be prepared to do that as well,

because the transportation system to agriculture is absolutely essential, a transportation that goes down into the community and serves their everyday needs. It is important not only for the agricultural industry, but for the whole economy of scattered and, indeed, the whole economy of Canada, and it is on that basis that we can justify Federal Government funds being invested in the main market road grid. Not only is it in the welfare of the whole Canadian economy, but this is one of the means, in the building up all the main market road grid through the contribution of federal funds, by which we could undertake a public investment programme in this province and in the Dominion of Canada.

My friend from Moosomin referred to the fact that this was not a farmers' government, and he recites certain increases that have taken place in our cost of production, increases which he attributes to the fact that we have got a C.C.F. government in this province. One of the items which he listed (which, I think, he regrets having listed) was that there was an increase in power rates so far as they affected the rural economy under the C.C.F. government. Certainly, there were increases in rates. There weren't any rates, there wasn't any power, previous to 1944. There couldn't be anything else but an increase in that; but we have been able to obtain services from it. One of the suggestions he made was that the taxes — and I assume he was referring to land taxes because he referred to them later on; that the land taxes of this province had gone up. Certainly they have gone up. The member for Regina pointed out here, the other day, they couldn't do anything else but go up in the type of economy which Canada has experienced since 1945.

I am going to suggest that land taxes are a legitimate expense of farming and a legitimate expense against the cost of production; and in arriving at your cost of production, in arriving at that which you should receive for your products, you must take into consideration the taxes, because the taxes on the local governing and the local authority level are a means by which we obtain the revenue to provide ourselves with our services on a collective basis. But the fact that the farmers are unable to pay the taxes is not because they are too high. I find them high myself; and when the time comes that I cannot pay 60 mills of municipal and school tax (as we are paying), then I cannot continue farming anyway, I am bankrupt and I am busted, and I am going to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, I am not too far from that at the present time.

I think the important fact why people complain about taxes is not that they are too high, but that their net income is too low. The average net income per farm in the province of Saskatchewan is a little bit over \$1,100 in 1954. What does that mean, Mr. Speaker? It means, in the year 1954, can't mean anything else, but that in the year through which we have just passed, the majority of farmers, the majority of rural workers in this province, received for their labour less than the legal minimum wage in this province. The reason they are unable to pay their taxes is because they are not receiving even that which we here say he shall be the minimum wage for their labour. You cannot expect people to pay taxes, even if they were 2 mills, or even if they were one male, if they haven't got further labour income above that of the minimum wage of this province.

I do not want to delay the House too long, Mr. Speaker; that there are one or two items to which I would like to make reference. I think it is significant that it was in our Jubilee Year on, I believe, January 4, 1955, that we saw undertaken another great step forward in the development of social ownership in this province and even western Canada, when we saw on that day the

amalgamation or the merger of Saskatchewan Federal Co-ops, and the Manitoba Co-operative Wholesale. Those organizations have been working in the same field, for the same purpose and with the same objective in mind, to create a savings for their people, to give to the consumer membership and opportunity of controlling their destiny and to return any savings or dividends to them. The fact that these two great organizations have amalgamated gives to the co-operative movement in western Canada an even greater and better opportunity to serve its members, than it has previously. I think that that is one event that we can set down, in 1955, as having been a great step forward to the point where we shall have established the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation under which a co-operative movement will be one of the predominant forms of social ownership.

In reference to social ownership we should also make reference, as my friend from Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) did, to the purchase of the Sodium Sulphate plant at Bishopric by the Saskatchewan Sodium Sulphate. This was once again another step forward in building in Saskatchewan a form of society in which social ownership, or in this case, public ownership, shall play its proper and important part. I think that steps in progress along this line are going to make it possible for us in a more effective and in a more efficient way to be able, as people of Saskatchewan, as people of Canada, to control and formulate our own destiny. In Canada we need not only political freedom; we need economic and social freedom as well, and it is through this medium of expanding our co-operative movement, through co-operative ownership and our public ownership, that we will reach that stage when we will have complete economic freedom.

I might suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in this, our Jubilee Year, we respect and look back at the accomplishments of the pioneer; but we, the present generation, giving all due respect to the past, take off our hat to the past and our coats to the future, because there still lies before us the last great frontier, that frontier of bringing to ourselves, not only as Canadians, but as world citizens, complete peace, complete economic security and complete social justice. Because it has been through the actions of people who have been associated with the Government; because of the fact that the Government in this province has undertaken to fulfil, not the commitments that they made, but the commitments that the 'little people' make in this province; because they have undertaken to do that in the last 10 or 11 years; and because I see no reason to change my opinion that in the future they will adhere to the same principles, that they will give the same consideration to the voice that is expressed through the political organization of the C.C.F.; that they will give the same adherence to them. I feel satisfied that, on that basis, I can support the Speech from the Throne.

Hon. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I wish, first of all to commend the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. The hon. member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst), representing and speaking for a rural constituency, gave an excellent contribution to the debate, as did the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Heming), representing an urban constituency and speaking for organized labour.

I wish also to congratulate the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) on being selected as the leader of the Liberal party in Saskatchewan, and as the Leader of the Opposition in this Assembly. His statement that he

intends to maintain debate at a high and constructive level is greatly appreciated on this side of the House, and I am sure that good wishes go out to the Leader of the Opposition in respect to that declaration. I have some misgivings, however, as to whether the hon. Leader of the Opposition will be able to implement a high ideals and purposes which he enunciated in his initial addresses the Leader of the Opposition in this House. It would leave very little for our Liberal daily press to write about, if that were the case.

I was very disappointed (and I say this in all sincerity) that the hon. member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Dunfield) departed from his usual natural, congenial self and saw fit to engage in the type of speech to this House that I believe is to be regretted more by the Leader of the Opposition than anyone else in this Legislature. However, it did provide an opportunity for the daily press to utilize the kind of material for which they seem to have a peculiar preference in Saskatchewan. I hope, tomorrow, to deal with some of the aspects of the speech of the hon. member for Meadow Lake, and also to make Some reference to the kind of editorials that we see in this province, and editorials that, I believe, are of no public benefit, and are certainly in complete contradiction to the often asserted statement of our publishers in this province that the press has a tremendous responsibility to the general public. I would suggest to the press that one of their responsibilities should be to comment on matters of public importance in an impartial way. That is peculiarly lacking in the daily papers that we have in this province in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

Before moving adjournment of the debate, I would like to make a comment or two on the observations made by the hon. member for Nipawin (Mr. McNutt). I know one thing he said was that we should be paying more in school grants and more in municipal grants because the dollar is only valued now at about 53 per cent of its former value. I would suggest to him that the value of the dollar that this provincial government obtains in revenue similarity is only worth 53 per cent as compared to what it used to be. It doesn't alter the situation at all, Mr. Speaker.

I have made careful note of the line of attack of the Opposition. I cannot find too much that is constructive in the tactics being utilized in an endeavour to criticize and embarrass the administration; and I wish to say at once that this Government has not changed its mind in regard to improving the lot of the social-aid recipients, has not changed its mind in the desire to increase the benefits to old-age pensioners. This Government led the procession in granting supplementary allowance to people who were the recognized responsibility of our Federal Government, and this Government has now announced, in the Throne Speech, that it is intended to do something to increase supplementary allowances to old-age pensioners. I know of no case where the Government has either changed its attitude or its opinion regarding the continuation of social services at a level commensurate with our ability to provide other essential services as well.

It has also been suggested in the criticism proffered by the Opposition, that somehow or other this administration is responsible for increased costs of farm production in this province, and that we are prone to blame Ottawa for everything that takes place in this province.

Some Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Tomorrow, I intend to deal with some of the responsibilities that are the responsibilities that Ottawa, and as I have said

February 23, 1955

on previous occasions, we are going to continue to criticize Ottawa for not having assumed the responsibilities that are clearly theirs.

The other line of reasoning of the hon. members opposite is that we should assume many of Ottawa's responsibilities, including research on rust, and developing another strain of rust-resistant grain. I want to talk a little more about that, tomorrow, too. They say we should assume practically all the responsibility for municipal services, and education as well. Well, I have often wondered, Mr. Speaker, what is going to be left to do on part of these other government jurisdictions, if we are expected to do so much. I rather feel that this line of attack as a means of endeavouring to embarrass the Government in maintaining the present levels of services that we have provided for the people of Saskatchewan, or increasing or improving these services.

We are asked to reduce taxes and we are asked to increase expenditures. The hon. member for Nipawin (Mr. MacNutt) suggested many new highway projects which could be developed in north-eastern Saskatchewan; but I would suggest to him that it is necessary to develop an agricultural area usually preceding the establishment of all-weather roads. There is no provincial administration in the history of this province that has done as much to develop lands that are decidedly reclamation lands, for new settlement, as this Government has done in the north-eastern part of this province.

The hon. member for Nipawin asked me if we are going to come to any agreement with the P.F.R.A. in respect to the development of the Carrot River triangle area. Well, he had best ask that question of the Rt. Hon. J.G. Gardiner. I asked the Rt. Hon. J.G. Gardiner if we could have help similar to what is being given in the province of Manitoba, and his reply has been in the negative. I am asking him again . . .

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — . . . and we are suggesting to the P.F.R.A. definite programmes that we hope will be included in next year's operations.

Mr. McDonald: — You mentioned a moment ago that the Federal Minister of Agriculture had given you a negative answer regarding whether you could follow the same policies they adopted in Manitoba. What is the reason for him giving you that answer? The Minister knows what the reason is.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The Rt. Hon. Minister of Agriculture Ottawa does not usually give any reasons. You can't even get a clear-cut answer . . .

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, . . .

Mr. Speaker: — You asked your question.

Mr. McDonald: — Well, now I am on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, if you don't mind.

Mr. Speaker: — All right, state your point of privilege.

Mr. McDonald: — My point of privilege is that I want to keep the record straight in this House . . .

Premier Douglas: — Oh, that's not a point of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: — Have you finished answering his question?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I will continue to answer his question, Mr. Speaker; I am not finished. There has been a suggestion proffered by a Federal M.P. in Ottawa to the effect that, if this Government dropped its land lease policy in favour of alienating these lands, possibly we might get assistance.

Some Hon. Member: — There's your answer.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, if that is the reason that the Rt. Hon. Minister at Ottawa does not see fit to extend assistance, the same as he has done elsewhere, I say it is a straight invasion of a provincial government's right to have the kind of policies they desire, whether they are land policies or whatever they are. That is our right, and whether the Rt. Hon. Minister at Ottawa or anyone else is pleased with those policies or not, is no reason why he should deny the same assistance as in Manitoba to the settlers in that part of our province. Later on in my address, tomorrow, for the benefit of my hon. friends opposite, I am going to make a comparison between the settlement policies on the Manitoba side of the border and the settlement policies on the Saskatchewan side of the border; and I hope that they are going to forget, or get over, some of their habits of suggesting to this House that there is only one solution to the agricultural problems, and that is to give everybody a small piece of land as they did in the old homestead days.

I want to say to hon. members opposite that P.F.R.A., where they have made public expenditures on land for irrigation development, have taken over that land completely, and have never yet indicated that they would give the title back on those particular lands, because of the public expenditure that was made, and because they want to protect that public investment to get speculation on the part of the land holders. The same situation prevails in north-eastern Saskatchewan. It is a reclamation project that will be very costly. My wonder is that the Federal Government would not insist that we should maintain land control there, the same as on deregulation projects, such as Val Marie, Eastend, Shaunavon and Maple Creek. They have done that. They keep back the last dollar. The farmer can never hope to get the title to that land; but there is no use making a sham of the thing, Mr. Speaker. If you are going to sell land, why pretend a farmer has a title when he can never get it? You might just as well give him a lease — a lease that is a good mutual partnership arrangement. Tomorrow, I intend to deal with some of those phases of provincial policy. With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

The Assembly adjourned at 5:55 o'clock p.m.