

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Third Session — Twelfth Legislature**  
**13th Day**

**Monday, February 28, 1955**

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

**DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY**

The House resumed, from Friday, February 25, 1955, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Dewhurst for the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

**Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale):** — Mr. Speaker, it is exactly two weeks ago today since the hon. member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) moved, seconded by the member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Heming), the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I am the 25th member to take part in the Throne Speech debate.

In listening to the preceding speeches I was struck by the unanimity among the members, both on this side of the House and on the Opposition, for that part of the Throne Speech wherein the celebration of the 50th anniversary of the formation of the province was mentioned. Nothing has appealed to the members of this Legislature or to the people of this province as much as has this Jubilee celebration wherein it is planned to pay homage to the pioneers of this land, whose toil and vision we honour.

One reason why I think this is so is because, for so many people in this province, this will be a personal celebration. Most of us have lived in the province so long that the coming celebrations are going to be like a grand birthday party — a personal birthday party, in which we will be celebrating something which seems to be a part of us.

The second reason which has helped to insure the success of the Golden Jubilee celebrations is the fact that so much effort has gone into the planning of the coming celebrations. The Government of this province is to be congratulated on the fact that it set up a Golden Jubilee Committee early enough, so that there could be an effective effort in formulating plans and in setting those plans into motion. Not only do I congratulate this Government on setting up this Committee early, but I would also like to congratulate it upon his choice of a chairman. Most people know that Judge Culliton was a former M.L.A., and that at one time he was a contestant for the leadership of the Liberal party. By choosing Judge Culliton to head up this Committee, this government not only chose a very able person, but by its choice it proclaimed that the celebration was not just to be a political party glorification but was indeed to be an honouring of all the pioneers by all the people of this province.

I cannot let this opportunity go by, Mr. Speaker, without paying tribute to the members of this Legislature who are pioneers of our province. It is my understanding that, of the members who are on the side of the House, there are three who were farming in what is now Saskatchewan before 1905, and three who came here in 1906. I understand that you, Mr. Speaker, started farming in this province — in what became this province — in 1904, as did the hon.

Provincial Secretary (Hon. Mr. Burton), and the member for Morse (Mr. Gibson). On the other hand, the province was one year old when the member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Wellbelove), the member for Lumsden (Mr. Thair), and the member for Kelvington (Mr. Howe) arrived and took up homesteads. It is quite right that there are others in the House who could qualify as pioneers, especially on the Opposition side. The member for Saltcoats (Mr. Lopton) certainly could, as I understand that he was only one year old when he insisted that his parents bring him into this country. The member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson), who has served continuously in this Legislature since 1935, would qualify for his political service, if nothing else; but I understand that he arrived in this province before 1905, which gives him a pioneer rating. I take pleasure in naming these pioneers, today, Mr. Speaker, so that I may, on behalf of the members of this Legislature, express a little of the honour which you and the others so richly deserve as pioneers of this province of ours.

I might mention that the Melfort Agricultural Society is planning to celebrate our province's Jubilee in conjunction with its Class B fair, next July. This promises to be a 'super' event in north-eastern Saskatchewan, as the town of Melfort is celebrating its 50th anniversary on the same occasion.

Mr. Speaker, I have referred to the hon. member from Arm River as a pioneer of this Legislature and have included him in the list of those whose toil and vision we honour. In order to help him recover from the shock, and also to prove to him that many years of service do not make one infallible, I would refer to a statement by him in this debate, just to show how wrong the hon. member from Arm River can be. I recall that he made a statement to the effect that C.A.L. Hogg, Deputy Minister of Mineral Resources, had worked for the C.C.F. in Montreal. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hogg worked for the Federal Government when he was in Montreal.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That doesn't mean he didn't work for the C.C.F.

**Mr. Willis:** — It is a matter of regret to the farmers of the province that the Throne Speech, reporting on the 1954 crop, had to say that the crop year just concluded was one of the most disappointing ever experienced. The Carrot River Valley, which has the reputation of never having had a complete crop failure came close to losing that reputation this year. There were good yields of the new Selkirk wheat and the rust-resistant Lee variety. Thatcher, on the other hand, it made good returns only where it was seeded early. As the majority of our farmers seed late in order to combat wild oats, most of the Thatcher was severely rusted and yielded quite low. P.F.A.A. payments will be made on a wide scale in my constituency for the first time since the Act was passed in 1939. Probably more than one-half of the farmers in Melfort-Tisdale will receive P.F.A.A. payments this year.

One thing which has helped save the situation from being a complete catastrophe for the farmers has been the Wheat Board. Had it not been for the Wheat Board, with its policy of orderly marketing, the wheat farmer of western Canada would have been in the worst position in our history. The Wheat Board has held the price line in the past few years, in the face of bumper crops, both of low and of high quality grain; and, too, its quota system has allowed equality of delivery among farmers. That doesn't mean that we are satisfied with the relationship between the price of the grain which we sell and the price of the things which we buy, and certainly we are not satisfied with the system of car allocations. It simply means that we appreciate the Wheat Board; that we could not farm today without it.

The recent announcement by the Minister of Trade and Commerce that the final payment on the 1953-54 wheat deliveries, along with confirmed payments on oats and barley, is to be made before seeding, was well received by the hard-hit farmers of the province.

One cannot help but contrast the Wheat Board system of the initial, interim and final payments with the open-market system of some years ago. On the open market the farmer sold his grain in the fall, on the low of the market; the high of the market would be reached sometime the next summer; but somebody else got the difference — not the farmer.

The experience of the farmers with the Wheat Board has led to a demand from certain quarters for a livestock marketing board on a similar set-up. The Throne Speech draws attention to the fact that the Federal Government was urged by this Legislature to set up a livestock marketing board, similar in principle to the Wheat Board, but that it has failed to do so.

Considerable interest has been manifested in the provincial livestock marketing scheme which has been drawn up and submitted to the Saskatchewan Marketing Board. The Board is holding a series of meetings in the province in order to hear the representations from those interested in the plan. Following the meetings, the Saskatchewan Marketing Board will submit its report and proposed marketing schemes to the Provincial Government. One of these meetings is to be held at Tisdale, and I would urge all interested farmers or farm organizations in that area to make this an outstanding meeting by their attendance and participation.

Reference is made in the Speech from the Throne to the opening of the Saskatchewan Nursing Home at Melfort. I would be remiss in my duty as M.L.A. for Melfort-Tisdale if I did not express, on behalf of my constituents, their pleasure at having such a fine nursing home in our area. The home, with its 64 employees, is an asset to the town of Melfort. It is particularly a godsend to those older people in north-eastern Saskatchewan who need care such as it can give. Many of these people in the past hesitated to enter such a home, because it meant being separated by long distances from their friends and families. When the home was ready for occupancy it did not take long to be filled to capacity, and on the waiting list at the present time there are 160 applications for this home alone.

The home was officially opened last August by the Premier, who delivered the dedication addressed to a large audience of some 3,000 people, and completed the official opening ceremony by cutting the ribbon which spanned the doors.

An organization very essential to the well-being of the guests in a nursing home is a Ladies' Auxiliary. Melfort is fortunate in having a very active group of ladies who give freely of their time and energy on behalf of the people in the home. This group sponsors monthly birthday parties for those guests having a birthday in that month. They see to it that the wards are visited regularly. Last Christmas, they staged a fine Christmas party, complete with carol singers, and with Santa Claus, with gifts for everyone. Its work has helped greatly in making this institution into a real home for the guests.

The Throne Speech makes mention of additional help to be made available to rural municipalities for market roads. The Opposition has criticized the help now given for main market roads, thereby trying to create the impression that this cannot government has given very little assistance to municipalities. Such, Mr. Speaker, is not the case. I have here a record of money

**February 28, 1955**

paid by the Market Road Branch of the Department of Highways to the rural municipalities in my constituency during the years 1935 to 1954. I would like to put on the record the story as shown by these figures, which cover a 20-year period. For the first 10 years, from 1935 to 1944, the Liberals were in power in this province, and during the last 10 years the C.C.F. were in office. The Premier must have been referring to figures like these when he said in this debate that the Leader of the Opposition must find it hard to criticize the government which has done more than any previous Liberal government. These figures show that this Government has done more in the matter of assistance for market roads.

There are nine rural municipalities, wholly or partially situated within the boundaries of the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale. Their assessment ranges from a high of \$4,100,000 to a low of \$800,000. During the 20-year period, a total of \$162,042 was paid in grants to the rural municipalities in the constituency; they vary from nothing paid one year to a high of \$24,484, in 1954-55. In the first year under review, nine grants were paid, totalling \$4,465; in the next year, 1936, no grants were paid; 1937 — two grants, totalling \$3,437; 1938 — nine grants, one to each of the municipalities, totalling \$7,415; 1939 — one grant of \$300; 1940 — one grant of \$300; 1941 — one grant of \$105; 1942 — three grants totalling \$665 . . .

**Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek):** — Who took away the \$500 basic grant?

**Mr. Willis:** — In 1943 — six grants, totalling \$1,666; and in 1944 — four grants, \$1,682; 1945 — seven grants totalling \$6,492; 1946 —

**Mr. Danielson:** — That came out of the farmers' own money.

**Mr. Willis:** — In 1946 — nine grants; and I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that from 1946 down to and including 1952, there were nine grants paid each year, one to each of the municipalities.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Why don't you give us 1952, 1953 and 1954?

**Mr. Willis:** — The grants varied from \$11,930 in 1949, to \$19,000 in 1948. In 1953 — five grants, totalling \$14,900. That was the year after the Government had returned the provincial Public Revenue Tax, and grants were reduced to some municipalities. In 1954 — grants to five municipalities totalling \$24,484.

**Mr. Cameron:** — That is where all the money went, eh? We sure didn't get any.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — They don't like to hear it!

**Mr. Cameron:** — That's where the money went, eh?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Willis:** — For the 20-year period, Mr. Speaker, a total in grants of \$162,042 . . .

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — They can't take it!

**Mr. Willis:** — Grants in the first 10-year period totalled \$20,235. Grants in

the second 10-year period totalled \$141,807. That does not take into account the amount of taxes returned to the municipality since 1952, as a result of this Government vacating the Public Revenue Tax field.

If we take the total assessment of these nine municipalities which adds up to \$25,053,000, and figure two mills of that, we have then \$50,107 to add yearly to the assistance which these nine municipalities receive as a result of this Government's action. This makes a grant total of \$242,021 — \$141,000 in grants, \$100,000 in Public Revenue Tax relief — which these rural municipalities received in the last 10 years, as compared to the \$20,235 received in the 10 years of Liberal rule from 1935 to 1944. Twelve times as much assistance, Mr. Speaker!

If we take two of these rural municipalities and examine their assistance re market roads we will get a better picture of what has been done as compared to the 10 years preceding. R.M. No. 397 (the lowest assessed of these municipalities) received a total of \$36,358 in the 20-year period; of this \$3,400 was received in six grants in the 10 years of Liberal rule, while \$32,000 was received during the period of C.C.F. government, or more than nine times as much. R.M. No. 429 (the highest assessed municipality in this group) received, in the first 10 years, three grants totalling \$1,645; in the period of C.C.F. government it received seven grants, totalling \$6,550, or four times as much.

As a result of the C.C.F. vacating the Public Revenue Tax field in 1952, both these municipalities are better off by two mills of their assessment. Taking this into account, in 1953, R.M. No. 397 received a grant of \$4,558 plus two mils taxes on the assessment of \$800,000, a grand total for this year of \$4,558 plus \$1,600, which equals \$6,158 of assistance in one year as a result of this Government's actions.

In 1953, R.M. No. 429 received no grant, but did receive two mills on an assessment of \$4,100,000, or assistance to the extent of \$8,200, because this Government vacated the Public Revenue Tax field in favour of the municipalities.

These are only two R.M.s and yet the same spectacular increase is true for any others of the nine which make up the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale.

Mr. Speaker, we are not claiming these rural municipalities have no road problems; we are claiming that these figures show that municipalities are now receiving aid far beyond what they had been accustomed to before this Government came into office.

**Some Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale):** — And this year, additional assistance is being proposed.

There is a bridge problem in the R.M.s in my constituency, especially across the northern part. Since roads and bridges are related, it is of interest to compare what is being done in a matter of bridge assistance in Melfort-Tisdale. The Bridge Branch of the Department of Highways has spent in the Melfort-Tisdale constituency, during the past twenty years, a total of \$217,222. Of that amount \$41,670 was spent by the previous Liberal government in the 10 years from 1935 to 1944; and \$175,552 in the 10 years of C.C.F. government, an increase of more than four times the assistance given in the Liberal 10-year term of office.

**February 28, 1955**

Reference is made in the Throne Speech to the extensive spring flood conditions experienced in 1954 in north-eastern Saskatchewan, which have created emergency conditions for many farm families. The area referred to here lies mainly in the constituencies of Wadena, Kelsey and Nipawin. Members will recall reading in the newspapers accounts of flooding of this area. A newspaper reporter travelled by motorboat over the flooded district. He wrote stories of cultivated fields being turned into lakes and of farm equipment being covered by the floods. Those farmers, being unable to seed a crop, have been particularly hard hit.

At this time I want to congratulate this Government on the prompt steps taken by it to alleviate some of that suffering. Along with the members for Wadena and Nipawin, I sat in on a meeting of rural municipal officials and Cabinet Ministers, called together, last summer, by this Government to consider what steps should be taken in view of the seriousness of the situation. At this meeting in Tisdale, officials of the rural municipalities, one after the other, reported on conditions in each one's municipality. Each of the Ministers of the Cabinet committee set up to aid in this emergency, outlined what steps his Department was prepared to take. The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. McIntosh), who acted as chairman for the meeting, summed up the proposals and made it clear that the Provincial Government, through the Departments of Natural Resources, Agriculture and Highways, intended to co-operate to the fullest extent with the municipalities in meeting this emergency situation. The constituency of Melfort-Tisdale is not part of this flooded district, but three of our rural municipalities received help from the Government as being in the fringe area.

Farmers in these flooded areas have suffered tremendous loss this past year. It will take some years of good crops before the effects of this disaster will have disappeared.

The Throne Speech draws attention to the fact that 6,500 additional farms are served with power, this year, and that it is planned to serve 7,500 in 1955. Saskatchewan's Power Corporation has made wonderful progress since 1944. It was set up in 1929 as the Saskatchewan Power Commission, but practically no progress was made in its 15 years of existence before the C.C.F. came to office. Total investment in power facilities was only \$7 1/2 million by 1944, compared to the more than \$17 million invested today. There were less than 13,000 customers in 1944; today there are more than 100,000. From only 136 farms electrified in 1944, the number has grown to the point where there are now in the neighbourhood of 25,000 farms with power — a farm electrification programme without equal. With 7,500 farms to receive power in 1955 there will remain only an additional 7,500 to be served in 1956 in order that the 40,000 farms promised in the election campaign of 1952 will be achieved.

**Some Government Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Willis:** — Melfort-Tisdale constituency has been particularly well served by the Power Corporation. More than 900 farms have received power and more than one-half the constituency is now on an area-coverage basis for power.

The Throne Speech has announced that there will be increased grants for Education. This has been welcome news for the ratepayers of the province. However, those who are expecting a \$15-million increase, as suggested by the Leader of the Opposition, will be doomed to disappointment. One wonders whether the hon. member news that he is suggested an increase of \$15 million when he was speaking in the Throne Speech debate . . .

**Mr. Kramer (The Battlefords):** — No, he didn't. He was just talking.

**Mr. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale):** — One of my friends, who is not a member of this Legislature, has told me that it is his opinion that the Leader of the Opposition did not know how much money was involved in his suggestion of grant increases. It is true that he did not get past percentage figures in his speech, but a suggested increase from 20 per cent to 50 per cent in educational grants means that he thought that this Government should provide two and one-half times the grants it is now making to education. This year's total grants are in the neighbourhood of \$10 million; 2 1/2 times 10 means that the Leader of the Opposition thinks that the grants provided by the Department of Education of this Government should be \$25 million, an increase of \$15 million. It is so easy to suggest increases, even a \$15 million one, when it is not necessary to say where the money is to come from. Since the hon. member has indicated that increases should be made in several other expenditures it is quite likely that, during the budget debate, he will be advocating new taxes to raise these extra amounts.

There has been a tremendous increase in grants to education since 1944. According to the latest annual report of the Department of Education, school grants, in 1945-45, were \$3,166,537; this had been increased to \$8,936,000 in 1953-54, with a further increase in the current year, school grants now would be about \$10 million, the highest in the history of the province. The Throne Speech forecasts a further increase for this year.

It is apparent, Mr. Speaker, that an examination of the Throne Speech shows that this Government is not departing from those policies of good government, nor from the principles of 'humanity first' which have guided it since 1944. I will support the motion.

**Mr. A. Lopton (Saltcoats):** — Mr. Speaker, in taking part in this debate, first of all I want to dispose of some of the remarks my hon. friend just made on the other side, with respect to raising taxes to increase grants to municipalities and school districts. It is not going to be necessary to raise taxes to pay more grants to the school districts of this province. All the people have got to do is to put in an economical administration, and I know where they can save at least \$8 million a year and not curtail any services.

Now that I have done that, Mr. Speaker, there is another matter I would like to dispose of before I go into the debate. This, you will all agree to. The hon. Minister of Agriculture made some mention of 4-H Clubs in his remarks, and I have great pleasure in endorsing the remarks that he made in respect to those 4-H Clubs. I think they are a splendid organization, and I want to tell you, too, that the C.C.F. had nothing to do with organizing them, because they are a national organization; as a matter of fact, I think they are an international organization. The figures I have of the membership of the 4-H Club was reaching close to 70,000 boys and girls in the Dominion of Canada; that is, young people, and some 8,000 adults are volunteering their services in 4-H Clubs as instructors, and that is a great achievement. From the records of the work that they do I think that everybody who thinks well of agriculture should be behind the 4-H Clubs.

I have the honour to mention here, today, two young fellows in my constituency, in the Esterhazy district, who won laurels in the Toronto Royal Exhibition for grain judging. They won the championship: a boy by the name of Don Knezacee, a lad of about 18 or 19 years old, and his partner, Ken Serdula.

**February 28, 1955**

These young lads have been raised in the district and learned what they did produce at the Royal Exhibition right in that community under the leadership of a local man. One of those lads, in addition to earning the championship (that is the Dominion championship, I presume), earned himself the candidature for the T. Eaton scholarship for the province of Saskatchewan. I want to say here, today, that I am proud of these young men, and I am proud of the people who were responsible for them being in the 4-H Club. I wish them well, and I wish the 4-H Clubs well for the work they are doing.

Next I want to join with the rest of the members of this House in expressing my congratulations to the mover and second are of this Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne. Of course, I do not have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I rather felt sorry for them, because they were not propounding the policies of the C.C.F., but, incidentally, they were supporting the policies of the Liberal party in that particular Speech from the Throne. I will deal with that later on.

Then I want to congratulate our new Leader, 'Hammy' McDonald, on his elevation as the leader of the Liberal party and the next Premier of Saskatchewan. There is some difference between the leader of our Liberal party and that of the C.C.F. party. I would say that they are equal on two virtues.

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — Vive la difference!

**Mr. Loptson:** — The hon. Premier of Saskatchewan has at least two virtues. He has a glib and a fluent tongue and a glad hand, and he is making good use of both, and I would say he is making pretty well out of it, too. Our leader has both those virtues; he has a fluent tongue and a glad hand.

**Premier Douglas:** — Why didn't you support him?

**Mr. Loptson:** — He has something else in addition, and that is that he knows something and he knows all, as a matter of fact, or almost all, of the things that are needed to be known about our basic industry, agriculture. He is an agriculturist himself, and for that reason is qualified by knowledge and practical experience of what is needed for our basic industry.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — He finds that out now, but not until after the convention.

**Mr. Loptson:** — That's one virtue. Another virtue that I think he has that my hon. friend over there has not got, and that is good, common, horse sense to apply that knowledge, and that has not be demonstrated during the last ten years.

**Premier Douglas:** — Aren't you a little late finding this out?

**Mr. Loptson:** — I have been telling at every year ever since I came to this House. To demonstrate and prove what I am driving at, I am going to give you some very important demonstration of what damage a man can do when he thinks he is doing something good but he is really doing harm. I do not think our leader, Hammy McDonald, would go on the air, as the Premier did in the Fall of 1953, and tell the world about the terribly unwieldy surplus of wheat that we had, and that we would have to give it away for nothing in order to get it out of the way before the next crop. The results of that was rather costly to the farmers of this province. After he had made that statement we saw prices start to slip. The buyers were not so anxious to buy our wheat because if they could wait another month or two, with a depression on, Canada would have to get rid of this unwieldy surplus. Then, when he found out that it was not popular



to talk that way, he scoured the Bible just before the last session, in 1954, and you will remember that he brought in a resolution here suggesting that we should not give it away any more, but that we should store it, because Joseph in the Biblical days had found that very advisable and good business. He had stored the surplus during the buoyant years for seven years, and then he had dry years after that, and they distributed it far and wide. He moved a resolution in this House suggesting that all provinces, co-operatives, and others who were interested in wheat, should get together and devise a means of financing this surplus that we were going to store up. I think you will remember that we agreed that the suggestion was not too bad, but I think I was the one who told him that I did not think anybody appreciated his advice in the business way, and I doubted if the conference would ever be held. I do not know to this day whether it has been held. I do not think it was held.

I think the hon. Premier got so disappointed and disgusted that there was no chance of getting these fellows to agree to store up the surplus wheat that, lo and behold! he gets on the give-away policy again in May, in June and again in July, with the result that down goes our wheat again another 10 cents a bushel.

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but we get a very eminent visitor here. He came from England. After listening to the terrible distressing condition of the disposal of our wheat, here is the report of the man who came from England, one of the big buyers of our wheat, and this is what he says. As a matter of fact, it was Sir Norman Vernon, a British top grain buyer. He buys wheat and flour for about 50 bakeries in England, and he has this to say — this is all dated after my hon. friend. the Premier, was out on a spree giving our wheat away:

“British millers are waiting for the Canadian price to drop, he told a press conference. That is why they may not be buying as much as normal even though grain reserves in Britain had declined.”

Again he states here:

“Canadian prices are still out of line with those quoted by other suppliers.”

Some say that what the hon. Premier said about the surplus of wheat here was no news to the grain trade in Great Britain. I admit that. I admit that they themselves know pretty well what we have; but there is Argentina with a large surplus. There were all the countries that did not belong to the International Wheat Agreement. They were free to sell their crop at whatever price they pleased. They were the ones that went out and said that they thought they had better get the market while the market was there, because it was just possible that this ‘fire sale’ might happen, and I would say that this gloom and thunder of my hon. friend sitting over there does not always pay off. It is not always good to be too generous with it. I like to listen to my hon. friend because he is easy to listen to, but when he starts to talk about something that he does not know anything about, it is a mighty costly recitation. I venture to say that his oratory on wheat marketing has been a mighty expensive oration, and has cost us tens of millions of dollars.

What I want to impress on you, Mr. Speaker, is the difference between the qualities of the two leaders. We hear the hon. members on the other

**February 28, 1955**

side bemoaning the condition of our agriculture, and yet I see in the press here, the other day, not only about the wheat situation but they are also talking about beef and dairying. You will remember (it is only a week or two ago) when the Federal Government decided they would get rid of some of the surplus butter they have in storage, and they decided that they should supply some of the institutions throughout Canada, hospitals and gaols and other institutions with butter at about one-third less than what they were paying for it. There is a lot of butter used here in Saskatchewan, and this Government buys it, and the Federal Government offered it to the Minister of Public Health and I guess, the Social Welfare Minister — I don't know who looks after the gaols; but anyway, they have to buy butter, and what was the reply? I have it here:

“According to press reports Hon. T.J. Bentley, Health Minister, has said that margarine is purchased for patients in the mental hospital because it is much cheaper than butter and equally nutritious as butter.”

Now that, Mr. Speaker, is a very costly word. If margarine is just as nutritious as butter, why should you and I be buying butter at twice the price of margarine? I venture to say that the statement is enough to wreck our butter industry. Why should anybody buy butter if margarine is as nutritious as butter and you can buy it for half the price of butter? I would like you, Mr. Speaker, to jot that down in your memo book and have a talk to the authorities and see if there is any possibility of them counteracting this statement, because it is of grave importance.

I want to go onto the Throne Speech. There are certain things in that Throne Speech I think deserve consideration. The Throne Speech, of course, is bankrupt, as it always is, unless they take something out of the Liberal platform to put into it. You will remember that the only thing there is in the Throne Speech now is increased Mothers' Allowances — that's Liberal advocacy; increased supplementary pensions — I think you have been voting against that for the last two Sessions.

**Mr. Danielson:** — For the last five years.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Five years. You have been voting against that, and you thought you had better put it in now as the election might not be far off, not more than a year or two; increased school grants — isn't that what the Liberals have been asking for ever since I have been here?

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Ever since they left office.

**Mr. Loptson:** — The right for veterans to buy land. That was brought in the first year I came here, in the 1949 session, and my hon. friends voted against it. Now they have got it in their platform. I would like to take the hon. Minister of Social Welfare to task, too. He has never given me credit for giving him the advice to build old-age pensioners' homes. I think I brought that up in the session of 1949, and I told my hon. friend that unless he did that the hospital plan would go on the rocks. I am glad that he is doing it now, but that is a Liberal suggestion.

I also advised him that it would be necessary to build hospitals for the incurables in order to relieve the pressure on hospitals. I think you

will find that in the records. I don't know whether it was in my speech or in committee, but I have got the notes of it. So, I think they ought to give us credit for having done something for them, in spite of the fact that we have been paying planners and advisers something in the neighbourhood of \$60,000 a year for 10 years; that is about \$600,000 to advise the C.C.F. government what is best to do. And now they find out they can't plan anything better than to come back to the Liberal platform.

**Mr. Danielson:** — They threw their platform out the windows.

**Mr. Loptson:** — I am not criticizing what is in the Speech from the Throne, but I may criticize insofar as the extent to which they will go. I think that it is about time that they were increasing the supplementary allowance for old-age pensioners. I think it is about time they were extending the grants to the school districts and extending the grants to the municipalities. So much for that.

There is another thing that is mentioned in the Throne Speech, or was mentioned in the speech of the Leader of Government. He took pains to take the Leader of the Opposition to task for having suggested some things that the Liberal party would do if they got into power, and he said that Liberal promises don't mean anything. I don't know any party that has less licence to doubt or discount the promises of any other party than the C.C.F., in view of the record of the C.C.F. party. I am prepared to challenge anyone sitting on that side of the House, or outside of this House, to name the one promise that the C.C.F. government or party made, in the election of 1944, that they have carried out in the way they promised to do it. I will challenge them to name one single promise. They just cannot do it. I have scoured all their promises, and they have not carried out one single promise the way they propose to do.

I will just mention one or two of the important promises, Mr. Speaker. One of the things that is one of the most popular things that they have done is the expansion of the hospital service and we are not criticizing that; but how did they promise to bring it about? Well, let me read what they had in their pamphlet No. 105 in the election of 1944. It reads as follows:

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

Without charge!

**Mr. Danielson:** — That's the stickler.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Well, now, almost anybody will vote for that. An awful lot of people did vote for it. Well, they brought about some of these promises. They brought about the hospitalization, and that's about all they did, of all the things they enumerated, and here is what it has cost us. Up until the end of 1953, I think it was, instead of this being free, it is costing the individual \$15 a year capital assessment, \$40 a year for property, plus approximately \$9 million out of the Treasury, including the hospitalization tax. I think, Mr. Speaker, you will agree with me that they did not carry out

**February 28, 1955**

this promise the way they promised it.

Then there was another promise they were fond of making, and that is to provide education. Let me read what they promised on education. This is part of the Saskatchewan 'Commonwealth', which is the official organ of the C.C.F. party, dated March 10, 1943, and that is just before they came into power:

“The first thing which the C.C.F. government would do would be to recognize education as the responsibility of the provincial government. There has been a tendency on the part of provincial governments to pass the buck to the municipalities and local school boards for maintaining our educational facilities.”

Just listen to this!

“The time has come when we must recognize that Canada's constitution places the responsibility of teaching our children squarely on the provincial government, and it cannot be passed on to any other body.”

**Some Hon. Member:** — Costs us \$30 million.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Well, now, how was that promise carried out?

**Mr. McDonald:** — Twice as much as I promised.

**Mr. Loptson:** — I, and everybody, expected to see improved education, but I did not expect that I had to pay for it. Here is the result of this promise. Rural school taxes in 1944, amounted to \$5,630,000 and up until 1953 it was \$12,158,000, and you can add another million to that for this year, because I am sure they went up again. Just about 2 1/2 times as much — yes, that was a pretty good promise; well kept. You ought to be proud of it.

There were more promises than that. Yes, sure, we heard much about the Education Tax. As a matter of fact, the member for Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs) said it was a 'stinking' tax, and then he said "we have promised to take it off; it is about time we wiped it off." That is what he said at the convention two or three years after they were in power, and when they had increased their revenue some \$20 million. Not only that. The hon. Attorney General has something to say about it at the convention and Moose Jaw. He said it was about time they were taking it off. Instead of taking it off, they increased taxes — at least they had collected about three times as much in the last year as they did in 1944.

They told the people they were not going to increase taxes in anything. What happened to the gasoline tax? They increased it some fifty per cent. They collected about \$3 million in 1944, and the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) gave the figures the other day — that it had risen to about \$12 million, I think he said.

**Mr. Danielson:** — \$14 million.

**Mr. Loptson:** — \$14 million — even worse! I will also challenge my hon. friend to pick out one service, even to the issuing of marriage licences,

that this Government hasn't increased the cost anywhere from 50 to 100 per cent.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Rubbish!

**Mr. Loptson:** — Everything that has to do with the Government has been increased 50 to 100 and in some cases 200.

**Mr. Erb:** — Are you now proving that we are carrying out the Liberal policy?

**Mr. Loptson:** — That is how the C.C.F. carried out its promises.

Mr. Speaker, I was reading the press the other day and I ran across a little article that I was very interested in, and I will show it to you. It was a statement reported from a speech that was made from an international authority, and man by the name of Dr. G. Brock Chisholm, a former director-general of the World Health Organization. He goes on to say in our democratic system of election, that people should be warned against the 'crackpot politicians' — that's the heading:

“The definition of a 'crackpot politician' is a man or a woman who advocates things that cannot be carried out in practice.”

I was just wondering if he had ever heard of the C.C.F. Government in Saskatchewan, when he made that statement.

**Mr. Cameron:** — The cap fits them.

**Mr. Loptson:** — It fits so perfectly. Just take their record, and if you have ever seen a picture that fits this statement to a “T” you have it sitting right on your right, Mr. Speaker.

With all these Crown Corporations — well we had a funeral this forenoon; or part, I think they left a limb out, and they had to bury it. I thought that we had heard the last of the woollen mill, last year, when we buried \$830,000, but this forenoon, my goodness! they came out with another bill of \$160,000. Evidently there was a leg left and we had to bury that this forenoon. I think the results of the last ten years will prove that the statement of Dr. Brock Chisholm is perfectly right.

Another thing that the Premier said in his speech — and I don't think he needs to feel proud of that statement, because after all, there are many supporters of the C.C.F. party who think well of the co-operatives; and when he made this statement on the floor of this House and said that all the Liberals had done for co-operatives was that somebody said, “For God's sake, read your contract!” and that they had never bought anything from co-operatives, then I think that he was a little far-fetched — not that we care. He can make himself as ridiculous as he likes. As a matter of fact, we would rather like him to do that. But I am just wondering how my hon. friends who sat around him liked him to make that statement.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — We know it is true.

February 28, 1955

**Mr. Loptson:** — They all know that the Liberals were the originators of the co-operatives. There is another one that has not got much; there is another crackpot, and you can see where they are. All you have to do is read the record. It was the Liberals who set up the statutes for the co-operatives in this province. Would you say that isn't right? I would like you to say that it isn't right.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — A year ago you said it was the Communists that set them up.

**Mr. Loptson:** — That's another crackpot right there. Everybody knows that even in my little short-pant days, under Liberal government we had a co-operative creamery in Churchbridge, established in 1898. Will the C.C.F. take credit for that? I guess so. Other co-operatives started just after the turn of the century. There were Liberals in power then. Who built the co-operative elevators in Saskatchewan? They started in 1910. The C.C.F. was not here then. It was the Liberals who established the co operative elevators, and they advanced 85 per cent of the capital cost. Put that in your pipe and smoke it!

Not only that, Mr. Speaker. The Liberals were the fathers of the co-operative creameries, and when the creameries got into financial difficulties, who was it that came to their assistance? The Liberal government. They took them over, financed them, and nursed them on to their feet again; and yet the Premier lowers himself to the extent to say the words that he said that the Liberals had never done anything for the co-operatives except say, "For God's sake, read your contract!" I do not think you need be proud of the Premier for doing that. He doesn't have to lower himself to that kind of thing. There is hardly a co-operative organization in this province . . .

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — How about the Co-operative 'Commonwealth?'

**Mr. Loptson:** — Well, I'll tell you all about that in a minute.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That's a communal commonwealth.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Virtually every co-operative in the province of Saskatchewan was organized while the Liberals were in power, and yet these men say that we did nothing. Not only that, if it had not been for the Liberal government advancing \$45,000 to the Wheat Pool when they were organizing, they would not be here today, and there is not anybody in this House who will deny that. That was a Liberal government. They were practically responsible for organizing the Wheat Pool. As a matter of fact, I helped to get some contracts signed and served as a member of their committee for a number of years.

The Premier said something else that wasn't altogether according to Hoyle, and I don't think he should have said that either, because he knows better. He said, in his speech, that insofar as rural electrification is concerned, the Leader of the Opposition was criticizing this Government because it wasn't serving the needy with electricity. What did he say? He said "the Liberals didn't supply any electrification"; as a matter of fact, you couldn't get it, if you had the money. I would like to ask how many hook-ups they made in 1945, and again in 1946 and again in 1947? As a matter of fact the Minister in charge stated right on the floor of this House that he could neither get help nor material to go into that programme until well after 1948. Then how was the Liberal, or any other, government going to provide rural electrification before 1944? There wasn't any extension anywhere in Canada during those years. Well,

if you want to make such ridiculous comparisons in the country it is all right with me, because it is the greatest insult that you can hand out to an audience, if you expect them to believe it.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — They know it.

**Mr. Loptson:** — They expect them to believe it. Now, they are providing electricity to those who have plenty of money — the man who can pay \$500 to the Government to get a hook-up and pay the \$1,000 that may be necessary to wire his buildings. What about the fellow who can't afford to pay the \$500? Well, we have a Liberal government in Manitoba, and they look after that situation. They provide electrification to the farmers whether they have money or not; and their rate is as follows. I am going to tell you what their rate is. Here is the basic rate that is charged both by Saskatchewan and Manitoba Governments. The basic rate for the minimum in electricity, in Manitoba, is \$3.60 a month, and that is after they have their hook-up without paying any money down. In Saskatchewan, the farmer has to pay \$500, or approximately that, and his monthly minimum charge is \$5.15. That is how this Government is helping the farmers! That is Socialism!

If the Premier wants to make these statements and expects somebody to believe them and appreciate them, it is all right with me. It has been said on many occasions regarding rural electrification rates, that it costs far more to generate electricity here in Saskatchewan than it does in Manitoba. I haven't the figures for Manitoba right here, but some of the rates that you are generating electricity for here can hardly go much lower until they won't cost anything. Here is the rate that was given to us in Crown Corporations, last year; the rate for generating electricity per kwt. hour . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! May I draw to the attention of the hon. member who is reading a newspaper that it is against the rules of the House.

**Mr. Danielson:** — You can't even read the 'Commonwealth'!

**Mr. Loptson:** — Saskatoon is 8/10ths of a cent; Estevan, 6/10ths of a cent — a little over half a cent per kwt; Unity, 5/10ths of a cent. I would venture to say that the others which we haven't got would be something along the same lines; but where you are generating power for less than 3/4 of a cent, you cannot be very much higher than the rate at which they are generating it in Manitoba. So the argument that it is costing too much to generate power here, and that you have to charge the farmers this exorbitant price, cannot hold water.

My hon. friend, the Premier, is in a bad way. His C.C.F. party is fast disintegrating. The events of the last few months, or in even less time than that, cannot be accepted as complimentary by some of its leaders. Take the spectacle in the House of Commons, the other week, when all but four deserted the leader on a division. Well, the chickens are coming home to roost.

The C.C.F. party is made up of all kinds of political beliefs. There are a lot of Tories in there, there are a lot of moderate Liberals in the C.C.F. party, and there are a lot of Reds in it too, and there are quite a few number of Pinks, and these Reds are beginning to show their courage now and some of the other fellows, the Tories, are beginning to show their courage. I think you will find that all the moderate Socialists will be leaving them and will be coming over to where they should be, in the Liberal Party, because that is where they were and that is where they should be.

Take the case of this Rodney Young, in British Columbia. I don't think that the general rank and file of the C.C.F. were very happy about that episode. At a convention in British Columbia, this man, this ex-member of Parliament of a constituency in British Columbia, came up on the floor of the C.C.F. convention and said that he was glad — as a matter of fact, he said he was proud — to be called a Communist. I expect that would be pretty horrifying for those who are not Communists, and I give credit to a lot of the C.C.F.ers — they are certainly not Communists; not in my constituency. Then there was a resolution brought on the floor of the House, suggesting that this Communist should no longer be called a C.C.F.er, there were enough of his supporters, who were probably Communists, or they were at least 'pink' enough, to sustain him in the party; and he was still a good C.C.F.er, although he said himself he was a Communist. Later on the Executive managed to vote him out of the party.

You have one man from Saskatchewan I say has some brains, and that is Ross Thatcher, M.P. There is a man who is really an imposter in the C.C.F. party. I guess maybe he can't get elected any other way, but I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that he is so smart that these fellows kick him out when there is anything of importance to be done, because he know something about the subjects. They kick him out of the committees, because he has some judgment to pass on to the committee. So they leave him on the outside, because he wouldn't stand for the nonsense of the rest of the C.C.F. members.

As a matter of fact, I would like to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that it would be good for the people in Saskatchewan if the C.C.F. members never put a foot inside the House of Commons; they could draw their pay and sit home and rock the baby or wash the dishes, for all the good they are doing there. They are 'needling' the Wheat Pool all the time, making it difficult for them; and for anything else they suggest, they are just wasting the time of the House, and all the members are pretty well disgusted with them.

There are people that like that kind of thing, but it is not a good thing. Few are going to carry on with the C.C.F. Party. They have gone to pieces now; they only got about 10 per cent of the last popular vote in the Federal election; that is recognized in the House of Commons in Ottawa. What we have here they don't worry about; but they certainly would like to see them go home from Ottawa and they are quite prepared to pay their indemnity in their pension afterwards, if they just let them go ahead and do the business of the House which they will do anyway; but the C.C.F.ers are interfering and making it difficult.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas:** — Like building the South Saskatchewan dam!

**Mr. Lopton:** — Another thing has happened with the C.C.F. and that is that they have built themselves up as an anti-American force in Canada, and I don't think that is doing us any good here in Saskatchewan. I felt rather uncomfortable and sympathetic toward the Premier after we had listened to the distinguished visitor we had here, the other day, in the person of the Hon. Richard Wood, when he made that very sound and sensible appeal to the Canadian people, and pointed out to us the importance of our position as a possible mediator between Great Britain and the American people. I think that Canada has played that role very forcibly in the past, and I am hoping that they will continue to do that. I think the Premier was quite sincere



when he agreed with that sentiment; but having to do so in view of what has transpired in the past makes me wonder whether he could be as sincere as he looked, because, as I said before, the C.C.F. party has certainly not shown any friendship to the United States. As a matter of fact, there are many of the members who have expressed much dislike for them, and I don't think that any of the C.C.F. have advocated unity between the British Crown and the Americans. As a matter of fact, the Premier himself advocated setting up a 'third force' to split up the unity between those two big nations. The only force in the world that wanted that was the Kremlin.

After he made that statement I saw some press reports. Here is one where the Premier is very much lauded by the Peace Council. Here is: "Moscow hails the C.C.F. action"; so that anything that was so endorsed would hardly be endorsed across the line. That is another factor that is giving some reason for the disintegration of the C.C.F. party, because there are a lot of supporters of the C.C.F. party who are supporters of the work the United States is doing. As a matter of fact, I think the only thing that the C.C.F. can have against the United States is the fact that they have been so generous in handing out relief to those who are suffering and needy. Another thing they hate the Americans for is that they have made a real success of private enterprise, and anybody that makes the success of private enterprise is certainly not a friend of the C.C.F.

Another thing I would like to mention that the C.C.F. is quite prominent in — at least they think they are a force in international affairs. They don't just confine themselves to Saskatchewan, or even to Canada, but they go outside of that to Great Britain. I read in the 'Commonwealth' here, when they were having trouble in British Guiana, where they were giving the British Government blazes because they had fired the Communist government that the people that elected in Guiana. Why, it was a terrible thing, that the Communists were not allowed to take over Guiana! Then they were going to South Africa; they tell the South African people how they should run their business. Then they go to Guatemala. I wondered, at the time they were blaming the United States' capitalist monopoly in the fruit industry in Guatemala, how about Saskatchewan, where American capitalist is certainly dominating the industry of our oil business! Maybe we should have a revolution here and blame that on American capitalists. Such is the record of my hon. friends over to your right, Mr. Speaker.

There was a matter came up here in this House that I did not expect to be brought up, and that was this Rawluk case. It would never have been brought up from this side of the House, as far as I know. But now that it has been brought up, Mr. Speaker, I think it is my duty to tell the Premier what the talk is about this Rawluk case by C.C.F.ers, as well as everybody else. People think that the Premier should clean this thing up, one way or the other. As a matter of fact, they say that if he doesn't, he, himself, is vulnerable. They figure the only reason why he isn't taking action is because of the fact that his business partner, Dr. Shumiatcher, is the star figure in the issue; whichever way it goes he is the one who is going to be in the swim . . .

**Mr. Kramer:** — Walter Tucker, too.

**Mr. Lopton:** — If Rawluk is prosecuted, and found guilty of corruption, Dr. Shumiatcher was his partner and he would also be guilty. If the evidence is found right and Allore is convicted, the Provincial Treasurer

February 28, 1955

is on the hook and Dr. Shumiatcher is still guilty. I think, in all fairness, the Premier should clean that case up.

Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to talk this long. I will leave the rest for the budget debate.

**Mr. E.H. Walker (Gravelbourg)** — Mr. Speaker, the other day, when the hon. member for Melville (Mr. A.P. Brown) got up to speak, he made mention of the fact that he was speaking following the member for Milestone (Mr. Erb), and he thought he was in a rather unique position in that he would have to follow such an eloquent speaker. I think possibly I am in a rather unique position here, today, in that I have to follow the hon. member from Saltcoats; but I think there the similarity ends.

I will not try to follow his nimble footwork, or stumbling, or whatever it was, but rather I will attempt to make comments on some of the other speeches which have been made in this House during this debate.

It has been rather generally agreed by most members in the House during this debate, that a very apparent general depression in the western Canadian economy has set in, and unfortunately, as usual, it hits the farm economy first and most severely. Along with that, the large number of unemployed in Canada (I believe it is the largest number since 1945) helps to make matters a good deal worse; they each add to one another's problems and they both add quite considerably to the depression in the whole economy.

The Dominion Bureau of Statistics is beginning to lower its figures on the estimated amount of wheat on farms, and I think likely they are now going in the right direction. I notice in the 'Leader-Post' today, they estimate that the wheat crop this year hit an 11-year low. It is now estimated to be around 298 million bushels, which is a little less than half the 1953 crop which was around 613 million bushels.

Unfortunately, the very low number of bushels was also a very low grade for the most part — at least one-third of the constituency of Gravelbourg, the eastern third, will get the full crop bonus. Practically all the wheat that was grown in that area was No. 4, 5, 6 or feed; very little of it was No. 4. The central third of the constituency will get part of the crop bonus, and the western third of the constituency had a fairly good crop, probably averaging in the neighbourhood of 25 bushels to the acre of No. 2 or 3 wheat. But in the most part of the constituency in which I travel, the amount of wheat held on farms is nothing like the official figures would indicate. Unfortunately, the wheat which is held on farms is not evenly spread and is not held by the farmers who are going to need the wheat.

The hon. members opposite, unfortunately again this Session, and I presume in between sessions, have continued to comment or talk about the results of the depression which is existing among the farmers of today, and once again, as in the 1930's, they have ignored the real causes of that depression. Any time we suggest changes in this House, or ask the Federal Government to give us some assistance in trying to get at the root causes of the problems of the farmers of this country, we either hear the members opposite directly opposing us, or else they attempt to confuse the issue. I can recall, at last Session, when we asked the Federal Government, not to make an expenditure, but

simply to guarantee money or to provide reserves for a crop insurance plan, the members opposite attempted to confuse the issue and did not give us their full and active support. They point out, among other things, that the farmers of Saskatchewan cannot afford a crop insurance plan. Well, I am farming myself, and I have a tendency to agree with them that we cannot afford the premiums to buy a crop insurance plan; but that is not the answer. The answer is to give the farmers a decent standard of living so that they can afford insurance.

When we asked for assistance to establish young farmers so that the agricultural land in Saskatchewan could be held by people who are capable of farming, want to farm, and so that it would be held in economic farm units so that a farmer could make a decent living, and when we asked them to support us in requesting the Federal Government once again to provide loans to those farmers, the hon. members opposite attempted to confuse the issue and have not given us their active support.

When we asked for parity prices and long-term contracts, 'floor' prices, they either opposed it or else they attempted to confuse the issue. The Liberal Government at Ottawa has failed very miserably in the meagre floor policy which they have attempted to put into effect, and which is supposed to help local farmers of this province.

We called upon the Federal Government to form a national livestock marketing board and once again the members opposite did not give it their support. They have attempted to leave the issue completely confused . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — It is you fellows who confuse the issue.

**Mr. Walker:** — . . . so that the people of the province did not know what would benefit them most.

Along with all of those things, the Federal Government has allowed farm costs to go up, and when we called upon them to do something about the high cost of farm machinery, a few years ago, they absolutely refused to do anything, even though we have had our inquiry. Even though the machine companies have as much as admitted that they were making excessive and undue profits, the Liberal government at Ottawa just shut their eyes and absolutely refused to do anything about it.

The members opposite have spent a good deal of time complaining about the high taxes. They talk about high school taxes as being the root cause of our troubles here. When we look at some of the figures we find out that, although school taxes have gone up, the rate has gone up, the amount collected has gone up; but we know that it is not those taxes that have caused the real trouble with the farmers of Saskatchewan. The Canadian Bank of Commerce puts out a little monthly (or weekly) letter in which they may comment from time to time. In this particular issue they are commenting on the total Canadian tax revenue, and they break it down for the different years and the amounts which are paid to the Federal government, the Provincial government and Municipal government, and then they give the percentage of those amounts, the percentage of personal income of the people of Canada. They point out that, in 1939, the Federal Government was collecting approximately 11 per cent of personal income. In 1951, that had risen to 24 per cent of personal income. Even though the average personal income had dropped, the percentage of that income increased to a little better than double — from the 11 per cent to 24 per cent; but the amount of money going to the Provincial Government held the same.

In 1939, 5 per cent of personal income was paid to the province. It dropped down slightly, but by 1951, it was back to 5 per cent again. In 1939, 6 per cent of personal income went to municipal governments; by 1951, only 3 per cent was going to municipal governments.

I think those figures indicate, Mr. Speaker, that the plight of the western Canadian farmer has been due largely to the actions or inactions by the Federal Government, and because they have received a tremendous increase in taxes out of this country, I think we certainly have an increased responsibility to try to set the people of this province up on a sound financial basis.

I noticed another article in the 'Leader-Post', just the other day. It was a news item about the Alberta Legislature, in which they spoke about the debt reduction in the province of Alberta. The hon. member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Kohaly) seems to have the habit of bragging about the wonderful things that the Alberta government is doing, but I think, if he would look a little more closely at the facts, he might have his eyes opened a little bit, too. They point out in this article that the provincial debt of Alberta was reduced from \$167 million to \$85 million (that is, for 1952), a reduction of \$82 million from 1936. During the same period of years the debt on the municipalities rose from \$67 million to \$187 million, an increase of \$119 million. Yes, the Alberta government did reduce their provincial debt, but they placed it on the backs of the municipalities and they placed a good deal more onto them.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald) mentioned in his speech here that two crop failures in a row would mean that we would have a virtual mortgage on every farm in the province of Saskatchewan. I don't think he really believes that; I rather doubt if he does; but I hope he does because it is one of the most damning statements that has ever been made in this House against his party. He mentions the fact that this Government has not done anything about rust. I think, if you will read a few scientific reports from other provinces and from the United States in particular, which is suffering even more than Saskatchewan is from the rust problem, he will find a good many statements in there which will commend the province of Saskatchewan and the Government of Canada for the manner in which they have attempted to solve this problem of rust. I should point out to him now that rust is not one of the big problems of the farmers of Saskatchewan. There are a good many things in which his government at Ottawa has control of, that cost the people of Saskatchewan a good deal more money than rust is ever cost them.

**Mr. McDonald:** — The C.C.F., for instance.

**Mr. Walker:** — Now, once again, Mr. Speaker, I want to remind you that the members opposite have attempted to try to confuse the issue. They have shown a complete disregard for the farming economy of western Canada and, although we in this province have had some of the largest crops that we have ever had in our history in the past five years, the farming economy of Saskatchewan is not in good shape. I say, again, that that is largely the responsibility of the Federal Government. If we look across the border we not only see the farmers down there receiving a good deal more for their wheat, but we see a good many other things which mean more to the farmers there than probably their large dollar value for a bushel of wheat. They get parity prices; they have no quotas; they have a crop insurance scheme which cost them only premium ranges from 6 to approximately 25 per cent of their

coverage, which I think certainly should be feasible and desirable to the farmers of Saskatchewan. They provide loans to their farmers so that they can buy their farms, build buildings on them, at low rates of interest. They can get loans to build storage buildings for the wheat; they can store and collect storage for their wheat. In the fall, if they wish to take an advance on that wheat they can take up to 96 per cent of the market value, and if the price of wheat goes up by spring, they can turn their loan in and sell their wheat. If the price of wheat goes down, they simply take final settlement for the wheat, and as long as the wheat remains on their farms they can collect storage for it. I think, Mr. Speaker, that if the hon. members really wanted to do anything for the people of Saskatchewan, they could do something to encourage their colleagues at Ottawa to do something for the people here, such as the Federal government in the United States have done for their farmers.

We hear a lot of talk about rural electrification here in Saskatchewan, and Manitoba and Alberta. I want to point out to you what the Federal government in the United States does. Down there the Federal government builds the dams and puts in the power projects and they run the highlines through the country, and when a group of farmers want to take power they form a co-operative and the co-operative goes to the Federal government and borrows the money to build the rural lines to the farmers. They borrow it on a 35-year basis at 2 per cent interest, and those farmers organize themselves into a co-operative throughout an area of any size or shape, the mileage per line might be anything — the average is around a mile per customer. In some areas the average mileage is a good deal more than one mile, but a farmer down there pays nothing towards the initial hook-up of his line, to get the line into his yard, but he has to sign a contract to pay the minimum bill, over a period of usually five or six years, and that minimum bill pays off his \$1,000 or \$1,200 or whatever the line costs are. The minimum bills run anywhere from \$20 a month to as high as \$50 and \$60 a month to pay for the line costs of building those rural electrification systems, and their rates down there are nothing to brag about, even though they do have all that assistance. They start out at 50 kwts. for 11 cents, and they go down as low as two cents. I might mention that, in Saskatchewan, we start out at 45 kwts. for 8 cents, and it goes down as far as two cents.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I am most happy to support this motion. Even if I couldn't find any reasons in the Throne Speech I couldn't support anything else, because there is nothing else in this House to support, or in the province; but I do want to mention a few of the reasons why I want to support this budget.

First of all, it is because the principles behind the C.C.F.

**Mr. Cameron:** — You're ahead of yourself.

**Mr. Walker:** — The Throne Speech, I am sorry. They mentioned in the Throne Speech that they are giving assistance to the needy farmers in the north. I don't know too much about them up there, but I presume that they are in the same plight that we in the south have been from time to time, through crop failures, and I am very happy to see that the Government has taken the initiative and given leadership to giving them employment and to provide for feed and seed and, for those who wish to work, to give them wages for some type of work that will improve their communities or their farms.

**February 28, 1955**

I am happy to see that they have increased the supplementary allowance to needy pensioners; unfortunately, it may not be as large as a good many of us would like to see, but at least we are doing the best we can.

I am happy to see that the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet), through his Department, has accelerated the policy on clearing and breaking, a principle which we have been asking the Federal Government to adopt in regard to other land and to help the young farmers. At least we in this province are doing something towards that end, and carrying out what we preach.

I am happy to say that I can support the rural electrification programme which electrified something like 6,500 farms last year, and will electrify 7,500 next year. When I was elected to office in Gravelbourg constituency there were no farms electrified and only the town of Gravelbourg had electrification. Since that time there have been quite a number of farms electrified — I don't know the exact number; but I am satisfied that Gravelbourg is getting its share. But more than that, I am satisfied that the principles behind the rural electrification programme are sound, in that they are going to provide power to the largest number of farms at the lowest possible cost. That is the only principle which we can adopt in this province and one which the Liberal party before us absolutely refused to have anything to do with.

The Throne Speech announced that it would continue with the highway programme in an endeavour to get our worn-out highways re-built. Fortunately, they are making good progress, and I was glad to see that they are going to increase assistance towards main market roads.

Mr. Speaker, before I sit down I want to touch on another topic here. There has been a good deal of talk, particularly before elections, about the South Saskatchewan dam. I am given to understand that we in Gravelbourg constituency are going to have a dam as well. I hope it doesn't go through the political scandals that the South Saskatchewan dam has gone through; but I should mention that the would-be leader of the Liberal party, as early as last spring, was quite anxious to see this project go ahead in Gravelbourg constituency. I was very happy about it, and I hope he will continue his interest in that dam, even though he didn't make the position aspired to.

I was rather interested in an article from the Yorkton 'Enterprise' which commented on that. It said — and I will just quote a portion of it — they were talking about the nominating convention in Saskatoon, and it says here:

“For any of the five men that are today suggested will put the Liberal party in Saskatchewan in the same class as the whooping crane . . . Dr. Thomson or no permanent leader at this stage.”

I couldn't help but notice the member for Saltcoats mentioning the fact that the present Leader of the Opposition had come up in the ranks of the Liberal party.

In regard to the dam at Gravelbourg I want to call upon our Minister of Agriculture and the P.F.R.A. (if I may be forgiven for mentioning

the two in the same breath) to proceed as rapidly with this dam as possible. The P.F.R.A. and the C. & B. Branch of our Provincial Department of Agriculture are urged to push the survey of possible irrigable land around there as fast as possible. They were asked to do that last spring, and I am informed that they had succeeded in getting their surveys done so that they know there is a good deal of good irrigable land in that area. The P.F.R.A. tell me that it will probably be a two-year project, for that dam and will cost in the neighbourhood of a half-million dollars. The dam is to be located just a few miles north of Lafleche, on the Wood river. There will be in the neighbourhood of 30,000 acre feet of water held in the one dam and that should irrigate the maximum of 15,000 acres of land. The C. & B. branch intend to make provision for a possible 10,000 acres immediately, with the other 5,000 acres to come later on.

Most of the land which will be irrigated is a light loam adjacent to the town of Gravelbourg on the northwest side and will, in all probability, make provision for a livestock economy rather than going into the more highly specialized crops of sugar beets and vegetables. It is estimated that the preparation of the irrigable land (the ditches, dykes, etc.,) will probably cost a little over a half million dollars, most of which is the responsibility of the C. & B. branch of the provincial department. The P.F.R.A. tell me that this proposed project is considered a very good project, both the storage and the land to be irrigated; they tell me there is a lot of private land involved, particularly where the dam is to be located and it may take some time, or there may be a little difficulty, and getting that straightened out, as apparently it takes a large part, or an important part of two or three farm units in that area.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have indicated some of the reasons, at least, why I want to support this Throne Speech, and I sincerely hope that the Government does get the revenue to carry out some of the programmes which we have been discussing in this debate.

**Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to add mine to the expressions of congratulation that have been extended to the mover and seconder and to the Leader of the Opposition. In addressing that House for the first time this Session, I think, perhaps I should say that, so far as Hanley constituency is concerned, the people there are well satisfied with the progress that the Government is making in its various programmes in that area.

The people of Hanley constituency are impressed by the programme of highway construction there. We still have some highways, however, that are badly in need of construction; some highways which were built by the Anderson government and previous to that, by the Liberal government. They never were very much to start with, and we are looking forward to having them reconstructed to the new standards set by this Government.

The people of Hanley constituency are also gratified with the progress of the rural electrification programme in that area. Years ago, before the present electrification programme was started, there were three or four farms getting electrification, in Hanley constituency. We can say now that 40 per cent of farms in that constituency are being served under the area-coverage system. I want to say the people who are now being served by rural

**February 28, 1955**

electrification in that constituency do not look forward to the ill-advised and poorly thought-out recommendations that are being made by the Liberal party with respect to rural electrification. They are convinced that the present programme is the only realistic approach that can be made in Saskatchewan to that problem.

The crackpots, as my hon. friend from Saltcoats describes them, have been advocating free electrification for the people of Saskatchewan. I want to say that, if any government introduces a system of bringing rural power to the farms without charge and without cost to the farmers of this province, I don't want to be a member of the Legislature. I don't want to have two or three thousand farmers from that area sitting on my doorstep asking to be given power first.

I think that the present system as carried out by the rural electrification branch of the Power Corporation has worked out beautifully. The people of that constituency are well satisfied. They consider that power at \$550 (or whatever it costs) is a bargain. They know, Mr. Speaker, as Brock Chisholm says, that there is no Santa Claus, particularly with governments. They know that any government that attempts to bring power to the farmers of Saskatchewan without charge would have to recoup themselves in some other way. They know that it would have to be added to the cost of power in some way, shape or form, or added to their taxes, and the people of my constituency want to know what they are getting and they want to know what they are paying for when they get it. Those ill-advised and ill-conceived dreams of the crackpots is not looked upon with favour in that area.

People my constituency, Mr. Speaker, are well acquainted with the co-operation existing between the Department of Education and the school units. They are well satisfied that the educational plants — the schools, are being well taken care of. They know that, over the past five or six years, this Government has given tremendous sums of financial assistance either in the form of loans, or grants, to the school units, which have financed almost the entire school construction programme in that area. The reconstruction, the repair, of schools is a conspicuous credit to the workings of the larger school unit there, and to the policies of this Government. I can remember, in 1947, which is not so very long ago, going out to campaign in my first election campaign, and I can remember school after school with broken windows that the wind whistled through. I can remember schools where you had to tread cautiously or your foot would go through the floor. I can remember schools that had no storm windows or storm doors.

I am pleased to say that the school plant and school equipment, in that constituency have been improved more than can be measured in dollars and cents. Today we have no 'slum' schools left in that constituency, and there were many, many of them in 1947. People of this province are not slow to see the real measures of the government's success in material things such as that. They are prepared to give credit where they know it is due.

I wish I could give a generally glowing report of economic conditions in Hanley constituency. I must say that out of approximately 60 townships all except 3 or 4 will, this year, be in receipt of the full bonus provided under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act and the others will receive half bonus. This year agriculture is in a distressed financial position.



When we hear that in the last three years the farmers of this province have produced five crops, we should expect that they should be able to sit and rest for another year without producing anything and still enjoy normal prosperity. We are supposed to have had five years of income over the last three years. Yet, if the farmers of Hanley constituency have another crop failure like last year, distress, and I mean physical distress, will be very much in evidence.

That, Mr. Speaker, indicates clearly that there is something radically and drastically wrong with the agricultural economy of this country, because it is impossible every year for agriculture to enjoy income in the ratio of 5 years' income in three years. It is impossible every year to have 60 per cent more than the normal crop.

I think that, if the Federal Government does not awaken to its obligations to agriculture, if it does not awaken to the dire circumstances that are existing in agriculture, then it is time that agriculture spoke with a united voice through another federal party in favour of a programme which will alleviate these conditions.

**Mr. Danielson:** — The new leader!

**Mr. Walker:** — I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, that in the Speech from the Throne we find that this Government has not only paid heed to these temporary emergencies, but has laid out another step in its programme for the general welfare of our agricultural population.

My hon. friend speaks of the Liberal platform. Liberal platforms come and go, and if Liberals adopt this as their platform, then I congratulate them. This programme set out in the Speech from the Throne, on the first page, contains three items which I think illustrate that this Government is concerned about the serious condition of agriculture in this year of adversity.

First of all, they met the emergency in north-eastern Saskatchewan by a works-and-wages programme. I remember in the days of the Anderson, Gardiner and Patterson governments, the way in which they met the conditions prevailing at that time. I recall that, in those days, farmers in need were asked to go to the municipal office and fill out applications for relief feed, relief hay — and my hon. friend from Saltcoats knows something about that relief hay. They filled out applications for relief and then were never advised when it was coming in. They had to go to town for perhaps 10 days hand-running to get it, not knowing when it was coming in; had to wait and line up for the train, and it would not be on the train, and they would have to go home with an empty wagon. I remember some of them going 10 and 12 miles to town with a team of tired horses and an old wagon to get some hay that they had applied for perhaps three months before, and after going to town 10 or 12 miles a dozen times, come home with one bale of hay. It was not enough hay to feed the horses that had to make the trips to town. This Government, however, instituted the programme of works and wages to meet this disaster.

They have accelerated their programme for paying farmers for clearing and breaking. One hon. member from northern Saskatchewan told how the Liberals helped farmers to clear and break. They gave them a broken-down plough and an axe and let them go to the woods to clear their land. I suggest that these things illustrate the contrast between a people's government and a Liberal government.

Then, of course, there are the general programmes for the well-being of agriculture; the demand for the construction of the South Saskatchewan River dam; rural electrification; market roads. There is the increase in school grants and so on, and I could enumerate others, all of long-range benefit to agriculture. So, we know what is in the Government's programme from the Speech from the Throne, a very excellent document, replete with policies, with programmes for the benefit of the agricultural people of this province.

I am sorry to say that the Opposition have not treated this House so frankly. I have listened with great care to speeches made by the Leader of the Opposition and others, and I am afraid that I still have to say that I don't know what their programme is. Let us remember, Mr. Speaker, that under the traditions of a parliamentary democracy, the onus is on the Opposition. The onus is on the Opposition, first of all, to criticize and attack the programme of the government and, secondly, the onus is upon them to bring forward a programme that merits the approval of the people of the province. This Opposition has dismally failed in bringing forth either of those two results. We know very little about what the Liberal party stands for.

I was just going through a copy of the resolutions which they passed at their convention, and that explains why I had difficulty in concealing my mirth when the hon. member for Saltcoats was speaking a moment ago. There were two resolutions there that caught my eye. One has reference to the Automobile Accident Insurance Act. I notice the proposal is that it will be done away with.

I think the people of Saskatchewan are not fully aware that that is the policy of the Liberal party. I think that Liberals ought to speak about that when they speak in this House and when they speak in the country. I did not hear a word about it either here or anywhere else except that it is in the fine print of your programme.

The Liberal party also has another resolution. I am not going to refer to all of them — I don't want to take the time of the House; but I want to refer to the one which they call No. 6.

**Mr. Loptson:** —The day will come when you will find out what their platform is.

**Mr. Walker:** — They say that they will institute a policy under which “the individual landowner, where mineral rights are held by the Crown, and in all other cases where possible, would receive an amount equal to at least one-fifth of the royalty in the event of the discovery and production of gas or oil on land owned by him on which he holds no mineral rights, over and above compensation for actual loss for surface damages.”

That, I suggest, is just typical of the kind of thing we would expect from the Liberal party if it was elected to office in this province. If they had the opportunity to legislate that the owners of surface rights are to receive 20 per cent of the Crown's royalty on all Crown-owned mineral rights, you would have the setting up of a new privileged class in this province; you would have the setting up of a new aristocracy in Saskatchewan. That, of course, Mr. Speaker, is what the Liberal party thrives upon: inequality of wealth, inequality of means. If for example, that policy was carried out in Alberta, I suggest this is what would happen. In Alberta, last year, there was a total

royalty paid to the Crown of \$37,416,000. If the Liberals have their way, they would have paid \$7,483,000 of that to a few score of people who happened to own the surface rights on which those minerals were produced; \$7 million they would have paid over to a small class of people who spent their time cruising the Caribbean and racing sports cars around our highways. That is the class of people that always thrives under Liberal government.

The Liberal party is hoping to appeal to the baser instincts of selfish people by offering this prize of riches to a very small number of people. These people, with \$7 million as a gift from the Liberal party, would be able to finance Liberal conventions for many years. The Liberal party would not die out completely for a long time. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that one resolution, along with the one to abolish the Government Insurance Act, would show that the Liberal party has neither learned anything nor forgotten anything in the last ten years. The Liberal party is still the tool and the handmaiden of big business and reaction.

**Mr. Danielson:** — You still think you are back in 1944.

**Mr. Walker:** — We want to know where the Liberal party stands on the other issues that concern the people of Saskatchewan. Where do they stand, for example, on larger school units? Oh, yes, they passed an Act in 1943, but they did nothing about it. They did it in the face of growing public demand for larger school units. They passed an Act and did nothing about it. We want to know where they stand now. We had Liberal members in this House in 1950 and 1951, who were unashamedly and avowedly opponents of the larger school unit. We want to know where the Liberal party stands today. I searched their platform to find out where they stand, and their platform overlooks that important issue. Where do they stand?

I suggest there will be another debate here in this Legislature, on the budget. Hon. members will have a chance to put their position on record. Let the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) tell us where he stands on the question of larger school units.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — You'll find out in due time.

**Mr. Walker:** — Well, I am still waiting.

**Premier Douglas:** — It's been quite a few years now.

**Mr. Walker:** — I was interested, Mr. Speaker, over the years to hear Liberals going up and down Saskatchewan saying that The Farm Security Act, the section which guarantees farmers security on the homestead, prevents loan companies and mortgage companies from lending in this province. I was interested in hearing the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) blame The Farm Security Act for conditions which he said obtained in agriculture.

**Mr. Danielson:** — When? When? Tell the people when.

**Mr. Walker:** — And yet, they had not enough moral courage to vote against it when it comes in this Legislature. We want to know where they stand on The Farm Security Act now, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Danielson:** — You're wondering, boy!

**February 28, 1955**

**Mr. Walker:** — I suggest that if my hon. friend from Arm River makes a speech that he make himself coherent on that subject.

Prior to 1952 we had several Liberal members get up in the Legislature and advocate a deterrent charge on hospital bills, that our hospitalization scheme should be amended to provide for a deterrent charge. One member said \$1.00 a day, and there were other various suggestions. Where does the Liberal party stand now, Mr. Speaker? An election has elapsed and three sessions have elapsed in this new Legislature, and we want to know where they stand now on that question.

Prior to 1952 the then Leader of the Opposition, a very frank gentleman, said that if the Liberals were elected, they would dismiss all C.C.F. hirelings in the civil service and those who had obtained promotions in the civil service during the C.C.F. regime. What is the Liberal party stand now, with respect to the civil service? They have not told us. Do they still propose to make the civil service of this province a corrupt and graft-ridden machine like the P.F.R.A. and the P.F.A.A.? Let's hear where they stand! Or, are we to judge them by their performance in the P.F.R.A. and in the P.F.A.A.?

**Mr. A.L.S. Brown:** — Don't forget the Grain Commission.

**Mr. Walker:** — Oh, the Board of Grain Commissioners. I don't know much about the Board of Grain Commissioners. I haven't heard of this young man being of any great assistance to the Liberal party.

**Premier Douglas:** — His father was; he campaigned for the right candidate, last fall.

**Mr. Walker:** — But the civil servants of this province are interested in knowing where my hon. friends stand.

We have heard a good deal of criticism a few years ago about the C.C.F. mineral development programme. We heard a lot about a gentleman by the name of Rubbra, and a gentleman by the name of Hershorn. The hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) did a long and elaborate calculation telling us how much Mr. Rubbra would make if he had a well on every 10 acres, and each well produced 100 gallons a day worth \$2.00 a barrel, and how much he would make on a certain lease that he had. I suggest now that he do a computation and tell us how much Mr. Rubbra has made on that lease, or, more to the point, how much he has lost on it.

**Mr. Danielson:** — He didn't lose anything; he didn't put anything in it.

**Mr. Walker:** — I remember when my hon. anti-Semitic friends were making speeches in the 1952 campaign. They always mentioned Shumiatcher, Rubbra and Hershorn. I see that Hershorn now has got a contract from the Federal Government; according to the news report, they say he will make a hundred million dollars on it. but he says that is just "peanuts" to what I am going to make." Now, my hon. friends in their Federal Government . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Cost plus contracts.

**Mr. Walker:** — Cost plus contracts to produce uranium: \$100 million he says that is just peanuts to what he is going to make. Why doesn't the hon. member for Maple Creek makes some speeches now and shed crocodile

tears all over the microphone? Why doesn't he ask the people of Canada now who has sold the heritage of the Canadian people? I want to hear what the Liberal party's policy is regard to these things. I want to know what their alternative is to the present policy of the Department of Mineral Resources in reference to the development of petroleum and minerals in northern Saskatchewan. So far we have heard nothing as to their policy, or their intentions.

The hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) was apparently at some pains recently to disavow statements that had been made to the effect that they were opposed to the hospital plan. I think he repeated his statements in this House; but in speaking on the radio in January 4th, he said:

“A Liberal government in Saskatchewan will continue the present hospitalization plan.”

I suggest they won't discontinue it, Mr. Speaker. Then he went on to say — and I say this with every sympathy to my hon. friend. I must concede that he probably must have written it; it would be unparliamentary for me to say that he had not written it. But I suggest that my hon. friend ought not in his position to be quite so naive asked to take these things and trust. He said:

“The Legislature adopted the report of the Committee”

That's a Special Committee set up in 1943 by the Patterson government.

. . . “adopted the report of the Committee, but in the session of 1944 the Liberal government, then in office, passed the Saskatchewan Health Insurance Act.”

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Sounds like Staines to me.

**Mr. Walker:** — Then he goes on to say:

“The Government in 1944 contemplated a complete health insurance, covering not only hospital services, but medical, surgical, childbirth, dental, drug and nursing services as well.”

**Premier Douglas:** — It would have been ‘in contemplation’ for a good many years.

**Mr. Walker:** — They contemplated it like the Buddha who spends his whole life contemplating his own navel.

What is this Act, Mr. Speaker? I happen to have the 1944 statutes at home, and when I turned the radio off, I went and got the statutes and looked up this Act. They did pass that Health Insurance Act in 1944, called The Saskatchewan Health Insurance Act and Section 10 of the Act does say:

“That the benefit to be conferred by this Act shall be administered under the following heads, namely: medical, surgical and obstetrical benefits, dental benefits, pharmaceutical benefits, hospital benefits, nursing benefits.”

**February 28, 1955**

It is true; it does say that.

Some people have been so unkind to say that this Act is mere 'window-dressing', Mr. Speaker. Let us see what this Act does provide. It has more than just Section 10. There is Section 12, which says:

“For the economic and effective administration of public health services and health insurance, the province shall be divided into areas, to be known, for public health purposes, as public health regions, and for health insurance purposes, as health insurance regions.”

So far, so good. Now, he is a friend of our hospital plan. What did his government propose? Do they propose a hospital plan which would involve spending \$18 million of the provincial revenue on hospitalized nation? No. Look at clause 5:

“The persons referred to in subsection 4, and in consultation with the Commission” . . .

They were to consult about this thing; they were very good at that.

“ . . . shall prepare a scheme for the apportionment among the municipalities or local improvement districts or municipalities and local improvement districts, within the region of that part of the costs of the public health services not otherwise provided for and for the utilization for public health purposes within the region of the public health facilities and personnel of the municipal councils within the region.”

So, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in this Act giving any assistance whatever to local governments in carrying out the onerous responsibility of providing a hospitalization plan or any other kind of health facilities. This Act is just window-dressing, and my hon. friend, if he were not so naive, would have known it or would have known better than to use it as an alibi for the Liberal party.

The Liberal party is enjoying the position of now getting further and further away from its record, but I suggest that its reputation will live forever. The Liberal party cannot help people going back and looking at the record and exposing it.

In past years we were accustomed to having a great lot of debate in this Chamber about the Government's Crown Corporation policy, and we were told by numerous members of the Opposition that they would chuck them out the window.

**Mr. Danielson:** — We couldn't beat your record.

**Mr. Walker:** — And the Liberal party went through an election campaign on that issue and they lost. They went from 21 down to 10 — and they are not through going down yet, of course . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Seven of them now, all buried away.

**Mr. Walker:** — . . . but they lost. Have the Liberal party now come to believe that the Crown Corporations of this province are rendering a valuable service to our economy? Have they now come to believe that the Crown Corporations are providing employment in producing wealth to contribute to the prosperity of this province? If they have had a change of heart, let's hear about it, Mr. Speaker. The people of Saskatchewan are entitled to know whether the Liberal party is going to throw these Crown Corporations out the window, or whether they are going to continue to operate them if they are ever so fortunate as to be elected. The people of Saskatchewan are entitled to have its Opposition fulfil its constitutional functions of stating where it stands on these issues, and the Liberal party so far has failed to state its position on the question of Crown Corporations.

The Saskatchewan Government is very much concerned on the matter of Dominion-Provincial relations. I do not propose to talk about a matter which is already on the Order Paper, but things have developed in our financial relations with Ottawa with respect to the future of our Dominion-Provincial financial agreement, which I think call upon the Liberal party to state its position. The Leader of our party has gone on record as deploring the scandalous sell-out which has taken place, but where do my hon. friends opposite stand on this question? They have not heard? Well, Mr. Gardiner is coming to Regina tomorrow.

**Premier Douglas:** — He is here now.

**Mr. Walker:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I spoke. I should have waited till tomorrow to see whether something was going to come. Whether the mountain was going to bring forth a mole, or whether it wasn't.

Mr. Speaker, some people think that this Government is on trial. Some people pretend to believe that it is the job of this Government to justify its programme. I suggest that the true theory of our parliamentary system, of our parliamentary philosophy, is that the onus is on the Opposition to effectively criticize our programme, to effectively criticize our administration, and to put forth an effective alternative to the Government of this province. I suggest that on all three, Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition has failed lamentably. In view of this fact, Mr. Speaker, I have no alternative but to support the Motion.

**Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Minister of Education):** — Mr. Speaker, I should like first of all to just say a few words about some of the remarks made, this afternoon, by the hon. member for Saltcoats. I thought it was, in many ways, a typical Liberal speech, and I thought he showed that particularly in his first few sentences. He said, "I know how you can raise school grants and increase assistance to municipalities without raising taxes." He said, "I know how they can raise \$8 million." And then he said, "Having disposed of that I will go on." Typically Liberal! To suggest that, having said something, they have done it, and then leave it go at that.

I am not going to enter into an argument with him about the personal qualities of the respective leaders of the two political parties represented in this House. All I want to say about it is this, Mr. Speaker, and I think the people of Saskatchewan will agree with me substantially.

**February 28, 1955**

With the exception of one or two extremely prejudiced people who sit across the House, every resident of Saskatchewan is pleased and proud when the present Premier of Saskatchewan stands up to speak for Saskatchewan.

The member for Saltcoats said the Liberal party has been asking for increases in mothers' allowances, in school grants and municipal grants, for years. He is quite right. They have been asking for them ever since they left office! They never asked for them before; but since they left office they have been asking most regularly. One of the attributes which he has which makes him undoubtedly effective as a politician is the ability to forget easily that which he doesn't want to remember. Even in the short space of time which elapsed between this morning's Committee meeting and his address here, this afternoon, he forgot some of the things that he had been told at that time. He forgot that just a few years ago he said in this House it was the Communists who organized the Wheat Pool. This afternoon, he told us it was he who had organized the Wheat Pool.

**Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I want to correct my hon. friend. I have told, many times in this House, that it was the Communist group that started the organization, but it was the Liberal group that finished it.

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd:** — I fail to get the implication of the correction, Mr. Speaker. May I just make one more comment about the hon. member from Saltcoats. He made reference — I didn't quite hear his adjective — but I think it was to some kind of the 'spectacle' created in the House of Commons, because the members of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation group down there divided on the issue of German re-armament. This is the same member, Mr. Speaker, who said, since this Legislature convened, that the 'Leader-Post' always speaks the truth — always tells the truth. And consequently, I want to read, for his benefit, what the 'Leader-Post' had to say about that particular happening. Here it is:

“Mr. Coldwell, National leader of the C.C.F. party, and some of the other C.C.F. members are taking a position contrary to that of the Party on German re-armament. It is not a reflection upon them, nor upon the C.C.F. party, nor upon Parliament. It is a sign of inherent health in our democracy, when on the occasion of such a crucial decision members of Parliament feel free to hew an independent line.”

What the hon. member said then, and what he said just following that, when he thought it would be best for everybody if all the C.C.F. members should go home, indicates that his basic feeling is that everybody ought to agree with him and nobody else should have the right or take the opportunity of talking.

**Mr. Loptson:** — There is the Conservative opposition there that will do that.

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, there are just one or two other remarks before I adjourn the debate for the evening. I would like to refer, first of all, to remarks made by the member for Moosomin, the Leader of the Opposition, when he spoke the other day. I thought he gave the impression in his speech that Saskatchewan was doing nothing about the important matter of research with regard to rust.



I think it well to remind ourselves that research of this kind is a responsibility which has been basically assumed by the Federal Government; that it is carried out in the prairie provinces under the general direction of the Federal rust laboratory at Winnipeg; and that the work is co-ordinated and is carried on at the universities of Alberta, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and in the Federal rust laboratory in Winnipeg. It was the result of this co-operative effort (and it is the proper kind of effort) which has produced Selkirk wheat. At the University of Saskatchewan there are two types of research bearing on this problem being carried on at the present, and they have been carried on at the present, and they have been carried on for several years. One of them is aimed at the breeding of rust-resistant types. It is financed, in part, by the Federal Government and in part by the University of Saskatchewan. Another is a type of physiological research on the same problem, which is financed jointly as well. In the year 1954 we spent, at the University of Saskatchewan, a sum of some \$250,000 on agricultural research. I don't want to leave the impression that all of this was on research with regard to rust. This was the amount spent on agricultural research. Of that \$250,000 some \$140,000 was provided out of provincial funds.

Then one other small comment with regard to a statement by the Leader of the Opposition. He went back to some remark that I had made in the budget debate of last year — a different debate, and one year ago, but evidently he thought it worthwhile talking about still. He attempted to “pooh-pooh” my statement that family allowances paid in the province helped to improve the taxpaying ability of the people of the province. He made so bold as to say, “surely the Federal Government did not intend this to be true when they first instituted family allowances.” Well, I know that the Leader of the Opposition may not be too conversant with what reasons the Federal Government had for doing things, in 1944, but perhaps I might read to him some of the statements made by some of the Federal Government Ministers when this legislation was being introduced, in 1944.

The Hon. Mr. Brooke Claxton is quoted, on page 5393 of the Revised Hansard for 1944 session, speaking about family allowances:

“This measure endeavours to create a greater equality of opportunity for all the children of Canada.”

I suggest that better educational opportunity provided by the community is an important part of greater equality of opportunity.

Mr. Martin, on page 5403, said:

“Providing this additional opportunity by way of perhaps better food, perhaps assisting in better housing, certainly, I hope, in better education.”

Mr. Claxton, again, on page 5394:

“Family allowances represent a method of creating employment as effective as public investment expenditure.”

And later, he said:

“It will also add to the ability to raise revenue and pay taxes.”

I simply quote that in substantiation of my statement of last year. I do not mean by that, of course, that people are necessarily going to run down to the tax collector's office with their family allowance cheque and pay the taxes over; but the distribution of some \$10 or \$15 or \$20 million in the province and the spending of that amount does improve the taxpaying ability of the people of the province.

**Mr. Loptson:** — You'd like to take it.

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, I will have the opportunity, I hope, at a later date to report to the members of the Legislature on my very gratifying experience of the summer, but I thought it would be in order if I were, at this time, to say just a few words about it in this debate. I would like to say, first of all, Mr. Speaker, how much the opportunity was appreciated and to submit my thanks for that opportunity. I would like to say here in the House a word of thanks to the officials of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, more particularly to our host countries during the summer, that is the countries of Kenya, Tanganyika, Uganda and the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland. It was a considerable undertaking for the governments of these countries, which face tremendous problems, to accept the responsibility of all the arrangements and the cost of such a conference.

The conference and the tours were most excellently planned. There was a great deal of most excellent hospitality and no end of effort was made to make available to us all the information that we wanted. The opportunity to spend some five weeks with members of Parliament and Legislatures from 50 jurisdictions, hearing of their problems and their programmes, was, in itself, a valuable experience. To do this while observing conditions in east and central Africa added extra value to it. This conference, as other conferences of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association brought together people representative of all the great colour groups of mankind, of all the great religious groups; there was, of course, a considerable variety of political and economic belief. Let me voice this feeling, Mr. Speaker, that the British Commonwealth of Nations has been a great force in the world; the world today needs great forces for good. The British Commonwealth of Nations, I think, can do much to provide the kind of leaven that will make co-existence possible in a world which faces the necessity of co-existence or the certainty of obliteration. The British Commonwealth of Nations is a practical association of nations — I hope it is not without sentiment, too; but it is a practical association, and such meetings of the Parliamentary Association strengthen the understanding and advance co-operation.

I can properly say that I have always been pleased and proud of being a Canadian and of Canada. I came home from this, my first opportunity of this kind, more pleased and more proud of Canada than ever. And I came home, too, more conscious, I think, of the responsibilities of a nation which is as well favoured as is Canada. You may remember that, when I spoke in this House, last year, I quoted from John Donne's 'Devotions' — one which begins "No man is an island into himself"; and later on says: "Never ask for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for you."

Our future in this country is inextricably tied up with the welfare of all peoples everywhere, and I think we have to realize that, when limitations are imposed on the rights of Africans or Asians or any other people to live decently and with dignity, then eventually that imposes limitations on

our own rights. I think we have to realize that the inhabitants of the world today are not properly described as 'white' and 'non-white', that they are more properly described as 'coloured' and 'non-coloured'. There are no groups of people who are unimprovably inferior because of their colour or because of their race or because of their religion.

The constitution and membership of the British Commonwealth of Nations accepts this great proven principle. There are, however, some groups of people, some of them within the British Commonwealth of Nations, who are presently inferior because of the effect of their environment and, sadly enough, frequently because of the advantage taken of them by the white man. The white man (and that includes us) has an essential task; that of demonstrating his goodwill by more good acts. The coloured races of the world must be convinced by developments which result for them in steadily increasing standards of living, opportunities for greater dignity and increasing rights for determining for themselves the discipline which we call self-government.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that I have time, as I said, at a later date, to say more to the members of the Legislature about the conference and the tours connected with it. I would ask leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

The Assembly adjourned at 6.00 o'clock p.m.