

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session - Twelfth Legislature
24th Day

Tuesday, March 15, 1955

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

BUDGET DEBATE

The House resumed from Monday, March 14, 1955, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of the Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair. (The Assembly to go into a Committee of Supply).

Mr. S.H. Carr (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, before continuing the few remarks I made yesterday, I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) on his election as Leader of the Saskatchewan Liberal party, and to draw to the attention of this House the fact that the Liberal party is the only political party in Saskatchewan having a farmer as its leader. His father, like mine and thousands of others, came from different parts of Europe and the eastern provinces of Canada to till the rich Saskatchewan soil, to build their homes, to raise their families, and to worship their God in the tradition of their fathers.

In this our 50th Anniversary we pay homage primarily to the tillers of the soil, and men and women whose work and thought and self-denial made Saskatchewan what it is today. I thought it rather significant that, in this our Jubilee Year, Saskatchewan, the great agricultural province of Canada should win the Macdonald Brier, emblematic of the Canadian curling championship; but I thought it even more significant that the winners, the Campbell brothers, are farmers. What Saskatchewan has accomplished in the past fifty years was made possible by farm production and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that through the next fifty years, the farmer will still be carrying the major load of our social and educational services.

I am glad that we are going to honour our pioneers this year, and I wish to commend the Government, and particularly the Golden Jubilee Committee, for the work that has been done in this regard. I would like to give special mention to Dr. Lewis Thomas and John Archer and the staff of the Archives Branch for making available stories of the early history of Saskatchewan. Telling these stories, this year, will be an excellent opportunity for the youth of Saskatchewan to learn the problems and the difficulties faced by our fathers and mothers, and to understand the reasoning and the methods that solved these problems, because, as a great man once said, "if we know where we have been, we have a better idea of where we are going."

I said, a few moments ago, that our fathers came from different parts of the world. They came in different clothes, with different languages, different religions, different music, different arts, and probably most important of all, they came with different ideas. They had one thought in mind, to till the soil and make this land the finest home in the world. I stress the word "different", Mr. Speaker, because I believe that the differences our fathers brought to Saskatchewan are the reasons for our great accomplishments in education, public health, in co-operation and, I believe, account for the tolerance and understanding, not only towards our neighbours in Saskatchewan and in other provinces of Canada, but towards all people throughout the world.

March 15, 1955

Today the differences of dress and language have almost disappeared. The old folk-songs of the pioneers have given place to the tunes on the 'Hit Parade'. The radio and magazine advertising tend to make people conform to a standard pattern. Sometimes we feel, when we look in a magazine and read some of the advertisements, that we are being ridiculed, because we do not do the same as the sponsor thinks we should. Even some political thinkers continue to press that all men be the same. Some call it equality; but, eventually and finally it means sameness.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if we are to be as great in the next fifty years as we were in the first, it is absolutely necessary that the Government do everything possible to preserve the differences that, I believe, have made us great. The most serious indictment with which I can charge this Government is its efforts to make Saskatchewan people conform to a pattern planned by experts. The policy of centralized control of education, of hospitalization; its efforts to centralize municipal government, and its distrust of letting people run their own affairs, have done, and will continue to do, a great deal of harm to our Saskatchewan way of life as long as this Government stays in power.

I said last year that Rosthern was the only seat in Saskatchewan that had returned a Liberal member throughout the fifty years of its history.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Shame!

Mr. Lopton: — Good, sensible people there.

Mr. Carr: — Rosthern is noteworthy for other things, too. In fact, I believe it is the most historic seat in Saskatchewan. I am not sure, but I think this is correct — that there are more historic sites marked in the seat of Rosthern than in any other seat in the province. For that reason, I would like to invite you, Mr. Speaker, and every member of this House to come to Rosthern, this summer, and visit some of these historic spots and learn something about the people. I have calculated the risk of having all the hon. members come to this seat in one summer, but I had the experience (or, we in Rosthern had the experience) in 1953, of having most of the Cabinet Ministers and some of the others there for a short time, and we managed to survive. I think, therefore, that I am safe in inviting all of them, this time.

When I say that Rosthern is the most historic spot I should like to tell you, briefly, why. The first record of a white man seeing the prairies is about 260 years ago, when Henry Kelsey left the river somewhere around Nipawin and came overland on the east side of the river to what historians think was Clark's Crossing. Because that was the best place to ford the river, he climbed the banks on the other side, and as far as his eye could see to the west was rolling prairie, and that rolling prairie was in what is now Rosthern seat. That is, as far as we know, the first time that a white man saw the prairies. The reason he saw that part of the prairie first was because of the river. On the west side of Rosthern constituency is the north branch of the Saskatchewan River, and through the centre is the south branch. These were the great transportation systems during the early trading in this country, and that is why, probably, a great part of the early history of the north-west territories centred in the area between the two rivers.

You will recall the stories about the traders: the Hudson's Bay people coming down the rivers from Hudson Bay, and then the rivalry of the North-West traders from Montreal who came out to Fort Garry and then crossed overland to steal the furs from the Hudson's Bay Company. I should not say

'steal', I should have said, to beat the Hudson's Bay in the trading. The Fort Garry trail crossed the south branch of the river somewhere in the neighbourhood of St. Laurent or Batoche, crossed overland to Carlton and got the trade. So, in the early days, before Saskatchewan became a farming community, the area of Rosthern seat was one of the greatest trading areas in western Canada.

If you started where Henry Kelsey saw the prairies at Clark's Crossing, you would be starting at the place where General Middleton mustered his troops in 1885 to proceed up the river to destroy, or put down the revolt of Louis Riel. He started there in 1885 from about Clark's Crossing at Henry Lake's place, started up the river and met Riel's forces at Batoche. I would like to read a little report about Batoche that will give you a little of the history of that place, and would be very interesting for you if you should come:

"Although 70 years have passed since the followers of Louis Riel and the forces of General Middleton fought it out near this settlement during the Riel uprising, the countryside still bears the scars of that battle. In many fields, now given over to the peaceful pursuit of farming, trenches dug by the combatants on that fateful day are still in evidence."

The Historic Sites Branch, I believe, have done considerable work to preserve those trenches:

"The old Mission House, now occupied by the parish priest, Father Denis Dubuc, still bears bullet holes from the fight that took place when the Middleton forces came up there. The house was also used at one time by Riel as a gaol where it contained both whites and Metis whom he did not trust."

The old rectory has now been purchased by the Historic Sites Branch and will be repaired; some work will be done on it this summer, I believe:

"The old church stands nearby and is still in use. Built of squared logs, it has been sheathed with siding and is well kept with a coat of white paint. It was here that Riel and Dumont met their Council during the uprising. Dumont is buried in the Batoche cemetery beside 18 Metis who fell in the battle. It is surprising that no monument marks the warrior's last resting place."

Since the House opened, announcement was made in the press that a rough stone would be placed on the grave of Gabriel Dumont with an inscription describing what he did. There is a rather nice little bit here taken from a book written by Dr. Black. In it he says:

"Hopelessly outnumbered in every engagement, totally unprovided with artillery, and possessed with but a scanty supply of arms and those largely of the crudest and most heterogeneous description, the Metis fought gallantly in defence of their rights, their homes, their leaders.

"The very qualities that caused the rebellion, their courage, their determination to stand for their rights,

March 15, 1955

are the qualities Canadians should cultivate and respect if Canada is to fulfil her destiny.”

Batoche is more than an historic place not just because that is where Louis Riel was defeated, but because it is the place where the first form of democratic government in the province of Saskatchewan was established. Back about 1870, some 40 families left Manitoba, came to Batoche to get away from the government (you might say) so that they could live their lives as they wished. But, they had had some experience with government, and they realized it was necessary to regulate their affairs. And it was there, in 1871, I believe, when they decided to set up a council of eight with Gabriel Dumont as the Chairman. They decided another thing that was very important in our history, and that was that they would quit hunting as a living and would settle down and farm. It was there they laid out the farms along the river after the manner that they did in Quebec, probably with the guidance of the leaders of the Church, and started to plant their crops of grain and vegetables. So, as far as we know, the Metis people at Batoche established the first form of democratic government in what is now Saskatchewan, and were the first people to begin farming as a vocation on the prairie. Some time before that there was some grain grown at Carlton and other places, but they were the first people that really made a vocation of it.

I thought you might like to hear the words of Father Andre, the priest who was stationed at St. Laurent and guided them in their choice to settle down and live an agricultural life. This is taken from an address made by Dr. Thomas at the dedication of the cairn at Duck Lake. He quotes these words:

“Father Andre, anxious for the temporal, as well as the spiritual, wellbeing of the people, spoke as follows on this occasion:

‘Your decision this day has given me great happiness. I shall then at last see my fond hopes for you realized, shall see you gathered together as one people, your church spires in your midst pointing towards heaven, showing you where all your earthly aspirations should tend. Your lowly schoolhouses ringing to the gladsome hum of the voices of young immortal souls, learning to serve their Creator with their intellects, as well as with their hearts. Should you persevere in carrying out the resolutions adopted this day, neither swerving to the right nor to the left, neither allowing trivial hindrances nor great obstacles to deter you, your children’s children will bless you this day’.”

I have often thought, since I read that, how prophetic Father Andre’s words were, because in the whole area surrounding Batoche, in the German Mennonite settlements, in the French settlements, the Ukrainian settlements, you see church spires and schoolhouses. I certainly have not been in any part of this province where there are more churches to the township than there are in the seat of Rosthern.

The Metis people, our first citizens, our first governors, prized things in those early days that we prize today, and I believe that the inspiration those early pioneers handed to us has meant much in the development of our province. I would like to finish that with a quotation from Dr. Thomas’ address

mentioned a few moments ago, after he had said that the Metis of the south branch not only have the distinction of being the first people of the province to establish organized representative local government on democratic principles, and he had spoken about them establishing a school, he said:

“They were also the first people to agitate for government grants for school purposes.”

It is rather interesting to note that the first school in the province was established at Batoche, and Dr. Thomas said:

“These things which the pioneers of the district prized, the privileges of work, of worship, of self-government and of education, are the simple but fundamental things that are cherished by all men everywhere. They are universal in their appeal and importance. Millions are seeking them today in all parts of the world. In remembering their place in the history of this district, we renew our sense of brotherhood with all men everywhere.”

Following the Rebellion in 1885, there was not too much settlement for a few years; but in 1890, the railroad from Regina to Prince Albert, the Qu’Appelle-Long Lake Railway and Steamship Company (I think it was), reached Rosthern and settlers began to flock in from all over the world. The first large group of settlers were German Mennonite people who came from Russia. Probably the man most responsible for their coming was Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who, at that time, believed that if we were to develop the western country, it was necessary to encourage as many people as possible to come to this country. Now, it wasn’t just by chance that efforts were made to get the German Mennonite people to come, because they had been recognized for generations as among the finest farmers in Europe. They were so good at farming that the Czar had given them almost everything they asked for to come to Russia to farm the prairie lands in the western Ukraine. So, the Canadian government offered them good inducement to come and settle in western Canada.

The first people came about 1891, and there was a continual stream of them up to 1901. I don’t want to give you too much of the history of it, but there were certain things they brought that contributed a great deal to our Saskatchewan way of life. For instance, as far back as 1820, these people were practising the selection of grains to obtain better seed. They were practising rotation of crops. They were practising summer-fallow in Russia on the same kind of land that we have here. So, when they came out they brought those ideas with them. They brought something else with them: They brought a very strict religious life. They were guided not so much by law, because in Russia they had their own laws, and in many cases they were not subject to the laws of the Russian state but to laws based on the teachings of the Bible. They governed themselves by those teachings.

One thing that was very important to them was the law “Thou shalt not bear false witness.” Another one was, “Let not the sun go down on your wrath” – with the result that you have a friendly, co-operative people, a people who knew how to farm, a people who were resourceful, and a people whose whole social life centred around the church.

Shortly after the German immigrants arrived the Ukrainian people began to come. It is a rather interesting thing that the first Ukrainians to

March 15, 1955

come to Canada went to visit the Mennonite people in southern Manitoba, and the Mennonite people helped them with funds to bring out their families from Russia. I was very interested to learn that, because in my seat they are the two major groups of people. The Ukrainian people are something like the Irish – a proud and independent people, a people who do not want to owe any man anything. An interesting little story is that some of them had to borrow money from the C.P.R. to get transportation from eastern Canada to the prairies. The C.P.R., of course, never expected to get it back; but as soon as they were able to earn it, the leaders saw that every cent was paid back.

An interesting and important contribution that Ukrainian people have made to our way of life is their love of the land. I think every home is occupied. Another one is the gaiety, the songs, the music that they have brought to Saskatchewan. Many of them, a generation or so before, had been serfs, and they did not have much education. I think perhaps if I read to you a little bit of history about the great Ukrainian poet, Tarus Shevchenko, as an indication of the troubles and trials the Ukrainian people had and still showed the spirit and courage that is in them:

“The great poet, Tarus Shevchenko, whose career was typical of the tribulations of the people; 24 years a serf, 9 years a free man, 10 years of prison, a prisoner in Siberia, 3½ years under police supervision – a tragic life, dying in 1861. He did not live to see the proclamation of the Czar abolishing serfdom.

“The love of the Ukrainian for his race and people is expressed with great depth of feeling by Shevchenko, as even the translation of one stanza shows:

‘Dig my grave and raise my bow by the Dnieper’s side,
On the Ukraine, my own land, a fair land and wide;
I will lie and watch the cornfields, listen through the years,
To the river voices roaring, roaring in my ears’.”

I was rather interested, earlier in the Session, when the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) read a poem. As hon. members will recall, it was about the land, “My Land.” I mentioned a moment ago about the gaiety and music and happiness Ukrainians have added to our way of life. I was rather interested to learn, the other day, from the assistant I have in my office, that her great grandfather was one of the first four Ukrainian families to come to Rosthern district. They brought the folk tunes in their heads; they did not have written music; they were not educated to that. Her parents have been able to give her not only a good academic education but a good musical training, and now her father is singing to her the old folk-songs and she is writing them to music. The contribution that the young Ukrainian people are making to our Saskatchewan way of life is something that we should be very, very proud of – their poetry, music, art; in professions – nurses, teachers, doctors, lawyers.

The families from France came about 1897; educated people, people bringing with them the heritage of the old land, people bringing with them a kindly personality that has contributed a great deal of generosity, kindness and friendship to Saskatchewan. Of course, one cannot forget the Anglo-Saxons. Two men, in particular, I would like to mention, who have made a great contribution to Saskatchewan as early pioneers of Rosthern district. I refer to Seager Wheeler and George Langley. I do not think that I could do better to indicate

to this House the contribution that Seager Wheeler made than to read to you the inscription on the marker that will be posted on his farm at Rosthern:

“In 1898, this property was purchased by Seager Wheeler. Shortly thereafter he began the selective breeding of hard spring wheat, and exhibited his first samples in 1910. By 1918, he had won five world championships, three times with Marquis, once with Kitchener, once with Red Bobs. The last two were varieties developed on his farm.

“Dr. Wheeler won honours with other cereals and developed hardy fruits suitable to Saskatchewan’s climate. One of his greatest contributions was the breeding of race 10-B of Marquis wheat which, at one time, represented most of the wheat grown on the Canadian Prairies. He once said, ‘The soil is ours to make or mar and we should aim to leave it – when the time comes for us to pass it on – in as good or better condition than when it first came under our hand’.”

George Langley did not stay in the Rosthern district very long because, in 1905, he was over in the Redberry district and was elected the first member of the Legislature for that area. George Langley probably had more to do with laying the foundations of the co-operative movement as we know it, today, than any other man in Saskatchewan. In 1909, he fought with Mr. Partridge from Sintaluta, according to the press reports of that day, for hours in convention at Saskatoon to establish in the minds of the delegates at the Grain Growers convention that a co-operative company should set up the co-operative elevators, and Partridge insisted that it should be a Crown corporation. The farmers’ own elevators have never become a Crown corporation, and probably George Langley is the man who should get the credit for it.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken a little longer than I intended to, but there are one or two things in regard to the Budget and speeches that have been made that I would like to draw to the attention of this House. The first one follows on with what I have said about the great contribution that the people from Europe made to this country. If hon. members realize that they have made a great contribution, it is hard for me to understand how members in this House can suggest that the immigration policy should be curtailed, and that we do not want more people in this country. The hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Heming) suggested, or indicated, that we should have a cautious immigration policy. The Minister of Labour said that fifty years ago, people in European countries were urged to emigrate to Canada and were told they would find gold lying about the streets. They made gold in this country, Mr. Speaker. He indicated:

“I feel that the transportation companies are partly to blame for this – anything to keep their boats filled.”

Mr. Speaker, maybe they would like to have their boats filled, but in my opinion, the best thing that could happen to this country is to bring more people here.

I have heard the hon. Premier say many times, and other hon. gentlemen opposite, that we should feed the hungry people of the world. Where is the best place to feed them? In their own country, or right here? We can

March 15, 1955

give them a way of life that they would never see in their own country in their lifetime, and I cannot understand how anybody in Saskatchewan could say that we should have a cautious immigration policy, because it is the immigrants that made this country what it is.

There is another matter that I would like to bring before this House. I mentioned, earlier, words to the effect that, if we were to go forward in the next fifty years as we have in the past, we must see that the people retain their differences, see that the people control their own affairs, and I offered some criticism of the centralizing idea that is so well-established in this Government's mind. I do not think there is any policy that this Government has undertaken which shows that more clearly than the policy of the Department of Social Welfare in its building of invalid homes. Now I want this House to understand that I am not opposed to building homes for invalids. I think it is the most wonderful thing that the people of today, the younger people, the working people of today, should make a contribution to provide for those who are unable to provide for themselves in their later years. But, this policy of the government doing it, doing all of it, is the part that I criticize. The Mennonite people in Rosthern have one of the finest invalid homes in the province. They built it and established it without government assistance. I am glad to see that they are now getting \$40 a year for each bed. In a few minutes I want to tell you why I say that this system that has been announced by the Department is not right. It is a most expensive plan, and I do not think that it will achieve the most for the people of Saskatchewan.

For instance, the hon. Minister said, in September I believe, that a home was built at Melfort, that another 300-bed home will be constructed in Saskatoon as soon as the one in Regina is completed, and other homes eventually would be located in Yorkton and Swift Current, two of Saskatchewan's smaller cities. Now, the home at Melfort cost somewhere between \$1¼ million and \$1½ million. The one in Regina, since it is 300 beds, instead of 150, will be somewhere between \$2½ and \$3 million. The one at Saskatoon will probably cost as much. The one at Yorkton, if it is equal to the one at Melfort, will be \$1¼ to \$1½ million, and the one at Swift Current may be the same. Now, that is \$9 to \$10 million, and will provide for 1,050 patients – that is, counting the one at Melfort. The operating cost, based on the cost at Melfort – for 150 patients at Melfort the estimates provide \$171,000, that is after taking off the revenue: \$245,000 less \$74,000 revenue. The operating cost per year, when these homes are set up, will be \$1¼ million per year. Let me compare that with the home that is built at Herbert. This is only a small home, but it is built by a community with the assistance of 20 per cent from the Department. The home was opened up at Herbert and cost \$17,000, with capacity for 24 patients. The total cost to the province was \$3,400 which was 20 per cent; the operating cost to the province is \$40 per patient per year, or \$960 per year.

Now, just take for instance what the home in Regina will cost, \$3 million. How many homes like the one at Herbert would that build? Suppose we built a better home? Suppose it cost \$30,000. The \$3 million that is being spent at Regina would build a hundred homes costing \$30,000 and would house 2,400 people, or twice as many.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member does not wish to misinform this House and does not wish to misinform the public. He is at least a million dollars out on the Regina Nursing Home, and he is confusing a housing project in comparison with a nursing home for the care of sick people, such as is operated by the provincial government.

Mr. Carr: — Mr. Speaker, I do not see the point of privilege. I was in a hurry, but I can quote the figures from the estimates to show the cost of the Melfort home.

Mr. Speaker: — I think the point of privilege is well taken, pointing out that you were dealing with different types of accomplished homes.

Mr. Carr: — If this Government gave 100 homes to the people of this province and gave them the \$40 per month, it would only cost \$96,000 and you would accommodate more than twice as many as this great plan that is going to cost \$10 million with an operating cost of approximately \$1¼ million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if money were the only question, I would not say one word; but to have these homes near to the people so that they can visit their friends is far more important than marble slabs, far more important than mahogany-lined walls, because the home at Melfort is a beautiful place. I thought so much about what a gentleman said when I was up there. I asked him if he was happy there. He said, "No, I am not happy, because I haven't seen my friends for a long time." The most important thing about building homes for the aged is that they are close to where their friends are so that their families can come and get them and take them out to see the old homestead, and that they are with people who know and understand them, with their neighbour where they can talk over old times instead of being put away off in a corner of the province where they very seldom see their friends.

I believe that much can be accomplished if the Government will see that institutions, like homes for the aged, are put under the control of the local people, that the local people are asked to take responsibility. I believe that much can be done to improve our life in Saskatchewan if the Government will see that the municipalities have the funds to carry out their responsibilities instead of trying to build a larger unit, holding back on the money because the Government does not trust the municipalities to spend it wisely. There is no other reason why money is not being made available in road grants now, than simply because the Government does not trust the people to spend it wisely.

Mr. Speaker, I have used up more than my time. I will not support the motion.

Mr. A. Lopton (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the last speaker, and he has certainly given us a good resume of some of the old time pioneer life; but before I express some of my experiences in the early days, I think it is well that I should pass on my congratulations to the Provincial Treasurer for the able manner in which he brought down the budget. I always like to listen to the hon. Provincial Treasurer because he seems to be quite happy with himself when he is quoting these large amounts and telling us about the millions that are coming in to the treasury, as if he were creating the millions himself. He doesn't seem to realize that there is somebody else who has to bring those millions into his treasury before he can spend them.

Having said that, I feel that, before I discuss the budget, there are a few things that should be said here. First of all, I want to say that there have been some statements made in this House that I feel should be answered before this Session is over, and probably this is as good a time to do that as any other. I think, in view of the fact that this is a Jubilee

March 15, 1955

year and many of the members have been voicing their experiences of the early days, that I should say a few words on what I have experienced in my time. I believe that I am in a unique position in this House. I have probably been longer in this province than anybody else sitting in this House, even though they were born here. Another unique position that I hold is that I sat with all the different parties that have governed this province during the last 50 years, and I do not know if there is anybody in this House who has had that experience, except myself. So I have some qualifications, I think, to pass judgment on what form of government I think is best for the people of Saskatchewan.

First of all, I sat here with a Co-operative government. Passing my judgment on how they operated, I came to the conclusion that the powers of that government were vested in two men; I think that they were fairly equally vested insofar as control and power was concerned, from 1929 to 1934. Then I sat with a Liberal government for four years, and, of course, the responsibility was greater then on my shoulders as a supporter of the government than it was in opposition. As a matter of fact, sitting in opposition is not too bad a position. Then I have sat here, since 1948, with this new form of government, and I believe that I can justly say that the powers of this Government are vested in two men, but I would say that the Provincial Treasurer probably has two-thirds of that power and the Premier has one-third, but they are getting along pretty good at that.

Having said that, I want to say a little about my community, a portion of what is now Saskatchewan; but when I came, it was part of the North-West Territories. When I think back into those early days when I was running around barefoot on the prairie, as every other kid was, I was located in rather a unique position. There was a little Icelandic colony north of Churchbridge, settled, I think, back, in 1887 and I was brought in in 1891. Being young at that time, it didn't dawn on me what was happening; but as I grew up and became older I realized that this little colony was surrounded by a variety of little groups of colonies who had come from many parts of Europe. When I started to count the different nationalities that surrounded this little group I found there was no less than 10 or 11 different nationalities. We had a German colony to the east, we have the Ukrainians to the north, some coming from Galicia, others came from Bukovina, and they classed themselves as two different nationalities. Then we had the Scotch, the English, scattered with the Irish to keep things livened up, to the west of us. A little further south we had a Hungarian colony and a Bohemian colony, and south-west of us later on came a Welsh colony. Then later on came a little closer relations when the Swedish and the Norwegians came in.

A very peculiar thing existed at that time, which I noticed later. It was that every one of those groups were more or less suspicious of the other, and when I grew older I wondered if that is not what exists in Europe, today. As these groups of people grew up in their meagre means this suspicion disappeared. Many of you have already spoken of the conditions they were living in, in other parts of this province, when they first came, so I do not need to go into that in detail, because most of them were in sod huts with sod roofs that leaked when it rained; many didn't have any floors in their shacks, and that is how they started.

I want to say that insofar as the Anglo-Saxons were concerned, I never found any particular suspicion among them; they were unique in this way,

that they accepted everybody as they were. Then there was another group that came from Ontario, and I would say that they were in a much better position than any other group, because they brought with them equipment to work with. They were the first group that had horses to work with, and they were the first who knew the way of the country, and as such, they became more or less directors to the rest.

The most outstanding individual I think I may mention was the Hon. Mr. MacNutt, the father of our member here from Nipawin. I think he earned his distinction and recognition by helping those people who came from the foreign lands more than anybody else, by being elected as first member of this Legislature, in 1905, and becoming the first Speaker.

I want to say that if you want to know how people with ambition and willingness can get ahead, you just have to read of the trials and tribulations that these young people went through. When I look back and figure out by how old I am, I find that my parents were very young when they came to this country, and so were the others. They had absolutely nothing; they did not even know the language, which made it very hard for them and was one of the worst things they had to contend with. Through thrift and saving, however, it wasn't very long until these young people got out of their sod shacks and into better houses, and today I can point my finger to some of the homes that were started in those early days, grew from the sod shacks, to some of the most commodious houses in the country – and that, Mr. Speaker, was done under private enterprise; there was no Socialism in those days.

There is one factor that I do not want to lose track of, and that is the unsung hero of those days, whom I seldom hear mentioned when we are talking about the pioneers and what they have done. They are the mothers and the grandmothers of the present generation. When we look back on what these young mothers did in those early days, it would put some of our grouchy ladies of today to shame. It was common, when the men folk went out in the summer to earn a few dollars (the only cash earnings they could have to buy an extra cow or a calf in the fall), that these young mothers had to stay on the homestead; they were the ones who had to herd the cows in the evening and in the mornings, too. They had to milk those cows; they had to feed the pig if they had one; and feed the calf if they had one. They had to bake the bread because it wasn't to be had ready-baked at that time. They had to wash the clothes in a tub and use a wash-board, because there were no washing machines then. They even had to saw the wood with a bucksaw invariably. They had to skim the cream from the milk as there were no separators in those days, and they had to churn the cream into butter because that was the only product they had with which to buy a little sugar and tea or coffee, and to buy yard goods to sew the clothes for the children.

That is what the mothers of that day had to do. No one but a mother can realize what anxiety those young mothers had to suffer, too, when they were frightened of disease or somebody getting hurt in the family. There was no doctor in sight, within 50 or 60 or maybe 100 miles of them; there were no telephones in those days. If you had to have a doctor you sent somebody on horseback for him, if there was a pony in the community, in order to get relief. But there was one person in each community who should not be forgotten, and that was the lady who dedicated herself to attend to the sick of the community, and became the midwife and brought many youngsters into the world, in spite of the scant education they had in preparation for doing so. I am telling

March 15, 1955

you, Mr. Speaker, that when we look back and see what these women went through we cannot praise them high enough, and many of those women now grandmothers – and there may be some mothers are with us today, because my mother is still living and she is about 94 years old; and she went through all this herself as others did. Many a time, after midnight, when the kids had all gone to bed, they had to stay up mending the clothes and making a shirt for Johnny or a dress for Mary; there were no ready made clothes then. There were no electric lights then; there were no gas lights then; and I may say that coal oil was scarce, too. Many a mending was done with a little lard or something in a saucer and a wick burning from it.

Having said this, Mr. Speaker, I want to go into some of the things that I think should be answered, as I said. We have been listening to our friends on the other side for about three weeks now, or nearly a month. We on this side of the House haven't got much chance to come back, so we have to concentrate our remarks to cover the number on the other side. I was particularly interested in the remarks made by one of the members on the other side criticizing the Liberal party for patronage. I think he said that they were the worst of any party for giving jobs to their friends and having politics in the civil service. Well, my hon. friend sitting on my right here, from Arm River (Mr. Danielson), I think covered a fairly good-sized list of what this Government has done since they came into power with respect to giving jobs to their friends. But there are some that he left out and I would like to say something about that.

Hon. Mr. McIntosh: — Take them as read.

Mr. Lopton: — In the first place, he left out one of their friends who is very vocal down at Ottawa. That is Mr. Castleden. When he was defeated as a member of the Federal House, he was given a job by this Government. I think he mentioned my hon. friend, the Provincial Secretary; he got a pretty good job until he got elected again – at least, I believe that his job won him a lot of votes, and maybe that is what elected him. I also find a Mr. Black who is supposed to be a defeated candidate from Ontario is holding a pretty good job. He is at the head of the Industrial Development Board, is he not?

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, Mr. Black has never been a candidate either in Toronto, Montreal or anywhere else.

Mr. Lopton: — Well, he was a very good C.C.F.er anyway; and then there was a Wilkes . . .

Mr. McDonald: — He was an organizer.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Lopton: — . . . who was also supposed to be a prominent C.C.F.er, and I don't think he has been very satisfactory, the last we heard of him anyway. We had a man by the name of Allore who was very prominently mentioned here not long ago, who also was a pretty good C.C.F.er – wasn't he a candidate, too?

Premier Douglas: — Who?

Mr. Loptson: — Allore.

Premier Douglas: — Not to my knowledge.

Mr. Erb (Milestone): — You've got your wires crossed.

Mr. Loptson: — Well, there are other men, Mr. Speaker, who have been very well taken care of by this Government . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Harvey Dorrance, for example.

Mr. Loptson: —

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Yeah!

Mr. Loptson: — I thought so. You gave him a job. There are other men who have done well by this Government, because they were good friends of the Government, or they became very good friends of this Government. This man Holland, I understand, didn't have very much when he made contact with this Government, and he became supervisor of the construction of the Sodium Sulphate plant. By the way, that Sodium Sulphate plant could have been build for \$531,000 . . .

Premier Douglas: — Who says so?

Mr. Loptson: — . . . as I understand, by a reputable engineering firm. This Government thought it was too much money, so they gave the job to a man by the name of Holland who was a mining engineer, as far as I know; and when he got through with it the building and the equipment cost \$1,285,000 instead of \$531,000. To indicate that he didn't go away with his shirt off his back, he had a \$10,000 judgment against him when he started the job, but since he left the job he has been living, I understand, the life of Riley down in the United States, in New York and the beaches of Florida.

There is another man, they tell me, who hasn't done too badly, and that is a man by the name of Dr. Shumiatcher. Many of you have heard of him . . .

Mr. Danielson: — He's a partner!

Mr. Loptson: — He became an employee of this Government and, I understand, he was the legal adviser to the Premier while he was employed. They tell me that he was mixed up in organizing companies, especially after this Government woke up and began to invite companies into this province to develop the oil and the mineral resources. It is very interesting to follow some of the activities of this gentleman and I would say maybe his associates — and I think you know who I mean. One particular case I would like to mention, today, because there are rumours around that some of these gentlemen have become very wealthy — as a matter of fact, from being worth nothing to being worth over a million dollars. You have to do something to make a million dollars. You can't do that by the sweat of your brow.

March 15, 1955

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — When did you sweat, Minty?

Mr. Loptson: — I am going to take the case, for instance, of Bata Petroleums, because that is a very interesting transaction. To begin with, I want to explain to you, Mr. Speaker, that after the election of 1948, when the Government saw fit to withdraw the confiscation clause from the oil permits which was responsible for chasing the Imperial Oil Company out of this province after they had spent several million dollars in exploration, and after they had located at least the sign of oil and gas, they came to this Government, in 1945, to get a renewal of their permit. There was no controversy as to terms, but there was one clause stuck in that agreement that they took great exception to, and I am going to read it to you. It is clause 19 in this permit agreement, which reads as follows:

“Notwithstanding anything herein contained the Minister may, at any time during the period of 30 days immediately preceding the expiration of each period of 12 months of the term mentioned in Article No. 1 hereof, give the Company written notice of his intention to terminate this agreement, and upon receipt by the Company of such notice this agreement shall be void and of no effect, provided that the Minister shall compensate the Company for the loss sustained by such termination, the extent of such loss being determined by arbitration to which The Arbitration Act of the province of Saskatchewan shall apply.”

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, might I ask the hon. member what agreement that is in?

Mr. Loptson: — This is a copy of the original agreement you offered the Imperial Oil. It happened to get into my hands by mistake, and I have preserved it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — An agreement with the Imperial Oil?

Mr. Loptson: — That was drafted for the Imperial Oil to sign, with the Minister of Natural Resources. It was never signed because the Company refused to sign it.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — What is the date?

Mr. Loptson: — The date is 1945. My hon. friend was the Minister of Agriculture at that time. In any event, that is what chased the oil company out of this province. When they withdrew that clause, the companies started to come in, and individuals came in from all over the North American continent and leases were given out. One particularly large one was given to a man by the name of Rubbra (I think you have heard of him before). Fourteen million acres was given to him and that cleaned up almost all the acres that was available. I want to say that Mr. Rubbra and his associates have done pretty well out of the 2½ per cent they got out of the oil companies when they transferred that acreage.

Then there came a man from Ontario or someplace in the east, who was looking for a lease, and there apparently was nothing available. But there was a small company financially not very strong, called Bata Petroleum, which held some 2 million or 2½ million acres under permit or lease. It was quite obvious that they were not financially strong, and I presume the designers, or those who were anxious to supply this man with some leases, saw the opportunity that some of this acreage could be taken away from Bata Petroleum. Bata Petroleum was composed of Saskatchewan shareholders, somewhere in the neighbourhood of 2,600 of them. They had spent their money in exploration work. They had drilled some 30 wells up in the Unity district. They were the ones who first discovered oil. They discovered gas; they discovered salt, and there is a salt plant, as a result of their activities, operating in that area now; and they discovered the potash deposit there of which this Government often speaks. In any event, in order to get acreage for this friend of the Government, they designed a scheme charging this company with irregularity under The Companies Security Act. The rumour went around; I heard about this thing as far back as August, 1948, and in the fall of that year their offices were closed by an order of the Attorney General – no, not the Attorney General. He, I understand, would not sign the order, but he conveniently absented himself from his office and the Provincial Treasurer became the Acting Attorney General and he signed the order. The result was that their bank account was closed, their books were closed and there was no possibility of them paying their dues on the acreage, which were then coming due or were due.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I do not want to try to correct my friend's inaccuracies; I will have an opportunity to do that later in the debate. But with reference to the statement that the Attorney General absented himself, that statement is incorrect; the Attorney General was not in the city . . .

Mr. Loptson: — Oh, I don't think he did it intentionally, but he was conveniently absent.

Premier Douglas: — I am saying that he was not in the city, and he was not in the province at the time.

Mr. Loptson: — He wasn't? Wasn't he in the province?

Premier Douglas: — He was not in the city, and he was not in the province.

Mr. Loptson: — Well, it came in very handy anyway that he was away; but the fact is that the order was signed by the acting Attorney General. Well, what happened was that after this little company had forfeited on their dues or whatever obligations they had to make in order to hold this acreage, they lost about 1,800,000 acres; part of that belonged to their subsidiary, Vera Petroleum. That is how this acreage got into the hands of a man by the name of Newkirk – I think that is his name. Anyway, he had associates and we suspect who the associates were, because we on this side of the House (and we are entitled to our opinion) figure that this man was the promoter; Dr. Shumiatcher was the designer of the scheme; the Provincial Treasurer had to make it possible by signing the order, and he couldn't do it unless he got the approval of the Premier; so you have the group there to start with.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Have you ever heard anything so stupid in your life?

March 15, 1955

Mr. Loptson: — Now, isn't that a pretty clear picture, a most logical one? I think it is. Right now . . .

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. Is the hon. gentleman suggesting that the people he has just named had any commercial or financial relationship with the company he is talking about?

Mr. Loptson: — I wouldn't suggest it; but I would say that they would have something to do with them getting the acreage.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman is making that implication . . .

Mr. Loptson: — They pretty near had to.

Premier Douglas: — I am on my feet — if the hon. gentleman will sit down. I am rising on a question of privilege affecting the privilege of members of this House. If the hon. gentleman is making that implication, Mr. Speaker, I wish to deny it. I say that it is false, and I wish to say that unless the hon. gentleman is prepared to advance some solid charge, he has no right to make such an implication. If he wants any investigation he can have it at any time.

Mr. Loptson: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I have my own opinion.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Yes, dirt.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! If the hon. member is making implications against any member of the Legislature he will certainly have to withdraw it.

Mr. Loptson: — Oh, there was nothing dishonest about it at all. They weren't taking anything from the treasury.

Premier Douglas: — Well, it's not true.

Mr. Danielson: — All friends together.

Mr. Loptson: — Sure, these men are all friends together. But here is the picture. There was 1,800,000 acres available which was considered at that time to be favourable acreage as a result of the development which had been done. After this 1,800,000 acres became available, another . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! Did I understand you to say at the commencement that you did not know the name of this person, that you were doubtful of it?

Mr. Loptson: — I gave the name of this man Rubbra and Dr. Shumiatcher, who later became very prominent.

Mr. Speaker: — I thought I heard you say that you thought that was the name.

Mr. Loptson: — Oh, no. But then we see this picture developing. It would be a very nice picture if we were travelling in a wagon, as we did in the early days. We would see five gentlemen going down south across

the line, and I would say the sixth one would be sitting in the back of the wagon, dangling his feet; he knew he was going somewhere but he didn't know where he was going. You might say that of the Minister of Natural Resources. But anyway, they go away down to the state of Delaware (of all places!) to get a charter for a company called 'Albercan Petroleum Corporation' — way down in the state of Delaware! I understand the reason they went down there is because it is the only state in the North American continent where you can get a charter without divulging the prospectus. Having done that they came back here with a company composed of 8,000,000 shares — their capitalization was 8,000,000 shares.

Under the ordinary organization of companies the promoters are entitled to one-third of the capital shares (my hon. friend, the Provincial Treasurer, knows that), for the property that they put into the Company, which was this acreage. That was done; 8,000,000 shares were available for distribution, and the promoters were entitled to about 2,600,000 shares. They came back to Canada from this trip, apparently, and they organized another company by the name of 'Canada Southern'; they had lots of money because Albercan had no money — they just had about \$3,000. I think that is all the boys put up. But this Canada Southern, according to the records as we found them, bought the open shares, as you might have expected, because the one-third of the shares that were given to the promoters were supposed to be in escrow and not available for the open market. So Canada Southern buys all these shares, — one time I looked up their statement, and they had, as a matter of fact, 5,600,000 shares of Albercan, and they put a bunch of money in the treasury, and then their shares started to go up on the market.

I looked up the record of Albercan about a year afterwards and right here, in Richardson's stockbroker's office, Albercan shares were on the board there at \$4.80 bid and \$5.00 asked. Well now, is it possible for the promoters to get a million dollars out of that deal, if they have these 2,600,000 shares — and not one share was in escrow? They were all open, and the public was paying that money for them. Well, now, it is worthwhile to be friends with a government that will give you that opportunity, isn't it? Is it any wonder they say that there are millionaires made by this Government?

In order to substantiate that some of them are millionaires, if my hon. friends are interested in knowing the facts, I have an affidavit here, an affidavit that was sent to me by a man I have never seen, never spoken to, never written to.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Another Rawluk?

Mr. Loptson: — This is to the effect that a blood relation of Dr. Shumiatcher had said that he is worth over a million dollars, and he is very proud of it. Now, if my hon. friends want this they can have it; I will put it on the table.

Premier Douglas: — I would suggest that it be tabled.

Mr. Loptson: — You can have it for whatever it is worth, and I will put it on the table for the boys to see.

March 15, 1955

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that that is one of the most dastardly manipulations to do people out of their earnings that I have ever seen in oil transactions. 2,600 shareholders, many of them people who have not got the money to lose, lost their money in that transaction. Their shares, today, should be worth on a par with Canada Southern (that is, about \$5 or \$6 a share) instead of 15 cents a share.

That is only part of it. I could go a long, long way, Mr. Speaker, in giving you transactions that have been going on here, showing that this Government has been very good to their friends. So much for that. Now that is in answer to my hon. friend who tried to make out that the Liberals were most generous to their political friends. I do not know where he would find a government or a party that would be more friendly to their friends than the C.C.F. have been since they came into power.

There was another statement made in this House which I think should be answered and that was by our hon. Provincial Secretary (Hon. Mr. Burton) in speaking in this debate on March 10th. The hon. member stated this:

“The hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) had to say something so he wandered all over the field. Now I would raise no objection to him or any other person comparing Saskatchewan with Alberta and Manitoba if they would only tell the whole story; but when they, in typical Liberal fashion, distort the truth by only telling part, I say that they are doing a disservice to themselves and worse than that . . .”

Well, of all people charging somebody on this side of the House with, not telling the truth! Do my hon. friends want to know who really is distorting the truth? Let me just go through some of it. I am not going to read it all, but I have just that much to read to you. I am going to start with the Premier first, because I believe he is the master of distortion. Here I have a statement quoted of him saying, in June, 1945:

“While addressing the Saskatchewan conference of the United Church of Canada, Premier Douglas made a number of statements about the manufacture and sale of penicillin. These statements were not only completely untrue, but were calculated to incite in the audience he was addressing a very hostile attitude towards the Government at Ottawa.

“He told this gathering that the production of penicillin had been turned over to distillers and that it cost four times as much in Canada as it did in the United States.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that that is one of the most dastardly statements that could be made by anybody in front of an audience of that kind. One of the reasons why I say so is that some of the Ministers who were at this conference actually went into the pulpit of their churches, after they came back, and spread that same fable, only to be sorry for it afterwards, because there happened to be some druggists in the churches at the time, who

drew their attention to the fact that it was false.

Now that is one of the big falsehoods that has been made by the Premier himself.

Premier Douglas: — Who says it is false?

Mr. Loptson: — Who said it? Wait till I finish it.

Premier Douglas: — Go ahead.

Mr. Loptson: — Do you still want to say it is true?

Premier Douglas: — I certainly do.

Mr. Loptson: — Well then, there you are. I will have to say it loud to everybody can hear it. “He continued to protest against the Bronfman interest having a monopoly on penicillin on the one hand, and being allowed to make alcohol on the other.” That is his own statement. From the ‘Leader-Post’ June 2, 1945.

Those statements were completely false. No distillers have anything whatever to do with the manufacture of penicillin.

Premier Douglas: — Who says that?

Mr. Loptson: — At that time identical bottles of 100,000 units of penicillin were being sold to the hospitals in Canada at 96 cents, Canadian funds, and to hospitals in the United States at 95 cents, American funds. Since the American dollar was at a premium, the price paid in Canada was slightly less than that paid in the United States. Penicillin was being produced in a number of chemical laboratories, and was being subsidized by the Dominion Government. For two months before making these statements the Department of Public Health in Saskatchewan, of which Mr. Douglas was the Minister, had been purchasing quantities of penicillin from this chemical laboratory . . .

Premier Douglas: — What is my friend quoting from?

Mr. Loptson: — I am quoting from the ‘Leader-Post’.

Premier Douglas: — Oh, yes!

Mr. Loptson: — Will my hon. friend stand up on the floor of this House and say that the statement is true that the Bronfman interest are making penicillin and have a monopoly on it?

Premier Douglas: — Not in 1945; but they had been making it when I made the statement, which was not made in 1945.

Mr. Loptson: — Never. I have the statement here that they never made it. The Minister of Health, Paul Martin, came out the next day and told exactly where it had been made. It was made in the government-owned laboratories, in another laboratory at Montreal; there were two laboratories that were making it . . .

March 15, 1955

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Mythical!

Mr. Danielson: — Saskatchewan did the same thing.

Mr. Loptson: — He, of course, is proud of the thing, but let him be proud of it.

Here is another good one – old-age pensions; that is a good one:

“Premier Douglas is reported to have stated in Yorkton, on August 14, 1947, that his party had increased old-age pensions from \$17.55 to \$30.00 a month.”

Mr. Danielson: — That’s a whopper!

Mr. Loptson: — As a matter of fact, when they came into power it was \$25.00 a month, and at the time that Mr. Douglas made the statement the maximum rate of pension was \$30.00 a month. No supplementary pension was being paid at that time, since there were a number of pensioners, under the means test, who were not receiving the full pension, and so the average must have been something less than \$30.00. That is that. Here is another one on the Premier.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. Did my hon. friend say there was no supplementary pension being paid?

Mr. Loptson: — Only under the means test. At that time, no.

Premier Douglas: — Did my hon. friend say there was no . . .

Mr. Loptson: — You did not bring it up to \$30.

Premier Douglas: — I am asking if my hon. friend said there was no supplementary pension being paid?

Mr. Loptson: — Oh, no, no. But only under a means test.

Premier Douglas: — Well, of course, all supplementary pensions are.

Mr. Loptson: — Now here is another one . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Let’s hear you talk about the money from the Dominion government that you stuck in your pocket.

Mr. Loptson: — Here is a \$100-million one:

“In a broadcast on October 6, 1946, Mr. Douglas was discussing wheat (and he likes to talk about wheat), and he said the Federal Government announced the initial price of \$1.40 a bushel based on Fort William, which is a drop of 35 cents a bushel, or a reduction of 20 per cent. On the basis of the estimated crop, this year, this means a reduction in the income of the Saskatchewan wheat grower of \$100 million.”

Well, I think everyone knows what the effects were.

Premier Douglas: — They certainly do!

Mr. Loptson: — I have another one here: Hospital grants. This is a pippin, too:

“In the Throne Speech opening the 1945 Session of the Legislature, it was stated that extensive grants for construction and equipment of hospitals have been made to various areas of the province during 1945.”

At that time there had not been a grant made to any hospital, and my hon. friends knew that.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — What date?

Mr. Loptson: — In 1945, at the opening of the House.

Mr. Danielson: — February 15th – before you had those by-elections. It was only after you started the by-elections you handed out the grants.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Loptson: — Yes, after the by-elections had started. But he said there were grants being paid all over the province in a number of cases, and there wasn't a single grant paid.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege again. Grants had already been committed to more than a score of hospitals throughout the province. Payment had not been made because the work had not been completed and we paid them when the work was completed. But grants had been committed, and those grants were paid. My hon. friend's pathetic attempt to misconstrue the facts won't fool anybody.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Loptson: — Let me read the statement.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — You haven't changed at all.

Mr. Loptson: — No matter what you say, here is the statement in the Throne Speech . . .

Premier Douglas: — That's right. What date, what year?

Mr. Loptson: — It says “were paid”: “extensive grants for construction and equipment for hospitals have been paid . . .”

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — You said 1946 when you first started.

Mr. Cameron: — Oh, no!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

March 15, 1955

Mr. Loptson: — “. . . to various areas of this province.”

Mr. Danielson: — Before the by-election.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — Say the date again. Give the date.

Mr. Loptson: — At the opening of the House, in 1945.

Hon. Mr. Sturdy: — You said 1946, first.

Mr. Loptson: — February 15th, that is the date. I have another one here:

“The Premier stated that Mr. Woodsworth was responsible for family allowance.”

That’s a pippin! He was responsible for family allowances, and the poor gentleman was in his grave for about three years before anybody ever thought about family allowances.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Let us not have so much of this cross-fire; the members will have an opportunity to reply.

Mr. Loptson: — He wouldn’t deny that.

Mr. Speaker: — As long as there is this cross-fire I think we had better wait and . . .

Mr. Cameron: — You can’t take it, but you sure like to dish it out.

Premier Douglas: — I’ve been used to lies for so long that I can take . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Loptson: — You ought to like it, because these are your own words, and you wouldn’t say that you didn’t say them:

“The Premier states that Woodsworth was responsible for old age pensions.”

There are a lot of the C.C.F.ers who say that – the Premier isn’t the only one to say that. To what extent was Mr. Woodsworth responsible for old-age pensions?

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — He had them over a barrel.

Mr. Loptson: — Let me give you the standing of the House at that time . . .

Some Government Member: — He had old ‘windy’ King over a barrel.

Mr. Loptson: — It didn’t make any difference whether J.S. Woodsworth voted for or against the old-age pension, it would have gone through anyway. He had no more to do with bringing old-age pensions into this country than the rest of the Liberals in the House of Commons, and I would say that the Opposition all voted for it as well; so Mr. Woodsworth didn’t have to be there. As a matter of fact, Irvine and Woodsworth tried to kill it. When it was in the House they tried to move it back into Committee, and this is the record, if you want me to read it . . .

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — You're a bigger joke than I thought you were.

Mr. Loptson: — . . . and at no time, when the old-age pension bill was before the House of Commons was there opposition against that bill. Where then did Mr. Woodsworth fit into the picture?

Mr. Cameron: — Imagination!

Mr. Loptson: — Just another fabricated falsehood. Oh, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot to be said when we talk about being truthful, and there is a lot of things to be covered up on the other side. I have some more here.

“The Premier stated in Yorkton, when he was there, that the Liberals had even higher tariffs than the Conservative party in Canada.”

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Loptson: — Hear, hear, he says. Well, that is about as much as he knows about it.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — And that's more than you know.

Mr. Loptson: — Who was it who reduced the tariff on cars from 42 to 17½ per cent? Who was it took the tariff from implements, from 27 per cent to nothing? There has never been a government in Ottawa that has done so much to get tariffs down and free trade as the Liberal government. If my hon. friends were in power in Ottawa, it would be all tariff, because there would be an embargo on everything . . .

Premier Douglas: — It's all tariff now.

Mr. Loptson: — . . . on the export of goods and import of goods. That is one of the great falsehoods that are going around from this C.C.F. government.

Another thing my hon. friend has said – and this is also the Premier; I haven't started on the other fellows yet. I have a lot more. Here is another one: “C.C.F. free enterprise party”. Of all the misstatements a man can make the biggest is to call the C.C.F. a “free enterprise party”. Isn't it a fact that right in their Manifesto, the last clause is that “the C.C.F. will not rest until it eradicates capitalism”, which means free enterprise. You will have to admit that. Well, then, is it true to say that they are a free enterprise party? That is what the Premier tries to make out. That is another falsehood.

There was another little instance that we had here not very long ago, when the Premier had gone through my constituency and said that a farmer had sold two perfectly good hides for 18 cents, when the price of hides was 5 cents a pound, the lowest price that has ever been paid. He said they were perfectly good hides. No one can say that that was true.

Premier Douglas: — They weren't as thick as yours.

Mr. Loptson: — He made another statement and said a perfectly good hog was sold

March 15, 1955

for \$7.50 a hundred – that is 7½ cents a pound. Who would say that that was true, when there was a floor on hogs of 22 cents . . .

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, may I point out that I produced a receipt from the hon. member's constituency, and he was careful not to challenge it when I was there.

Mr. Loptson: — I wasn't there. There were hundreds of other people there that night . . .

Premier Douglas: — You were there, all right.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — You were hiding.

Mr. Loptson: — . . . and my hon. friend . . .

Premier Douglas: — You were out under the sidewalk.

Mr. Loptson: — Will you stand up on the floor of this House and say that that was a perfectly good hog?

Premier Douglas: — I didn't see the hog; I saw the receipt.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Premier Douglas: — I had seen my hon. friend, and that was all I wanted to see of hogs for that day; but I saw the receipt, and my hon. friend didn't challenge me.

Mr. Loptson: — The receipt did not say "a perfectly good hog". The Premier didn't read the receipt. The receipt was right. It was a stag. My hon. friend is a farmer and he would know what kind of hog it was. It wasn't a perfectly good hog. There were also two hides sold for 18 cents, but they weren't perfectly good. And the Premier said, in his speech in the House here, that Liberals had never given any assistance to co-operatives, that all they had said was "For God's sake read your contracts!" Now, surely, Mr. Speaker, you couldn't say that was true. So much for my hon. friend.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Will the hon. member tell me, Mr. Speaker, how much grain he has ever hauled to a co-operative elevator?

Mr. Loptson: — Me? I have hauled . . . I sell my grain where I get the best price for it.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — That isn't the story I hear.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Loptson: — I'm a capitalist.

Premier Douglas: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Loptson: — I sell it for as much as I can get for it.

Mr. Danielson: — You are honest about it.

Mr. Loptson: — If the Co-ops give me as much or more than the others, then I will sell it to them; and if they don't then I will sell it to the other fellow.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — That's good Liberal philosophy!

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Loptson: — Well, so much for the hides and my hon. friend. The Premier isn't the only one who makes mistakes; we have one on the Provincial Treasurer here – would you like to hear it?

Premier Douglas: — I hope it is better than the others.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Hurry, 'Minty', the suspense is terrible.

Mr. Loptson: — He says here:

“When the C.C.F. took over net debt of \$214 million was what the government owed. Then after that other agencies paid about \$76 million — \$214 million, less \$76 million leaves about \$136 million. At the end of last year it was \$180 million.”

Instead of reducing the debt they have actually increased it \$42 million.

Mr. Danielson: — That is correct.

Mr. Loptson: — And yet he says, “we have reduced the debt”. My hon. friend said, in Yorkton:

“I doubt if the average person pays as much in this tax, today, at 3 cents on the dollar as he did when it was 2 cents on the dollar under the Liberal administration.”

Now if you divide the population into the amount of taxes that are being collected, today, and what was being collected in 1944, you will find that the education tax was \$4.96 per person, in 1943-44; and when he made the statement, at the rate of the amount they were collecting, it amounted to \$13.44 per person – that is when he made the statement, in 1951; but, today, Mr. Speaker, it is \$20.42 per capita. That is the amount of money that he has collected in education and hospital tax today, and yet my hon. friend goes out on the hustings and he says “you are not paying as much now as you were under the Liberal government”. I have all this –

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Let's have ;more. We like it.

Mr. Loptson: — I have another file, too. We have one on this man Argue, the man they have in Ottawa, who, every day he comes to the House, tries to say something to get his name in the paper; and that is about all he does.

Mr. Cameron: — He has been to Quebec, hasn't he?

Mr. Loptson: — No, he hasn't been to Quebec. He said in the House of

March 15, 1955

Commons, on March 5, 1953, that good fresh eggs in his constituency were 18 cents a dozen.

Some Government Member: — That was the truth.

Mr. Loptson: — Well, the investigation proved that Grade A large eggs were worth 32 cents a dozen right there in his town, and 36 cents in Weyburn.

Premier Douglas: — He writes the questions and the answers both.

Some Hon. Member: — Where did his statement come from?

Mr. Loptson: — That isn't the only one that has gone wrong. The Minister of Health, speaking in British Columbia, said that the car insurance scheme in Saskatchewan was flourishing and was making money. Three or four days afterwards the Provincial Treasurer comes out and says we are three or four hundred thousand dollars in the hole. They had better get together before they make these statements.

The hon. member from Hanley (Mr. Walker) . . .

Mr. Cameron: — One statement is for home consumption and the other for outside the province.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Loptson: — The hon. member for Hanley also goes off the beam sometimes.

Mr. Danielson: — Sometimes?

Mr. Cameron: — Have you ever seen him on it?

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Loptson: — Speaking in Alberta on March 17, 1954, he made the statement that the Government (the C.C.F. government) is making a grant to the hospitals to the extent of \$16 million a year. Well, now, there is one honest man on your side of the House, Mr. Speaker, and that is the Minister of Health (Mr. Bentley). He wouldn't say that they were making any grants to hospitals; but these three fellows here — the Premier, the Provincial Treasurer and the Minister of Natural Resources try to uphold the member for Hanley, and say that there were grants. Of course there are no grants, and yet he would tell the people and try to make them believe there are.

I have another thing that should be answered. I always like to listen to the Minister of Telephones (Hon. Mr. Kuziak). I think he gives me a perfect picture of one of those real outstanding propagandists, and I would say that he could be a real product from the University of Moscow, because he is tall, uses big words, has a loud voice and is absolutely unscrupulous insofar as what he says is concerned. He tried to convince this House . . .

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I do not want to interrupt the circus my hon. friend is staging; but so that we will have some guidance for the future conduct of the House, I want to know if the term 'unscrupulous' is a parliamentary term. If so, we will feel free to use it in the future.

Mr. Speaker: — No. I would ask the hon. member to withdraw that when he applies it to an individual in the House.

Mr. Loptson: — What was that?

The Speaker: — The term ‘unscrupulous’ as applied to the Minister of Telephones.

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, I would say ‘most careless’. I will say that, then, and it will be all right.

Mr. Speaker: — You must withdraw.

Mr. Loptson: — Yes, I will withdraw the other and say that he is most careless.

Now, he tried to tell us that the Crown Corporations they set up have made a large profit, and he really wasn't too extravagant about it – if he had just carried on and told the truth. I cannot describe the Crown Corporations any better than they are described here in the ‘Leader-Post’. Not being an expert auditor . . .

Premier Douglas: — Ananias can do no better.

Mr. Loptson: — This editorial is as a result of scrutiny of Crown Corporations statements by an eminent auditor, and I am going to read it in part:

Hon. Mr. Fines: — What date is this?

Mr. Loptson: — It is only two or three days ago, after the hon. Minister of Telephones spoke, and that isn't long ago. I quote:

“There obviously is no recommendation for Socialism in these statistics which the Government has given out when they are critically examined. They prove beyond doubt that the nation is better off to let private enterprise run the nation's businesses while the government collects its share of the profits through the corporations income tax, without risking the taxpayers' money.

“For Mr. Kuziak's particular edification the Leader-Post is not irked over the so-called Crown Corporations, because it has been denied juicy job-printing plums with the establishment of the Saskatchewan Government printing Crown Corporation . . .”

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — Let somebody read it that can.

Mr. Loptson: — You will remember that the hon. Minister went after the ‘Leader-Post’ because he thought that they would get printing from another government that they were not getting from this one. And they go on further:

March 15, 1955

“Twenty-five years ago, on November 1, 1925, this newspaper sold its job-printing equipment and engaged exclusively in the publication of the newspaper. Since then this newspaper has not sought, nor has it done, a penny’s worth of job-printing. Mr. Kuziak is a quarter of a century behind the times.”

Mr. Cameron: — As usual. It sounded good in the House and over the air.

Mr. Loptson: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I didn’t go all through it. There is another article up a little higher:

“Private enterprise presently is assessed for corporation income tax on its profits of approximately 50 per cent; therefore, if the socialist enterprises had been operating on a comparable basis Mr. Fines would have had to hand over half of his \$7,300,000 surplus to the Government. This would have left him with approximately \$3,650,000.”

I think the hon. Provincial Treasurer will admit that is right.

“Private enterprise has to pay interest on capital always, but under the socialist system followed by the C.C.F. government, the Government borrows the money at about 5½ per cent, the taxpayers of the province pay the interest and the money is loaned interest-free to the Crown Corporations. On the \$96 million capital advance to the Crown Corporations the taxpayers are paying an interest bill of approximately \$3,300,000.”

Now, isn’t that right?

Some Opposition Members: — Sure, it’s right.

Mr. Loptson: — “This leaves the hon. Provincial Treasurer with a profit of about \$350,000, instead of \$7,000,000. In a computation which ignores the millions, the people of Saskatchewan invested in the Telephones and the Provincial Power Corporation before the socialists took over as government”

Now, Mr. Speaker, apart from that they have made \$350,000. I can tell you one Crown Corporation where they claim about that profit, and they made it only by the sweat of the brow of the workingman, and that is the Forest Products – the Timber Board. In checking over the Timber Board Crown Corporation, this Session, they alleged that they have made approximately \$200,000, plus another \$100,000 set aside – say that they made \$300,000 on a turnover of \$5,500,000. Now if they had to pay income tax on that, it would be cut down to \$150,000, wouldn’t it?

Some Government Member: — You always want to give it to Ottawa!

Mr. Loptson: — But the picture is that they are paying the people who are producing the lumber and the logs, the telephone

poles and the pulpwood, about two-thirds of the price that the people could get for them from private enterprise. If that was reflected in their profits, then they should have had a loss instead of \$200,000 profit. My hon. friend is appointed an official undertaker for Crown Corporation, in addition to being the Minister of Telephones. He has done a pretty good job up until now, but I think he will have some more funerals before long.

Premier Douglas: — You hope!

Mr. Loptson: — Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I think I would like to say a little more about the progress of Saskatchewan. Much has been said about what has been done and how the province has been developed. It came up from nothing, and I am going to give the Provincial Treasurer credit for having given the oldtimers credit for what they have done, but it is unfortunate that, when the province came into this prosperous period, in 1945, Saskatchewan should have to become a guinea-pig for socialist experiments. After the Liberal Government had pioneered for 35 years (34 to be correct), had gone through two wars, gone through ten years of devastating depression, and had built all these institutions that the Provincial Treasurer mentioned (and that was right), then, when the opportunity came to really go someplace, we would have to get an experimental government like this one sitting to your right, Mr. Speaker. Four years were lost in establishing socialistic enterprises. Private enterprise was scared out of this province. The next four years were spent in trying to get private enterprise into the province; and only now are we beginning to get some results of what we should have had right after the last war. This, Mr. Speaker, is reflected in the records.

I have, for instance, a very significant comparison, compiled by the 'Financial Post', a few months ago, showing the standing of the three prairie provinces. After all, we can best see how Saskatchewan is doing by comparing it with Alberta and Manitoba. This is a record up to the end of 1953 from the industrial side. Here we have manufacturing industries in Manitoba producing \$360 million worth of goods that year; Alberta produced \$528 million worth of manufactured goods; and here we come to Saskatchewan, the banner province of the three, and after nine years of C.C.F. administration, with \$189 million worth of goods. I think that is a significant story as to what happened to Saskatchewan from the industrial point of view.

Let me give you an inkling of the reason for this condition which prevails. I have here a report from a speech by a man named Harry Young of Winnipeg, manager of the western section of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, a body of men who would be responsible for bringing industry into this province, or any other province, and he says:

“An unfavourable industrial climate, resulting from restrictive provincial legislation and not lack of capital, keeps industry out of Saskatchewan.”

This is from the head man:

“Appearing before the Saskatchewan Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life he referred, Monday night

March 15, 1955

to the Hours of Work Act, Trade Union Act, Minimum Wage Act, as among those giving the impression that Saskatchewan did not want outside industry and sought to restrict industry by law.”

These are words from a man who is responsible for bringing industry into the different provinces. Industrial development was bound to come to Saskatchewan because of its possibilities. “Rural electrification could be speeded up by industrialization; more consumption of power in manufacturing plants would reduce cost to farmers”; J.C. McDonald, Prince Albert, vice-president of the Saskatchewan section of the Canadian Manufacturers’ Association said his foundry could not take in young men to learn the trade because of the minimum wage of \$26 a week. He said there should be some system of apprenticeship which would be better than present vocational training. There is the real reason why we have not had industries in Saskatchewan.

Premier Douglas: — Do you agree with that?

Mr. Loptson: — I agree with it, of course I agree with it. And as long as you continue that policy you are not going to get them into this province.

Premier Douglas: — Twenty-six dollars a week is too much!

Mr. Loptson: — No, Mr. Speaker . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — That is Liberal policy.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Cameron: — Says who?

Mr. Loptson: — I have spoken a lot longer than I intended to, so I think I will leave Highways until we get on the estimates, and quit this oration, Mr. Speaker, and tell you that I am not supporting the budget.

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Minister of Education): — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just taken his seat took considerable time at the beginning of his address to explain to us some ways in which he was unique in this House. I think that he took us further in an example of his uniqueness in the words that he has just said. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that very touching soliloquy with which he began (and I think all the members of the House will thank him for it), in paying tribute to the hardship and the great courage and the great service which pioneer women and pioneer mothers have given in this province. With that all of us would agree. Then this benevolent, large hearted, kindly old gentleman suddenly shed his skin and portrayed himself in real character, because he has, in this House, within the last hour and a half, shown his uniqueness in another way – his uniqueness in his desire to cast aspersions and slurs and insinuations against the integrity of members of the Government.

Mr. Cameron: — Oh, oh!

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — There is one more way, Mr. Speaker, in which he might have intimated that he was indeed unique.

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. Will the hon. member say that I made a false statement in anything that I said?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Danielson: — Why, you said that just now.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — I said that he had attempted in this House to cast aspersions and insinuations and slurs against the integrity of members of this Government, without producing any proof for the statements that he made. His proof was “I have a right to my opinion.”

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, everything that I said in this House, I have here documentary evidence for every statement I made.

Mr. Danielson: — This is not a Rawluk case, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! The hon. member did give the newspaper editorials.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Sure, but he did not give any evidence to indicate that what he was suggesting was true, namely, that members of this Government have been making illegally, illicitly, money out of the exploitation of the resources of this province, and that is the kind of statement which he made. That is the meaning which he hoped to convey to the people of this province, and he gave no proof with regard to it other than to state what was his opinion.

Mr. Loptson: — The result is there.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — There is one more way in which he could have claimed uniqueness had he wanted to. He could have claimed uniqueness as having had the reputation of being the best salesman of hay to the provincial government in the province of Saskatchewan. When he was talking with regard to the lists of civil servants . . .

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, I would . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — No, I said “salesman of hay”, and I apologize, Mr. Speaker, for calling it hay; the member could properly object.

Mr. Loptson: — I never sold hay.

Mr. Cameron: — Who’s casting aspersions now. Where is your proof of that?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Cameron: — Bring it out.

March 15, 1955

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I sat for an hour and a half without moving from my chair, or opening my mouth once when the hon. member was speaking.

Mr. McDonald: — You wouldn't dare.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, would it be fair to ask him that he produce his proof?

Mr. McDonald: — It wouldn't be fair to ask him.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, shut up then.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — I said the hon. member . . .

Mr. Loptson: — I will challenge my hon. friend to prove that I ever sold a bale of hay to anybody – or bought it.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Loptson: — I challenge him to prove it.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Cameron: — He can't prove it. Put up or shut up!

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Danielson: — He can't prove it.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I listened to the hon. member for Saltcoats and in the main he was expressing his opinion of some of the actions he spoke of. I take it the Minister of Education is now expressing his opinion.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, when the discussion was going on with regard to certain civil servants of this Government and the attempt, once again, to insinuate that these were not well qualified people, capable of performing a good job, my mind went back to a pamphlet that the Liberal party circulated during, I think it was the first by-election we had after this Government came to office. I recall it was in the Shellbrook by-election – a pamphlet in which they undertook to set out some of the people whom they called 'political hacks' who had been employed by this Government. I recall at that time they listed such people as Dean Cronkite of the University, Dr. Britnell and Dr. Spencer, who is now employed in the University hospital. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that they forget something. They forget that this same type of rumour, this same type of insinuation, this same attempt to . . .

Mr. Loptson: — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I never insinuated that these people who were employed by this Government were not qualified; I said that they were appointed as supporters of the Government. I never put any slur on their qualifications. As a matter of

fact, I think some of them are well qualified.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the point. He didn't have any reference (and I said that) to their lack of qualifications or their lack of ability. He did try to pretend that there was something wrong with the appointment of these people.

Mr. Loptson: — No, I didn't even say that.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — As I was saying, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Loptson: — I didn't say there was anything wrong. I was merely saying that they were the last ones to be criticizing anybody else.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member made one . . .

Mr. Loptson: — I didn't say . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member rose, what the hon. members across the way forget is that ever since 1944, they have tried to convince the people of this same line of reasoning, and they forget that the people, in 1948 and in 1952, have solidly repudiated that same kind of an attempt to insult the intelligence of the people of this province. One would think that they would learn something as a result of that particular experience.

I was interested in the last remarks of the member from Saltcoats, who suggested that the reason we do not have industry in this province is because of certain labour legislation and regulations enacted by the present Government. And yet this same party, Mr. Speaker, will hold out promises to labour of doing even more for them than we are now doing.

I want to turn to discuss some of the statements that have been made by members of the Opposition who spoke more seriously in the debate than did the member whom we have heard more recently, this afternoon. When the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron), who was speaking in his capacity as the official spokesman on finance, was replying in the budget debate, he quoted an authority with regard to taxation. He did not, on that occasion, name his authority, but he quoted someone as having once had the opinion that studies made revealed "the limit of taxation for municipal and educational purposes in a prairie economy should not exceed \$1 per acre." As I say, he did not give the name of his authority, or the name of the study, but that was his statement: that the limit should not exceed \$1 per acre. He went on to add this statement: "Where school taxes, a few years ago, averaged 40 to 50 cents an acre, today, our average school tax is well above \$1 per acre."

I thought that was what he said at the time and I went to the records of the House to check to make sure that that was what he did say. He did say that, "whereas school taxes a few years ago averaged 40 to 50

March 15, 1955

cents an acre, today our average school tax is well above \$1 per acre.” I suggest that one can only interpret that as meaning that the average school tax per acre of land used for agricultural production is well above \$1 per acre. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, to you and to the Legislature and to the member for Maple Creek, that the average school tax per acre in the province of Saskatchewan, in 1953, was not well above \$1 per acre. It was not \$1 per acre. It was not 50 cents per acre. It was not 40 cents per acre. It was not 30 cents per acre, and was not even 25 cents per acre. It was approximately 24 cents per acre.

Mr. Cameron: — Where did you get your acreage?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — The hon. member, when the Provincial Secretary was speaking the other day, interrupted him to say that there was no distortion in any of the statements which he had made when speaking earlier in the budget debate. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we should be ready to admit the possibility of an honest error on his part; but if it was an honest error then I think he should admit it. I think he should correct the statement made in this House and, above all, I think he should not repeat further that particular statement which is a distortion of the facts. But if he fails to . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member answer a question for me? Would you give me the total tax for both municipal and schools, if you have it.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Yes, indeed I will, and that, Mr. Speaker, is not well above \$1 an acre, or not \$1 an acre . . .

Mr. Cameron: — Will you give me your number of acres?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Yes, yes, yes, if you just can hold your patience for a minute or two . . .

Mr. Cameron: — All right, I don't want to miss any points.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — As I say, I admit the fact that there may have been an honest error, but unless he is prepared to admit that then we can only construe it as a distortion.

Now for the facts which the hon. member is interested in. According to the report of the Department of Municipal Affairs – schedule 18 of that report indicates the area of taxable land in rural municipalities in the province of Saskatchewan as 58,275,000 acres. The 1953 levy in rural municipalities (and this can be found in schedule 4 of that report) is stated as \$31,400,000, and that, Mr. Speaker, is the levy for general municipal purposes, for school purposes, for drainage, for telephones, for union hospitals, for health services and for hail. Of that taxation some \$1,400,000 is not on farm land; it is on improvements in the hamlets or it is on railroads or it is on pipelines. Consequently the levy on farm land in the rural municipalities, in 1953, was approximately \$30 million, which works out to approximately 51 cents per acre. But that, you will remember, included not just general municipal and school taxes, but also drainage and telephones and hail and health services and union hospitals. If you take just general

municipal and school taxes, it works out then to some 44 cents per acre. If you take just school taxes, as I said before, it works out to some 24 cents per acre. Yet the chief financial critic for the Opposition stood up in this House, in a serious and prepared speech, and said that the average school tax is well above \$1 per acre, when, in fact, the latest statistics indicate that it is closer to 24 cents per acre.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, the other statement of his that I quoted, in which he said that studies made reveal the limit of taxation for municipal and educational purposes should not exceed \$1 per acre. By his own measurement, then, we have not even half-reached the limit at the present time.

I would like to say a few words . . .

Mr. Cameron: — . . . \$50 on a quarter-section. I wonder what he thinks about it.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — I would like to make a few remarks with regard to the school building programme which has been carried on in the province over recent years. The Provincial Treasurer, you may recall, in his budget address referred to the fact that during the early years of development in the province there was a period during which there was one new classroom for every day in the year. Now we did not quite meet that record during the last ten years, but during the last ten years — that is from 1945 to 1954 — there was built in the province over 2,200 classrooms. That is an average of more than one for every school day in the year. Of course to those more than one classroom for every school day in the year you have to add such other facilities as shops (home economics or woodwork) in some 30 centres in the province, as science labs, as assembly rooms and auditoriums, gymnasiums in a number of places; you have to add hundreds of teacherages and several dormitories. As a matter of fact, during the year 1954 there was built 386 classrooms, or more than one for every day of the year in 1954.

I would like to mention again that much of this has been financed out of tax revenue and out of grants for building purposes. That is, of course, one big reason for some of the current borrowings which have been referred to, and it is one reason why current taxes have been higher than they might have been. It is worthwhile remembering that on every \$10,000 debenture taken for a period of 20 years, paying interest at 5 per cent and paid for serially, there is added to the cost of the building some \$5,000, or more than one-half of the original rate. Now the school mill rate in the province could have been less if the major part of our capital programme had been financed by debentures. Our current borrowings could have been less if more of the programme had been financed by debentures, but millions of dollars more would have been added to the ultimate cost of school buildings in the province. Take for example the years 1952 and 1953 alone. During those two years the school districts spent almost \$12 million out of revenue for capital. If this had been paid for by means of the issuing of serial debentures, and if the payments had all been made, there would have been something like \$6 million added to the cost of those school buildings. In other words, some \$6 million was saved because of that particular method of financing.

March 15, 1955

There are other reasons, also, why the cost of building would have been greater in this province had it not been for some of the activities of the present Government. The cost of building would have been much greater if the majority of it had had to be undertaken by an organization other than school units, because of the savings which school units have effected by using their own crews instead of having to employ contractors for all their building, because of the very considerable savings which they effected by buying supplies in large quantities. I feel quite safe in saying that the building programme which has been undertaken in this province during the last ten years would have cost millions of dollars more if it had not been for the organization of school units in this province. The fact is, of course, that a great deal of it would not have been done at all.

I would like to say, too, that the school tax in the province could have been much lower if the school plant had not been in such a deplorably poor condition in 1944. It is not necessary to give too many explanations for that. We do know, as has been pointed out, that the province had experienced ten years of depression, had experienced some five years of war, and many years of the devastation of a Liberal government, and the repairs which should have been done during that period, delayed as they were, added up to additional cost to the extent of a great deal of money.

Then I think, too, we must not underestimate the very great amount of building that had to be done in certain parts of the province. When one considers that in the Nipawin school unit, for example, they have had to build new approximately 50 per cent of the classrooms they are using; in the Hudson Bay unit something over 60 per cent of their classrooms have had to be new; in the Prince Albert unit almost 50 per cent of their classrooms have had to be new since the unit was begun, and in the Meadow Lake unit they have built some 84 new classrooms – almost 70 per cent of the classrooms now in use – almost 70 per cent that have been built since the unit was first organized. Now that was not, of course, all done without accumulating some capital debt. I think I did point out in a previous statement in the House, that something less than 8 mills of taxation would be necessary to liquidate the entire capital debt of those school units, and this, even after a very heavy building programme at very high costs. In spite of that heavy building programme and high cost, we have this situation. Our assets have increased tremendously; our school plant is very greatly improved; we have provided many facilities such as science labs and auditoriums not previously provided, and the relative amount of capital debt in the units is less than that of the whole province ten years ago.

Reference was also made by the member from Maple Creek to supposed advantages which rural parts of Manitoba and Alberta had enjoyed because of the industrialization in those provinces. Most of that has already been thoroughly exploded by the Minister of Telephones when he spoke, and by the member for Hanley, when he spoke later on. I will have reference to just one aspect only, and that is still this matter of capital debt as it applies to the rural areas of the three provinces – capital debt for school purposes.

The capital debt per operating classroom in the province of Manitoba stands, as last reported, at something over \$3,000 per classroom;

in Saskatchewan, the capital debt stands at less than \$2,000 per classroom. In Manitoba, if you want to put it on a per pupil basis, it is some \$111 per pupil; in Saskatchewan, something in the neighbourhood of \$80 only per pupil, so, plainly Manitoba has not enjoyed too much advantage in that particular way. Or, if we turn to the province of Alberta and look at the position of the capital debt of school units only in that particular province, these are figures from their annual report for the last year available as yet, that is for the year 1952. In that year their units showed a capital debt of some \$11 million on an assessment of less than \$500 million. In other words, it would require 25 mills of taxation on their assessment to liquidate that capital debt. In Saskatchewan – and I won't even compare with 1952, I will compare with 1953 one year later – our capital debt was in the neighbourhood of \$5 million on an assessment of \$600 million. That is, the total debt was less, the assessment more, and to liquidate that it would take not 25 mills as in Alberta, but 8 mills – and one year later.

I would also like to comment on the statements that have been made with regard to increased taxation for school purposes in the province. The member for Maple Creek had reference to the taxation as it was in 1944 and as it was in the 1953-54 year. He, quite correctly in this case, pointed out that it had gone from around \$10 million to something over \$24 million. Now there are some factors that need to be considered when we are talking about those two figures. First of all, I think it is not unnatural that taxes would go up. In 1944 we were still paying taxes and providing services largely at a more or less depression level. We have since that time seen an increase in teachers' salaries of more than 2½ times; we have the building programme of which I have just spoken; we have had increased services of which I will speak later – all of this done during a period of greatly increased costs. In spite of those increased costs, I think it is safe to say that there are few, if any, other services which have not, since 1944, increased more in cost than the service of education.

I want to point out, too, that that dollar increase reflects more than the actual increase in the burden on the taxpayer, because, in 1943 and in 1944, the school districts of the province received in each year something in the neighbourhood of \$2 million of taxes more than their levy. That is, they were collecting arrears of taxes which had accumulated during the last ten or 12 years, and many of the school districts were, of course, using these arrears of taxes to pay for current costs. I am not arguing or criticizing that particular procedure, but it is a fact that many school districts, in 1944 and 1945, were not levying – did not in their opinion find it necessary to levy the full amount necessary for the school because they had an accumulation of arrears; so for that reason the difference between the 1944 levy and the 1954 levy does not reflect the actual increase of burden.

A second reason I want to give, why the actual difference is less than the difference in the figures is this. In 1954, the taxes are paying for many services not provided in 1944, or services which were provided frequently at the expense of the parents. Let me, for example, have reference to the matter of high school fees. In 1944, the rural student who went to a high school outside of his district met the necessity of paying fees in that other district; he paid it himself, or his parents paid it. There are very few parents now, in school units, who have to pay those fees. It was

March 15, 1955

not only non-resident students who had to pay fees; it was frequently the practice in many of the towns in the province that even the residents, the taxpayers of that area, had to pay fees to the high school which they attended. That was the case in the town in which I was teaching at that time – the town of Biggar; and it was the case, I know, in the neighbouring town of Rosetown. So that was not reflected in the actual taxation, but it was a cost of education and a very substantial one, particularly if a family happened to have two or three youngsters in high school.

And, again, in those days the rural parent had to pay the full cost of living away from home when the child, the young man or the young woman, went to high school in the town or the village. Today, as has been stated frequently, in most of the school units there is a payment. The payment varies with the policy of the unit, but it averages out to be about \$100 per year. Again, this is something which the parent paid out of his own pocket but which now comes out of the collective pocket holding the taxes. \$100 on \$10,000 assessment is worth 10 mills to the taxpayer. There are, in the province, today, something close to 3,000 high school students being taken right to the high school by means of a school bus. I think it is fair to say that if the parents of those youngsters being taken by bus today had to pay room and board costs for those youngsters, as they would have previously, they would have paid out of their own pockets an additional \$1 million at least, in order that their boys and girls got to high school.

There are several dormitories operating in the province, all of which have served to decrease the amount of money paid by individual parents. There are towns in this province, today, like Rosetown and Kindersley, Eatonia, Arcola, Sturgis, Meadow Lake and many others which are giving services of a variety and type which previously could be obtained only in the larger cities of this province. They are giving equality of educational opportunities to many of those youngsters and I am sure that the parents and people are pleased to pay for it. There are many cases in which pupil supplies are being provided in considerable amounts, which previously parents had to provide out of their own pockets. That is a second reason why the increase in burden of educational taxation is not as great as the raw difference would have one think.

There is a third very important reason, Mr. Speaker, and it is that the 1954 taxes are carried by a much larger assessment than were the taxes in 1944. The assessment of the province has increased by over \$110 million – over 13 per cent, since 1944; and it is worthwhile noting that a larger amount of that is non-farm assessment than in 1944.

Some concern has been indicated with regard to the arrears of taxes now owing in the province of Saskatchewan, and all of us will admit that arrears of taxes are unfortunate, and they need to be watched very closely. Let me point out that the tax collections, in 1944, amounted to only 83 per cent of the current levy; in 1953, they amounted to some 83 per cent of the current levy. In 1944, it would have taken 24 mills on our assessment to liquidate the arrears; in 1953, 12 mills would liquidate all of our arrears. In 1953, our arrears of taxes were approximately \$100,000 more than they were in 1952, and the arrears, in 1952, were the lowest except for 1948, of any year since 1918. That is, the arrears during those

years, 1948, 1952 and 1953, are less than they have ever been in the province of Saskatchewan since 1918.

In looking through the Department of Municipal Affairs' reports from which this information comes, there is one item in the 1944 report, under taxation, which is conspicuously absent in the 1953 report, and that is the amount collected by the government of the day, in 1944, as Public Revenue Tax. It is interesting to note that the 1944 levy for Public Revenue Tax on rural municipalities and L.I.D.'s amounted to about \$1,300,000. The rural school grants of the Liberal government of the day amounted to approximately \$1,600,000. Here was this great Liberal party, this group of people who are so concerned about the weight of taxation on the land, actually collecting from the land \$1,300,000 and distributing back only \$1,600,000 in school grants. As a matter of fact, it is a safe bet that since that year they were collecting more than the levy; they actually collected more in land taxes than they distributed back in rural school grants at that particular time.

Again, it is worthwhile noting that the major attack of the members of the Opposition seems to be on school taxes. They have overlooked (or at least they never mention the fact) that municipal taxes come from the same pocket and that, since 1930, the percentage increase in rural municipal taxes has been greater than the percentage increase in rural school taxes. They overlook, and do not mention, the fact that other farm costs come out of the same pocket and have increased a great deal more. They are strangely quiet on those matters. As a matter of fact, if school taxes in this province were cut in half the average amount returned per farm would be in the neighbourhood of \$70 – some farmers would get more and some would get less; and, of course, many farmers would not keep all of that because the Dominion Income tax would probably reach in and take a share of it. I am not suggesting that \$70 is an amount to be minimized, but I am suggesting that it is not the major factor in determining whether or not the farmer is going broke.

School taxes are a factor in production costs and they have increased, without a doubt, Mr. Speaker; but when the Liberals of this province spend all or most of their time trying to convince the farmers that school taxation is a major cause for their economic dilemma, they are misleading the people. When they try to make people forget the real reasons for their economic problems by suggesting that school taxes are the big bad wolf in the economic forest, they prove, I suggest, unworthy to be leaders of the people. When they suggest to the people that economic problems can be solved by forgetting the major reasons for these problems – reasons frequently identified by the policy of the Federal Liberal government – they are guilty of gross misrepresentation.

Mr. Speaker, if it is convenient, could we call it 6.00 o'clock, and I will proceed after recess?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd (continuing): — Mr. Speaker, when I was concluding just before recess, Mr. Speaker, I had referred, briefly, to the fact that in 1944 the Liberal party of the day had levied almost as much, and collected more taxes from the rural municipalities and the L.I.D.'s than they paid back, as rural school grants.

While I am wandering around in the midst of statistics, I would like to have reference to one other statement that has frequently come from the Opposition side of the House, and that is with regard to the percentage of costs which are carried by school grants. The school tax levy for 1953 was \$24,300,000. The member for Maple Creek suggested that school taxes were going up at the rate of \$1½ million per year. Let us suppose that, in 1954, they went up by \$2 million – I don't know, but I will use \$2 million. If you add certain other operating receipts which the schools have, and add school grants which will be paid on behalf of 1954 of \$10 million, that totals up to some \$37 million that the school districts will probably spend in 1954. If you take the relationship of \$10 million to \$37 million that works out to 27 per cent – not 20 per cent as has been said, or 18 per cent, as has been said, on occasion, by some members of the Opposition.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Their usual margin of error.

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that there are items pertaining to distribution that are perhaps more meaningful than the actual total percentage of cost carried by grants. I have reference to the percentage of costs that is carried in certain areas where the burden is most heavy. The pattern of grant distribution which we have tried to develop in this province during the last ten years has been to put the majority of assistance into those areas which needed it most, and as a result we have this situation: In the northern part of the province, the part represented by my friend, the member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) and the member for Athabasca (Mr. Ripley) and the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Dunfield), receive from the Government approximately 100 per cent of the operating costs. They do have some taxes in those areas; the taxes, in some cases, will produce enough to purchase the fuel and pay for caretaking services, but the Government's contribution in that northern area is almost 100 per cent of their costs.

There are other areas in the province in which our contribution amounts to over 70 per cent of the total costs. I think it is correct to say that in units such as Meadow Lake and Medstead we are at, or about, 70 per cent. There are a number of areas in which the contribution is actually over 50 per cent – between 50 and 70 per cent. It is true that there are some of the areas in which the assessment is relatively higher, in which they have a more complete programme, and our cost is probably only 10 or 12 per cent. Those, however, that are getting only 10 or 12 per cent, I must point out, are cities in general to which the Liberal government of the day paid for elementary schoolrooms a grant of 90 cents a day, or \$180 a year only. In 1954, those classrooms did receive a grant of \$500 a year (more than twice as much), and in 1955, they will receive a grant of \$600 a year, or more than three times the amount they received during the last year in office of a Liberal government.

Not so many days ago, the 'Leader-Post', in one of its editorials, had reference to statements of mine supporting Federal aid to education as being 'flimsy subterfuge' – I believe that was the term they used. Well, may I say this about Federal aid to education. The Trustees' Association of this province and many other provinces in Canada do not think that a request for Federal aid for education is flimsy subterfuge; they have endorsed the idea. The Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities has, on occasion, endorsed the idea of Federal aid to education. And to that very impressive list, Mr. Speaker, I suggest can be added the Liberal party in the Province of Saskatchewan, because at their . . .

Mr. Ripley (Athabasca): — Will the hon. member permit a question? I understand that there is a certain amount of Federal aid in northern areas, towards education. Does that only apply to northern areas, or what is the percentage of Federal aid towards education?

Hon. Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, I think that the extent of Federal aid towards education in the province of Saskatchewan probably amounts to about one-half of one per cent, or something like that: I am thinking of the total. What the hon. member has reference to are two, I think, and perhaps three, communities in northern Saskatchewan in which we have an agreement with the Federal government sharing the costs of education. The reason for that sharing is, of course, that we are undertaking the education of the Indian children in those areas who are properly the wards of and a charge on, the Federal government, so that particular part I do not think could be called Federal aid to education. They are simply discharging their responsibility through paying us for a service, rather than pay somebody else to do it.

I was referring to the fact that the Liberal party, at its recent convention of which we have heard, did endorse, to some extent at least, the principle of Federal grants in aid of education. This was, of course, the convention at which the Liberals in the province of Saskatchewan decided to tell all. They decided to drop all of the veils which they had been holding up previously. This was the convention at which they admitted they had been machine-dominated at which they were going to regenerate the Liberal party; they were going to revive the Liberal party; they were going to rebuild the Liberal party and everything else. We saw some of the results of that regeneration and rebuilding and reviving here, this afternoon. But they did, at that time, endorse the principle, and they went on to urge, I may say, an increase in subsidy to the provinces to restore the original purchasing power of that subsidy. I was reminded of their promise to the people of Canada in about 1945, when they talked then about restoring purchasing power. But in addition to those people whom I have quoted as being in favour of Federal aid, I would like to quote part of a news item appearing in the 'Star Phoenix' under date of March 8th, and it is headed "Royal Commission Recommends". It has reference to a Royal Commission in the province of New Brunswick. Among other things the news item says this:

“Significantly, the best basis of financial support for the schools of New Brunswick will not be obtained until the government of Canada participates in it.”

March 15, 1955

I want to refer to a document to which members of the Opposition are fond of referring, namely, the Britnell-Cronkite Committee report, published in 1950. They were commenting on this matter of the subsidy from the Federal government, the tax-rental payments from the Federal government, and the passing on of these to municipalities and school districts, and they had this to say:

“While the Saskatchewan Government has ear-marked no specific part of the tax agreement revenues for the support of local services, these funds have, nevertheless, supported a large measure of the expansion of direct and indirect expenditures of the Saskatchewan Government on welfare services in recent years. If specific allocations were to be considered, the increases in provincial educational grants in 1950 might be regarded as absorbing a substantial proportion of Saskatchewan’s tax agreement benefits.”

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, they said “the increases in school grants in 1950 might be regarded as absorbing a substantial proportion of Saskatchewan tax agreement benefits.” Since 1950, this Government acted, in 1952, to divert the proceeds of the Public Revenue Tax into the Education Fund and increased the grants by some \$1,600,000. In 1953, in spite of the fact that in that year the Public Revenue Tax was removed, we continued that grant of \$1,600,000. In 1954, we added to that another \$1,000,000.

In another place, the Britnell-Cronkite report had this to say, Mr. Speaker. I am quoting now from page 60:

“With the revenues presently available, your Committee is unable to recommend that a larger share of provincial revenues should be devoted to education.”

In spite of that, we have, since 1950, not only increased the total amount of the grants, but the total proportion of provincial revenues going to education.

I have one more reference for the benefit of those who think that requests for Federal aid may be a flimsy subterfuge. This is point No. 4 on page 61 of the report:

“The real solution of the equalization programme problem (speaking of education) lies in the assumption of a substantial measure of responsibility by the Government of Canada. This solution was, in substance, recommended by the Rowell-Sirois report, and the implementation of that report should be pressed for by all concerned.”

So let us do away with this suggestion that it is morally wrong to request Federal aid for education. I think it is impossible for a government in a province like Saskatchewan to remain quiet, decently quiet, on the problem of Federal aid for education. Let us recognize again, that the tax rental agreements which are referred to by the Opposition, are not a subsidy; that if there is such a thing as any ‘flimsy subterfuge’, it is the

attempt that is frequently made to show the tax rental agreements as a subsidy, and that is something which they are not. Let us realize that they do not equalize adequately as between provinces of Canada; that they do not distribute completely or adequately income originating in one province and transferred and spent and taxed in another province, and they do not, moreover, take into consideration the additional cost of services such as education or highways in a province such as Saskatchewan.

I want to read at least one more reference to Federal aid, Mr. Speaker, and I read now from the 'News Letter' of the Canadian Educational Association, an Association which is made up of all of the Departments of Education in Canada, plus many of the Universities and other educational groups. They have this to say, on page 4 of their February News Letter:

"In a special message to Congress on February 9, 1955, President Eisenhower requested a Federal-State emergency school construction programme designed to build more than 300,000 classrooms in the next three years. The programme called for Federal grants of \$200 million to school districts financially unable to build schools by other means; for Federal loans of \$900 million to help communities finance their own schools; and Federal aid in the amount of \$20 million to foot half of the administrative bill of State school plans."

It would be very pleasant, Mr. Speaker, to imagine (but it would take some imagination!) a Prime Minister of Canada saying something like that in Canada. If he were just to divide by ten and announce that the Federal Government was going to make available grants of \$20 million to school districts, loans of \$90 million, and further grants of \$2 million to foot planning bills, it would make very welcome news in the ears of all people genuinely interested in education, genuinely interested in the welfare of Canada's young people, and genuinely interested in building a great and united Canada.

The difference in Canada seems to be that we are not moving in the direction of Federal aid to education; we are, rather, moving away from what Federal aid has been provided in recent years. I give two examples. One of them has to do with a programme inaugurated jointly by the Federal Government and the provinces in 1944, under the National Fitness Act and comparable legislation in the provinces. Since that time the provinces of Canada who wished to participate (and most of them did) have been receiving from the Federal Government some grants which were matched by the provinces, and which have made it possible, in this province at least, to have a very fine programme. Some of the members of the Legislature will know the Federal Government acted, about a year ago, without any notification to the provinces, without any consultation with the provinces, to withdraw that legislation. And regardless of what the Hon. Paul Martin may say in the House of Commons at Ottawa or may say to the Press, that statement is true: the Federal Government acted to withdraw that legislation without consulting the provinces, without informing them in any way whatsoever. I first heard about it when I read about it in the newspaper. I know that that is true, but at least one other Minister of Education in another province read it. I know the Premier

March 15, 1955

of Manitoba made a similar statement just a few days ago; so we have moved away from Federal aid in that regard.

Then with regard to the assistance to vocational schools, we have had with the Federal Government for some ten years an agreement which has worked well, which has been welcomed in many communities in this province, and under which we have been able to provide many facilities which people in many communities want. The agreement expires as of the end of this month. We had placed in our hands, not many months ago, a copy of a draft agreement from the Federal Government which would have made a new agreement available, would have provided more money for this purpose than did the old one. This agreement had been approved by the Advisory Council to the Federal Department of Labour – that is the Council which represents all the provinces in Canada. Then, just before the end of the year, we were told that there would be no new agreement available for signing for the fiscal year beginning the first of next month. We were told, I must add, that the old agreement would be extended for one year. The old agreement, however, does not provide the amount of money which the new one would, and furthermore we, at the moment, have absolutely no assurance that, after April 1, 1956, there will be any agreement whatsoever. So I do not know, of course, what is going to happen there. I am hopeful that there will be a new agreement, but I must confess I am somewhat apprehensive.

I would like to add to that that I urged Federal aid for education long before I came into this Legislature. I will continue to urge it. Certainly it will be certain that the C.C.F. in this House and at Ottawa will continue to urge Federal aid for education.

I want to look, for a few minutes, at the position in Saskatchewan with regard to the number of students who are in attendance at high schools. I want to consider the percentage of our total enrolment, excluding the correspondence schools, and excluding private schools, which is in enrolment in the high school grades. In the province as a whole about 17.3 per cent of the enrolment is made up of the high school grades. We will remember, of course, that the high school grades are only four out of the twelve grades, so one would not expect them to have 50 per cent. We will remember too, I hope, that the higher birth rate is just now beginning to be reflected in high schools. In spite of those qualifications it is right, I think, to say that the drop-out is still too great, that we need more opportunity, such as only school buses can provide, in order to increase that 17.3 per cent.

It is of interest to note that if you take the non-unit areas, which include a very small rural portion of the province, which includes all the cities of the province, the proportion of high school total enrolment there is 19 per cent. In the unit areas, which includes, of course, the majority of rural area and a relatively small urban population and area, the proportion is 16 per cent. But, one has to consider that of the high school students in attendance in the non-unit areas, there are about 1,900 who come from unit areas. Nearly all of them are receiving some assistance, in many cases by agreement with a collegiate, such as Yorkton or Melfort or Humboldt, and so on. So those 1,900 students, properly, can be deducted from the non-unit group and added to the unit group. If that is done, then, of the students originating in non-units and in attendance at high schools, it is 14 per cent of the total enrolment, whereas the students originating in the school units

of the province have an attendance at high school of 17 per cent. Remember that that non-unit group, which has the smaller percentage, includes the large urban centres in which, traditionally, there is a higher enrolment of high school students; so that the school units, not having solved the problem entirely, true, and in spite of the much larger rural population, the problems of distance, have a better percentage of enrolment in high schools than the non-units, including all of the cities and the large towns.

I would like to look at this problem from another basis, from the basis of the percentage of our population that is in attendance in certain age groups at high school. Let me take, first of all, the rural population in the age group between 15 and 19. Saskatchewan has 49,000 rural people in that age group – that is about 10 per cent of the Canadian population of this age group; that is about 50 per cent higher than British Columbia has in that age group. British Columbia has 26,000 rural people between the ages of 15 and 19; Manitoba and Alberta come in between that and Saskatchewan, which has 49,000. It would not be surprising, under those circumstances, if we had a much smaller percentage of our rural youth in Saskatchewan getting to high school than in the other places named, but such is not actually the case. In Canada, as a whole, there are 63 per cent of rural people between the ages of 15 and 19 not attending school; in Manitoba, 60 per cent; in Saskatchewan, 52 per cent, not attending school; in Alberta and British Columbia, 50 per cent. So we stand above the Canadian average, well above Manitoba, and a little bit below Alberta and British Columbia.

If you take the same group in urban population, then we find that the Canadian average not attending high school is 57 per cent; in Manitoba, it is 52 per cent; in Alberta, 49 per cent; in British Columbia, 47 per cent; and in Saskatchewan, 45 per cent. So we actually have a better percentage of our urban young people in that age group attending high school than in any of the other four western provinces.

I would like to give one more picture of this distribution of school populations, because it is a reason for doing many of the things that have to be done in this province. In the year 1951-52, the latest year for which we have comparative statistics, Saskatchewan had about 12 per cent of our classrooms in which there was an enrolment of less than 10 pupils; Alberta, in the same category, had only about 6 per cent; Manitoba, about 4 per cent; British Columbia, less than 2 per cent. Saskatchewan, in other words, needed many more teachers relatively than any of our neighbouring provinces. It makes our position that much more difficult, and I think we need to remind ourselves that our present population simply will not provide enough qualified and trained people to staff our schools in that particular arrangement. We need to remember that the birth rate, at the time of those people who are now becoming teachers, was much lower than was the birth rate at the time of the people who are now filling schools. We have an unbalance there. Those are reasons, I suggest again, for such measures as Larger School Units, for such measures as transportation of youngsters to central places by means of school buses.

• • •
• • •
• • •

March 15, 1955

(NOTE: At this point in the speech of the Honourable Mr. Lloyd, recording was interrupted by a power failure. The following is part of the speech not recorded.)

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to make some reference to the proposed changes in school grants, which affect both the basic grant and the equalization grant. And first I would deal with the basic grants.

Members will recall that, last year, we raised the basic grant for elementary classrooms by 50 cents to \$2.50 per diem. This year, we propose to increase the basic grants both for elementary schools and high schools. We propose to increase the grant for elementary schools from the present per diem grant of \$2.50 per classroom to \$3.00 per classroom; that is an increase of another 50 cents per day. Taking it on a yearly basis, this means the grant per classroom for elementary schools will be \$600 instead of the present \$500, or an increase of \$100 per classroom per year.

We propose also to increase the basic grant to high schools giving the academic course, from the present \$3.50 per day per teacher to \$4.00 per day per teacher, or, figuring it on a yearly basis, an increase from the present \$700 to \$800 per teacher. For vocational high schools, the present grant of \$5.25 per teacher will be increased to \$5.57 per diem, and that 50 cents per day increase will mean, on a yearly basis, an increase from the present \$1,050 per teacher per year to \$1,150. In other words, the proposal means an increase of \$100 per year per teacher in the high schools.

Turning now to the new formula for calculating the equalization grant, first I shall take the change as it affects the Larger School Units. A change was made, as you will recall, Mr. Speaker, last year, in the method of calculating the equalization grant, the result of which was that the equalization grant as at present, added to the basic grants and tax revenue in the Unit at 14 mills on rural assessment and 18 mills on urban assessment, provides finances for a programme at the rate of \$2,750 for each elementary classroom and \$2,950 for each high school room. The new formula will provide an equalization grant such that, when added to the basic grants and the tax revenue on rural assessment and 19½ mills on urban assessment will provide finances at a level of \$2,940 per operating elementary classroom and \$3,140 per operating high school room. In other words, a mill rate of 14 mills on rural assessment, and 19½ mills on urban assessment, together with the basic grants, will provide enough money to finance an elementary classroom at the rate of \$2,940 per year and a high school room at \$3,140 per year. For vocational rooms an additional \$300 per room is available.

The second group to which the equalization grants will apply is the non-Unit group. The present formula there is 13-mills times the difference between the assessment per classroom and \$125,000, in the case of urban schools; and 13-mills times the difference between the assessment per classroom and \$130,000, in the case of rural or village schools. The only change we make there is that we take the difference between the assessment per schoolroom and the same figures (\$125,000 in the case of urban schools, and \$130,000 in the case of rural schools) and multiply the difference by 14 mills instead of by 13 mills. For example let us take a rural or village school with an assessment of \$60,000 or less. You subtract that \$60,000 from \$130,000, leaving \$70,000 which, when multiplied by 14 mills, gives you a figure of \$980 of an equalization grant.

A word as to the effects of these increases, Mr. Speaker. All operating rooms, as I mentioned, will receive \$100 more per year plus the equalization grant, if earned, and all conveying rooms will receive an additional \$100 per year, if earned, on the cost basis used in calculating those grants. The value of the total increase will be from \$100 per room to \$255 per room, per year, plus the equalization grant. It varies from area to area, from .4 mills to almost 5 mills (4.8 mills to be precise) in areas of low assessment. That is, the areas that get the bare minimum of \$100 per classroom will get an increase at the rate of 4/10s of a mill in value, and areas which get the maximum amount get an increase equal to the revenue from 4.8 mills on the assessment. Thirty-nine of the 56 Units will gain from 1 mill to 4.8 mills; nine of the Units will gain from a half-mill to one mill, and about eight will gain to an extent in excess of one-half mill. The greatest increase will go to the Meadow Lake unit, which will gain by an amount of between \$25,000 and \$28,000 per year.

. . .
 . . .
 . . .

When the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) was speaking recently, he seemed to be very suspicious about British teachers and our recruitment of British teachers, so I will report briefly on what took place in that regard. We sent to the British Isles, just about a year ago, three men from the Department of Education to interview teachers, and to attempt to arrange for teachers to come to Saskatchewan to teach. We had previously, over many months, had discussions with the teachers and school trustees of the province ascertaining the need, and arranging for this activity, and our team of interviewers went to the Old Country with what amounted to contracts for some 200 positions in the province. That is to say, the school boards said that this number would be required, and they gave full information regarding the positions available so that our interviewers could say: this is the kind of job it is; this is the salary; this is the kind of living there.

Over 680 teachers there responded to advertisements that were placed in the newspapers, and our team interviewed some 600 teachers in the period they were there. That was a tremendous job; they had to work exceedingly long hours during the time they were there. Some 165 accepted positions, of which number some 30 either did not pass the Canadian immigration tests or withdrew for reasons of their own. On the whole, however, the results were satisfactory. True, there have been a few disappointments. That was to be expected. No matter what the group, you will have disappointments anywhere with any group of like size. Altogether it was a satisfying experience – not perhaps from the viewpoint of quantity so much as from the viewpoint of quality. All of these teachers had put in three years of training, and that was one more than required here; some had experience, and all were well-trained by Saskatchewan standards. It seems to me an altogether healthy thing to introduce into our educational stream some 135 people of that kind.

Now, had we been willing to sell the teachers over there a ‘bill of goods’, we might have obtained more. The difficulty with a procedure of that kind is, however, that we might not be presenting conditions as they actually were, conditions different from what they were in the positions available. So those interviewed were told exactly what the conditions were; what they could expect when they came here. Some, when they found the conditions offered were not to their liking, withdrew; on the other hand, some who were not able to come,

March 15, 1955

last year, indicated that they might be prepared to come this year. To others, the team said, frankly, "We don't think you would fit in; we have no particular position to offer you."

May I point out, again, that if we had wanted to take all comers and tried to sell a bill of goods, we could have got a good many more than we did; but, as I said, we felt that was not a wise procedure.

Altogether, we did better than the province of Ontario which wanted to get more, and were not successful in getting more; in fact they got a good many less than we did.

. . .
. . .
. . .

I should like now, Mr. Speaker, to say a word about the Student Aid Fund. As was to be expected, conditions being what they are, a year like this has caused a heavy drain on the fund. That, of course, was one of the reasons for establishing the fund; and I should like to say, as I have said before, that any students, having attained Grade 12 standing, and wanting to go on to University or to Teachers' College, but cannot go without some financial assistance from a source of this kind, have a better chance here than in any other part of Canada.

This year, some 279 students attending the Teachers' Colleges at Saskatoon and Moose Jaw are receiving assistance from the fund. Then, too, there are some 275 at the University, and 11 in other groups taking Nursing and Library courses, making altogether, a total of 564 students in the province getting assistance from the Student Aid Fund, this year. We have disbursed a total of approximately \$180,000 this year, to these 564 students, and it is interesting and gratifying to note, Mr. Speaker, that, since 1949, almost 3,000 students have made use of this fund, and that about \$800,000 has been disbursed from it.

. . .
. . .
. . .

There is another branch of the Department to which, at the risk of expending too much time, I want to have reference. It is the Adult Education branch, and I wish to refer particularly to one of the new programmes of this last year. I have reference to the organization of what is called the Saskatchewan Council of Public Affairs. This Council, this activity, is sponsored by the Extension Department of the University and the Adult Education Division of the Department of Education, and comprises some 15 provincial agencies and organizations. It has as its purpose the distribution of information and material concerning, and the promotion of intelligent discussion on, public affairs.

The first major undertaking of the Council was a three-day summer institute on the theme: "Trade and Aid – Prairie Interest in Foreign Policy." The institute was held, last summer, at Valley Centre in Fort Qu'Appelle, which is proving itself to be a very useful place for the holding of conferences and institutes of various kinds. The Opposition has been somewhat critical of Valley Centre, this enterprise in the Qu'Appelle Valley, but the centre is proving its value, and has become an extremely useful place to have, and it is being used

more and more by organizations throughout the province.

At the institute, we were fortunate in having several people like Dr. S. Gupta, First Secretary to the High Commissioner for India; Mr. Albert Watson, Mid-West Secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation; Dr. E.A. Corbett, former Director of the Canadian Association of Adult Education; Dr. Edgar McInnis, President of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs, attend to lead and participate in the discussions. There were some 50 people there taking part, and, in addition, some 20 visitors spent a few profitable days there at what we think is the beginning of a western 'Couchiching Conference.' Any member of the Legislature would, I am sure, be warmly welcomed at these institutes, and would profit by attendance at them.

. . .
 . . .
 . . .

Before I close, Mr. Speaker, I want to sum up by giving three or four reasons why I think it highly desirable to support the Budget. My first reason is that it takes further steps toward carrying out the platform placed before the people in 1952 and endorsed by them at that time. It is fitting that, in this Jubilee year, the Budget should go one more step further in carrying out our promises to the people.

My second reason is that the Budget reiterates the increasing importance to the finances of the province of revenue from non-agricultural resources, which shows the success of the Government's programme and policy for the development of a varied economic basis in Saskatchewan. This has made it possible to maintain, and even to extend, social services in a year of very disappointing agricultural production.

Thirdly, I think it should be mentioned again that the record level of the proposed capital programme will be an effective measure on combatting unemployment in the province. And finally, Mr. Speaker, this Budget does provide for increased expenditure for Health, Social Services and Education. In doing that, it reflects the philosophy of this Government which was expressed by the Provincial Treasurer in his first Budget Speech in the 1945 session. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that he referred then to "human budgets" – that budgets must increasingly become "human budgets". And he has carried on since presenting human budgets. For this is a human budget, which recognizes the increasing importance of the human being. For that reason, and for the others I have mentioned, I will support the motion.

Mr. Arnold Feusi (Pelly): — Following the Minister of Education, I feel that the people of Saskatchewan will be very proud of the programme set forth in the budget, this year, and, before passing on, I should compliment the Provincial Treasurer on his very fine performance in presenting it. Possibly, so far as my constituency of Pelly is concerned, the statement of the Minister of Highways that a quite substantial amount of roadwork will be done in the constituency, is probably the highlight.

Last year, the Department was not able to fulfil its programme so far as it concerned the constituency, and I am afraid the situation will not be much better, this year. With the moisture in the ground and frost-boils, they

March 15, 1955

may have trouble, this spring; but, weather permitting, there will be a good chore done in Pelly constituency. Incidentally, the work planned in Pelly constituency is quite a substantial chunk of road, and I am sure my people are going to be quite enthused by that portion of the budget. I intend, tomorrow, to speak on the history of some of the roads in my constituency, so I shall leave that for the present.

To date we have had a resume dealing with some of the early pioneers of the province by the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) and previously by the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron). I was very much interested in the pioneer story given by the member for Saltcoats, today. I was a close neighbour of his for many years. I was raised in an adjacent area, and knew him well; in fact I know all his good and bad qualities.

The area we come from is very much broken up with a variety of settlements. I know the area I was raised in is a German settlement; to the east of us was a Scandinavian settlement; to the south of us was a Hungarian settlement, and to the west of us was a Belgian settlement; in the north-west was an Icelandic settlement, and north was a Ukrainian settlement.

The settlements, I suppose, aren't as solid any more as there has been a tremendous amount of mixing. Evidently the youth of the province do not seem to consider race any barrier at all these days.

I would like to go back also to a type of pioneer that probably can be also classed in this modern age. I believe the member for Nipawin (Mr. MacNutt) and the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Dunfield) will bear me out in this, that we have, even to this day, pioneers or people who are on the fringe of settlement that are in a measure, pioneering. They are going through the same problems and situations probably, as some of our forefathers did 40 and 50 years ago, probably in their type of living and the way they make their livelihood. I know, for instance, of families being raised on quarter-sections. I know of one family that came to my attention recently, raising 14 children on a quarter-section, and it was not the best quarter-section by any means. Many of these folks probably are living in some semblance of a log building today. I know there was a time in our area that the early settlers did not even have a log building. They had an excavation in the ground with a roof and poles overhead.

I know there is a story told of them not being able to find their home, coming from the town after a snowstorm; there wasn't anything to be seen of the building until the horses broke in on it. Some of those settlers on the fringe of agriculture have to make their living in a variety of ways and possibly their skill in the use of the axe and saw, and a few other tools, stands them in good stead. I know that down my way some of them are very adept in the use of an axe. In fact, there is a sort of standard saying there that when they wish to appraise a man for his ability to use an axe, they say he not only cuts his bread with an axe, but he also butters it; and they have a pretty good idea of the keenness of an edge.

Before closing, this evening, I just wanted to pay a bit of a tribute to one such pioneer whom I knew very well. He had raised a large family under very grim circumstances, and he probably raised them through the means of logging – that is, his employment at that time was logging and trapping, and I believe he did a bit of moonshining on the side; but the man was very skilled with an axe, and he was fearless. He ran a sawmill in the Duck Mountain Park

for several winters in the first years that I was a field officer there. I remember visiting his sawmill on a Saturday, and the information they gave me was that they were quite sure there was a bear den at a place where they were doing their logging. The sawyers and the lumberjacks there did not have the right to carry a weapon within the confines of the park, it being a game preserve; so I arranged with this pioneer of whom I am speaking that I would appear, the next day, on a Sunday afternoon, with a gun, and we would probably have a bit of a hunt. There was some danger of the horses stampeding, because the scent of the bear was quite strong, and evidently the logging trail was adjacent to the skidway. Anyway, in those days – I believe the field officers nowadays have more or less of a picnic compared to the field officers of our time – Sunday was the same as almost any other day. We had to serve the public, and it was well on in probably mid-afternoon before I got away. By the time I got to the mill-site, I found the bear already hung up, though they had used no weapon other than an axe. I asked them how they had managed to kill the bear. The old miller had coaxed one of the younger fellows, a 15-year-old lad, to go out with him after he had waited some time and figured I wouldn't show up. He made his way to the site where the bear was dened in, and none of the other loggers would go with him. They figured it was a foolhardy enterprise to tackle a bear with an axe. When they got to the site of the bear den, they had an idea it was rather a small bear because the hummock in the snow, where the den was, was not very prominent; it did not show up very much, and they considered it to be a very small bear.

Of course, the old miller cut a prod or a sapling, and he lined up the young lad as to where he was to do the prodding. Evidently he found out which direction the bear was aimed at for the simple reason that the vapor, or ventilation hole that rises from a warm body in the snow was a sort of a window, and they were able to drop a little crystallized snow and see which way the hair shook, and they gleaned from that which way the bear was pointing. He got the young lad to stand in behind the bear and do some prodding through the deep snow – and incidentally, there was about three feet of snow. As the young fellow undertook the prodding, the bear somewhat awoke from its hibernation; the growls attained a deeper and deeper volume, and the young fellow stopped momentarily and said, "That's a bigger bear than we figured on. In fact, that bear is going to be very mad at me because I'm doing the poking." The older man coaxed him to continue the poking, saying he would look after the bear. Finally the bear burst out of the den in a tremendous cloud of snow and hit directly for where the old logger stood. In just a matter of two blows with the heel of the axe, he had it down. The bear stretched out to a size greater than the logger himself.

This is just an example of what these early pioneers, or fringe settlement people, put up with. A bit of activity such as that was something ordinary, or almost day-to-day. I believe that I could regale this House with quite a few stories along that same line, but we have business to attend to, and I should like to adjourn the debate until tomorrow, Mr. Speaker.

(Debated adjourned)

March 15, 1955

GRAIN MARKETING

Moved by Mr. Dewhurst, seconded by Mr. Thair:

“That this Assembly, reaffirming full support of the Wheat Board system of marketing, requests that the Federal Government abolish speculative grain marketing by placing all grain under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board.”

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, this motion which appears on the Order Paper under my name does not need too much elaboration on my part. As hon. gentlemen are aware, from time to time there have been discussions in this House on the Wheat Board and those who stand for it and those who don't, and I have yet to hear anyone in this House say that they don't stand for the Wheat Board and all that the Wheat Board stands for.

You will notice, Mr. Speaker, in this motion we ask that all grains be placed under the jurisdiction of the Wheat Board, and that the speculative grain marketing system be abolished. I believe not only will the members opposite support this motion, but also that they will get up and verbally support this motion, because I know on past occasions they have said that they are the ones who originated the Wheat Board. I hope we can have a unanimous recommendation on this motion in order to try and obtain for the western farmers what the farmers would like to have.

It was not until 1943 that we had the Canadian Wheat Board established as it is today to take over the full responsibility for the wheat, for the marketing and all the rest of it. We had before that a Wheat Board, but still it wasn't the full Wheat Board as it is today, which started in 1943. However, the Grain Exchange started away back on November 24, 1887, approximately 68 years ago. It was only 13 years after the Grain Exchange was established until the farmers of western Canada were so dissatisfied with the Grain Exchange that they asked the government for a Royal Commission to investigate into the Grain Exchange. In the year 1900 the first Royal Commission investigated the Winnipeg Grain Exchange and it was from the study and report to that first commission that today we have the Canada Grain Act and the Board of Grain Commissioners.

There have been no less than 15 Royal Commissions in the last 68 years investigate the Winnipeg Grain Exchange and I am sure that working out to be one approximately every four years, and knowing how long it takes commissions to sit, we realize that commissions have been sitting a good part of the last 68 years. I am sure that if the fluctuations we are having from the Grain Exchange, this past few years, are allowed to be continued we will have numerous more commissions in the future to investigate what they have been doing.

For this past few years we have seen the Grain Exchange have a free hand with rye and flax while other grains have been brought under the Wheat Board. During the time of the Wheat Agreement we had such men as Mr. Strange, of the Searle Grain Company, telling the people of western Canada how much more they could obtain for their grain if they had the open speculative market. But the grain that was on the market – what security did they give for the farmers?

For just one glaring example of how the grain exchange functioned, we can take 1948 as a good example. I have the statistics here from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, quoting each month for the past ten years. I know that statistics are tiresome if they are pursued to too great an extent, but I would like to give only one or two examples.

So we will take rye. In April, 1948, it was selling at the basis in Fort William for \$4.41½ per bushel. A lot of the farmers of western Canada, thinking that rye was over \$4.41 a bushel, thought that it would be a good thing to sow more rye. But, in September, when the rye was ready to be harvested, what did we find the price of rye to be on the Grain Exchange? It was \$1.45, Mr. Speaker – less than one-third in September, after the farmers had harvested, compared with what it was in the spring when they seeded that grain.

Flax, the same year, was \$5.50 a bushel in April at the start of seeding time, and \$4.06 in the fall, a drop of \$1.44 a bushel. Those things are not necessary, Mr. Speaker. Both rye and flax have as much potential value, as far as serving the needs of society are concerned, in the fall as they had in the spring. Farmers of this province and of the other western provinces, cannot plan their production and plan to meet their costs, and to know their needs, if grains are going to be allowed to fluctuate that rapidly. When prices of grain go down that seriously just in the space of a few months, it means that, in the course of a year, farmers have less money than they had planned to meet all their obligations including the clothing of their families, meeting their taxes, obligations for machinery and all the rest of it.

We can take the crop year of 1953-1954. The authorized low price of rye at the Lakehead was 85 cents a bushel, while the high was \$1.14 1/8, a spread of about 35 per cent. In 1950-51 there was a spread of \$1.03 between the high and low; in 1952-1953, a spread of 83 cents; in 1953-1954, 55 cents. The spread between the high and low prices for flax was \$2.16 in 1950-51; \$1.74, in 1951-52; \$1.16, in 1952-53. These were the cash prices at the Lakehead. Those things speak very well for themselves, and I do not think there is a member in this House who would want to continue such a speculative system at the expense of the producer.

The Wheat Pool of this province represents the farmers equally as well as any other organization of this province. All of us who take and read the 'Western Producer' know from year to year, in season and out of season, the Wheat Pool has been condemning the Grain Exchange, have passed resolutions annually asking for the abolition of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. They also want a marketing agency under the Wheat Board for all grains of the west, and I could at some length quote Wheat Pool resolutions to this House; but I believe most members are familiar with those resolutions, and I do not think it is necessary to quote them at this time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we do not abolish this speculative system out of the farmers' production, it leaves the farmer, as I have said, where he does not know where he is at, and I am sure that members on both sides of the House will support this motion. I would like to see some of the members opposite verbally support this motion, too, because I believe that it would make it that much stronger when this resolution is presented to the authorities, the Government of Canada, asking them to take the necessary action, if they feel that all parties in Saskatchewan, regardless of our political beliefs, that we all equally

March 15, 1955

are endeavouring to help the farmers of this province by abolishing speculative marketing and by closing the Winnipeg Grain Exchange.

So, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Thair, the motion appearing under my name.

Mr. Wm. S. Thair (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, in seconding this motion I would like to draw to your attention the fact that the provisions of the Wheat Board Act, which enable the Board to act as the sole marketing agency of wheat, is due to expire on July 31, 1957, which, of course, will include the marketing of the 1956 crop.

While oats and barley as well as wheat have been under the Wheat Board, they actually used the facilities of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange in the actual selling of oats and barley at the present time for the western provinces, while the flax and rye have not been placed in any way under the provisions of the Canada Wheat Board. The Hon. C.D. Howe, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, has given really no satisfactory answer up to the present time as to why they use these facilities in the marketing of oats and barley. Actually, then, only wheat is sold direct from Fort William to the importing agencies throughout the world. I would like to quote from the annual report of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, 1954, Clause A:

“Your Board recommends that the use of the speculative market by the Canada Wheat Board in the marketing of coarse grains should be eliminated.”

And that also means oats and barley —

“And that the marketing of flax and rye should be the sole responsibility of the Canada Wheat Board.”

In this connection it is recommended that the Government be asked to make regulations which would extend the application of the regulations of the Wheat Board to flax and rye. I am sure it has been well illustrated and pointed out by the mover of this resolution as to the reactions and the differences in prices that are paid under the Winnipeg Grain Exchange and by the Canada Wheat Board. But this just simply means that in addition to wheat, oats and barley and flax and rye would be sold direct in the same manner as the wheat is now marketed.

As I have just stated, the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, and also I would like to say, the Farmers' Union have been urging the marketing of all grain through the facilities of the Canada Wheat Board. A partial victory was achieved in 1949 when the Government did place oats and barley under Wheat Board control, and the prices in many ways have been reasonable, but they fluctuate. This would remove the day-to-day fluctuations in price as far as the producer is concerned. The uncertainty and instability of this method of marketing, both from the producers' and the consumers' standpoint or viewpoint, is considered by organized farmers to interfere with the orderly movement of grain.

The principle of marketing through the Grain Exchange or in other words, the only device at the disposal of the open market for the sale of surplus

grain of all kinds (and that includes the coarse grains and flax and rye) is to keep reducing the price until some speculator is prepared to purchase in the belief that if he holds the grain for a time the price will go up and he can dispose of it at a profit. That is the way the speculative market works on all kinds of grain; but this does not move a single additional bushel into consumption. It merely changes the ownership of the grain from one to another. That is the speculative market.

Statistics show that the world consumption of wheat was not increased by a single bushel with drastic reduction in prices, and I have articles here which I will not take the time to read, and charts which have been sent out by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool showing that it is a fact that the world consumption of wheat was not increased by a single bushel, by drastic reduction in prices. This applied particularly to wheat, but also, in a lesser degree, in the case of coarse grains. I am going to quote here:

“For the period of 1924 to 1925 on to the period of 1936 and 1937 there was a fluctuation in the price of wheat ranging from \$1.70 per bushel down as low as some 35 cents per bushel, and the world consumption of grain was scarcely affected. It is only the manipulation of the market that causes the violence of fluctuations in the price. In fact, there was a slight reduction in the world consumption of wheat in the year when the price of wheat in Canada was at its lowest level.”

The line elevator companies of western Canada have at all times urged the government of Canada to return to the open marketing of wheat in western Canada, but I shudder to think what would have happened to western wheat growers if we had been forced to sell our wheat for the past two or three years on the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, or, as it is generally known, the ‘open market’.

I would like to close with a quotation from a submission of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool to the Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life, October, 1953:

“During the past two years the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, along with other member organizations of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture representatives, both western and eastern, have discussed the movement of feed supplies from west to east with a view to removing some of the uncertainties of western suppliers. The question is still under study by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, but they believe that this would benefit the western producers of grain and eastern farmers as well.”

For many years the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool has advocated the marketing of all grains through the facilities of the Canadian Wheat Board.

I have great pleasure in seconding this motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R.A. McCarthy (Cannington): — I would just like to add a few remarks; I am not going to take up any amount of time. I think that, as farmers, most of us realize what a great service we have had from

March 15, 1955

the Wheat Board. If we hark back to 1951 when we had wheat that, in my opinion, was a very low quality wheat and was worth very little, we find that we got well over the dollar for that in the end. I think if the Wheat Board never did anything else, it justified its existence in that year.

One thing that has come to my notice during the last season is the matter of rye. Rye is sold on the quota; but there is no responsibility on the part of the Wheat Board for pricing. I cannot quite see how, if they are going to put it on a quota, they should not also accept the responsibility of pricing it, because what happened last year was that, when rye was up to about \$1.25 a bushel, the quota said you could not deliver any, and then by the time you were able to deliver it was very much less in price. That is one thing that I think, whether they agree to putting it all on or not, that rye at least should be put on. If they are going to hold it on a quota, they should at least assume some responsibility for selling it and some responsibility for evening the price. As far as flax is concerned, it is not on the quota and that does not apply to it so much.

I cannot quite agree with all the statements made by some of the gentlemen over there, but I won't go into that tonight, except to say that I think that I am quite prepared to pass the marketing of all grain; but in the event of them not seeing their way clear to take it all, they certainly should either take rye off the quota, or else accept some responsibility for the selling of that product.

Mr. A. Loptson (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, this motion in one part passes commendation on the Wheat Board and in the second part proceeds to tell them how they should run it. In my opinion, if we have confidence in the Wheat Board, we should have confidence in the methods they are using to dispose of our wheat.

I realize that the hon. member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) is a smart man. He probably should be running the Board himself with some of those who know so much about the marketing of wheat. I have been in this country a long time, and I have heard of many conflicting opinions as to how we should handle our wheat, and the member for Wadena said there had been about 15 Royal Commissions investigating the advisability of closing up the Winnipeg Grain Exchange and whether the open market was to the advantage or the disadvantage of the producer. I do now know one of those inquiries that did not say that the open market of the Grain Exchange was to the advantage of the producer, in spite of what these people say. I think, if you will look over all the inquiries, they have all endorsed the option market as beneficial to the producer, in spite of what we think ourselves.

He mentioned the fluctuation of rye and flax. The same fluctuation transpired when we were under the Wheat Agreement with Great Britain during the war and after the war. Wheat went up as high as \$3.00 a bushel. It does not make any difference what we say about the price of wheat, it will fluctuate in spite of ourselves until such time as all governments of countries that consume wheat and the governments where we produce wheat can agree on a basic price and that would be a stable price. I do not think it is possible to come to that agreement, because wheat comes into competition with other food stuffs, and if we set a price on wheat that is out of line with rye, or rice, potatoes

or other coarse grains, then we are going to be sitting with our wheat. The reason why it fluctuates is simply because there are substitutes that either are cheaper or higher than wheat is, and I do not see how we are ever going to set a price on wheat that is entirely stable, much as I would like to see it done.

Insofar as the Grain Exchange goes, that is a matter for the Manitoba government. But the Board, of course, could take under their wing the handling of rye. They can take under their wing the handling of flax; but I do not think it is up to us to say what agency they should employ to help them to sell the grain. Surely I would not want to think that I was competent to be a salesman for the Wheat Board. Maybe the member for Wadena is; maybe he knows a way that is better than the Board members know, of disposing of it. I think it is presumptuous on our part, if we are in favour of the way the thing is handled now (that is by the Wheat Board), that we should go and tell them that they cannot use this agency or that agency to sell our grain. They use agencies to sell this grain. The board members are not selling all this wheat themselves. They are getting a lot of orders direct, sure; but there are a lot of agents throughout the world selling Canadian wheat.

I venture to say that some of the brokers on the Grain Exchange in Winnipeg have sold a lot of our wheat. Their commission, if it is no bigger than it used to be, is very small, and you could not hire a man for as little as the commission that is charged. It is only one-eighth of a cent a bushel in most cases, and that is not very much of a commission; yet, it amounts to quite a lot of money when you are selling it in millions. So, I am going to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we change this motion a little bit and I am going to move an amendment. I think the members of the House should be reasonable enough to adopt it.

So I move, seconded by Mr. Cameron:

That all the words after “marketing” in the second line be deleted, and the following words be substituted therefor:

“And deplore the action of some organizations and individuals who continuously endeavour to advise the Board of the method they should follow in carrying out their selling policy which invariably would hamper their progress if carried out by them.”

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

Hon. J. H. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the privilege of saying a few words on this amendment, and more important are the words that are struck out by the amendment offered by the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) than the words he proposes to substitute, because he proposes to cut out these words: “requests that the Federal Government abolish speculative grain marketing by placing all grain under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board.”

March 15, 1955

For once my hon. friend is consistent over a long period of time. Back here on March 30, 1937, my hon. friend from Saltcoats voted against an amendment which asked that the 1937 grain crop be marketed through the said Canadian Wheat Board. He is found in the list of the members voting against it, together with the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson). The others on the list are no longer here.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — And they won't be back.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I would suggest that the casualty list of this group of 41 members has been very, very high indeed. I would advise my hon. friend . . .

Mr. Loptson: — I'll take my chance.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . that he would be well advised to give second thought to this amendment of his. It is a typical amendment which is often offered by those people who are trying to ride two horses. They are trying first of all to go along and appear to be in favour of the Wheat Board, and at the same time prevent it from doing a full and complete job.

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, that has nothing to do with the amendment. That is not condemning the Wheat Board. You are endeavouring to say that the amendment is condemning the Wheat Board.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend has not any point of order. I just said the motion is typical of certain people. It was the hon. member who put himself in that class by rising on that point. As far as I am concerned, I will certainly vote against the amendment.

Mr. A.L.S. Brown (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, there is not much more I need to add, except that the wording of the amendment deplores the organizations and individuals who apparently take unto themselves, in the opinion of the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson), to advise the Wheat Board.

In this resolution before the amendment was proposed, there was no attempt to advise the Wheat Board. It was simply an attempt to bring to the attention of the Federal Government the necessity of undertaking certain acts. When he undertakes to deplore the actions of certain organizations, he must realize that he is not only referring to the C.C.F. He is referring also to the Wheat Pool, because year after year they have passed similar resolutions to this, asking that all grain be placed under a marketing system similar to the Canadian Wheat Board. The United Farmers of Saskatchewan have done a similar job. The Association of Rural Municipalities has done so at convention after convention, and if it is those organizations that he is deploring the actions of, I am going to suggest that he is not going to make himself very popular in that respect.

Mr. Loptson: — On a point of privilege again, Mr. Speaker. He is trying to construe that the amendment is preventing the Wheat Board from taking these other grains on. Let them take them on. I have no objection to them taking on other grains and handling them. Let them do it.

Mr. Speaker: — That is not a point of privilege. That is simply an argument.

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, in spite of the attempt of the hon. member to confuse us, it does not alter the fact that his amendment refers to the organizations such as the Wheat Pool, the Farmers' Union, the Association of Rural Municipalities, the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, the Canadian Federation of Agriculture; practically every organization in western Canada, practically every organization that is associated with agriculture on a national and provincial level — his amendment deplores the action which they have taken not only this year, but which they have consistently taken over the past number of years.

Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I am very interested in this amendment of the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson). We have been hearing a good deal about the two wings of the Liberal party. We have been hearing a good deal about who is really in charge of the Liberal party in this province, and I want to read the resolution that is before the House:

“That this Assembly, reaffirming full support of the Wheat Board system of marketing, requests that the Federal Government abolish speculative grain marketing by placing all grain under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a resolution passed by an august body meeting in November of last year in the province of Saskatchewan — No. 16.

Mr. Loptson: — That has got nothing to do with speculation.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — The preamble is as follows:

“Realizing the paramount importance in our economy of the great agricultural industry, the Saskatchewan Liberal party adopted the following programme respecting agriculture: (and here is No. 16)

“Endorsement of the Canadian Wheat Board as the best method of marketing grain and extension of the powers of the Wheat Board to include full control over the marketing of all grain.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is the clincher. Here is the Liberal party putting itself in the very position that is condemned by the hon. member for Saltcoats:

“And with adequate representation of producers on this and other such boards.”

Mr. Kramer: — How mixed up can they get?

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal party is still running on its split personality; its schizophrenia is showing. I suggest that the big battle we heard about on the hustings of

March 15, 1955

Saskatchewan in November, that the people of Saskatchewan were going to take control of the Liberal party and that they were going to kick out . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! I think the hon. member is out of order. We are not discussing the policies of the Liberal party here. We are discussing the amendment to a motion.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Will you read the amendment again, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: — Yes.

“And deplore the action of some organizations and individuals who continuously endeavour to advise the Board of the method they should follow in carrying out their selling policy which invariably would hamper their progress if carried out by them.”

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Well, Mr. Speaker, the amendment has advocated that this Legislature should condemn those people who give advice to the Wheat Board, and, as I understand that resolution, they are condemning all people who give advice to the Wheat Board, and I suggest that this Legislature is entitled to look to see who are the people that are being condemned.

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Who is condemning them.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — And the hon. member for Saltcoats is undoubtedly condemning the Liberal party in that amendment, because the Liberal party by its resolution No. 16 has put itself right under the gun of the hon. member for Saltcoats.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. member for Saltcoats has the prerogative of doing so.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I am going to oppose the amendment, because I think he is being very unfair to the Liberal party. I think that one very good reason why this House should oppose the amendment of the hon. member for Saltcoats is that, last November, there was some real hope that there might be a rebirth in the Liberal party, that it might shake off the shackles about it; there was some hope that the Liberal party had kicked out the ‘old guard’; there was some hope that the Liberal party had . . .

Mr. McCarthy: — Oh, you’re away out!

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — You can’t take it. There was some hope that the Liberal party was again going to represent the real hopes and aspirations of the people of this province. However, if what my hon. friend is now moving is the ‘new face’ of the Liberal party put on since Mr. Gardiner’s recent visit to Regina, a week ago Monday; if that is the new face of the Liberal party, then I think he owes an explanation to those Liberals who attended at Saskatoon and who passed this resolution which is almost word for word with the motion put on the Order Paper by the hon. member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst). I suggest that, in closing this debate, he offer his apologies to the Liberal convention.

Mr. J.W. Horsman (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, it seems very strange to me that the hon. member for Hanley (Mr. Walker) is so concerned about the welfare of the Liberal party. It seems to be most peculiar. He is not in the habit of that; just because one man gets up here and moves a resolution on an amendment that he does not like. Usually it is the other way around. Anything that is going to hurt the Liberal party is something that the hon. member for Hanley is always right behind. In this case, I would advise him to vote for Mr. Loptson's amendment, if he thinks it is going to do so much harm to the party.

Regarding the fluctuations on the grain market, I just want to say this: I am not sticking up here for the Grain Exchange, but if there were no grain exchange the price of wheat on the world market would still fluctuate, the price of all grains would fluctuate, because we cannot establish a price and hold it at any certain figure if we are selling on the world market. It is all right to sell it by the Wheat Board; but I cannot see, and never could, what harm the Grain Exchange would do there, because anybody who likes the Wheat Board would not have to use them unless they wished to do so.

What struck me as very funny was the concern shown by the hon. member for Hanley all of a sudden.

Mr. W.H. Wahl (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Mr. Speaker, I may be confused, but I understand that the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) is condemning the hon. member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) for posing as an expert, and what amused me about that . . .

Mr. Loptson: — I said he should take it over.

Mr. Wahl: — . . . was that he spent all afternoon posing as an expert. I have to admit I enjoyed that part of it. But, then, I see that the thing he is condemning, the Liberal party is condoning. So, I have decided that he must be the new leader of the Social Credit party.

The question being put on the amendment (Mr. Loptson), it was negative by 30 votes against 4.

The question being put on the motion (Mr. Dewhurst), it was agreed to unanimously.

The Assembly adjourned at 10 o'clock p.m., without question put.