

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
Fourth Session – Twelfth Legislature

12th Day

Friday, February 24, 1956

The House met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day:

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Minister of Education):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to draw the attention of members of the House to an honour which has been bestowed upon one of our citizens.

I refer to Dr. T. Thorvaldson, who has been made a Knight Commander of the Icelandic Order of the Falcon. Dr. Thorvaldson is dean emeritus of graduate studies at the University of Saskatchewan and director of the Saskatchewan Research Council. He is an international authority on the chemistry of cement.

In 1938, the Icelandic government awarded Dr. Thorvaldson the Knight's Cross of the Order of the Falcon. He has now received the higher order of Knight Commander.

I would like to pay special tribute to the great work of this man, who is from a different land and who has made such a tremendous contribution to our province.

**DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY**

The House resumed, from Thursday, February 23, 1956, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Brown (Last Mountain) for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

**Mr. C.G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale):** — In the Throne Speech last session, I put before this Legislature the amount of assistance for market roads and bridges received by the R.M.'s in the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale over the 20-year period from 1935 to 1954. I compared the 1935-44 10-year period of Liberal administration with the 10 years of C.C.F. government from 1945-54, so far as assistance to the R.M.'s was concerned.

The members will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the records show that the nine rural municipalities wholly or partially within the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale received, in the 10 years of Liberal rule, the total of \$20,235; and in the 10 years of C.C.F. Government a total of \$141,807 in direct grants for main market roads.

**February 24, 1956**

You will remember that I calculated the Public Revenue Tax which had been turned back to the rural municipalities in the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale. The total amounted to \$50,107 per year. For the two years of 1953 and 1954, this made a total of \$100,214 which when added to the direct grants made a total of assistance of \$242,021, which the nine rural municipalities received as a result of this government's action in the period 1945 to 1954. This amount when compared with the \$20,235 in aid from the Liberal administration during 1935-44 made a most creditable showing for the present C.C.F. Government of this province.

Figures were also given by me, Mr. Speaker, showing assistance given in repairing and constructing bridges. The total assistance over the 20-year period amounted to \$217,222. From that figure, Mr. Speaker, it would appear that we have in the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale almost as many bridges as roads. We have indeed a great many rivers and creeks and consequently there are a great number of bridges. It is my understanding, that one rural municipality in Melfort-Tisdale constituency, the rural municipality of Connaught No. 457, has more bridges than any other rural municipality in the province.

I remember informing the Legislature last session, Mr. Speaker, that of this \$217,222 spent for the repair and construction of bridges over the 20-year period, \$41,670 was expended in the Liberal period from 1935-44 and \$175,552 in the C.C.F. period from 1945-54. Mr. Speaker, I had shown that the amount for roads, for bridges and the return of the Public Revenue Tax received by the rural municipalities in the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale during that 10-year period of C.C.F. government amounted to a grand total of \$417,573 as compared to the total of \$61,905 received during the Liberal administration.

Mr. Speaker, I didn't mean to speak on this topic again this session, but after listening to the smug statements emanating from the opposite side of this Chamber to the effect that this Government is doing nothing for rural municipalities, I thought that I should not only repeat the figures, as I have done, but also that I should bring them up to date by showing what assistance has been given in the year 1955 to the nine rural municipalities situated wholly or partially in the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale. Perhaps by repetition of the facts some penetration may be achieved across the way, but at any rate I shall have given the facts to the general public and I have found that they are not as biased as those who sit on your left, Mr. Speaker.

The figures which I gave to the Legislature, last year, proved that a very great deal has been done for the municipalities of my constituency, and consequently throughout the province. The figures which I shall give this afternoon concerning assistance in 1955 should convince even the most sceptical that rural municipalities are being assisted in a worthwhile manner.

First, Mr. Speaker, the turning over of the Public Revenue Tax to the rural municipalities has meant a great deal of assistance to the municipalities as a whole. In the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale, alone, this means an increase in the revenue of the nine rural municipalities of \$50,106 each and every year. Compare this to the \$20,235 paid out by the Liberal administration in the 10-year period spread over nine rural municipalities.

And, Mr. Speaker, remember that the Liberal Government was collecting the Public Revenue Tax all during that time! They collected up to \$50,000 a year from the rural municipalities in the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale and returned to them the paltry amount of \$2,023 per year. And, this session, the members opposite have the gall to rise in their places in this Legislature and parrot the words of their Leader that “the C.C.F. Government is doing nothing for the municipalities.”

In one year this government, through the return of the Public Revenue Tax, has made available to the rural municipalities of Melfort-Tisdale an amount 25 times greater than the pitiful handouts the Liberals gave back to the rural municipalities – usually in election years. I can see that the opposition members are not impressed - \$50,000 to them is nothing. I am pleased to be able to say, Mr. Speaker, that my municipal friends in the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale do not agree with the views of the Opposition. My municipal people appreciate the \$50,000 in extra revenue each and every year.

That wasn't all the assistance received in 1955, Mr. Speaker – we have still the equalization grants. Our Liberal friends do not like equalization grants. I think it must be because they are arrived at by applying facts and figures to a formula; it might be that a formula in itself is very confusing to them. When the member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Dunfield) mentioned multiplying the 1952 equalization grant by  $3\frac{1}{2}$  and then subtracting the 1952 Public Revenue Tax, one got the idea that he was greatly confused before he had gotten halfway through the reciting of the formula. And when he arrived at nothing for the result, one knew for sure that he was certainly away off. Perhaps the confusion in which the Opposition appears to be may have some effect on the general public, so I will attempt an explanation of the equalization setup.

**Some Govt. Member:** — They will really be mixed up!

**Mr. Willis:** — Perhaps the member from Meadow Lake could give special attention. One of the first considerations of this Government, upon taking office was to devise a method of giving to each municipality in the province a grant based on the need of that municipality. This payment was called an equalization grant, and each municipality received the grant yearly as its right. The, in 1952, the Government decided to return to the municipalities the 2 mill Public Revenue Tax, mentioned previously. This threw out of line the equalization grant, so the government came up with the 1952-grant-times- $3\frac{1}{2}$ -minus-the-public-revenue-tax formula, in order to redistribute the amount paid out in such grants, on a more just and equitable basis.

Don't ask me to explain how the formula was arrived at. Such an explanation would only be more confusing to the members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. One thing is certain, the formula worked. First, the amount paid out over the province in 1953 was the same as had been paid out in 1952, and second, those municipalities with high assessments had a decrease in equalization grants, or had the grants cut off entirely, while those with

**February 24, 1956**

low assessment had an increase.

In the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale six of the nine municipalities have a high assessment in excess of \$4,300,000. These six have received no equalization grants since 1952. The other three with low assessments received an increase in the equalization grant, compared to 1952.

Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me, I will give two examples of how the formula applies. First, municipality No. 39 received an equalization grant of \$1,760 in 1952; 3½ times that grant is \$6,160. The 2 mill Public Revenue Tax yielded \$1,602 on an assessment of \$801,000. \$6,160 minus \$1,602 gives a new grant of \$4,558 for that municipality – a substantial increase over the grant which they had received in 1952 of \$1,760.

R.M. No. 429 received an equalization grant of \$740 in 1952; 3½ times \$740 is \$2,590. However, 2 mills on an assessment of \$4,100,000 yielded \$8,200, so this municipality has received no equalization grant since 1952.

Both of these municipalities are much better off than they were in 1952. R.M. No. 397 receives \$4,558 in grants, plus \$1,602 in former Public Revenue Tax money, or a total of \$4,397 more than in 1952. R.M. No. 429 loses the \$740 equalization grant it received prior to 1953, but gains \$8,200, a net improvement of \$7,460.

The officials of R.M. No. 397 are satisfied with their equalization grant of \$4,558 each year, and would be the first to argue with the member for Rosthern's statement that "equalization grants are not fair and equitable." And I am certain that the Councillors of R.M. No. 429, even though they are receiving no equalization grant, will admit that the redistribution of the grant is fair and equitable.

I wonder for whom the member for Rosthern, a municipal secretary by occupation, was speaking, when he claimed that "the equalization grant was not on a fair and equitable basis." Certainly, Mr. Speaker, he was not speaking for the R.M.s in the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale.

Mr. Speaker, returning to the question of aid in 1935, three R.M.s in Melfort-Tisdale . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural Resources):** — In 1955.

**Mr. Willis:** — In 1955, thank you, received equalization grants totalling \$8,284. Adding that \$8,284 to the \$50,107 Public Revenue Tax returns, one has a total of \$58,391 assistance to the nine R.M.s in the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale in the year 1955.

I point out, Mr. Speaker, that the R.M.s of Melfort-Tisdale have been receiving \$58,391 assistance in each of the past three years. This is a total of \$176,173 in three years as a result of the action of this C.C.F. Government.

Besides the aforementioned \$58,391 received by the R.M.s in the year 1955, there are special emergency grants received by our municipalities which I would also list. These are not regular grants and perhaps they detract from the value of this report. But, Mr. Speaker, as they were given by this Government to help our R.M.s in an emergency and probably will be given again under similar circumstances, I shall include them today.

There was excessive flooding in the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale in the spring of 1955. The damage to roads and bridges was assessed by the R.M.s and an inspector of the Department of Municipal Affairs and set at a figure of \$241,619. To assist in repairing that damage the Provincial Government made grants totalling \$70,289 to the nine municipalities. One of the municipalities received a maximum amount of \$15,000, another \$13,677, a third \$9,378, with the other payments ranging downwards to \$2,923, for a grand total of assistance to the municipalities of \$70,289, to help in repairing damage to roads and bridges. Then too, the R.M.s received in grants for the repair and construction of bridges, a total of \$23,050. Besides this, \$5,100 was made available for work-and-wages programmes in hard hit municipalities in the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale. The total assistance provided by this Government to these nine R.M.s to meet the emergency caused by last spring's floods was \$98,539. Total aid provided in 1955 was \$58,391 plus \$98,539 for a grant total of \$156,930. Mr. Speaker, that averages out at \$17,436 per municipality in the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale.

Surely now, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition will admit that something has been done by this Government for our municipalities.

There is other indirect assistance to municipalities by this Government, which can also be listed at this time, Mr. Speaker. The Speech from the Throne notes the expenditure of over \$1,600,000 on an emergency drainage programme undertaken to drain many thousands of acres of the worst flooded farm lands in the province. The Conservation and Development Branch of the Department of Agriculture undertook the blasting of shallow ditches to drain flooded acres where there were good prospects of a crop being sown in 1955. Under this so-called first phase of the programme there was estimated to be spent in the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale \$30,000 in money entirely provided by the Provincial Government.

Then under the second phase of the Construction and Development programme, namely, that of constructing main ditches for the development of natural water courses, it is estimated that there was spent by the Provincial Government in the Melfort-Tisdale constituency, \$72,880. These two programmes accounted for an expenditure of \$102,880 by the Department of Agriculture in the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale.

So, Mr. Speaker, in both direct and indirect assistance to the rural municipalities of the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale, we have a grand total expenditure of \$257,810 by this Government in the one year, 1955.

My hon. friends opposite do not need to come into the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale with the statement that this Government has done

**February 24, 1956**

nothing for the rural municipalities. You will have to wait in some other part of Saskatchewan, but in what part, I, for the life of me, cannot see.

Just for the sake of the records, Mr. Speaker, I procured figures of grants to R.M.s in a constituency which is presently represented by a Liberal member. The figures cover the 20-year period from 1935 to 1954. Outside of the fact that the total assessment of the rural municipalities is somewhat lower in this constituency than in Melfort-Tisdale, the results parallel each other. As a matter of fact, the Liberal constituency obtained a better equalization grant. Their equalization grant in 1955 totalled \$19,343 compared to the equalization grant of \$8,284 in Melfort-Tisdale.

How different this was back in the good old days of 1934-44 when the Liberals were in office. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, in the years 1935-38 Melfort had a Liberal member. Melfort's road grants were \$19,295 for the four-year period. Then Oak Valleau won the seat for the C.C.F. During the next six years the grants were only \$3,036. There wasn't a shortage of money, Mr. Speaker, during that period for in the figures here of this other constituency represented by a Liberal for the two terms, \$14,014 was paid out during the first term and \$11,942 in the second. But, today, grants are given under a fair and equitable equalization formula, under which we can have a constituency represented by a Liberal receiving twice as much equalization grant as the constituency of Melfort-Tisdale.

These figures for the Liberal-held constituency show the same pattern of grants during the first 10 years from 1935 to 1944. In election years grants were handed out; years of no election – no grant or a small grant. The second ten years from 1945 to 1954 show grants every year. It would be of interest to read this record of grants as received by the rural municipalities in this Liberal-held constituency.

In 1935 there was a grant of \$12,814 to the municipalities of this Liberal-held constituency. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there was an election that year. In 1936, the grant was nil. In 1937 the grant again was nil. In 1938, another election year, there was a grant of \$1,200. In 1939, a small grant of \$150.50. In 1940 the grant totalled \$717.02. In 1941 - \$750.00. In 1942, nil again; and in 1943, when there should have been an election, grants were \$5,425.60, and again in 1944, when the delayed election was finally held grants were \$4,900.

For the next ten years, under a C.C.F. Government there were grants every year. In 1945 - \$5,803 was paid to the municipalities in this constituency. In 1946 - \$5,739, 1947 - \$11,000, 1948 - \$12,000, and \$10,000 in 1949. Then \$8,000, \$10,000, \$16,000, \$15,000 and finally in 1954 \$17,631.

The total of grants for the first period under the Liberals 1935-44, is \$25,957. Under the C.C.F. for the 1945-54 10-year period the total is \$114,157.

Besides this, the return of the Public Revenue Tax yielded, in the two years 1953 and 1954, \$86,782, making a grant assistance of \$200,939, for the 10 years the C.C.F. were in office, as against the \$25,957 in grants during the Liberal regime. Grants from the C.C.F. Government were about 7½ times those of the previous government.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, the people in this constituency would think that something had been done for the municipalities even if their member cannot bring himself to admit that fact publicly!

In 1955, equalization grants plus the return of the Public Revenue Tax realized \$62,734 for the municipalities of this Liberal-held constituency. This \$62,734 in aid in one year, namely 1955, is 2½ times the total that the Liberals granted the same municipalities in the 10 years from 1935-44.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the record of assistance to this Liberal constituency could be duplicated in any constituency in the province. This is a record which does the C.C.F. Government credit and which certainly proves that this Government has done a great deal for the rural municipalities.

I would challenge the members sitting opposite to get the record of this C.C.F. Government's assistance to the rural municipalities – for each one's constituency' and then place the same before the people of their constituency in comparison with the record of the Liberals during 1935-44. Let the people judge whether or not something has been done for the municipalities by this government. The C.C.F. does not fear their verdict!

However, the opposition members do not appear to be interested in facts. They go about the province, and stand up in this Legislature, howling blue-ruin, telling all who will listen that this government has done nothing for the municipalities. It is time, Mr. Speaker, that the people in the constituencies presently represented by Liberals in this House were told the facts about assistance to their municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, the figures I have given re assistance for main markets roads apply to the constituency of Maple Creek which at the present time is held by a Liberal. I shall be pleased to forward this statement to the C.C.F. candidate in Maple Creek for use in the coming election.

**Some Govt. Members:** — He won't need it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Willis:** — Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, we could consider briefly aid to the municipalities in the future. In 1956 and thereon the municipalities will continue to collect for their own use the former Public Revenue Tax. The equalization tax will also be continued, in addition, the Provincial Government has announced in the Throne Speech its intention of spending \$25 million over the next 10 years in aiding the building of a 12,000 mile main market all-weather road grid system. The Throne Speech also states that there is to be a continuation of the drainage, reclamation and flood control programme

of aid an awareness of the needs of the municipalities and of the farmers of this province, and is exhibiting a willingness to assume new obligations to bring about the desired end of a more prosperous Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

**Mr. S.H. Carr (Rosthern):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the hon. member said, I didn't wish to interrupt him when he was speaking, the hon. member said I had stated that equalization grants were unfairly paid. I wish this House to know that I did not make that statement.

**Mr. R.H. Wooff (Turtleford):** — Mr. Speaker, the Golden Jubilee Celebration of Saskatchewan is now history, or as someone said, "it is behind us"; but yet, Mr. Speaker, I believe that that anniversary will bear fruit on behalf of Saskatchewan for many years to come.

I was pleased that so many communities in the Turtleford constituency took part in this Celebration. For one or two strictly rural communities the old community of Emmarville, which is my home community, and the history community of Fort Pit, I think put on very good programmes for strictly rural areas. It was amazing; it was entertaining, and it was delighting to see the unique ways in which different communities reproduced pioneer scenes. The experience, on the whole, of seeing people devote themselves so wholeheartedly to this anniversary was very gratifying.

It was also my good fortune, Mr. Speaker, along with the hon. member from Meadow Lake (Mr. Dunfield), to be present at Goodsoil on one of these Jubilee celebrations. There I unveiled a stone cairn marking one of the historic sites in the province. And I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I was very pleased to listen, on that occasion to the hon. member from Meadow Lake. Only having heard him in the House, I didn't realize that he could be so agreeable and so complimentary as he was on that afternoon, and in all seriousness, I wish to compliment the hon. member for his address that afternoon.

**Mr. R.A. Walker (Hanley):** — He wasn't acting like a Liberal then.

**Mr. Wooff:** — Following a very wet spring, the early part of the growing season in Turtleford constituency was exceedingly dry, especially for the late seeded crops; yet on the average crop returns were good in quantity and quality. However, there were a few areas where the drought was so severe that yields were very low for both grains and forage crops. Had marketing conditions been normal, the economic situation would have been as good as the 'two-way stretch' to which agriculture is being subjected. So far the prevailing situation is not good. the feed question has not become acute; if spring comes early I think most people will get by, if it is delayed there are going to be some serious trouble spots.



I am happy, Mr. Speaker, to note by the Speech from the Throne that the Government is continuing to pursue a bold imaginative programme, as progressive and all-embracing as revenues will permit.

In spite of many of the critical remarks of the hon. members opposite and in spite of the inaccurate, untrue and misleading statements from Liberal broadcasts, speeches and papers, the Power Corporation moves rapidly towards its 1956 goal of 40,000 farms electrified, and all the towns and villages in the province served. At the present time, we have almost twice as many farms electrified in the Turtleford constituency as there was in the whole of the province in 1944. I never could quite understand the workings of the old Liberal administration and the interlocking of the various departments and branches. In 1944 we had 144 towns and villages served by the old Commission, we had 136 farms electrified, and we had 135 miles of blacktop. If you add those three figures together, Mr. Speaker, you get a figure of 418. If you divide them by three, you get an average figure of 139. If you divide it by 35, the number of years that the Liberal Government was in power, you get three. Now I cannot decide whether that's an average of three towns and villages served by the Commission in a year, whether it's three farms electrified, or whether it was three miles of blacktop a year, but the thing that puzzles me more than that, Mr. Speaker, is that I have left over 34, and I don't know whether it's 34 power poles or 34 highway signs, or 34 mad farmers!

Now that is being absurd, being ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, but I maintain it is no more ridiculous, no further from the truth and just as logical as many of the statements that are constantly being made by the Liberal Party, and repeated with parrot-like precision even in the Turtleford constituency.

**Mr. Kramer (The Battlefords):** — By the P.F.A.A. people.

**Mr. Wooff:** — I have here two or three copies of broadcasts made by the official Opposition. I am going to read just a part from all three of them:

“The Liberal party in Saskatchewan will continue to work for better health services, wider benefits to the present hospitalization plan, which they pioneered in 1944.”

That is one; the next one refers to power:

“The socialist government of Saskatchewan is making large profits from its power utility and for years used these profits to cover up losses they incurred in tanning hides, and making shoes, etc.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe they have made profits, but regardless of rising costs, they have also built something over 3,000 miles of power line in this province and serve at the present time over

**February 24, 1956**

32,500 farms besides the towns and villages, and on no occasion, Mr. Speaker, have they ever used one dollar to cover losses incurred by any other Crown Corporation.

Now comes the best of all, even the Liberals are still laughing.

“When they (that is the C.C.F.) took over in 1944 we had 8,000 miles of all weather highways.”

The high tension power line from North Battleford to Glaslyn was not completed owing to the severity of early winter weather. Power service will be extended in 1956 to Glaslyn, Medstead, Spiritwood, Leoville and intermediate points, bringing power to an area long isolated.

Highway No. 55 is steadily nearing completion. The final lap, will, we hope, be contracted for this season. Its completion will give an all-weather road from White Fox via Prince Albert to Frenchmen’s Butte. There is an ever increasing mileage of municipal roads being gravelled, which we appreciate very much and rural municipalities are planning a new market road grid system – this in spite of the tears of the Leader of the Opposition. How they have loved the rural municipalities since taking up the position on your left, Mr. Speaker. You may add subdivision, you may talk in terms of ratio or percentage, it was still the same good old-fashioned goose egg, absolutely nothing.

I would like to turn to a very important issue, which I believe is fundamental to a well-ordered and secure society, namely, this relationship and mutual understanding of the problems facing both farmer and labourer, wage earner and agriculturist. If it were not a matter of vital concern certain groups would not spend so much time, money and effort to confuse the picture to feed inaccurate and untrue information to the press, the radio and from the public platform.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would consider this matter of vital importance because some people speaking in Western Canada tell the farmer his economic trouble is caused by wage demands of labour Unions, while in Eastern Canada the same speakers tell labour that their cost of living troubles are caused by the western farmers’ demand for International What Agreements, floor prices and parity prices.

We are constantly being told that strikes are to blame for dislocation of production and for the tremendous volume of unemployment; that Unions are responsible; that Trade Union legislation which protects labour and wagger earners creates abuses and makes labour arrogant and difficult.

Let us examine a few facts. First, however, let me say quite frankly I do not think labour is always right; I think they make excessive demands at times; some labour leaders are tough, but so are some farmers,

so are some employers, industrialists and financiers. Labour came up over a rough and thorny road, and wage earners know that eternal vigilance is the price of retaining any securities they may have won.

It is insinuated again and again that favourable labour legislation, what some people call biased labour legislation, creates strikes and industrial strife. Saskatchewan labour legislation is considered the most advanced in Canada, yet according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics there was less time lost in Saskatchewan through strike action during the nine years from 1945 to 1953, inclusive, than anywhere in the Dominion.

In 1953, for every day lost through strike, 96½ days were lost through unemployment; 71 days through sickness and eight days through accident; 171½ days lost through other causes. For each day lost through strikes employers could more than make up all time lost by strikes each year in Canada by eliminating just one day of unemployment.

Here again, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has failed to meet its commitments and responsibilities, when dealing with unemployment, one of the greatest menaces to a sound economic policy.

“More working time was lost in Saskatchewan by unemployment in just a single day of February, 1955 than was lost through strikes in the province for the whole of 1954!

“In Canada, during February of 1955, more time was lost in only three days of unemployment, than was lost in all of 1954 because of strikes!

“During the first three months of 1955, more time was lost from unemployment than from strikes in Canada during the first 50 years of this century!”

Labour is also blamed for favouring strikes rather than methods of mediation or conciliation.

“For 1952, the Honourable Milton Gregg, Federal Minister of Labour, said there were strikes in 69 instances out of a total of 7,000 union agreements in Canadian industry. In other words, strikes affected only one per cent of all union contracts.”

When some of them are investigated, Mr. Speaker, they are not strikes – they are lockouts.

Now, I would like to look at the other side of the picture, and that is the influence that wages have had on prices, especially the cost of farm machinery, which has been the nightmare of the western farmer. In 1945 wages and salaries took 42.4 per cent of the selling value of farm machinery

**February 24, 1956**

at the factory, but in 1950, five years later, labour costs had dropped from 42.4 per cent to 28.9 per cent. Certainly during that period, Mr. Speaker, wages had gone up, but so had the value produced by each worker. That value had gone up almost 50 per cent. In that five-year period, the cost of labour had gone down 13.5 per cent, and labour production had gone up 50 per cent, a very good picture so far as labour's responsibility was concerned in the production of farm machinery.

Now, let us look at the other side, that of the profits. Over an eight-year period, one machine company, after taxes, made a profit of no less than 170 per cent; another company from 1936 to 1951 had, after taxes and dividends, a total profit increase of 480 per cent. In the farm implement business as a whole, from 1945-50, operating profits increased by 338.5 per cent, but yet, Mr. Speaker, we have our Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde posing as friends of labour and farmer who go from each to west blaming the troubles of each of these groups one upon the other, but always protecting the real culprits by their silence.

I think many of you will remember the steel settlement, only last summer, across the border in the United States. I believe that settlement cost the steel producers of the United States something like \$220 million per year. But, Mr. Speaker, while there was never any evidence given that it was absolutely necessary to increase the price of steel to meet the increase in wages, the prices were advanced, not \$200 or \$300 million, Mr. Speaker, but a total of \$748 million.

Right here in this city and in this province this winter, bread went up one cent a loaf. There were no wage demands, there were no wage increases, and an actual decrease in the price of wheat. There were no headlines in the press, and we have never heard a word from the gentlemen opposite. As a farmer, Mr. Speaker, I feel that profit-hungry corporations and business executives are the real culprits in this eternal price squeeze, and they camouflage their identity by a constant babble about the cost of farm products and the rise in wages.

I think we have got to remember as farmers and as labourers that both groups are producers, both groups are consumers, but above all, Mr. Speaker, both groups are taxpayers and this must never be lost sight of.

During the last world war, when beef was rationed, it was rationed not because of the quantity of beef that was going overseas, but because never in the history of Canada had there been the buying power in the hands of the wage earners to buy beef in the quantities that they desired. That was the real reason for rationing beef.

A few days ago, the 'Country Guide' came on to our desks, and there is an article on the beef and hog industries of Western Canada, and in the opening paragraph, two factors are pointed out, two of the important factors, one is population, but the other thing they emphasize is that the population must have buying power if the producer of livestock is to make an adequate living. I say that the wage earner must be kept in a strong buying position if the farmer is to survive and our economy is to remain sound.

Home markets are becoming more and more important every year, as industry expands, as competition for world market increases. Another factor that we as farmers must never lose sight of is the transition that is taking place in our own industry. Fewer and fewer farmers are producing more and more of our food stuffs, which is suggestive not only of an expanding non-agricultural market but a growing wage earning group which is also carrying an ever-increasing share of our taxation. What would happen to our revenues from such sources as the sales tax and the gasoline tax, never to mention property taxes, should labour be reduced once again to a mere subsistence level? Hospitalization and educational services would be in grave danger of curtailment, if not utter collapse.

How having said that, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to infer that so long as wages are good, all is well, or that wage earners in any field should be out of line with other segments of society. The plea I make is that we as farmers and wage earners should never allow ourselves to be pitted against one another by the interests who gain by keeping up the family quarrel while they carry off their ever mushrooming profits. Always remember that the nation is in a much stronger position with money in the hands of everyone rather than millions of profits piled up in the hands of a few. The best insurance policy for a sound, stable economy is buying power in the hands of both the farmer and wage earners; these are the people, Mr. Speaker, who keep money in circulation.

I believe that right at the moment perhaps too many of us think only, and I wish to emphasize that, that we think only in terms of unsold wheat on the farms and of hog prices that are at floor levels, of our great reduction in the farm income; and well we might, but I think sometimes we forget to ask ourselves some of the reasons for the crisis that is upon us. These are terrific problems, Mr. Speaker, which have been allowed to develop to their present proportions through the failure of the Federal Government to take necessary steps to supply boxcars, to make payment for grain stored on the farm, perhaps to make as bold a bid for world markets for Canadian grain as they should have done. But, Mr. Speaker, the foundation for the farm crisis now upon us was first laid in 1945, when the Federal Government broke faith with the people of Canada following the election when they promised not to life price controls. The result of that shameful capitulation to the privileged and protected, pampered pets of the Federal Government for some time was hidden, first by the Korean War, and once more, as the old Hebrew Prophet Micah put it, "We sacrificed the fruit of our bodies for the sin of our souls", and secondly, by the tremendous defence programme, which gives an artificial boost to our economy.

But, Mr. Speaker, unceasingly, day and night, the buying power of the farmer and the wage earner, and the consuming public was being siphoned off as rapidly as possible for just as little in return as could be given the farmer. The farmer's costs of production far outran his income. Machinery, repairs, fertilizers, fuels, etc., are once again heaping mountains of debt upon the western farmer and small business man. Quite true, rural municipalities are finding the going difficult not because they have not been helped, but because any help given is constantly wiped out by increasing costs of services of all kinds.

**February 24, 1956**

Only yesterday, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. McIntosh) read back to the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) a portion of his 1948 address dealing with the return of the Public Revenue Tax, where he stated "give the rural municipalities the Public Revenue Tax, and we'll forget about grants." I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member made that statement without taking into consideration what his colleagues at Ottawa had done to him.

Hospital and School Boards find themselves in the same position today, while what could have been a reasonable pension today, is back at a \$20 buying level, and the Federal Government refuses to do very much to alleviate the result of its own broken promises, even though 70 per cent of all taxes collected in Canada go to Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, the price of coming into the world, the cost of living while we are here, plus the terrific price of passing out, will soon have reached the prohibition stage of this very exciting experience.

Some of the economic policies which bring justice, equality and opportunity to all segments of our society are important and essential if all our people are to be granted the right to develop their God-given talents for the benefits of themselves, their fellow men and their country. But, Mr. Speaker, there is another vital reason for concern over the injustices within our own borders. Canada is playing an ever-increasing role in international affairs. She is called upon to mediate, to advise, to pass judgment on world problems. Unless we set our own House in order we are in a very weak position to give advice to our neighbours. There is little use talking to a brother who has a splinter in his eye while we carry a 2 x 4 in our own. Let us not be fooled, important as defence measures may be; it is at best but a belated breathing spell giving us an opportunity to build justice, equality, and brotherhood into the warf and woof of national and international affairs. The alternative is to be blasted into eternity by the very so-called defences we have built.

I shall support the Motion.

**Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland):** — We have had some excellent speeches in this House and in this debate. Together with those who preceded me, I wish to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your long term of office; also to wish you well in your retirement, and I want you to know this House will miss you.

I particularly wish to congratulate the hon. Leader of the Opposition, as it is evident that he is becoming an excellent orator. If he has taken a course in public speaking, then it certainly has been worthwhile, as I did get considerable pleasure in listening to him, though there was little essence to his arguments. However, as to the arguments which he used in this House, they appear to be weak and sometimes too weak to be effective. I might suggest that he could take a special course in logic during the next four years when I suspect he will be relegated to his farm for at least one term.

Seriously, Mr. Speaker, it is surprising, when one considers that the hon. members opposite have political experience and ability, that they should fail so miserably in giving the Government at least some constructive criticism. To me they appear to be still living in the old horse-and-buggy days when politicians got elected by promising anything, anywhere, anytime.

I do not intend to say too much about the behaviour of the hon. members opposite and the Liberal candidates in the field, but I am duty-bound to point out that there is certainly too much inconsistency in their statements to the public.

Last fall, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and the former member from Melfort, who by the way, has indicated that he will be the Liberal candidate in Cumberland constituency, had a meeting at Heath Park. I think there were three other Liberals present from my constituency, any about a dozen from outside points. The rest of the people were supporters of this Government, I am told. While discussing the subject of the Saskatchewan dam at Heath Park, Mr. McDonald was alleged to have said these words: "What do you want a dam for – to bathe in?" He knew that the people in my particular area were concerned more about such things as wheat, farm prices, roads and northern development, and so he took the opportunity to say what he thought would please the people there. And yet, Mr. Speaker, on many and varied occasions he has said at other meetings, to please the ears of the people, how much he was in favour of the Saskatchewan dam.

What I cannot understand is how anyone in public office can underestimate the tremendous value of hydro, which could bring not only lower power rates to the rank and file, but provide a cheap source of power to industry which is most anxious to establish itself in our province. Mr. Speaker, when I say 'most anxious', I mean exactly that; because there is ample proof and indication that industry has confidence in the potentialities of this province, and it has confidence in this Government.

When the hon. member from Wilkie spoke over the CBC 'Provincial Affairs' series recently, he stated that a Liberal Government would give investors confidence and would give encouragement to people who had money to spend. In my opinion, this statement means very little, because during the long term of office of the Liberal Government, industry had no confidence, and was not encouraged to invest money in a province which was yearly adding to the provincial debt. Today there is confidence and there is encouragement, because of the excellent financing under the guiding hand of our Provincial Treasurer. Our financial standing on the lending markets is 'tops' and we can obtain loans at lower rates than most provinces in Canada.

Mining companies and other industrial firms have been negotiating to establish themselves in the heart of Canada, here in Saskatchewan. But there are a few things which every individual with common sense can easily recognize – difficulties and barriers to industrial expansion. First of all there is a discriminatory freight rate. Neither have we a cheap source of power, such as hydro or gas, near the industrial points, and we lack the means of transportation for heavy freight, such as railways and heavy highways in the areas where wealth exists.

How can you get cheaper power than through a hydro system? If they are going to do the things that they say they are going to do, and the things that we are trying to do, the only way that we can do it cheaply is through hydro power. If they want to do other things of that nature, and if they want to see development in the province of Saskatchewan, then they should speak for the Saskatchewan dam or any other hydro, wherever it may be, and there are other areas in Saskatchewan that have potentialities. I am referring to the Churchill are, and the Churchill River. For example, I have a recent clipping here which says that the member from Wilkie (Mr. Horsman) gave as his reasons for this prediction:

“Under a Liberal Government progress in the development of Saskatchewan’s natural resources in the next 50 years would rival farm progress made in the last half-century.”

He does not forget the last half-century; he does not want to say from 1944; this is according to Jack Horsman, Liberal M.L.A. from Wilkie. Mr. Horsman gave as his reasons for this prediction the fact that the Liberal Government would give investors confidence, and would give encouragement to people who have money to invest. What confidence can you give private investors if you are not going to get behind a project such as we have been discussing, such as the dam, where we will be in a position to provide industry with cheap power. What kind of confidence are you going to give them when you get out into another province and knock out your own province? And yet he says that under Liberal administration, we would have that confidence.

Another clipping that I have here is a statement made by the candidate for the Liberal seat in Yorkton, and I believe this clipping appeared just two days ago in the ‘Leader-Post’. He also attacks the Government, and it says the speaker criticized the compulsory car insurance policy and the \$200 deductible clause. Dr. Novak said he believed such insurance should be compulsory, but the owner should have the right to buy from whom he pleased.

“The same coverage can be obtained from other mutual companies at a much less rate, and that none of these companies sell a policy with a \$200 deductible clause”, he said. That is true, but if they did sell one with a \$200 deductible clause, I say they could not do it for the price we are selling our insurance today. I say this, Mr. Speaker, because it is the only insurance corporation (or if you want to call it a co-operative), where we don’t have to pay out dividends in cash to shareholders; we don’t have to have high salaries for managers and directors. That’s why we can give the cheapest insurance on the North American continent. I compared notes not long ago at Flin Flon, with an insurance agent who has an office on the other side. I said, “Look, what will it cost me for the same kind of insurance from a private company that I have here in Saskatchewan for \$45, which means the compulsory \$200 deductible and the package policy?” (As a matter of fact, it didn’t cost me that much, because being a good driver, I got my package policy for \$18.50). He quoted me, rightly or otherwise, that the same coverage I have here in Saskatchewan for about \$45 would cost me up to \$164 in Manitoba. Supposing he had said \$80. Compare that with the amount we are paying in Saskatchewan, and the reason we are getting that kind of coverage is because of the fact that it is a compulsory insurance. If we had it, as Dr. Novak said – he said, “it should be compulsory, but we should be able to buy it from private companies” – then why should the people of Saskatchewan, if it is going to be compulsory, be forced further to go to private companies and pay two or three times what they are paying today for their insurance coverage? That



is the question I would like to ask the hon. members on the other side of this House. They talk against compulsion, and yet they say, 'We believe it should be a compulsory insurance, but we are going to compel you a little bit more to go over to the private companies and buy your insurance there.'

**Mr. Danielson (Arm River):** — Who said 'compel' you to go? Who said that?

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — You did.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — He's your candidate (Dr. Novak) and he must know what your platform is.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That's absolutely untrue!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to indulge in politics at this time. I would like to discuss some of the things that affect my constituency; some of the things that have been done in the past few years, and some of the things I hope will be carried out in my constituency. I feel, as I have said on a number of occasions, that my duty as a representative in this House is not only to stand by and back the Government in whose philosophy I Believe, but stand up and speak for my constituency, and I shall continue to do so as long as I continue to sit in this House.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! The hon. member for Arm River has used an expression here that is not allowed. You cannot accuse a fellow hon. member of telling an untruth. You told him to tell you the truth, implying that he was lying. 'Tell the truth', you said.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, I asked him who said that we were going to compel . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — I heard you call across the floor and say, 'Tell the truth'.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Yes, I did. I wish he would . . .

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I read the article in 'The Leader-Post' and I mentioned Dr. Novak from Yorkton.

**Premier Douglas:** — It's the Liberal Party's policy to make it compulsory; everybody knows that.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I'm sorry that probably the hon. member from Arm River couldn't follow me because I am a fast speaker, but I hope I make more sense in what I say than he does when he gets up.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like, as I said, to touch upon some of the things that I know about in the north. I would like to speak a little on natural resources. I wish to compliment the Government, and particularly the Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank) for having completed the inventory of the forest area in my constituency. I notice by the recent report that the inventories have been completed up to the 55th parallel north. I also notice in a report publicized in the press, we are now certain that we can sustain at least four pulp mills, and of that I am sure all the members in this House are glad, too.

**Mr. Lopton (Saltcoats):** — You can't even get one.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I notice, according to the Speech from the Throne:

“During the past year the forest inventory was completed from the area south of the 55th parallel of latitude. Negotiations are proceeding for the establishment of a substantial new forest industry, which will further increase our forest utilization. The production of fur continues to occupy a place of importance in the economy of the northern part of our province, and last year a record was established in the number of beaver and muskrat caught.”

I am not concerned at the moment with the fur, but I am glad that we know of the forest potential that we have in Saskatchewan, because under former administration there were no records to indicate to private industry, or to co-operative industry, or even to the Government, what we had. Now we know what we've got, and we know we can have four pulp mills.

I would also like to compliment the Government for having set up a Crown Corporation such as the Saskatchewan Forest Products Corporation, because in the past two years, in particular, our farmers have suffered both in crop failures and also in the marketing of whatever little grain they had, or cattle, or other products. They have found an opportunity to go into the forest and supplement their meagre incomes by work there. I notice in the report here that this Government, instead of buying the product from British Columbia as the former government used to do, had produced, in 1954-55, some 120,097 poles, that is power and telephone poles. I would like to point out to this House that these poles were produced by people of Saskatchewan at fair wages and at a time when they needed the jobs most.

At this time I would like to dwell briefly on the fact we are trying to harvest the timber that we have left to us – the little that we have left to us after the exploiters removed most of it during the Liberal regime. Yes, that's true. There were years when hundreds of millions of board feet of lumber were taken out of northern Saskatchewan (and if the hon. members are willing to listen, sometime I'll tell you about it) away back in the beginning of the century; the beginning days of Saskatchewan. But I am not interested in that at the moment. I am trying to point out that we are gradually beginning to produce a little more lumber; to point out in this report, for 1954-55 the total produced is 81 million.

From the Speech from the Throne, I understand that negotiations are underway for the establishment of some forest industries. I am quite certain that the Government will give every inducement and special consideration to any of these companies, and the only thing that can hold them back is the things I have mentioned previously.

There has been much talk and criticism in connection with the dropping of the option by Anglo-Canadian Pulp Company who have established themselves, I think, in Ontario. I would like to point out to the hon. members of this House that there was a Return tabled, at my request, two years ago, and in this Return were all the terms and conditions of the option. It must be noted that if these terms were more generous and if we had conceded more, it would have meant losing all revenues from dues. I am quite satisfied the only reason the company dropped its option is because of the high transaction costs of freight.

In my travels through my constituency last summer, I ran into scouts from major paper companies at Candle Lake and also at La Ronge. In my short talks with these people I was happy to hear that they had assessed the forest wealth north of Prince Albert as some of the best in Western Canada. My impression was that these gentlemen were certainly interested in the potentialities for a pulp mill in that area, and I am quite satisfied that, if they can work out the problem of transportation, even if it means hauling the raw craft pulp out of the plant to the American markets by truck, we may expect an early agreement. Certainly I will not be surprised to hear, one of these days, an announcement by the Minister of Natural Resources that an agreement or option has been entered into between the Government and some major pulp company.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to this House that the Government has been doing everything possible to encourage industry in this province. But I will say this, if private enterprise delays too long and considers high profits as most important, then the only action that will be possible will be for the Government to empower the Saskatchewan Forest Products to venture into pulp production. I hope that the people of Saskatchewan will give greater encouragement to this Government to take such action. Although it is true that the convention, this summer, did suggest that the Government continue to make research in this direction, yet we need more support.

The pulp business is one of the most profitable in Canada today. I have made some research, and I find that pulp companies make from 25 to 35 per cent net profit, before paying corporation taxes. If one takes the price of \$160 as the probably price for a ton of craft pulp f.o.b. shipping point, which ton is in effect equivalent to two cords of pulpwood, then one can easily calculate the profit from \$40 to \$50 a ton, or \$10 to \$15 on a cord of pulpwood. I believe the only difficulty facing such an industry, if operated as a public venture, is markets, because the pulp industry is privileged to be a monopoly, and monopolies are hard to fight.

I would like to inform you, Mr. Speaker, that the Stanford Institute of Research, which is not connected with any pulp or paper company, indicates in this report here that the demand for craft pulp will be double in 25 years what it is today. Prices, too, are certain to stay at a profitable point, and it seems to be important (maybe I should say, urgent) that this Government get into a partnership with a pulp company, if it is considered inexpedient or unwise to have the proper Crown Corporation make the complete hurdle.

I believe such an arrangement is working very well in certain Scandinavian countries, and it may be very worthwhile to do likewise. I say this, Sir, because whether we have this Government returned or any other government, it is certain that in this day and age we must find other sources of revenue to provide the many services, which have been discussed in this House, for our citizens. Even the Leader of the Opposition, were he so fortunate as to get his group into the government, could wisely explore this possibility.

What surprises me is the lack of constructive criticism that

**February 24, 1956**

is the prerogative and duty of any Opposition. I ask the hon. members opposite, if they think they have a better policy or programme than is indicated by the Throne Speech, why don't they tell this Government and the people of Saskatchewan what that alternative is? If, in their opinion, it is better for the people that we throw our valuable Crown Corporations 'out the window', why not tell us instead of just criticizing and witch-hunting? If they believe in a different power or gas policy, why not print out the alternative they have to offer? If they don't believe it is in the interests of the people of Saskatchewan to give labour some of the rights under our legislation, then tell labour what they would do instead of referring to Union leaders as 'gangsters' and labour organized unions as 'Communists'.

If they believe that it is in the interest of our Saskatchewan community to sell the forest wealth to private enterprise to contractors at a set price or by bid, then let them tell the people how they would handle our natural resources. If they believe, as free enterprisers do, that we should open the doors to competition for the exploitation of our natural resources and our heritage, then let them tell the people of Saskatchewan that they would throw opportunity open for speculators and their free-enterprising friends.

If they believe that compulsory car insurance is good, but that it would be better if the private insurance companies competed for the business our car owners, then why not say so? They will then be consistent, and either win popular support or go down to defeat on principle.

If the Leader of the Opposition and his supporters have a platform, I think it is fair that the people of this province should know what that platform is.

I would like to know if the Liberal Party proposes to turn over the Saskatchewan compulsory insurance to the insurance companies, and whether it will curb free speech and association by civil servants.

I do not propose, Sir, to go over ground that has been covered in this debate, but I would like to mention that there have been many changes in our legislation that have been of tremendous value to our people. I recall a number of years ago, before we had The Farm Security Act, how farmers were evicted from their homesteads by mortgage companies; I will say that some of these mortgage companies' directors were members of this Legislative Assembly. This Government made certain that none would lose his home, and I suppose the hon. member from Rosthern (Mr. Carr) would say that such legislation is Communistic, because, Mr. Speaker, he made it clear that by helping farmers we were doing the same thing as was being done in the Soviet Union.

I presume that when this Government tried to assure Saskatchewan trappers a decent income by bringing in a programme of wildlife conservation and compulsory marketing of muskrat and beaver so that the middle man, the profiteer of the primary producer, could be eliminated, that it too was Communistic. They forget, Mr. Speaker, that this was an

arrangement between the Federal and Provincial Governments, and that the agreement had a purpose, and it was a good purpose.

It is true that, in line with the representations of many trappers and because our conservation purposes had been achieved, we have thrown the market open to the trappers. Yet it is just as true that, in some cases, trappers are at the mercy of the fur traders who know only one thing – profit and exploitation of humanity.

In my constituency, Mr. Speaker, I have a most versatile area. I have the farming community, the forest community, communities where people trap and fish for a living, and I have mining. This Government has done considerable for these people. It has even gone along to the point that when it knew it was best for them not to take the steps they did, yet in order to be democratic and to accede to the wishes of these people, they have done things that probably were not the wisest choice. I think it is correct to have done it that way, and I am referring at the moment to the opening of the Fur Marketing Service.

I would just like to mention, though, for the benefit of the members why, as I said last year, the compulsory fu-marketing was better than having it open, except for the fact that we are always hearing this saying, ‘Well, we want to be free’. I don’t know who wants to be free in a situation like this. Last fall, I met a gentleman at Montreal Lake who had caught on his trap-line two blanket beaver which should have sold at any market for \$25 to \$30 a piece. This man was pressed for money, had to have a bag of flour as he has a large family. He sold these two pelts at \$8 each. Blanket beaver, Mr. Speaker! That’s what free enterprise will do for the trapper – rob him of his last penny! This man had six small beaver, cubs as he called them. He was offered less for these beaver than for a muskrat - \$1 a piece. I said, ‘What did you do?’ He said he decided he would not sell those six beaver cubs, but would send them to the Fur Marketing Service. He got over \$5 a piece for them, net, by selling them to the Fur Marketing Service. There’s the difference between compulsion and free enterprise: \$5 to \$1!

**Mr. Loptson:** — He got that from a private dealer, eh?

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — That’s right, from a private dealer he got \$8 for a \$25 or \$30 beaver! This same kind of discrimination has been going on in the north all along, and all we have been trying to do is to try to rid that area of discrimination. If you want to know something about it, I will take you just for one moment back to 1929 and 1930, when I was up in that northern country. The hon. member from Meadow Lake knows this is true. When I bought a bag of flour up at Stanley in 1929, I paid \$7.50 for it, and when an Indian came in, or a Metis, he paid \$15 for the same bag. When I paid 10 cents for a chocolate bar, the Metis was asked to pay 20 cents. Discrimination of the worst kind! I asked the trader (he’s dead now, a fine old gentleman too): “How come that you charge the Metis \$15 for a sack of flour, and me only \$7.50?” He said, “Well, we have two prices, one for the Indian and one for the white man” – as if we had two kinds of Canadians in this country.

**Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek):** — And yet you call him a fine, old gentleman.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — He worked for a company, and had no choice. As far as

himself is concerned . . . and I could tell you about others. There were natives working for these companies and they had to do the same thing or lose their jobs. They were doing no more than you do when you are dictated to from Ottawa.

**Mr. Cameron:** — That really was a smart one!

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like also to commend the Government on the service they have for tourists. The publicity which has been given to the resource of this province has been remarkable. I understand from the Tourist Branch that they are getting about 100 letters a day, inquiring about the possibilities of fishing and sport in Saskatchewan. When somebody sometimes gets up and says, why do you spend that money for? I say it is well worthwhile. The films that the Government has, I have just forgotten the names of these films; but I understand that they too have had tremendous circulation throughout many of the States of the Union. I think it is a fine thing for those people to come here and spend their money here. We like them and they like us, and I hope we continue to expand the programme for the tourists.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak (Minister of Telephones):** — The Liberals want an iron curtain around Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — I want to point out one other thing in my constituency, and this time I am going to make a suggestion to the Government., Back a few years ago, up in the north, taking my constituency and the constituency of the member from Athabasca (Mr. Ripley), we have three outpost hospitals that were built by this Government, and I have found they are modern in every way. I wish to congratulate the Government for having considered the people who have difficulty finding that kind of accommodation. I understand another hospital will be built shortly down at Pelican Narrows, and I am sure the member from Athabasca should be very happy about that.

But I want to talk about a hospital that the Liberals built away back in 1941 – I'm not sure of the date. This building is a rambling, one-storey, un-insulated log structure, and it has for a basement a cellar that is full of water most of the time in the summer.

**Mr. E. Walker (Gravelbourg):** — Is that your hospitalization programme, Danny?

**Mr. Berezowsky:** — It was not until 1954 that anything was done, and I think probably the Government wasn't too much aware of it. An X-ray was installed, and a generator to provide electricity.

Now the suggestion I wish to offer to the Government is this: there are quite a number of people in Cumberland House and the surrounding area, and they have no way of getting to a decent hospital. When you have a hospital like that, it is a wonder that we have a staff that will stay. We have a very fine, a remarkable staff. They have never complained; but people have complained to me, this year, and when I looked into the situation I thought they were certainly justified in asking that the Government sponsor a new hospital. I suggest to the Minister of Public Health (Hon. Mr. Bentley) that as soon as possible, if we are to consider that community as you have considered other communities in Saskatchewan, we get a hospital

at Cumberland House to meet the needs of the people there.

One other thing I would like to suggest to the Government, though probably I should not do it at this time, but I may not have another opportunity. First of all, I wish to congratulate the Minister of Highways for the excellent bit of road that was built for the people in around Flin Flon. There exists a very bad situation, though. There is a short stretch from Creighton down to Flin Flon which is as heavily travelled, I believe, as No. 1 is out of Regina. For the life of me I cannot see how it is that we haven't had any more accidents than we have had on this stretch of road. The only solution to that, I think, is building it up a bit and probably putting on black-top to keep down the dust. They have asked, of course, for me to make representation for similar work at Phantom Lake. The Minister knows all about it, but I think that I should mention it in this House. Although I recognize all the nice things that have been done, I still think I should speak up for my constituency, and suggest what I think should be done there. I will not forget, of course, that we need a road to Flin Flon from Prince Albert, as well.

My people are quite happy about power. There are some that are too poor to be able to afford it at this time. Had the Power Corporation come in two or three years ago, probably all the farms would now be electrified. But I do know the people in my constituency appreciate what the Government is doing in regard to supplying power throughout their area.

The best way for me to express my views would be to quote from an article written by Robert Tyre, 'Power Comes to Rural Saskatchewan', taken from the Canadian Geographical Journal, February, 1956, in which he says:

"It was in 1929 that the principle of public transmission and distribution of power was established in Saskatchewan with the creation of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. It began operations with a staff of four people and no power plants, no transmission lines, and no distribution systems.

"Starting from nothing, the power utility in 25 years built an organization which maintains 30,000 miles of power lines, serves 120,000 customers, and employs 1,200 people. It operates steam-generated plants at Estevan, Saskatoon and Prince Albert, and 12 diesel plants in other parts of the province. Net kilowatt hours distributed by the utility last year totalled more than 500,000,000.

"In February, 1949, the year The Rural Electrification Act was passed, the status of the Saskatchewan Power Commission was altered to make it a Crown corporation. The Saskatchewan Power Commission was retained as a regulatory body to deal with the operations of those municipal utilities still functioning in the province. And as a corporate property, the Saskatchewan Power Corporation thus became the main utility in the province dealing with the production and distribution of electrical service."

”Rural Saskatchewan is delighted with its new electrical way of life and the Saskatchewan Power Corporation was delighted to receive this tuneful tribute to incandescent light from one of its farm customers – a parody on the song “When You and I Were Young Maggie”:

“Ah, but something I saw on that hill, Maggie,  
Just made me stop and stare,  
There are poles to be seen on the hill, Maggie,  
And wires are strung everywhere.  
For power has come to the hill, Maggie,  
And lights up the homes all around.  
Many changes we’ve seen in our time, Maggie,  
But this is the best that we’ve found.

CHORUS

“For power has come to the hill, Maggie,  
And lights up the homes all around.  
Let us sing of the days that have come, Maggie,  
With far yards a gleam like the town.”

I should contribute a few words on the wheat marketing problem, Mr. Speaker.

Although, as was pointed out by various speakers on this side of the House three years ago, this House voted unanimously on a resolution for cash advances, yet today, for some reason known only to themselves, they have betrayed the farmers into the hands of the loan sharks. It is argued, as was argued Wednesday by the hon. member from Rosthern (Mr. Carr), who should know better, that the farmers are not entitled to be paid; that they should accept the status quo and be at the mercy of federal policies in regard to wheat; that the farmers are not to be paid their wages, but should wait for payment for their product until the grain is marketed, and until the elevator companies eat up most of his wages in storage costs.

Well, the farmers look at the situation from a different viewpoint. They are demanding the same kind of consideration as is given the mining companies who must deliver ore to the Federal Crown Corporation, Eldorado Mining and Refining. The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that this is an industry which stockpiles ore, uranium ore, and as soon as the ore is delivered, the companies are immediately paid for the product. No storage is charged against the producing mines, and no one tells these mining companies that they must wait to be paid until the product is sold on the world market, or to the countries who have an agreement with Canada. They are paid for the product. Labour is paid by the companies, and it is unnecessary for the producers to go to a bank and borrow at the bank rate, in order that they may continue to operate. As a matter of fact, if payment was not made, these mining companies could not carry on the producing of ore. No more can a farmer continue to produce, because he has creditors also, and should be paid for his product, or his wages, if you prefer to call it so.

This game of protecting ‘big business’ is sickening, Mr.



Speaker. Only a few weeks ago the price of bread jumped one cent a loaf all across this country. There was no increase in wages; the price of wheat had not gone up; there was absolutely no reason for the increase. The amazing thing was that the price was raised by the companies on the same day, and for the purpose of getting one more pound of flesh by Shylock. The same story repeats itself daily. Tires, machinery, gasoline, or whatever it may be, have been going up and up and up, and yet the members opposite refuse to recognize that a government has responsibilities towards its people, and will say in this House that we should have no controls.

What do they represent, anyway – monopolies or the people who placed their faith in them to legislate for justice? Mr. Speaker, when the member from Redberry (Mr. Zipchen) suggested that the hon. members opposite will likely be relegated back to their farms, or businesses after the next election, I think he was absolutely correct, unless the people of this province, and in the constituencies presently represented by the opposition members, don't know what is good for them. There is a limit to how much people can take. If it is otherwise, then none will be to blame for continued discrimination except the electorate, which has the power in its hands. Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

**Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River):** — Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take up much time of the House, but there are one or two things that should be said in this debate.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I wonder why the Government side are so jittery this year. They are nervous. You can't say anything from the Opposition benches but what they all jump up and start talking. They are really nervous . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — No, the only difference is that we are alive on this side.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Now we come, Mr. Speaker, to the question of power and the South Saskatchewan dam.

**Mr. E.H. Walker (Gravelbourg):** — Jimmy Gardiner's swimming hole!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Now Junior, you be quiet. It is a funny thing that the C.C.F. should talk so much about power and the South Saskatchewan dam which they, or I should say one of their engineers, had so much to do with holding it up.

**Premier Douglas:** — No, no.

**Mr. Danielson:** — You know, Mr. Speaker, that one of the engineers hired by this Government (and I am not saying anything against him; as a matter of fact, I think he is a very good engineer – Mr. David Cass-Beggs) took a look at this thing, and, because he was an engineer, he was concerned with whether it was an economical proposition, and he told, in his report that this was primarily an irrigation proposition. Now, if it is purely an irrigation proposition . . .

**February 24, 1956**

**Premier Douglas:** — Not purely – primarily; you misunderstood the words.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, as I said, primarily, but you cannot expect the Federal Government to go ahead until they are satisfied that it is a good proposition and that it should take priority over things that have to be done in other parts of the country. And so they decided to take a second look at the South Saskatchewan dam project.

Not long ago, Mr. Cass-Beggs discussed the cost of developing hydro electric power before the Saskatchewan Association of professional engineers. He talked about the South Saskatchewan dam and Island Falls and the Churchill River, and, Mr. Speaker, I say that Mr. Cass-Beggs' view on the South Saskatchewan project was the biggest knock it has ever received.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we all know that power is important; and surely, if we need power that badly this Government has some responsibility for taking up the slack. They should build power plants or build the dam, if it is going to be used just for this province.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — How many kilowatt ours does it generate?

**Mr. Danielson:** — That's all right, you fellows . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — It's the truth.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, there is no one in this Power Corporation with the influence and with the knowledge of the subject that Cass-Beggs has, who has ever made a statement like that. I might say so, and Mr. Minister of Agriculture, even, might say so, but nobody would take any notice of us; because we don't know. But here is an expert, and a very eminent expert, telling the people of Saskatchewan . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — The truth.

**Mr. Danielson:** — The truth – and telling the Dominion of Canada the truth.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Right.

**Mr. Danielson:** — And he is you own employee . . .

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Well, that is correct.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, then, what are you belly-aching about? There is nobody that spoke any more plainly against the construction of the Saskatchewan River dam than Cass-Beggs did. That's what he did.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — The whole world knows how much of that . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — But there is another peculiarity in connection with this, Mr. Speaker, and that is the amount of money that this Government is willing to throw into that project. They are talking about \$60 million, \$70 million and \$80 million, and they have all kinds of money. The Minister of Highways (Hon. J.T. Douglas), just previous to the last election, said, “I will spend \$75 million before the next election on highway construction in the province of Saskatchewan.” And I think probably he will have spent that amount. But when our Leader comes out and mentions that we, if we are elected as the Government in this province are going to spend a few dollars, he says, “Where are you going to get the money?” And these fellows stand up here with a typewritten manuscript before them, trying to convince that there isn’t any money. There isn’t any money at all!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — He promises \$100 million a year.

**Mr. Danielson:** — This Government, Mr. Speaker, has never told the people how much money they are spending. It had a budget, this year, of \$82 million. The money they have spent, this fiscal year, amounts to \$160 million, and I can look the Provincial Treasurer in the face and tell him that.

Net Revenue - \$79,972,000 – practically \$80 million . . .

**Mr. Walker (Hanley):** — Out of \$160 million!

**Mr. Danielson:** — . . . Reimbursement Revenue, \$11,016,000; Net Capital, \$19,813,000; Increase in Advances: to Power Corporation, \$24,000,000; to Telephones, \$12,000,000; Dominion Health Grants, \$1,954,000 (that is almost \$2 million); Hospitalization Tax (which should be put through the House in connection with these Estimates) \$8,795,000 – and there is your \$160 million! These fellows are pulling the wool over the eyes of the people of this province. They haven’t voted the money, but they are handling it in from the Treasury into this Finance – into what you call the Finance – into that ‘hole in the corner’, and he puts it out and takes back and moves it back and forth. But this is the money, this is the money, and he cannot deny one nickel of it; but when we say that we are going to do something, he says, “Where are you going to get the money?” Well, Mr. Speaker, I don’t think he needs to worry about that because if his Government, extravagant and incompetent as they are, have been able to fleece enough money out of the people of the province of Saskatchewan to carry on their operations, then I am sure that we could never pick a poorer bunch of Liberals in the province of Saskatchewan who would dare exceed that; and they would do a better job, cutting down on overhead and expenses, and they would render more services to the people of Saskatchewan.

This bunch is getting no better fast, Mr. Speaker. They are getting worse every year. I can’t think what is wrong with them, but after all, it’s getting close to election time . . .

**Mr. Lopton:** — Finding out their sins.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Yes, I was going to say that. And the day is coming when

**February 24, 1956**

blowing off and knocking the Liberal Party and talking about things that happened during the 'thirties' isn't good enough. That is about worn out, Mr. Speaker.

I had a letter from a certain individual in my seat, a few days ago; and I think it is one of the nicest letters I have ever got . . .

**Some Govt. Member:** — That was before you spoke.

**Mr. Danielson:** — It is brief and to the point, Mr. Speaker. I take full responsibility for this letter and I am going to read it to you:

“Dear Mr. Danielson: Will you please remind the C.C.F. opposition in the House that they are not the Federal Government . . .”

**Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg):** — But they are the Government.

**Mr. Danielson:** — “. . . and I hope they have more concern for provincial matters and let the Federal members take care of Federal issues. To listen to Mr. Douglas he is trying more to solve Federal and International matters than our own affairs.

“Here are some of the problems I would ask him to get busy on before he tackles Federal matters.

“I cannot deliver 800 bushels of wheat out of 1954 crop . . .”

**Mr. Erb (Milestone):** — Why? Why?

**Mr. Danielson:** — “I cannot deliver 800 bushels of wheat of the 1954 quote, because the roads have been blocked the last three months, and this is along the highway.”

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — What quote was that from?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — He's in terrible shape.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Here is what he says, too:

“I have eight pigs. They were ready for market two months ago and I cannot get them to market until the road is open.

“I have 75 roosters – spring chickens last spring, but will have to be sold as roosters next spring.

“I am paying for a licence and insurance for 12 months and using it for six months.

“Regarding power, I cannot give any party credit for anything that they do with my money.”  
(There is no Government in power that ever existed that should get any credit for taking the people’s money and making them pay before they get the power.)

“I cannot give them any credit for anything they do with my money, when I pay in advance for things. On paying for my line, if the group does not collect enough money to build our line, we do not get the power.

“I do a little custom work and if I get power I will have to have a business meter for my shop which is closed six months of the year on account of the roads. I would also need a meter for my house. For the two meters it would cost be about \$30 a month in the summer.

“Now Mr. Fines may be able to afford these things, but not me. I think I will continue to use the C.C.F. wind for my windcharger.”

Mr. Speaker, you know we have heard so much about the gifts we have been getting from this Government. But you know there is a bad taste left in your mouth when you know you have paid for all these things. There never was a government, nor will there ever be one – and I think the people of Saskatchewan have brains enough to know that – that ever gave the people anything. The people pay for these things! And if they do not pay in advance, they pay afterwards.

**Mr. Howe (Kelvington):** — You are going to give them power for nothing.

**Mr. Danielson:** — But to get back to what I was saying – no government ever gives the people anything.

**Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek):** — The people pay for it and you fellows take the credit.

**Mr. Howe:** — There is a difference in using the money to the advantage of the people.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Shame!

**Mr. Danielson:** — I don’t mind these interruptions, Mr. Speaker, let them have all the fun they can. You see, Mr. Speaker, it is beginning to hurt; they can’t take these truths I am trying to tell them.

**Some Govt. Member:** — It is a big load to swallow.

**February 24, 1956**

**Mr. Danielson:** — But I do think, Mr. Speaker, that if we are going to do these things with the people's money, then the people should know that they have to pay for them; and they should know how much the things are costing. Of course, Mr. Speaker, the people are interested in how their dollars are spent.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — What about your wooden nickels?

**Mr. Danielson:** — We could do more with wooden nickels than you ever thought of.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — What a fine dream!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — There is another thing, Mr. Speaker, and that is the power that this Government has given to some of their Boards and their officials. People do not have any recourse from their judgments; they can do just about what they like. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the laws should protect the citizens.

**Mr. E. Walker (Gravelbourg):** — What about the income tax department?

**Mr. Danielson:** — You C.C.F.ers always talked so much about the income tax inspectors, you can just listen to this for a while.

And when they do get the big revenues they have been getting for the past twelve years, Mr. Speaker, they put the people's money into all kinds of socialistic dreams.

**Mr. Lopton:** — Fooling around with the people's money.

**Mr. Danielson:** — But whether they get the money from this tax or that tax, or whether it comes in from royalties or from businesses, it is all the people's money — and sometimes even the people on your right, Mr. Speaker, realize that there is just so much money to go around.

I recall the Resolution that was brought in with regard to our old-age pensioners at the C.C.F. Political Convention in Saskatoon in July, 1955. In discussing this matter there was a resolution asking for more money for the old-age pensioners, and speaking to the resolution was Premier T.C. Douglas. He told the delegates, "anybody can pass a resolution calling for the spending of more money, but the fact remains that you cannot provide additional services until the funds are available. If you increase one service you must decrease another." Now that was quite a concession to make, because he was going to do everything without money and without price. This is what the Premier said:

"To make money available there are three alternatives; you increase the taxes, you cut down on the services of another Department, or you spend the money only as you develop your resources."

He suggested that the latter alternative was the only reasonable action.

Replying to Mr. Douglas' statement that by raising old-age pensions the Government would have to cut down in other Departments, one delegate asked, "What is more important – fancy museums, or our pioneers?" Now that is one thing – there are some people in the C.C.F. who still have their balances with them and they are able to tell right from wrong and they think that first things should come first, Mr. Speaker, particularly from a government who have dedicated themselves to 'humanity first'.

Now then, what is the condition with regard to our mental hospitals? Last year we had a report on the floor of this House, Mr. Speaker, from the John Howard Society, telling about the deplorable conditions in the gaol out here. There is the man sitting over there laughing, and I think he should go out there and familiarize himself with the conditions out there, because he can't find out any other way; but that was last year. This time, after a regrettable and very serious incident had happened at Weyburn Hospital, it came out, and here is the report of Dr. Osmond, superintendent of the hospital, and he said the hospital was badly designed for mental patients; and even though he had a staff of a very high quality, they were unable to supervise constantly every patient. Even in the hospital was well designed, it was impossible to watch closely 120 people who were mentally ill, but the fact is that the hospital is 100 per cent overcrowded.

Now that is your own medical superintendent of that institution. This Government has sat here for 12 long years; they have had an abundance of money; they have had more money this last year to spend, Mr. Speaker, than any other provincial government has had in four years, and that is the truth. And why haven't they done something about this hospital? Are they so callous – have they forgotten all about their beautiful promises?

**Some Hon. Member:** — What about the Moose Jaw Training School?

**Premier Douglas:** — This Government has done more for the mentally ill than the Liberals did in 34 years. Some day I will tell my hon. friend about conditions at the Weyburn Hospital under a Liberal government.

**Mr. McDonald:** — We'll tell you what they are now, too.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker . . . do you really think that the gentleman who has just sat down would have sat here for 12 years without telling us about that 12 years ago and kept on every year for the last 12 years. We never heard about it before.

**Premier Douglas:** — Oh yes, you have.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Shame!

**February 24, 1956**

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Even if that was true there is no excuse for you.

**Premier Douglas:** — Conditions are better there than they have ever been.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Oh, they are? Then this doctor is wrong.

**Premier Douglas:** — No.

**Mr. Danielson:** — He is wrong when he says it is 100 per cent overcrowded.

**Premier Douglas:** — Do you know how many people were there in 1943?

**Mr. Danielson:** — What are you doing about it?

**Premier Douglas:** — Take a look and see.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I have the floor, he hasn't.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I apologize for interrupting my hon. friend.

**Mr. Speaker:** — When you address your remarks to a particular member, you are certainly asking for a reply and it is perfectly out of order.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, I couldn't help that, but he got up and replied, Mr. Speaker, before I asked him. He is just his usual self; he thought he was going to turn me off, but he'll have to wait. It is a thing that is extremely serious, and I don't think anyone can dispute the statement of their own superintendent of that institution. Even if it cost as much as one museum in the city of Regina, surely, with the millions of dollars you have spent, why didn't you go down and spend something and let the poor people there live decently.

**Premier Douglas:** — Oh, nonsense!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Is that nonsense?

**Premier Douglas:** — Has the gentleman asked me a question? I'll tell him what the nonsense is. There is not a statement in Dr. Osmond's report . . .

**Some Opposition Members:** — Sit down!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Premier Douglas:** — The gentleman asked me a question. Does he want me to answer, or does he not? He is just making noises.

**Mr. Danielson:** — You can't take it now.



**Premier Douglas:** — I don't like a man misrepresenting a public servant.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Do you deny the report of your own superintendent?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! If the hon. member who is speaking directs his questions directly to another member, he must expect a reply.

**Premier Douglas:** — On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman has directed a question to me and asked me if I deny the report of the superintendent. The report of the superintendent states that the building was ill-designed and uneconomically designed . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — That is correct.

**Premier Douglas:** — And that it is still uneconomically designed, because the Liberal Government built it and knew nothing about building mental hospitals. The conditions in that hospital have been improved and the number of patients reduced progressively ever since this Government took office and the care of those patients and the feeding of those patients has improved every year since this Government took office. And . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — That's what you say.

**Premier Douglas:** — And when my hon. friend asked about the report of the superintendent — the report is correct. My objection is that what my hon. friend is attributing to Dr. Osmond is not what Dr. Osmond said.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Are you making a speech or asking a question?

**Premier Douglas:** — I know you don't want me to answer it, but . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask him through you — does he deny what Dr. Osmond says here? Does he deny that?

**Premier Douglas:** — I have agreed with Dr. Osmond's statement. I say Dr. Osmond's statement is not what my hon. friend was trying to put into his words after he stopped reading.

**Mr. Danielson:** — All right, I'll read it to you:

“Even if it were well designed, . . . 120 people . . . for the mentally ill, he said, our building is designed so uneconomically that we believe the hospital is 100 per cent overcrowded.”

**February 24, 1956**

Can you twist and turn and distort that any more? You can't do it. It's there staring you in the face and you deny that it is not correct.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Give some credit to the Liberals, you put it there.

**Mr. Danielson:** — You deny that this is not correct.

Mr. Speaker, when we came into this House last year, we had an exhibition by the Premier (he always has to have a 'whipping boy'), or somebody he can lash away at, and last year it was Duplessis. He was rubbing it into Duplessis at that time, and there wasn't anything in the world to do with him, the action that Duplessis was asking to be taken in regard to his province by the Federal Government. But, according to the Premier, the whole country was going to go to pot. The whole constitution of Canada was trodden upon, and all that sort of thing. On February 1, 1955, which was shortly before the session opened, he made a radio broadcast and I am going to read the first paragraph to you:

“The most abject surrender in Canadian history has taken place with Mr. St. Laurent's recent concessions to Mr. Duplessis. This may well be a turning point in Canadian history. The Federal Government has set its feet along a path which leads back to the old dog-eat-dog days of provincial rivalry and federal impotency. Ottawa has hoisted the white flag of surrender over the forts of full employment and a high level of national prosperity. Children not yet born will pay the price of this pathetic appeasement by a government which lacks the moral courage to practise what it has preached for twenty years. Whether we realize it or not the fact remains that Mr. St. Laurent has turned back the clock a quarter of a century.”

Mr. Speaker, there is something in Holy Writ that goes like this:

“The little Zaccheus, publican and sinner, has to climb a tree to be seen and heard.”

And that is why he makes all this fuss – this smokescreen – to draw attention away from what is going on here, when he rants on about the province of Quebec.

And here is another thing, Mr. Speaker, Everything has to start somewhere and there are always bad times and good times. We in Saskatchewan have known both.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — He's as meek as a lamb now.

**Mr. Danielson:** — But this bunch over there to your right, Mr. Speaker, they think that everything bad happened in the 1930's and everything good since 1944. They point to the 'thirties', but there

is no basis of comparison. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, they are hurting Saskatchewan by crying so much. What is the idea to harp and harp and harp back to the 1930's, making themselves ridiculous? You are just doing Saskatchewan a disservice.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in this House for twenty-two years and I want to tell some of those new members on that side that times haven't always been good like this. You know, Mr. Speaker, we have had some very hard times in Saskatchewan. Take, for example, the winter of 1938, when we were so short of feed that we had to ship in 450,000 tons of fodder into this province and even then, Mr. Speaker, some of the livestock died.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — They choked to death on Minty's hay!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Anyone who couldn't help and didn't help was doing a disservice to the province, but of course they had to buy fodder wherever they could get it.

**Mr. Feusi (Pelly):** — How much of it was Minty's?

**Mr. Danielson:** — That's all right. But they did get feed and they did all they could and we did save the situation.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge anyone on that side to look over the record of the Liberals, both in the federal and provincial fields, as far as helping the farmers are concerned, in cancelling relief debts. Those people over there don't know what is going on and they don't know what has gone on.

They do not talk about the payment of storage by the Federal Government, amounting to between \$30 and \$35 million. You can take 200,000 wheat farmers, with an average of five persons to a family, which would make about 1,000,000 people, and the contribution to each family would be about \$30 per head, or about \$150 per family. About \$18 to \$30 million, or about two-thirds of the total will come to Saskatchewan.

And, incidentally, Mr. Speaker, this storage plan was proposed by the Liberal Party, without any urging or suggestions by the C.C.F. or any other party.

. . . talking about the Public Revenue Tax. They don't know anything about what took place in the early days in this province, and during the 'thirties'. But \$7 million of Public Revenue Tax cancelled to the farmers of the province of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Wahl (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley):** — And the mortgage companies.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Yes, I could tell you that, too. I could tell you that. I can tell you what it was. Mortgages and Agreements for Sale -

that was due to the mortgage companies and to farmers who had sold their farm to some other farmer, and I know who they were, or have personal knowledge about them, in dozens of cases. The cancellations and the debts wiped out on that score alone was \$37,140,000. Tax sale certificates, \$24,617,000; my friends can talk about the mortgage companies – yes, but the farmer was the one who was on the land and he had an Agreement for Sale, or a loan, and he salvaged that farm; and when the mortgage company . . . \$37,140,000, then they said this: “Put that farm in condition where you can operate it on a paying basis, and there will be no provincial taxes.” And there weren’t any taxes except telephone taxes – they were not cancelled because they were necessary to pay back the debentures on the telephone system, which the farmers themselves had built up in the province of Saskatchewan. Now these cancellations - \$5,841,000; adjustments by Provincial Debt Adjustment Board, \$2,791,000; school lands contract, \$13,276,000; homestead purchase, \$931,000 . . .

**Mr. Wahl:** — That is the municipality’s money.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That is all the brains you have, when you say that is the municipality’s money.

Provincial lands, \$733,000; Local Government Board, \$2,512,000 – or a total, as I said a few moments ago, of \$206 million. The total reduction, under the Farmers Credit Arrangement Act, was \$54,470,000 in the province of Saskatchewan. I could spend two hours telling you these things; I could quote you the Bills cancelling this; I could quote you from letters of the Provincial Treasurer, and prove every statement that I have made.

**Some Opposition Member:** — They’re pretty quiet now.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Now then, I have here in my hand the cancellation, Mr. Speaker, that went through, but it is not complete – there was millions and millions of dollars added to that afterwards. This is dated April 21, 1938, and the statement was set up by Mr. Andrew Sibbald, who is dead now; he was a member of the Local a Government Board of this Government the first few years, and he was in charge of this Board set up to carry on this debt cancellation in the province of Saskatchewan. And I am going to say to you – and you know, Mr. Speaker – I think you were the only one in this House, except myself, that probably went through those days and in my own constituency, \$6,185,000 was written off – but that is not the complete amount. It was increased after that. You may not believe it, but it is true.

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — You are breaking the debts off twice . . . now.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Never worry, I know what I’m talking about.

There were 13 municipalities in the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, that had cancellations of over \$1 million; and one municipality had a cancellation of \$1,555,000; and that wasn’t all of it, because this

was not fully complete when this statement was made out.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — You sure helped the mortgage companies.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Now then, how much have you cancelled? I could tell you what you have cancelled, but I asked for a Return here a short time ago and I have the figures here but I want to have some verification on them before I use them. So, Mr. Speaker, what is the idea? They harp and harp and harp and harp on the 1930's. Well, I think that we are all ridiculous now, particularly the members on your right, Mr. Speaker, because we are making ourselves ridiculous to do that thing. The reason I am mentioning this — I never did this before, and I have been here for 22 years — was to try to give the people here on the other side of the House, who came into this House in 1954, some information that they didn't know anything about. I am trying to give them some idea of what the situation was here in the 'thirties'.

In 1934, Mr. Speaker, the total revenue of this province, on revenue account, was \$11,700,000. That is all we had to work with. But during that period, Mr. Speaker, we paid to the doctors in the province of Saskatchewan, in the rural areas of this province where they didn't get any money, during this eight, nine and 10 years, and I think it was just about 10 years, because the depression was here before 1934, but we paid \$3,101,000 to these men in order to enable them to carry on and give services to the people; and they did, and all glory and honour to them. We paid \$3,001,000 to hospitals in relief grants. And, by the way, may I say this to clarify what I mean — this was in the 157 municipalities that constituted the drought area of this province; it wasn't all over the whole province; it was in the drought area of this province. There wasn't a hospital in the whole province inside the drought area that would have been able to carry on if it hadn't been for that. The nurses worked for next to nothing; the people supplied the hospitals with many of the things that they would otherwise have had to pay cash for — all the meat, eggs, butter and vegetables of every kind — these were all supplied by the people. We had our 50 cent a day hospital grant per patient. In addition to that we got a relief grant which was given for several years in one of my own hospitals and that relief grant, together with the 50 cent per patient per day netted us about \$1.47 to \$1.60 per day; it varied a little bit, but very little. And this, together with what little the municipalities were able to collect and with what the people did for us, enabled us to carry on; and there was no one ever turned away from the hospital that I know of.

**Mr. Gibson (Morse):** — I know of some.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Maybe you do, but I can tell you one thing — it wasn't from the Davidson hospital.

**Mr. Kramer (The Battlefords):** — I know one man that died because he couldn't get in.

**Mr. Danielson:** — There were many people who died . . .

**February 24, 1956**

**Some Opposition Member:** — They still are.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Might I point out to the hon. member that it is getting near to adjournment time.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Recess time.

**Mr. Danielson:** — . . . I could keep on here for some time, but I am going to close and I want to tell you that I am not going to support the motion.

**Hon. T.J. Bentley (Minister of Public Health):** — Mr. Speaker, although the hour is late and I do not intend to speak for more than a minute or so, I think there are one or two observations that I should make concerning this vitriolic speech on the part of the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron).

I would say that in all the time I have been listening to speakers in here, and elsewhere, I have never heard so much concentrated hate.

**Mr. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition):** — You . . .

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Just a minute. I thought I should say a word or two about it so that I can go on with my speech tomorrow, when perhaps things will be quieter.

**Mr. McDonald:** — You don't want to answer it now?

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Personally I cannot see that it merits much of an answer and I couldn't see any particular good or value in the speech, but I do not think such an attack should go unanswered.

**Mr. Cameron:** — That's a ridiculous statement.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — But, Mr. Speaker, the clock goes on, and so I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

The Assembly then adjourned at 5:35 o'clock p.m.