

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session - Twelfth Legislature
36th Day

Thursday, March 29, 1956

The House met at 10:30 o'clock a.m.

On the Orders of the Day

CONDOLENCE

Premier Douglas: — Before the Orders of the Day are called, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the House will join with me in expressing deepest sympathy to the member from Last Mountain (Mr. R. Brown), whose mother passed away last Monday. The funeral is to be held at 2:30, this afternoon.

While I do not propose moving a formal motion, I know the members would wish Mr. Brown to know that he has a good deepest sympathy in his hour of bereavement.

On the Orders of the Day:

Paper Bag Industry

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to make an announcement. When speaking on the Cement Bill, I mentioned that this industry would attract further industries. The first such industry has now announced that it will be established in Saskatchewan shortly. I would like to read, for the benefit of members of the House, the copy of a news release dated today, March 29:

"A \$750,000 plant to manufacture multiwall paper bags, the first of its kind between Winnipeg and Vancouver, will be established in Saskatchewan shortly, according to a joint announcement made by Premier T. C. Douglas of Saskatchewan, and Vernon E. Johnson, President of Canadian International Paper Company.

"Arrangements for the plant were completed this month by officials of the Continental Paper Products Limited, a wholly owned subsidiary of Canadian International Paper Company of Montréal, the largest newsprint producer in the world. Just recently C.I.P. entered the kraft paper manufacturing field in Canada.

"The company said that a definite decision on where the plant is to be located in Saskatchewan is deferred pending some further study of the situation. Continental officials have considered possible plant sites in two or three large urban centres. The site will be announced in a few days.

March 29, 1956

"Continental will produce heavy kraft multiwall bags for a great variety of industrial uses. These bags, of which some varieties are interlined with asphalt paper and polyethylene paper for moisture protection, are used to package such commodities as cement, flour, salt, sodium sulphate, potash, fertilizer, etc.

"Construction of the new plant will commence as soon as the engineering plans are completed. The company hopes that machinery deliveries will allow them to be in production in Saskatchewan by the end of the year. The building will be of single-storey construction with a floor area of approximately 40,000 square feet.

"The plant, incorporating latest developments in automation, will initially employ about 25 people. The company expects to train local people for the work, a limited number of whom may receive advance training in the company's eastern plants. The plant will have an annual production capacity of 3,000 tons or 10 million average-sized bags per year.

"Saskatchewan industries indicate great interest in such a local source of supply. Bags manufactured by Continental will be used by the Saskatchewan Cement Corporation in their plant now under construction just east of Regina.

"The kraft paper to be used by Continental in Saskatchewan will come from the La Tuque, Quebec, pulp, paper and board mill of the parent company. The largest kraft paper-making machine in the world was brought into production at that plant during the current month. Of interest is the fact that this paper-making process employs sodium sulphate, most of which is shipped to La Tuque from Saskatchewan.

"The principal paper converting plant of Continental is located in Ottawa. Two other plants, one manufacturing multiwall bags, and the other grocery bags, are operated by the same company in Cap-de-la-Madeline, Quebec. The company's decision to establish a plant in Saskatchewan was influenced by the growth of the Western Canadian market, of which this province is the geographical centre."

I am sure all members will be pleased to know that this new company has announced its intention to set up in our province.

Select Special Committee Report On Marketing And Farm Income

The Assembly resumed from Wednesday, March 28, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Brown (Bengough):

"That the Final Report of the Select Special Committee on Marketing and Farm Income be now concurred in."

Mr. H. C. Dunfield (Meadow Lake): — Mr. Speaker, in resuming this debate, I wish to make mention of one of the esteemed witnesses appearing before this Committee. In reading some of the transcripts of evidence given by these witnesses, I was particularly interested in remarks made by Professor Baker in regard to his findings of the Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life in Saskatchewan, as set forth in that report on farm prices and the marketing of agricultural products.

His clear and concise interpretation of the Royal Commission report on farm prices and marketing are, in many instances, at complete variance with statements and conclusions found in the final report of the Select Special Committee now before us for discussion.

In addition, much of the valuable and indisputable data offered the Committee by agricultural associations of various kinds and their representatives, seem to have been ignored wholly or in part in the final draft of the report. While I believe, on the whole, the Committee has done commendable work in pointing out some of the immediate and pressing problems of agriculture in Saskatchewan, I do not think their recommendations go far enough in the long-term interest of western agriculture, and I, therefore, move, seconded by Mr. McCarthy (Cannington):

"That all the words after the word 'That' in the motion be deleted, and the following substituted therefor:

"The Select Special Committee on Marketing and Farm Income be revived, and that its Final Report be not now concurred in, but that it be referred back to the said Committee with instructions that the Committee have power to amend the Report as hereinafter set forth:

"That the part of Chapter 10 headed 'findings' be amended as follows:

- (1) That Clause (D) of Paragraph 1, Section (1) be deleted.
- (2) That the word 'not' in Clause (B) of Section (3) be deleted
- (3) That the Paragraph under the heading 'Boxcar Shortage' in Section (4) be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"The Committee finds on the basis of the evidence presented that there was no shortage of boxcars in the fall of 1955, but that sufficient boxcars were available to move into terminal positions all the grain that could be exported.

March 29, 1956

"The Committee recognizes that because of the large number of kinds and grades of grain being handled, it is necessary that there be sufficient space in terminal elevators to enable the Canadian Wheat Board to move into the forward positions those kinds and grades of grain which are deemed in demand for export.

"The evidence indicated that grain was moving into terminal positions in the fall of 1955 in quantities well up to the volume which could be efficiently handled from a terminal-operating standpoint."

(4) That this heading, 'Powers of Transport Controller', and the Paragraph thereunder in Section (4) be deleted.

(5) That the words 'has been greatly exaggerated' in the Paragraph under the heading "United States Price Support Programme' in Section 6 be deleted, and the following substituted therefor:

"Which may necessitate the implementation of controls over production."

(6) And that this Paragraph be further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Your committee recognizes that because of our much smaller population, and our relatively much larger exportable surplus of grains, a similar policy in Canada would involve a much greater per capita cost."

(6) That Paragraph 2, 'Farm Stored Payments' of Section (1) be deleted, and the following substituted therefore:

"2. Snow Removal: That the Government of Saskatchewan make immediate arrangements for the use of all available snow removal machinery to open up the roads so that farmers may deliver grain to occupy the available local elevator space for 40 million bushels of grain."

Hon. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Who wrote that?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Dunfield: —

(7) That clauses (b) and (c) of Paragraph 6 of Section One be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

"(b) bi-lateral and multi-lateral trade arrangements."

(8) That Paragraph 10 of Section (1) be amended by adding the words 'continue to' after the word 'Should'.

(9) That all the words after the 'return' where it first occurs in Paragraph 11, Section (1) be deleted and the following substituted therefore:

"to each grain producer by providing:

(a) a payment of \$2 per bushel (basis No. 1 Northern at the Lakehead) for the first 1,000 bushels of wheat delivered in each crop year by each producer with comparable arrangements for coarse grains.

(b) best market prices for the balance of each crop year's delivery."

(10) That Paragraph 12 (a) of Section One, and the heading 'Domestic Parity for Wheat' be deleted and clause (b) of Paragraph 12 become clause (c) of Paragraph 11.

(11) That Paragraphs 13 and 14 of Section 1 be re-number 12 and 13 respectively.

(12) That the words 'continue to' be added after the word 'should' in clause (a) of Paragraph 16 of Section. III.

(13) That clause (f) of Paragraph 16 of Section III be deleted.

(14) That paragraph 18 of Section IV be deleted, and the following substituted therefore:

"18. Additional Storage Facilities: That Federal and Provincial Governments, together with elevator companies take appropriate action to provide additional temporary or permanent grain storage facilities so that farmers' delivery quotas may be substantially increased."

(15) That Paragraph 19 of Section IV be deleted.

(16) That Paragraphs 20, 21, 22 and 23 of Section IV be renumber 19, 20, 21 and 22 respectively.

(17) That clause (a) of the present Paragraph 20 of Section IV be deleted and the following be substituted therefore:

March 29, 1956

"(a) Livestock Boards: That such provincial or National livestock boards as are requested and approved by votes of the producers concerned be established."

(18) That all the words following 'products' in the present Paragraph 22 of Section IV be deleted.

(19) That the following new Paragraph 26 of Section VI be inserted:

"26. Prairie Farm Assistance: That the Federal Government increase the payments and the levy under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act, and that the Government of Saskatchewan enact legislation to provide assistance to farmers suffering crop losses, and who are not provided for under the Federal Prairie Farm Assistance Act."

(20) That the word 'provincial' be inserted after the word 'that' where it first occurs in the present Paragraph 26 of Section 6.

(21) That the present Paragraphs 26, 27, 28, and 29 of Section VI be re-numbered 27, 28, 29 and 30 respectively.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, I notice the hon. members opposite all have copies. It is quite a comprehensive list of amendments, and I wonder if we could have copies here on our desks?

Mr. Speaker: — There are three copies here.

Mr. Dunfield: — I can give you this one, too, Mr. Speaker.

Premier Douglas: — Where are all the other copies?

Mr. Speaker: — I have two copies here.

Premier Douglas: — I think someone should explain the reasons for the deletions and substitutions that are being suggested in this amendment. It certainly has not been explained so far.

Mr. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition): — There are a lot of things in this book here that nobody has ever explained to the House to the Committee nor to anyone else, and that's why we asked for the adjournment of the debate yesterday, to give those members of the Legislature who are not members of the Committee an opportunity to study the report. I would suggest now that, if the members on the Government side of the House would like to study the amendments which we have suggested here this afternoon, one of their members should ask for the adjournment.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): — That's our business.

Mr. Speaker: — The motion before the House is quite self-explanatory. It says:

"The Select Special Committee on Marketing and Farm Income be revived, and that its Final Report been not now concurred in, but that it be referred back to the said Committee with instructions that the Committee have power to amend the Report as hereinafter set forth."

Mr. James Gibson (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, I wasn't on the Committee, and I believe that the chairman here made a very good summary, and gave a very good account of what this report contains; and I think, before we can vote intelligently on this amendment, that we should have an explanation of why they are arriving at those findings in that report.

Mr. McDonald: — We can explain it.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentlemen have no desire to explain what they are amending, or to substantiate it, I suggest we take a vote on it.

Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! I think I might point out that the question before you is really whether the Committee shall be revived.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — That's right. Mr. Speaker, the hon. members are setting out reasons here why they think the Committee ought to be revived. I think they should stand up on their feet and tell this Legislature - explain the reasons why they want this Committee to be revived. Surely they must have a reason.

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker, I never expected this thing to come up at this time. It was adjourned yesterday, and last night those who like horses went to the horse show. We sat here at 5:30 or 6 o'clock and then the House adjourned. We came here at 9 or 10 o'clock. What time have we had for the members who are not on the Committee (I am not going to say I am in that class) to peruse the report? Now, this amendment can, I suppose, be explained, but I think in all fairness to the members who are not on the Committee, and the members who were on the Committee, if they think it serious at all, they ought to at least have something to say about it, then they should take a week-end recess to study it.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, the Opposition admit this is a serious matter, but why can't they get up and explain? Why introduce something and then not go ahead with it and explain; but expect us to go back into Committee? They must have some good reason, Mr. Speaker, why we ought to go back into Committee.

Mr. Loptson: — Then, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate until I can get my material. . .

Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — Oh, no, no!

March 29, 1956

Mr. Loptson: — I didn't expect it to come up again.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! The motion is, these recommendations to the Committee are all contingent upon the Committee being revived. Now the question before you is whether the Report be not concurred in, but that it be referred back to the said Committee with instructions that the Committee have the power to amend the report as hereinafter set forth.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, when we were discussing this report clause by clause in Committee, we found that we could get no co-operation from the members of the Committee, and had to go so far as to walk out of that Committee in protest, in fact. If the members on the Government side of the House, this moment, are not prepared to take the amendments that have been suggested by the Opposition, related to the findings and recommendations of this report, then I do not think that is any concern of the Opposition in this Legislature. That is entirely up to the members of this Legislature - to look into the suggestions which we have made, and if they are not even prepared to read them, then I think that is their responsibility, not ours.

Mr. Gibson: — Read them? How can we read them when we haven't even got them?

Mr. McDonald: — They were presented in this House this afternoon, and if you want to take the opportunity of discussing what we are suggesting, and the opportunity of looking through this report, you will find plenty of evidence to substantiate what we are recommending here this afternoon.

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg): — What is the evidence? Tell us.

Mr. McDonald: — That's up to you, to get it out of this report.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — It's your motion. . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. McDonald: — You know full well when we discussed this in Committee that we couldn't as much as get a word changed, let alone a paragraph.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Oh, no, no!

Mr. McDonald: — And I suggest you, Mr. Speaker, that in all fairness the Government members ought to give due consideration to the amendments which we have suggested, and I suggest to you that they cannot do that in a matter of a half a minute here this afternoon. I would suggest to you that someone in this Legislature should have the opportunity of adjourning this debate to see where our amendments fit in with the report, and if the Government members want me to adjourn the debate, I would be pleased to, to give them the opportunity to study and see where the amendments fit into the findings and recommendations of the report. But if they do not want the debate adjourned, then I think it is obvious that they are carrying the same attitude here as they adopted when we were discussing this before the Committee.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, I want, as a member of the Committee, to correct one statement, one impression, left by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. He maintained that they got nowhere, and they are offering certain changes in this report. There were many changes made at the suggestion of the hon. members opposite, and at the time the hon. members walked out of the

Committee like so many children, there was no matter of serious importance before the Committee. It was on a point of order. The hon. member from Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) was called to order, and he wanted to refer back, Mr. Speaker, to things that had already been dealt with. But because he couldn't get his own way, he walked out like a petulant child, and the rest of them followed him. And now they come around here and introduce a frivolous matter in the hope that this House will be convinced that we should go back into Committee again. Just how ridiculous can these members get? They can stand up in this House and put their points before this Legislature. Surely, if we go back into Committee again, do they expect then they are going to have our opinions changed unanimously? They have a responsibility as an Opposition, Mr. Speaker, and they ought to know, as a responsible Opposition, that they are not going to get their way entirely, no more than I am going to get my way entirely, Mr. Speaker, in Committee. But they took the attitude that whatever they suggested, we should agree to unanimously, and not having had their way, they refused to stay and discharge their responsibility as members of the Opposition, and walked out of that Committee. Now they propose to go back into Committee again on a frivolous matter which they cannot explain themselves.

Some Govt Member: — They'll probably walk out again. . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! Might I bring to the attention of the House that this is a proper motion, and I will have to keep within the rules of the House.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to answer one or two things.

Mr. Speaker: — You have already spoken.

Mr. McDonald: — All right, I will let somebody else speak then.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I have seen quite a few things happen, quite a few things done in many different ways in the Legislature, but never before did I see an amendment consisting of five pages and over, introduced in this Legislature, simply read; the member moves it, sits down; no argument to substantiate it point by point.

Premier Douglas: — Who wrote it?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — And then the hon. Leader of the Opposition gets up and makes a speech of about three minutes, and in that there was not one argument to substantiate the points which they are supposed to have made in this amendment. They suggest that we should adjourn the debate, or they should adjourn it, or I suppose that we should get up and debate it. I do not propose that I should waste my time debating a motion proposed by the hon. members opposite. . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Which they can't explain.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . which they do not consider of sufficient importance to get up and substantiate point by point. As a matter of fact, I wonder who prepared the amendment? It is quite evident that the hon. member from Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) and the hon. Leader of the Opposition are not prepared to talk on their own amendment.

March 29, 1956

Premier Douglas: — They don't know what's in it!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — And talking about an adjournment now. The hon. member was on his feet and exhausted his right to speak on the amendment.

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — He hasn't spoken on the amendment. You're wrong.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — He certainly did speak on the amendment.

Mr. McDonald: — No, he hadn't. Neither have I.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — . . . and never gave one bit of argument. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, unless some member of the Opposition is going to get up, some member who has not exhausted his right is going to get up and point by point support this amendment, it doesn't deserve any time from any member of the Government, and we can take the vote on it.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Exhausted, period. Well, I'm exasperated!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — So I think I have now exhausted my right to speak on the amendment, but as there has been no argument in favour of the amendment, it is not necessarily to produce any arguments contrary.

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

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — You have exhausted your right.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I take it that the seconder of this amendment is willing is to speak to it.

Mr. McDonald: — He hasn't had a chance.

Mr. Speaker: — You do second the motion?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — It's not their child.

Some Govt Members: — Question, Mr. Speaker!

Mr. Loptson: — I want to take objection to the statement made by the hon. . . .

Premier Douglas: — Well, Mr. Speaker, hasn't the hon. member already spoken on this amendment?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — He is out of order.

Premier Douglas: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Hasn't the hon. member already spoken on this motion?

Mr. Speaker: — Yes, he has.

Mr. Loptson: — I haven't spoken. I suggested that somebody on your side adjourn the debate.

Premier Douglas: — I withdraw my objection.

Mr. Loptson: — I appeal to the fairness of the House. I didn't speak, but if you want an explanation I am going to give it to you.

Premier Douglas: — Go-ahead.

Mr. Loptson: — I want to give you an explanation of this amendment. You seem to think that somebody brought it into the House a few minutes ago and nobody knows anything about it.

Mr. Speaker: — I am thinking nothing of the kind.

Mr. Loptson: — My hon. friend, the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) just said that I wanted to revert back to something that had already been passed, and that when they wouldn't allow me to do it, I walked out of the House. I patiently took abuse and accusations from everybody that was on the Government side of the Committee, on five different occasions. I can tell you the Clause that I walked out of the House on - and I will soon come to it.

But, in the first place. . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — We don't want to know why he walked out.

Mr. Loptson: — In the first place. . .

Mr. C. G. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. If raising a point of order means heaping abuse on members heads, then I am guilty.

Mr. Loptson: — Yes, you are as guilty as any of them.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Willis (Melfort-Tisdale): — I raise a point of order in the Committee and the hon. gentleman says that I heaped abuse on him. But raising a point of order certainly isn't heaping abuse on anybody.

Mr. Danielson: — When it's your point of order.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Let's get this straight. Any member has the right to rise to this debate, or any other debate, if he thinks he has a point of order, and then it is the Speaker's duty to rule as to whether he has a point of order or not, as far as the hon. member is concerned who has now got up, I am prepared to waive that you have already spoken.

Mr. Loptson: — Well, my hon. friends want an explanation of this amendment. Now I am going make it very brief and to the point. I don't need to read the top part of it because you have already submitted that, but the parts that are objected to, and the amendments are asked for by this amendment.

March 29, 1956

Let me take No. 1, if you would like to follow it:

"1. That clause (d) of paragraph 1 of Section I be deleted."

Now if you will look at page 147 in the Report. . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — On a point of privilege. . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Did the hon. member who moved this amendment supply sufficient copies for all the members?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — I was going to raise that as a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. Dittoed copies - now when it is dittoed, for goodness sake, there could be 55 or 60 copies made.

Mr. Speaker: — Are there enough copies?

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, we haven't the facilities at our disposal that the Government members have, or anywhere near them.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — It was dittoed.

Mr. McDonald: — We have a secretary - my own secretary - and a secretary to the members, and after all, when the report was prepared I understand that our legal counsel and that our economists and the Chairman of the Agricultural Committee spent hours, night and day, doing nothing else but preparing the report. We just do not have the facilities to provide the members of the Legislature with proper information, and I submit that is the case to you, Mr. Speaker, and that is why I would like very much to have seen the members take this amendment, to have had an opportunity to distribute it to every member of the House, for them to have compared it back to the report. . .

Premier Douglas: — How can they compare it if they haven't got it?

Mr. McDonald: — . . .and then I think we could all have intelligently discussed it.

Premier Douglas: — But how are they going to compare it when they haven't got it?

Mr. McDonald: — Well, I say you have facilities, now, to produce that en masse, if you want to.

Premier Douglas: — Is my friend suggesting that it is more difficult to run off 50 copies than to run off 10?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! I want to say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McDonald) that I am quite sure if you had got in contact with the Legislative Office, or if you had told the Clerk, that you wanted this, he would have done everything possible to have produced it.

Mr. McDonald: — We have asked for secretaries. . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Where was it produced, in the McCallum-Hill building?

Mr. Speaker: — The Clerk would have given you all the assistance, I am quite sure, and he has given you all the assistance that he possibly could, and if he had been notified that this amendment was coming in he could have given you that assistance. I do think the members are entitled to a copy.

Mr. Loptson: — I am prepared to adjourn the debate so that you can get copies for all the members of the House. If they feel that they should have it, and I think that they should have a copy - or are they going to assume that the Opposition has no right to make any suggestions?

If it is agreeable, I will speak now and we will have copies of this amendment prepared and distributed this evening.

Mr. R. Walker (Hanley): — Question.

Premier Douglas: — I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the member who is on his feet now might just as well go ahead and give us his explanation and we will mark our copies as we go along; and then later the members can take copies if they want to, or debate it without copies.

Mr. Loptson: — You have copies.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — We have four or five now.

Mr. McDonald: — You have a lot more than that; you have 15 or 20.

Mr. Speaker: — All right, go ahead.

Mr. Loptson: — All right. . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question? Could I have his reasons as to why he wants to delete (d)? Is it not. . .

Mr. Loptson: — That is exactly what I am going to do.

Mr. Wahl (Qu'Appelle-Wolsoley): — Well, let's hear it.

Mr. Loptson: — Mr. Speaker. . .

Mr. Wahl: — Mr. Speaker, can I ask you. . .

Mr. Speaker: — Is this a point of order, or a point of privilege?

Mr. Wahl: — It is a point of order. These members here had left the Committee when we were framing this report, and if they had stayed there it could probably have been framed to their approval.

Mr. Speaker: — I have no information in that regard.

Mr. Wahl: — Well, can I give you that information now?

March 29, 1956

Mr. Speaker: — No, no!

Mr. Loptson: — Well, this Clause (d) in Paragraph 1, on page 147, says this:

"Exports of agricultural commodities other than grain have declined from very high levels in 1945 to almost insignificant amounts in the last few years."

Well, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this clause is nonsensical. . .

Premier Douglas: — Give us the figures.

Mr. Loptson: — . . .for the simple reason that we have had no exportable surplus to send anywhere with the exception of a little butter, and we have exported that. . .

Premier Douglas: — And pork.

Mr. Loptson: — . . .and what little surplus of beef we have had has gone to the United States on the highest market in the world, and as a matter of fact, at the present time, the United States is sending beef into Canada, because the Canadian market is the highest beef market in the world today.

Some Hon. Member: — Don't blame them.

Mr. Loptson: — To put in a clause so nonsensical as that, saying that our export of other than grain has depleted as if it was a lost market. We haven't lost any markets, because we haven't got any surplus to send to world markets. For that reason, we are asking for it to be deleted and I think that every sensible person will realize that is the sensible thing to do.

Premier Douglas: — Good! Good!

Mr. Loptson: — Now then, No. 2 - the word "not" in clause (b) of Section 3 be deleted, that is page 149, and that clause reads as follows:

"The present municipal tax levy is not a significant factor in the cost-price squeeze."

Well, my goodness, Mr. Speaker, I have a piece of land on which I paid a tax of \$240 in 1945, and today the tax on that same piece of land is over \$800. Can any man with common sense say that the taxes are not a factor in the cost-price squeeze? Furthermore, I say that it is more than a factor in the price squeeze, because you have got to pay your taxes irrespective, or lose your land. You don't have to buy a combine because it has doubled in price. You can hire somebody to do it, and then you don't have to buy it; but the taxes you have got to pay, and all of them, I venture to say, over Saskatchewan have at least doubled since 1945.

So, we suggest that this must be deleted, and the clause should then read that:

"The present municipal tax levy is a significant factor in the cost-price squeeze."

I think that that is only a reasonable demand, and it only suggests the facts.

Now then, let's take the next one, No. 3, and you can find that on Page 150, under the heading "Box Car Shortage" in Section IV, and that clause reads as follows:

"That the paragraph under the heading 'Box Car Shortage' in Section IV be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

'The Committee finds on the basis of the evidence presented that there was no shortage of box cars in the fall of 1955 and that sufficient box cars were available to move into terminal positions all the grain that could be exported. The Committee recognizes that because of the large number of kinds of grain being handled, that it is necessary that there be sufficient space in terminal elevators to enable the Canadian Wheat Board to move into forward positions those kinds and grades of grains which are in demand for export. The evidence indicated that grain was moving into terminal positions in the fall of 1955 in quantities well up to the volume which could be efficiently handled from a terminal operating standpoint'."

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is entirely according to the evidence that was produced in the Committee and any deviation from that is falsifying the evidence.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Well, then. . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Loptson: — It is not true . This here as it is presented is absolutely not in conformity with the evidence that. . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I don't think that the hon. member is right to say that the Committee is falsifying the evidence.

Mr. Loptson: — I have got to refer to them, Mr. Speaker. I have got to refer to the facts.

Mr. Speaker: — No, no! I will have to ask you to withdraw that, because the Committee cannot be charged with falsifying the evidence.

Mr. A. L. S. Brown (Bengough): — Unless he is prepared to substantiate it.

Mr. Loptson: — I said that. . . that it was not in conformity.

Mr. Speaker: — No! You use the words 'falsifying the evidence'.

Mr. Loptson: — Well then, I will withdraw the falsifying, and say that they were not in conformity with the evidence.

March 29, 1956

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that while he makes that bold assertion, he hasn't produced one quotation or one statistic to show that it is at variance with the evidence. Will he produce the evidence to show. . .

Mr. Loptson: — That's for you to do. If that isn't true, you can prove that I was wrong.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Is this a new procedure in this House for members to get up and make a statement saying that a Committee has distorted the evidence, and now it is the responsibility of the Committee to prove that he is wrong? Surely if a man is going to get up in this House, and say that a Committee has distorted the evidence, and he was a member of the Committee, surely it is his responsibility to either substantiate his statement or to withdraw it.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member did withdraw it.

Premier Douglas: — He did not withdraw, Mr. Speaker. Pardon me for rising on a point of order again. He did not withdraw the statement that the Committee was making a statement at variance with the evidence. Now he has some responsibility to substantiate that.

Mr. Danielson: — It can be proved.

Premier Douglas: — Then prove it.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Danielson: — It's in the evidence.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Get your evidence!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Danielson: — We proved that this. . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — You weren't there.

Premier Douglas: — Go lay an egg someplace else. No one is talking to you.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! He did withdraw.

Mr. Loptson: — Now then, I said it is not in conformity with the evidence.

Premier Douglas: — Let's have the evidence.

Mr. Loptson: — Now then, No. 4. . .

Premier Douglas: — The hon. gentleman is going to substantiate his statement. I am asking him to substantiate it from the evidence.

Mr. Speaker: — Evidently the hon. member is not. He doesn't have too.

Premier Douglas: — Oh, well, that is fine.

Mr. Loptson: — I am making a statement of facts.

Premier Douglas: — What a farce! What a farce!

Mr. Loptson: — No. 4 is on page 151. There is a recommendation that the heading "Powers of Transport Controller" and the paragraph thereunder in Section IV be deleted. Now I will read you that section.

"Powers of Transport Controller: The Committee was alarmed to note situation developing in which the Transport Controller apparently is not utilizing the formal regulations provided him for the control of bulk transportation facilities in the manner specified. The Committee recognized that there may be times when it is permissible or even desirable to use the powers of persuasion rather than to issue decrees. But the Committee submits that, at the very minimum, a formal directive should have been issued to the railways incorporating whatever prior arrangements or commitments had been made."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that statement is not in conformity with the evidence, because when the Transport Controller gave evidence. . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — What was the evidence?

Mr. Loptson: — . . .he said that there was never any necessity to issue a decree, and that they were always ready to provide what cars were desirable to move. . .

Mr. E. Walker (Gravelbourg): — Why didn't he?

Mr. Loptson: — And we submit that that clause is an insult to the Transport Controller. He is being blamed for something that he had no control to do, or it is just a submission, an idea, to substantiate the cry of the C.C.F. party that has been going around the country. They want to substantiate that boxcars were not supplied.

Now the next one is No. 5:

"That the words 'has been greatly exaggerated' in the paragraph under the heading 'United States Price Support Programme' in Section VI be deleted (that is on page 153) and the following substituted therefor:

'which may necessitate the implementation of controls over production'."

Now I will read that section on page 153. That was No. 5, Section VI. I will read that section.

March 29, 1956

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — Read it as amended.

Mr. Loptson: — Words. . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Maybe wrong glasses.

Mr. Loptson: —

"United States Price Support Programme: Evidence submitted to the Committee revealed that the effect of incentives of the United States price support programme in causing the buildup of surplus stocks has been greatly exaggerated. Further evidence revealed that to date the cost of the price support programme to the United States taxpayer has been quite modest. The annual average cost of all farm price support programmes, from their inception through fiscal 1955, has averaged less than \$1.00 a year for every person in the United States."

Well, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that to compare the United States with Canada is as absurd as trying to compare what we do at night with what we do in the daytime - 160 million people as compared with 16 million people, and they have only as much wheat exported annually as we have to export. They consume four bushels out of every five that they grow, and we consume one out of every five and sometimes less than that.

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg): — Where did you get those figures?

Mr. Loptson: — So that the distribution of the cost of subsidizing exports on the same rate which the United States has done, in putting ourselves on the same level it would be necessary to reduce our production to the same proportion per capita as they are going doing in the United States.

What would be the result? It would mean that we would have to reduce our production so that we would only have one bushel out of five for export, and then we would be on the same level as the United States. How much would that allow every farmer in the way of production?

Surely, Mr. Speaker, there are some men on the other side of the House with some vision or a little common sense - and forget about politics altogether. This might sound nice to the man who doesn't know the facts. . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — That is like getting advice from. . .

Mr. Loptson: — . . .but at least the members of this House have access to the facts, and they can use them if they want to. So we are proposing that the words "has been greatly exaggerated" in the paragraph under the heading "United States Price Support" in Section VI be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"which may necessitate the implementation of controls overproduction."

And No. 6 - "And that this paragraph be further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Your Committee recognizes that, because of our much smaller population and our relatively much larger exportable surplus of grains, a similar policy in Canada would involve a much greater per capita cost."

Now that. . .

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, before the member proceeds on with the next point. I would draw to his attention that I think there is some mistake in his first amendment there. If you strike out the words suggested and then insert "that", it just won't make sense at all, it just won't read right. I was trying to follow the hon. Member's argument, and by inserting "that" it just doesn't make a readable sentence at all.

Mr. Loptson: — I will straighten it out when I come to it.

Now we come to Paragraph 6, that part of Chapter X headed "Recommendations" on page 157.

"No. 6 That Paragraph '2. Farm Storage Payments' of Section I be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg): — Read that part again, it's pretty good.

Mr. Loptson: —

'2. Snow Removal: That the Government of Saskatchewan made immediate arrangements for the use of all available snow removal machinery to open up the roads so that the farmers may deliver grain to occupy the available local space for 40 million bushels of grain'."

Hon. Mr. Bentley (Minister of Public Health): — He really wants the 'cost-price squeeze' doesn't he?

Mr. Loptson: — We propose that this clause be deleted "Farm Storage Payments", and I will read this clause:

"That farmers who have grain stored on farms in adequate storage be paid storage on the undelivered portions of their annual anticipated quotas on the same basis as if this grain were in commercial storage."

Now I submit, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot recall any evidence introduced before this Committee that recommended this clause.

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg): You don't agree with it, eh!

Mr. Loptson: — I don't remember. . .

March 29, 1956

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — Do you agree with it or not?

Mr. Loptson: — I do not agree with it. . .

Mr. Wahl (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — Sooner pay at the elevator.

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg): — Is that Liberal policy or yours?

Mr. Loptson: — . . .because it all works against the smaller farmer in favour of the big farmer.

Mr. Walker (Gravelbourg): — Is that Liberal policy?

Mr. Loptson: — Just imagine men on the west side of this province and in Alberta, who have 100,000 and 150,000 bushels of grain on their farms, being paid 1¢ a bushel, and some of them \$1,500 a month, and who is to pay it?

Mr. Wahl: — What about the elevators?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Loptson: — Us fellows who had to sell all our grain, we would have to pay our portion of that storage, and that has been rejected by all co-operative organizations; and yet these men who are now diverting from the little fellow to the big fellow, they want the little farmers to pay the storage on the grain that the big fellows have in their granaries.

Hon. Mr. Nollett: — Why don't you vote for it.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Loptson: — So, we propose to have that deleted.

Now then, the next thing is No. 7 - clauses (b) on page. . .

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — Now here's the straw that broke the camel's back.

Mr. Loptson: — No. 7 - well, I think I am not doing too bad.

Premier Douglas: — For a fellow who hasn't seen it before, I think you are doing very well.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Loptson: — Surely you will have to admit that I am not doing too badly.

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington): — I think the Premier ought to withdraw that.

Premier Douglas: — If the hon. member asks me to withdraw that, I will, but until the hon. member says that he has seen it before, I certainly will not withdraw it.

Mr. McCarthy: — It certainly is. It is true, I can tell you that.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! Order! The hon. member can't speak for someone else.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — When he is here.

Mr. Speaker: — I think the hon. member for Saltcoats can take care of himself.

Mr. Lopton: — In view of the fact that it is now near 5.30, will you call it 5.30, Mr. Speaker?

Premier Douglas: — Walking out again, Minty?

Mr. Speaker: — Since it is 5.30, the House will recess until 7.30.

Mr. Carr (Rosthern): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I would ask if the House is to continue this debate. Now it seems to me that this subject that is being dealt with tonight is a controversial matter. Two of the members, on the understanding that matters of a controversial nature were not going to be discussed, left, and they were to take a leading part in this debate, and it seems to me that an unfair advantage is being taken.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! I don't think that is a point of order at all.

Premier Douglas: — If I may be permitted, Mr. Speaker, it does raise a matter affecting the business of the House, and if I have the consent of the House I would like to say just a word on it. The member for Rosthern is quite correct in that I said, this afternoon, when the matter of business came up, that we would try to take items this evening that wouldn't be too controversial because of the fact that there would be some members absent from the House, and I for one am quite prepared to see us adhere to that understanding. The only reason I was agreeing to the debate continuing, and personally I was not keen about having an adjournment as I was still hoping that the hon. members opposite, having presented an amendment to a Report to the Committee would take some time to explain it, and when they had explained it and given us their reasons for moving deletions of certain clauses and substitution of other clauses, that we could then have the weekend to study it and debate the matter further. If the member for Saltcoats when he was finished his explanation and told us why the gentlemen opposite are moving certain amendments, I think it will be quite in order then to adjourn the debate and continue the debate on Monday.

That is my feeling on the matter. I think my colleagues on this side will agree to an adjournment when that explanation has been given.

Mr. Carr: — Mr. Speaker, if I might explain the two hon. members from this side who went home were the ones who were going to give that explanation, and this was sprung on us suddenly and they had gone.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! I personally know that the hon. members who left knew that the House was going to sit, because I pointed out the fact. They must have known, at least I presume that they would know. They were quite acquainted with the fact the House was going to sit.

March 29, 1956

Mr. Loptson: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I know very well that there were two members on this side of the House who studied this thing and were ready to go on with it when it was brought up, and they understood it was not going to be proceeded with until they got back.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, there was no suggestion that we would not proceed with it. They knew that the hon. member for Meadow Lake (Mr. Dunfield) had adjourned the debate, and they, of course, knew, what we didn't know, that there was going to be an amendment moved. I think as soon as my hon. friend has explained the amendment, or if he wants to defer explaining it, or feels that he would rather have one of them explain it, I for one would be quite agreeable to an adjournment.

Mr. Loptson: — I am quite prepared to go on until 10:00 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. Loptson: — Well, you refused me the opportunity of adjourning the debate.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, when we refused to adjourn, we didn't know that he didn't know anything about it. We thought that he was supposed to explain it; but we have been told by the member for Rosthern and that the two who know something about the amendment are not here, so I would certainly suggest that we should wait until they are here.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! The hon. member for Saltcoats will proceed.

Premier Douglas: — Move the adjournment, move the adjournment.

Mr. Loptson: — Rather than to. . . I know there are things that I will say that I would not say ordinarily, and if it will help to do some other. . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! We have got to proceed in an orderly manner.

Premier Douglas: — Is the hon. member moving leave to adjourn the debate?

(Debate adjourned)

The Assembly adjourned at 9:50 o'clock p.m.