

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session — Thirteenth Legislature
13th Day

Monday, March 4, 1957

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

On the Orders of the Day:

RE QUESTION 105

Hon. A.G. Kuziak (Minister of Natural Resources): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, Question No. 105 asks for certain information that no commercial concern would divulge. I would suggest that the question be withdrawn and re-submitted, asking for the average during any of those particular years and we will give the average, but we cannot give definite information at the end of the year which will divulge to our competitors what we may pay to the operators in the bush, or sell the lumber at. May I also point out that the question is asked "what was the price paid per thousand?" We don't pay the operators in the form of a price; we contract them to harvest our lumber.

Mr. D.T. McFarlane (Qu'Appelle-Wolseley): — What kind of a scale would you, would you go by then?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I understand the question is not in the public interest if this question is answer as asked. The Minister has suggested that if the hon. member will withdraw the question and re-submit it in another form it may be answered.

Mr. McFarlane: — I would be perfectly agreeable to withdraw the question, Mr. Speaker, and re-submit it, provided the hon. Minister would give me the information if I saw him personally.

Mr. Speaker: — Is leave granted to withdraw the question?

(Question 105 withdrawn)

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Debate on Address-In-Reply

The House resumed from Friday, March 1, 1957, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Wood (Swift Current) for the Address-in-Reply- to the Speech from the Throne.

March 4, 1957

Mr. Karl F. Klein (Notukeu-Willowbunch): — Mr. Speaker, some time ago now, we witnessed the opening of the 13th Legislature here in Regina, and I must confess that I was thoroughly impressed with the dignity of the proceedings of that day, and I felt at that time that nothing should be done to lower the dignity of the proceedings of this House. I would like briefly to describe an incident which took place which, in my opinion and the opinion of the pupils I was teaching, happened to lower the dignity of the proceedings to a very low degree, just by listening to one broadcast.

In this particular case I was preparing a class on the debating section of our high school chorus, so I went to work and listed all the ‘do’s’ and ‘don’ts’ of good debating, and I said now, ‘to illustrate what I have been trying to tell you, we will listen to a broadcast from the Legislative Assembly where debating is of the highest order of this province. ‘ So we took the opportunity of listening in to a very excellent debater. Unfortunately, I had not watched what the proceedings were prior to this, and there was a particularly bad feud on in the House at that time. During the course of the debate one of the first things they started checking off was ridiculous, abuse, name-calling and just about everything you are not to do in a debate. Now, after this broadcast was over I said to my pupils, “Well, today we have learned what not to do in debating; next week I will teach you what should be done.”

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the constituents of Notukeu-Willowbunch for giving me the honour and the privilege to represent them in the House at this time. I would also like to beg their pardon for not taking several minutes of time in order to describe this constituency at any length. I could describe many phases of the Notukeu-Willowbunch constituency that are second to none in the province. We have one of the wonders of the world in there, namely, the Sinking Hill, the first Northwest Mounted Police post at Wood Mountain and Sitting Bull is supposed to have come up to that reserve, and left some interesting history. I could not do justice in describing it in five minutes. However, I know that my constituents are very understanding people, and they will realize that while I am describing one constituency, 52 other constituencies will be thoroughly bored, and therefore, I am sure they will forgive me for not describing their constituency at any great length.

One of the last requests I had from my constituents, in fact just two days ago I met some people at the hotel and they said, “Now look, when you get up in that House, the first thing we want you to do is ask for roads.” “Well,” I said, “from past experiences it won’t do much good asking for roads and judging from past experiences, those people who could put in high-pressured delegations, and the more you could put in, the sooner you get your roads,” and I said perhaps that is the procedure we should follow in the next few years. So I am thoroughly convinced that we will organize sever high-pressure delegations to get the roads they need.

Last Friday in this House we had the unique experience of listening to perhaps the most junior member of the Government, and at the same time listening to one of the more senior members of the Government, a Cabinet Minister. I would like to compliment sincerely the first speaker – the more junior speaker from Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson). I think he did a fine job of representing his speech, and you could tell very soon that he is a well-trained speaker. I would especially, and particularly, like to compliment him on the section where he expounded Liberal philosophy. I think he spoke somewhere near five minutes on political philosophy, and he said this is what we believe to be the true philosophy. Now I think I could sum it up for him very briefly, by holding up our Liberal card. I noticed the members of the Government have been taking extreme pleasure in holding up that white card for ‘prosperity’, so today it is my pleasure to hold up the Liberal card.

The philosophy of Liberalism is summed up here very briefly and right to the point, and it states this: “Liberalism is a free way of life based on social and economic justice to all. It seeks to apply Christian ethics to all human affairs. Liberal ideas and ideals promote liberty, equality and democracy, regardless of race, colour and creed. Liberalism recognizes the dignity of man and woman, and sees family life as the basis of a healthy nation. Liberal Government in Saskatchewan would aim to serve, rather than rule, its people. Liberalism encourages private ownership of land, business and industry; co-operative enterprises free from politics; public utilities. Liberalism discourages the drift towards state control ruled by arbitrary boards, encroachment upon the individual.”

I am sure I, along with the member from Souris-Estevan, will accept this political philosophy as the true philosophy. Now, while I am on the topic of political philosophies, because this is the true philosophy it was here long before the member from Souris-Estevan’s time and before my time, and it will be here long after our time.

Some Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Klein: — Again, because it is the true philosophy, it is not the type of philosophy that requires a reconditioning job such as the ‘Regina Manifesto’. It is only the false philosophies that must be scrubbed up and brought into shape; and the ‘Regina Manifesto’ was taken to the body shop and given repairs and it came out as the ‘Winnipeg Declaration’. I am afraid that the members of the Government are going to be stuck with this ‘Winnipeg Declaration’ whether they like it or not, and regardless of the political philosophy they preach in this House, they will still have to say that, “private progress and corporate power much be subordinated to social planning designed to achieve the equality of opportunity”. That is the philosophy you will be stuck with, and we will continue to use the Liberal philosophy – the one true philosophy.

March 4, 1957

I would like to add at this time that in a democratic society we must recognize the right of the individual to seek the truth as he sees fit, or as he believes. Not only should he seek this truth, but I believe that he is obligated in conscience to accept truth when he finds it. Therefore, I do not think anybody has the right to condemn any individual for abandoning a false philosophy and expressing and getting behind what he considers true philosophy. I could never understand men who would get on public platforms and say that intolerance is wrong, racial prejudice is wrong, religious prejudice is wrong and then, in the very next breath, get up on that same public platform and violently denounce an individual because he saw fit to abandon what he considered a false philosophy and accept what he considered a true philosophy.

I would say any individual in this country who has done that, or is doing it, is not worthy to be called a true citizen of democratic society. Furthermore, I believe such an individual is not only not worthy of public support, but he is worthy of public condemnation.

Some Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Klein: — Then that same Friday, the Minister of Mineral Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank) got up and spoke. Now, as he is a senior member of the Cabinet, and (I would assume) vitally interested in mineral development in this province, I sat here expecting to hear from him a report on what is taking place in mineral development and what we can hope to look for to continue to take place in the future, because I will agree with everybody that mineral development will certainly play an important role in the economic structure of this province. But what did we hear, in effect? We heard some ridiculous comparisons of the depression economy as compared to the post-war 'boom' economy. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that very few individuals in any walk of life use that comparison any more, unless it is for political expediency. It would be absolutely ridiculous for me to look upon my old Dad, and tell him, "Now, look, you must have been a pretty poor farmer. Back in the 'thirties you were farming with a single disc, and you scratched the surface of the far, and you created dust storms and what not. Look at what I am doing today with all the modernized machinery we have." I believe you will agree that would be a ridiculous comparison. So also it is a ridiculous comparison if anybody in business tried to compare the economic depression with the post-war boom economy, and I cannot see why, particularly a Minister of the Cabinet would come into this House and bring in a speech of that nature.

If the words of a speech is any indication of the ability of the member, then I would suggest to the Government that, for the benefit of the province, the sooner that junior member will take the place of his senior Cabinet member, the better off his province will be.

Some Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Klein: — Ever since I have been sitting in this House, along with others we have heard from the Government side, difficulties that agriculture is facing in this province. In fact we have listened to it so often that the paper said, “We are at repetition ad nauseam”. Everybody on the Government side from the Premier down to the rest, told us that the solution to these agricultural problems is parity price, cash advances . . . tell me the rest, you know them— -and I often wonder why they ever bothered engaging a Commission to investigate the problems of agriculture because apparently the Commission reported to the Government that there is a migration from the farms to the urban centres. The Premier in his speech mentioned that this migration is taking place, so apparently the Government sits back and takes the attitude “So What” Let it take place!”

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is a bad thing that it is taking place, and the Commission also said that approximately 50 per cent of the farmers in this province are farming uneconomic units of land; half-section farmers. Surely then, we must have some place to get a large loan at a low rate of interest in order to put ourselves on an economic unit of farming. Because I know – I happen to be a half-section farmer. I find myself in the position today where there is about 3,000 bushels of grain on the farm. Now, I don't have to have the Government come and tell me what my problems are. I know what they are. I realize that I am not farming an economic unit in order to get back fair returns for the price of investment, and I was amazed that nobody on the Government side, particularly in view of this agriculture report, ever said that that was one of the problems. How then do we face this problem? Tomorrow I could go home and buy sufficient land to put me on an economic unit of farming, if I could find some place in this province where I could borrow sufficient money to purchase that land with on long-term loan.

I venture to say at this point there are about 15 of you fellows ready to get up and say, “That's Ottawa's job. That's what the Farm Loan Board is for.”

Some Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Klein: — My contention is this, “None are so blind as they who will not see.”

Premier Douglas: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Klein: — If you look around at what is happening in other provinces, you will find, for example, Quebec, with a Farm Credit Bureau, and if it will do any good to hasten the thing, I even will submit and table the legislation that brought it in. Ontario saw fit to make loans to junior farmers. I understand Alberta is in the process of setting up such a Loan Board. What then is wrong with Saskatchewan?

March 4, 1957

Hon. J.T. Douglas (Minister of Highways): — We had one under the Liberal Government.

Mr. Klein: — What is wrong with it?

Mr. Lopton (Saltcoats): — C.C.F. Government!

Mr. Klein: — I am sure you will agree that one of the basic difficulties is that too many farmers of this province are not on an economic unit, and I am also sure you will agree that the only way he can purchase this land is by having a place where he can borrow money at low terms of interest over a long period of year. That might do something to stop this migration from the rural areas into the urban centres.

Premier Douglas: — That will speed it up. If you take the man's farm over, somebody will have to migrate.

Mr. Klein: — I heard somebody say that would speed it up. At the rate you are going, the rich get richer and the poor get poorer, and you are the fellows that always proclaim you want fair treatment to all!

Hon. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — That's Socialism.

Mr. Klein: — It was mentioned in this House that the next time this Liberal party decides to go to the people and become elected, they will have to build up a better program to capture the imaginations of the electorate. Now, it was never our intention to put out an 'imaginative' program. It was our intention to put out a program that was feasible in every shape and form. In fact, it was so feasible that you saw fit to steal one of our planks. We recommended a provincial-municipal Conference; a fair deal for municipalities. The C.C.F. called such a conference after the election and proclaimed it to be unprecedented in the history of Canada. Nobody had ever called such a conference before. Where did they get the idea? We had it on our platform. As I said, it was not our intention to submit an imaginative program. However, the Government is certainly in a very good position to advise us to that affect, because if we review the events and the campaign that they put on in the 'thirties, I can venture to say that was the most imaginative program that ever was developed in Canada.

Now, what were some of the promises? I know they know what they are, but I would like to remind them of some of them. First of all they say "The first thing that a C.C.F. Government would do would be to recognize education as the responsibility of the Provincial Government," and so on and so forth. "The time has come when we must recognize that Canada's constitution places the responsibility for teaching our children squarely upon the Provincial Government, and it cannot be passed on to any other body." That is one of their planks.

“The C.C.F. will provide a complete system of socialized health services so that all will receive adequate medical, surgical, dental and nursing and hospital care without charge.” Purely imaginative! Premier Douglas suggested ways in which the C.C.F. proposed to get money to pay for a social service program, namely: saving considerably money by taking the Civil Service out of politics and by setting up purchasing boards to buy Government supplies.

“Two, raising of revenue by government engaging in revenue-producing business.” I submit that was the shoe factory, the tanning factory, the box factory, and what have you.

“Three, setting up of commodity boards to sell goods now being sold by monopolies”, and so on down the line. I can quote from experience that, during the ‘thirties as a young boy going to high school, and I would say at a very impressionistic age, I too, was captured by this imaginative program. I remember during the summer holidays a man cornered me and wanted me to become a C.C.F.’er. He said, “Now look”, and he heaped abuse upon the loan companies, the farm machine companies, the banks and the railways and what have you. He said, “Everything we are suffering today is because of those fellows.” He said, “This is our humanitarian philosophy. We are going to take over these wicked corporations, and the profits they realize will be poured into the public coffers, and out of those coffers we intend to erase and wipe out all human suffering.” Now believe you me, as a young boy that captured my imagination; and I said – I could visualize in my own mind a group of dedicated people who were dedicating themselves to only one thing, namely, eradicating human suffering. I never believed they were interested in putty a penny in their own pocket. Time has proven me wrong in all phases.

Not only do we recognize that was the wrong thing to do; again time has proven us right. Your box factories, your shoe factories, all your things folded up. Instead of making revenue for us, they lost us money. It was not only we who changed our minds: it was the C.C.F. Government who changed their minds, because in 1954 or thereabouts, our Premier romped through the whole world to get in touch with leading industrialists, trying to coax them into investing money. I am not condemning this action at all; I am commending him for it. I only say it was too bad he did not do that in 1944, when these private industrialists were anxious to invest, to supply the demands of the post-war boom and of a post-war economy. Had he done that in 1944 then perhaps we would have many of those industries here now, and that is why I think it is only fair to say that we lost 10 years in industrial development.

Premier Douglas: —Mr. Speaker, I don’t want to interrupt the hon. gentleman in the very admirable speech which he is making, but his dates are all wrong. I made no such trip in 1954; I made the trip in 1945 and again in 1948.

March 4, 1957

Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Oh! Oh!

Mr. Klein: — I remember it to be '54 or thereabouts. It was the only concerted effort. I remember the ads that appeared in the papers.

To conclude this point that I am making about imaginative programs, may I once again say that it was not our intention to submit an imaginative program to the electorate, and at no time will we ever intend to do such a thing. If our platform is not feasible and not practical, I will not support it; and I don't think any other member in the Liberal party will support the thing.

Some Opposition Members: —Hear! Hear!

Mr. Klein: —It has been implied by many persons that we could not see anything in the Speech from the Throne, due to inability to comprehend. I don't know how often that has been implied. Now, we are not the only ones in that category. Apparently the press couldn't see very much in it, either. So I suggest the next time the 'brain trust' on that side of the House decides to submit a Speech from the Throne so complicated that apparently they are the only ones able to decipher it, then certainly they should supply us with a key to help us decipher the thing. Since I was not supplied with such a key, and nobody else, either, as far as I know, was supplied with a key, I do not see fit to support the motion.

Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the Speech from the Throne, I rise with a certain amount of humility on this occasion, because of the fact that it does tend to bring back to a certain extent memories to my mind when, as a small boy, I quite often used to sit up in the gallery of this building, watching members at their work, and watching Government at its work; at that particular time and at that particular day. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I feel that there are others in this hall that perhaps have been thinking there is a ghost wandering around in the Legislative Buildings, because during the last two weeks, on more than one occasion, some of my friends across the way would take their finger and they would point at me as though someone else were sitting in this chair. I can assure my friends across the way that, if I can only prove half as effective and half as good as the person of whom I am supposed to be the ghost, I don't believe there will be one of them left after the next election in this province.

Before opening my remarks I would like to take this opportunity of extending to you, sir my congratulations for the position that you have achieved in this province, of Speaker of this Legislature. It is an honourable position; it's one that will take a great deal of patience, I know,

from all of us. Some members opposite and some on this side have stated that they don't think they will be too much trouble to the Speaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to try to claim that I am not too much trouble. You only have to go to some of my schoolteachers to find out what I was like when I went to school, to find out whether I could make a little trouble once in a while or not. I am sure the Minister of Health (Hon. Mr. Erb), who had the – I wouldn't say distinct – pleasure (I don't think it could have been that) of teaching me at one time, will admit that I used to give him some trouble, when he was teaching me here at Luther College in Regina, and some bad moments; and I hope possibly I can do that in this House from time to time, and in the province between now and the next election.

I would like to take a few moments, before going into the main part of my address, to say a few words about the constituency which I represent. Despite what some may believe, the Melville constituency, Mr. Speaker, is not a traditionally Liberal constituency. Within the last 20 years it hasn't had the same representative from the same party for any two sessions of this Legislature. It has been represented by every political party, sitting in this House today, even by the party represented by our Social Credit friends to the left of me. They also have had a representative from that constituency down through the years. So we have proven, in a political way, a cosmopolitan area of the province. We have been prepared to accept a trial of almost all political parties that have appeared in this province, with the exception possibly of those represented by some people who are supposed to be in this building today, and who can call themselves a political party in this province. That is about the only group that as yet has not been represented in my constituency, and I don't believe they ever will be.

However, Mr. Speaker, I hope that, in the next three years that are to pass, I may be able to show to the people of the Melville constituency that, for the first time in the history of that seat, they will return the sitting member to this Legislature as their representative – the first time in 20 some years that a member has been re-elected in the constituency of Melville. We, too, have a great many points of beauty, as have been suggested by some members speaking of their constituencies. We have a great deal of history. The previous speaker spoke about Sitting Bull coming through his constituency. Well, Sitting Bull sat down in mine about the point where Lebret is today, and brought about history. It was there that he was finally persuaded to return with his Indian friends back south of the border, and to bring about peace between the American Government and the American Indians of that day. The little village of Lebret, for anyone here who has travelled down to the Qu'Appelle Valley particularly in the evening in the summer time when the lakes are open – the beautiful sight of the seminary standing across the lake, the lights of the little village, and the lighted cross that stands up on the hill, and the little church, relic of the religion

March 4, 1957

that the people in the Lebret area believe in, strikes a responsive chord. Those symbols, those things bring to my heart, and I believe to all those who have the opportunity of seeing that sight, something in the way of comfort that can only come through religious belief and religious faith.

On top of the historical and beauty point of Lebret, we have what is still the largest town in Saskatchewan at the present time; up until Friday it was the second largest town, I believe. But on Friday, the largest town up until that time, in the constituency of my friend from Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson), was the largest town in this province. But today, Melville has that honour back again, which it had for many years, and it once again, I believe, can be called the largest town in the province. Melville itself, being the largest centre in that community, is representative of perhaps a slightly different group than the majority of my constituency, and that is the labouring people of that town, and I would say here that I hope that although coming from a small community, coming from an agricultural area, I can prove to the people of that community that their interests as workers can be just as close to me as the interests of the people from the smaller centres that I represent, and the interests of the people from the rural areas of that constituency. Many of the citizens of the Melville constituency, Mr. Speaker, are people who are descendants of the original people that lived on these plains. The people of the Indian nations live on the File Hill Reserve in my constituency. The Metis people who live in my constituency at two or three different points, have added a great deal to the history, to the folklore and to the interest that we have to show the people who come to this province of ours.

Before continuing with my address, I have what I consider is an unpleasant task to undertake this afternoon. As I said at the beginning, I have had the pleasure in the past of sitting in this Assembly. I not only have had the privilege of sitting in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, but I have had the privilege of sitting in the House of Commons and listening to addresses from time to time; but never at any time when sitting in either of those places, have I ever heard a statement to quite equal the one that was made by an hon. member of this Assembly, last week, before this Legislature. It was about two weeks ago that we had the opportunity, the unfortunate opportunity, of wishing farewell to members who used to sit in this Legislative Assembly. There were fine tributes paid to these men at that time. Fine tributes and fine words were paid not only by private members, but by the Premier of this province, who sits across the floor of this House. Following that, on Wednesday last, the hon. member for Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst) rose in his place, and during the course of his Address, he made the following statement which is taken down verbatim from the recording of the Legislature of that date. This is the statement that my hon. friend made on that occasion:

“At the opening of this Legislature, respects were paid to former members of this Legislature. Among those was the former member for Wadena (Mr. MacMillan). While I did not say so on that occasion, when I spoke on it to his memory in this Legislature, I wish to take the opportunity now to point out, Mr. Speaker, the first time I had an opportunity to vote; when I was old enough to vote, I had the pleasure of voting against Mr. MacMillan, but on the last three elections in Wadena Mr. MacMillan had personally told me he had the pleasure of voting for me. Mr. MacMillan shortly before he died, while sick in the hospital, told some of his friends, and they were much surprised when he told them, that if he was able to be up and around in the last provincial campaign, he would have taken an active part on behalf of the C.C.F.”

This morning, I received a letter from the widow of Mr. MacMillan, and Mr. Speaker, I would ask your permission, sir, to read this letter with regard to the statement of the member from Wadena (Mr. Dewhurst):

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Will you please take your seat. As all members know, the rule with respect to the reading of private correspondence is very definite and is very usually followed. Now, the member for Melville consulted with me on Friday evening, and told me at that time his intention to bring this matter up. He also told me that he expected to receive the letter which he has referred to. I have given the matter a good deal of thought since that time, and I decided that, in spite of the rule which usually applies to the reading of private correspondence in answer to members of the Legislature, in this case because of circumstances which are somewhat peculiar, or unusual, let me say, the hon. member should be permitted to read that correspondence. The statement made by a good number of people, and I think it is well that the matter should be brought before the House, and since, in order to reply to a statement made in debate, in this instance the only source of information about which a reply could be made is from people outside the House, I decided that I would allow the hon. member to read that letter in this case. I would like to make it clear, however, that it should not set a precedent; that any departure from the rule in future, where the circumstances attendant in this case to a reply, would be quite rigidly enforced.

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much your words and the opportunity that you are providing me to read this letter to the Assembly. I would like to say, for the information of those who may not be too clear, the fact is that Mr. MacMillan was a sitting Liberal member in this House some years ago, and was also a Liberal member in the House of Commons in Ottawa for some years. The letter reads as follows:

March 4, 1957

“Dear Mr. Gardiner:

On Wednesday afternoon, February 27, 1957, I have heard that the member for Wadena constituency, Mr. Dewhurst, stated in the Legislature that my husband had voted C.C.F. in the last three elections.

I would like to state a few facts that will put the records straight. At the time of the June election in 1948, my husband and I were in the province of Nova Scotia. My husband had not been well, and he went there to a brother who was a medical doctor. In June of 1952, he was ill again; he was in the Wadena hospital from May 17 to June 7. His doctor has told me that at that time he had another coronary. He was at home the day of the election, but was still confined to bed most of the time, and, of course, unable to go out. Again, in 1956, he had been very ill for several weeks. This time he had been moved from Wadena hospital on May 12, to a Saskatoon hospital. He was home again from June 15 to June 21, and on that date had to return to the hospital. So, again, he was unable to go out to vote.

The above facts will correct any wrong impressions, I trust.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs. M. MacMillan,
Widow of the late John Angus MacMillan.”

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the reading of this letter may clear up any misunderstanding that may have taken place. I am sure that the statement of my friend from Wadena constituency was probably made in a time of haste, and perhaps he had not taken time to study the implications of what he was saying. I would hope and trust that, at some future time, the hon. member might have struck from the records of this Assembly, the statement that he made with regard to one who has passed on.

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I wonder if the hon. member will allow me to clarify that statement.

Mr. Gardiner: — I think the hon. member could perhaps wait, Mr. Speaker, and if he has a statement to make following my address, since it is on the air, that he could make the statement then, if it would be satisfactory to him.

Mr. Speaker: —The hon. member may ask the indulgence of the House, after the speaker is finished.

Mr. Dewhurst: — After the airtime is over, too, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, having concluded that unfortunate incident, I hope, in the history of our Legislature, and with the words of Mrs. MacMillan with regard to the facts in the case, I am going to continue now with the major part of my address which has to do with the Speech from the Throne which has been presented to this Legislature by the Government of this province.

I would just like to state, sir, to you, that this morning I had the privilege of going down to the parliamentary library, and reading a Throne Speech which was made in practically identical circumstances in this House, a Throne Speech which was written immediately following a provincial election in this province, and with the opposing Government sitting in Ottawa only a few months away from a Federal election. When I read that document, Mr. Speaker, I find it strangely unlike the Speech from the Throne that we find in this province today. You can go through the first three-quarters of that address, and in spite of the fact that we were in those days going through some of the most difficult years in the experience of our province, and in the experience of this country, sir, in spite of that fact, for the first three-quarters of that address the word “Federal Government” never enters the address of that day on the Speech from the Throne. I submit, sir, that in the days that I am speaking of, the Governments of that time had more serious problems to deal with than any Government that we have had in this province since that time, and I hope no Government will ever have, in future years a very serious problem; and yet, here is an opportunity for that Government, led by a man, who some over there claim to be a great ‘machine’ man, a politician of the worst type, we find that in the Speech from the Throne you would hardly recognize that fact. There was no attempt to take the opportunity to ridicule the forces that were then in control of the Government of this country, handling the most serious problems that have been handled also by a Federal Government, and much more serious than are being handled today by our Federal Government, and much more serious than are being handled today by our Federal Government or Provincial Governments in this country. So I say, Mr. Speaker, that for that reason alone, this Speech from the Throne of this year is a political document, pure and simple – a political election document hoping to aim it at the people with the idea that it might save the necks of a few of their Federal representatives in the next Federal election.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think we should possibly set the record straight with regard to some of the activities of our Liberal party, not only in this province, but in the Dominion of Canada. We have heard some strange stories and some strange facts, from the other side of the House,

March 4, 1957

with regard to what type of Government is represented by those on this side of the House, of the same political party in Ottawa, what type of Government our fellow members of our party give us in the Federal House down at Ottawa. We have heard the statement from some members that Saskatchewan has been the 'forgotten province' as far as the present Government in Ottawa is concerned. We have heard that from the member (I believe) from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer), and from a Minister who isn't in his seat. I regret that he isn't there this afternoon, because I am told that, when I was out of the House on Friday, he made mention of the fact. It was heard in my constituency that I was not in my seat on the occasion that he made his address. So I think it only fair, sir, that I should refer to the fact that the hon. Minister, and the member for Kelsey (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank) is not in his seat this afternoon, when I have an opportunity to reply to him.

Premier Douglas: —Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, since the hon. member . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — No, no, there is no question of privilege.

Premier Douglas: — The Speaker will decide that, not the member from Melville.

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — Sit down!

Mr. Gardiner: — Sit down! Sit down! This is my airtime.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Premier Douglas: — You are not Speaker yet. Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, a question has been raised regarding a Minister of the Crown, and why he is not in his seat. I have a perfect right as Leader of the Government side of the House to point out that the Minister is on business right now in eastern Canada, representing the Government on an important matter.

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to see that the Premier wouldn't by jumping up all the time, when I am on the air. The day that he spoke, I don't believe that I interrupted him at all during the course of his address, and I can definitely say to him, sir, that on Friday I was on very important business as well. I was looking after the business of constituents in my constituency, who came in here to meet with members of the Government with regard to a very important question of school grants from the Government of this province. I am told that on more than one occasion the same thing has happened. Many times when there is a member out of his seat from this side of the House, someone is sure to refer to the fact when the airtime is on, so that all his constituents will know about it. So I hope and trust, Mr. Speaker, that my constituents will not feel too badly about my being out of the House on the business of some of the people of that constituency, last Friday, for a couple of hours.

Now, to return to the subject at hand, and that is, as to what part the Federal Government is playing as a Liberal party and this party is playing in the affairs of this province. To hear my friends on the other side of the House, you would think that if you picked up the facts in relation to P.F.A.A., I suppose everyone saw the big headlines in 'The Leader-Post' and every place else the other day: 2 "P.F.A.A. – P.F.R.A." Well, I have the figures here, Mr. Speaker, so that we can see whether this P.F.A.A. is a political organization such as my friend would make it out. I wonder if their Leader in Ottawa would claim that his constituency, Mr. Speaker, was a constituency in which perhaps money would be spent for political purposes. We find that, since the inception of the P.F.A. Act in this country, the constituency that has received the largest amount of benefit from this Act has been the constituency of Rosetown-Biggart in the Federal Parliament in this province, and when we look at the place where the demagogue of all demagogues is supposed to come from, when we look down to the constituency of Melville, what do we find? We find that there the constituency of Melville received \$2,449,000 or for every dollar that the Melville seat received, Rosetown-Biggart received approximately \$10 in P.F.A. benefits. And yet there are some people on the other side would dare to stand up and say that P.F.A.A. is paid out on a political basis! You can go down every constituency =, Mr. Speaker, and you will find the same thing: all the biggest payments have been made to constituencies represented by members who are not on the Government side of the House in Ottawa. There was also a reference made, the other day, with regard to payments to municipalities back in days gone by.

I read a reference in the paper (as I wasn't here, I had to get it through the press) with regard to the constituency of Melville some years ago, and municipal payments. the only thing the member for Kelsey (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank) didn't know at the time was that there was no Liberal sitting in that seat at the time, from 1938 to 1944. From 1938 to 1944 it was represented by a Social Credit member, Mr. Speaker, and I am certain, air . . .

Mr. McDonald: — Goofed again.

Mr. Gardiner: — . . . that political pressure certainly wasn't brought too much to bear in order to retain the membership of the hon. member on the opposition side of the House.

So I hope, with those few short statements, to disprove some of the statements that are made, without any basis at all from the other side of the House, and I am sure that the people of the Battlefords in particular will be very pleased to hear that a member from their area would like to see this thing done away with, because it is a 'political machine'. because they received a lot more than the people of Melville did, too. They received over \$11 million – five times the amount that was received in the constituency represented by the member he was referring to, the other day, as having a 'machine'.

March 4, 1957

Mr. E. Kramer (The Battlefords): — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, I certainly won't allow any interruptions.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Kramer: — The hon. member, Mr. Speaker, suggested that I had made the reference that the P.F.R.A. Act or the P.F.A. Act should be done away with. I did not such thing. I suggested that some of the 'heelers' that are employed by that Department should be done away with.

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, I didn't rise when the hon. member was speaking, and I hope the hon. members on the other side will not interrupt during my radio time. I wouldn't mind on any other occasion. I rather enjoy people interrupting me, whether it is at a political meeting or any other place, . . .

Mr. Speaker: — All hon. members have the right to rise and correct anything that is being said which is not in accordance with their own statements.

Mr. Gardiner: — Well, maybe, Mr. Speaker, I should have said that he left the impression with me that he thought that should be done. I believe that that will set the record straight. He left the impression, by his remarks to me, and what I would like to say to him is that, when I sit and look at some of the officials of some of the Departments of Government in this province, I wonder, perhaps if I shouldn't have the same feeling with regard to dealing with some of their provincial departments when it comes to the matter of employing what he might term "political heelers" to take charge of the Departments of Government in various spheres in this province.

Let us return once again to the payments that have been made in various regards to this province, and you will realize, Mr. Speaker, that we can take just two or three items from Federal expenditures and find that through those two or three items, our Federal Government pays more to the people of this province in services and in cash, than is paid out by this Provincial Government in all its spheres of administration. Those items, Mr. Speaker, are as follows: Family allowances – some \$21 million comes into this province every year through Family Allowance legislation; with regard to Old Age Pensions, both the complete pension of \$40 for those over 70, and half of the pension for those between 65 and 70 – another \$24 million is paid into this province. Then, when we take the Dominion-Provincial grant, without going any further, and add that \$28 million, those three items will show an expenditure of more than is paid out through the revenue of this province, during the past year. So I say to my hon. friends across the way if that is the type of legislation that they would like to see done away with; if that is the type of legislation that they feel that we can do without in this province of Saskatchewan, then perhaps

we can think in the future that our Government in Ottawa may be would deserve defeat.

Coming back to some of the other issues that they have mentioned; coming back to issues dealing with agriculture. There has been some reference in this House to the fact that the population in this province has been going down in the last few years. There have been references made that the only reason for that is the fact that our agricultural economy is not booming as the rest of the country is. Now, we can go to other provinces (and I don't believe in comparing other provinces too much) and we can take the completely agricultural province of Prince Edward Island, and there we find, under an agricultural economy, that the province has increased its population at double the rate that the province of Saskatchewan has in the last few years. We can go to other provinces where they are just as highly agriculturalized as the province of Saskatchewan, and find the same condition existing. Only here in Saskatchewan, where our Provincial Government has taken no action whatsoever to assist in the problems of our agricultural people, only here in this province, Mr. Speaker, do we find the circumstances of farmers pulling out to the extent that they are.

When we look at the history of agriculture during the last few years, and we take a few figures – the members on the other side of the House usually like to quote figures, and I am going to quote just a few. These are tables that are taken from General Statistical Information of the Branch of Trade and Commerce of the Federal Government, an organization that most of us get our information from, and this is based on five-year periods, Mr. Speaker. It is the estimated income in cash earnings of the farmers for certain periods in this country. Now let us go back from 1930 to 1934, a five-year period, and see what the farmers at that particular stage were earning in the way of incomes in Canada. \$664,424,000 in income came into Canada during that five-year period. We go to 1935-39, and we find that it is \$804,320,000; the period 1946-50 - \$12,518,000,385. We go to the period 1951-55 and it is \$3,189,116,000; and the estimate for 1956 - \$3,144,000,000. That is the overall Canadian picture of agriculture in this country for the period of years which I have read, and I might say, sir, that those are gross figures, and if we want to take the net figures, there is not too much difference as far as change is concerned. The net figures in 1930-34 (and I will read just the two figures in this in order to save time). In 1930-34, the figure was \$187,849,000, and in 1956 the estimated income will be \$1,557,000,000. In other words, Mr. Speaker, I would say that at the present time, in Canada as a whole, agriculture is enjoying a fairly good increase. Taking the years as a whole, they are enjoying a fairly good increase in income over that period. I am not one that is going to say, and I don't believe anyone ever will, that that is sufficient. I hope that increase is going to continue. I hope it is going to be even better than is predicted for 1956, and that in 1957 it will go on to show further improvement.

March 4, 1957

But, Mr. Speaker, there is some mention of parity prices. In fact, there are quite a few in this House who have made mention of parity prices from one time to another. I believe in fair prices, too, Mr. Speaker; but there are some in this province who on many occasions do not have the opportunity to enjoy parity because they suffer crop failures, and our Federal Government in Ottawa is trying to present legislation which will alleviate this hardship in the form of the P.F.A.A. legislation, which some people hint may be a political weapon of sorts. Now, I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the remarks of my friends across the way will not be taken to mean that they are joining with certain people in Manitoba, and particularly 'The Winnipeg Free Press', in urging that the P.F.A.A. be done away with, because I can assure them that, in this province, the P.F.A.A. is looked to by many people who have needed to use its services down through the years.

Now, to get back, Mr. Speaker, to Saskatchewan, because that is actually where we should be, I thought I should say one or two words with regard to the other problems, because some of my friends on the other side were wondering when I was going to speak, and when I was going to say something in this House, one individual in particular. And before leaving agriculture for the moment, I would like to read from a particular document, just a short writing with regard to agriculture in this province:

"Indications are that 1956 will be the best year since 1953 for Saskatchewan's agriculture. This year's crop again attained bumper proportions, and its value is estimated to be well over \$550 million. Grain marketings this year have been maintained at a level substantially higher than those of 1954 and 1955."

You would think to hear some of our friends across the way that there aren't any markets at all left in this country . . .

"The outlook for wheat exports remains favourable, and marketings during the coming winter should show a marked improvement over last year's. As a result, farm cash income for the first six months of this year rose to \$269 million, an increase of 35 per cent over the same period of 1955."

And yet, Mr. Speaker, I have heard gentlemen on the other side say that our income has been dropping for the last few years, and is still dropping . . .

"Cash income in the second half of 1956 is expected to show a similar increase, which would result in a total farm cash income figure of around \$600 million in 1956."

Mr. Speaker, this is not Liberal propaganda, I might say in closing This document is put out under the signature of the Hon. C.M. Fines, our Provincial Treasurer, and of his Deputy, Mr. A.W. Johnston.

So, Mr. Speaker, according to our Provincial Treasurer in this province, things are just rosy as far as agriculture is concerned, except when you hear him speaking from the other side of the House.

Premier Douglas: — That's better than 1955.

Mr. Gardiner: — Now, Mr. Speaker, getting back to our province, here. We have many problems that, I believe, in the days that are going by we should be dealing with, and particularly today, the beginning 'Education Week'. I believe that we should say something with regard to the problems of education in this province. Perhaps it is a good omen that we had a school teacher speak first this afternoon, and now we have a Secretary of a School District addressing this Assembly, perhaps representing the Trustees' group, because of the fact that I am secretary of the school from which the students in the gallery come from in the town of Lemberg. You know, the hon. member who spoke just previous to myself, referred to a statement that was carried in "The Saskatchewan Commonwealth" with regard to the promises of the present Government affecting education.

I think that, in our district in particular, Mr. Speaker, we are in a position to compare what has taken place during the last few years, and I am going to do just that. We hear glowing words about what is being done for education, so I think that when we have the statement — and I am going to re-read it, because I think it is an important statement: this is a statement set forth by the Rev. T.C. Douglas and reported in "The Saskatchewan Commonwealth" of March 10, 1943, namely:

"The first thing which a C.C.F. Government would do would be to recognize education as the responsibility of the Provincial Government. There has been a tendency on the part of the Provincial Government to pass the buck to the municipalities . . . (listen to that) . . . pass the buck to the municipalities and local school boards for maintaining our educational facilities. The time has come when we must recognize that Canada's constitution places the responsibility for teaching our children squarely upon the Provincial Government, and it cannot be passed on to by any other body."

To that I say 'Hear, hear!'

March 4, 1957

Now, Mr. Speaker, the facts that I have here are facts that I know a little bit about, and there is one thing about these figures – they are not figures that can be hidden behind changes in administration. Because of the fact in our particular district we are not in a larger unit of administration, therefore, we are operating under the same circumstances as we were 13 years ago, when this Government came into power. We are operating under exactly the same set-up.

Let us see what advantages we have received from having the present Government in office with regard to educational grants in the area from which I come. Here is a small country school, Chickney School, not very far from the town of Lemberg, and in 1944 the provincial grant, the grant paid by the provincial government of that day, took care of 23 per cent, and then you take the net grant and it took care of 27 per cent, and then you consider the gross grant. In 1956, Mr. Speaker, what do the figures show? In 1956, they show 22 per cent. In 1956, after the increases that have been mentioned by this Government, 22 per cent of the operating costs of that school are being handled today by the Provincial Treasurer. With regard to my own school, the school represented by the students in this Assembly, the Lemberg School District, in 1944, under the basis of the net grant, 23 ½ per cent of the operating costs of that school were handled by provincial grants, and in the terms of the gross grant, 25 ½ per cent. In 1956, just last year – and I have these facts, because I have the financial reports of all these years as hand; in 1956, we find that, on the basis of the net grant, it took care of 18.5 per cent of the cost of education in that school, and in terms of gross grants 23 per cent of the total operating costs of our schools.

This is a school, Mr. Speaker, which hasn't changed as far as administration is concerned over those years, and I am as certain as I am standing here, unless the premier and his Government do not believe in equality of education for the children of this province, I believe that I can say, Mr. Speaker, that probably the facts will show that the province as a whole is not too much better off than it was back in 1944, when the Liberal Government went out of office; as far as school grants are concerned in this province. I have figures here with regard to 12 schools, but because of the time element here this afternoon, I am not going to take time to read them. But when we have statements – and my friend from the constituency who sat down a few moments ago, was speaking about the glowing statements that members of the party opposite had made in years gone by – of what they were going to do for the children of this province, and what they were going to do for the less fortunate in this province. And the once or twice that I have met with officials of the Department of Education at meetings, at public affairs, you know the one stock answer they have on most occasions is, why don't you join a larger unit and make your neighbours pay it? Well, I have told them on all occasions it isn't my neighbours' business to pay it.

The Government of this province promised, back before they were elected in 1944, to accept that as their responsibility, and as far as I am concerned, I hope to remain here until I see the day that a Government will accept its fair share of the cost of education in this province.

You can all remember, a few years ago, hearing the slogan “Humanity First”. During the last campaign I tried to show, on certain instances, the real meaning of this “Humanity First” of the present Government, and I am going to take a few minutes to run through one or two of the policies of the Government to show what they believe “Humanity First” is.

Power is the first thing: the organization of power in this province. I have heard speakers get up and say that there was an organized power program in this province. If there was, Mr. Speaker, the people in the country never realized it. The only way the power program of this province was organized, Mr. Speaker, was because of the fact that there were people out in the country areas of this province who, in order to get it, in spite of even the large amount of payment that had to be made, were prepared to go out among their neighbours and get their neighbouring farmers to agree to join up to the power, and they even went out as a collection agency. I know municipal officials, a few years ago, who had to come in here, and it wasn't a matter of first here, first served; it was usually a matter of the municipality or the district was able to collect the largest amount of money to have power installed. That was the basis of the power program in this province. It was based on dollars, not humanity. Any power line that has been established in this province in the last few years has been built by the homes of many who couldn't afford to have power put into their homes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is what the Government of this province considers to be “Humanity First” I say with regard to their whole program, that the program of this Government is one of the dollars first – they will think of humanity some other time. \$515, I believe it is, Mr. Speaker, and then they have to have the money as well to go and place the power into their buildings, to have the installation placed in which amounts to usually as much if not more than the total amount paid to the Government of this province. Usually around \$1,000 it costs the farm people to have power in their homes and to have the advantages for which this Government claims the credit for progress should go to them. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the credit for power program in this province, such as it has been, belongs to the people who had the energy to go out and work and see that it was put into effect.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is the question of social welfare. You know, a few years ago, you used to hear down in Ottawa, you used to see it in the paper every day, a statement that certain members were rising in their laces and saying: “Do away with the means test for old-age pensions.”

March 4, 1957

My friends on the other side (a few of them have sat in Ottawa) have probably risen in their seats and urged the same policy. But what happened in this province? When the Liberal member s, I believe on this side moved a motion to do away with the means test with regard to the supplementary payments for old-age pensioners, it was opposed by every member on the opposition side. Now, that is what they consider is "Humanity First", Mr. Speaker. I usually believe that you should try to practice what you preach after all, and the present Government doesn't believe in that slogan. They believe that you should preach it to the other fellow, and do the opposite yourself.

Now, with regard to these question s, I know what went on in my community; I know what went on in many communities in this province. People were sent out to sit in community halls, bring in the old people of this province into those halls in a public fashion to ask and plead that they be given an increase in supplementary allowances, only two years ago. I feel that there could have been a much more humane way of approaching the matter of increases in supplementary allowances to the pensioners of this province, and I would say, Mr. Speaker, the fact that half of those who appeared and applied were turned down, and only a very few received the maximum pension under that legislation, shows that the present Government has not too great an interest in the "Humanity First" that they used to speak of in such glowing terms before they came to office, back in 1944.

We could go through almost every department of Government in this province, even in regard to the grid scheme for municipal roads at the present time. The Government of this province says, "Oh, we're big fellows. We're going to provide you with 50 per cent of the cost of your grid roads, and let you dig up the balance." They say, "You can pretty well decide where the road is going to go. Since you are paying your 50 per cent, we'll give you that right to say where your roads are going to go, to the greatest extent." Then at the same time when those roads are constructed, under the present policy, Mr. Speaker, the municipalities and the farm people of this province will have to pay for the maintenance and the upkeep of those roads, and there are many people in municipal life today in this province who have stated to me – I had the opportunity of attending all my municipal meetings before coming to this House, and without fail every municipality meeting I attended told me that they felt it would be extremely difficult for their municipalities to look after the maintenance and upkeep of these roads once they had been constructed.

Now, with regard to highways, and while I am on the question of roads, there is one matter that I would like to raise in this House with regard to my constituency and with regard to roads. The hon. Minister of Highways sometime ago had a delegation visit him from the town of Melville with regard to roads in the constituency. I have a copy of the letter which was written to the delegation, or handed to the delegation by the Minister at

that particular time; but if that is the basis and policy on which the roads are built in this province, Mr. Speaker, then I don't think there has ever been a time in the history of this province when politics has entered more into the construction of roads. I would like to say to the Minister that it is definitely up to his department to make the advances for the construction of this road, and to approach the proper authorities with regard to it, which of course, is the Department of Indian Affairs in the Federal administration.

I might say just a little bit more about what this road has to do with the municipal road. It is a municipality road that leads from No. 47 Highway to what is termed 'Melville Beach' down in the Qu'Appelle Valley, and in order to sort of satisfy the delegation that day, he told them that the Provincial Government would be prepared to pay everything that wasn't going through the Indian reserves that were located at that location, providing the Federal Government were prepared to pay the cost of the construction of the piece that goes through the reserves. Now I asked a question here the other day, Mr. Speaker, as to what this Government intends to do, and the answer was that they are not going to do anything until the Federal Government have finished that three miles. Well, Mr. Speaker, that three miles is right in the centre of this stretch of road. There is some that the province will have to build on one side, and there is some that the province will have to build on the other side, and he said the only terms under which he will build that road is if the Federal Government complete their portion of the road first, and then they will commence construction. Well, I can definitely inform him and his Department – yes, I believe he knows, Mr. Speaker, - that the place he must go to apply for assistance from the Federal Government in this regard when the road is going through a reserve is (as he very well knows) the Department of Indian Affairs. As there is an office in this city, he can quite easily contact that office at any time and take up the matter with them, discuss it with them, and I am sure they will give him a good hearing, because I understand that they have done likewise in certain other cases in this province. I am certain, Mr. Speaker, if he takes that action, possible the people in this particular section of this province will be able to enjoy the right to the use of a fairly good standard road down through this particular summer resort in the Qu'Appelle Valley.

With regard to roads generally in my constituency, Mr. Speaker, . . .

Hon. J.T Douglas (Minister of Highways): — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I just want to put the hon. gentleman right. I didn't ask for any such road; the delegation came and asked for me. I told them where to go to get this road completed, and I am going to ask the hon. member to table that document which he has in his hands.

March 4, 1957

Mr. Gardiner: — Well, this letter here, Mr. Speaker, is slightly torn, but I will be glad to table that document. Probably I should read it prior to that, should I?

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — Why sure, read everything you've got.

Mr. Gardiner: —

“This letter will confirm the information given to the delegation from Melville at the meeting held in my office today, January 3, when you requested the province to construct a road from No. 47 Highway along the north side of Crooked Lake. At that time I pointed out to you that part of this road traverses the Indian reservation, an area which pays no tax either to the municipality or to the province.

“This being the case, I felt that this section of road was the responsibility of the Federal Government. However, I made a commitment to have the province construct a municipal grid standard, the road from a point near the northwest corner of Section 19, Township 19, Range 6 west of the Second Meridian to a point approximately 90 rods east of the southwest corner of Section 21, Township 19, Range 6 west of the Second Meridian, providing the Federal Government constructs a road built and gravelled to municipal grid-road standards, commencing approximately 90 rods east of the southwest corner of Section 21, Township 19, Range 6 west of the Second Meridian to a point on the east side of Indian Reservation No. 74-A, which would end on the east side of Section 6, Township 19, Range 6 west of the Second Meridian.

This offer is made on the understanding that the province will not undertake the construction of this road until the Federal Government has completed the portion through the Indian Reservation No. 74-A to grid-road standards.

It is further understood that the municipality must make formal application to the province to construct this section of road from a point near the northwest corner of Section 19, Township 19, Range 6 west of the Second Meridian to a point approximately 90 rods east of the southwest corner of Section 21, Township 19, Range 6 west of the Second Meridian, and the province makes no commitments for its maintenance.”

Mr. McDonald: — Who signed the letter?

Mr. Gardiner: — The letter was signed by — the original letter was signed by J.T. Douglas, of which this is a copy.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — Who is it addressed to?

Mr. Gardiner: — It is addressed to Mr. Phil Walters, President of the Melville Board of Trade, in the town of Melville, Saskatchewan. Now, Mr. Speaker, the municipality has sent in a request to the Department of Highways in this province, requesting the construction of this particular road, and I submit to the Minister of Highways that it is now his duty, as the Provincial Government should be the one that approaches the Federal Government in matters of this type; that it is now his duty, as is done in other places, to go to the Indian Affairs Department and ask them to take part in the construction of this road and to build the section through the Indian Reservation that has been named. I am certain if the hon. member does that, he will receive full consideration as he has in the past.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — Again, on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. When the municipality wrote me, they asked me to do this once the Federal Government had built their road. They made this request with the understanding that we would not be called upon to build our section until the Federal Government built theirs. Apparently they had no more faith in the Federal Government than I have.

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, I still submit that the Minister knows how these things are handled, and what channels they go through; but he doesn't want to build them so he makes his letters so that nobody else can have any right to build it as well.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — Of course, I do.

Mr. Gardiner: — But I submit to him that if he will take the responsibility that is his, instead of making a political issue out of the matter, that road will be built for the people of that district.

Some Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — But again, if he doesn't take that action, Mr. Speaker, I submit the responsibility for that road not being constructed will lie entirely at the door of the Government of this province.

Some Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

March 4, 1957

Mr. Gardiner: — Now, Mr. Speaker, with regard to roads in the remainder of my constituency. You know, during the last election I had a visit from quite a few of my hon. friends across the floor of this House; in fact almost half the Cabinet were up there taking part in the election in that constituency. The Premier of the province made two trips up into that constituency. Promises were made prior to the election for construction and work on almost every highway throughout my constituency.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — That's not true.

Mr. Gardiner: — . . . And some of the first work was done. No. 22 Highway was going to be reconstructed — and the Minister can say that isn't true, but it is; the announcement was made by his party in that constituency. No. 15, No. 10, No. 22, No. 47 — work was promised and reconstruction, on every road in my constituency prior to the election. I think that some of the hon. members opposite and some of his members who were defeated, would probably like to know that fact — that roads were going to be built, and some of them were done. Some of them were built; they were busy at some of them during the course of the election, and I want to thank the hon. members opposite who made it their purpose to come down to my constituency. About half of the Cabinet, and two or three of their private members came — and I would just like to state to one private member — I imagine he will know when I tell him the little story. There is a friend of mine in a clothing store up there who has been waiting for something for some time, that the hon. member said he would send him if such and such a thing happened. So I would just like him to remember that fact, and maybe carry out the pledge he made at that particular time. This friend asked me if I would remind him of that. I am not going to mention any names; but I am sure that the hon. member who is concerned will remember only too well. It is rather an amusing thing, but it is rather a personal thing, and I thought that the member should be told, and I can see that he knows whom I am referring to.

I want to say again that I appreciate the fact that my friends came down to my constituency. I am only sorry, sir, that I was not there to welcome all of you in the fashion that maybe you should have been welcomed. I regret, particularly in my own hometown that I didn't have the opportunity to welcome the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines). There have been references made to the fact that some of us on this side of the House didn't have much of a majority in that particular election, but I say with a great deal of pride that at least there are some of us on this side who were able to obtain the support of the people who knew us best, in our own home town, which cannot be said of the gentleman who made the reference to small majorities in this Legislature during this present Throne Speech Debate.

I want to say to those in my own home town who made that possible, that I appreciate the right of representing them here in this Legislature, and I hope that, during the next three or four years I can, as I have done today just in a passing reference – it is not really the fault of the Government, but I thought I should make one thing right. I noticed in the press the other day, a statement that the Provincial Government had spent a great deal on special levies for the construction of rural telephone lines. Now, reading that report you would almost gather that the Provincial Government had expended some of its own funds. It is not the fault of the Government, as I say; it is a misunderstanding. But I would just like to point out that every cent of that money that was mentioned that has been spent has been collected from the municipalities in the areas in which it has been spent, and that they have been spending their own money, only they have to send their cheques in here to the Provincial Government, to have them endorsed by the Minister of Telephones or his Deputy in this province, before they can be cashed. But every cent of that administration, Mr. Speaker, is collected and is spent by the people who live right in the districts where the Rural Telephone Companies exist.

Mr. Speaker, in closing today I would just like to say that there are three or four reasons why I cannot support this Speech from the Throne. I believe that I have clearly outlined that, in the first instance, it is first and foremost a political document written by the C.C.F. party in this province; secondly, Mr. Speaker, 55 per cent of the voters in this province told those of us who are sitting on this side of the House that it was our job to do everything within our command to see to it that the present Government would be out of office after the next election; and thirdly, Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Government of this province has refused to bring about the improvements that they promised when they originally came into office – and even if education was the only one, I would have to say that I cannot support the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. G.H. Danielson (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I wish to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your elevation to the responsible position that you hold. I am sure, as far as I am concerned, that your conduct in that office during the last three weeks has been such that I have every confidence in the world that you will be able to conduct the proceedings of this House in an impartial and proper manner.

There are many things that could be said this afternoon, but time is going on and I would like to conclude my remarks before the adjournment of the House; but there have been a few things said here during the debate which I would like to refer to briefly in order to clear up some of the misunderstandings and the confusion that has been created by certain speakers on the other side of the House.

March 4, 1957

I refer to the debate that took place here a few nights ago on the mothers' allowances, and the comparison that was drawn between Saskatchewan and Manitoba. Last year I took part in the debate and I produced some documents containing evidence for whatever I was saying in regard to the comparisons that I made; and after I had concluded my remarks the member for Morse (Mr. Gibson) took part in the debate and he quoted figures exactly the same as I used just before him; and when I asked him where he got his information, he said, "just from the same books you got them from." So there can be no question about these things. I have checked the figures and they are correct.

I will take Saskatchewan first. In Saskatchewan, during the year 1953-54, there were 2,272 families receiving mothers' allowances, and the total amount of money – let us get this thing very clear – that was paid out to the 2,272 families was \$1,217,309. Now, when we take that amount of money, \$1,217,309 and divide it over the 2,272 families, we have \$535 per family per year. When this money was paid out there weren't any strings attached to it.

Then we come to Manitoba, and the number of mothers' allowance cases in the province of Manitoba was 1,099, and the amount of money that was paid out in the province of Manitoba to these 1,099 families was \$1,006,507. That, Mr. Speaker, is \$915 per family, as compared with \$535 per family in the province of Saskatchewan. There you have it; there is no question about these figures. But the other night when the discussion took place in this House after the member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) had brought this matter up (and by the way, it was made clear by what was said that the discussion was on the same 1953-54 operations of mothers' allowances in the provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan), the Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Bentley) got up and said this: "In Saskatchewan they provided assistance for 8,895 people at a cost of \$1,217,309 – exactly the same amount as was quoted a moment ago, according to the figures provided by the member for Morse (Mr. Gibson).

Now then, he goes to work and he says here that in Saskatchewan there were 8,895 and the total amount paid out was \$1,217,000. In Manitoba, the number of people assisted – not the mothers, but all the members of that family – was 4,247, and the total amount paid out was \$1,657,000 – exactly the same amount as was quoted by the member for Morse, and which is correct. Now then, let us see – if we take these people who are in receipt of the benefits from mothers' allowances, Mr. Speaker, we have in Saskatchewan \$136.90 per person; in Manitoba we have \$236.90 per person. I might just as well mention Alberta, which hasn't entered into my discussion, but there the figure is \$212. So you see, there is exactly \$100 per month more in Manitoba than in Saskatchewan, even when you break it up and divide it among them who are in receipt of mothers' allowance benefits.

So here we have it, and it is clearly established that this Government is way behind the province of Manitoba in the mothers' allowance, and that was admitted by the member for Morse last year.

Mr. Gibson (Morse): — Oh, no!

Mr. Danielson: — Oh, yes. Let me read it to you. We will see what you said. Speaking in the Legislative Budget debate, Mr. Gibson declared:

“It is true, as he said (referring to myself) that the rate per mother and one child in Manitoba is \$51 compared to \$40 in Saskatchewan . . .”

And that is the difference, in favour of Manitoba. If you go back and check up on your speech of last year you will find it all.

They will say, “Here, what about Manitoba's means test?” Well, Mr. Speaker, that is exaggerated, twisted and turned in every way possible. Manitoba takes care of their people and they do this — as a matter of fact, additional pensions are paid by the authorities in Manitoba. Why? Because, if the individual recipient is in need of any larger income than the ordinary pension provides, there the local authorities, just like it used to be in the province of Saskatchewan, have all the information; all the circumstances are known to the individuals in the local communities who are saddled with the responsibilities of local government, and they are the best means of taking care of any emergencies that may exist. Grants are paid by the Manitoba Government to the municipalities and this year, they are increased by approximately \$2,000,000 from what they have been before, to take care of these local circumstances as they arise. So there is nothing to talk about; and we don't need to leave the impression, Mr. Speaker, that Manitoba is not taking care of their unfortunate people just as well as Saskatchewan; and the proof is here that they do it a whole lot better.

Then they will say, “What about your hospitalization?” Well, Mr. Speaker, one month of the over-payment in Manitoba, over what is paid in Saskatchewan, will take care of the hospitalization for any one individual or family — just one month; and in some cases it will take care of it three times in a month's increase in payment. So there is absolutely nothing there, and any credit they think they can get from this particular item has ‘boomeranged’ and cannot be claimed with any shadow of truth connected with it.

There is another thing, Mr. Speaker, and that is that, as we go along here, particularly this Session, here and there statements crop up which are absolutely false, but they have been repeated and repeated and repeated. As you know they had an election in Quebec last summer and that was

March 4, 1957

a very rough election I understand, a type of election which was not very much to be proud of. And there were two clergymen who wrote a number of articles on the means and the methods of the election in that province. They point out one thing which belongs right here, and it is that the constant repetition of misinformation, if it isn't caught right at the time and denied and there is publicity given to it, becomes an accepted truth. For instance, I listened to the junior member from Regina (Mrs. Cooper) just shortly before I came down to the House, on a radio broadcast. She said on that radio broadcast – she had to hand some knocks at the Liberals, of course, and she talked about hospitalization, and she said that this great scheme of hospitalization was opposed by the Liberals. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely untrue!

Premier Douglas: — Oh, oh! You are the man who opposed it! The very man.

Mr. Danielson: — I will challenge the Premier to prove, by any documentary evidence in this House, that anybody ever opposed that Bill. I challenge him to do that.

Premier Douglas: — All right!

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, you go ahead and do it and bring it onto the floor of the House. You take the 'Votes and Proceedings' . . .

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has challenged me. Am I to accept the challenge?

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, he can prove that afterwards. I am speaking now.

Premier Douglas: — I have exhausted my right to speak.

Mr. Danielson: — You take the 1956 'Votes and Proceedings' and there was not a division on that Bill. Surely, when the Bill was before the House, there were certain sections of it we took exception to; but that doesn't mean that we opposed the Bill – not by any means; and that is absolutely a falsehood, and whoever says it knows that it is a falsehood.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, it is only three or four years ago since the Premier brought a Bill into this House – Hospital Commission Bill or whatever the title is – and I asked him a question in regard to certain meanings in it, and he barked back at me and he said, "Oh, you should know; you passed the Bill." And that is true. In the Statutes of 1944 we put the Health Commission Bill on the Statute Books of this province; they were the body that set up your hospitalisation scheme.

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington): — In 1944?

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, in 1944. And that Bill created the body, Mr. Speaker, which was responsible for setting up this present hospitalization scheme.

Premier Douglas: — Oh, oh!

Some Opposition Member: — That's true.

Mr. Danielson: — You admitted that we passed the Bill 13 year ago.

Mr. P.A. Howe (Kelvington): — The Larger School Units, too?

Mr. Danielson: — And by the way, Mr. Speaker, anything that has been for the benefits of the people has had its origination by a Liberal government. If he wants to point out anyone who was criticizing this hospitalization scheme in this province, he can go to Dr. Mott. Dr. Mott delivered a strong indictment about the weaknesses of the scheme the last time he attended a convention held in Saskatoon – stronger criticism than any I ever heard; and by the way, to the credit of that gentleman, Dr. Mott came here, Mr. Speaker, and rescued this Government from the mess that they were in when they started to set up that hospitalization. They were in the deepest mess that any government has ever been in, and not until he came here and brought order out of chaos were they able to go to work and operate the scheme.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — What did he say about it?

Mr. Danielson: — The Premier can't get away from that. Surely, there were sections in the Act that we opposed and suggested changes to, but he can look from one end to the other and he will find there was no vote registered by the Liberal party and by the Liberal Opposition against that Bill in any way, shape or form.

Premier Douglas: — Read your speeches.

Mr. Danielson: — But you can repeat on your radio; you can keep on making statements. And that is what they say in Quebec, that is what these two men said, after the election there; they called it the 'systematic lie', Mr. Speaker. After you repeat it and repeat it and repeat it, the people commence to believe that it is so.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Liberal policy!

Mr. Danielson: — But, Mr. Speaker, we hear time and time again, day after day, in and out of the House, condemnation of the Federal Government – what they haven't done and what they should have done, and all that sort of thing from the members opposite. What about this Government? On June 13, 1952 – just about election time – the Premier spoke at Hanley, and do you know what he said?

“Premier Douglas, in a campaign speech at Hanley and elsewhere throughout the province explained what he meant by the statement – the Premier said:

March 4, 1957

“If, during our next term of office, the Liberal Government at Ottawa does go ahead with a national health insurance plan, we will welcome it, and we will work with them to carry it out, but I pledge that if the Liberal Government does not go ahead with that plan, the C.C.F. by itself will institute a medical care plan so that you can pay your doctor bills when you are well and you will not have to worry about paying them when you are sick.”

Premier Douglas: — That’s what we have been doing.

Mr. Danielson: — That wasn’t in 1956, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Loptson: — But you haven’t done it yet.

Mr. Danielson: — That was in 1952.

Mr. Loptson: —What about it? Why didn’t you do it?

Mr. Danielson: — Why, he has had millions of dollars here . . .

Some Opposition Member: — And spending it every year.

Mr. Danielson: —He has \$5½ million to sink into a cement plant to help their capitalistic friends out. They build a Museum over here which will cost \$1½ million by the time you get through with it; last year the cost of landscaping was \$100,000 and now it’s probably more, and all that sort of thing – but no money for this solemn promise which was made by the Premier. That wasn’t the only time; he has done that several times. Why didn’t he do so?

Premier Douglas: — We did. We have done . . . every year, every year.

Mr. Danielson: — You’d better suck your lollipops and shake your rattle . . .

Mr. Cameron: — That’s telling him, Herman boy.

Premier Douglas: — His venom is showing.

Mr. Danielson: — No, Mr. Speaker, I don’t know why it is but just as soon as I get on my feet he can’t sit still. You know, last year, he jumped clean out on the floor, and all he could say was “that man Dixon”; and do you know he blamed him for electing me?

Premier Douglas: — I wouldn't put that burden on anybody.

Mr. Danielson: — But after all, he is trying to keep his patience.

Premier Douglas: — I am patient as can be.

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, you see they have to have something for political purposes and they have played this hospitalization scheme, and the proposal by the Dominion Government — back in 1919, wasn't it? I'll ask the junior member for Regina. She talks about it every time she is on the radio.

Mrs. Cooper (Regina City): — Yes, it was.

Mr. Danielson: — You know there were nine provinces in Canada at that time; there are 10 now. How could any person who had any little bit of reasoning power in his brain at all, not understand that, if the Dominion Government, the Government of all of Canada, was going to go ahead with this scheme they must have at least half or a little better of the provinces to go ahead with that scheme.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — For an excuse, no doubt.

Mr. Danielson: — And by the way, this Government knows that. I know that and they confess that they know it; but they have been using that for political purposes. And here is what happened — Mr. Fines, on January 27, reported in the press to have said:

“Mr. Fines said that while Saskatchewan welcomed Ottawa's proposals, the province regretted there was no provision being made for depreciation charges for hospitals. Saskatchewan has always considered these charges should be provided for. The province will also be responsible for all of the administrative charges.

“We feel that this is a short-sighted policy . . .”

I am going to read it all. He said this:

“We feel that the plan as drawn up would enable the maritime provinces to receive additional support and bring up their standard of hospital care to that enjoyed in other parts of Canada. We are very pleased, he said.

March 4, 1957

“Saskatchewan has consistently fought for a complete health service plan including medical, dental and optical care.”

Now here he is, talking sense. This is a confession:

“We recognize, however, that any all-embracing plan must be brought about through progressive stages and are in agreement that hospitalization insurance and diagnostic services have top priority.”

He knows that this thing must be brought about by agreement. Many provinces in Canada today, Mr. Speaker, are not equipped or prepared to accept and put that scheme into operation. Even Ontario has hinted that they may not even be ready to put it into operation until 1958 or even 1959. So these fellows have known all along that this was coming. The medical health scheme will come, Mr. Speaker, when the majority of the provinces of Canada are ready and willing to participate in it. But this Government is all the time, all the year around – you see, they had to get something new to take the place of the depression: “Colwell prophesies depression.” Those people on the floor of the House were prophesying a depression all the time up until about 1946, and then they had to quit because they were on the wrong track. Now they have picked this thing up; and they have to have something to ‘damn Ottawa’ for, and they think they can use their political cousins in the province of Saskatchewan in doing so.

I want to say a few things more about the hospitalization scheme. I shall always deny that the Liberal party was opposed, or are opposed, to the hospitalization scheme. It is a falsehood from beginning to end, and I repeat it again. But the Premier, when he came into the House in 1946, said that this thing wouldn’t cost over \$6 million, and he said it wasn’t a question of finding the money; that the big problem was to find trained staff – and maybe he was right. After the muddle he got into when he started, I think he was correct; so he has a lucid moment sometimes, when he tells things that really count. But what has happened since? Now the cost has gone up 300 per cent, and every time, after the three last elections. They have known at election time and previous to election time that they had to increase that charge on the public for hospitalization payment. Did they have the decency and the courage to go out and tell the people that they would have to increase the hospitalization payment? No, sir. Talk about deceit! There you have it. Every time for three elections – immediately after the elections, they raised the payments.

Hon. Mr. Walker (Attorney General): — You always told the people we would.

Mr. Danielson: — Just like the Provincial Treasurer did with the compulsory automobile insurance. He knew that months before the election. We had the figures before us on the floor of the House and he probably had another half-million dollar account out in the country which he didn't have in his figures at the time; but not until after the election did he raise the deductible to \$200 per vehicle, and increase the payments. Well, is that playing the game with the people of the province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker? I question it very much. But that is the method of the C.C.F. That is their method. That is the way they do business. The people don't count.

They are cry over the farmers, and out of their Cabinet of fifteen, there are only three farmers.

Premier Douglas: — What?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Can't your count?

Mr. Danielson: — There is my friend, Mr. Douglas from Rosetown, a good friend of mine; then there is my friend the Minister of Public Health (Hon. Mr. Erb).

Hon. Mr. Fines: —How about this one here?

Mr. Danielson: — Who is that?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — 'Brock'.

Mr. Loptson: — He blew up.

Mr. Danielson: — Who is he?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — He's a farmer.

Mr. Loptson: — You should go and see his farm.

Mr. McDonald: — I've heard everything now.

Mr. Danielson: — Three farmers among fifteen Cabinet Ministers in this prairie province. Aren't you proud?

Hon. Mr. Walker: — How about Mr. Willis here?

Premier Douglas: — In 1944, I don't think there were any.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, I think you'd be anything except a farmer. You saw how he acted in the Committee . . .

Premier Douglas: — A better farmer than you.

March 4, 1957

Mr. Danielson: — Well, I happen to have here a file that I am going to speak on for a few moments, Mr. Speaker. I marked it “T.C. Douglas and Thatcher.”

Hon. Mr. Walker: — You are defending Thatcher, are you?

Mr. Danielson: — Well, you know, after all, that’s not a bad scheme. I hope they give me a complimentary ticket when they are going to have that debate. You should be there, Mr. Speaker.

Premier Douglas: — Won’t you come and be Chairman?

Mr. Danielson: — Well, that might be all right.

Premier Douglas: — You’d be impartial!

Mr. Danielson: — I think, Mr. Speaker, would be the best one, and he should have the book of regulations and rules with him.

You know, after all, Mr. Speaker, it is a peculiar thing. Here is a young man who was one of the leading lights in the C.C.F. party. He has tried it out and he became gradually forced to the conclusion that he was in the wrong camp and that he had to get out, and he is not the only one. There were 1,292 in Weyburn who did the same thing last June.

Premier Douglas: — There were 44,000 Liberals in 1952 that weren’t there in 1956.

Mr. McDonald: — How many C.C.F.ers?

Mr. Danielson: — But what is wrong? Down in Newfoundland, at the last election last summer, we had a Liberal, and he was one of the misguided souls who went over and took the leadership of the C.C.F. party. Of course he wasn’t elected, and it’s a good thing; but you never heard any objection from the C.C.F., or from the Liberals, either. We didn’t heap abuse and condemnation on him; but there is nothing in the world that these fellows haven’t heaped onto Mr. Thatcher – all the abuse in the world. But don’t forget, he knows more about you than I do.

Premier Douglas: — It wouldn’t be hard to know more than you do.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, you sure don’t know as much. And after all, Mr. Speaker, the reason I am bringing this up is this – I am serious about this thing. This statement has come from the Premier that if Thatcher had to run in Moose Jaw-Lake Centre he would be tarred and feathered.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Oh, who cares about that?

Mr. Danielson: — Well, one-third of my constituency, Speech from the Throne is in that part, and I have lots of friends among the C.C.F. up there, and I don't mean maybe, either. They haven't voted for me — some of them have, and there will be more every year. I increased my majority by three hundred and some-odd per cent and the Premier lost 65 per cent of his majority. But after all, I take objection to the Premier or anybody else throwing a libel on the people of Arm River constituency, which is in the Moose Jaw-Lake Centre constituency. Now who is supposed to tar and feather Thatcher? The Tories? No, no! The Liberals? Of course not! Well, that just leaves the C.C.F., and I have better principled C.C.F. people in Arm River than would ever do a thing like that. I stand up defending them here. It is a slur on the people of that constituency, and that is the reason I am bringing it up, whether he likes it or not; the less he likes it the better I like it. And he said he is going to hound him over that whole seat until he submits to this so-much-advertised debate between Douglas and Thatcher. Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you that I think Mr. Argue will have his hands full when he commences to talk Mr. Thatcher out of Assiniboia, and it might surprise the Premier of Weyburn, which is in that seat. We mustn't forget Weyburn, because that is a very potent place and I am sure he won't run in Weyburn next time.

Premier Douglas: — Would my hon. friend like to make a bet?

Mr. Danielson: — No, he got his lesson . . .

Premier Douglas: — Would my hon. friend like to make a bet on that?

Mr. McDonald: — No betting — it would be contrary to the Act.

Premier Douglas: — Would my friend like to put up a wager on that, for the Canadian Red Cross?

Mr. Danielson: — I wouldn't be afraid.

Premier Douglas: — He's ducking for cover now.

Mr. Danielson: — You will never run in Weyburn any more. They will find you a corner of Regina here, and he'd be sure to be elected. I take objection to the Premier of this province throwing slurs on the people of my constituency, which is part of Moose Jaw — Lake Centre Federal constituency.

Some Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Danielson: — He did. When the Premier can talk about any person who has been elected to the House of Commons three or four times, because he is now going into another seat, and say that he is afraid to run in his own seat; and that the people there would tar and feather him . . .

March 4, 1957

Hon. J.T. Douglas (Minister of Highways): — Why didn't he run in his own seat?

Mr. Danielson: — He said the people there would tar and feather him. Well, you ask him that. The people of your district will tell you after the election. That is a libel on anybody.

Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek): — He wanted something more difficult.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, now I am going to talk about the election . . .

Hon. Mr. Bentley: — Good campaign so far.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, I happened to look back here and I have a clipping from two years ago, in 1955. Carlyle King, when he spoke to the C.C.F. faithful in Saskatoon, said this:

“Charging the C.C.F.ers were sometimes guilty of losing their perspective, the speaker said, ‘when I look at the total body of resolutions sent in from constituency conventions or listen to the discussing I wonder if our C.C.F. members are interested in anything beyond the parish pump, or the local beer parlour, or the municipal road between Pumpkin Creek or Gopher Junction.’”

Now that is what Carlyle King says; that is what he thinks of the rank and file of the C.C.F. That's right, Mr. Speaker. And then, last year, he said this:

“Carlyle King, Provincial President of the Socialist party said the \$36,000 campaign budget laid down by the provincial council had been exceeded during the campaign. The bills are paid, and we are still solvent.”

Of course they were; they have a good Treasurer! He can get the money.

“When the pressure was at its heaviest, when the Opposition was spending tens of thousands of dollars in a terrific barrage of propaganda, it seemed the part of wisdom to throw a few thousands into the fight and hope that the movement would bail us out afterwards.”

Oh, yes! It did, too.

“He said the campaign indicated that capitalism is a ‘very rough dog’ . . .”

We should ask the Provincial Treasurer.

Premier Douglas: — A rough what?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — A rough dog.

Mr. Danielson: — That is Carlyle King; those are his words, not mine. He said:

“I think that you may expect this to happen again and again until something finally happens to the dog.”

Well, that means your capitalist friends. He went on to say this:

This time the attack came from the west of us, but the same kind of big money was available to those who would like to destroy the social progress of the past 12 years and hand over the wealth and resources of Saskatchewan to the plunderers and exploiters.”

Oil deals and Rubbras and all those people. You know them.

“Last month their extravagant expenditure and their soap-opera ballyhoo failed to stampede the Saskatchewan electorate. The enemies of the Co-operative Commonwealth, however, are not dead. They will be back, Dr. King said.”

And by the way, he referred to my Social Credit friends over here – from the west.

We have another one here, and the silent Minister here – the Minister of Silence (he is not in now) – had a meeting at Saskatoon and he said this:

“Saskatchewan has the best scheme for caring for aged persons of anywhere on the North American continent, Mr. Sturdy observed.”

All was not sweetness and light in his speech, however, as he jarred his listeners with the declaration that the Social Credit party “is bad to the core and cannot last. The Social Credit party has made such a mess of the two western provinces that they should not be campaigning in Saskatchewan”, Mr. Sturdy flatly asserted.

March 4, 1957

Well, you know it is a peculiar thing – what right has he to tell any political party that they cannot campaign in Saskatchewan? Every person has a right to campaign in Saskatchewan. They don't have to ask Mr. Sturdy; they don't have to ask the C.C.F., either.

Then we have another declaration. On June 9 at Govan:

“Orvis Kennedy, Social Credit national organizer, made a revealing statement when he told a meeting in Drake that Hitler would have been all right if they had left him alone, Russ Brown, C.C.F. candidate for Last Mountain, said Thursday night.

“He and dozens of other Socred storm-troopers are invading our province today, said Mr. Brown. They are financed and directed by the big business monopolies to wipe out the gains achieved by farmers and labour in Saskatchewan under the C.C.F.”

Well, he could have left the farmers out, Mr. Speaker.

“Guest speaker at the meeting, Provincial Treasurer C.M. Fines, said Saskatchewan's welfare program was the best-rounded in Canada.”

That is the feeling of the C.C.F. party about the Social Credit party.

Now then, this election, Mr. Speaker, was in great doubt for some time; and as the election progressed it became more and more evident that there was still not any sure forecast of what was going to happen. Of course, the C.C.F. goes out and they tell us that if it hadn't been for the Social Credit party there wouldn't have been any Liberals in this House. You have heard that, Mr. Speaker. Of course you have. Well, I am going to tell the Premier that if it hadn't been for the Social Credit party there would have been a very, very good chance that he wouldn't have been in this House. He would have been out some place washing his feet in the ocean, living on his pension now.

Hon. Mr. Walker (Attorney General): — What a peculiar little 30 per cent!

Mr. Danielson: — You take off the cities of this province and analyse the C.C.F. votes and you will see what might have happened. As a matter of fact, they know it themselves. There is no question about that. They know it themselves; you can tell that by their attitude and their speeches in this House, since this Session began. But there is another indication that shows that this Government is on their way out, a clear indication . . .

Premier Douglas: — You said that last year.

Mr. Danielson: — . . . and that is this . . .

Mr. McDonald: — We made pretty good progress, too.

Mr. Danielson: — . . . That this year they are so dilapidated and so worn-out and so broken-down that they had to provide themselves with a spare tire. They had to get an extra Minister now.

Premier Douglas: — Are you supplying the wind for the tire?

Mr. McDonald: — There is no scarcity of that over there.

Mr. Danielson: — No, no, you can do that and you can shake your rattle and you can suck your lollipop.

Mr. Cameron: — He's content and leaves us flat.

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, here we have a Government over a few thousand people, and we have 15 Cabinet Ministers; and this new man, who had a position — why did they take him out? Well, I understood that they wanted to get him out before the election, but I guess he stood his ground and he came back to the House. Now then, these Cabinet Ministers . . .

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I don't usually interrupt the silly hallucinations the hon. member indulges in, but I am certainly not going to let him allege that he knows what is going on inside the Cabinet without some denial. I want to say categorically there was no question that the Minister in question was quitting before the election . . .

Mr. Danielson: — You sit down.

Premier Douglas: — I don't have to sit down, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Danielson: — This is not a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Premier Douglas: — I am up on a question of privilege.

Mr. Danielson: — That is not a question of privilege.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a question of privilege.

Mr. Danielson: — I am speaking and I am giving facts. You have 15 Cabinet Ministers over there.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

March 4, 1957

Mr. Danielson: — No, no, there is no point of order here.

Premier Douglas: — Sit down. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman going to sit down?

Mr. Speaker: — The Premier has the floor on a point of privilege.

Mr. Danielson: — What is your privilege? State it.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, the Opposition seem to have a difficult time realizing they are not all the Speaker, as well as the speaker of the occasion. I will state my point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Danielson: — That is not a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Cameron: — Of course it isn't. Don't make a speech.

Premier Douglas: — I will state my point of privilege to you, Mr. Speaker. I am not required to state it to the hon. member.

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

Premier Douglas: — If the hon. member will sit down, I will . . .

Mr. Danielson: — What is his point of privilege?

Mr. Speaker: — Will the hon. member sit down?

Mr. Danielson: — A point of privilege refers to himself.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Sit down!

Mr. Speaker: — Will the hon. member take his seat.

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, a reflection has been made on a member of this House and the hon. member cannot make assertions which are completely incorrect and of which only I am in a position to know the facts. The hon. gentleman has just stated that the Government wanted to get rid of a Minister of the Crown prior to the election. I am saying on a question of privilege that I deny that categorically and say that it is not true, lest my failure to deny it will result in my friend going out and saying that it is true.

Mr. McDonald: — You are saying that all the time.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, Mr. Speaker, that isn't any point of privilege, but it is all right.

Premier Douglas: — You wouldn't know what a point of privilege is.

Mr. Danielson: — You don't have to go very far in the city of Saskatoon where they know all about the C.C.F. politicians — that's where I got it. I didn't ask for it; it was volunteered to me. But, after all, I was just getting to the point when he rose up on this feet to make a little speech. I was just going to ask him if he had had enough concern for the people of Saskatchewan to explain to the people why he needs 15 Cabinet Ministers in his Cabinet. It is six or seven months since the election and we haven't heard a word from him since. This one is supposed to be adviser to the Premier; so was Shumiatcher, who was not in the Cabinet. I never had very much concern for the Premier, but when I saw that in the press I was just on the point of praying, "Lord help the Premier".

Premier Douglas: — That isn't the usual prayer you have!

Mr. Danielson: — Lord help the Premier. What is he? Is he a full-time Cabinet Minister? Does he draw a full-time Cabinet Minister's salary? Nobody knows. This Government has never told anybody, and there isn't a man in the province of Saskatchewan, outside of the group that sits across the floor of the House, who knows anything about it. But the people's money is being paid out — 15 Cabinet Ministers; and then you had to make a new table because the old one was too small. This new one is big enough to get all these Ministers around; I hope you have made it big enough so you can get one more in.

Premier Douglas: — I'm afraid there is no vacancy.

Mr. Danielson: — And, Mr. Speaker, out of these 15 men in this province of Saskatchewan there are only three farmers — three farmers!

Premier Douglas: — You can't count.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, Lord help me if I ever get to count the way you do, and then there would be confusion confounded right!

That is the position in this province. But then they go to work and hire another one. Why? Tell us why you had to take him into the Cabinet after you had taken his Cabinet position away from him? He might tell something too, yet; don't be too sure. He might add much to the knowledge of the people of this province. There has never been a Premier before who sat here, except for Dr. Anderson, who had a Cabinet Minister without portfolio and he made an explanation to the people of the province about it, and he only had nine Cabinet Ministers. But here are 15. There are 20 in the Dominion House, covering all of Canada — 20 Cabinet Ministers, with 16 million people or more. And here we have about 850,000 or 860,000 people — I don't think there are any more.

Premier Douglas: — You still can't count.

March 4, 1957

Mr. Danielson: — They are going down. You are the one that can't count, and I am going to show you that you can't count before I get through with you. But that is the situation. Why in the world should the taxpayers, these poor farmers who are broke and worse than broke; why should the taxpayers have to pay for this useless expense . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I thought they were never better off.

Mr. Danielson: — . . . to keep up 15 Cabinet Ministers in this Government? It is an outrage. It is an imposition on the taxpayers of the province of Saskatchewan, and he hasn't even got enough respect for the people to tell why he has to have them, and he won't either.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words in regard to the P.F.A.A. Act.

Mr. Kramer: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Danielson: — I shall not go into that because the member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) went into that very well. One thing is that, after listening to the member for Battleford (Mr. Kramer) the other day, you would think that they were the very, very lowest type of people that run it, even worse than the Ward politicians in the big cities in the United States.

Mr. Kramer: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Danielson: — Well, I happen to know something about that.

Mr. Kramer: — I'll bet.

Mr. Danielson: — I know something about that. The fellows who are doing the work out in the field are farmers from the far, taken off the farm in the fall of the year; and we have had quite a problem, s in the last two or three years on being able to get enough people.

Mr. Kramer: — There are not as many Liberals any more.

Mr. Danielson: — That is all that you know about it. We will excuse you for anything you say. We don't count you. But that is the position. And don't forget this, Mr. Speaker. This thing has been of inestimable benefit for the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Kramer: — And the Liberal party.

Mr. Danielson: — That's what you say. I am sure you could ask the people of your constituency what they think about it.

Mr. Kramer: — They know, and they said so last June.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, if they don't know any more about it then you evidently do, they don't know very much . . .

Mr. Kramer: — They'll be glad to hear that.

Mr. Danielson: — . . . judging by your expression in this House, a few days ago. But certain things have been done with that Act in the last few weeks, and it is really a new Act. That Act now provides for increased indemnities. It has provided for a new classification, there was two – the 250 and 150 area. Now we have one \$4 per acre; \$3 per acre; and \$2 per acre in the new Act, and that is going to be of great benefit to the people of the province who will be unfortunate enough to get that bonus; because, after all, when you get that bonus, Mr. Speaker, that doesn't mean that you are well off. You don't get it unless you need it. Your crop condition has to be such that you must earn it; so it doesn't indicate any favouritism or anything else. There is one thing I think we can feel satisfied with and that is that by increasing this Act to \$4, \$3, and \$2 they have not seen fit to increase the deductions that the farmer now pays, namely 1 per cent of the gross amount of their grain.

Under this Act, Mr. Speaker, practically all of the operations are set out by regulations. Now to my mind there is a certain thing wrong with that Act. I have always said so, and I am going to say so today, and I hope that, when the new regulations are drawn up, the powers-that-be will take heed of some of these things, and I think probably they will. One thing is that an elevator agent, who has a quarter section of land, or a half-section, which he probably farms in the evenings or late at night should, so long as he does the work himself, be entitled to benefits under that Act. He should be.

Some hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Danielson: — The same thing should apply to a small merchant who does the same thing in the small towns and villages. As long as they do the work themselves, they should have a full right to the benefits of that Act.

Mr. Kramer: — We've been telling you that for the last six years.

Mr. McCarthy: — You didn't know it.

Mr. Danielson: — I fought in this House 14 years ago, 15 years ago, to get some of these things in.

There is another thing, Mr. Speaker, and it is this. When a company that operates a number of farms and delivers and contributes one per cent on all their grain to the fund which goes to pay for this thing, they

March 4, 1957

should be entitled to receive the same benefits, as anybody else, up to 200 acres. That is the limit to it. No matter how many acres you have, 200 acres is the maximum on which you can draw the benefits. We often hear 'no taxation without representation'. I would say that there should be no compulsory deduction or committee contribution without corresponding benefit to anyone, whether he is a capitalist or a farmer, or whatever he is.

Then there is another thing that I think should be done and that is that the elevator agent – and you know, Mr. Speaker, as well as I do, that there is a tremendous job for all these agents to keep track of the amount of money which is contributed to this fund; there is no reason in the world, because every bushel of wheat that goes through the elevators goes to the Wheat Board, there is no reason in the world why that deduction cannot be made by the Wheat Board from the interim or final payment, whichever they like. That should be done. It would simplify the work, and a great deal of work which all the elevator agents have been asked to carry on during the last few years. There is no reason – because the Wheat Board is here to stay and if a Liberal party is in power they will stay; and that is one of the things that I believe, Mr. Speaker, should be written into the regulations governing the P.F.A.A. I do hope that at least some of them will be accepted and put into that Act, because it would be for the benefit of everyone.

I left this House on Friday afternoon about four o'clock and the Minister for Mineral Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank) was just through with his harangue about 1938 and road grants and things like that. Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, for you and me who lived through the 'thirties and for myself, sitting in the House in 1938, I thought – well, I hesitate to apply what should be applied to his speech; but I thought it was nonsensical, it was foolish, it was absolutely inexcusable coming from a man who knows, when he sat in the House in 1938. You know 1938 followed 1937, Mr. Speaker, - the average yield of the wheat of the farmers of the province of Saskatchewan was 2 ½ bushels to the acre, and the total income of all the farmers was \$32 million. The Government in power at the time had provided millions and millions of dollars. We had 82,000 farmers who received assistance from the Government, through the municipalities and the governments during that year. In order to get all the feed and fodder we had to have at that time we shipped in approximately 360 cars a day, every working day from 1 October to 5 March; 739 shippers took part in this shipping of fodder; 1,125 points received shipments. In addition to this there were approximately 5,000 carloads of feed grain distributed that year. This, Mr. Speaker, had nothing to do with feed and fodder, gas or repairs and seed before spring seeding. That was for winter maintenance. In addition to that, most of these families were supplied with – I should not say 'enough'; but they were supplied with coal, they were supplied with flour, they were supplied with the necessities of life so they could get through the winter and through that awful period.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — Two dollars a month!

Mr. Danielson: — Well, that's a darned sight more than you pay the old-age pensioners now, and that was more than \$2.00 a month, depending on how much they had of their own. You know, Mr. Speaker, most farmers provided their own butter; they provided their own meat and eggs and things of that kind. In some places in the province they probably were able to get their own firewood. Previous to that, Mr. Speaker, - talk about difficulties. In 1931-32 there was relief handed out. We cancelled that relief by Order-In-Council No. 557/35 in the amount of \$12,698,000 (I am not going to talk about the hundreds); from 1920 to 1934-35, Chapter 92 of the Statutes of Saskatchewan, 1937, drought area debt adjustments - \$32,156,899; 1936-37, Chapter 38 - \$9,124,000; 1938-39, Chapter 64, 1940 Statutes - \$21,455,000, making a total of \$75,446,000. That was what we cancelled, and here we have a Minister sitting over here, when there was a complete blackout over the province so far as revenues from agriculture were concerned (and when that ceases revenue from everything else ceases, Mr. Speaker) who now says, "Why didn't they give out more in road grants."

Mr. Speaker, he didn't tell you that, go back a few years, and you will find that there are 130 some municipalities in this province that have never got a single cent of road grant from this Government in the very flush of good times, when the economy of this province has been the highest it has ever been in any period. This Government is getting more money from the Dominion Government in one cheque than was the total revenue of the province in those years.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — In return for certain tax fields.

Mr. Danielson: — You talk about cancellations. Well, I have some of your cancellations here, too.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — What about the Dominion Government and the province?

Mr. Danielson: — Well we cancelled them, in collaboration with the Dominion Government. You talk about your cancellations. Yes, I know what you cancelled.

Hon. J.T. Douglas: — So do we.

Mr. Danielson: — In 1938 – and this is the Premier Mr. Speaker. You know there were 172 or 174 municipalities, and local improvement districts in the drought area in the province, and then we had the fringe areas which were on a different basis from the rest of them. In 1938 – and this is what my friend has cancelled, and it is here in a letter coming out from the Minister, and it is dated March 28, 1945, and he sets them out here:

Cancelled	1918	\$6,000
	1925	\$2,250
	1928	\$70
	1929	\$167,440
	1930	\$188,402
	1931	\$55,033
	1932	\$380,933,

and then we have the cancellation of \$7,750,000 for the 1938 season. All the rest was in the fringe areas. You cancelled that \$7,000,000 and some odd dollars. That is all right; it was to the good; we didn't object to it. That would have been cancelled in any case, whether there was a C.C.F. Government in this province or not; but this Government turned around and put a mineral tax on the farms in this province, and out of this they picked up over \$6,000,000 and there are other places where they have picked up money. But you didn't cancel that \$7,000,000. You turned around and got it back into the revenue of the province of Saskatchewan by means of taxing the farmers and the rest of the people. So we paid it. What was cancelled by the Dominion Government, in co-operation with the province, was written off, and we of the province didn't pay it; we paid it from the general revenue of the Dominion of Canada, but we have not paid it as a province.

However, to listen to the Minister sitting over there and talking and smearing, and getting on the radio and pointing out "what did you do in 1938?" Oh, Mr. Speaker, you know it is hard to believe that a person who will do that kind of thing thirteen or fourteen years afterwards really has all his faculties. It is hard to believe. It is so low; it is so despicable that any man who has any respect for himself would stoop down to that – but he was on the radio, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Kuziak: — That is exactly what is going on now.

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, he was on the radio. I see I have a little time yet. My friend, the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) over here -

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Old pal!

Mr. Danielson: — You know, Mr. Speaker, I never thought I would ever live to see the day when the province of Saskatchewan would be in such a deplorable position as it is now – according to him.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — You just said it was deplorable.

Mr. Danielson: — He said "this is absolutely terrible". But what puzzles me, Mr. Speaker, is that these fellows will soon have been sitting in power in this province for thirteen years, and before the election in

1944, before the election, in 1933 and years before that, we had 10 of them sitting over here from 1938 to 1944 and there wasn't a solitary thing wrong with the people in the province of Saskatchewan but these fellows had a cut-and-dried remedy for, and proposition to fix it up. They knew what was wrong; they were going to put it right when they got into power. Well, after ten years they came to the conclusion that they knew little or nothing; they didn't know as much as they thought they did. So they appointed a commission, who have spent close to half a million dollars, to the present time, of the taxpayers' money, to find some way of getting these fellows off the hook. That is what the Commission was appointed for; and to find a way, to find an excuse to give the municipalities and ruin them, too, before they get through. That is what the Commission is for – to go out and pound into the people that that if you get larger municipal units everything is going to be all right.

I don't see why you needed a Commission, because, good gracious – they know all about what needed to be done and they were going to do it. Well, Mr. Speaker, here is a clipping from the daily press:

“Economic ruin facing farmers, says Nollet.”

And then I have one here, and here is Provincial Treasurer Fines:

“The Provincial Government's frequent indications were that 1956 would be the best year ever since 1953 for Saskatchewan agriculture and a bumper crop of more than 550 million with higher grain markets and farm income in the first six months of 1956 rose to 35 per cent above the same period last year. The total farm income for the year is expected to be \$600 million.”

Well, he is a pretty good guesser; he was only about \$4 million out, I think, and that wasn't too bad. But why don't these two fellows get together, Mr. Speaker? Surely to goodness, when they sit around that big round table couldn't they get them together, chair by chair, so they could talk to each other and find out what the other fellow thinks, and then they could kind of fix up these statements so that they would be a little more in harmony with what they talk about.

The Minister of Agriculture should, and I am very, very anxious that he should, sit down and have a little talk with his Deputy sometime. You know he has a pretty good sensible person in his Deputy Minister. I have every respect for him, and I think that he could give the Minister some advice if he sat down and talked to him.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Oh, the speech he made? It was a good speech.

March 4, 1957

Mr. Danielson: — I have here the statement coming from a speech that he made to the Rotary Club in the Hotel Saskatchewan on Monday. The date is January 15, 1957 – that is just very recently; and I am going to read it. I will ask you to bear with me, Mr. Speaker, because it is good sensible stuff:

“Speaking at a Rotary Club luncheon meeting in the Hotel Saskatchewan, Monday, Deputy Agriculture Minister W.H. Horner said the Wheat Board system of marketing with quotas and accumulation of unsold grain, is the greatest pressure applied towards restricting wheat acreage.”

Now, he is right in that. Wheat acreage is going down and it wouldn't go down if the farmers didn't have some wheat on hand. He goes on:

“In the past with free marketing and free prices the tendency was to increase the acreage rather than reduce it, he said.

“The closest comparison to be made to the tremendous annual average wheat crop of 311,000,000 bushels between the years 1950 to 1956 inclusive was from 1922 to 1928 when the average was 240,000,000.”

And here is where his technical knowledge and insight comes into play. He said this:

“The tendency to explain the improved yield through technological improvements and mechanization is not altogether true, said Mr. Horner.

“These help to maintain yield in the face of declining fertility of the soil, but the real reasons for the recent excellent crops are the rain and the weather, he said.

“The unusual crops of the last seven years, with the only one crop failure, tend to make us forget that the major problem over most of Saskatchewan is too little moisture and short crops, advised Mr. Horner.

“Outlining the major sources of farm cash income in the province, Mr. Horner pointed out that the income from livestock and livestock products has gone up continually since the war years.

“The particular stability from these sources has increased their importance, compared with the obvious variability in gross income from wheat.

“With wheat still the main feature of our agriculture there is too much inclination to measure farms in terms of acreage, said Mr. Horner.”

Good common sense!

“Some farmers tend to think that size of farms in terms of numbers of acres and efficiency are about the same thing, he said.

“Farm operations can be extended without adding to acreage by developing a second productive factor – transfer of grains and forage to livestock and livestock products, suggested Mr. Horner.

“The Canadian economy is absorbing vastly increased supplies of these products today, consuming almost total production. Forecasts of national earnings and population indicate that these requirements will increase in the next 25 years.

“It is in this market, suggested Mr. Horner, that we can compete on reasonably favourable terms with the farmer in the east. This is the best opportunity for Saskatchewan to increase the size and gross income of farm business without having to see another 30 to 40 per cent of farm business disappear.

“In light of the advantages of livestock production, it would seem surprising that more farmers are not going in for it, said Mr. Horner.

“He suggested farmers were slow to change their ways because of lack of capital, fear of dropping prices if too many farmers were to change, labour problems and dislike of livestock.”

Now these, Mr. Speaker, are all common-sense arguments, and he points out that the acreage of the farm is certainly not an indication of the success of the farmer. You know and I know that a great many farmers on 160 and 200 and 300 acres raise families and supply them with everything by way of comforts of living and facilities that any farmer will on a section and a quarter. Others, on the other hand, might have a farm three or four times

March 4, 1957

that size and yet go broke. Now that is the problem. But the policy of this Government evidently is to chase the farmers away. They say there are already 37,000 who have left the farms. Well, that is nothing to be proud of, I am sure.

Another thing I think is an indication and a suggestion that this Government has not carried out the policies which would be to the best advantage of the farmers. There is no indication that they have any remedy for the ills that beset the farmers at the present time, because the only thing they talk about is the defeatist attitude of taking the farmers off the farms, so that they just leave a few farmers, who will farm more acres and will consequently become prosperous. Well, history doesn't indicate that, Mr. Speaker, as you well know.

There is another thing I would like to speak about and it is that everybody does not agree with the C.C.F. Government on this thing; and the most clear-cut statement on this policy I think comes from the editor of 'The Western Producer'. I am not going to take the time to read it to you, Mr. Speaker, but I am suggesting that the Minister of Agriculture read it. It will do him good, because he is certainly in need of some education on this topic.

Another thing that is eternally talked about and repeated and repeated, is the result of that farm committee which was held here during the Session of last winter, which was lost in transit some place. I have never seen or heard of it since, and you admit that you didn't do anything with it.

Premier Douglas: — Does my hon. friend mean he didn't get a copy?

Mr. Danielson: — Oh, it might be around. I get so much of it, you know.

Premier Douglas: — Well, if my friend didn't get a copy -

Mr. Danielson: — I get so much now. I got some information on rural life, and they are going to send me three or four more before they get through with it.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — If you read that instead of newspapers you would get . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Yes, I have it; and I was on that Committee, Mr. Speaker. I sat in that Committee that last night, and that should have been on the television, because some of the Ministers got up and just screamed, Mr. Speaker. They couldn't talk, they just screamed, when we walked out the meeting of that Committee.

Mr. Speaker: — May I remind the hon. member that it is just one minute until 5:30.

Mr. Danielson: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you, not seeing anything at all in the Throne Speech, except one thing, that they are going to set up a Tourist Bureau and give more jobs to a few C.C.F.ers, I am not going to vote for the Speech from the Throne. I am going to vote against the motion.

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate Adjourned)

CORRECTION (Mr. Dewhurst)

Mr. F.A. Dewhurst (Wadena): — Mr. Speaker, may I make a brief statement. This afternoon while the member from Melville (Mr. Gardiner) was speaking about what I had said, I wanted to say on a point of privilege to point out that while in the transcript the word ‘voting’ appeared, I meant to say ‘supporting’. If the rest of the paragraph had been read to the House it would have indicated quite clearly, as further on in the same paragraph I say that he had supported us silently. In the last line of that paragraph I said, “Mr. MacMillan was a Liberal – a true Liberal, not a back-sliding one. He was a Liberal that looked toward the future.”

At no time have I ever tried to cast any disparaging remarks on Mr. MacMillan, because he was a personal friend of mine. I know, as far as him turning out to vote, he didn’t get out to vote, because he told me he wasn’t well enough. He would have had to go out in a chair, and he figured his health was worth more than that – to be carried out to vote. Where I said ‘voting’ that should have been ‘supporting’, and I said nothing to hard Mr. MacMillan’s friends or family, and I had no opportunity while the member for Melville was on the air (my speech wasn’t on the air) to explain exactly how the last half of that paragraph read. He didn’t read the full paragraph; therefore, I had no chance at that time, Mr. Speaker. I wish to have the word changed from ‘voting’ to ‘supporting’.

Mr. A. Lopton (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, I would also like to say a word on that question. I happened to have been with Mr. MacMillan just a few weeks before he died and we were discussing the possibility of a Liberal candidate, and it didn’t look to me then that he was supporting the C.C.F. candidate in the Wadena seat.

The Assembly then adjourned at 5:30 o’clock p.m.