

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**Fifth Session — Eleventh Legislature**  
**12th Day**

**Monday, February 25, 1952**

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

On the Orders of the Day

**OUTBREAK OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE**

**Hon. I.C. Nollet** (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, I assume that all members of the House have been reading the papers, this morning, and listening to the radio and now know that the outbreak of animal disease in the Regina area has been diagnosed as foot-and-mouth disease. There has been a temporary quarantine placed on the nine municipalities where there are infected animals, and some 18 herds in that area have infected animals. We have some measure of hope that it is not a particularly virulent type of foot-and-mouth disease; but nevertheless, that is what it is, and it certainly will be a blow to the livestock industry not only in Saskatchewan but perhaps other parts of the west will also be affected.

I have not, as yet, received a detailed announcement as to the controls and measures that will be taken, but the Department of Agriculture here has extended its full co-operation to the Dominion Health of Animals Branch in assisting in any control measures that may be decided upon.

It might be opportune, too, for me to say, Mr. Speaker, that we hope that all farmers, particularly in the area affected, and everyone in the area, will do all they can not to come into contact with the herds; and that all farmers will keep their cattle just as carefully isolated as they can, in all parts of the Province. We are hopeful that we can keep this contagion in the restricted area, and if we can do that, then there is a possibility the disease will not spread any further. The animals in the area affected will be destroyed and buried — that means the live animals in all herds affected.

I thought, Mr. Speaker, that I should bring this to the attention of the members in the House, and we will be getting further information by airmail.

## DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The House resumed, from Friday, February 22, 1952, the adjourned debate on the proposed Motion of Mr. Erb for the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

**Mr. W.S. Thair** (Lumsden): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with those members who have preceded me, in congratulating the hon. member from Milestone (Mr. Erb) and the hon. member for Gravelbourg (Mr. E.H. Walker) who so ably moved and seconded the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

I just want to make a short statement in regard to the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease as it is practically all within my constituency. The Minister of Agriculture has made a statement in this House and also over the air and everyone is well acquainted with the seriousness of the condition, so there is not much that I can add.

Some of this outbreak is very close to my own farm — three or four miles away — in the valley; and it is confined mostly to some three municipalities. I am sure that the Department of Agriculture, with the help of the Animal Health Branch, in co-operation with the Provincial Government and the municipalities concerned, will take every precaution, and there will be active co-operation on the part of every farmer in an effort to wipe out this dreadful disease. The Minister just mentioned to me now that compensation will be made for animals that have to be destroyed. I cannot tell you on what basis, but I believe a carcass basis is the usual custom.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to the fact that, almost one year ago, in a debate on the Speech from the Throne, I drew the attention of this Assembly to the plight of Saskatchewan wheat farmers because of frost damage to what was really a record-breaking crop. Today, one year later, I regret that I have to state again that a possible record-breaking crop has been greatly reduced in yield, grade and value because of weather conditions which are acknowledged to have been the worst, and the most adverse weather for harvest, in the past 50 years.

I am sure farmers will look on with mixed emotions that, although a big crop has been produced, it was like drawing teeth to get it safely harvested, and much of it will be threshed this coming spring. The Saskatchewan wheat crop for 1951 is estimated to be about 329 million bushels — a record-breaker. In 1942, it was 305 million; in 1928, 321 million; but, unfortunately, as I said before, because of very wet, dull weather, harvesting was not completed, and a large portion of this crop at the present time lies un-threshed in the fields, either in the form of stooks, or in most fields, swathed. A very high percentage of this threshed wheat is damp. There are millions of bushels yet in the hands of

the farmers. A most recent estimate, Mr. Speaker, made by a survey of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, is to the effect that, on February 1, 1952, some 28 per cent of the prairie wheat is still under snow, or about 150 million bushels. Saskatchewan, of that amount, has approximately 91 million bushels un-threshed at the present time.

At the present time, one of the greatest problems facing the farmers of Saskatchewan, as well as both the country and terminal elevators, is that of damp wheat. Under the Wheat Board Act, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government is actually, wholly and solely responsible for the selling of all grain available in the west, regardless of its condition; and they are making an attempt only now to handle it. Had a transport controller been appointed last summer, as was urged by the Saskatchewan Government, the Farmers' Union and other farm organizations, and had box cars been made available in time to take care of the 1952 crop, a good deal of the wheat in the province might have been taken to the elevators long ago.

However, Mr. Speaker, after months of delay, a statement was made by Mr. John Vallance, a member of the Board of Grain Commissioners, at Regina on Saturday, and I quote from the Leader-Post:

“We are hopeful that there would be little, if any, damp grain still in western Canada when the warm weather returns in the spring.”

He also stated his opinion on the continued operation of drying facilities at the Lakehead and in Duluth, and on farms in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, it is estimated, according to the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, that between 6 and 10 million bushels of damp wheat may be shipped in bond or dried at Duluth and stored there until navigation opens on the Great Lakes. I also understand that the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool have made arrangements to dry some 10,000 bushels per day of damp grain at Altona, in Manitoba. The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool are also installing a new large capacity drying plant at No. 7 terminal at the head of the lakes.

The Provincial Government, the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and the Farmers' union are urging that grain driers be shipped into Saskatchewan, duty free, from the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that I should make a further statement with regard to damp grain. I believe the original proposal made by the Saskatchewan Government to make advances to farmers on un-threshed or stored grain through the Wheat Board is a good system and the farmers could have their advance recorded in their Permit Book. I believe that the Wheat Pool, the Farmers' union, and even Opposition members in this House have supported this plan.

I understand, a brief presented to the Government recently by the Farmers' Union states they are having a number of complaints coming to their office from farmers with un-threshed or un-delivered grain, who have been refused cash advances by the banks to carry them over until Spring. Then they further state:

**February 25, 1952**

“We consider the original proposal made by the Saskatchewan Government to be superior to, and more helpful to the farmers, than the plan finally adopted by the Federal Government, incorporated in the Prairie Grain Producers Interim Financing Act.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, outside of the problem of damp grain and the spring harvest (which will be rather unusual) the farmers today are vitally concerned with future prices of farm products and particularly wheat, and farm costs, more concerned than they are with any other problem connected with farming. It is not correct, Mr. Speaker, to say that the farmers are all prosperous today. I think there is a great deal of evidence to prove otherwise. Because of the poor harvesting seasons and the greatly increased cost of production, the low grades of grain and the low prices for almost all farm products which are below parity, farmers are not prosperous. The prices of farm machinery and repairs, Mr. Speaker, have sky-rocketed the last four years beyond all reason and most western farmers, who had been getting ahead of the game some years ago, have been forced into debt again by machinery expenses. Just mentioning one item, Mr. Speaker. In 1950, according to a report that was tabled in the House of Commons by the Hon. Douglas C. Abbott, the Minister of Finance, loans for the purchase of farm equipment and trucks during 1950 were fifty per cent of all tractors, 64 per cent of all combines, 60 per cent of all trucks purchased in Canada — all financed under the Farm Improvements Loan Act. The highest percentage of these purchases were by Saskatchewan farmers.

Mr. Speaker, just another short statement with regard to this matter. The net income of farmers from farm operations in 1950 was about \$274 million. The total expenditures on farm equipment, materials and repair parts, at retail prices, was \$86 million. Thus, nearly one dollar out of every three dollars net income which is received by the Saskatchewan farmers in 1950 was spent on farm machinery and equipment — and that includes the loans and credits and farmers' cash. One third of every three dollars of his net income was spent on farm machinery and equipment in 1950.

During recent months, according to some of the farm papers, the only suggestion for some of our farm problems offered by the Federal Minister of Agriculture was that the farmers should go back to using horses again, because of crop conditions and other relative problems. And horse machinery, I presume. Well, you can find a lot of it in the fence corners today, and possibly it could be bought cheap.

Now, with regard to farm prices and price supports, I would like to say a few words, Mr. Speaker. I believe it is the opinion among Saskatchewan farmers that the Agricultural Prices Support Act has been used very little since this policy was announced by the Hon. J.G. Gardiner back in 1946. The Canadian Federation of Agriculture, the Western Wheat pools, the Western Agricultural Conference, Alberta and Saskatchewan Wheat Pools, the Western Agricultural Conference, Alberta and Saskatchewan Wheat Pools, as well as the C.C.F. Party both at Ottawa and in Regina have urged that greater use be made of the Agricultural Prices Support Act; have urged higher floor prices for farm products. At the last convention in Saskatoon, the Farmers' Union and the C.C.F. Conventions had passed Resolutions to that effect, asking that the present Agricultural Prices Support Act be immediately

widened to include all cereal grains, wheat, oats, etc., and that floor prices be provided by the Government, similar to other agricultural commodities, by an increase in the present guarantee funds provided for in the operation of the Agricultural Prices Support Act. However, up to the present time, the price support of farm products since 1946 has cost the Canadian people about three quarters of a dollar, or exactly some 73 cents per capita over a five-year period — just covered by a report released by the Prices Support Board at Ottawa. I repeat that 73 cents per capita, over a five-year period, is the cost of Agricultural Prices Support to farm products in Canada. That is not a very large amount. Nearly all price supports for farm products, Mr. Speaker, are regarded by many people, particularly in Eastern Canada and the urban dwellers, as outright subsidies. Mr. Speaker, the farm organizations and I myself maintain that if the wheat farmer cannot obtain a fair and just parity for so-called subsidies or any other method of obtaining a parity price for his products.

About one year ago a motion was introduced into this House urging the Federal Government to make a payment of about \$48 million to the wheat growers of Western Canada for 160 million bushels of wheat supplied to the millers of Canada from 1945 to 1947 at 30 cents a bushel below the Anglo-Canadian Wheat Agreement. The above amount was considered a subsidy by the wheat producers to Canadian consumers and should have been paid by all the people of Canada and not by the Western wheat farmers. Mr. Speaker, this is not the only occasion when subsidies were handed out by the Federal Government at Ottawa. Dr. A.J. Hannam, President of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, has listed some Government payments. In the year 1949-50, subsidies were paid to Canadian Gold Mines of \$14 million — in 1951, supposed to be about \$20 million; the movement of coal, \$4 million; subsidies to steel and iron, \$5 million; unemployment insurance, some \$45 million; subsidy on feed grain to Eastern farmers, \$18 million; subsidy for 114 judges' pensions in Canada, \$500,000; special depreciation granted Big Business during World War II, \$520 million. The Canadian tariff also operates in the nature of a bonus or a subsidy to manufacturers and Big Business. When, in 1930, the late Mr. Norman Rogers, who was a Minister in the MacKenzie King Government, prepared a paper showing that tariff cost to the three prairie provinces in 1930 was \$60 million per year. In 1951 it will probably be \$150 million per year. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, in 1930, the same paper revealed that the provinces of Ontario and Quebec had an annual gain from the tariff of \$83 million, which, at today's prices, might be as much as \$200 million per year of a benefit or assistance from tariffs in the two provinces, Quebec and Ontario, while it cost the Western provinces up to \$150 million a year. So I believe it is correct to say, that the prairies have long been the "milk cow" for the East concerning high freight rates, increase in prices of farm machinery, consumer goods, income tax, etc. For a long time the farming people in Western Canada, in most cases, have had a lower standard of living forced upon them in order to swell the profits of Big Business in Eastern Canada.

As proof of these great profits made by corporations and industries in Eastern Canada, I would just like to list these: 626 corporations piled up more than one billion dollars of profits in 1950, \$845 million

**February 25, 1952**

in 1949. It is believed that, in this past year of 1951, the profits will reach over two billion dollars. The "Globe and Mail" made the statement lately that dividend payments of \$536 million were paid during 1951, according to figures compiled from a brokerage firm during the previous year, 1950, coupon clippers garnered 475 million. The biggest dividend payment of all was from International Nickel which distributed over \$40 million and mine companies distributed \$140 million of profits.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Anglo-Canadian Wheat Pool payment, in Western Canada there was some disappointment in respect to the final payment of \$65 million. Elsewhere in Canada, particularly in urban circles in Eastern Canada, payment by Federal Government gave rise to a good deal of criticism. Some papers in Ontario looked upon it as an unjustified raid on the Treasury for the benefit of one particular section of Canadian economy, the farmers of Western Canada. Another paper called it a "big steal." But the farmers are not forgetting the 50-cent wheat netted in the years 1941 to 1943.

I would like to sum up here some statements of the farm organizations and Wheat Pools over the past two or three years. Number one is that in eight years commencing with 1941, the Government of Saskatchewan paid in subsidies over \$100 million dollars to give consumers in Canada cheap bread. Number two, when the price of wheat started to advance in 1943, the Government closed the market, expropriated all wheat in commercial position at \$1.25 a bushel, which assured itself some cheap wheat for Mutual Aid purposes. The domestic price for wheat was fixed and continued at that level for a period of four years. Now that is imposing upon the Western wheat producer the burden of providing Canadians with cheap food.

Mr. Speaker, I am not in the least blaming the British Government with regard to the Anglo-Canadian Wheat Agreement settlement. It was, and still is, I believe, the responsibility of the Liberal Government at Ottawa. Speaking of the low price of wheat, the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, at a recent convention in Montreal, decided by resolution to urge a higher price for Canadian wheat, not to mention other farm products. And Mr. Wesson indicated in his remarks at that meeting that the price of wheat at the present time was too low. He proposed an increase in the domestic price and, speaking in support of farm organizations, he proposed the domestic price of wheat should be cast loose from the International Wheat Agreement and should be adjusted in accordance with the price of farm production and living costs.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note today that, considering its use and food value, bread is one of the cheapest commodities which make up the food requirements of all people. It has been figured out that an increase of 52½ cents per bushel in the price of wheat adds only one cent to the cost of a loaf of bread. Or, to put it another way, the farmer only gets 2 2/3 cents out of a 16-cent loaf of bread.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to turn to the record of this Government during the past 8 years. The Leader of the Opposition has recently wishfully adopted the practice of referring to the Liberal Party as the party of progress and overall expansion. Sure, Mr. Speaker, there is one way of foretelling what to expect of a person or a political party in the future,

and that is by their record of past performance: "By their fruits ye shall know them." And so I would like, Mr. Speaker, to list a few of the present benefits enjoyed by the people of Saskatchewan. These benefits, some of which were non-existent during the 34 years of Liberal administration, were opposed by all Opposition members, whether Liberal or Conservative, in this Legislature.

I would like to mention the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan, more and more recognized as a model for all Canada. It is doubtful, Mr. Speaker, if there is anywhere in the world a hospitalization plan so generous, so efficiently and economically administered. The Hospital Services Plan continues to be one of the finest and the most popular health insurance schemes in the world. When the plan was proposed it was opposed, I believe, by nearly every Liberal member in the House. Today it is recognized by 90 per cent of Saskatchewan citizens, regardless of their political views, as the most complete hospital service anywhere and at the lowest cost per person.

**Mr. Danielson** (Arm River): — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I would say that that statement is untrue.

**Mr. Thair:** — I have just three more minutes to go on the subject. Today, it is recognized by 90 per cent of Saskatchewan citizens, regardless of political views, as the most complete hospitalization service anywhere and since the inauguration of the Hospital Services Plan nearly one million people have had their hospital bills paid in Saskatchewan. In Saskatchewan, 97 to 98 per cent of the fees have been collected. In B.C. over 100,000 people to date are evading hospital fees. The administration costs have been reduced from 7.9 to 4.6 per cent in 1951, while in B.C., they are 8.5 per cent or more.

Saskatchewan Air Ambulance has just completed its sixth year of service, covering one and one half million miles. Over 4,300 individual flights have been made, and it has provided emergency transportation for an area of approximately a quarter of a million square miles — a remarkable humanitarian service to our fellow men, particularly in the long winter season of Saskatchewan.

The Automobile Insurance Plan is another notable achievement of the C.C.F. Government in Saskatchewan. No similar plan exists anywhere in the world. It was introduced in 1946 and was, I believe, opposed by every Liberal member of the Legislature. And the Liberal Party, if they were ever returned to power, no doubt will throw this out of the window. To the present time the Automobile Insurance has paid nearly \$6 million in benefits and damages and claims of all kinds, and nearly 40,000 persons have received benefits under the plan. It has, because of the competitive Saskatchewan automobile insurance rates, caused all private line insurance companies to lower their rates so that they are lower in Saskatchewan than anywhere else in Canada or the United States.

The Purchasing Agency, from a business standpoint, has more than justified itself since it was set up in 1946. Approximately 85 per cent of all Government purchasing has been done through the wholesale or

**February 25, 1952**

or manufacturing channels, and has resulted in tremendous savings. Since 1946 the Purchasing Agency has issued 192,000 orders, has purchased goods to a value of over \$57 million, and the earned savings today amount to more than three million dollars.

The importance of the co-operative movement was recognized in 1944 by this C.C.F. Government and never was recognized to any extent by the former Government, so far as actions go. The Department of Co-operation was set up in 1944, and Saskatchewan is now known as the banner co-operative province of Canada. In Saskatchewan, 1948-1949, according to a recent report, Saskatchewan Co-operatives transacted some 26 per cent of the total business done by marketing and purchasing co-operatives in the whole of Canada. Alberta did 17 per cent, Ontario 15 per cent, Quebec 12 per cent, Manitoba 12 per cent and Saskatchewan 26 per cent. Their growth has been phenomenal in recent years. In 1950-51, there were 1,100 co-operatives with a membership of nearly half a million. The purchases made by this present Government ran into hundreds of thousands of dollars since 1944. I might add that in 1951 the Government purchases of tires from the Co-ops is approximately \$40,000, and oil and gas over \$200,000. Those are just two items. But I can recall back in 1943, because of an oversight by the Liberal Party, the "Western Producer" did have a bill sent over by Saskatchewan University for printing of \$60.00. And the only other purchase made by the Liberal Government that time was from a Co-op Refinery for gas and oil of some \$72 — less than \$150 all told. In the past year purchases made by this Government from the Co-operatives amount to half a million dollars at least.

Rapid progress has been made in the extension and development of electric power in Saskatchewan in the past seven years as compared with so-called Liberal progress — or stagnation — of the previous 34 years. When the C.C.F. came into power in 1944, actually only 135 farmers had electric power and of these only 26 had been added in the six years previous to 1944. In 1951, over 2,500 farmers received power and at the present time some 8,000 farms have been electrified, in comparison with 135 farms in 1944. And we hope that some 4,000 farm homes may be electrified this year, if materials are available.

Power rates have been reduced some four times. They were never reduced, as I recall, under the former Government, from 1938 to 1940. The farmers using power paid from \$10 to \$11 for about 70 kilowatts — I think that was the charge that I was paying at that time. At the present time you can get 325 kilowatt hours for the same amount of money. Some \$35 million has been expended in power since 1944, and the power generated has more than doubled in that time. The Liberal Government spent, in 1944, \$300,000 while this present Government this past year has spent \$7 million, or twenty times as much. So today, sixty times as many farms have been electrified, four times as much power generated in Power Corporation plants, and three times as many miles of power lines have been built. The voters can choose whether you would call that progress or stagnation. The C.C.F. has turned a deficit of \$200,000 in 1943-44 into an accumulated surplus of over \$2 million this past year; and, as I stated before, some \$35 million has been expended on power since this Government took office.



I might say in closing, Mr. Speaker, that this C.C.F. Government in Saskatchewan has put into effect much useful legislation, which, I believe, has the approval of the majority of the people. It has expanded greatly in the field of agriculture, health, social welfare, highways, mineral, oil and gas development, and many other services which were almost entirely unknown during the 34 years the Liberal Government was in office. So in closing I would say that it will be for the people of this Province to judge at some future time whether the past eight years have been years of stagnation or of progress and expansion and deep interest in the welfare of the people, uncontrolled by monopolies or Big Business of Eastern Canada. Mr. Speaker, I shall support the Motion.

**Mr. M.J. Willis** (Elrose): — Mr. Speaker, I would first like to congratulate the member for Milestone, the mover of the Motion, and the member for Gravelbourg, the seconder of the Motion. I must disagree with the Opposition that there was no material to make a good case; and, following that up, I am glad to congratulate the member for Athabasca, who has seen fit to sit on this side of the House.

I am quite certain the year 1951 was a unique and red-letter year in the constituency of Elrose. The long cherished dream of those pioneers who crossed by boat the South Saskatchewan River has been fulfilled with the building of the south Saskatchewan bridge. For over 30 years the Federal Government promised and pussyfooted about a bridge there, and even the Liberal Party in this province at provincial elections kept saying, "Wait until we get in again." They go in — nothing was done. Finally, when the C.C.F. Government came in, they took the initiative with the co-operation of those people in that district who went out and sold bonds to the amount of over \$300,000, and I may say that those people in that area, had they been left alone, would have sold many more thousand dollars worth had the Leader of the Opposition not gone down and made a trip through that area. It is strange how the sales campaign dwindled after we had a visit through that area. However, in June of last year the bridge was opened up. There were over 10,000 people there to attest to the accomplishment of the co-operation given to this Government, and the initiative of this Government, in the building of that bridge, and I am sure if the weather had been favourable (it had rained in the morning) there would have been 20,000 people down there.

The second thing that has been unique here is that we have found gas in the Elrose constituency. Four gas wells have already been found at Brock, and the startling thing of all is that they have all come in at a depth of 2,400 feet, approximately, and each of those wells has been drilled about one mile apart. At the present time there is no indication of the size of the field, but we are quite hopeful that it is quite a large gas field. Besides the Brock field, gas was found at Elrose at a depth slightly less than 2,900 feet, but as oil was seen in the core there, drilling is continuing, and when I was home last weekend, I noticed the drill working as we passed in the bus. So I say it is a unique year. We have completed the building of the Saskatchewan bridge; we have found gas (on which I will have something further to say a little later on), and south of the Elrose constituency, of course, in the constituency of Swift current, we have found oil.

**February 25, 1952**

I would like to take this opportunity of congratulating the members here in the selection of the member for Kindersley-Kerrobot (Mr. Wellbelove) as our representative at the Parliamentary Committee meetings at Colombo. The hon. member is my co-worker and fellow citizen in the town of Eston. He has worked his whole life in the service of farm movements and the betterment of the areas around Eston district. He was one of the guiding lights around that district in the doctor and hospitalization scheme in the early years, and Mr. Wellbelove has spent his whole lifetime in service to his fellowmen. When he returns this week, there is a certain tinge of sadness awaiting him, as one of the pioneers of the Eston district who was caring for his dwelling, and living in it, suddenly passed away in his sleep — Mr. Wood. This afternoon, I send to Mr. Wood's relatives of the Eston district my sincerest sympathy.

Since I represent a rural area I want briefly to touch upon some of the problems that the farmers in that area are very worried about at the present time. First and foremost, they suffered like all other farmers in this province in regard to the harvest; a very promising crop. Much of it was harvested under adverse conditions, and consequently there is a large amount of damp grain in that area. Secondly, there is a great amount of harvesting to do, but during the summer months, on certain railroad lines it was almost impossible to get boxcars, and particularly was that true on the branches of the C.P.R. On the branch line from Gunnworth to McMorrان only three cars were received during the whole of the summer. I was in that area, and there the elevator men were waiting and hoping that some cars would come, as the previous crop had the elevators plugged to the doors. Now I am quite hopeful that the report that we have seen will bear some fruit, and that cars will be made available to handle the damp grain, or otherwise a large amount of it will spoil.

The second thing that worries the farmers in my area is the high cost of the implements of production and the high cost of living. We have seen that the high cost of living has now reached the index, according to the last one that I say, 191.5 points, the highest in the history of Canada. This affects everyone, not only the farmer, but the small salaried person, and yet nothing is being done about it. We are told, of course, the thing to do about it is that the Dominion Government is looking after it well. I read a statement in the press, the other night, that the best plan to stop this inflation and cost was to take away the extra income of people. On December 31st of this past year, the Federal Government had a surplus of \$700 million.

Now, let me look at the figures of farm income tax based on 1949. I agree that income tax is a fair method of taxation; but I say it should apply all across Canada, and from the figures that I have from an issue of "Saturday night", I find that, in 1949, 23 employees of the Income Tax Department collected an average of \$255 from the farmers in the Province of Quebec, and according to the 1941 census there were 134,000 farmers and stock-raisers. In Saskatchewan, there were 74 employees; the average was \$331 per farm of 20,000 farmers; the census of 1941 showed that there were 115,000 farmers in Saskatchewan. In Ontario, there were 92 employees who collected an average of \$242 per farm, and 8,010 farms; the census showed there were 161,600 farmers. Or put it another way. The Income Tax Assessors and field Investigators had a per capita yield of \$2,200

in the Province of Quebec; in Ontario, \$22,000; in Saskatchewan, \$90,000. Or, in other words, one out of every 20 in Ontario paid income tax, and one out of 670 paid income tax in the Province of Quebec. Now, I know that in finding averages there must be some latitude, but our farmers in Saskatchewan feel that surely the farmers and stock-raisers in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec must be in the income tax brackets too. They think that the income tax is not equitably collected, and that has even been brought up in the House of Commons. Now, I might surmise, of course, that the Federal Government are not very interested in the farmers in the Province of Saskatchewan, as their main strength comes from Ontario and Quebec; but nevertheless, when we travel through our rural constituencies, the farmers do not begrudge paying income tax, but they feel they are not getting a fair deal on it.

Now, coming back close home — for almost two weeks during this debate we have had the Opposition changing their tune. It reminds me that as a boy in the Province of Manitoba, we used to have house parties, and the music that was supplied was usually what we called fiddlers — they are called violinists now. We usually had two, and sometimes we had an old-timer, and he could always play every tune, and then there would be someone helping him out, and the first thing we knew the old-timer would say, “What tune can you play?” So the second fiddler would have to name his tune and the older and more experienced one then would play the tune that the second fiddler was able to play. In this Province, I was reminded, as I have been listening here for two weeks now, how the Opposition has changed its tune. They are in the category of the second fiddler, and so for several years they have been telling the people there will be no gas found; there will be no oil found, as long as you have that C.C.F. Government in. Moreover, I am of the opinion that the Opposition in this Province would far rather see no capital come in to develop our natural resources, for political expediency, than to see this province progress.

Now the tune has changed. We have found gas. We have found oil. What do they say? “Let’s get in now; we must develop it for you. Forget about that we told you it would never be found.” It has been found, but now the tune has changed. And, then let us look at the record of the oil that has been found in this province: up to 1944, 400 barrels of oil. Not bad, when you take the number of years — just about 10 - 12½ barrels per year. Last year, over one million barrels were brought in. Now the Opposition say, “Why, we would have discovered it two or three years sooner if we had been in.” Let them snicker — they were only in office for 35 years. Now, if they had been in two or three years they would have found it. Do you think the people of this Province are going to accept those facts of the Opposition? Now, of course the Liberal Party in this Province may claim: “Why, we have a new motor in the old machine,” but I am afraid that the people will not be fooled with a coat of paint on the old machine.

Let us look at power development. You really have to smile about power development. How many farms were electrified? The hon. member from Lumsden has stated some 135; I think it is 137. I do not want to take two away, because the percentage would come down very greatly. On an average, under the Liberals in 1934-44, 13.7 farms per year; now that may possible, Mr. Speaker, account for the limited oil development — 400 barrels, and 137 farms. There is close correlation there between the two. I am not

sure about that, but those are the facts.

Now every Session we are taken away to the Province to the east of us, Manitoba — what they are doing there and what has been done. Well, I have looked through a Winnipeg paper and see now that the Provincial Government of Manitoba is giving a plebiscite to the people to take over the offices of the Winnipeg electric Company. Why? Because I remember living in the Province of Manitoba when there was quite a row in the Legislature of Manitoba when the Winnipeg Electric got the power site on the English River. Now they are going to buy it back. Manitoba needs power too. But we have gone over to Alberta with respect to oil development. Why doesn't the Leader of the Opposition be consistent and tell the people of this province, "Look at the Province of Alberta — the rural electrification plan they have out there." No, he goes to Alberta on the one hand, and to Manitoba on the other. He will be going to Timbuktu next.

How many farms have been electrified under any kind of a scheme in the province of Alberta? He does not tell that, but what have we accomplished? 8,000 farms in this Province since 1944 have obtained electricity, and if materials are available there will be added to that next year another 4,000. Compare those figures — 8,000 to 137. These are some of the facts, and I hope they tell them when they go out to the constituency of Elrose, where there was not a farm electrified prior to this Government coming into office. The only place that had power when this Government came into office was the line across the river from Abbey to the town of Eston. What have we today? We have a line that connects Dinsmore to Eston from the east, and all the intermediate villages and towns along the way. We have a branch from that high power line to the area to the south, connecting Tynar, White Bear, Lacadena, Kyle, Sanctuary; we have a line built from Riverhurst connecting Demaine, Beechy and Lucky Lake besides several rural crossings connecting the farmers in those immediate districts.

Now, when the Opposition goes to Elrose to tell them about rural electrification, it will be the biggest joke that has been known to the electors in that area. I heard one speaker in the Opposition say, "Oh, the highways are no better than they were under the Liberals." I hope they tell that to the people of Elrose, because before 1944, there was no highway on No. 44, only the sign posts; and a lot of those posts had been knocked down by cattle rubbing on them. That highway has been completed from Dinsmore to Eston, a distance of 75 miles. Over 30 miles have been re-built and gravelled on No. 4; 18 miles has been built and gravelled on No. 42. During the Liberal regime nothing was done. We saw, just at election time, contractors come in, and three days after the election pull out; and we were told in the Elrose constituency that because you voted C.C.F. you will not get any highways. I heard in 1938, at a public meeting in the town of Eston, where the question was asked: "Why is not something done?" One of the former members of the Liberal Government said, "When you vote Liberal, you will get some roads" . . . and I will tell you who that man was. It was Mr. Haggerty from Lucky Lake who was speaking with the ten Premier of this Province in the town of Eston. That is what we were handed out in that area during that time.

Grants have been made to municipalities to help those municipalities that are not so fortunate to be on the highway system, and, at the present time, we have a municipal gravelled road from the town of Beechy all the way to Macrorie on the east side. Those grants have helped those municipalities, and I say equalization grants are a fair means of distribution of funds to help the poor municipalities. I hope that when the time comes that the Opposition will tell the people of Elrose constituency that the roads are no better than they were in 1944.

Now we come to the field of education. We have been told that if the Liberals had two more years to find some oil; but in the larger unit administration, they had their two years. The Larger Unit Act was passed in 1942; we did not come into office until 1944. How many larger units were established? Oh, well, we should not ask that question. You know the answer. There was not one. I suppose if you had had more time! But do you see, the elapse of two years does not fulfil the fondest expectation of the Opposition. Today in this Province, due to the initiative of this Government and the Minister of Ed we have 40 larger units established out of a total of 60 areas. So we have made progress in the field of education today, and I am proud to be a member of this Government. Last year, we spent \$121,000 to help students — 183 university students received loans from our education fund to the amount of \$56,000; \$60,000 was loaned to students going to Normal Schools. In all, 435 students received loans or awards. I am proud of that record.

I am also proud to see, when I read the Speech from the Throne, that consideration is being given to teacher tenure in this province. I think it is one of the things that is long overdue. I am also proud to see that certain changes are to be made in The Teachers' Superannuation Act; but I want to say that the service pension for teachers was \$13 in 1944. Already the Government has raised that to \$25 per year for service pensions — almost doubled already; and it will come up for further increase later on this year.

Now, I have listened here since 1944 for the member for Melfort (Mr. Egnatoff) and the member for Redberry (Mr. Korchinski) to take a stand on the larger unit. Not one word has been said. I have listened attentively. I have looked over the record — why? Because they were listening. I do not say that a larger unit is the whole answer for education, but it is a step forward in the right direction. Those members over there know, too, that it is a forward step. Why do they not stand up and say they are in favour of it? Oh, no, nothing has been said. I listened and thought surely at this Session something would be said; but oh, no!

Now, I am proud to be a member of this Government because of the progressive steps that have been inaugurated in the field of health. With regard to the air ambulance, we know that that brings a certain measure of security to people in isolated districts. Our hospitalization scheme (I know the member for Arm River interrupted the member for Lumsden in saying, "The Liberals did not vote against it"), but when that Act was brought into this House they endeavoured by every means of obstruction that was within

their power, to obstruct the passage of it. I am proud of what we have done to help alleviate the condition of our elderly citizens in this province; hospitalization and medical care for the pioneers of this province; for the blind-pensioners — the hospitalization for them; for the mothers' allowance cases — the hospitalization and medical care for them. I say to the people of Saskatchewan that this Government deserves your support for the advancement we have made in the short time of eight years in the field of health; our power development; our highway development; the field of education and social welfare; and in the field of automobile insurance; and to those people, I am sure, when the opportunity comes there will be no question as to what is the outcome.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the Motion.

**Mr. N.L. Buchanan** (Notukeu-Willowbunch): — Mr. Speaker, after last Wednesday night, I do not know whether anything I have to say is going to be duly and truly appreciated in this House. I had expected to adjourn the debate that evening, and hon. members will recall that even some of my own supporters voted not to have me adjourn for the next day in order to give way to my hon. friend, the member for maple Creek (Mr. Cameron).

So now, I believe — and the Minister of Agriculture has just assured me that, as far as the C.C.F. cause is concerned, possible the member for Maple Creek did more good than I might have done. If there is any truth in what the member from Canora (Mr. Kuziak) has to say (and I usually find him sticking pretty close to the truth) that the best solicitors for campaign funds that we have on this side of the House is the Opposition. So after that speech that we heard last Thursday, I would imagine that if we went down to the C.C.F. central office we would find money rolling in from people out in the country to make sure that the member is not returned to that seat and that the opposition are never at any time sitting on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker.

I have been here now some eight years, sitting across from the smiling member from Arm River and enjoying his quips and remarks. I have been sitting here for eight years, Mr. Speaker, trying during those years to gain something of value from opposition speakers' remarks. To date I want to say that I have not got anything. I have not received anything that I can really get my teeth into and understand that would be of benefit to the people of Saskatchewan. They come forward each election year and during each session of the Legislature with all kinds of proposals. We heard the Leader of the Opposition in his initial address in this House, a couple of weeks ago, promise everything to everybody. He was going to increase services in every field of Government enterprise and Government expenditures. And then, on the other side of the picture, he was going to reduce taxation. The member for Elrose has just referred to the stand of the Opposition on the larger administration unit. Mr. Speaker, I have never heard any one of them get up and make a definite statement as to whether they were in favour of, or opposed to, the larger unit of administration.

we have a name for people like that down home, Mr. Speaker. It was invented by a friend of mine there. We call them mugwumps; they sit with their mug on one side of the fence and their wump on the other side of the fence, and so whichever way the wind blows that is the way they want to be able to fall. I want to say that wherever the Opposition finds a community which pays a high assessment in which taxes have been raised as a result of the larger administrative unit over and above what they would have been raised had they just had a local district, then they are opposed to the unit. Then, in districts such as the district in which I have been living during the last number of years, where our mill rate was some 32 mills and now it has been reduced to 19 mills, they are in favour of the larger administrative unit. They are one group of people, Mr. Speaker, that can very gracefully keep their pie and still eat it.

Mr. Speaker, I was interested, the other day, in listening to the member for Melville (Mr. Deshaye). I might say that I have a deep personal regard for the member for Melville; he is a friendly chap, very interesting to talk to and a nice fellow to visit with, but he came into this House and said, "Everybody knows we had free cancer treatment in Saskatchewan before the C.C.F. came in; why," he says, "everybody knew we had an air ambulance service before the C.C.F. came; why," he says, "everybody knew this; everybody knew we had a hospitalization scheme before the C.C.F. came in." Well, perhaps we did, but I am here to say, Mr. Speaker, that everybody did not know this. You go into my district, or into any other community in the province of Saskatchewan and try to tell them that everybody knew we had a hospitalization scheme during the 1930s. I know time after time of people going into the hospital, Mr. Speaker, right from my own community, and before they could be admitted (and it was not the fault of the hospitals); but before they could be committed to hospital care in Rockglen, Willowbunch, Assiniboia, Kincaid, Mankota, Val Marie, all of those places, the head nurse, or whoever was in charge of the finances of that hospital, had to refer back to the municipality from whence they came to see whether their bill was going to be O.K.'d or not. Hospitalization was a terrific burden of responsibility in the hands of the local municipal authorities. Today that burden, through co-operative efforts made possible by legislation that this Government has passed — legislation which is not difficult, legislation which the Opposition could have passed when they were sitting in these benches, Mr. Speaker; but people today, through that legislation in a co-operative way are sharing the burden of their hospital bills. Today a loved one gets sick in any family, those at home — the breadwinner — or whoever may be responsible for the economic conditions of that family need not worry about being saddled with a great hospital bill. If someone is stricken ill with cancer today, Mr. Speaker, the entire care, the financial burden of that care, is taken off the shoulders of the family that that individual comes from, and placed where it belongs on the shoulders of all the people of this province through legislation passed by this Government. And so another worry has been taken away.

You know, I have noticed time after time the Opposition do not hesitate to take political advantage of any situation that they may find regardless of whether they might be doing damage or not to the people concerned. That is true of education; that is true of hospitalization; it is true of anything that this Government has done. I have here a paper which explains that much better than I can. It is the 'Prairie Messenger' and a

brief description of the papers says “a Catholic family paper, edited by the Benedictine Fathers of St. Peter’s Abbey and published Thursday by St. Peter’s Press at Muenster, Saskatchewan.” And on the editorial page this paper says:

“Perhaps few people realize how much untruth has been spread, for example, about hospitalization in this province, and, consequently, how much it has done to obstruct a noble effort to help the sick. People familiar with conditions in Saskatchewan will be astonished to hear of what a professional man of this province wrote, last year, to a person residing in the United States. He criticized the Saskatchewan Ho Services Plan for the following reasons:

- (1) The Provincial Government is Communistic and considers all hospitals should be under State control.
- (2) It pays sisters operating hospitals only enough to cover bare cost of operation, and it makes no allowance for depreciation. As a result of this Sisters cannot enlarge hospitals. This is enough to make them so disgusted that they are willing to sell their hospitals to the Government cheaply and then leave the province.

“Those reasons (the editorial goes on to say) for criticism are packed with untruth, and the resident of this province will ask ‘why lie about our hospitalization? He will then go to find the answer for himself, and he will say that if an opponent of any plan has to tell lies about it, one can assume that there is too much good in it to be told; for if it is told the public will want to keep the plan. In other words, telling lies about a plan in order to get rid of it is really speaking in favour of the plan for those who do their own thinking.

“The writer did something, however, that may bring serious harm to the reputation of Catholic Sisters operating hospitals in this province. To those outside of the province he represents Sisters as being so disgusted with the hospitalization plan as to be willing to sell out and leave. This is not only untrue, but also unfair. Hospital Sisters are going right ahead with their good work. They even are enlarging hospitals. To their everlasting credit, it can be said that their official mouthpiece, the Catholic Hospital Conference of Saskatchewan did not oppose the hospitalization plan when it was introduced, but offered its wholehearted co-operation.”



Time after time we pick up papers that have no political axe to grind, and we read things of this nature in them, not only about our hospitalization plan but about the larger unit, the air ambulance and so on. Only a year ago or so, we had quite an enquiry over the air ambulance and when it was all boiled down it was found that the air ambulance was operating efficiently and well. I want to say that the air ambulance scheme, since its inauguration by this Government, has carried some 2,500 patients to hospitals.

I did not intend, Mr. Speaker, to take a great deal of time in the preliminaries of my talk. What I did want to do for just a moment was to take a couple of trips through the Province of Saskatchewan. After all, it is what the people of Saskatchewan can see with their own eyes, that is of importance to them. I did considerable travelling in this province during the number of years that I have lived in it. During the 1930s I travelled from the North to the south and from the South to the North several times, and into the northwest of the province. Last summer, I also took several comparatively extensive trips through the province. I would just like for a moment to compare those two trips. I remember back in the 1930s one trip I took in an old jalopy. Leaving Prince Albert and heading south I met wagon after wagon covered over with hoops and binder canvass and people living in there, trekking north, going north in the hopes that they would find a place where they could once again re-establish themselves; people in whom almost all hope had gone; broken-down transportation, old horses and cows, children under-nourished, ill-fed and ill-clothed, father and mother practically ready to give up, hope practically gone; going north where it would rain; going north — what for? To raise wheat for 20 cents a bushel; to raise cows that would produce butter for 10 cents a pound; to produce steers, as my Father did, for \$3.50 apiece; to go into the woods and cut cordwood for 75 cents a cord? That is what they were going up there for, Mr. Speaker, and we did not have a C.C.F. Government on this side of the House in those days. We had a Liberal Government and it is that same Liberal Opposition today that talks about stagnation. If we want to talk about stagnation we had it then, and we had it with a vengeance.

Well, as I travelled further south, what did I find on No. 2 Highway? I found prairie trails with a marker alongside of them, ruts, sand, holes that you could hardly drive through. I passed through the city of Moose Jaw, one day, on a trip during those years and, as I stand here, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that there was not one single automobile moving or standing still in the entire main street of Moose Jaw at that particular time — not one. I went down south and I saw the grasshoppers; I saw the hopelessness of drought conditions down there, and the hon. member sitting across the way remembers those times very, very well.

He remembers when the relief inspector used to go out and get in a fight with the municipal secretary or the municipal reeve. I heard a very interesting little story just the other day. The relief inspector was a pretty powerful chap and so was the municipal reeve in a municipality not so far south of Moose Jaw, and they got to arguing about things and so the relief inspector says, "I'll knock your block off if you talk like that

**February 25, 1952**

any more.” “Well,” the reeve says, “we don’t want to bust up the office so come on outside.” So they went on outside and instead of the reeve getting his block knocked off the relief inspector got his knocked off. But when he came in the secretary says, “Gosh, you tackled a pretty husky fellow. I was afraid you were going to get the worst of it.” He says, “I was afraid I was going to get the worst of it, too; but I just happened to get in a lucky punch.”

I went up to Alsask during those years — I taught school in that district. I drove over No. 1 Highway where the blacktop had broken away and where you had to watch or you would fall into a hole about three feet deep and break the axle of your car. I went through Swift Current, over the ferry at Saskatchewan Landing that was attended by an old man who barely received enough wages to keep body and soul together. We crossed the river and went over No. 4 for miles, which was just a prairie trail with No. 4 Highway signs on it. And I conducted classrooms for the children that came there, came in very poor clothes. They did not own a pair of shoes to wear all summer long. During the winter months they picked up something and managed to get by. And so, enough of those years. I do not need to remind very many people about them. But if we want to know what the word stagnation means, all we have to do is to recall those years, Mr. Speaker, and we have got the real definition of stagnation; the years of the hey-day of the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, last summer I again took a rather extensive trip over the province — and what a difference! As I was leaving Rockglen on No. 2 Highway I met a big trailer truck, and what was it doing? It was hauling logs to Rockglen from northern Saskatchewan, logs which were going to carry the wires to bring rural electrification to the people of that community. I passed a road construction outfit, finishing up the last portion of No. 2 Highway between Assiniboia and Rockglen. I went through Moose Jaw, and I wanted to have a lunch in Moose Jaw, and I had to go three blocks away from the place when I intended to eat in order to find a parking space. Just 10 years previously there was not an automobile on that entire street. That was 1937. I can give you the date, too. I went on blacktop and first-class gravel roads all the way to Lac la Ronge. I saw the air ambulance flying overhead, I met the Saskatchewan Government bus — the Government bus which today serves some 5,000 route miles in the province of Saskatchewan, the bus which brings transportation and the conveniences of quick and modern transportation to remote communities all over this province; the bus company which, if hon. members opposite were on this side of the House, they would throw out the window and make provision, possibly for Greyhound to be there to catch it; the bus company which is doing this and which at the same time is showing a profit. I am not one who believes that the measure of success of our public utilities should be as to whether they show a profit or not. I believe, particularly, that the Saskatchewan Transportation Company is of sufficient importance to the people of Saskatchewan that it should be continually extended in operation whether it shows a profit or not, and I have advocated that time after time. If it shows a profit, all to the good. However, that is not the true measure of its success.

Mr. Speaker, I also stopped into the woollen mill. It does not show a profit, and hon. members across the way are bemoaning that fact

over and over again. But there I saw Saskatchewan people, Saskatchewan men and women, working, busily working, producing cloth and blankets. Its total payroll, each year, is over \$177,000. Well, now, I suppose if they came in that would be tossed out of the window, and so would the people who work there; and so they would contribute to the dwindling population of Saskatchewan in that manner, Mr. Speaker. And so on down the list. I saw the box factory in Prince Albert — a new one, which is producing grain doors to be distributed over the prairies here to help to carry our wheat to market, which is providing employment to the people of Prince Albert, which is giving a service to the settlers around Prince Albert and which is showing a profit.

As I went westward I went to Alsask again to visit the old community in which I was during the 1930s and I went over No. 1 Highway. No ruts any more, Mr. Speaker, on No. 1. I went over the Swift Current bridge — the people call it “arry’s bridge”; a beautiful bridge; a bridge made in such a way that, when a C.C.F. Government is elected to Ottawa and builds the dam across the Saskatchewan, we will be able to raise that bridge. We will not need to worry about raising it until we do elect a C.C.F. Government at Ottawa, Mr. Speaker. That has been one of “Jimmy” Gardiner’s election promises for I do not know how long; and I also have some recollection of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition doing a little bit of promising in that regard, too.

However, as I went on through Kyle, Rosetown, over No. 4 Highway again, I went over first-class gravelled roads. I went into Alberta. I was going to say I hit Alberta, but rather, Mr. Speaker, Alberta hit me. As soon as I passed over the boundary between Saskatchewan and Alberta — and this is the truth — I passed from good roads onto poor ones. The gravel there was larger than a person’s fist. It had not been screened; it had not been crushed. The ditches were full of weeds and rocks; the highways were not maintained. I visited an uncle of mine there. He is a rancher at Cereal, Alberta. I found that he was paying 25 cents an acre tax for land which we in Saskatchewan pay 7.4 cents an acre for. Now, to say it that way does not give the true picture. In Saskatchewan the taxes are over and above the rental. In Alberta, the taxes are contained in the rental. Half of the rental is taken to pay taxes on Alberta leaseland. And so the comparative figures in that case would be 12 ½ cents for land whose carrying capacity was from 32 to 49 acres per head of stock. Going on to land that required 50 acres per head of stock, the comparative figure in Alberta is 8 ½ cents an acre, while in Saskatchewan it is 4.6 cents. And from 24 to 31 acres per head of stock, 19 cents is the Alberta comparative figure; Saskatchewan’s comparative figure is 11.2 cents. So I found that a lot of this talk about conditions in Alberta, the wonderful progress that they are making there, is not simmering down to the people that need it. Their roads are not any better than ours; they are paying higher taxes than we are; their educational standards are no better than ours, and though they have found oil there, it does not seem to have done the people, the working men and women, the farmers of Alberta, any great deal of good. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, and people on both sides of the House, that when oil becomes an important part of the economy of Saskatchewan, so long as we have a C.C.F. Government on this side of the House, the people of Saskatchewan are going to benefit from that oil.

**February 25, 1952**

Over last weekend, Mr. Speaker, I was down home and I was listening to a C.C.F. speaker over the radio. He came in clear and concise even though there was a howling blizzard outside. We have a bit of a blizzard across the way at the present moment. However, I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that when a person is speaking the things that are true, a thing such as that does not bother a person one bit. So this blizzard at home did not bother this speaker coming over the radio.

I want also to say that a week ago Sunday, we had as heavy a blizzard as has been experienced at any time in the south-western portion of Saskatchewan. It lasted until Tuesday. Roads were completely blocked; no possibility of moving it. And yet, on Wednesday, 24 hours later, every road was open in that whole area. On Wednesday morning, Mr. Speaker, there were four big push plows in the town of Assiniboia, and there was a rotary on its way. Previous to 1944, we never knew what a snow-removal programme was. If we got sick, if for some reason we had to move over our roads, the only possible way was by a snowplane, an airplane or a team of horses. The first snowplow was seen in Rockglen in the winter of 1944. There have been many seen there since. There is one stationed there now all the time.

I did not intend to go into great detail on the highway programme of this Government. I had planned to do that later on. But I believe Opposition members, Mr. Speaker, will agree with me when I say that I am going to support the Address.

**Mr. G.H. Danielson** (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, in taking part in this debate on the motion, I can assure you that it is impossible to go into all the statements and all the stories that were told by the members opposite. I could not follow their ramblings and their dreams to any extent anyhow. I just want to point out one or two things that have been said this afternoon, before I go into what I have to say.

I have every respect for the member from Lumsden. He is a farmer like myself, and I surely like him and I count him as a friend; but he made one mistake when he spoke about the 1942 wheat crop price. That crop brought us \$1.01¼ at Fort William when the final payment was made.

Many things have been said in regard to the Power Corporation. The Power Corporation has done good work the last two years. But why did it not do good work before the last two years?

**Mr. Tucker** (Leader of the Opposition): — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — This Government has been in power now for eight years, and I am going to tell you why it did not do good work, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to use the statement of the Minister himself. I do not mean that the administration of the Power Commission was neglected, but I mean as far as new construction and extension of service was concerned.

The Minister, from his seat there, two years ago this Session, said quite frankly (and I admire the hon. gentleman from Watrous because he is pretty sincere and honest in anything he says) that it was only the last year or maybe two that we have been able to get any material to do anything in the way of new construction. That was true, Mr. Speaker. You know how true it was. And I imagine that even today they have difficulty in securing the necessary supplies along certain lines. So there is no use for these gentlemen over there to stay here and blather about what they have done and tell all that they have done. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, they went out and took the credit of the people of the province of Saskatchewan, and with the abundance of revenue that started to come into the coffers of this Government when the people of Saskatchewan got into the position where they got some prices for their products and good crops to sell which brought them some income, they went out and bought a number of companies that were operating in this province, and they added, as far as customers were concerned, a considerable number of customers. Why shouldn't they? They go out and buy the Dominion Electric which probably had 1,200 or 1,500 customers in the province of Saskatchewan and was rendering excellent service. I know that because they were in my home town. Then why should that be classified as some great accomplishment by this Government? These people had a good service, and it is only the last couple or three years that this go had done anything in the way of extending the service in any appreciable amount. Now that is the situation, and the members sitting on that side of the House ought to know it, Mr. Speaker. Look yourself in the face and look at what you have done and what you are doing this Session, and you should be ashamed of yourself.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, some of the members over there are the most cheerful liars I have ever seen.

**Hon. Members (Government):** — Withdraw! Withdraw!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! The hon. member must withdraw.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Sir, I will withdraw. But when the Premier held up the microphone to his face there today, and told the people of the province of Saskatchewan that all that was said in this House in regard to natural resources was a tissue of lies, he did not have to withdraw that.

**Mr. Gibson:** — I was in the House . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! The hon. member will kindly take his seat unless he is rising on a point of privilege.

**Mr. Gibson:** — I am. I was in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, when the Hon. Premier made that statement and he did not pull the microphone towards him and he made it audibly, clearly.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, he leaned over like this and talked into the microphone and I sat here and watched him. I do not think

**February 25, 1952**

the Premier needs any apologies made on his behalf by the member for Morse. He generally used to be able to take care of himself.

Well, now, Mr. Speaker, the member for Kelvington, I think it was, had something to say about the Liberal Party; that someone came to him and told him, or somebody else told somebody else that he could not get so and so, and nothing was done unless he voted Liberal. Well, you know I have heard that fairy story so many times that I do not take any notice of it. It was only in 1946, Mr. Speaker, that the members, not only the members, but one of the Ministers on the other side of the House, stood right on this floor and told Mr. Patterson, Mr. Procter and myself and two others, Mr. Marion and Mr. Hooge — that was the Opposition, that was the tremendous opposition which they were so hampered by in that day — that nobody could write insurance for this Government without they were socially minded. I can bring supplements to this House and show it to you. More than that, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture at that time also made the statement that in handing out grazing leases in this province they were looking to see if the person who wanted the grass lease was a socially-minded person or not. I heard it.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — On a point of privilege. I never at any time made any such statement, and that has never been adopted as a matter of policy or anything else, and the hon. member for Arm River knows it.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Take about liars!

**Hon. Members (Government):** — Withdraw, withdraw!

**Mr. Danielson:** — I will withdraw this thing.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — You had better.

**Mr. Danielson:** — But, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you what I am going to do some time this week. I am going to bring in a copy of the budget address by Mr. Patterson when he acted as the critic and show that he made that statement and he never had to retract it. I have not got it with me, but I will be glad to do that, Mr. Speaker.

There are a few things that I would like to draw to the attention of the House, and I am not going to let them slip. If I can't get through today, I'll speak tomorrow. Yes, sir, If I don't get through today, I can tell the Premier I am going to speak tomorrow.

**Premier Douglas:** — You don't have to tell me.

**Mr. Danielson:** — The member for Bengough stood in his place, the other day, and made the statement. Here is what he said:

“The Liberals have said we would throw back to the municipalities the burden of hospitalization.”

Now, I call that a tissue of lies. Either he lied, or somebody told him a lie. That is what I do right here, and I throw it back in his teeth.

**Premier Douglas:** — I hope his teeth are not as false as this statement.

**Mr. Danielson:** — He made that statement the other day on the floor of the House here and he will deny it. He said:

“I have been chasing rats in the last two elections.”

I think the people of Saskatchewan will be glad to know that any one these thousands and thousands who went and supported the Premier are classified as a bunch of rats.

I have something here, but I will leave that till a little later on. I will leave that for the Minister of Natural Resources.

Many things have been said, Mr. Speaker, about the Gravelbourg by-election. You know I was down there for a couple of trips, and I did no level best to make true statements. I am one of these, Mr. Speaker, I believe this, that if one thing is worth doing at all, it is worth doing well; so I didn't hold back, I did my best. But it was not quite good enough. But how in the world, these C.C.F.'ers over here can take any comfort out of that by-election, is beyond me, because, after all, all they succeeded in doing in three years, from 1948 to 1951, with all the portion they could hunt up in the province of Saskatchewan (they even brought them in from Ontario) and all the characters back of them, and all the hangers-on and all the civil servants, at the public expense for three months in that seat, and they could only raise 46 votes more than their candidate got in 1948 when he was defeated by 410 votes by Mr. Culliton. All the increase in their votes down there last year, Mr. Speaker, was 46 votes.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — How in the world we should have any jubilation or any celebration over a figure like that, well I don't know. When I listened to the Premier on that memorable evening when he talked to the people of the province, and he took all the comfort that he could possibly develop out of this thing — he is an artist you know when it comes to that — but he said, “I could just say in moderation, but,” he says, “after all the majority is small.” I could say it — and that is about all the hula-hula he said all afternoon. That is about all he ever said.

**Premier Douglas:** — I did not cry and say I was wronged, like the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, if you can get any fund out of this, I can sure give it to you. I had a lot of fun out of it myself.

**February 25, 1952**

Now, I shall continue, Mr. Speaker. In 1950 the Canadian Institute of Public Opinion tried to popularize the vote in the reverse in the Dominion of Canada. That means they did not do it in the usual way, but they just reversed the whole thing. They asked for the popularity of the different political parties in the Dominion of Canada, and all Canadians from Newfoundland to British Columbia were asked this question: "Of the three major political parties in Canada, Liberals, Progressive-Conservative, C.C.F., which party would you be least likely to vote for?" And in one big slice the C.C.F. leads the vote. This was the standing of the parties: C.C.F. 53 per cent, Progressive-Conservative, 17 per cent; Liberal 9 per cent; and undecided 21 per cent. That makes 100 per cent. You have got three over the 50 per cent, more than the others added together.

Then the election in Ontario the last two months has indicated that that poll is correct. It also indicates another thing, Mr. Speaker, and it is that the C.C.F. Party is losing the support of organized labour, because there can be no other explanation of what is taking place all over the world practically: in New Zealand, in Australia, in Ontario and in Great Britain. They are losing the support of organized labour, because, how do you account for the defeat of Mr. Jollet, Mr. Millard and many others in purely labour seats of the province of Ontario? It cannot be explained any other way. There was only one class of people that could put them out of office and that was the labour vote.

Something was said about the mineral tax, the other day, by the Minister of Natural Resources, and, of course, he tried here for about an hour and fifteen minutes to cover up the radio time, and tried to answer the statement that had been made by the member for Maple Creek and he was at a horrible loss to find something to say. He did everything except answer a single thing that the member asked him. He did everything except that. And he went back 44 years to quote the Clifford Sifton days. He talked about everything that he possibly could, and I imagine that he probably was not born when he talked about some of the things that he said were very interesting at the present time. But he started to talk about the mineral tax. Well, the mineral tax was brought into this House, and long before that time, Mr. Speaker, when the same C.C.F. sat in the Opposition and you were one of them. You know the former Minister — the Hon. Mr. Phelps who was Minister of Natural Resources; while he was in Opposition he advocated all the time that this thing should be taken away from these "Big Shots" these big corporations they spoke of, and vested in the Crown by straight out confiscation. There was not any beating about the bush at all. It was straightforward. And when he came into the House as Minister of Natural Resources he came into this building and I remember on the second reading of that Bill, what did he say? He said:

"First of all, we thought about confiscation, but we finally decided to do it this way because it will amount to the same thing. Nobody will pay these taxes and the Crown will get the mineral rights."



Now that is the situation. That was said right on the floor of this House. One thing about the hon. gentleman, who is now in other occupation, he is an honest fellow; he speaks his mind; whether you agree with him or not, that is his opinion. I will say that for him. But, when the Bill was brought into the House, Mr. Speaker, it was not 3 cents an acre, it was 5 cents an acre in that Bill. And I remember the time; I came into this House just a few minutes past 2 o'clock, I think it was, and here were three or four of these big limousine cars coming up with these Big Shots (as you call them), these "plutocrats", these "robber barons", as the Premier calls them — C.P.R., Hudson's Bay, C.N.R., and probably somebody else. But they all got out of their cars and walked into the House and Mr. Phelps and I watched them. And Mr. Phelps comes out on the floor of the House and when we got to this section, he immediately got up and made an amendment and cut that 5 cents to 3 cents. Well, I just wondered what the reason for it was. It could not be possible that these plutocrats, these robber barons were the cause of that thing, was it, Mr. Speaker? Do you think so? I cannot understand how all these fellows who were going to do away with the capitalists and throw these fellows out the window, could agree to it. There was not a man of them that said a word.

Now, that is the history of that; but after all, that mineral tax had done a lot of harm to the farmers of this province. We heard the Minister who belaboured this point to some extent by asking us how we could return these mineral rights to the farmers without giving the whole caboodle back to these Big Shots also. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is simple as A.B.C. How has the farmer — the average farmer in the province of Saskatchewan — got this mineral right? Well, I know how he got them. I know farmers up there who have three or four sections of land. They have had the mineral rights of a quarter here and a half-section there, and some of them haven't got them at all. How have they got them? Well, just supposing they happened to buy a piece of land from the Hudson's Bay Company: it might be a half, it might be a quarter and so on. And you can safely say to any farmer in the province of Saskatchewan, "we will do this": We will return to you the mineral rights up to a section or a half a section, whatever the Legislature will decide, and no farmer is going to be hurt, and then you can get the mineral rights from the Big Shots in the same way, because you can say, "Here, you can pick out two sections out of your holdings and the rest goes to the Crown." And there is no farmer going to get hurt, because there is no farmer in the province of Saskatchewan who has a block of land, or 2 or 3 sections, or anything like that, who has the mineral rights in all that land. Many of them have not got one acre in mineral rights. Many of them have, as I said before, acquired an extra quarter or half-section from somebody else, possibly Hudson's Bay, C.N.R. or C.P.R. land, and that is the reason he has any mineral right, because it does not come into the picture at all.

The Minister of Natural Resources, Mr. Speaker, spent about half an hour, I think, on my radio broadcast that I made here some time ago, and that radio broadcast was just in answer to one that was made by Dr. Carlyle King, the President of the C.C.F. organization in the province of Saskatchewan. I happened to sit and listen to that radio broadcast one night; merely accidentally I happened to listen to it. Yes, it just so

happened I turned the button, and there he was. As a rule I do not listen to very many radio broadcasts, and I just thought I would sit down and I got a pencil and I made a few notes on it. He was bemoaning the fact that the faithful in the province of Saskatchewan were not digging down in their pockets and coming up with enough money. And he said, "You should have the horrible example of Ontario before you." Ontario only had \$25,000, Mr. Speaker, to win that election. Then he tells the people of Saskatchewan or his friends, the C.C.F. (because he does not speak to anybody else) that if they do not come through with more money this horrible thing that happened to Ontario is going to happen here. And I think this and I said this, that this may be beneficial to Ontario but Dr. King says it is horrible for the C.C.F. That is my reply to that. And I think it is good, it is all to the good.

But why should Dr. King be so solicitous about the money? Why should he worry his head off so far as getting money for the C.C.F. is concerned, when these C.C.F. friends have made so much money? This \$25,000 they had in Ontario is just chicken feed to some of the C.C.F. friends in the province of Saskatchewan. \$25,000 was just about the amount that some of their friends got out of one oil deal, just about that — and a thousand shares on top of that. So there is where Dr. Carlyle King should go and get his money, because that is easy money. It is oil money, Mr. Speaker. It is slippery money; yes, slippery money. And if he wants something else he might get that 2 per cent.

I have been asked time and time again, Mr. Speaker — the press was full of rumours and statements, straightforward, substantiated, and it has been printed all over. As a matter of fact, I had a letter from a gentleman in Ontario enclosing a clipping from a paper down there. And he also mentioned that Premier Douglas may have wanted this to send down there to tell the Ontario people how to vote. Gee, I am sorry! I have not got it written to read it to you. But he mentioned some of these things and it is scandalous how this Government how the true champions of socialism, these sworn enemies of private property and private capital, have deserted the banner, or deserted the cause which they devoted their life to, because we find now, according to press reports that have never been contradicted (as a matter of fact they have been confirmed by some of the Ministers sitting across here looking at me now) that they have invested in private enterprise to the extent of \$60,000 together with their friends. I came in here one afternoon, last summer, and it was very warm, just before harvest, and I ran across a gentleman down in a central hotel, and he said, "My wife is away on a vacation. Let us go in and have a glass of beer." Oh, yes, I like a glass of beer; but one bottle is my limit; I am a very mild drinker in all things. We went in to sit down and have a bottle beer apiece. Then I said, "You come out and have dinner with me." So he did. And he says, "I got my car here, let's go out for a drive." So we drove around here and we came up here and drove around and looked at all these nice flowers in these well-kept grounds — and I give them credit for that. Then he took me out on No. 1 Highway. And then I happened to see what they called "The Theatre Under the Stars" and I said "Is this what they call the Theatre Under the Stars?" There were two of them; then he pointed it out and said, "Yes, but that is not what

they call it in Regina.” So I said, “What do they call it in Regina?” “Oh,” he said, “P.P.P.” Well, I did not know, I was at a loss, Mr. Speaker, and I said, “What do you mean?” “Well,” he said, “That is what they call the ‘Premier’s Passion Pit’. That is what they call it in Regina.” So I think that every C.C.F.’er, every true C.C.F.’er, they should have kicked him out through the window and then picked some other leader who was still true to the concept which they swore to destroy and eradicate the capitalists. That is what they should do.

I was also interested in the Premier juggling the figures over here in industrial development. I hope you will bear with me, Mr. Speaker, because the member from Lumsden read 95½ per cent of his speech, and I am going to read about 10 per cent of mine. There were a lot of figures in it, and I did not call him to order because he had the figures, too, and I was interested in them. And I am going to say to him that I agree with many things he said. I do not see any reason in the world why we farmers of western Canada should supply the Dominion of Canada with cheap bread. As a farmer I have been against it all the time, and I have said so several times on the floor of this House. And there are many other things he said with which I agree 100 per cent.

Now I want to go back to what I was going to say. Premier Douglas in a recent broadcast, discussing the decline in population and industrial development in Saskatchewan, said:

“A recent census shows that, since 1941 there has been a drop of about 67,000 in the population of Saskatchewan.”

Mr. Douglas says this is caused by the use of machinery on the farms, but what he did not say was that in the provinces of Manitoba and Alberta, which are also largely agriculture, they have had increases rather than decreases in population. While Saskatchewan’s population decreased 67,000 in the past 10 years, Manitoba’s increased 42,000 and Alberta’s 140,000. And in that address the Premier said:

“The reason that Saskatchewan has suffered a loss in population as compared with other provinces is due to the fact that there have not been the industries here to which the people could go and consequently many of those who left our farms went to the larger industrial centres of Canada and the United States in search of work.”

I can say ‘amen’ to that, Mr. Speaker, because it is true. I agree with that statement because it is just what we have been saying for years. From the Saskatchewan Socialist Government we have not experienced any of the industrial development that have been enjoyed by the other provinces. Then he goes to work and shows that there has been something done insurance. He mentioned the plywood factory, the woollen mill and I say this, in reply to that. In any province or in place in the Dominion of Canada, or any other country, there will be some little bit of industry starting up, probably a very small one, and you cannot hardly prevent that. But the Dominion

**February 25, 1952**

Bureau of Statistics recently issued a publication entitled "The Manufacturing Industries of Canada by Provinces." It covers the period up to and including 1949. I am going to give you a few figures for 1944, the year the C.C.F. Government was elected, and for 1949, the last year reported. In 1944, Government was elected, and for 1949, the last year reported. In 1944, there were 1,054 manufacturing establishments in Saskatchewan — 1,054. In 1949 there were 962, a reduction of 92. Get these figures. Saskatchewan is the only province in the Dominion which experienced during that period a reduction in manufacturing establishments. All other provinces had increases. Manitoba and Alberta have a condition similar to our own, except they do not have a Socialist Government; they are not blessed, or cursed, with that, whichever way you look at it. In the period referred to, 1944 to 1949, manufacturing establishments in Manitoba increased by 230. In Alberta they increased by 520. In Saskatchewan they decreased — just a moment, I will get it for you. Don't think you are going to rattle me because I have been here to long for that. During this period Manitoba gained 230 manufacturing industries, Alberta gained 520, and Saskatchewan lost 92. That is the record and that is something that nobody across the other side of the House can call a tissue of lies, Mr. Speaker, because it is the truth.

**Mr. Tucker:** — They have been calling the truth a tissue of lies, because the Premier has been doing that . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, I am not going to go any farther with this thing, except there is just one thing I want to point out, which he made a great fuss of, and that was when I said in my radio broadcast in regard to public health and hospitalization. It is here, I can read it to you:

"If it had not been for this Government coming into office the hospitalization plan would have started in 1946 and maybe sooner."

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am going to deal with that too, before I leave here — you can smile — you won't laugh so much then. I say this, Mr. Speaker, because we passed The Health Commission Act. We put \$10,000 in the estimate in 1944-45 to set up a Commission that started the work that he never started until a year or two afterwards, when he got that gentleman from the United States in here to condemn everything we had done, and he did not do it. They expected him to do it. Now, then, we would have set up that commission immediately after election . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — When did we set it up?

**Mr. Danielson:** — You brought it in here in 1945 in the winter; you amended the Act. And you remember the time when I asked you about a certain section of the Act and you spit back at me and you said, "The hon. gentleman ought to know, you passed the Act."

**Premier Douglas:** — That is right, and you never did anything about it.

**Mr. Danielson:** — You don't deny that, do you? Well, anyhow, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — When did you bring in the Larger Unit Act?

**Mr. Danielson:** — We did not need to, we had one.

**Premier Douglas:** — That is right, just the Act and no unit.

**Mr. Danielson:** — But we gave the people the right to say whether they wanted it or not. That is all the difference. The Premier told me when I brought that to his attention that his Party did not believe in counting noses — that was his expression. They did not believe in people having anything to say about what they should do or shouldn't do. That is the attitude.

**Premier Douglas:** — That statement is not true.

**Mr. Tucker:** — But you did anyway.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I certainly could bring it down and read it to you. I read it to you three or four times, last year. You never said it wasn't true.

**Premier Douglas:** — That will be as true as the statement that you did not vote against the kids getting the right to vote at 18.

**Mr. Danielson:** — There is no good pulling that radio up to your mouth now. Well, Mr. Speaker, we put in \$10,000 in the estimates for that year in order to set up a Commission. That was for organizational expenses. Then we would have gone to work; the foundation had already been laid in this province, and we would have extended this health insurance scheme on the basis and in co-operation with the municipalities, and that would have increased just as it is now. You know, these gentlemen over there, Mr. Speaker, talk about Sweden. The first year they were here they lived in New Zealand; then they went to Russia. They sent arguments out there, and then they lived in Russia for a few years. Then they got to Australia and finally they found a haven in Sweden. Now everything they say they try to justify and point to Sweden. Well, I will tell you what they did. Some time ago they sent one of their young budding squirts over to Sweden and he takes certain advice, this young C.C.F.'er. They sent him over to Sweden and he came back two months ago and he put an article in the "Commonwealth", of all papers  
...

**Government Member:** — The best in the west. I don't blame you for reading it.

**Mr. Danielson:** — And you know, he spent several months over there, and he was well received over there; and he writes this article and I wish I had brought it; but you have no doubt seen it — it is a whole page in the "Commonwealth." You know, Mr. Speaker, it is the most remarkable thing I ever saw. There is not one word in that article of the system of how they do things in Sweden. There is not even one word about the health services; there is not one word about their municipal services, or anything at all; there is nothing about their taxation system and how they pay it, or how it works. It is true that what the Swedish health system is built on is a municipal level entirely, and also the medical services, Mr. Speaker; but they cannot tell you that now because they have been telling everybody in the province of Saskatchewan that it is a state-controlled and state-operated system. It is built on the municipal level. Their taxing power

belongs to the municipalities; the Federal Government there allots them a certain amount of money for grants for their health system, and that is based on certain principles which I have not got the facts of. I cannot tell you about that because I have not got it; it is very complicated, but that is what it is. And this young man that spent money over there, paid by the C.C.F. (maybe there was some oil money in it, I do not know) has come back after all these months, but he has not one solitary word to tell the people of Saskatchewan about how they do things over there. I still repeat, Mr. Speaker, that if the Liberal Government had been re-elected in 1944, the Health Service Plan would have come into operation in 1946. I say so seriously, and I mean it.

I am sorry the Premier went out of the House, because I just wanted to call to his attention that, last year, he laboured bravely in this House to put over an indirect sales tax on the people of this province. He brought in a Bill and, of course, he did not want it; but he said somebody else wanted it, and he was going to help them out — you know, he is very accommodating. But the member for Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs) got up on his feet and he let the cat out of the bag entirely. He said, “We want this money to pay for hospitalization and old-age pensions.” That is what he said. But what I wanted to call your attention to is this: I pointed out some of the inequities of an indirect sales tax; any tax is bad. I do not suppose anybody likes to pay tax; I don’t, I know, Mr. Speaker, but I pay it because I have to. But an indirect sales tax, everybody knows, if they know anything is a tax on the tax — he pays a tax on tax when he pays an indirect tax to anything. I do not care who employs it, or who uses it, or anything like that; but that is the fact. That is the principle here of this indirect taxation. I pointed that out to the Premier and the rest of the House that evening, and then I had to go out of the House. I find that when I left the House the Premier got up and said: “The member from Arm River’s mathematics were very faulty — they were very, very bad.” I have an enormous amount of material to back me up, by technicians, chartered accountants, by presidents of banks; I have here the President of the Royal Bank of Canada’s annual address to the meeting here a few weeks ago, and he said this:

“This system is very inefficient. It takes out of the consumer’s pocket much more than it gives to the Government in revenue. But, worse still, the purchaser sees the whole increase in price not as a tax, but as a rise in the cost of living and a reason for demanding higher wages for his work or a higher price for his product. A further aggravation is that provincial and municipal sales taxes, levied on the retail price, obviously become in part a tax on taxes.”

Then he goes on at some length and completely substantiates the things that I said on the floor of this House, last year; and, of course, the Premier, in this House and out of it, works on one principle, Mr. Speaker — anything you can get away with.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — The member for Gravelbourg (Mr. E.H. Walker), of course, makes a pretty good speech. I have no fault to find with him.

He made a better speech than mine, I have no doubt. My speech the first time in his House, Mr. Speaker, was only 12 minutes, and I am sure you wish I did not speak any longer than that now! I want to say to the member for Gravelbourg that no doubt, he is a new member and he does not know much about what is going on in the House, except I suppose he does read the "Commonwealth" — and you know what effect that would have on anybody that swallows all the stuff that is in there. He talks about the old-age pensions and social services, but particularly about the old-age pension which I am dealing with now. He shows what a tremendous benefactor this Socialist or C.C.F. Government has been to the old-age pensioners of this province. I say, Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to this Government for having put in this free hospitalization scheme for old-age pensioners. I said so before. I give them credit for that; but I do not like any party or any government, I do not care who it is, to brag and try to make political capital out of a social services that are extended to the needy people of our province.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — That is the only thing I have against them; but the principle they accepted when they put through that service, I commend them for it. But I want to say to the member for Gravelbourg that in 1922 to 1927, when the Old-Age Pension Act first came into effect, Saskatchewan was one of the first provinces to take advantage of that legislation. The part of the pension paid by the Saskatchewan Government at that time was 50 per cent of the pension — that was \$10 per month; and the Dominion paid \$10 a month. In the last two years, that is all your Government insurance has paid out of the \$40 a month pension — just the same as the Liberal Government paid in 1927 and 1928. That is all you paid — the Dominion paid the other \$30.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Canada have come through the years, to realize that it is the duty of the State to look after social services of the needy people who cannot look after themselves. There is no Liberal Government, no C.C.F. Government, nor any party, or anybody else on the part of the people as a whole that takes exception. There is general acceptance of their duty to look after the needy people in our midst. And it is not Socialism. Socialism and social service has nothing to do with government — absolutely nothing. Every province in the Dominion of Canada has social services that we have, and some of them have more, yet none of these provinces has a Socialist government, for that is the last thing they want. They are throwing them out the window just as quickly as they get in there.

Now then, that is one thing; but when it comes to the administration of old-age pensions in this province, Mr. Speaker, what have they done? During the last eight years I would say, without any hesitation, that the record of this Government is nothing to be proud of.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — There is no government in the Dominion of Canada that has done anything more than pay the basic pension, that has paid less than these gentlemen over there. In one year they took

**February 25, 1952**

\$760,000 of money paid by the Government of the Dominion of Canada into the coffers of this Government, and put it in their own pocket to offset the \$2.50 a month that they had to pay from May 1st up to September 1st. That was the old-age pensioners' money; and I say to you again, it has been proven on the floor of this House, this Government enforced a means test under the \$2.50 a month supplementary pension; and they stood on the floor of this House and voted twice in the last Session, that that was their responsibility and that is the way they wanted to do it.

**Premier Douglas:** — Did the Liberals have a means test on their supplementary bonus?

**Mr. Danielson:** — Did you have one for the first six or seven months you were in? I will tell you what you did. On October 4, 1944, you stood right where you are now and said this, "If we extend the supplementary pension to old-age pensioners, it will be \$5.00 a month," and when he comes through with it, it was \$3.50. I will repeat again, Mr. Speaker, there is no government in Canada that has done anything towards supplementing the Dominion's basic pension in the Dominion of Canada, that has done less than this Government has done here.

**Premier Douglas:** — That is the worst nonsense I have heard today and that is going a long way.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I will tell you, Mr. Premier. I said this: there is no provincial government in Canada that has done anything towards extending supplementary pensions — there are two provinces that have extended no supplementary pension — but I repeat, there is no government that has done anything along that line of extending supplementary pensions that has done less than this government.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — May I ask the hon. member a question please?

**Mr. Danielson:** — Sure, but don't make a speech now, because I have not the time.

**Hon. Member:** — You have till tomorrow.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — How many provinces in the Dominion of Canada give supplementary allowances, and how many do not? There are three who give, including Saskatchewan, and there are seven that do not give; and those are Liberal governments too.

**Mr. Danielson:** — The hon. Minister is going back in history; the other fellow was 44 years back today, and he is going back too.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — No, I am dealing with today.

**Mr. Danielson:** — You are going back in history now. That has been threshed over on the floor of this House time and time again.

**Premier Douglas:** — Will the member tell us what Manitoba pays as a supplementary? What does Nova Scotia pay? New Brunswick; Prince Edward Island?

**Mr. Danielson:** — One of the provinces does not pay anything . . .



**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, I am not bothering with him any more.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Mr. Speaker, the information that is being given by the hon. member is entirely false and . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Member:** — Make him withdraw,

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker . . .

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Have I your permission to . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

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

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! You were dealing with the Minister's Department . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — I was dealing with the pension . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I am ruling that, as a Minister of that Department, he has the right, on a point of privilege, to correct the statement.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, he has already done that. Now, he is going to make a speech.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — I merely wish to point out, Mr. Speaker, those governments of Canada which do not pay a supplementary allowance . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Order! Order! On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, and a privilege of all of us: it is surely accepted by this Legislative Assembly that members of the Government sitting in this Legislative Assembly have no more rights than any private member. Now you have just enunciated a most amazing doctrine. You said a Minister of the Crown has more rights here than we have . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — I did not . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — . . . And if you lay that down, Mr. Speaker, I must . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — I did not . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — May I continue, Mr. Speaker?

**Premier Douglas:** — No, not when the speaker is on his feet.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well I am certainly entitled to make my point, Mr. Speaker. I am surely not entitled to be interrupted by you, Mr. Speaker. I am not out of order. I am dealing with an important question of privilege, and you have enunciated a most amazing doctrine — that because a man is a

**February 25, 1952**

Minister of the Crown, he has a right to get up and interrupt another member's speech. I put it to you, Mr. Speaker, that we are all equal on the floor of this House, that no man has a special privilege here because he is a Minister of the Crown. That is the very basis of our parliamentary government; and if you lay the doctrine down, Mr. Speaker, that because the Minister of Social Welfare is a Minister of the Government, he has a right, a special right to get up and interfere with the member who is speaking, I must appeal from that ruling, and I would ask all the members to uphold me in it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. Leader of the Opposition is absolutely misconstruing what I said, and I still hold that it is a privilege of a Minister of a Department, when a misstatement is made by a member speaking, that he has the privilege of correcting him; and I will hold that that is a good ruling.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I point out to you that because he is a Minister it does not give him any special right to the floor of this Legislature.

**Premier Douglas:** — No one said he has any special right.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well he just said, because he is a Minister he has got a right.

**Mr. Speaker:** — No, I did not . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — That is what he said, and I object to that, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, let me clarify this and then you can hand down your ruling. I said this, "that no provincial government in Canada, who paid any supplementary pension, has paid less than this Government has." That is the statement I made, and if they want to draw any outside question into this, well then, I am not going to take it. I will have nothing to do with it.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — I said this, "of any government that is paying supplementary allowance" . . .

**Hon. Member:** — Weasel words!

**Mr. Danielson:** — I told you there were governments that did not pay any supplementary pension . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Weasel words!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — I told you a little while ago. I suppose that makes you happy . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — I have to congratulate, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! I understood, when the Minister rose on a point of

privilege, it was to correct a statement relative to his Department.

**Mr. Danielson:** — There was nothing to correct. They brought this other question into it. I did not do it.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — He got on his feet and brought this matter up. Now, who has put into effect in the Dominion of Canada and in Saskatchewan the social services that we have in the Dominion of Canada today? How much has this socialistic Government, this “humanity first” Government ever done in regard to instituting and enforcing social services in the Dominion and in the provinces of Canada? Well, I have it here, Mr. Speaker. There has been placed on the statutes in the Dominion House, and in all the provincial Legislatures, 34 such Acts in effect. The Liberals have put into operation 24 of them; the Conservatives, 5; the Union Nationale, 2; the United Farmers, 1; the Social Credit, 1; and the C.C.F., none.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — They extended this medical services to the old-age pensioner . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Who compiled this list?

**Mr. Danielson:** — . . . and I will give them credit for it again, if it is any comfort to my friends over there.

**Premier Douglas:** — May I ask my hon. friend who compiled this list?

**Mr. Danielson:** — It is from the records of the Hansard of the House of Commons.

**Premier Douglas:** — Who put it on Hansard?

**Mr. Danielson:** — The Minister, I think, of Public Health. He thinks that anybody is not any more reliable than he is; that is why he will not believe anybody. He judges everybody by himself.

**Premier Douglas:** — You still have not answered the question.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — You will have the chance to answer this thing. Who pays for the social services in this province? 82 per cent, the last two years, has come from the Dominion Government. As a matter of fact, if you take off the administration costs, the Dominion Government pays for all social services in this province — every penny of it, and there is money left.

**Hon. Member:** — Prove it.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Yes, I can prove it, and I might do it.

**Premier Douglas:** — You might, yes.

February 25, 1952

**Mr. Tucker:** — We can do it if we take time, tonight.

**Mr. Danielson:** — It has been proven on the floor of this House before. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, what the Premier says is so sure does not make it so.

**Mr. Tucker:** — He thinks it does though!

**Mr. Danielson:** — I am not going to make any statements here that I cannot prove. I am saying this more for the benefit of the member from Gravelbourg than anybody else . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Even he is not that naïve!

**Mr. Danielson:** — . . . because there is no hope for him. He is so smitten with this double talk and these weasel words, that he uses the C.C.F. dictionary. I have it here but I will not take time to read it. What did you just revise this thing for? But, after all, Mr. Speaker, that is one thing this Government has done. They have set up such a tremendous machine in the social service Department, which is election brigade in this province. They have it now running all over the province of Saskatchewan. They have it now running all over the province of Saskatchewan. They have had, for 3 years, easily 85 full-time inspectors running around the country in this province, in social services, at a time when the wealth of this province and the economic condition of the people are better than it has ever been. That might be something for the people to think about. That is the situation.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — You should be able to think up something more.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I have a few minutes before 6 o'clock, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to talk about education for a while. I see the Minister of Education (Hon. Mr. Lloyd) coming in, and I want him here.

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd:** — You go right ahead. I can sit here all night.

**Mr. Danielson:** — You know, I have a letter here that I got from one of the most sincere C.C.F.'ers in my district, but he does not act like a C.C.F.'er any more. They closed the school and stole the barn away from the school, and the Minister of Education writes and says he cannot do anything about it: "I am sorry but I cannot do anything about it." I am not going to read it because I will leave the reading of letters to the Provincial Treasurer. He was very successful at that last year. When the Minister of Education was speaking, Mr. Speaker, he did just like the Minister of Natural Resources, and many of the other fellows — he went back to 1934, to the Speech from the Throne. He said that Speech was remarkable because it did not promise anything to anybody. Well, I think that is probably true; but then that was being honest anyhow. The Speech from the Throne, this time, Mr. Speaker, does not promise anything to anybody; it just hints at something. It just makes you believe that something important might happen. But he went on talking about the old days and the old Liberals and all this; but the one thing I noticed this time, Mr. Speaker, was that he was very moderate in his speech. He only called me an "old crock." You will remember the first year, he called us "political charlatans", "political scoundrels", and all that sort of thing. I have the quotation here — I keep these mementoes, so I can refer to them sometime.

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member care to read the quotations? Let's see this "political scoundrel."

**Mr. Danielson:** — Yes, here is what he said one time: "political charlatan of the Nth degree" — that was Mr. Patterson — "scoundrels that oppose the necessary administration changes." I have many more here; many, many more of them. Well, I don't know, I may be an old crock . . .

**Hon. Member:** — We know you are.

**Mr. Danielson:** — . . . but I am sure that the Minister of Education can hold more than I can yet, because he is a healthy young crock, you know, and I think he likes to take a little . . .

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd:** — I must inform the hon. member I assured him I was not calling him an old crock.

**Mr. Danielson:** — But he just put in the reverse — that is in the C.C.F. dictionary. Everything is said in reverse. I thank him for the compliment in any case. But he did not tell you anything. He tried to tell you how well the people were off because they had so many supervisors — how many was it?

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd:** — 558.

**Mr. Danielson:** — 500 — you did not have very many more than that last year — only about a dozen or two: 546; and he was trying to make the people believe that they were reducing the number and getting better off, as far as education is concerned. I can say to him that the rural school system in the province of Saskatchewan, in the part of the province where I live, is practically ruined; and I mean every word of it. In the district where I am how many schools have you got open? Less than half of what was open in 1944-45. What has happened to them? That is the situation.

And another thing, Mr. Speaker . . .

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd:** — Will the hon. member permit a question?

**Mr. Danielson:** — Yes.

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd:** — Will he suggest why the schools are closed?

**Mr. Danielson:** — You closed them. I know schools closed today that should have been opened last fall, but they are closed; and the excuse was because they could not get a teacher.

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd:** — Will the hon. member tell the House how I closed them/

**Mr. Danielson:** — Because that is under your control, and you can ask your officer up there why he closed it.

People who lived next to the school had to move their

children to town. Half a dozen families came into the town of Davidson this fall, because they had to get their children to school. I came down on the train, the other day, with a man, and both of his sons had to move to town — one came in last year, and the other fellow this year. Why? You can go from Elbow clear down to Craik and there are only two schools open; and they will be closed, next year, if the gentleman who sits over there can get his agent up there or somebody to do it.

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd:** — You still have not answered my question, but it does not matter.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, I was kind of expecting the Minister, when he was talking about how well off his Department is and what good work they were doing, how the schools are progressing more and more; I was thinking, perhaps, he might have gone back and told something more; I was thinking, perhaps, he might have gone back and told something of the history of his own Department. I think he should have done that. It would have been the fair thing to do, Mr. Speaker. He should have told the people of Saskatchewan some of the things that have happened in his Department since he became the Minister of Education in this province. He should have done that, because I am sure that the people would be very much interested to be reminded of some of the things that have been done by his Department and by those he has shipped in to this province to do this work for him. Who doesn't remember Mr. Watson Thompson, "Nosey" Parker, Hilda Buckley, and all these fellows who come here to cram down the throats of the people of the province of Saskatchewan, through the Adult Education Department, the communistic ideologies of this Government. Who doesn't remember the radio broadcasts? Who doesn't remember Mr. Thompson's summing up when he talked about the ghettos and the slums of Europe and compared them with these nice, clean nurseries of Leningrad and Moscow? Who doesn't remember that? They paid him a good many thousands of dollars, and then they shipped his furniture to Vancouver for him, to get rid of him, and he has been back once since. That "Nosey" Parker was here for a long time, carrying on his work. Finally you had to get rid of him too. We called him "Red Nosey" Parker. Then you had a fellow by the name of Henderson; we had Dyson Carter, but that was up on a different angle. Who doesn't remember Dyson Carter and "The Atomic Future", which was a textbook in the schools? Why don't you keep it there now? Did you get weak? Did your mind get weak, or did you get scared? The Premier told the Leader of the Opposition he gets scared sometimes; I have never seen him, but maybe. I think that is what was wrong with the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker; he got scared of the result.

What became of the accumulative record? There was a dossier on every child in the Province of Saskatchewan.

**Premier Douglas:** — You are just rambling over your old speeches.

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I don't mind a considerable amount of inaccuracy coming from the hon. member from Arm River, but when he makes a statement that there was a "dossier" on every child in this province, then I insist that it is a false statement. It is made knowing that it is false, and it must be withdrawn. It has been withdrawn before.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I think I made one mistake. It was “the World of Today” that was the textbook.

(Interruptions)

**Mr. Speaker:** — If the hon. member had listened when the Minister of Education got up on a point of privilege, he would know what he was asked to withdraw. He was asked to withdraw the statement that there was a complete dossier kept on every child in the province.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, I have seen that accumulative record and seen that they started it and filled it out and kept it up. I don't know what in the world you would call it; but if there is any objection to using the word “dossier”, I will say “record.”

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, on a . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — I will call it the record.

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd:** — That is very different, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Danielson:** — The record. Well if that satisfies you, I am pleased to have satisfied in some respect anyhow.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. the hon. Minister of Education said my colleague here made a statement that was false and he knew it was false. Now, if there is one man that I resent that being said of in this Legislature, my friend here made a . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! A point of privilege is on something that appertains to yourself.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I am raising the point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member, in effect, said that the hon. member was saying something that was untrue deliberately. In other words, he was lying and I am asking that you . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — You have no point of privilege. The hon. member who was speaking has a point of privilege.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I am asking that you ask the member to withdraw, that is what I am asking. I want that withdrawn, Mr. Speaker. Do you rule that he can say that and get away with it in this Legislature?

**Mr. Speaker:** — I am not ruling at all, I am ruling that you have no point of privilege.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well on that point I appeal from your ruling then; I have a point of privilege. When a member of this Legislature calls another, in effect, a liar, I have a right to call it to your attention and ask that it be withdrawn.

**Mr. Speaker:** — You have no point of privilege. The hon. member is appealing from my ruling?

February 25, 1952

**Mr. Tucker:** — Yes, I certainly am.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, let us get this point clear. The Leader of the Opposition knows the rules of the House, although you would not know it from watching him at work today. A member can only raise a point of privilege on something which affects himself. Now if the member for Arm River raises the question of privilege, then it may be a question of privilege; but certainly the Leader of the Opposition all day has been saying that nobody has special privileges in this. He not only wants to rise on questions of privilege for himself, but on questions of privilege for every other member. The member for Arm River can get up on his own. He is certainly capable of talking; he has been doing it for quite a while. If he has a question of privilege, let him raise it. One member cannot raise points of privilege for another member who is present in the House and on his feet.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** — No, you rose on a point of privilege.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Well I raise it on a point of order. The hon. member cannot call another person . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Let's get this out of the way first. You are appealing against my ruling what you had no point of privilege.

**Mr. Tucker:** — I appealed against your ruling that you ruled that a member here could call another, in effect, a liar. That is what I am appealing against. And I pointed out again, Mr. Speaker, that if the one hon. member, in effect, calls another a liar any member can call it to Your Honour's attention and, having called it to your attention, we are entitled to have a ruling on it. I asked you — did you rule that the Minister of Education is in order? And you said you did; and I appealed from that ruling.

**Mr. Speaker:** — No, I did not say he was in order.

**Mr. Tucker:** — All right.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. Leader of the Opposition rose on a point of privilege, and my ruling was that he had no point of privilege, and you appealed from my ruling. If you wish to withdraw that appeal and then start something else that is all right; but you did rise on a point of privilege and my ruling was given on that point of privilege.

**Mr. Tucker:** — And my objection, Mr. Speaker, was to your ruling that the Minister of Education is in order. I appeal from that ruling.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I did not rule that the Minister of Education was in order.

**Premier Douglas:** — He gave no such ruling.

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd:** — Mr. Speaker, I should be very glad to try to clear the matter up. Perhaps I should not have said that the hon. member knew better, but he should, Mr. Speaker, may I say he should, Mr. Speaker; may I say he should have



known better, because he has withdrawn the same statement several times before.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, that statement is not correct. He told you that I was uttering deliberate falsehoods and I ask you to have him withdraw that. I made my explanation, and I am going to explain it more.

**Mr. Speaker:** — If the hon. member accused you of making a deliberate falsehood, then the hon. member must withdraw it, but I certainly did not hear him. If the Hon. Leader of the Opposition would keep his voice down a little I might hear some of these remarks.

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd:** — If I made the statement, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw, and say that the hon. member should have known better.

**Mr. Danielson:** — There is nothing very important involved in this . . .

(Interruptions)

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — The minister tried to save his own face. I said that an accumulative record is a dossier and he takes exception to the word “dossier”. Well, if he has any objection I will say it is a record, which, if it is completed and continually added to, is a complete record. I am going to take that word “dossier” out, and that is all that he is objecting to. So there we are now, the whole thing is settled. If the Minister has withdrawn, I change the word “dossier” to “record.” There we are, we can go on from there.

But anyhow, I have a little more to say about this history and this C.C.F. control of the Education Department in this province. We had Watson Thompson, we had Edward (Red) Nosey Parker, we had R.B. Henderson, G.G. Caulfield, Bill Harding, Irene Leeman, and Hilda Buckley. These were the storm brigade — these were the storm troopers for communism in this province.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I have listened to a good deal of nonsense this afternoon, but when any man comes in here and lists a series of people who have no opportunity to defend themselves, some of them who are — who have rendered service in this province — and some of whom are still rendering service in this province, and refers to them as “storm troopers” of communism, I say that that type of thing is lowering this Legislature to the level in which the member for Arm River is most at home, and I think that it ought not to be permitted.

**Mr. Speaker:** — The hon. member is just giving his opinion; he is not accusing anybody in the House.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago a man on that side of the House called us a bunch of Nazis. I did not raise any objection because I considered from whence it came.

February 25, 1952

**Premier Douglas:** — Who called you Nazis; who did?

**Mr. Danielson:** — Look up the record and read it yourself.

**Premier Douglas:** — On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman cannot just drop phrases and then wander off. He accuses someone on this side of the House of having called them “Nazis”. Now he must either produce the record or withdraw that statement.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I certainly have it here, Mr. Speaker, but I am not going to take time.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Maybe my recollection will clear that point up if it is of recent origin. One member on this side was referring to what someone said at a public meeting, where they accused the C.C.F. of being Nazis.

**Mr. Danielson:** — He applied it to us.

**Mr. Speaker:** — No, I assure the hon. member that it was not applied to any of the Opposition, at least not in my hearing.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — On the point that the Premier spoke on, Mr. Speaker, I think I was the only one who used the term “Nazi” during this Session, and the way I used it was that a former Liberal Minister had called me and another C.C.F. member “Nazis” at a public meeting.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I will accept that explanation, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** — I might point out to the member it is now three minutes to six and if there is any point in his address where he would like to cease I will call it six o’clock.

The House resumed at eight o’clock p.m.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, when you called six o’clock, I was dealing with some of the things in connection with the Adult Education Plan as it was operated in this province a few years ago, and I was particularly trying to show what the object and attitude and purpose of the activities of Dr. Watson Thompson and his colleagues was in connection with that activity. There are many things that he has written, many things that we can read today, which clearly indicate what the purpose of this thing was, and I have one here.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, when this “Radio College” — this short term on the radio — was over, the Commander-in-Chief, Mr. Thompson, had come up to the radio to sort of sign-off and then he delivered his judgment, or his comment, on what had been said and what had been done during the previous radio time. One time he said this:

“In short, the world has outgrown the property basis for society, both economically and psychologically. We are maturing beyond the childish stage when, fear-stricken because there may not be enough for all, we clutch our little toys and cry out, ‘This is mine.’ The best thing, even the best machines, are too big to be treated that way; they affect the lives of too many other people for one man, or even any few to have those exclusive property rights over them. The one country in the world where none of these big things can be privately owned is, of course, the Soviet Union. Nothing seems to have lessened their success or their happiness. Indeed, Stephenson, the great American writer, wrote, just after his visit to Soviet Russia: ‘I have seen the future, and it works. I do not know of any sociologist who doubts that sooner or later we will pass from the property society to the functional society of public ownership of all the instruments of prod, both man and machines.’”

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that the teachings of this gentleman and his colleagues were approved by the Department of Education. He was hired to carry on a programme of that type. But I want to point out to you what he said, when he spoke about his particular work that was before him. Mr. Thompson’s programme was to be “dynamic;” it would deal mainly with controversial political issues, and here is what he said — and that is within quotation marks:

“Rather than the old-style subjects,” he said, “We will choose issues of the activist intention, and the activist intention will be maintained. Too much of our adult education work has led upwards to abstract academic subjects. Our work here is going to lead downwards to logical conclusions. We are not only going to encourage a study, but we are going to show the people how to use it, how to get action.”

All that fits in exactly and very clearly indicates what his whole campaign was and what his purpose and what his references, so to speak, were in this work. He was here to do a certain job, as he understood it, and he must have understood it very clearly, because he had no hesitation in wading into his work like he was going to do business — and he did business for a little while. He said, another time, describing the possible reactions of the Russian soldiers when they came into Western Europe and saw the —

“bombed-out cities, which were also the ghettos even before they were blitzed; country roads strewn with dead and dying, small towns depleted of life, substance and water. What may have impressed Red soldiers as beautiful in terms of buildings or city services could all have been found in the great cities of Leningrad, Kiev and Odessa. What may have

**February 25, 1952**

impressed them as ugly — the disease, the unsanitary living condition of the millions, the crematoriums and enforced slavery. Many were undoubtedly grateful that ‘home was never like this.’”

He now is referring to the Russian soldiers when they got into France and Germany:

“Their peasants are peasants. The standard of living on a co-operative farm in the Soviet Union is higher than that on any feudal farm in any of the countries which Red Army men saw.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is really laying it on the line, and that was the purpose, that was the object of him coming here. This man was hired by this Government. He worked for this Government for 15 and a half months. He was paid \$6,354 and he was sent away and we have not seen much of him since. We have heard of him at times, but not very frequently; I think he has been in the city of Regina about once since that time. Now then, it is idle for anyone to deny that the Department of Education’s programme and the policy of it was, under this Government, to introduce and to foster and promote socialism through the public school system of this province. There is no doubt about that. We have the Provincial Treasurer going up to Alberta to address one of the C.C.F. Conventions in Alberta; it was reported in the press he made a speech there. Then it has been printed in the daily newspapers of this province, and he said this. He was asked from the audience about the possibility of extending socialist doctrines among the youth. Then he replied that at least 95 per cent of Saskatchewan’s teachers are supporters of the Government, and it made our problem easier. Easier for what? To teach socialism in the public schools of the province of Saskatchewan; that is what it was. Well, Mr. Speaker, the people have not forgotten these things. They are still vividly before us as it was only five or six years ago when some of this took place. And I would say to you that the intention is still there in the policy of this Government. They had to let up; they had to ease up in order to avoid the wrath of the people of the Saskatchewan, parents of the children of Saskatchewan; but it is there; it will be put into operation.

I want to say another thing. I said something in regard to rural schools a few moments before recess, Mr. Speaker, and the Minister of Education took strong exception to it. I am going to say again that the steady progress that has been made during the last eight years to eliminate entirely the rural school system is still in effect, and if this Government should have power in this province in the next ten years there will not be any rural schools in this province. That is not the policy. Their policy is to get everything in to the centres of this province, to the towns and villages; put up dormitories, with certain supervisors or matrons to look after the children and get them away from their homes and the control and influence of their parents. That is the pattern, Mr. Speaker, that has been followed in every one of these states across the ocean where the Marxist rules today. It has started already in this province. It is advocated by my friend over here — you won’t laugh so much, because the people realize these things. I said that there is no rural school system

in part of the province today. I can mention road after road, township after township. Between one town in my district and the town of Liberty, 24 miles, there is only one rural school in operation. Now that is the situation. And I am sure that the policy preached by Watson Thompson and his colleagues is still the policy of the Education Department in the province of Saskatchewan insofar as adult education is concerned.

Now, adult education, Mr. Speaker, of course, can have a very wide interpretation, and we find that our friend, the Minister of Agriculture, is stepping into the picture and trying to give the Minister of Education a little lift once in a while, so far as his work is concerned. He has distributed throughout the length and breadth of this province, a book called "The Road to Survival." It is sent out with the compliments of the Hon. I.C. Nollet, Minister of Agriculture. As a matter of fact, I got two books and I stuck them under a little side-table in my house; I never looked at them, and there were other books in there. My wife asked me one day, "Where did you get these books?" I said, "I don't remember seeing them. I took them out of the package and stuck them in there. I never looked at the inside of the book and I haven't looked at it until tonight."

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — You don't need to tell us that.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, that is all right; thanks for the compliment. If that applies to me it certainly applies to the Minister of Social Welfare. But, Mr. Speaker, some one came into the house and they picked that. They exchanged a book some time and they got hold of this book; and that is when my wife came in and said to me, "Where did you get this book?" — because someone else had read it and made some very pointed remarks at the contents of this book. So there we have it. I am going to read you just a short part of this book:

"To the extent that our aid increases the European population, to that extent do we increase Europe's difficulties and our own danger. Our food and financing and medical care, unless they are a gross failure, will reduce death rates.

"Birth rates are falling, but not fast enough to be much help. Vital statisticians solemnly tell us that if we wait long enough population curves will level off and birth rates be adjusted "naturally" to death rates. What may happen to the world meanwhile they seem to regard as one of those bothersome realities which seep into academic cloisters like the essence of leaking drains. Politeness demands that we ignore the stench, if possible. Unfortunately, however, it is rising.

"Anything we do to fortify the stench — to increase the population — is a disservice both to Europe and ourselves. Stabilization and eventual reduction in population in Europe would be one of the longest steps that could be made toward world peace and well-being.

A United States of Europe, with one-half or one-third its present population, could probably maintain a standard of living that would equal or exceed that of the United States.”

“We are in a position to bargain. Any aid we give should be made contingent on national programmes leading toward population stabilization through voluntary action of the people. We should insist on freedom of contraception as we insist on freedom of the press; it is just as important. And as we pour in hundreds of millions of the American taxpayers’ dollars we should make certain that substantial proportions make available educational and functional contraceptive material. Quite as important as the four Freedoms, which we have made a shibboleth, is a Fifth Freedom — from excessive numbers of children. Far more than much of the world realizes, even the partial achievement of the first four is dependent upon this last.”

Well, this I would classify as adult education, Mr. Speaker, Watson Thompson should have had that. That is supposed to be the Government’s policy, or else they would not spend public money. They can’t laugh this away, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what the hon. gentleman is trying to prove by the quotation from his book. Is he trying to prove, for instance, that those are our opinions? In the Foreword to that book — and he did not read it — we set out specifically that we did not agree entirely with the author; but there is such a thing as academic freedom, Mr. Speaker. Other people can have opinions . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, I don’t need any instructions from . . .

(Interruptions)

**Mr. Danielson:** — You can’t, Mr. Speaker, take public taxpayers’ money and buy this tripe that is in this book . . .

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — It is not tripe.

**Mr. Danielson:** — . . . and distribute it among the taxpayers of Saskatchewan without being responsible for what you are doing. And we know that what is in this book is contrary to many religious beliefs in this province. It is contrary to the morals of many people in this province. Oh, you can laugh; it is very flattering. The proof is here. That is the document that was sent out to the people, into their homes, where children can read it, where anybody can read it. I think it is something that is beyond anything that should be attempted by even a government like this one.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say any more about this particular education. I want to point out to you that I have stayed within about five or six years. The Minister of Education, when he discussed his Department, went back to 1934, so I am a little better than he was anyhow, in regard to that.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am going to say a few words in regard to public health, because that Department has been touched on and everything has been gone over, the last two weeks, to try to prove to the people of the province that there was nothing here, there was nobody doing anything until the C.C.F. and this socialistic Government came in. Well, when they came into the province of Saskatchewan, we had an expenditure on health, in 1942, Mr. Speaker, not in 1944, which was the second highest per capita of any province in the Dominion of Canada, and I would like to have anybody contradict that statement. We had a better public health system in the province of Saskatchewan than any other province in Western Canada. There is no question about that. We had a highly developed municipal health system. Over a hundred municipalities, towns and villages had not only free hospitalization but they had also free medical services, Mr. Speaker.

I come from a municipality where we took care of our problem in that way, and the cost was very reasonable. I come from a Union Hospital district, Mr. Speaker, that built the first union hospital, I think, in the province of Saskatchewan. We did not have a Union Hospital Act in 1912, but we incorporated by a special Bill going through this House. I am still on that Board since 1922, and I know whereof I speak. All this has been done, and, between 1935 and 1942, through all these bad years, there was \$3,101,000 distributed in the province of Saskatchewan in special grants to hospitals and doctors. I know what happened. In the whole dried-out area, which I think comprised 157 rural municipalities (I am maybe out one or two there, I am not sure, but not any more) we had not only the fifty cents per capita basic grant but we got as much as 80 cents per day special grant for our patients in that hospital for years, during the bad 'thirties, and so did all other rural hospitals inside the drought area. The grant varied a little bit, but in our case it varied all the way from 40 to 80 cents per day. That is the special grant in addition to the 50 cents per day grant. And, I am interested to see here, on March 3, 1945, speaking in this House, the hon. Premier said this:

“At present, all hospitals which were bona fide hospitals received the grant of 50 cents per day per patient. That grant is one of the highest paid in Canada, it speaks well for the previous administration of this province and for the people in taking such an interest in health matters.”

That is the Premier of this province talking about the Liberals. You wouldn't believe that, would you? You ask him. Maybe he will say he was misquoted. He won't believe that. He would change it today if he could.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, when this Government came into power, the first thing that they did was to get somebody in here to discredit the whole health set-up that we had in the Saskatchewan. They

**February 25, 1952**

couldn't find anybody inside of Canada, so they went down to the United States and picked up a gentleman by the name of Sigerist, and, for some reason or another (I never saw the gentleman, I don't know) he was not willing to do what he was supposed to do here. He disagreed that we did not have anything in the province of Saskatchewan in connection with public health, and he said so quite frankly. He said this — he was speaking at a banquet in the city of Regina and here is what Dr. Sigerist said — and, by the way, this is September 27, 1944:

“The Saskatchewan survey was one of the most pleasant he had ever undertaken in his career. He had had many similar assignments, but this in Saskatchewan differed from those in south Africa and the Balkans as it was one in which health services did not have to start from scratch.”

In Saskatchewan, Dr. Sigerist said, it was a case of bringing the existing facilities into more service for more people; to extend and improve, which has always been the part of progress, and I think the policy of every government, no matter whether they are Tories or Grits or what they are.

Dr. Anderson — let us give him credit for starting the Cancer Clinic in this province; that was a great thing to do by that Government and they deserve credit for it. But every government in this day and age is progressive, and anything that this Government has done which I think is a new thing that they started, I gave them credit for in the past and I am going to give them credit for now. But where they built on what we had already started, we should give credit to the people of the province who had supplied the means and the money and the dollars to pay for it. What they have done they have done in a very extravagant manner, Mr. Speaker, but nevertheless, the people have had some benefit from it.

Now then, that is what I want to point out; and I want to point out that there is nothing here, today, that was not here when this Government came into office except the one particular thing they did — extending the hospital and medical services to the old-age pensioners, free, as far as it can be called free, because everybody pays for everything.

We have heard — I do not think I have been in this House one day since we started, Mr. Speaker, without somebody has been up talking about the Cancer Clinic, Cancer Commission and the cancer treatment in this province. I want to point out — and I am sorry the Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank), who handed me that compliment, has gone out — but I want to tell him that he should read, because by the way he talks I am sure he never read anything in connection with this Cancer Clinic. I said that the Cancer Clinic was started by the Anderson Government. It was carried on by the Liberal Government, and there was a nominal fee charged for services in that clinic. Any person who was sent there by his medical doctor — nobody else could go through — could go through that clinic. It took a few days. I have gone through there myself and I know all about it, from my experience going through there. It took about three or four days to go through that clinic, and the nominal fee was \$10,



Mr. Speaker. That is all it cost. That did not pay for one-tenth of the expense in connection with it; the rest was paid by the Government. I say that the Anderson Government started it; we carried it on up to 1944. At the Session in 1944, I remember Dr. Uhrich waited and prayed for the day that the finances would permit him to put a Bill through the House that would establish free cancer treatment in this Province. I think one of the greatest men, so far as public health services is concerned, was the late Dr. Uhrich. He was known over Canada as a whole. He was an efficient and a very conscientious servant of the people in that respect. His whole life was devoted to that service, and he should have some credit for it.

Now then, during the Session of 1944, we passed a Bill establishing a free Cancer Clinic. All of the Ministers have the proof of this thing, and there is nothing in the world, or in the province of Saskatchewan, that has been more misrepresented, more what the Premier calls a “tissue of lies” spread about this service of free cancer treatment. I have Mr. Patterson’s Budget Speech here of Tuesday, February 29, 1944, and I am going to come back to what I said this afternoon, when my friend over here laughed so heartily over what I said. He said this, it is on page 8 of the Budget Speech of Mr. Patterson, February 29, 1944:

“Public health increases (that is the increases in the estimate) cover the cost of providing medical and hospital treatment to patients suffering from cancer as announced in the Speech from the Throne. It also provides an amount to cover the cost of work preparatory to establishing a Health Insurance Plan in the province.”

Now then, what was in the budget that year, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to take the first item — for Cancer. Well, Mr. Speaker, the amount included in the budget for cancer — new cancer treatment — was . . .

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — Five dollars and thirty cents.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That is just your size. Peanuts would even suit you better.

Well, Mr. Speaker — these fellows do not bother me. I have seen so many of these funny fellows before that it doesn’t excite me at all. But we voted, in 1943-44, before the Cancer clinic, Mr. Speaker, when we only charged \$10.00 per head, and that is all. The rest of it had to be paid for by the Government, and we voted \$76,760. In the new budget which I just quoted, we voted \$215,000 — an increase of \$138,240 for cancer treatment.

(Interruption)

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, that is your size too. When a man speaks like that, he is full of something and it comes out. That is exactly the way the C.C.F. puts it.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley** (Minister of Public Health): — Would you repeat those figures please. I would like to write them down.

**February 25, 1952**

**Mr. Danielson:** — An amount of \$215,000, or an increase of \$138,240. Look up the documents of the House, they are all in it.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — We will check them. We just want to check them and see that you tell the truth all the time.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I have the documents here; I'll give them to you. I think the Minister of Public Health will look it up and see that I am right. I want him to do that.

Now then, there was \$10,000 in that budget, also, for setting up the Health Insurance Commission — not \$5,000 as the Premier said in his Speech from the Throne, in the fall of 1944. It was \$10,000. And when I said in my radio broadcast, which I partly read to you this afternoon . . .

(Interruption)

**Mr. Danielson:** — Oh yes, you do it yourself many times! You use a word that is not placed in the right place and you change it; but I generally am able to correct myself; that is more than you can do. Anybody who knows his weaknesses is all right, but a fellow who does not have brains enough to realize his weaknesses is no good; he is a weakling somewhere. As for me, I have all kinds of weaknesses, of course, and this is not my work the year round. I come down here into this House just for a few weeks, and I am trying to pick up this stuff and do the best I can, and that is good enough. I have not had any complaints from that other side. I think these young gentlemen are getting just about all they can stand over there. I have no objection. I might give them a little more if they want it.

But anyhow, to get back to this statement that I just made. I said we increased the amount voted, in the budget, by \$138,240.

Now then, let us see what the present Provincial Treasurer says about this thing. In his Budget Speech (and this is not Patterson, or any Liberal speaking — this is the Hon. Mr. Fines speaking) he says, in 1945, when he delivered his Budget Speech, that you had socialized health services, and here is what you found: "The estimate for the Physical fitness programme has been increased from \$20,000 to \$55,000. Already a programme has been worked out which is recognized as one of the best in the Dominion." (Of course, if he had been a Russian he would have said the first in the Dominion; but he wasn't). "It is also proposed to extend the Public Health Nursing and Sanitation programme at an additional cost of \$25,000." then he comes down and says this: "Patients suffering from cancer will now receive complete medical, surgical, hospital and nursing treatment. This will be provided at an additional cost of some \$78,000 over last year's estimates."

Now then, that is a great credit to the ability of Mr. Patterson under the Liberal Government. We, for the first year, put \$138,000 in there, and there is no supplementary to prove or uncover any shortage, Mr. Speaker, in the Supplementary Estimates. They are right here; I have them, and I invite any C.C.F. member to come and search them. That shows the amount of money we put in the first year, \$138,000, was approximately or barely enough to cover the cost for that year, because the next year

the costs were rising. With gradually rising costs all the time, and in some respects, I imagine, rapidly rising costs, like nursing services and things like that, he was only required to put in \$78,000 more for 1945-46 than what we put in for 1944-45. Now these are on the record. How then can these C.C.F.'ers go over the province of Saskatchewan and repeat and repeat these falsehoods that there was no cancer treatment in this province prior to their coming into office?

Now then, what about on February 20, 1945, Mr. Speaker, when the Premier, in his speech on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, said:

“May I now say a word about the Department of Public Health re medical care and hospitalization? Free drugs are now provided to 25,000 persons — old-age pensioners, blind pensioners, and those in receipt of mothers’ allowances. We are now giving free care and treatment for cancer cases, not only diagnostic and x-ray treatment, but also surgery.

“I remember the hon. member from Moosomin (Mr. Procter) insisted, at the last Session, that money had been voted for an estimate for surgery in cancer treatment. Well now, (he says) no one in his Department can find it. It is true that \$5,000 was provided, but that was used to set up the clinical doctor.”

It was \$10,000, Mr. Speaker — not \$5,000; but it looks good for him to be half-price sometimes. “\$5,000 would never begin to pay for surgical treatment for cancer.” What do you think about a statement like that, Mr. Speaker? What do you think about such nonsense as that? I think it is silly! “That amount would never begin to pay for surgical treatment, which even my hon. friend most admit. Now, however, anyone that comes in with a recommendation for free treatment from a doctor, he will receive that free treatment from the day he comes in until the day he leaves.” Now then, I asked him a question:

“Mr. Danielson: Are you directly paying for surgery now?”

That was not my question at all, but it is in this book. My question was simply, when he started paying for cancer treatment — that is what I asked him.

“Premier Douglas: Yes, we are paying the bills that are sent in to us. We are circularizing the doctors in the province, telling them that we are paying for cancer surgery. Mind you, that is for those cases which go through the Cancer Clinic.”

And so he goes on. Well now, Mr. Speaker, this was on February 20, 1945, but we had a Special Session in the fall of 1944, and I mentioned, when I started to speak after lunch, about this gentleman he

brought in from the United States — this Dr. Sigerist. He came in here and did his work, he wrote his report and handed it to the Premier. He spoke to one of the service clubs in the city of Regina and gave the health condition and the health situation in this province a very, very nice recommendation. But he handed this report to the Government a day or two before, because, if I remember correctly, that was the and opening day of the Special Session. Now I stand corrected on that, Mr. Speaker, but I am not out very far on that — it would be only a day or two if I am wrong. Now then, reading this report which had just come into the hands of the Government, and which was handed to every member of the House, we see here what Dr. Sigerist says:

“Cancer Commission Act of 1944 provides that any person suspected to be afflicted with cancer shall be entitled to care and treatment at the expense of the Province. The intention of the Act is to encourage people and to make it as easy as possible for them to seek treatment, and the most expert medical service. The two Cancer Clinics in Regina and Saskatoon have already rendered invaluable service, and the number of patients that have received treatment has increased from year to year. In formulating policy for the future, this point should be considered, and here is where I want to draw the picture of health:

“(1) The present examination — radiological treatment and hospitalization are provided without charge. Cancer patients still have to pay for the cost of operation, but this is going against the intention of the Act, and the cost of operation should be paid by the Province.”

This Government took office on the 10th of July, and that was on October 4th, Saskatchewan. Now then — I am not blaming the Government; I know what has happened when we started this thing. I had a case in my own municipality where a man came to me and said: “I thought you provided for this thing.” I said, “Yes.” “Well,” he said, “my wife is down there now, and the hospital is all right, but the surgery bill will not be paid.” I took the train and came right to the city of Regina because I wanted to get at the bottom of this thing. I walked into Dr. Uhrich’s office and I told him the story, and here is what he said, (and I know, Mr. Speaker, that he told the truth):

“We have been trying our best to get an agreement with the medical men of this province to get this thing started. So far we have not been able to do so. They say, ‘many of our best men — our best medical men — are at the war and we do not feel we should tie ourselves up to any hard and fast agreement without knowing what they think about it when they come back’, and for that reason we have not been able to step forward and pay these bills for surgery.”

And evidently, according to the written word of Dr. Sigerist, of that date, October 4th, that situation existed exactly the same then. I am not blaming the Government. They were up against the same difficulties, Mr. Speaker, as we were; but why in the name of commonsense were a group of men, who are supposed to have every intelligence, going out on the highways and byways of this province and trying to minimize any peddle such untruths in order to discredit the Party in the province of Saskatchewan that put this operation into effect?

Now that is the situation with all these men sitting over here. I would not do that under any circumstances, Mr. Speaker. I have said on the floor of this House, and I said it more than once this afternoon, that I am willing to give them credit for anything they have done; and I have done that. At the same time I believe that credit should be given where credit is due. Even if they did not say anything about it that would not be so bad; but they go out today, eight years after they come into office, and peddle that story. That is just like the reduction of the Public Debt — that finally died; it had to die. This eventually will die too, when the people of the province know the circumstances, and know the facts.

Now then, I will go on to Item No. 2 which Dr. Sigerist has set out here in his report:

“Travelling expenses of patients referred to one of the clinics by a physician now weigh heavily on the individual’s budget, living in the district. The compensation of travelling expenses from provincial funds may there be considered.”

That is a recommendation by Dr. Sigerist which I think is very worthy, and which, so far as I know, has never been implemented by this Government. And here is the most important and interesting part of it:

“Well, if it is true that a larger percentage of all patients examined by the clinic are found to be suffering from other diseases than cancer, yet it would not be sound to make a charge in the case of negative diagnosis. This would act as a deterrent. Accurate diagnosis in all cases where the suspicion of cancer prevails represents available public services. The increasing load of work upon the clinic must be met with an increasing number of persons.”

Well now, that is commonsense and that was the policy in effect at that time. This Government has done this: They have put this charge on the person who is presented to the Clinic by his medical doctor and is found not to have cancer. He has to pay the cost himself, and I think that is wrong. Dr. Sigerist points out clearly that this is a deterrent; he says it will keep people from going there and finding out what is actually wrong with them.

February 25, 1952

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question? Did I understand you to say they pay the whole cost themselves?

**Mr. Danielson:** — I did not say so; but we know that the Government of this province has done away with the full payment of the patient's fee where the patient is found not to have a cancer.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows the exact answer — he should give it.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. Minister of Public Health that if he knows it, he give it.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — I will give it. You go ahead and make your speech.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I would suggest then, Mr. Speaker, that he has no business to interrupt when he sits there and knows it and he won't give it.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — I have asked the hon. member to answer a question and he has not answered it. I will answer it myself.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I thought of it last year, and the Premier over here says, "Well, it is not a question of money", and there is something to that, Mr. Speaker. I know that expenses run up higher, but I think that what Dr. Sigerist says is on solid ground when he says this method of putting the charge on the patient who has no cancer is probably a hardship on many people, and, as Dr. Sigerist says, a deterrent.

Well now, there has been so much talk, Mr. Speaker, about the discussion on cancer. We put the Cancer Bill on the Statute Books; we voted the money to put it into operation and it is here today. This province has carried on the work of Dr. Urich and the Liberal Government — and what has been done? I give them credit for bringing in expanded and more modern, up-to-date methods of treatment. I think we can say that we in Saskatchewan should be applauded that we have the most up-to-date cancer treatment, probably, in the Dominion of Canada.

There is another thing, and this particularly distressed my friend from Gravelbourg (Mr. E.H. Walker), and that is farm security — and he was supplemented by the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Why, he did not have anything else to speak about, but he covered the whole thing. Of course he does it in such a fast way and in such a rambling fashion that he told them that he had to give 8,000 pounds of grass seed to the farmers, and when I was home, a week ago Sunday, Mr. Speaker, a gentleman called me up and said: "I listened to the radio, the other day. Were you in the House when the Premier spoke?" I said "Yes." "Well", he said, "you tell him from me that he better send me that money back for the grass seed, because I paid for mine." So he does not get away with these "weasel" words all the time.

Now I am going to go into this a little further. I am going to start out by saying, Mr. Speaker, that every bit of farm protection in the province today was started by the Liberal Government — every particle

of it, and they were: The Moratorium Act of 1943, the Land Contracts (Actions) Act of 1943, the Provincial Mediation Board Act of 1943, and the Limitation of Civil Rights Act. These are the Acts of today to protect the farmers on their farms here in the province of Saskatchewan.

I have here a pamphlet — this is all your publication. I suppose this is some of the — information writers' work (it is probably their work to write these pamphlets) and it goes back to 1945, and do you know where I got it? I got it from the big guys down in the Mediation office. There's nothing wrong with it at all, only it is honest, and that is an exception for the C.C.F. When he handed me this pamphlet, I said so, and I meant it, Mr. Speaker. He said: "Take that with you." I said, "What is this?" And he said, "You see what is in it. It is all yours. You put it all in there except just two small paragraphs." That is why I say it is honest — he was honest about it, anyway. They took all this legislation, Mr. Speaker — every word of it — lifted it word for word, and put it into their Farm Security Act. I hope that my young friend — he probably thinks that I do not know anything, and I do not mind that at all, because if he knows my estimation of some of the men sitting over there, well, he would not feel good at all; but I say this to him: We had a man sitting here who, I think, knows as much law as anybody, or as much as any legal man in the province of Saskatchewan, and that was Mr. Procter. He checked this legislation, as did Mr. Hooge, and I want to say this — Mr. Hooge, while he was not a bombastic sort of gentleman, did know law. You between he did — he did know law. He took this Bill — every Bill that came on this list, he took down, that was his work. He took them down to his room in the hotel and went over them word for word; and he typed the copies, explaining every section that was changed or amended, or added to, or anything like that. There were four other members on this side of the House, there were only five of us, and that was his work. When we were here at that time, Mr. Speaker, we had to divide up the work, and in spite of the fact that there were only five of us on this side of the House, I think there were very few things that slipped by here without being checked up. As a matter of fact, I think we even had some compliments on that account from the Premier of this province at that time.

Mr. Speaker, there is one crop failure clause provision, and it simply means that if the return from a crop-acre of land is less than \$6.00 per acre — no, I was going to tell just the way that really works out. They have an ingenious way about them; they can get around this thing. They said an amount equal to the interest shall be cancelled and cut off the principal. That was the way they got around it; and Mr. Speaker, that is, of course, a provision which I think has been contested, and it is still in doubt as to whether that can be done or not. As a matter of fact, so far as I know, in my constituency — and I have talked to a lot of people outside my constituency — I never knew one farmer in my seat who ever had any benefit out of that clause; not one. Maybe the Government has applied it in their own business under the Farm Loans to some of these men who, perhaps, have some balance to pay under the old Farm Loan Board Act, or something like that; but so far as having been taken advantage of, or put into operation, for the protection of the general farming public in this province, in their business of dealing with loan companies of their creditors or contract holders, there has been nothing done.

I spoke to a farmer about this thing one time, and he said, "I wouldn't ask for it. The man that I bought that farm from and the company were so good to me during the years when I could not pay them anything, and after the cancellation we got form them, I am ashamed to ask for it. If I get a crop like I did in 1941 that didn't even bring \$3.00 to me, it might be all right; but wouldn't it be just as fair if they came back to me in 1942 when I got 38 bushels to the acre, and said to me, 'Well now I think you should pay a little more than what the contract calls for?'" It is only a matter of right and wrong, and fairness and fair play on both sides.

What it has done, of course, is simply this: It has tended to bring about in the province of Saskatchewan a situation whereby anyone that has not the amount of money that is necessary to pay full cash for his farm, whether it is a half-section, quarter-section or a full section, is absolutely prohibited by the atmosphere and by the feeling that has been created, when it comes to securing a farm with the idea of starting up farming. That is the condition all over the province of Saskatchewan. It is no wonder that the big farms are getting bigger and bigger. Who is it, Mr. Speaker, today, that is able to step out and buy a quarter-section, half-section or whole section of land, when death removes some old couple from the farm? This fellow that has probably three or four sections and maybe more, can buy the farm. I can mention many farmers here — eight or ten of them that I know personally — who have increased their holding, in the last two years, from a section and a half to as much as five or seven sections, just on that basis. That is the situation, and that is one of the things that this legislation, by the C.C.F. has created.

There is another section in here which says this: "A person shall not be dispossessed out of his home" — that means the quarter-section or the area on which the buildings are situated. Well, that is a pippin, because, after all, that certainly is a warning and a signal to any person who owns a piece of property, because when he sees that that is the law of the land then he knows that someone can go on there and say to him, "Well I have a section here, you can take the three-quarters, but I am sitting on this quarter where the buildings are." That man he sells to in the first place might be a reliable man but he does not know how long that man is going to be in operation. Death removes people at all ages in this life, and something may happen that puts him out of business. The property passes to someone else, and maybe that individual is not so straightforward, so honest or reliable as the original party was; and, therefore, we find that every person, today, who has property, that is farms and farm dwellings in this province, the only way he will dispose of that is for a cash consideration, and we know it; and the young people in the province of Saskatchewan haven't got that cash; and, therefore, we find that the farm population is gradually moving into the cities and towns, into the mines, into the forests, lumber camps and into offices and places like that. They are drained off the farm; and that is one of the things your farm legislation has done. What protection the farmer has is through the legislation that was passed by the Liberal Government in this province.

Now the Premier, and some other speakers over there, have mentioned something about farm foreclosures. Well, you know these things are easy because they are all on record. You can go to the proper place and get a record of all these transactions. Therefore, there is no doubt



about where we are in this case; we have it all before us; there is no doubt or any misrepresentation about it. But that was one of the things, Mr. Speaker, which the C.C.F. Party, previous to 1944, really went to town on — foreclosure on farms. And they were so enthusiastic, Mr. Speaker. the foreclosures, for seven years during the Liberal Government, were 6,740; and if you take the number of municipalities in the province of Saskatchewan, and divide it up, you will find it amounts to about three foreclosures in each rural municipality each year. but, that is nothing to what the C.C.F. said, during the 1944 election. We will probably have something like that this time. I have here a full-page ad — “The C.C.F. Land Policy for 1944”; and, by the way, curiously enough, they do not speak any more of it. They didn’t say anything more about this wonderful blessing that they were going to confer on the people of the province of Saskatchewan, particularly the farmers. What interests me, Mr. Speaker, is this — 12,292 foreclosures and evictions in six years! that comes from the birthplace of the C.C.F.’er from Canora (Mr. Kuziak). I think that is some of the stories he cooks up, up there.

**Mr. Kuziak** (Canora): — They are true.

**Mr. Danielson**: — Well, what you would call true — that is C.C.F. true!

Now then, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact what I told you was this: that there were 6,740 (in great big black letters here it says 12,292 in six years, not in seven years) and that is the stuff that this group peddled all over the province of Saskatchewan; paying good money for a full page ad, and they more than doubled the figure. Well, we do not deny the foreclosures that were made. I can assure you of this, Mr. Speaker. Having been reeve of my municipality during those years, I know that it was the hardest thing there was to get anybody, loan company or anybody else, to foreclose and take possession of a piece of land. I will tell you why. If they did, that the municipality would say, “All right, come on and pay up the taxes, or we will take the land.” And the loan company couldn’t pay the taxes. They wouldn’t take possession.

**Some Hon. Member**: — That was under the Liberal rule.

**Mr. Danielson**: — Yes, it will be the same under your rule if you ever go through the times that we went through; and peculiarly enough it seems to be running back into your regime, too. I am going to deal with that in a few moments. But that is the situation. But I said, here is this hollering attitude of these people over there; they go out and double the figure, and they have access to all that information. It was brought out in this House, and there were 10 C.C.F.’ers sitting on this side of the House at that time; but they go out and spend the people’s money and double the figure. That is all the faith you can put into anything they say. It is the same thing today.

Now then, let us see what has happened. In spite of the fact that the Premier gave his solemn promise, when he was elected and his Government came to power in the province of Saskatchewan, that if one farmer lost his land through foreclosure, he was going to resign his place . . .

**Some Hon. Member**: — Hear! Hear!

February 25, 1952

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well you had better tell him “hear, hear,” because he would have gone out of here 7½ years ago. But that was just another C.C.F. promise and you see how much faith there was in it. He is still here.

**Hon. Member:** — He will be here this time next year, too.

**Mr. Dundas:** — That will be the day. There won't be an election then.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — We will provide a room for him at the Old Folks' home at Melfort.

**Government Member:** — We are here to stay.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, that is what keeps you going — just that distant hope; hope that you will be able to hang on. I can tell you right now, you are hoping for something that will never happen.

**Mr. Kuziak:** — We'll show you.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Member:** — Hope springs eternal.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I am going to be absolutely sure, Mr. Speaker, that I give the right figures — and they are your figures.

**Hon. Member:** — You had better read them out.

**Mr. Danielson:** — You will get it. The foreclosures, Mr. Speaker, from August 1 to December 31, 1944, were 273 — that was the beginning of the C.C.F. golden rule in the province of Saskatchewan. Cancellation of agreements for sale, 41 — a total of 314 from August 1 to December 31. Then we go into the next year, 1945. January 1 to December 31, 1945, foreclosures on mortgages, 609 — they are just about as bad as the Liberals — what is wrong with you fellows over there?

**Mr. Gibson:** — Can I ask the hon. member a question? Will you tell us how many of those foreclosures were by agreement?

**Mr. Danielson:** — I will tell you something else, before I get through, that you won't like. 609, Mr. Speaker, the next year; and cancellation of agreements during that year, 1945, was 139; and the foreclosures and cancellations of agreements both were 748. By the C.C.F. over here. Why, I believe the Premier has resigned. He isn't in the House any more.

Now then, evictions. My friends know what evictions are. In 1944 there were 6; in 1945, 54 evictions, a total of 60. Evictions by sheriff, 28; by physical expulsions, 22 — that is C.C.F., Mr. Speaker, and they are on the records of this House. If you go back you can find them and check over the reports tabled. This was tabled at the Session of 1947; and I have another one here tabled at the Session in 1946, both bearing out every word that I say. And these are the fellows that rumble over there and wave their arms in the air and talk about “those terrible

Liberals.” I am not, Mr. Speaker, denying that there have to be foreclosures or evictions in the province of Saskatchewan. Any person that hasn’t got any more sense than to say there does not need to be, does not know anything; and I am not going to accuse some of these fellows over there of knowing anything — for a simple reason. Now what would you do, Mr. Speaker. You go out and settle up an estate over here — perhaps the only way to settle that estate and get it cleaned up will probably be by a foreclosure.

And by the way, while I am speaking here tonight. I had a rather unique experience in my own seat, in 1946. I had just got back from this House. It was a Sunday morning in the spring, and I just got through breakfast, walked out and here came two men driving into my yard in a nice big car, and who jumps out of the car but the very gentleman that ran against me as C.C.F. candidate in 1948, Mr. Speaker; and I know his circumstances.

**Hon. Member:** — He is a nice boy.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Sure he is a nice boy. If you had left him alone he would have been a gentleman. He came out of the car — the other fellow stayed in the car — and he represented the mortgage company in the city of Regina, and his farm had two mortgages on it; one mortgage was held in the United States, and the other one was held by this particular mortgage company; and there was so much money and so many taxes against that farm that the poor boy never had a chance in the world of every liquidating that debt. He spoke to me about this thing and I told him I did not like to give him advice because maybe I was all wrong; but I said that before I could say anything he would have to tell me just what the position was. He told me honestly what it was and I said this, and I do not mind saying it here tonight. I said, “if every farmer was sitting in the position you are, they have the greatest opportunity in the world to get debt adjustment.” He asked me what I meant, and I said, “For one thing, that mortgage company in Regina does not want your farm; it is the last thing they want to take. You go to them and get them to foreclose on your farm and then sell it back to you.” “Well, what will the other fellow do?” “Well,” I said, “if he wants the second mortgage he will have to pay up the first one.” Isn’t that the way it goes? I am not a lawyer but I have been in public life for 40 years, Mr. Speaker, and you cannot be in public life and deal with the problems of municipalities, hospitals and your own business in the province of Saskatchewan, without learning something; and I have been able to absorb some of this knowledge, and I know this is so. Then I said, “Do not forget, my friend, that there will be just one more foreclosure that they will throw into our faces when we get down to Regina at the next Session.” But he did that, and I am glad he did. Not only did he clean up the second mortgage, but the first mortgage was reduced so considerably that that man who paid his debt on that farm years and years ago, is a wealthy man today; and good luck to him. I wish him well. He did not have to go the C.C.F. to get debt adjustment either.

But the reason I mentioned this, Mr. Speaker, is this. In any nation or any place in the world where there is business going on where farms are bought and sold, where men are dying and settlement of

estates have to take place, and all that sort of thing, there must be a legal process of foreclosure, if you are ever going to do business. If these fellows would be honest enough to admit these things and put a proper perspective on things, then we would have no complaint; but to go out with pure vilification and falsehoods and tell us all these things over the length and breadth of this province and take full page ads in the newspaper, not only do they misconstrue the actual facts, but they take and double them and a little more; and then they peddle their propaganda over the province: 12,000, Mr. Speaker — 12,292 foreclosures.

Now that was in 1944; that is what brought you into this House, Mr. Speaker — a bunch of tissue of lies and falsehoods brought them in here, and they have been trying to hold their position with those same tactics ever since; and they are harder at it than ever, today.

I could spend an hour dealing with these things; but I just want to answer these fellows who talk about these things when they do not know anything about them. What my friend, the Minister of Education, knows about this thing would not hurt anybody; that is a cinch. He may know something about education, and I think he does; I think he has a fair knowledge; but his policy is not suited to the province of Saskatchewan, and he will never bring any benefit to the people of this province. The biggest benefit he could do to the people of the province would be to open the Regina Normal School and get some school teachers to teach the young of this province, regardless of what it cost. The people of the province would pay the price if he would do that, and forget about his Watson “Thompson and his socialistic friends.

Now what about cancellation of debts? They have been throwing these words on the floor of this House, this Session, and there is not a bit of sense to anything they say, Mr. Speaker. No sense to it at all. The thing is not true. And they say that we never did anything to cancel debts. Well, Mr. Speaker, some of the men who are sitting here today — of course, you cannot blame them because, after all, there was a time when a lot of these debts were created and they had to be taken care of. I am just going to say to you, today, and here are authentic figures — I have not got time to go into them and I am not going to bore the House with them; but by the acts of 1936 and 1937, Mr. Speaker, of this Legislature, which was a number of Bills, \$110,446,000 was cancelled by the Board of Review which is a Federal agency for adjustments of debts in this province, by the voluntary adjustment taking place between persons and persons; and by the Local Government Board of Saskatchewan. During these years, from 1935 to 1944, there was \$243 million dollars written off from the shoulders of the farmers and the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

**Hon. Member:** — Mortgage companies.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That is not his fault, Mr. Speaker; here is just one instance. Machinery debt from December 1, 1936, there was \$28 million of machinery debts owing by the farmers of the province of Saskatchewan. Most of that, Mr. Speaker, was old debts, because during the depression and

the drought periods in 1929 and 1930 there was very, very little new machinery bought. So they were old debts, and much of it was interest. There was principal, of course, included in that \$28 million, but anyhow it was the combined machinery debt owed by the farmers to the machinery companies at December 31, 1936 — \$28 million. On December 31, 1943, that debt had been reduced to \$1,448,493, and that was by reduction through debt adjustment. That is one story.

I am not going to do like the Premier says — so and so that was \$390 million worth of debt that was owed by the farmers to the mortgage companies, and then with one sweep of his arm, he says, “Look, under our administration, it has been reduced to so and so — \$92 million.” Well, of course, if you do not happen to think, he might get away with it; but any person who listens to him and knows anything about business, knows that there is not anything in that statement, because he did not pay off one penny of it. The farmers paid it off by their own labour and by their own efforts.

Now those are some of the things, Mr. Speaker, that I wanted to tell this House, and to see to it that this wild statement, this untrue statement, this tissue of lies, is not going to go outside of this House unchallenged by us here who know the facts.

I notice the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) has left the House; I am sorry he has left. Someone told him, the other day, that he had forsaken the principles of the “Regina Manifesto” — had thrown them out the window. I am not so sure, Mr. Speaker, that that is true insofar as the Minister of Agriculture is concerned. I am satisfied it is true of most of the other fellows, these fellows who handled the oil and uranium and that sort of thing; they have chucked it out . . .

**Mr. Tucker:** — Just for the time being.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Just for the time being, of course, because they reserve the right to change it and bring it back in at any time. In Saskatchewan, today, there is a crying need, Mr. Speaker, for places for farm land; for an opportunity for the young people of our farms to go and settle on a farm of their own. That is true; and I am not the only one who thinks so, Mr. Speaker, because only last year, on May 3, 1951, the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Hartnett — I know him and think he was a gentleman and a very well qualified man — made a statement. He spoke, I think, at the annual meeting of Agricultural Institute of Canada, North Saskatchewan branch, at Saskatoon; and here is what he said:

“20,000 Saskatchewan farmers are in desperate need of more land. There were 40,000 more asking for additional land. It was true that 1 ½ million more acres might become available for agricultural purposes in northern Saskatchewan, but these acres would be developed at high cost for clearing and draining.”

And I commend the Minister of Agriculture for what he has done in trying to make more land available in the northern part of the province, by clearing

February 25, 1952

and making it possible to be used for agricultural purposes. That is all to the good, Mr. Speaker. I think he is doing good work there; but the minister of Co-operatives (or whatever his title is, I do not know) told us, a short time ago, that he does not want any more men on the land. He said this, when he addressed the Dairy Council in Saskatoon, last week — this is March, 1951: “If Saskatchewan needs more population, it doesn’t want them on the farms.” He is reported to have added that with increased mechanization, we need fewer people on the land.

Well he must have had some sort of recipe that he is putting into effect, which is very effective, because they are surely going off.

**Hon. Member:** — Who said that?

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Douglas, The Minister of Co-operatives in the province of Saskatchewan. Now that is what he said. I would say to my friend, the Minister of Agriculture, and to this Government, that there is a crying need, and the problem that is facing us today is to get more places for farmers to settle; and while the Minister of Agriculture is doing what he can in northern Saskatchewan, he cannot solve the problem with the limited space he has in the northern part of the province. There should be something done right here on the prairies, Mr. Speaker, to try and break up some of these big farms, and at least try and prevent them from getting bigger; and the young people — the young men and women who want to start out farming — should be permitted to settle here, on a farm, if that is what they want to do. There is no question about that. Why should they be driven up into the northern part of the province of Saskatchewan?

This Farm Security Act, as I said, is one of the problems in carrying that plan out. Insofar as the Government settlement scheme in the northern part of the province is concerned, it could be accelerated; it could be taken more advantage of, if the policies that this Government has been putting into effect, and is still persisting in keeping in effect, of preventing anyone from purchasing a piece of land and paying for it and getting a title and calling it his own, would be done away with. We know that now, that it has been the policy and the practice of this Government, and in that respect the “Regina Manifesto” has fully operated by never letting them purchase that land. Thirty-three year leases! And I know the present Minister of Agriculture is very strongly convinced that that is the proper system and the proper way of coping with this problem. I know, because in 1948 he and I had a debate on it in the House here.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. member a question? Would the hon. member tell us what positive action might be taken to prevent farm units from getting larger?

**Mr. Danielson:** — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have tried to tell them that all afternoon. I have tried to do that. I have tried to say and I have persisted in this, that, through the farm legislation, which does not protect anybody, that was put on the statute books by this Government under those two clauses: (1) in regard to the \$6 per acre, and, (2) full protection for the home quarter, whereby you can take the rest of the land away from him but you could not take the home quarter away — he has prevented anyone who has a piece of property on the farm or in the rural part

of this province, to sell that land for anything except a spot cash price down.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has not answered by question at all. I would like to tell the hon. member that they have the same situation in North Dakota, and they do not have this Farm Security legislation. Now what would you do to stop farms from getting larger?

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, I pointed that thing out. From my own experience . . .

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Let us get something positive for once on this.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I have had my own experience in this thing because I was looking after a section and a half of farm for a man that lived in the United States, and I was looking after two places in another part of the constituency owned by two sisters of this gentleman, and the two farms have been sold now. I had a returned man renting the farm, at Davidson three years ago. He came there, and I don't mind telling you that I helped him myself to get a combine. He paid the money all back to me; he does not owe me anything today. He was a returned man. His father was doing all he could to help him, more than he could to help him, and this land was for sale. He put a price on it. He went to Regina to the Saskatchewan Hotel. He went up and had a conference with the Income Tax Collector. He wrote me a letter from the city of Regina and he said, "You know, when I left so-and-so the day before yesterday, we agreed on (I won't mention names) consulted a legal man in Regina and he advises me not to sell my property except all cash in the province of Saskatchewan, and therefore the price was so much." Well, as a matter of fact, it prevented this young man, that I would very much like to have seen have that farm, from buying it. As a matter of fact, two other men who had a farm of 4-section of land, just outside the boundaries of my constituency, and who had some brothers living west of Davidson, one man and one brother in the University of Saskatchewan — they dug up all the cash, the four of them, and paid the money down for that section and a half, spot cash; and there were half a dozen fellows after that that have more land than they should have, much more land. And that is the practice all over this province. If you prevent the person, take the security away from them . . .

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — What security is taken away, Mr. Speaker?

**Mr. Danielson:** — I would just go to work and read the two sections that the Government put in the Act.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — You would make them pay because . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — No, no you don't. If a man has six or eight or ten thousand dollars worth of improvements on a quarter section of land, that quarter-section, with these improvements, is probably worth more than all the rest of the section of land together. You get a man in on that land, and, under certain circumstances, you cannot get him off, can you? You know that is a fact. There is no use defending this, Mr. Speaker, because they are all in black and white, and that is the situation. And this Government persists in that. They are persisting in a theory that is wrong in principle.

**February 25, 1952**

It is discouraging to the people who want to make a home on some property and have some place they can call their own in this world.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — There is a Royal Commission . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — It is discouraging to these people. It has driven hundreds of them, thousands of them, in the province off the farm into the lumber camps, into the stores, offices, garages and so on, and into the mines in other provinces. That is what the Premier complains about. And today, as I see it, there are less people on the land, bigger and bigger farms, because the man who can pick up a farm for sale now is the man who has got the cash — not the man who starts out and would probably be able to pay \$1,500, \$2,000 or \$3,000 down on a section or half-section of land; but the man who can plant down \$12,000, \$15,000, \$22,000, or \$30,000. He is the man who gets it, and there is nobody knows this better than the Minister. Now, I think that policy is wrong. I think it is a detriment to the people of the province of Saskatchewan, and I think it should be done away with.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Woods:

“That this Assembly regrets that the policy of Your Honour’s advisers in regard to the settlement of vacant Crown land suitable for agricultural purposes is that all such land will be allocated on a 33-year lease basis with no provision for the settler ever having the right to obtain title to any such land settled on by him.”

(Mr. Speaker, ruled that the proposed amendment was out of order in that it did not add words to the motion for the Address).

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, before you make a ruling I would like to say a word about it. There is a motion here that an Address be presented to his Honour thanking him for the speech and this is a substantive amendment, an amendment to that, regretting that a certain policy is followed in regard to agriculture. Now then, as I remember it, this matter was not even mentioned in the discussion on the first amendment of lack of confidence. It was not mentioned at all, and there is no reason in the rules, unless you are going to sort of make new rules, Mr. Speaker; there is nothing in the rules that indicates that such an amendment as this cannot, be moved to the Address. Just because I moved an amendment does not exclude any other member from moving one. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, with all deference, when you rule out an amendment like this on the Speech from the Throne that they are moved in Ottawa right along. Once the main amendment is disposed of, I have seen more than one amendment moved by different groups, once they are back on the main motion; and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that you cannot produce a single ruling that upholds you in making this ruling. In other words, Mr. Speaker, you are just making a ruling that is not based upon rules whatever. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that, as you say yourself, in your ruling here, you cannot find any basis for moving this out of order. Now then, if we are not going to go according to established parliamentary rules, as laid down for years and years, I don’t know where we are going to get to, Mr. Speaker. I realize that you can rule this out of order and if the majority in this are ready to



sustain your ruling, then, of course, it just means that you are establishing and following a rule that is not in accordance with the established rules of parliamentary procedure. It is unfortunate, Your Honour, if we are going to have a ruling that has no foundation in parliamentary rules whatever. And I do submit that, Your Honour, it has no basis.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Let me remind the hon. member that every ruling that has been made, somebody made it first. As a matter of fact, I think we can find lots of reasons why this is not a proper amendment. This amendment had nothing at all to do with the Speech from the Throne. You have already regretted in a previous amendment, and this is not in a proper form as an amendment and I rule it out of order.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Mr. Speaker, in all deference, I appeal from your ruling.

(The question being put by Mr. Speaker: Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained? — It was agreed to on the following division: 27 to 19.)

**Mr. J.G. Egnatoff** (Melfort): — In rising to speak at this time on the main motion, I wish to draw to your attention that last week was celebrated as a “Brotherhood Week.” During the past week many people throughout the world have been giving additional thought to this idea of brotherhood. I have noticed that the hon. Premier has either already spoken on this subject, or will be doing so. I cannot help but feel, especially in view of the attitude of ridicule that was in evidence on the part of the members sitting on your right, this afternoon, that it would be an excellent idea if those of us who are elected to this chamber to represent people of this province would display a little more of this idea of brotherhood right on the floor of this chamber. Time and time again we have heard hon. members ridiculing possibly the accent or the odd slip made by members sitting opposite them, I cannot help but feel that this brotherhood must start at home, and I would have urged the Premier, were he in his seat tonight, especially after the demonstration that he put on here this afternoon and on previous occasions during the debate thus far; I would have urged him, tonight, to use his high office as Premier of this province, which is indeed one of the highest offices attainable for any man in this province, to set an example for the rest of the hon. members here in conduct that would be a little more in keeping with the idea of brotherhood, rather than using his high office at times to play the role of a circus clown.

**Hon. Mr. Sturdy:** — There’s a nice brotherly statement!

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — It may be so, in your opinion; but one who has been accustomed to . . . I am very happy to note, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Agriculture gets that expression, gets that assurance, that as far as he is concerned there is a bit of so-called brotherly love.

One problem which has not, in my opinion, been adequately dealt with at this Session, is the problem of opening up new land to help accommodate some of the 20,000 farmers who need land, and there are even a greater number who need additional land to establish economic units. It is very interesting to observe, Mr. Speaker, that the original idea of the use-lease had its beginning in this province during the early historical days of the C.C.F. Party. It was their intention, at the very inception of their political movement, to make province-wide use of this idea of a use-lease. Later on, you will recall, sir, that it was necessary, it was politically expedient, for them to withdraw somewhat from that original policy if they were to have any hope at all in attracting some of the farmer votes. Although in the original Regina Manifesto of 1933, while they had pledged themselves to move towards the socialization of the means of production and distribution of wealth, they were prepared to socialize everyone and every industry except the farming industry. Naturally, it was necessary to soft-pedal Socialism as it would apply to agriculture if they were to have any hope of securing that farm support. And so, in 1944, what were the agricultural policies on which the C.C.F. sought election I have in my hand an issue of the "Saskatchewan Commonwealth", dated May 31, 1941, and right on the front page it has something to say about saving the family farm, and I quote:

"The C.C.F. Government will guarantee that every honest and industrious farmer is enabled to keep the title to his farm and to pass it on unencumbered to his children."

Here they pledged themselves definitely to guarantee that every honest and industrious farmer is enabled to keep the title to the farm and to pass that title on to his children. I am very happy to note that the hon. members opposite, at least some of them, agree with that policy. In view of that agreement if becomes all the more surprising how they can possibly tolerate their most recent policy with regard to the allocation of Crown Land only on a straight 33-year lease basis.

Further in that same issue of the "Commonwealth" under the heading of "The Truth about the C.C.F." they have this to say — and this is in answer to the criticism of the C.C.F. Party, that if the C.C.F. were elected to power you will not be able to own private property. This is the answer, and I quote:

"The C.C.F. believes that there are two kinds of property, namely, public and private property. Public property includes such things as railways, banks, communication systems, mines, power developments, timber tracts and heavy industry. To prevent exploitation these should be socially owned and operated by a people's government. Private property includes such things as farms (note, Mr. Speaker, farms), homes, cars, radios, furniture and all things that go to make up the abundant life. The C.C.F. believes that the people should own more of these things and will make this possible by providing

full employment through social ownership, just wages and parity prices.”

Now, first of all, with regard to this idea, that the C.C.F. would do everything in their power to see that the people did not lose their farm homes, I have here a quotation from a broadcast by Mr. J.W. Corman, who is now the Attorney-General of this province, as reported in the “Moose Jaw Times” of June 9, 1944. And this is what Mr. Corman is reported as having said:

“I expect to have some small influence with the new Douglas Government and I give you this pledge, and my word in public affairs has been found good. I believe that if a C.C.F. Government does anything to disturb a farmer in the full ownership and enjoyment of his farm and the right to dispose of it, I will resign.”

**Opposition Member:** — That is something he did not do.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — Then it is high time that the Attorney-General, if he is an honourable man, if he wishes to maintain his good record in public affairs, did indeed resign.

I say then, Mr. Speaker, that in 1944, to gain support from the farming population, the C.C.F. speakers throughout the breadth and depth of this province promised the farmers that farmers would be able to have title to their homes, to their farm lands . . .

**Mr. Kuziak:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Might I draw the attention to the hon. member from Canora that he should not speak when he is not in his seat.

**Mr. McCormack:** — He should not speak when he is in it either.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — Forgive him, Mr. Speaker, for he knows not what he does.

**Government Member:** — He’s speaking from experience.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — Now it appears that since the election, and particularly since the 1948 election, the C.C.F. Government has found it necessary to satisfy some of its extreme leftists who actually believed that agriculture, along with other industries, ought to be socialized, and there must be some honest socialists on your right who believe in socialization of everything. So, to satisfy this extreme leftist element in its government and in its party, the Provincial Department of Agriculture announced its policy of allocating Crown Lands. So, for the records of this House, I wish to quote from a policy statement issued by the Department of Agriculture on June 12, 1950. There are some portions of this policy on which land is to be allocated with which I am in agreement. For the benefit of some hon. members opposite, it might be well to just review

the basis on which that will be allocated and I am now quoting:

A realistic and firm allocation policy for the allocation of new lands has now been established. At the outset all new areas will be utilized as far as possible to meet the needs of farmers now living on sub-marginal land or on uneconomic units. In this way the utilization of new land will constitute a positive step towards greater farm security, and a factor contributing to the stabilization of the Saskatchewan economy. The following general policy of eligibility will be applied when dealing with applications for new lands:

1. In the fringe areas of settlement local eligible farmers will necessarily enjoy a preference, after which preference will be given to other eligible persons with basic agricultural background who are resident in the vicinity of available lands and whose need for agricultural establishment is evident. In view of equipment costs special consideration will be given to applicants interested in operating on a co-operative basis.”

Now, with practically everything I have read so far I can agree, with the exception of this latter part “that special consideration will be given to applicants interested in operating on a co-operative basis” I think it is up to the farmers themselves, Mr. Speaker, to decide whether they are going to farm on a co-operative basis or whether they would like to operate on an individual basis, and I do not think a government should give special consideration to those who are interested in farming on a straight co-operative basis. The next, No. 2, quoting again;

2. “A continuous connection with farming will naturally carry a preference as against an intermittent farm background.
3. In all cases where eligible applicants are dealt with and all other things being equal, veterans will receive a preference.”

Certainly we can endorse that part whole-heartedly.

“But after the land in an area has been inspected for disposition it will be advertised, applications will be invited, and eligible applicants dealt with, as far as possible on an area basis.

“The final allocation will be decided by a Land Allocation Committee which will, whenever practicable, hold local sittings to make these dispositions.”

Now, it is the next part of the Government policy with which I cannot agree, and with which I find an increasing number of people disagreeing, particularly around the areas which may be opened up, which can be opened up, and which should be opened up, in the northern part of the province. All land will be leased. Now where are some of my hon. friends on the other side who, a few moments ago said, "Hear! Hear!" when I quoted as part of their C.C.F. platform of 1944, a pledge to defend this idea of private ownership of land?

**Mr. Tucker:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — Dealing further:

"All land will be allocated on a 33-year lease basis. The primary purpose of this lease is the well-being and security of the lessee. It permits the efficient development and utilization of Crown land resources. The need for initial heavy land-purchase commitments is removed, allowing the financial resources of the lessee to be fully available for development. Equitable rental rates will be established on the basis of the soil rating and productivity of the land, and will vary from 1/6 to 1/10 of the crop. The 33-year lease includes a clause whereby the lessee is not required to pay rentals in a crop failure year."

I want to say again, Mr. Speaker, that the portion of this land policy with which I take issue is this idea that from June 1950 and on, as long as the socialistic Government is in office, Crown lands in this province will be only available on a 33-year lease basis. So I want to ask some of my hon. friends opposite who are farmers themselves, who have had the thrill of owning their own land, who have experienced the thrill of possessing a title to that land: how can you justify, how can you reconcile that action of yours with the policies that are in force by your Government at the present? If you are prepared, if my hon. friends are prepared to socialize all the Crown lands of this province by allocating them only a 33-year lease basis, Mr. Speaker, then they should be sufficiently imbued with Socialism to allow their own land to revert back to the Crown and to be allocated on a 33-year lease basis, because that is, after all, the acid test of socialism. If Socialism is good for the other fellow, then Socialism, Mr. Speaker, ought to be good for the Minister of Agriculture; and I venture to say that the Minister of Agriculture of this province would be one of the last men of this province who would give up the title to the land that he holds in the north-western part of the province, even though a lot of that land in his constituency is so thickly infested with weeds that he maintains that people will be moving away from it.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member suggests that socializing land would be good for me. All I have to say to him is that I have about 2,500 or 3,000 acres that I would be glad to turn over to the Provincial Government, because I could operate that much cheaper.

February 25, 1952

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — Mr. Speaker, actions always speak louder than words. You have had eight years in which to turn it over to the Crown — why have you not done it?

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — If you cannot pay for a dog, you could not pay for my land.

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — You see, Mr. Speaker, the trouble with the Socialist Government is this: now they are Socialist, now they are pretending they are not Socialists. Wherever it seems to be expedient to pull in the Socialistic tentacles a bit, they do so; but whenever the opportunity presents itself, out spread those tentacles as is indicated by their land-lease policy which I know in effect in this province. And what does it really mean? What does it mean but a reversion to the old idea of feudalism. It is not my intention to go into the entire history of feudalism. I think it should be sufficient to say that many people who settled in this province of Saskatchewan, many of the people to whom we owe so much for having opened up this land for us, came to this country because they saw in this land an opportunity to acquire a home of their own — a piece of land which they could call their own, a piece of land to which they could possess the title.

Now in the north-eastern part of the province, there is an area concerning which I have spoken in this House, a year ago, known as the Carrot River triangle. The Minister of Agriculture is well acquainted with the needs for developing that area. There have also been recent announcements that there may be a fair acreage of arable land in the Big River country. Those of us who reside in the north-eastern part of the province are grateful for some of the survey work that is being done. Some of the survey work should have been done immediately after the war. Unfortunately, we have found that some of the land was even cleared and settled before the survey work was even completed. We find fairly large acreages of land which had been cleared before proper drainage projects had been carried out. I am sure the Minister of Natural Resources, who ought to be familiar with that part of the country, will agree with me that the people on some of those Co-op farms that are really the 'baby' of the Minister of Social Welfare; the people on some of those Co-op farms will suffer because the Government was so hasty, so anxious to get people settled on some of the collective farms, some of the Co-op farms, that they even neglected to carry out proper drainage programmes, as a result of which there will be fairly substantial losses in that area.

Judging by the annual report of the Department of Agriculture, some work is being done in that part of the country, but not nearly enough; and I want to take this opportunity of urging the Government of Saskatchewan to even launch forth during this election year and undertake a little more serious activity there, because the Department's own report has this to say about the land:

“There is in north-eastern Saskatchewan a large area usually referred to as the Carrot River triangle. Part of this area is settled. Much is completely underdeveloped, but almost all of the entire area can be

rated as one of great potential agricultural wealth. Drainage is the key to the development of this area.”

I want to urge the Government to carry out as rapidly as possible the necessary drainage programme and the necessary survey in that part of the province.

I know that the Minister of Social Welfare is very strongly in favour of collectivized farming; he is very strongly in favour of co-operative farms. You will recall that, on previous occasions in this House, the Minister of Social Welfare stated that the day would come when those who advocated collective and co-operative forms of farming would be very highly praised and would, in effect, have left monuments to them, and that those who would be opposed to that form of farming would be held in scorn — I presume that is why he has already had a farm in that part of the province named after him known as the Sturdy Co-op Farm.

I want to urge the hon. members on the Government side to bear two things in mind. First, I would like them to bear in mind that the allocation of land on a use-lease basis is the very antithesis of the principle of land ownership which has served as such a major inducement to convert new land for agricultural purposes in this province and in this country in the past. I mentioned, a few moments ago, one of the reasons why many people came to this land was because they sought here an opportunity to own their own land. One of the major reasons why many of the hon. members opposite came out in the earlier days of this province was because they saw here an opportunity to acquire a piece of land which they could call their own. You know that, Mr. Speaker; you yourself have been motivated by that same impelling force.

The second thing that I would like the hon. members opposite to remember is that, if you are anxious to apply socialism to others, the real test of whether or not you are socialist lies in your willingness or unwillingness to apply Socialism to your self. Therefore, I would urge the private members on the other side of the House to use whatever influence they have behind their closed doors upon the Government to change this policy of allocating Crown lands only a 33-year lease basis, for in doing so they will be rendering a real service to many of our young men who are anxious to settle on these Crown lands, who are anxious to build their homes, who would like, as the hon. member for Lumsden (Mr. Thair) to own their own lands, rather than just be tenants of the state.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take this opportunity of drawing these sentiments to the attention of the members on the other side of the House, because I feel that there are so many younger farmers who are anxious to get settled on Crown Lands, who are anxious to have the opportunity of not being tenants of the state, but owners of their own land. I think it is rather interesting to note that in the “Progress Report”, where agriculture is discussed under the heading “Lands Branch”: for goodness sake, why, when the Government puts out propaganda at public expense, why cannot it be honest and include right here that the only way you can get Crown lands from the Socialistic C.C.F. Government is on a 33-year lease basis?

**February 25, 1952**

**Mr. Kuziak:** — Son-of-a-gun!

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is that in keeping with the dignity of British Parliamentary procedure to use such language? If not, I would suggest the member for Canora deserves at least a slight reprimand.

**Mr. Tucker:** — Maybe he has this foot-and-mouth disease — mostly mouth!

**Mr. Egnatoff:** — It could be that he just has this foot-and-mouth disease, that is quite true.

Now, with those few remarks, I am sure you will gather, Mr. Speaker, that it is not my intention to support the Motion.

**Mr. Tucker:** — On a point of privilege. I noticed an article, Mr. Speaker, on the “Leader-Post” editorial page which reads as follows — I draw it to your attention, Mr. Speaker, because it is the first time I have noticed it. It says:

“It developed that Mr. Tucker made the suggestion verbally that in acting upon it to protect members who have claims against the Government Insurance Office the Government also include the amendment on oil and mineral leases.”

I want to say that I at no time made any suggestion that the Legislative Assembly Act should be amended, either verbally or in writing, Mr. Speaker.

The question being put on Mr. Erb’s motion for the Address, it was agreed to by 27 votes against 19.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:40 o’clock p.m.