

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
First Session – Thirteenth Legislature
4th Day

Tuesday, February 19, 1957

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

WELCOME TO UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Hon. J.H. Sturdy (Minister without Portfolio): — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the first occasion on which I have to address you since your elevation to your present high position as Speaker coincides with another auspicious occasion. The members of this House join with me in extending to our distinguished guests a most cordial and hearty welcome here, this afternoon. Our distinguished guests are from the University of Saskatchewan and (which is of equal importance, Mr. Speaker, they are from the fair city of Saskatoon. They are members of the University debating directorate and members of the International Students' Union who have come here to listen to our debates and see the Legislature in action; and if we do not provide them with the same degree of enthusiasm and high order of debate to which they are accustomed in their Parliamentary Forum, I know that the warmth of our welcome will compensate. And, Mr. Speaker, our distinguished guests, as well as all members of the House and the members' husbands and wives and the members of the press, are going to be your guests at your dinner in the Parliamentary restaurant at 5:30 this evening. That will also serve to compensate for any shortcomings that may be experienced here today.

Mr. Kim Thorson (Souris-Estevan): — Mr. Speaker, may I also say how pleased I am to see these students here from the University of Saskatchewan. On a number of occasions I have enjoyed this visit because of this House, that it is equally a pleasure to receive these people as it is to be among them when they make their annual visit to members of the International Students' Club and those who participated in the University of Saskatchewan's Parliamentary Forum when they visit this Assembly.

February 19, 1957

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The House resumed from Monday, February 18, 1957, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Wood (Swift Current) for the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I was just beginning to wonder whether or not I was going to get any radio time today; but I, too, would like to join in the remarks that have already been made with regard to our guests here this afternoon; and I continue to think that it was an excellent plan of — I was going to say the Minister of Social Welfare but he has changed his portfolio and is now assistant to the Premier — the member for Saskatoon, when he conceived the idea of inviting the members of the Parliamentary Forum and International Student body from the University of Saskatoon to attend at least two of our sittings of the Legislature. I, too, am very pleased to see that we have as many here on this occasion as are present this afternoon. I hope that they will be able to get something out of my remarks this afternoon, and for those who will be here again tomorrow, I am sure they will enjoy the remarks of the Premier.

I would also, Mr. Speaker, like to congratulate the members of the Liberal Party on the campus on the support that they polled in the election on the campus, last fall. I hope that their experience might be followed by the experience of the Government that sits opposite; that is that they, too, might be voted out of power on one of these Bills they are proposing to amend. We hope we will have the opportunity of meeting all of the visitors personally at the banquet that the hon. Minister has mentioned, this evening, at 5:30.

Yesterday, when I began my remarks, you will recall, Mr. Speaker, that I congratulated yourself, the new members of the Cabinet, and new members to this Legislature upon their election. Perhaps I should have congratulated all members who are in this Legislature at this time, because of the fact that we are all new members. We have all just won an election, and this is our first Session of this Legislature; and, therefore, I do extend my congratulations to all of the members on their success at the polls on June 20th.

Since yesterday I was looking through a few newspaper clippings that I have accumulated over the years, and I happened to notice one which I thought I should refer to at this time. It is dated November 10, 1956, and it is an article concerning a speech that the Premier of this province made in Winnipeg to some C.C.F. gathering there. The heading of

this newspaper clipping is: "Liberals' end seen by Douglas." Well, I can quite agree with the heading, because he is certainly going to see their end — it will be when they go by him; that is about the only thing he will see. But you know, I often wondered why he ever made such a statement that the Liberal party was coming to an end, because I went back to the records to see how on earth he could substantiate such a statement. I looked up the records of the last provincial elections that were held throughout the Dominion of Canada in the year 1956, and I found that there was one political party in Canada — but it wasn't the Liberal party! The Liberal party were steadily making gains across Canada; but the C.C.F. party lost support in almost every province in the Dominion of Canada, and I want to refer to some of the support they have lost.

Prior to the provincial elections that were held last summer, the C.C.F. had 71 M.L.A.'s in the Dominion of Canada; but after the provincial elections they had 57. I think they are probably disappearing! On the other hand, the Liberals had 161 members prior to the elections of last summer — 161 M.L.S.'s; and after the provincial elections they had 187. Well, if that is called parties disappearing, the sooner we get there the better.

There is only one political party in the Dominion of Canada that lost strength and that is the C.C.F. Party. The Social Credit party, prior to last summer's elections, had 77 M.L.A.'s in all of Canada; after the elections they had 81 members. The same thing is true in the House of Commons. In the last election the Liberals were able to elect 170 members to the House of Commons; today they have 171. The C.C.F. were able to elect 23 to the House of Commons in the last election; now they have 22.

If you want to look at what is happening to the Socialist party in Canada. I think probably we should look at different areas in Canada and just see where, if any strength, as far as the Socialist party is concerned, exists in Canada. We will find that, for instance in Newfoundland away down in the eastern part of our country, when the Legislature dissolved there, there was one C.C.F. member in the House. They had an election in 1956, and that one chap found himself defeated, and now they haven't got any; so they don't amount to very much in Newfoundland.

Then in Nova Scotia before they dissolved the House, there were two C.C.F. M.L.A.'s in the House. After the smoke of the election cleared away there was one — a decrease of 50 per cent. The popular vote in Nova Scotia decreased from 7 per cent in 1953 to 3 per cent in 1956.

February 19, 1957

Speaking of New Brunswick, there is no such thing as a C.C.F. party in New Brunswick.

Then we come to the province of Quebec, and I don't know what is wrong with the words, 'C.C.F.' or 'Co-operative Commonwealth' or whatever you call it, but those words didn't seem to appeal to the people of Quebec, because down there they are called 'Socialist Democrats'; and in the province of Quebec there are no Socialist Democrat or C.C.F. members in the Legislature. In 1952 that party was able to garner 6 per cent of the vote in the province of Quebec, but by 1956 it had dwindled to one per cent.

And then we can go to the province of Ontario, and lo and behold, they gained one seat. They used to have two members in the Ontario Legislature and now they have three. But they used to have 19 per cent of the popular support of the people of Ontario, and now they have seven per cent.

If we are to come back even to Saskatchewan, we find that, when this House was dissolved and we went to the people, the C.C.F. had 42 members; but when they came back they had 36; and the only party that lost support is the party to your right, Mr. Speaker — the C.C.F. party. The Liberal party was able to gain four seats in the election, the Social Credit three, while the C.C.F. lost six members. And if we want to go to British Columbia it is the same story there — a decrease in membership and a decrease in the popular vote.

So I am not too concerned as to whether the Premier thinks the Liberal party is disappearing or not, but I am very happy to see that the C.C.F. party is certainly disappearing not only in Saskatchewan, but in the whole of Canada. Some people who reside outside the province of Saskatchewan seem to be just as concerned about this matter as we are, because I noticed a clipping from the 'Toronto Daily Star' of July 28, 1956, and I want to read part of that clipping to you. It is headed: 'Born of Depression':

"Fighting for Very Life. Can the C.C.F. Survive as a Separate Party? The biggest question mark in Canadian politics today is the future of the C.C.F. Twelve years ago its surprising election gains in many parts of the nation stamped it as the political party of the future. Today, after a series of demoralizing defeats, its problem is simply how to stay alive."

So I am not so much concerned even with whether the C.C.F. survive or not.

Also, at the close of my remarks yesterday afternoon, I had something to say in regard to the Speech itself and also to the reference that was made to agriculture. I think if we had taken that part of the Speech which tells what this Government has already done out of the speech and left what they propose to do in the future, then the entire speech could have been reproduced on one side of a cigarette box. Even the press found it most difficult to get even a heading when they were writing up their newspaper account of the Speech from the Throne. The Regina 'Leader-Post' headlined: "Saskatchewan to Form Tourist Office". Well, that's a major development. It is certainly something that we in the Opposition have been asking this Government to pay more attention to for many years — the tourist industry of this province. But I am not prepared to accept this expansion until I know more about it. I wonder if it isn't a smoke-screen so that they may not only continue, but enlarge, their program of sending out political propaganda to all of the province of Saskatchewan. Certainly we need a Tourist Bureau in this province. It is one of the major industries of this province, if we only realized it. But we do not need a Bureau of Publications to turn out propaganda and political literature as they have turned out in the past and turned out in the last provincial election.

In the 'Star-Phoenix' the headline was to the effect that we are having a change in our economy from that of the previous agricultural economy to an economy that is supported by both agriculture and industry. A similar line was adopted by the Canadian Press. But I am sure that this Speech from the Throne will go down in history as being the most inadequate Speech from the Throne that has probably ever been delivered in this Chamber. We have problems in the province of Saskatchewan that all of us know and realize; but apparently this Government is not prepared to take the necessary action, and to adopt the necessary policies, to alleviate the problems that confront this province of Saskatchewan.

I quoted yesterday the only reference in the Speech from the Throne as far as agriculture is concerned, and after they tell us what our trouble is then they put a period; and there is nothing in the Speech from the Throne to alleviate any of the problems that are confronting agriculture in Saskatchewan today.

Now, what are some of the things that we, as a provincial body, could do to help out with this agricultural problem? Apparently this Government doesn't know of any plan that would help, or they are not prepared to implement it —one or the other. The Government of this province could adopt at least sixteen different programs that I have in mind at the moment that would help to alleviate the agricultural problem in Saskatchewan today, and I want to mention those sixteen programs. In the past they have seen fit to adopt Liberal policy on many occasions, and I sincerely hope that they are prepared to adopt more of the Liberal programs as far as agriculture

is concerned. They can certainly adopt our program as far as rural electrification is concerned; and that would help every farmer in the province of Saskatchewan.

You know, it seems strange to me why the Saskatchewan Power Corporation should have two policies — one for the distribution of electrical energy and the other for the distribution of natural gas. They have told the farmer: “You can pay part of your capital cost to bring electricity to your farm”, but they have told the person who is going to receive the services of natural gas: “We will bring it right up to your door for nothing.” Why on earth should a farmer be asked to pay, on the average, something over \$500 to bring power to his farm, and the same citizen (at least in my opinion he is the same citizen) living in an urban centre has natural gas brought to his door, with the Province paying the cost? Is the citizen who resides in the urban centre a little better than the one who lives out on the farm? I don't thin so, Mr. Speaker. I can recall here, it wasn't more than two or three years ago, when the part of the province that I reside in was unfortunate enough to have almost a crop failure due to rust and we received P.F.A. that year. The greater part of the P.F.A. payments that went into that district were paid directly into the Power Corporation so that the farmers could receive the benefits of power. The Federal Government was putting money into the hands of the farmers and the Saskatchewan Power Corporation was taking it out.

They could adopt our program as far as the grid road is concerned. Here again, Mr. Speaker, by admission of this Government that a grid road system in the province of Saskatchewan — in some instances where they have rebuilt the highway or connecting highways — would be in the main a secondary highway system in the province. And here again, you have a ‘humanitarian’ Government, supposed to be a friend of the farmer, but they didn't tell them that the people of Saskatchewan would pay half the cost of the grid roads, and the farmers would pay the other half. Why on earth should the farmer pay 50 per cent of the cost themselves, and then all the rest of the people of Saskatchewan, including the farmers, pay the other 50 per cent? Is the farmer some other kind of a citizen? Has he got more money than anybody else? — Not when you listen to the howls of some of them on the other side of the House. But here they are making the farmer to pay his share of the 50 per cent that is paid by the Provincial Government, and then to pay the other 50 per cent himself. A secondary highway system in this province, or a grid road system, would serve all the people of Saskatchewan. It not only serves the farmers; it serves all the people; and you are not providing the municipalities with something they are going to get revenue out of. The grid road system, when it is completed, is going to cost the municipalities more money because of the fact that you have a higher standard of roads which demands a higher maintenance in upkeep. Instead, the municipalities are going to be saddled with a bigger loan than they ever had before; but on the other hand the Provincial Government will

receive a good deal of additional revenue because of the construction of this grid road, and will receive that revenue from gasoline tax and from licence fees.

Another program that could be implemented was referred to yesterday (and I am awfully pleased that the gentleman who referred to it sat on the Government side of the House), and that is the elimination of Education and Hospitalization Tax on farm fuels and greases. It is something that we on this side of the House have asked for continuously but the Government has opposed it; but I am thankful now that we at least have two supporters on the other side of the House.

Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Yes, little by little they are adopting our program.

Mr. McDonald: —And they could help out by No. 4 — taking off the Education and Hospitalization Tax on municipal equipment. No. 5 — they could help out by doing away with the 3¢ mineral tax. I have always been opposed to the 3¢ mineral tax. Just what is it, Mr. Speaker? What are you taxing? If you own a section of land you will have no idea what the minerals under that land may be worth. They may be worth millions, and they may not be worth anything, and yet the Government of the day imposes a 3¢ tax per acre. That amounts to about \$20 a section per year. Certainly the mineral wealth of this province must be taxed, but the tax should be derived out of the production, and the farmers of this province should not be taxed on something they don't know whether they own or not.

You could help out a good many farmers in this province by giving them a fair share of any minerals that may be found under their land, whether they own their mineral rights or whether they do not. Why shouldn't a farmer who owns his property, owns his farm, have some equity in any minerals that may be found under his property? I am sure it would help a good many farmers in the province of Saskatchewan.

You could help out by carrying out the program that you announced many years ago in regard to education: pay the total cost of education. You said you were going to do it. Do it.

Mr. Cameron: — If they only paid 50, that would help a lot.

Mr. McDonald: — You could help out by using a lot of this government equipment that has been bought, this highway construction equipment, to build these grid roads. You could help out by providing adequate storage for farm products here in the Saskatchewan. I can recall certain C.C.F. speakers back many years ago: at one time they even talked about taking over the packing industries. Well, they haven't taken any over and they haven't built any. It might be a good idea if we were to put some of

these under storage for agricultural products here in the province of Saskatchewan.

You could help out by decreasing the farm truck licences and bring them down to the level they were when the Liberal Government left office in this province. You could help out by decreasing the compulsory premiums on farm truck insurance. You could help out by decreasing the cleaning charges for farmers' grain, couldn't you? There is a 300 per cent increase on this item alone imposed by the man who has been the Minister of Agriculture in this province for 12 years, and who has the audacity to sit in his place in this Legislature and allow his Government to bring in a Speech from the Throne with no recommendations that his Government do anything. I am going to refer to a few other speeches from the Throne in a minute. Yes, you could even decrease the hay-cutting fees that you have imposed in this province. You could even decrease the dues collected on lumber, fence posts, and other forest products . . .

Mr. Lopton (Saltcoats): — Lots of them.

Mr. McDonald: — . . . and you could certainly decrease the rates charged for electricity. There are 16 little items that this Government could implement all alone; but no! they say they are not prepared to do anything about it. I want to say another word or two about this grid road system, while I am on the subject, because, if my memory serves me right, it was back last May when the Premier was in my hometown making a speech, and he was talking about the grid road — this is what he said:

“If any municipality will build roads to fill in gaps in the highway system . . .”

(Here is an admission; now they want the municipalities to build roads to fill in gaps in the highway system)

“ . . . the Provincial Government will pay 80 per cent towards the cost of such gap-filling roads.”

He was referring to a new grid road that was being built just on the west side of my constituency. Later on, he said that this road was in my constituency, or part of it, and that I was not in favour of provincial Government paying 80 per cent of the part of the construction costs of some road that was in my constituency. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the road in my constituency, and if I had had anything to do with it, it would have been in my constituency; but you know, they moved it into the next constituency west which at that time was represented by a C.C.F.'er. Thank goodness it isn't represented by a C.C.F.'er anymore — that is the Qu'Appelle-Wolseley constituency. But the truth is that of the mileage that was built on that particular

grid road, 14 miles of it was in the Weyburn constituency which is represented by the Premier, and 37 miles in the Qu'Appelle constituency which was represented at that time by a C.C.F.'er and now by a Liberal. So, thank goodness! We got the long end of the stick anyway, because the greatest portion of it is in Qu'Appelle, where my friend from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) is now the Liberal member.

There are other ways that a good Provincial Government could help out. Many provincial governments across Canada are making money available to farmers, today, over a long period of years, at a low interest rate. First, in the province of Quebec loans are made available to farmers at 2½ per cent interest repayable over a period of 39½ years. In the province of Ontario, I understand, loans are made available at 4 per cent interests. And I note from the press and also from the Speech from the Throne presented in the Alberta Legislature, that legislation will be introduced to establish a farm credit union program under which capital loans will be made available to young farmers for the purchase of agricultural lands. I don't know what else is in the Speech from the Throne in Alberta. I haven't had time to read it; but I hope that some of my friends on my extreme left will probably read it to us, because it seems to have quite a bit more in it than our own here in Saskatchewan. There are several places in which I noticed measures were going to be introduced to do something, but in our Speech from the Throne—well, there isn't anything in it.

There are other problems confronting agriculture. There are problems concerning veterans in this province who are established on farms. Only this morning I received a letter from a chap from Saskatchewan, and I want to read you this letter, Mr. Speaker, with your permission. It is dated February 16, 1957, and reads:

“I am enclosing two clippings from the ‘Western Producer’ published last summer, the contents of which I believe apply to most of us veterans in the southern part of Saskatchewan. I have tried to get our M.L.A. to take it up, but to no avail. Evidently he was so busy acting on the Select Committee on Agriculture and Rural Life, making recommendations to the Federal Government, that he failed to see what is needed right here in Saskatchewan.

“For instance, my son and many other young lads would like to farm, but how can we . . . “

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition agree with the contents of that letter? Are they his own opinions that he is reading?

Mr. McDonald: — I am reading a letter that I received, Mr. Speaker, and I take full responsibility for the letter:

February 19, 1957

“For instance, my son and many other young lads would like to farm but how can we fathers manage that, when we cannot even buy our own land? Consequently, my 20-year-old-son has spent three years working out, and two of them were in Alberta. If the Government wants to keep the farm boys on the farm, why not set up some provincial loan board so they can get established?”

He is now referring to the two letters enclosed):

“So if these letters can be of any use in the fight for a better deal, you may use them. I have heard the hon. members ‘haw-haw’ when this issue was brought to their attention in the House. I can assure them it is no laughing matter. Neither does their old alibi, “What did the Liberals do for the First World War Veterans”” excuse them from their shameful laughter. What a farce — ‘Humanity first’.

“In regard to arbitration we must pay down 10 per cent of the present set price after they are certain all taxes are paid up, and they have received their full share of rentals to date; and then still have to purchase at the new price whether we agree to it or not.

“I may add that I have supported the C.C.F. for a number of years up until the last provincial election, just in case they want the records. But this land price deal takes the cake, and I’ve had enough.

“Hoping to hear this issue brought to the floor of the House and shoved down their throats,

Yours very truly”

Hon. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Leader of the Opposition give a legal description of the land he is talking about?

Mr. Cameron: — Oh, let him speak.

Mr. McDonald: — A year ago, during the proceedings of this Legislature, I made an agreement with the Minister of Agriculture of this province that, if he would give me certain information I would give him certain information, when I was referring to a settler in some of the area over in the north-western part of our province, and I provided him with my half of the information, but to date I have not received his.

Now, I want also to refer . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Would the hon. member place the letter on the table?

Mr. McDonald: — No, I will not.

Mr. Cameron: — He accepts full responsibility for it. Sit down and let him get on with it.

Mr. McDonald: — I suppose you would like to go and put the squeeze on this fellow, or something.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member is required . . .

Mr. McDonald: — I take full responsibility for the letter.

Mr. Speaker: — . . . to explain any statement that he has made at the request of the Minister of Agriculture, since the Minister of Agriculture has asked a question.

Mr. McDonald: — He wants to know if I would lay this on the table. No, I won't.

Mr. Speaker: — He also asked for the legal description of the land referred to.

Mr. McDonald: — I haven't got that information, Mr. Speaker. Then again, I want to refer to another statement that was made by the Premier of this province at Oungre, June 20, 1956 when he said:

“The Premier also dealt with a recent statement made by Leader of the Opposition leader ‘Hammy’ McDonald. The Liberal leader had stated that the Premier said he would resign if the C.C.F. socialized a single farm.

“Mr. Douglas told the gathering that in 1944 at Gull Lake, he said he would resign if the C.C.F. Government socialized any farmers there.”

I don't think that was the statement at all, Mr. Speaker. What I referred to, and I think that the Premier was referring to what I said, was this: that the Premier had definitely made a promise, not in regard to the socialization of land. Here is the promise; I will read it to you. This is taken from his speech at Gull Lake, May 24, 1944, referring to Mr. Douglas:

“He made a definite promise that if it could be proved a single farm family lost title to its home under a C.C.F. administration headed by himself, that administration would resign.”

Mr. Speaker, they ought to resign pretty soon, because I am going to go back and just present to this Legislature some of the records of what has happened from 1944, when this statement was made, up to date. When the Premier made that statement, you know, he was taking part in another election campaign, and he said there were over 12,000 — now let me get this straight; there were over 12,292 foreclosures and evictions in six years. That is a lot of evictions, but that is the record. For the six years he refers to, over 12,292 evictions and foreclosures — over 6,740. Does that make it any better? I think it is just as bad when 6,740 people lose title to their land or are kicked off, or foreclosures or evictions or whatever you want to call it, as if it were 12,200. But then to get on with the statement about the Premier and his Government resigning. Here is a copy of Sessional Paper tabled in this Legislature — Session Paper No. 92, Session 1946; and what does it say? It says:

“1. How many foreclosures and cancellations of agreements for sale have been allowed in each month of the year 1945 — (the following year) — 748

“2. Number of Writs of Possession issued and handed to Sheriffs — 54

Number dealt with by Sheriffs — 28

Under the 28 Writs of Possession dealt with by the Sheriffs, the number of tenants evicted without actual physical expulsion were 6

In five of these six cases no applications were made to the Mediation Board for protection and in the remaining case eviction took place after expiration of a period of one month's protection granted by Order-in-Council prohibiting proceedings by the Sheriff.”

If one wanted to go on and bring them all up to date, one could; but I only referred to it because I want to set the records straight.

There is something else I want to refer to at this time. There is reference to it in the Speech from the Throne, but the reference is about all. It is the matter of the South Saskatchewan Dam. I want to read what the Speech says about the South Saskatchewan Dam:

“My Government continues to recognize that the construction of the South Saskatchewan River development project will contribute materially to the stabilizing of the provincial economy. The Government is

willing to co-operate with the Government of Canada to undertake the construction of this project immediately and will pay its fair share of the cost as soon as the Federal Government is prepared to proceed.”

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Speech from the Throne could have gone much further. Instead, of saying it would stabilize the economy of Saskatchewan, I think it should have gone on and said it is going to help stabilize the economy of the entire Dominion of Canada. I think that is major importance. The construction of this dam would not only help stabilize the Canada of this province, but it would certainly help in the overall picture to stabilize the economy of the Dominion of Canada.

The Provincial Government say they are prepared to pay their fair share. Sometimes I wonder what on earth a fair share is, because I am a little confused at the attitude the Government seems to take. On April 10, 1956, when the Premier was addressing a nominating convention in the city of Regina he said, in reference to the South Saskatchewan dam, that the province had offered to pay up to 60 per cent of the cost, but still the Federal Government would not go ahead with it. Then later on, in February, 1957 — I have not the exact date of this, but I am sure the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) will remember the exact date — I quote:

“Provincial Treasurer C.M. Fines said Wednesday the Provincial Government is still prepared to pay 25 per cent of the cost of the South Saskatchewan River Dam . . .”

Well, when he was talking to the nominating convention, the Premier said 60 per cent, and when Mr. Fines was giving an interview to the press it was 25 per cent, and when we get to the Speech from the Throne it is a ‘fair share’; so I don’t know, Mr. Speaker. It doesn’t look to me like the Government knows.

The third thing that I want to refer to, as far as the dam is concerned, is also mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. It says this: “. . . as soon as the Federal Government is prepared to proceed”. They say it is going to stabilize the economy of the province of Saskatchewan. Well why don’t they do any more until the Federal Government is prepared to proceed? Mr. Speaker, everybody in this Legislature, and anybody who knows anything, knows that when the South Saskatchewan dam is constructed it will do this province more good than any place else in Canada. Certainly it will help other area; but its major beneficial effect will be here in the province of Saskatchewan, and this Government, and we in the Opposition and everybody else who is interested in the development of the South Saskatchewan River project ought to be doing everything humanly possible to see that this dam is constructed. Certainly I made the statement in Whitewood — the Premier referred to it when he was speaking in this House a year ago — that I didn’t

think this dam would ever be built as long as this Government is sitting in office in Saskatchewan. Well, what I said then has been substantiated by their attitude in the Speech from the Throne: they are going to sit here until Ottawa gets ready to build it.

Mr. Speaker, this Government has even failed to sell the idea of the South Saskatchewan dam to the people of Saskatchewan, let alone the rest of the people of Canada. Last Saturday night, I believe it was, I watched a TV program sponsored by the C.C.F. party. Two of our friends opposite were on that program, the hon. member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson) and the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet), and they had with them two candidates in the forthcoming election; and they were discussing the South Saskatchewan dam at that time, and they were discussing the benefits of this dam to Saskatchewan, the irrigation and power development, and somebody did mention the water supply for industry that it would supply. In my humble opinion, Mr. Speaker, the major reason for the construction of the South Saskatchewan dam is to provide an adequate supply of water in this province for industry. In the occupied southern portion of Saskatchewan today, through no fault of our own — we have no ideal industrial site, because we have not adequate water supplies for industry. You can cross the South Saskatchewan River early in the spring of the year, not far from the proposed dam site, and what do you find? You find a raging torrent — millions of gallons of water going down that river, and, I might add, millions of tons of dirt going with it. But you can go into the same area now, and I wouldn't doubt but that you could walk across the river, and I don't mean on the ice — even if the ice was out of it. It is just a meandering little stream.

Part of the reason that we have no first-class industrial sites in this province, Mr. Speaker, is because of the fact that we have a scarcity of water in Saskatchewan over a twelve-month period; and we do need an adequate water supply, a guaranteed water supply, in Saskatchewan before we can attract the industries that we would like to attract to diversify our economy to the extent that we would like to see it diversified. So, in my opinion that is a major need for the dam.

Some people have talked of the cost of building this dam. I don't know. You hear figures all the way from \$80 million to \$250 millions. I believe the actual cost of the dam itself would be around \$80 million. I think we should proceed, just as soon as it is humanly possible, to construct that dam, perhaps over a period of years. Yes, we would spend \$250 million in that area; undoubtedly we would; but the first thing that is necessary is to corral that body of water, that body of water itself, and add it to the natural resources of this province. If that were done, I am convinced that, over the period of a few short years, you would see industry move into that area, and in fifteen years the largest city in this province would not be the city of Regina or the city of Saskatoon; but there would be a new city built in the area somewhere close to the dam itself. Then you would have a market

for your products that would be produced from irrigated land in that area.

The Gordon Commission, while it did not mention the South Saskatchewan dam specifically, recommended against large irrigation projects. I couldn't disagree more with anything, or with a report or statement from anybody, that would recommend against irrigation in a country such as this, where one of our greatest problems is scarcity of moisture of a period of years. But, as I mentioned a moment ago, you create your body of water, a guaranteed supply of water to industry, and industry will build in that area; and once you have the industry established, the irrigation will come into effect and you will produce, not wheat, Mr. Speaker, on irrigated land; you would produce such crops as clover, alfalfa, etc., to build a storage bank of feed for our livestock industry. You would produce such products as sugar beets, peas, beans, cabbage and what have you. We would have a sugar beet industry in the area; we would have a canning industry in the area. It would not interfere with the sugar beet industry in either Alberta or Manitoba, or the canning industries in those two provinces, because over a period of years we would build our own markets in the area around the dam to consume the products that would be produced from irrigated land.

I understand now that we are spending about \$80 million to build new power plants, one at Estevan, I think I am right in my figures; if I am not, I hope the Minister in charge of the Power Corporation will correct me; but we are spending about \$80 million in developing new power plants in Estevan and Saskatoon. I don't know the amount of electricity that will be generated annually from this expenditure of \$80 million; but it seems to me that an equivalent expenditure on the South Saskatchewan dam would generate far more electricity than will be generated from Estevan and Saskatoon from the expansion that is taking place at the moment. Don't think for one moment that I am criticizing the expansion at Saskatoon or Estevan, because I sincerely believe that we need to develop every potential power site here in the province of Saskatchewan and every other part of Canada, as rapidly as possible.

I want to say something else about power rates. Another deterrent to industry in Saskatchewan is not only the water, But our climate, Mr. Speaker. We may as well admit that we have the most severe climate on the North American continent right here in the province of Saskatchewan. Because of that, it costs more to live in Saskatchewan than it does in other parts of the North American continent and when I say the North American continent I want to include that great country to the south of us, because we are naturally competing with them in industry. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, to offset this problem that we are confronted with, our severe climate, that it is all the more important that we should have some cheap source of heat or energy, or whatever you like to call it, for the people of our province, and for industry. But we are not able so far, apparently, to provide any source of heat or energy to our people, or to industry that might be interested in coming to Saskatchewan, at a rate that is equivalent to the

rates of our neighbouring provinces. Our natural resources in Saskatchewan are similar to the natural resources in Alberta and Manitoba, our two neighbouring provinces. Each province has a source of cheap energy. On the one hand Manitoba has cheap electricity, one of the lowest rates on the North American continent; on the other side of us in Alberta, they have cheap natural gas. Well, if our natural products are similar in Saskatchewan to the natural products of Alberta and Manitoba and yet they have a cheap source of energy in both of our neighbouring provinces and not in Saskatchewan, how can you attract industry here?

What is the case as far as natural gas is concerned? in the province of Saskatchewan, for the first 6,000 cubic feet of natural gas you pay \$6.30 and for amounts over 6,000 cubic feet per month the rate is 54 cents per 1,000 cubic feet. These are the rates that I received from Saskatchewan Power Corporation. In Alberta — in Calgary, for instance — the rate for the first 6,000 cubic feet is \$3.54 as against \$6.30 in Saskatchewan — 54 cents for anything over the 6,000 in Saskatchewan and 26 cents in Calgary. You can see that we are not competing. Our prices for gas are not competitive. I have heard Government speakers say, “Why, our prices for gas are competitive.” They are comparing gas with oil and coal! Mr. Speaker, you do not compare gas with oil and coal. You compare the price of gas in Saskatchewan with the price of gas in other provinces and other states of the Union. That is what you compare gas with; not with coal or wood or straw.

Mr. Kramer: — Or hot air!

Mr. McDonald: — Well, there is lots of that in this province; if we could catch the hot air that emanates from the Bureau of Publications and the Minister’s office we would have enough to provide every city and town in the province of Saskatchewan and support all the industry in the whole of Canada.

Mr. Cameron: — They’d charge for it, too!

Mr. McDonald: — Well, perhaps at this time I should, in passing, refer to this other newspaper clipping I have. This is a newspaper account of the speech that was made here by Dr. Link. You know, for years we attempted to tell the people on your right, the Government of this province, that they had hindered the development of oil in this province for many years. Now a gentleman by the name of Dr. T.A. Link, President and Managing Director of the Cree Oil Company, and who at one time was geologist for the imperial Oil, says that is exactly what happened — that this Government purchased the oil companies out of Saskatchewan. It took ten years to get them back. They are back here today, and thank goodness they are! But in the meantime what happened, Mr. Speaker? There is far more to an oil industry than just digging oilwells and building refineries. One of the major products in an oil industry is the petrochemical industry. We have

no petro-chemical industry in Saskatchewan, and, had we not chased the oil companies out of here, we would have had. We have petro-chemical industries in both Manitoba and Alberta, but we have none here; and you know yourself that once you have an industry set up in your neighbouring province that is in production and supplying a product to the market that you would like to horn in on, it is a lot more difficult to attract that industry to your province.

The next thing that I want to refer to is the Dominion-Provincial Taxation Agreements, and again the Provincial Treasurer has said, "We are not going to get near as much money out of this agreement as some people think." I think that is the way he worded it. I don't know whether he was referring to me, or the newspapers, or whom, and I don't care, because he and his Government are the reason that we are not going to get as much under the Dominion-Provincial Taxation Agreement as was estimated. How do we arrive at the amount of money we receive under the Dominion-Provincial Taxation Agreements? First of all we have to find out how much money will come out of the richer provinces such as Ontario and British Columbia, then divide that into the number of people who reside in those richer provinces to get a figure which can be multiplied against the populations of such provinces as Saskatchewan (we are known as the 'have-not' province), to arrive at the amount of money we will receive. The Federal Government underestimated the growth of some parts of Canada, but over-estimated the growth of other parts. they under-estimated the growth of the province of Ontario and the province of British Columbia, for instance; but they over-estimated the growth of the province of Saskatchewan. They didn't believe it was humanly possible for some parts of Canada to grow as fast as they have; and, on the other hand, they didn't believe it was humanly possible for some places to stagnate as much as they have.

It was estimated that the tax would yield \$40.16 from the Provinces of Ontario and British Columbia. But after they got the population figures, it decreased to \$39.31. Well, then, to get the amount of money that the Province of Saskatchewan would receive, we multiply \$39.31 times our population, which is about 880,000 people. The Federal Government has estimated, as I said a moment ago, that the tax yield would be \$40.16 per head, and that the population of Saskatchewan would be approximately 897,000, which would have yielded the Province of Saskatchewan \$36 million a year. But, as I mentioned a moment ago, the growth was more rapid in some areas than they expected, and was even slower in Saskatchewan than they had expected; so, rather than receiving some \$36 million, we will be receiving about \$34,700,000 under the new proposal.

What about this growth in population? The growth, for instance, in the Province of British Columbia, from 1951 to 1956, on a percentage basis, British Columbia has increased by some 20 per cent —

Alberta	19.5 per cent
Ontario	17.6 per cent
Newfoundland	14.8 per cent
Quebec	14.0 per cent
Manitoba	9.5 per cent
Nova Scotia	8.1 per cent
New Brunswick	7.5 per cent
Saskatchewan	5.9 per cent
and poor little Prince Edward Island	.9 per cent

British Columbia had increased by 20 per cent and Alberta by 19.5 per cent (my social Credit friends will probably be tickled about that!), and poor little old Saskatchewan by 5.9 per cent.

Why, Mr. Speaker, are we not able to keep pace not only with the rest of Canada, but even with our neighbouring provinces? We will go on to Manitoba — 9.5 per cent. Why?

Mr. Loptson: — Liberal Government.

Mr. McDonald: — There must be a reason for it. And, Mr. Speaker, I think that there is a reason for it. One of the speakers on the other side of the House, yesterday, I believe it was the hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. Neibrandt) said that we were providing money to students to attend University. That is quite true. But a good many of the young men and young women who graduate from the University in Saskatchewan today have to move to other parts of Canada to seek employment. You know that, and I know it, and everybody else in Saskatchewan knows it. We are not even able in Saskatchewan to keep the people here that are born here. They talk about a 5.9 per cent increase in our population. Mr. Speaker, in 1951 we had 831,728 people in Saskatchewan; in 1956 we had 880,665 people, or an increase of 48,937. But the number of children born over the number of people that died in the province of Saskatchewan in this same period was 85,112, so, Mr. Speaker, in the period 1951 to 1956, we lost 36,175 people out of Saskatchewan. We didn't gain anything. In 1944 this province had an estimated population of 836,000 people. Today we have a population, as I mentioned a moment ago, a little better than 880,000 or an increase of some 44½ thousand people. But the natural increase, the birth rate over death rate in this same period, was 125,417 people. Thus, the equivalent of the City of Regina, Moose Jaw, and you could probably throw Yorkton in to boot, all added together, have left this province in the last 12 years while other provinces are growing at the rate of 20 per cent.

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — A Socialist paradise!

Mr. McDonald — Here is one reason why we are not keeping pace with the rest of Canada. Despite the fact that the Minister of labour and some of his cohorts may run around and say “Oh, Ho, Ho! We have the best labour legislation in the world, and pay the best wages.” What does the record say? The average weekly wage in British Columbia is \$65.79; in Ontario it is \$63.43; in Alberta, \$62.00; in Quebec, \$58.00; in Manitoba \$58.00 (I am leaving off the cents), and in Saskatchewan it is \$57.00. We are not paying the wages in Saskatchewan there are in certain other parts of Canada. I have said before, and I want to say here again, that you do not necessarily bring about good labour conditions by passing legislation. You bring about good labour conditions when you, the employer, bargain with labour for his services; in other words, a great demand for the services of labour. And, I think, this condition would not exist if Saskatchewan compared to other provinces in Canada.

There are many other reasons why we are not keeping pace. Immigrants are not coming to our province in the same number as they are going to other parts of Canada. A lot of those that come here do not stay here, because they are not able to get the same weekly wage, or same living conditions, or the same cost of living, that exist in other parts of Canada. I don't know, there must be a reason. Is it because they do not believe that working conditions, or wages, or job opportunities are as great in this province as they are in other parts of Canada?

Mr. Lopton: — They come from Socialist countries, and they don't like it.

Mr. McDonald: — I don't know. Now, to go back to the taxation agreements. This lack of population not only hurts us in regard to our subsidy or grant, or whatever you want to call it, from the Federal Government, but it affects us in our hospital grants and every other grant from the Federal Treasury.

I want to read to you briefly from an editorial of January 24, 1957, from the ‘Star-Phoenix’. They are pointing out, as I mentioned to you earlier, that the Provincial Treasurer said at the Local Government Conference that we weren't going to get nearly the money from Ottawa that he had suggested. I want to read you part of the editorial, with your permission, sir. I will read to you part of what Mr. Premier said, and part of what Mr. Fines said at the Local Government Conference:

“Fortunately (he said) there are some prospects for increased revenues next year, partly as a result of the new tax-sharing arrangement with the Federal Government. I want to make it perfectly clear, however, that the payments from Ottawa next

year are not expected to produce anything like the increase of \$6 million given so much publicity in recent months.” (So much publicity of \$6 million).

As Mr. Fines will indicate later, that figure is highly inflated by gross errors of exaggeration, and I think it most regrettable that the public should have been subjected to a misleading impression of this kind.

Now the editorial goes on and says this:

“Mr. Douglas was right. The payments from Ottawa this year ‘are not expected to produce anything like an increase of something like \$7.6 million. If this proves to be so, the Provincial Government’s proposed increase of ‘at least \$7 million’ in ‘direct provincial transfer to local governments in 1957’ will not be, as Mr. Douglas said they would be, ‘considerably more than the anticipated increase which the province expects to receive from Ottawa under the tax-sharing agreement.’ Shouldn’t the province, therefore, do even more for the municipalities than it ‘has proposed? It should, for Mr. Douglas himself said, on December 11, that ‘as long as there is assurance that the funds will be used economically, efficiently and to good public purpose, the Government is certainly committed to share any increased revenues with local governments. I restate that the categorical commitment this morning without hesitation .’”.

And so we are going to get a little more.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order! I didn’t wish to interrupt the gentleman when he was reading something that probably most of us have read before, the but reading of editorials is something that is hardly in keeping with the purpose of debate in this House. It is stating the opinions of people outside this Legislature, and people who are not members of this Legislature have not the privilege of expressing their views here. If the hon. member read something with which he agrees, he is stating his own opinions, but when he reads an entire editorial . . .

Mr. McDonald: — But, Mr. Speaker, if you would have allowed me to finish, in the first place, I didn’t read the entire editorial, and in the second place, I heartily agree with the editorial, and I only read the editorial to substantiate the arguments that I have presented here this afternoon, that it is not only the opinion of myself but some people who are in the employment of news services think the same as I do on this particular matter.

I was rather amazed that the Government would attempt, during the Local Government Conference, to keep the argument more on the boundaries of local government areas than to get it on to a financial discussion, because it seems to me that not only have we a problem with regard to boundaries of local governments, but we certainly have a tremendous financial problem as far as local governments are concerned. I had hoped that more would have come out of the Local Government Conference than did appear during the discussions at that time. I also had hoped, when the Conference was called, that we in the Opposition should have had some representation at that Conference. Yes, we were there, as invited guests. We were not delegates; we were not able to take part in the discussions. It seems to me that there are two sides to every story. The Government has proposals to make to the local government bodies, and I think that when we are the final body that will deal with any proposals or legislation that may change the areas of our local government bodies and may change the amount of money that is made available to them, or the tax fields that are made available to them, then we in the Opposition certainly should have had some representation as a delegate at this Conference. But I noticed that there was quite a change of attitude of this Government of this Government when dealing with their local governments, than of this same Government when dealing with our Federal government at Ottawa.

Many times the Premier has stood in his place in this Legislature and agreed with the proposals in general under the Dominion-Provincial Taxation Agreements. He has often said that the method is quite correct for Ottawa to impose taxes and to have control of the taxation in the whole of Canada, and then hand out grants to the Provinces. He is in complete agreement with that. But when the local governments come to his Government and ask him for a similar arrangement — Oh, no! He has an entirely different attitude. He said, “We are no Santa Claus you know. We haven’t got a big bag with a whole lot of money in it. Why don’t you levy some taxes of your own?” Here was a suggestion. He said, “No, we are not prepared to pay local governments unconditional grants. You go and put on some taxes of your own,” — as if taxes weren’t high enough now, Mr. Speaker.

Surely to goodness we don’t want every local government in the country running around putting taxes on this, that and the other thing, those double and quadruple taxations. Surely now it is the argument that the Premier himself has used with respect to Ottawa, and then when he is dealing with his local governments in Saskatchewan it is an entirely different attitude. He said, “Well, you can assess amusement taxes; you can have a poll tax; you could have six additional levies within your boundaries; you could have a sales tax; you could have licence fees on resident motor vehicles; you could impose a tax on charitable and other community service institutions; you could have taxes on farm buildings, machinery and equipment; you could put taxes on personal possessions; you could have a surcharge on electrical power and gas bills; you could have a frontage tax on land adjacent to roads; you could have a tax on farm fuel, or you could put more taxes on

February 19, 1957

on the land. I am sure the farmers will be pleased; not only the farmers, but the city dwellers as well, to learn that their municipal government has the authority to put on all of these taxes, and apparently the Government would let them.

There are many other items that I would like to deal with here this afternoon, but my time is running out. However, I do want to say something about the change in attitude again of our Premier. You know, he is something like a double-headed coin. After the provincial election of last June 20, the C.C.F. party in Canada literally called themselves together, and said, "Gee, whiz! The people in Saskatchewan don't like this Socialism — 56 people out of every 100 voted against this Government; proof we have got to do something." So they threw the 'Regina Manifesto' out the window with one hand, and ran around and caught it, and brought it back, and then they put an appendix on it and they called that little appendix 'The Winnipeg Declaration'. I wonder why they didn't call it the Winnipeg Manifesto? Apparently somebody has got a lot of steam in the C.C.F. party since the Manifesto was produced. Is there anybody that doesn't actually know the meaning of Manifesto? I thought I had better look it up. A Manifesto is a public declaration, usually of a prince, a sovereign, or other person claiming large powers. I can realize why they had a Manifesto in 1932; probably Mr. Fines thought he was a prince or a sovereign — at least he possessed large powers, so they introduced the Manifesto. But then as I say, they threw it out the window and then ran around and caught it and brought it back, and put on an appendix, 'The Winnipeg Declaration'. That was the first change — double-headed coin.

When the Premier was speaking to a nomination convention here in the city of Regina, he really got off on that old Regina Manifesto stuff. He must have found one of those old speeches he made 15 or 20 years ago. He brought it out and dusted it off, and he went right to town. And, he said: "Why, these big businessmen, these quick-buck artists, these hucksters of our economy, are persons completely dominated and motivated by profiteering principles." Why, they are terrible people, dreadful people; it's an awful thing! He said the great investment class have never had it so good as they have had in the past ten years. I suggest that a few people over there ought to know.

You know, that reminds me of another TV program I happened to be watching not too long ago, when the Premier was on TV., and he was having quite a time for himself. And he was likening the problems that confront us to a cream separator, and immediately I could see our little cream separator that we have down on the farm, you know, the one with three legs on it, and the big bowl. He said, "You know the producers of the raw products put the raw products in the big bowl of the cream separator . . ." and I could just see that little old one down on the farm; and then he said, ". . . the labouring forces of Canada turn the handle; and under the cream spout

you have these hucksters and quick-buck artists and one thing and another; and under the skimmed milk spout the rest of us are sitting around trying to get a little cupful there.” Well, you know, up to where he mentioned the people sitting under the cream spout I could go right along with his story; and I could see the whole thing right there in front of me; but when he mentioned this cream spout, I could see him and Mr. Fines sitting under the cream spout! And I could see some of their business associates sitting under the skimmed milk spout! And I could see the rest of us standing around waiting to get a little bit of the cold water that they poured in to rinse out the bowl!

In any case, it wasn't very long after this nominating convention in Regina until we had an industrial conference in Regina; and all of these people — ‘the quick-buck artists, the big businessmen, the hucksters, and persons completely dominated and motivated by profiteering principles’, I suppose, were at this industrial conference. Then he said, “You boys have to go home to your own communities and do anything you can to see that people invest money in Saskatchewan. We not only want to build up the industries that we have, but we want to attract new industries.” Now, goodness me, how on earthy could a man have that tremendous change of heart in a week? There was just one week between the two meetings!

The same thing happened when the Premier was down in Dallas, Texas, speaking to the Independent Petroleum Association of America. At that time he was referring to the oil development in Canada and he said, referring to the Imperial Leduc No. 1 discovery in Alberta, it was like winning an Irish sweepstake for Canada, and especially Alberta. Well, you know, we in Saskatchewan had the winning ticket on that darned horse, but he chased it out! And, you know, down in Dallas, when he was speaking to John D. Rockefeller's cousins or whoever they were, he said this:

“This development has been greatly stimulated by the introduction of capital from the United States, especially to the oil industry; and we have welcomed it because of the future promise which it holds for us.”

Well, in Saskatchewan, the C.C.F. Government are anxious to have American capital. We are also anxious to have American capital, or any capital, Mr. Speaker. If we could get the capital at home so much the better; but if we are not able to provide it, or not willing to provide it, then, I say, let it come no matter when it comes from. Let it come from Great Britain, Europe, Asia or wherever it may come from, we would welcome it. But, oh no! Down in Ottawa — my goodness me! The Americans have taken over the country; why, they are going to own everything, according to the C.C.F. It might be all right in Saskatchewan, but not in the rest of Canada!

I notice in the Speech from the Throne of last year we were told that we were going to have a new women's gaol. Well, I don't know what happened to the gaol. I don't think it has been built, and there is no reference to it in this year's Speech.

In last year's Speech we were to have a new Technical Institution. Well, this year's Speech is so barren that it couldn't even forecast something that isn't going to happen through the next year or so.

Then to really cap everything off, Mr. Speaker, on the third page (I believe it is) of the Throne Speech, we have a reference to the Time, and it says this:

“In accordance with the provisions of The Time Question Plebiscite Act, a vote was taken at the time of municipal elections last fall. The results of this plebiscite will be placed before a Committee of this Legislature for study and recommendation.”

We have been studying Time, making recommendations, for a long time. We in the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, for at least the last nine years that I have been here, have tried to tell this Government they didn't know what time it is, and now they have admitted it!

Mr. Speaker, I wish we could have had the opportunity of writing the Speech from the Throne, of putting those things into the Speech that would have, at least, gone a long way towards solving and meeting some of the many problems that confront the province of Saskatchewan. I shall not support the Speech from the Throne, not chiefly for what is in it, but for what isn't in it. Sure there are a few recommendations in the Speech from the Throne that all of us would like to support — those that refer to education, which are long past overdue. There are one or two other items in the Speech from the Throne that would deserve the support of any of us; but how any member could support this Speech from the Throne wholeheartedly I will never know, because the Speech from the Throne ought to contain many of those things that I have referred to.

Therefore, I propose to move an amendment to the Address — an amendment to the motion of Mr. Wood, moved by myself, and seconded by Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek):

“That the following words be added to the Address: —

“But regrets that Your Honour's advisers

- (1) have failed to provide an adequate increase in school grants;
- (2) have failed to provide that the Provincial Government pay the entire costs of constructing the market road grid;

- (3) have failed to provide a sufficient increase in supplementary payments to recipients of old age security payments and to recipients of blind persons' allowances;
- (4) have failed to provide any supplementary allowances for recipients of old age assistance payments or for recipients of disabled persons' allowances;
- (5) have failed to provide a reasonable increase in mothers' allowances."

Mr. Speaker, I shall not support the motion.

Mr. Speaker: —I should like to have direction from the House as to how the debate should proceed. For a number of years, past, because of the use of the radio in broadcasting these debates it has been the accepted way to speak on both the motion and the amendment. Is it the wish of the Assembly, that the procedure be followed?

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, we would certainly agree to that. I think it is the most convenient way. I would like to raise a Point of Order, however. I am not requesting Your Honour to give a ruling on it now, without consulting the authorities, but my rather limited knowledge of parliamentary procedure has always taught me that you cannot, in a Speech from the Throne debate, anticipate a Budget. We are not now discussing the Budget, and, therefore, how can you say that we have failed to provide amply for an increase in school grants, when there is no Budget saying what the increase in school grants will be? How you can say it fails to provide extra costs for constructing the main market road grid, when there are no figures before the House as to what the Provincial Government is going to pay toward the main market road grid? Or that it has failed to provide an increase in supplementary payments to recipients of old-age security payments and to recipients of blind persons' allowances?

The Budget is not yet before the House and the House has no indication yet as to what the Budget will provide with respect to those things. The same thing is true of supplementary allowances for old-age assistance, and for mothers' allowance cases. Now it is true that in lieu of these five there is no indication in the Speech from the Throne that the Government intends to increase these payments, but it is still possible it might be done. It would be quite within the right of the Government to do that. It hasn't been announced in the Speech from the Throne, it is true, but in the first two items it has been stated definitely in the Speech from the Throne that those two items, namely, school grants and assistance for the main market road grid, will be increased. It doesn't say how much, so I don't see how the House can vote saying it is not enough when the House has not yet been informed as to how much the increase will be.

It seems to me, therefore, that is a very proper amendment to the Budget, but could not conceivably be called in order as an amendment to the Speech from the Throne.

Had the amendment — I don't see why I should help my friend draft one; but had the amendment said that the Government had made no mention of its intention to increase old-age pensions or mothers' allowances, that would seem to be a proper amendment; but to say that there are no amounts provided is a matter for the Budget, which the House can only have information on when the Budget is before us.

Mr. McDonald: — Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed to say a word or two — first of all, on your ruling as to how the debate is to proceed on the Speech from the Throne when we have an amendment. I realize that because of the radio broadcasting, it is necessary for speakers to not be confined to the amendment when they are making probably the only speech they will have the opportunity of putting over the air. They should be given a field to wander over. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, because of that ruling it prevents someone who has already taken part in the debate from getting back into the debate later on, on an amendment. I notice the Premier is shaking his head, but I have never, in this Legislature, seen anyone making a second speech on either the Throne Speech debate or the Budget debate, no matter how many amendments there have been, because of this ruling. Now, I know the ruling is necessary because of the radio, but then the radio is curtailing the amount of debate that we allow to take place in this Legislature. I just want to point out that one problem that is created.

As far as the amendment is concerned, in the first place the Government has announced to the local government councils the amounts of money they are going to pay in educational grants and their share of the grid road system and, in addition to that, we have found from past experience that Cabinet Ministers, when making probably their major speech of the session (it might be on the Speech from the Throne or in the Budget debate), in many instances they announce programs that have not appeared in the Speech from the Throne, and maybe not in the Budget. But we do feel, sir, that major program such as we have referred to in the amendment, should certainly be referred to at least in the Speech from the Throne, if it is the intention of the Government to carry out any of these programs. We feel that all of these matters ought to have been mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, undoubtedly without using a figure as to the amount of money that would be spent, as that is something for the Provincial Treasurer to have in his Budget Address; but we do feel that this certainly should have been included in the announced programs of the Government in the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Speaker: — It is not necessary to cover all the five points. If one of those points in the amendment should prove to be out of order then the entire amendment is out of order. Having it drawn to my attention that the Speech from the Throne does not mention the amounts of the school grants which will be paid — I hope I am correct in that, I have read it, and I believe the Speech from the Throne does not state how much will be paid in school grants, — I think we can pass over any statements that may have been made prior to the opening of the Legislature with respect to school grants. I have no choice but to rule this amendment out of order on the basis of No. (1).

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): — Mr. Speaker, may I . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Danielson: — I know I am out of order, but have I got consent to speak? Mr. Speaker, if the Premier's explanation and statement in regard to this amendment is valid, then you cannot move an amendment to any Speech from the Throne. That is absolutely prohibited. You might read the Speech from the Throne and you might see many things, but there is no definite statement in the Speech from the Throne. I think, so far as the grid road system is concerned, if I remember correctly (I just heard it read) the amendment deplors the fact that the Government is not paying the whole cost of that particular expenditure. I didn't get a copy of it and I have not seen it . . .

Premier Douglas: — No, no, it says "provide". It says: "has failed to provide".

Mr. Danielson: — That is practically the same thing, Mr. Speaker. Here is how it reads: "have failed to provide that the Provincial Government pay the entire costs of constructing the market road grid." That certainly is in order. There is no question in the world about that.

Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, may I rise on a point of order? I think that . . .

Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Sit down! Sit down!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — The point of order is this . . .

Mr. Speaker: — The member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) is speaking to the point of order.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — No, he is not, Mr. Speaker. May I point out your ruling has been given and, unless it is challenged, it cannot be evaded and I don't think we should allow this Session to start off with an argument with the speaker.

Mr. Danielson: — I'll start it right now.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, I asked you for permission. I said "I am out of order, but with your permission I would like to say a few words"; and you gave me that permission.

Mr. Speaker: — I would like to say that I have ruled this out of order on the basis of just one part of it. I haven't had an opportunity to study the entire amendment, but if one part of the amendment is out of order, then the entire amendment is out of order.

Mr. Danielson: — There is only one paragraph in this amendment, Mr. Speaker, that might possibly have any connection with what is in the Speech from the Throne and that is the second paragraph.

The debate continued on the motion:

Hon. T.C. Douglas (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, I should like, sir, in continuing the debate, to commence by offering you my congratulations on being selected in this House as the president officer. Those of us who have sat with you in the House know of your constant desire to be fair and impartial, and I am sure that all of us feel that you will preside over the deliberations of this House with dignity and fairness.

I would like, too, in continuing this debate to extend my congratulations to the member from Yorkton (Mr. Neibrandt) and the member from Swift Current (Mr. Wood) on the very excellent job they did yesterday in moving and seconding the Motion for the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne. Those of us who have sat in the Legislature for a number of years know what an ordeal it is to make your first speech in the House — even if you are making your twentieth speech it is still difficult; but the first one is certainly an ordeal. I think all of us would feel that these two new members conducted themselves, yesterday, in a very able manner. I am sure their constituents must be very proud of the fine exhibition they gave.

I would like, too, since this is the First Session of a new Legislature, to extend congratulations to all the members who have taken their places in this Legislative Assembly. We come here not because

of who we are, but because of what we are. We have rights and privileges here, not because we are any particular individual, but because we are representatives of the people who sent us here. In this House all are equal and all members have a right to be heard, because they are sent here as a result of a democratic election to speak for the people whom they represent. I do extend congratulations to those who are here for the very first time, and I am sure that they will find this Assembly an interesting and stimulating place to be in and a very worthwhile experience.

I would like, too, Mr. Speaker, to join with those who have extended congratulations to the University students who are here from the University generally, from the Debating Society, and from the International Students' Group. We are always delighted to have the students come to sit in on the opening days of the Assembly. We hope that you will derive some benefit from your visit, and we certainly look forward to the privilege of meeting you.

I should like also to extend congratulations to my friend, the Leader of the Opposition, on the very able manner in which he has opened up the debate for the official Opposition. I want to thank him for the compliment of referring to me as a 'two-headed coin'. There are some people who are lucky to have any head at all, let alone have two; and even those who have only one would be wise to make better use of it.

Does the member from Saltcoats (Mr. Lopton) want to say something?

Mr. Lopton (Saltcoats): — Well, a two-headed calf doesn't seem much good.

Premier Douglas: — That is not the end of the calf that the member from Saltcoats has been interested in.

The Leader of the Opposition began his address, yesterday, by deploring the fact that sometimes in this Legislature we became interested in matters pertaining to affairs at Ottawa, and he expressed a very strong hope that, in this Session, we wouldn't take the Legislature down to Ottawa. And then he spent 15 minutes visiting every Legislative Assembly in Canada. After wandering from the Atlantic to the Pacific, he finally after 15 minutes, got back to the province from which he did not want us to wander in the course of this debate.

My friend has described the Speech from the Throne as a 'lean document'. He says there is nothing in it. Well, of course, Mr. Speaker, that could be a reflection on the contents of the Speech from the Throne, or it could be a reflection on the capacity of the Leader of the Opposition to appreciate the things that are in it. Remember the fable of the blind men who were examining the elephant: one blind man got hold of the elephant's tail, and said, "An elephant is a rope." Well, the fact

that you think an elephant is a rope, doesn't make it a rope; it just indicates lack of vision to appreciate what an elephant really is. My hon. friend apparently has completely failed to understand the implication of the programs which are outlined in this Speech from the Throne. These various programs have benefited the people of this province over several years, and we believe will increasingly benefit them in the years ahead.

Some reference has been made to the recent Local Government Conference. My friend expressed regret that the official Opposition were not asked to sit in as delegates. I want to point out, first, that it has never been a practice in Canada, when the Federal Government calls a Federal-Provincial Conference in Ottawa to have the Leader of the Opposition at Ottawa sit in at the Conference. Such a Conference is presided over by the Prime Minister, and he is attended by the Ministers of his Government. It is very understandable why the Leader of the Opposition or the leader of any of the other political parties is not invited to sit in. At these Conferences, the Government must express Government policy, must outline the Government's intentions and must clarify the Government's program. That can only be done by those people who have accepted the responsibility of government, and who have a uniform policy to put before a Conference. We did, however, do what I don't think has been done at any other conference in other places. That is, we did ask all the members of the Legislature to sit in as observers, because we felt that they would get a good deal of value out of hearing the various points of view and the various suggestions made by the delegates to that Conference.

My friend has said that we take a different view with respect to taxes when we are attending a Federal-Provincial Conference than when we are attending a Local Government Conference. He said that at Ottawa we are all in favour of having the Federal Government collect certain taxes and then pay them out to the province. That part is true. Insofar as our income tax, corporation tax, succession duties are concerned, we rent them to the Federal Government. We cannot properly tax industry in our province. Sometimes head offices of companies are located in one province with branch offices all across Canada. Therefore, the taxes should be collected by a central government and paid out. That is precisely what the Provincial Government does. We collect taxes from all over Saskatchewan and then we pay out grants to local governing bodies for education, for roads, for social welfare and for a number of other services. As a matter of fact, the gentlemen opposite for years were the people who opposed that principle. At one time the Provincial Government (and it wasn't the C.C.F. Government who started it, it was a Liberal Government) collected tax on land called the Public Revenue tax, first imposed in 1917. They collected that tax on land all over the province, and then paid it out again to the people in the form of provincial services. The gentlemen opposite (not when they were in office, of course; only after they got into the opposition) were very anxious that the Provincial Government should no longer collect that tax, and that the municipalities should be allowed

to collect their own taxes. When we talked about the taxes which municipalities were collecting or could collect, we were not suggesting that they should collect these taxes. We were simply saying that here are fields of revenue into which the Provincial Government doesn't want to go. We turned over to them the Amusement Tax. The Provincial Government could collect all the amusement tax and pay it back in grants to the municipalities; but most of the municipalities have preferred to collect their own amusement tax. There is no difference of opinion. If the municipalities want to rent any tax to us and have us collect it and divide it amongst them, we are prepared to do that; but that there are taxes which the municipalities want to collect themselves is recognized and agreeable to us.

I was exceedingly glad to hear the Leader of the Opposition give such an exuberant espousal of the South Saskatchewan River Dam project. To hear him today speak on the value of the South Saskatchewan Dam and all that it could do for industry and for the stability of our economy, almost made me forget that this was the same gentleman who, speaking in Prince Albert, as reported by the "Prince Albert Herald", Wednesday, July 27, said:

"Prime Minister St. Laurent has stated that it is not in the national interest at this time, (speaking of the South Saskatchewan Dam), and I am in full agreement with him."

He went on to say:

"What would we do with the power that would be generated, and what would the farmers do with the vegetables that would grow on the irrigated land?"

Today, there are all kinds of things that could be done with the power that would be generated. But, speaking up in Prince Albert where the q is not of such paramount importance, he suggested that, instead of wasting \$60 million on the south Saskatchewan Dam, the C.C.F. Government should build a pulp and paper industry! So my friend has changed his position, and I am very glad.

Mr. McDonald: — I never said . . .

Premier Douglas: — I am very glad that he has been converted to the position that the South Saskatchewan Dam is in the national interests, that we would be able to do something with the power that was generated and that we would be able to do something with the vegetables which are grown on the irrigated land.

Mr. McDonald: — If you would get out of the way and let somebody else do it.

Premier Douglas:—May I just say a word about the South Saskatchewan Dam. My friend (I am sure it wasn't deliberate) attempted to confuse the situation by saying I had talked about the contribution we had offered to make as being 60 per cent, whereas the Provincial Treasurer had talked about 25 per cent. If my friend had examined it carefully, I think he would have noticed that I was talking about the entire project, while the Provincial Treasurer was talking about the dam itself.

Let me just re view a brief history. The South Saskatchewan dam project was first suggested by the Federal Minister of Agriculture away back about 1935. When we were first approached on the subject, the Federal Government was going to build the dam and all the supplementary works, and the only contribution the Provincial Government was asked to make was to put in the hydro-electric installation. But as time went by we were asked to assume more and more of the responsibility. We were asked to assume the responsibility for levelling the land, for the main reservoir, for the main ditches and canals, and for the lateral ditches! At no time had we been asked to make any contribution to the dam itself! That meant that even if we had accepted our responsibility for hydro-electric power, for levelling, ditches and the main reservoir, and made no contribution to the dam, we would still have paid about 40 per cent of the cost of the entire project.

In the fall of 1954, the Federal Minister of Agriculture placed before us a draft agreement, and in that draft agreement he suggested that, in addition to these things for which we should accept full responsibility, we should also accept responsibility for paying 25 per cent of the cost of the dam itself. We accepted that draft agreement and so notified the Federal Minister of Agriculture. In April, 1955, the Provincial Treasurer and myself met with the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Agriculture. We hadn't had any word from Ottawa regarding the agreement which we had accepted in principle. We were extremely disappointed when the Prime Minister then said to us, at this meeting, that, irrespective of the fact that we were prepared to assume the financial obligations outlined in the agreement which had been given to us, the Federal Government had come to the conclusion that the South Saskatchewan Dam was not in the national interest at that time, and that, therefore, irrespective of what share of the cost we might be prepared to assume, the Federal Government under no circumstances would proceed with the project.

The Provincial Treasurer said in a press statement, a short time ago;

“We are still prepared to pay the share outlined not by us but by the Federal Minister of Agriculture in the draft agreement placed before us in the fall of 1954. We are still prepared to assume the responsibility for 25 per cent of the cost of the dam itself, and 100 per cent

of the cost of these other ancillary works. That would mean a division of costs of something in the neighbourhood of \$83 million by the Provincial Government and some \$62 or \$63 million by the Federal Government.”

All of these costs, of course, are subject to change, because these estimates were made a few years ago and, undoubtedly, contractors' estimates will have risen in the interim period. But the ratio now, on the basis of the agreement put before us, would be roughly 60 per cent from the Provincial Government and 40 per cent from the Federal.

Mr. McDonald: — Pardon me, Mr. Speaker. Would the Premier permit a question? I am sorry I missed it, but I want to get those figures — \$83 million and \$60 million. Just what would that cover? You may have mentioned it, but I missed it.

Premier Douglas: — Yes, the Federal Government's \$62 or \$63 million would be 75 per cent of just the dam.

Mr. McDonald: — Yeah.

Premier Douglas: — Our \$83 million would include our share of the dam, which would be some \$21 or \$22 million, and would include the reservoirs, the main ditches and canals, levelling of the land, and the hydro-electric installation, of which we would pay 100 per cent. That is where the matter now stands, and I want to make it abundantly clear so that there will be no misunderstanding. This agreement was submitted to us; we agreed to accept it; we are still prepared to accept it. There is only one point of issue, and that is that the Prime Minister has said repeatedly in the House of commons, and outside of the House of Commons, that he is not yet convinced this project is in the national interest. The moment he is convinced that it is in the national interest, we are prepared to sit down with the Federal Government and negotiate on the basis of the financial allocation which they put before us in 1954. One of the clauses in that agreement was that each year we would pay half our share in cash and the agreement was that each year we would pay half our share in cash and the other half in Treasury Bills. That is a detail. The Federal Government prefers not to have part of it paid in Treasury Bills but to be paid in cash each year; we are prepared to discuss that with them.

Let us not lose sight of the basic issue. The question is not a matter of Treasury Bills. The question is not a matter of any basis of payment. The essential question at the present moment is: has the Federal Government finally come to the conclusion that the South Saskatchewan Dam is a project which would benefit the national economy? The Prime Minister himself put it very well in the House of Commons about eight or ten days ago — I haven't got the Hansard with me, but I can have it here tomorrow. The Prime Minister said, in effect, that the question the Federal Government has

February 19, 1957

to determine is whether the South Saskatchewan Dam would take out of the national economy more than it would put back in. And, as far as we are concerned, we have no doubt whatsoever that it will put more in than it would take out.

I noticed, for instance, in the Gordon Commission Report — and I was glad to see Dr. Stewart later clarify this in his speech in Moose Jaw; the Gordon Commission said that it could not support large scale irrigation projects at this time, because it would only add to the problem of surpluses. They did not mention the South Saskatchewan Dam, however, and that should be noted. Dr. Stewart in his speech in Moose Jaw clarified the point that the Commission was not referring to the South Saskatchewan Dam, because the South Saskatchewan Dam rather than increase surpluses would take production and put it into the production of other crops. Therefore, instead of adding to our burden of grain surpluses, it would probably help relieve the situation with respect to grain surpluses and would utilize that land for growing other kinds of crops.

This comment has been necessary because I wanted to make the Government's position abundantly clear with respect to the South Saskatchewan Dam.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is all I probably want to say at this time, and, with the consent of the House, I would like to move adjournment of the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I didn't want to interrupt my hon. friend while he was on the radio, and with your permission can I raise the point of order now, Mr. Speaker? It is in reference to the letter from which the hon. Leader of the Opposition quoted.

Mr. Speaker: — I don't think you can raise that now.

Mr. Brown (Bengough): — Well, it wasn't in reference to the letter.

Mr. Speaker: — If I allowed you to speak on it, now, you would be exhausting your right to speak in the debate.

Premier Douglas: — Probably at some time or other it might be helpful if Your Honour gave us a ruling so we could all be guided in this matter of quoting from letters. My own impression of general

parliamentary procedure is that official documents which you quote from must be tabled. With respect to private correspondence, a member is not required to table it if he accepts personal responsibility for it. I may not be right, but it might be helpful, so we are all clear on it, if at some time or other Your Honour gave us a ruling on that question.

Mr. Speaker: — It is my understanding that private correspondence need not be tabled if the member quoting from it will be responsible for the contents; in fact, that the contents are his opinions.

The Assembly then adjourned at 4:45 o'clock p.m.