

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN  
Second Session — Thirteenth Legislature  
19th Day

Tuesday, March 11, 1958

The House met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.  
On the Orders of the Day:

**DISTRIBUTION OF PAMPHLETS ON AGRICULTURE**

**Hon. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to call to the attention of the members, particularly in the light of the great interest in agriculture, to the publications that we have made available to them covering various agricultural subjects. I think they will find in these publications something of special interest, — I know the hon. member for Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) will be interested.

I would like to mention, too, that there is one pamphlet here that should be of interest to all members, and that is the care and development of the beef sire.

The only further comment I want to make is that a little care in handling the bull is always good advice!

**GALLERY VISITORS**

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, may I draw the attention of the House to the fact that we have some visitors in the gallery. We have the students from Grades XI and XII of the high school at Ceylon, with their teacher, Mr. Forrester. I would like to express the hope, which I am sure will be shared by all members, that they will enjoy their visit here, and that they will get a great deal of value out of watching the procedures of the Legislature.

**WELCOME TO VISITORS**

**Mr. Gardiner (Melville):** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to extend a welcome also, to about 70 students who are in the Speaker's gallery — half of a them are Grade XII students from the town of Melville, the others being VIII and IX students, from the town of Lemberg.

**March 11, 1958**

I would like to take this opportunity of extending to them a welcome on behalf of the members of the Legislature, and I would also like to mention to the Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Bentley) that I think it was very nice of me to bring them down on the day that he was going to address the Legislature. I am sure he will appreciate that act.

### **TISDALE SCHOOL UNIT**

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd (Minister of Education):** — Mr. Speaker, I am sure the members of the Legislature will be interested to know that, the Tisdale School Unit, on Friday of last week, completed its 5 1/2 year trial period and is now on a permanent basis. There were no petitions received, and there were not even any requests for petitions for a vote in the whole area.

I would like to take the opportunity of congratulating the Unit Board on the work it has done and the local board and the people, for the fine co-operation they have given to the Unit.

### **BUDGET DEBATE**

The House resumed from Monday, March 10, 1958, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer):

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair. (The Assembly to go into Committee of Supply).

**Hon. Mr. Bentley (Minister of Social Welfare):** — Mr. Speaker, I first want to express my sincere thanks to the Premier and the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) for having invited a number of my contemporaries in to hear me today. It's a very good thing when we young people get together once in a while, and I am happy to welcome you here.

You will recall that last evening, when the debate was adjourned, I had spent a little time correcting some of the misimpressions that our friends across the way appear to be labouring under. I had advised the hon. member for Wolseley-Qu'Appelle (Mr. McFarlane) that if he would look up the statement of the arrears of taxes, he would find that farmers were very ready to pay their taxes on time when they have the wherewithal to do it with. But in the Federal field, where the authority and the responsibility lies to see that they do have the wherewithal, for many years no action had been taken to provide them, and consequently the arrears of taxes developed because farmers are unable to get enough money to pay. I am sure that the statement that I drew his attention to, will be convincing to anybody, that the minute the farmers have enough money they will start paying up those arrears, and will reduce them, as is shown they had done in that statement, from the bad years to the good years.

I would also draw the same to the attention of the hon. and lovely from Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) who dealt with much the same matters. I had also mentioned to the House that Crown Corporations, as operated by this Government, had no way interfered with private enterprise, that in each case — and in fact the only two cases where private enterprise had been purchased by this Government to become Crown Corporations, the owners had been paid. I also mentioned that insofar as the Liberal and Tory governments at Ottawa are concerned, they had no hesitation in taking over companies and forming Crown Corporations, but they only did it in the case of their largest one, the C.N.R., in order to protect the bond holders and had continually, since its inception, voted large sums of public money to pay the deficit to see that the bond holders were paid from the public treasury in the years that the C.N.R. did not earn its operating expenses.

This afternoon I first want to join in most heartily in congratulating all those who have taken part in this debate up to this time. I know each one has done his or her best to expose to the public gaze his or her philosophy, and I assume with all that have spoken they have meant what they said, and therefore support the philosophy that is inherent in the kind of speeches that were made. I congratulate them.

I most particularly want to congratulate you, sir, on the high office that you hold and the way you are discharging your duties. I want to congratulate the Premier for the very excellent opening speech he made in the Legislature, and which he told the fundamental beliefs of the C.C.F., and to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) who, throughout the years has, to my personal knowledge, performed his duties in a manner which will cause him to be remembered as one of the most honoured, able and respected citizens of this province.

I am aware that I must not quote from speeches made in other debates, but as I said last night, while I was compelled to be idle for a while, I did listen, and I gained some impressions. The impressions that I gained were that there were a great many inconsistencies on the other side of the House.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Is that what you call it?

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — I remember both in this debate and in others, reference has been made to government in business, and we are condemned for that, and it is called unwarranted for the government to be in business. Yet I distinctly remember one member of the Opposition, after condemning our policies, which he called 'Socialistic' and which were going to interfere with private enterprise, suggesting that we should build plants for the storage of poultry products which,

**March 11, 1958**

of course, is a distinct interference with private business, this being a field for a private or a co-operative enterprise. It has been suggested also in this House that we have become senile before we became wise.

**Mr. McDonald:** — That was in the Throne Speech debate!

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, when a comment of that kind is made from over there — and I have no doubt that whoever made the suggestion felt that it was so. Senility indicates at least, at one time in your life, you were normal. So I suggest that some hon. members never have been, and never will be normal, and this is very evident on the other side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, we don't claim great wisdom; we're just plain, ordinary people, picked out of the rank and file of the ordinary people of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. McDonald (Leader of the Official Opposition):** — They're not all that bad!

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — . . . in spite of the fact that we have been advised not to remember the dirty 'thirties, I cannot forget them, Mr. Speaker. I remember them well.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Here we go!

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — I remember the dirty depression after World War I. I remember the dirty depression before World War I. I remember the depression of 1907, when young people such as I was at that time, were tramping the streets, in slush up to our knees and ankles, looking for jobs, lining up at the Salvation Army for soup and bread once a day, not because we would not work, but because the country would not provide work for young Canadian citizens.

We remember other things. We remember the protection that has always been given since Canada became a Confederation, to the industries in the central provinces. The reluctance of both Liberal and Tory governments to give even a little protection to the farmers on the prairie or the farmers anywhere, for that matter.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — What of your labour friends?

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — We remember the long and the bitter struggle for orderly marketing of our cereal products. Don't anyone in the Opposition think that I should not remember those things. I was in the thick of that fight all the years. I remember where the opposition to those orderly marketing schemes came from. Now it is an accepted fact, the bulk of farmers in Saskatchewan would not want anything

but orderly marketing, but, it was a rough and tumble fight to get it across both Liberal and Tory governments, Mr. Speaker, who were most reluctant to interfere with the private speculative grain growers.

I can remember the speech by the Hon. R.B. Bennett, when he was Prime Minister of Canada. When people who were trying to have orderly marketing and other important social reforms introduced in this country, he made a speech in Toronto, where he said that people who were not satisfied with the situation that exists are traitors to their country and the 'iron heel' of authority must be placed in the face of people of this kind. I remember his "iron heel" speech.

I remember Section 98 of the Criminal Code and the long struggle there was before it was finally taken off the Statutes in Canada. I remember Mr. Mackenzie King's show, made just a few years previous to R.B. Bennett's 'iron heel' speech, where he stated "not a five-cent piece to any provincial government for its assistance, that does not agree with the Liberal policies which I expound".

I remember the Rt. Hon. J.G. Gardiner . . .

**Mr. Cameron:** — You are senile now.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — . . . his attempts, in 1939 to have the Wheat Board payments reduced from 80 cents to 60 cents a bushel.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — How about your father?

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — I remember the moral and trades support given by both Liberal and Tory parties to Hitler's Germany, Mussolini's Italy, and Tojo's Japan.

**Mr. Cameron:** — Oh, for Pete's sake!

**Mr. McDonald:** — You are nuts!

**Mr. Gardiner:** — What did your father say about it?

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — I remember the refusal of the Liberal Government to conscript wealth for total war against aggressors prior and during the early days of World War II.

I remember the charge that the C.C.F.'s were a Nazi Party. Our friends across the way, and their colleagues have never failed to apply to us whatever term is most appropriate at the time. They did it then, and they do it now. We remember the many delinquencies of those senile and unwise parties, Tories and Liberals, who have always

**March 11, 1958**

put party welfare first and the welfare of Canada second.

**Mr. McDonald:** — That's too low for a comment, even.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — I remember the basic philosophy of the C.C.F., which is 'Humanity First'. We are opposed to the philosophy of both Liberals and Tories, which is profits first, particularly profits from the suppliers of their campaign funds.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Your radio time's up!

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Now, in accordance with our philosophy of 'humanity first', every budget presented by our treasurer has provided for the basic needs of Saskatchewan people in generous measure. This one is no exception. Over \$66 million out of \$104 million of ordinary expenditures are provided for education, health and welfare. No other provincial government in Canada devotes such a generous share of its funds for humanity. Possibly someone will say that that is an exaggerated statement. Well, I happen to have a statement from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. Their financial statistics of provincial governments, 1957, and it discusses the net general expenditure estimate of the various provinces. Because there have been comparisons made here between Manitoba, Alberta, British Columbia and Saskatchewan, I have extracted from that report some pertinent figures, and those figures will be available to anybody who cares to look up the same source. But those figures indicate this, Mr. Speaker, that for the year under review, March 31 1958, the government of Manitoba devoted 39 per cent of its expenditures for the three humanities — education, health and welfare. The province of Alberta devoted 45 per cent of its very large and rich budget for the humanities, education, health and welfare. The province of British Columbia, a tremendously wealthy province, rated next to the province of Ontario in wealth, devotes 43 per cent of its budget in that year under review to the humanities, education, health and welfare. I would like our hon. friends on the opposite side to remember those figures, and if they wish to check them, they can look up the source.

The Opposition continually cry that we provide no help for municipalities. Now, apart from the help that is provided in other departments which have been explained here by other speakers on this side of the House, and which are of no small consideration, or should not be considered small from a municipal point of view, the Department of Social Welfare has assumed a tremendous share of what is properly under the legislation of the province of Saskatchewan, the responsibility of local governments. Now, when I said the responsibility under legislation, I would like to point this out, that we had a Liberal Government in this province from 1905 to 1944, during which period of time the municipal governments or areas were created. Municipalities are creatures of the provincial government. Under the legislation in creating them, certain duties were handed to the local governments, which is proper. One of those duties, and you will find if you check

the City Act, the Town Act, the Village Act and The Rural Municipalities' Act, one of the duties and responsibilities which was to fall on local governments was the relief of the poor, and those in need.

This Government has gradually assumed most of that load, as far as the municipalities are concerned. Before this Government came in, there were relief measures, but there were no planned provision for the relief of those people. There was nothing on the Statute Books that said relief or social aid will be provided for the people in the municipalities, when they need it, under basic and planned and well-documented and prepared formulas. All that happened was that, under pressure, when they were compelled to help the municipality out with some of its relief expenditures, the whole works was done by special warrant, and no special planning or provision was considered. But since 1944 there has been a great change in that. This Government has now assumed, through a Department of Social Welfare and other departments, financial, administrative and service responsibilities, and in the field of public welfare, that is done through my Department.

I would like to give the Legislature some information on some of our major programs. I haven't the time — I understand my friend from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) and my friend from Willowbunch (Mr. Klein) will follow me with their time today, and I assure them that I will not encroach on their time. So if I am brief in my explanations, it is because I have regard for their rights to speak.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — We'll take it as read.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Now, this was the first government to supplement allowances, and to give complete health care to old-age pensioners. This is still provided for the old-age security pensioners on a means test, that is, those over 70 years of age. Supplemental allowances for old-age security and blind persons will cost approximately \$1,170,000 in the coming year. There were no such provisions in the year 1944, Mr. Speaker, nor prior to that time. If municipalities still have to accept the responsibilities that they had, under the Acts, provided by former Liberal Governments that created the municipalities of this province, they would have to assume that loan. Or, if they didn't assume it, then the people who need that assistance would simply have to go destitute. That's the alternative there would be, failing what this Government has done. This Government shares with the Federal Government 25 per cent of the basic blind person's allowances, in addition to supplemental allowances and medical and hospital care. And we share 50 per cent of the old-age assistance and disabled persons' allowances with the Federal Government, and we have repeatedly told the Federal Government that any time they are prepared to increase that amount, we will be willing to accept our

**March 11, 1958**

share as our responsibility, and we have done so on two occasions recently. The first small increase that was made last July by the Liberals before going out of office, we accepted without question, and the next one granted by the new Government in November, we accepted also. It wasn't very much either, but we were happy for both increases, and are glad.

Now then, the net cost of that to the Provincial Government will be well over \$2 million. In addition to this, the Department of Public Health provides hospitalization for the old-age assistance groups through the Department of Public Health, and the municipalities are relieved of all this expenditure. I would like to draw this matter to the attention, as I did last night, of the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Elias), whom I know, as I said last night and I still believe it, would not want to arrive at any conclusions of his own, even for his own purpose, unless he was satisfied in his own mind that he had considered every factor which would bring him to that conclusion. I am sure he would want to give consideration to these things that I am saying today, when considering the percentage of provincial revenue that goes to the assistance of municipalities, as it was in 1943 as opposed to the present time, which was the subject of his discussion the other day.

The Provincial Government is providing \$2,080,000 odd for mothers' allowances, plus the full range of medical and hospital services. When I say the full range, I mean the full range — for the mother, her children and her disabled husband, if she has one. At the moment it is possible for a mothers' allowance case to receive \$170 a month. A mother and one child starts at \$60 plus the other services I have just mentioned, and goes up by \$10 a child so that a mother could conceivably now, if she has 10 children and a disabled husband, receive \$170 a month, plus all the medical services I have mentioned, and the hospital services, for herself and her family which, Mr. Speaker, if that were left to the municipalities to provide as the legislation on the statute books say is their responsibility, then they would have to assume that load themselves, or these people, these families, would be left to perish.

Obviously, anyone who thinks at all, must realize that this is a tremendous help to municipalities, because municipal councillors, be they urban or rural, are human beings, and if they were faced with a number of families that presently are receiving mothers' allowances and other forms of public assistance, who were in need, and they found the coffers of the municipality not sufficient to provide them with those needs, many of those councillors would be broken-hearted, and the result is that now, because this Government assumes that, their hearts are not broken — their hearts are glad, in the knowledge that these people are being cared for.



The Government has always helped the municipalities in regard to social aid, and I might say in the case of any of these other categories I have just passed over, that, in addition, at some period of the year, some condition arises that shows that one of these families or persons required some extra care, that can also be a part of the social aid program, of which the Provincial Government will share in the amounts that I am going to mention.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — Pretty good reader!

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — My hon. friend from Cannington (Mr. McCarthy) grunts and groans a little bit, whenever something is said that he doesn't like, but I must remind him that he is about the same age as myself. He is a contemporary of mine, and he should remember these things. Possibly he is both retarded and senile. I don't know, but he lived in the same period of time and consequently should know exactly what I am talking about, and I think he does. But sitting where he does sit, of course, it is impossible for him to admit it openly, he has to have someone . . .

**Mr. McCarthy:** — It wasn't me!

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Before the Federal Government began to assume any share of the social aid costs, this Provincial Government provided 50 per cent of all social aid issued by local governments. However, when the Federal Government finally got around to accept some share of its responsibility for unemployed people, and eventually brought out an unemployment assistance agreement which this province signed with them, then that brought in extra revenue under the unemployment assistance. Immediately that was done, this Government increased their share that it would pay to old-age, or rather to social aid recipients through municipalities, to 75 per cent. Now then, most of the people, or a large number of the people on social aid who had municipal residence, are being provided by the municipality and billing the Provincial Government for 75 per cent. The many hundreds who have no municipal residence are being paid for at 100 per cent by the Provincial Government. Let no one say, Mr. Speaker, that this Government is making no contribution to the municipalities of this country.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Nobody ever said that.

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — We are making a great contribution, and the latter point that I mentioned just now on social aid will have a net cost of well over \$1 million to the Provincial Government in the coming year.

**March 11, 1958**

Now, the House might be interested in just a little brief comment as regards children. We have approximately 2,000 children in our care nearly every day. It varies from 1,950 to 2,100 and so on, but it is in the neighbourhood of 2,000 continuously who are in the Minister's care. They have to be cared for. The cost of caring for them will be \$786,000.

There is an occasional court order, requiring a municipal government to make a contribution to the welfare and maintenance of the child that is placed in our care. It is never more than \$3.50 a week, which doesn't anything like pay the cost of the maintenance of a child these days. The Government pays the balance. But beyond that, if there were enough court orders in a municipality for the maintenance of its children that would bring the taxation up over one mill, then the municipality's responsibility ceases after one mill of taxation, and the Provincial Government picks up the balance, besides the amount over the \$3.50. I think that again should be considered as something that this Government does for municipalities.

Another matter with regard to child welfare is that, under The Child Welfare Act, no municipality is required to make any contribution, even by a court order, after the child reaches the age of 16. We continue to look after those children until they become 21 or until they become self-supporting. Some get married, some proceed with higher education, for a variety of reasons. Some will become, as I say, self-supporting. If they wish to continue education, and indicate that they have an ability and a desire, and the capacity to absorb the education, we care for those children until they are 21 years of age. This doesn't happen under Liberal rule, Mr. Speaker, and when anyone in the Opposition of either party in the Opposition say that no contribution is made to the beyond what they will pick out as municipal grants, or something, is plainly an indication that they are not absorbing the information that is available to them through the various documents and reports from this House.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — We can read!

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — I would like to mention one other thing. Child welfare at one time was charged against the local government by the previous governments, and a great deal of money was owed by them to the government when we took office. Up to date we have written off something over \$75,000, I believe, of these accounts, that have been collectable under the Liberal rule.

I mentioned the amount it would cost to service these children. It must never be forgotten, and when you have a family of 2,000 children, it is just the same as a family of five or six children —

every one of them must be looked after. Somebody that knows how must look after them. They haven't got parents to do it. In most cases; it may be they are in institutions, some of them, and many of them are in foster homes or in other places, but they must be serviced and counselled and assisted by our people. The consequence is we have to keep a staff of people who are trained for that sort of thing, who have the nature and the philosophy of child care and child affection within and the necessary spirit to be able to provide the kind of service, and these people must be paid, of course. The actual administration cost of this service is comparatively low, at \$39,000, but the money, of course, spent for salaries for those who do service them is very considerable, and the total amount we pay in child welfare would be well over \$1 million.

We also have other things and other people we must care for, in two different types of situations of large size. We have four geriatric centres. Geriatric centres were formerly known as nursing homes, but because they are devoted to the care and treatment of people who suffer from old-age illnesses, apart from senility, Mr. Speaker — and even sometimes that is added to their other afflictions, they are mostly bedfast or chairfast for the constant nursing care, and this means we have to have good places for them to be in. I think everybody here has now seen the new centre out here on the Legislative grounds, and I think most people in the north have seen, the one at Melfort. They have seen the one at Saskatoon, which is not as new as the others, and they have seen the one at Wolseley. I would like to mention the one at Wolseley, if I may, because it is the only one we inherited from the Liberal Government in 1944, and the provision made for it at that time was for its operation. That meant that the wages were low and the service was low. As a matter of fact, it was referred to as a 'poor house' mostly, and that is what it was.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Aw, baloney! Baloney!

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — This Government has expanded a program from that centre, that poor house at Wolseley, until now the net expenditure of this Government for these centres will be over \$900,000. That is the net from the provincial treasury, which will go into the operation of these homes, because they are necessary for the care of these people, a direct relief to the municipalities concerned, or a direct relief to the people because if the municipality couldn't give this kind of service, then the people themselves would be living in destitution and misery.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — You ought to be ashamed of yourself!

**March 11, 1958**

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — I would like to say something about, if I had time, our housing for the aged, but will suffice it to say this, that we have made grants, unconditional grants, grants that do not have to be paid back, to municipal organizations and other organizations to assist in building low-rental and good housing for aged people. Forty-three of these projects, and those that are presently in operation and another 600,000 odd will be provided in the coming year and will be making room for about another 4,000 people in this category. Plus that there will be 230,000 in maintenance grants, also.

We also have the correctional institutions, Mr. Speaker, which we are responsible for, and when I say correctional institutions, I don't mean caves where we put an offender behind bars, and keep them there in a state of vegetation and resentment until such time as their sentence expires. I mean correction institutions where the inmates are given every opportunity to receive training which will make it possible for them to be received in the community again, as workmen.

I would like to say, just in conclusion, that it would surprise this Legislature and the public, if they knew the number of good employers that worked with us and who absorb into their institutions people we have trained in our correction institutions, and our gaols, and have come out and have, through our collaboration with employers, found their way back into society. These are confidential matters so I cannot divulge them, Mr. Speaker. I have now exhausted about one more minute of my time. I regret it, but you will understand of course, that I am happy to support this budget.

**Mr. Karl F. Klein (Notukeu-Willowbunch):** — Mr. Speaker, in my opening remarks, I would like to also congratulate those who have participated in this debate at this time. I feel everyone has made a sincere effort and a fine contribution to the debate thus far. I would like in particular, to congratulate the financial critic (Mr. Cameron) for the fine job that he made in reply. The effectiveness of his speech can best be judged by the ineffectiveness of the rebuttal made by the Minister of the Bureau of Publications when he tried to refute some of the arguments that day. Even after sleeping on that speech, the arguments next day did not get too much stronger. At the same time that I extend my congratulations to the financial critic, I would like to extend my sympathies to the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines). I do this, not so much because of the words that have been said from this side of the House, but because of the words that have been expressed by some of the members of the Government on that side of the House.

The Premier proudly announced in the House last week an industry that was coming in the city, expending some \$800,000 in capital, and which was going to provide employment for quite a number of people, and I think we were all very pleased to hear that was taking place. Then, about a day or two later, the member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) got up and very vociferously said that these monopolies, these capitalists, these private enterprisers, they are the enemies of the worker, and of the farmer. Now, when I looked across at the Provincial Treasurer's face at that moment, I saw a very pained expression upon it, and for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I extend my sincere sympathies to him.

I was very pleased last week to hear the Minister of Highways (Hon. J.T. Douglas) say that he is now prepared to construct the road linking LaFleche and Gravelbourg. Just a plain announcement does not tell the whole story. He finally decided to take over that road which links two main highways, after the people in that area presented him with briefs, made representations to him, and the briefs by the way, were very sound. Anything that was used in the briefs could not be refuted, and they finally threatened that if this Provincial Government didn't do anything about that road, they would simply leave it to go to ruin, and that they were not prepared to do anything with it. Therefore, because the bus uses that road, it made it quite inconvenient to travel any other road, and so those were perhaps some of the factors that made him decide that perhaps now the Provincial Government should do something about taking over the building and maintenance of that road. I am very pleased that they have done so, but the fact that he has done that on this particular road, throws the question of these secondary highways, as they are called, wide-open once again. This is not the only road of its nature in that area. There is another one which is exactly like it. I hope that before these other roads are given consideration, they will not have to send in petitions, make representations, raise Cain, and finally get his submission.

The fact that people are protesting this type of road, I think, very well, indicates that the whole policy of the Government in regard to roads, secondary highways and grid roads, is completely wrong. If it were right, then you would not get the complaints and the threats from the municipalities that are presently being made.

I would also like to say a few words on behalf of those people who are devoting themselves so energetically and so unselfishly to the purpose of setting up, as they are now called, lodges for the old folks. The one I have in mind, in particular, is the Pioneer Lodge in Assiniboia, which is starting into operation now, and I believe they have already taken in the first residents of that lodge. But we must

**March 11, 1958**

take into consideration some of the difficulties that these people who earnestly worked for this lodge are faced with, and they are mainly financial ones. First of all, there is a tremendous effort on the part of the people who organized, and decided to build a lodge of this nature; it is a tremendous effort to raise the finances of building incurred, and in helping to build these lodges the Government is paying approximately 20 per cent capital cost for construction. That help was appreciated, but nevertheless 80 per cent must be raised by other means, and practically every charitable organization in the vicinity, and in that whole area, had to tax themselves, put on fund-raising campaigns, in order to achieve the goal that we so much desire, namely that we have these pioneer lodges within our area.

Secondly, after the Lodge is in operation, I feel that the carrying on of the lodge is going to be quite an expense to the people responsible for it. They would like to set up what we call in navy language a 'sick bay' — I don't know what you would call it in civilian language, but it is a place where people can come and receive treatment for minor ailments. When people are old, it is quite logical that they will have to be treated from day to day, and some of these people will have to be perhaps administered to by a nurse. It is not practical to send these old people away downtown to see a doctor every time they have an ailment, and so in order to increase the service to the people in these lodges, they decided that they should hire a full-trained nurse to administer the small, you might say, cures, or whatever they need at that particular time.

Again, in this matter of hiring and paying for nurses, they can receive no assistance at all. So the big burden is going to be how to carry on after the home has been constructed, and provide the facilities. Here again I think the Government's attitude towards pioneer lodges, and other private lodges of this nature, is entirely wrong. When we consider that it costs in the Nursing Home, approximately \$4.50 a day roughly per patient, and then you look at what a private home gets, per bed per year — that is a meagre grant indeed, especially when you consider that, in the Nursing Home, it costs \$4.50 per day per patient. The people in the various districts of the province do not wish to send their people who have devoted their entire lives, to developing a community; they are expending their energies in that community, and then when they get old we are to send them off to some institution far removed from the people that they have associated themselves with, all their lives. It seems rather a cruel fate to any person who is growing old and who some day may not be able to take care of himself. We should be giving more thought to helping out these people who are devoting so much of their time and energy and effort towards the accommodation for our old senior citizens right within their own community.

Because the farm problem seems to be the darkest picture in this year's budget, it has come up for considerable amount of discussion from practically every angle. I note that the members of the Government are freely and glibly advocating price control as one of the means of eliminating the price-cost squeeze of the farmer. In a few moments it would be impossible to deal with the complexities of price control, but in order to indicate some of the complexities of price control, I would like to raise a few questions with regard to price control. In applying it in terms of the farmer, I would like to ask, where do you start price control? Are you going to control only the price of machinery? Are you going to control the price of the tractor, the truck, the car? Are you going to control the price of the fridge that the farmer buys; his TV set that he buys, or indeed, are you going to control the price of the farm-wife's lipstick? Where do you start, and where do you end? Or do you propose to have a price control for one segment of our nation, and not for the other?

Further instances where this business of price control, high-sounding as it may be, runs into severe complications is that how do you determine and assess when the product is selling at its proper price? In setting the price that it should sell, do you consider the quality of the thing, or can it be any quality, and you are going to control this price accordingly? It is an interesting study, and particularly when you read of the dilemma that England was in after the last war, because of price controls. After all, if you are going to institute price controls, someone will have to go in and see that you are administering price controls, and as I said, are you going to have an inspector go around and see if a machine company is selling any article on the farm at the proper price? Are you going to see that the housewife gets her butcher knife at the proper price? How do you administer this thing? It's much too complex; and furthermore, I think the Government is not sincere in advocating price controls. They have never instituted price control in this province, where they have in many instances the jurisdiction to do so. It's just something now, because there is a Federal election on, because farmers are in a cost-price squeeze, and which will have a good vote-catching slogan "price control". But they don't tell the whole story behind price control here in the House, or elsewhere. The editor of 'The Commonwealth', though, does give the complete story of price control. He says this:

"The only possible way to stop private business from profiteering so that the general public can obtain an equitable share of what is produced is by a system of planning and price controls, similar to that in effect during the last war. The catch in this, however,

**March 11, 1958**

is that private business would, to a large extent, refuse to produce if such an effective ceiling was placed upon their profits."

"So the answer is that, where necessary, we must move towards public ownership of key industries, so that production can be carried on for the good of the people and so that the unspeakable chaos of unemployment and depression can be permanently avoided. Price control means Socialism and public ownership."

So I think when you are advocating price control, you might as well tell the whole story, not just glibly advocate price control and sit back and say, "That will cure all your ills." As indicated, some of the complexities of price controls are too numerous to mention at this time.

One thing that has struck me as very amusing and perhaps very important, as far as Members of the Government are concerned, is that after 25 years of C.C.F.'ism we now have this desperate attempt going on within their ranks to salvage the ship. The other day we had a plea from the Minister of Public Health (Hon. Mr. Erb), pleading with the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) to "please do not desert us now. Give us a little more of your time; stay with us and enjoy a long and fruitful public life". This plea, Mr. Speaker, was more than just an earnest plea. It was an SOS — a distress signal to save the ship!

**Premier Douglas:** — At least we've got a ship!

**Mr. Klein:** — You might not have, but I shall try to help you salvage it! When we review the whole system, the whole C.C.F. organization from the time of 1933, I think practically everybody realizes that the C.C.F. years were very fortunate to get two men at the helm — one an able financier, the other an able mouthpiece. Now, a financier, according to a deft definition that I read, is a good figure manipulator, and in that role the Provincial Treasurer was extremely successful. He led and steered that C.C.F. ship on its course, and he gave them quite a few inspirations and thoughts, and the mouthpiece has spouted out the product of the brains of the organization.

Now, this Finance Minister is going to quit, so that leaves us the mouthpiece. In the lives of some men, it happens to be either their good fortune, or their misfortune, to enjoy a lofty realm far superior to us lowly mortals, and they have enjoyed a realm where no other person made invade. This lofty realm they enjoy reminds



me ever so much of the eagle that, for centuries now, has enjoyed a lofty realm which has never been invaded by any other bird. This eagle, when he noticed any other birds soaring through the lofty height which he had attained would swoop down upon them and destroy them so that they would not be a threat to his realm. Unfortunately though there comes a time when most people — even the eagle, meets an obstacle which causes their downfall, and this is what happened to the so-called dying eagle when its realm was invaded by the aeroplane. This is a description of the dying eagle after this glittering object had entered into his realm:

"A light had gone out from his languished eyes, His head was tucked within the hunch of his shoulders; his feathers were dull and bedraggled. The tips of his wings sprawled down to the edge of his tail. He was old, yet it was not his age which made him roost on the crags like a rain-drenched raven, on the branch of an oak in November, there was a tonight — for there was an hour to go before sun-set, and iron had entered his soul which bereft him of his pride and his realm; had struck him today. That crag had been his throne — space was his empire, bounded only by forest and sky and the flowing horizon. He had outfought, outlived all his rivals, and the eagle sat now poised over his glaciers or charting the coastal outlines of clouds — they were his by descent. They had been tumbled out of their rockiness by his mate . . ."

So it was with the Premier. At that unfortunate time in his life when the iron of Mossbank had entered his soul. After enjoying this lofty realm as a great debater at least in the minds of some people he had not met his Waterloo. Along came this shining, glittering object that has destroyed its effectiveness as the C.C.F. mouthpiece. It can best be summed up, I think, in a cartoon that appeared shortly after the debate, and here it is, Mr. Speaker: "This is the Might Casey; he is dragging his heavy badge of Socialism back into the C.C.F. dug-out, and the caption is "Might Casey Struck Out".

**Mr. Kramer (The Battlefords):** — What did happen?

**Mr. Klein:** — Now that we have no more mouthpiece, and now that the Provincial Treasurer — the brains of the organization is going to quit — we find ourselves in this unfortunate position of having to try and find replacements for them. Now, when you look over that crowd there for replacements, if you look in the front row you see some pretty worn and weary veterans, grey of hair, bald of head . . .

**Mr. Howe:** — Take a look . . .

**March 11, 1958**

**Mr. Klein:** — . . . pretty nearly every description.

**Hon. Mr. Erb:** — We'd rather have bald heads than empty ones!

**Mr. Klein:** — It's small wonder, Mr. Speaker, that they are war-weary. I'd be pretty weary too.

**Premier Douglas:** — We should be weary, listening to you.

**Mr. Klein:** — Anybody would be weary, especially now that they have to try and explain away the law of supply and demand. So then we have to look further back in the other rows for some of the younger element, and what do you see there?

**Hon. Mr. Brown:** — A lot more than you see over there.

**Mr. Klein:** — What do you see? I'd hate to have to make the pick from that lot over there to replace the mouthpiece and the financier. It's going to be a desperate task, and yet if they aren't replaced, then this animal is now 25 years old, I think and is well on the way to disintegration — fortunately for us.

My time is nearing conclusion, but, I wanted to deal for a moment with the budgets in general, and when you speak of budgets, I think before you can try and solve and cure economic ills, you must take a look at what has gone before and what you think may happen in future. Throughout the entire period of history, we see that many orators came to the fore; many people with principles have preceded us, so much so that we feel like rank amateurs in the game of trying to decide the fate of the nations. Yet, in spite of the many principles and policies that have been advocated, we find our history books filled with nations that have come and gone. It wasn't the money that was spent, or the amount of money that was contained in the hands of these nations that caused their ruination, or success. There was something deeper, more fundamental, than the amount of money expended, and I think that without exception, if you dig down you'll find that most nations were destroyed because they suddenly adopted false principles, and because there was a decay in the morality and corruption set in. People became adverse to work, in many instances; people waited to make quick gains, and such it was during the period in the French revolution. Granted the conditions were severe. We had different classes, but instead of people trying to correct the institutions of the society, of that day, they adopted high-sounding phrases such as, 'liberty', 'equality', 'fraternity' and because some fanatics or radicals, you might call them, preached this to the group who were hungry and out of work, we had one of the bloodiest blots of our history books, and that same thing has been repeated in many other cases, over and over again. It should, I think, be a warning to us, because we have

created the self-same monster right here in this province some 25 to 30 years ago. This monster, in its infancy, because of its preaching this gospel of hatred that C.C.F.'ers like to peddle, namely that the financiers, the capitalists, the monopolies are the enemies of the workers, and of the farmers, we had the first semblance of a minor revolution in this province which had to be stopped here in Regina. They took up the slogan, "Let us march on to Ottawa!"

I can also agree with the Minister of Public Health (Hon. Mr. Erb) when he stated the other day that Tories and grasshoppers are synonymous with hard times — I think it was something to that effect.

**Hon. Mr. Erb:** — I said the Price Stabilization Bill is synonymous . . .

**Mr. Klein:** — You said Tories and grasshoppers are synonymous with hard times. I agree fully with that statement, and we could easily find ourselves in the same predicament we were here in the 'thirties, if we are foolish enough to elect this Tory Government to run Ottawa. If they should inflict this recession or depression in our country here, we could easily find ourselves in a very dangerous situation. When we realize that thousands, perhaps a million men would be unemployed, would have nowhere to turn for finance, and that they have had nowhere to turn for even their basic needs such as food, shelter and clothing — those men's minds would be very open to some high-sounding phrase and slogan. There are some factions in our society that could easily set off the spark to start a great conflagration, as we have seen it in other past phases of history.

So at all cost we must avoid another depression. What are the factions in our society that will supply the spark? The people that will supply the spark are these 'jackasses' I call them, that go around the country preaching this gospel of hatred, that monopolies, invested interests, private enterprise are the enemies of the worker and of the farmer, and those 'jackasses' exist, Mr. Speaker, in all levels of our society here in Canada. Some exist at our Universities; some within the ranks of labour, and some may even sit in this very House that we are in today.

**Hon. Mr. Erb:** — To your left, Mr. Speaker!

**Mr. Klein:** — So, when we try to assess just what might be done to cure economic ills, I think we should not promote or preach this gospel of hatred, but we must rather accept the attitude and adopt the attitude that labour and management are not opponents, they are not enemies, but they must work together as a team.

**March 11, 1958**

We must work to that aim of trying to define the responsibilities of capital, if you like, towards labour, and we must define the responsibilities of labour towards capitalism. I think only in that way can we establish a society which is at peace with each other, and will be prosperous.

Because this budget speech is an outward expression of the inward Socialism, I cannot support the motion.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas (Minister of Highways):** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the hon. member stated that I have promised to rebuild the Gravelbourg-LaFleche road. I made no such statement; I simply referred to it. I said it would probably be taken into the provincial highway system in the next fiscal year.

**Hon. Mr. Walker (Attorney General):** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who just spoke referred to an address given by the Provincial Secretary in this debate. I want to draw your attention to the fact that I have not spoken on this debate.

**Mr. Danielson (Arm River):** — Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon we had a lecture handed to this side of the House by the sage from Estevan (Mr. Thorson) — a man who knows all about parliamentary procedure and customs all over the world; and he gave us a lecture that we didn't know how to act as an Opposition; that we didn't have any solution for the problems, and all that sort of thing. What I think about him is that he is suffering from an overdose of C.C.F. propaganda. It has given him indigestion — C.C.F. indigestion and sometimes (he is still a young man) there is hope for him yet. Sometime when he goes down there tell him to stop in at Weyburn and have a little check-up.

**Premier Douglas:** — That is a sage remark for a man of your age.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Now, here is the man that sucks the lollipops and shakes the rattle. He has started to shake the rattle right now, and he will be keeping on as long as I am here, and that might be until 10 o'clock.

**Premier Douglas:** — I'm not going any place. Go right ahead.

**Mr. Danielson:** — It doesn't make any difference whether you are here or any place else; you don't count any more, anyway.

But, Mr. Speaker, what are the facts? An Opposition's duty in a House of this kind, in the Parliament of the British Empire, and in every place elsewhere they have a parliamentary procedure, is not to formulate policies; the duty of the opposition is to Oppose, and nothing else. We have a government here to formulate policies, and it is only because they are barren of any policies that my friend over there thinks we should help them out. Well, we are not going to do that.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, I will read to you: Edward Stanley, the Earl of Derby, stated in the House of Commons in London, England, June 4, 1941:

"When I first came into Parliament, Mr. Tierney, a great Whig authority, used always to say that the duty of an Opposition was very simple — it was to oppose everything and propose nothing."

**Hon. Mr. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture):** — Fits you perfectly!

**Mr. Danielson:** — That's all right. That shows how bankrupt you are. Sir Winston Churchill, Mr. Speaker, in quoting Lord Randolph Churchill's statement: "The duty of an Opposition is to oppose". That is Mr. Churchill. I don't know whether he thinks he is a great authority on parliamentary procedure or parliamentary practice, or not.

I have one here from Anthony Eden, but it is a lengthy one, and I am not going to read it. But from a statement which was printed in Great Britain — it is called 'Cabinet Government', second edition, page 464, and it says this:

"Attacks upon the Government and upon individual Ministers are the functions of the Opposition. The duty of the Opposition is to oppose. It adopts Sir Toby's advice: 'So soon as ever thou see'st him, draw, and as thou drawest, swear horrible'. That duty is the major check which the constitution provides upon corruption and defective administration."

**Some Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — So you see, if he wants to, he still has a chance to redeem himself — this young chap — but he shouldn't believe what the C.C.F. tell him; that is where he has gone astray, you see; he keeps listening to them, and of course anyone that

**March 11, 1958**

does that sooner or later finds that he is in a sort of a box where he can't get out; and he will have lost prestige and faith as well.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Sometimes finds himself in Weyburn!

**Mr. Danielson:** — There is another thing, Mr. Speaker. He spoke about the Lignite Research Board set up, I think, in 1911 or 1912 by the Dominion Government, by the Manitoba Government and by the Province of Saskatchewan. That Board was a Research Board — it wasn't a Crown Corporation. That was a Research Board set up to try to find out if the cheap lignite coal, and the abundance of lignite coal that we have in the province of Saskatchewan, could be utilized to the best interests of the people, for industry or commercial use of any kind, and domestic use, as well. They spent a lot of money on that Research Board, but it was comprised of men who were worth money. They were men who were trained scientists, who were capable of carrying out that investigation. They did succeed in making, as you no doubt know, what is called the briquettes — lignite briquettes which have been very widely used in this province, during the early days. I remember the winter of 1907, Mr. Speaker, and if we had not had the lignite coal from Estevan and the briquettes, we would have frozen to death; we had coal on the siding at my town of Davidson, but there wasn't enough. The railroads were broken down, the snow was six or seven feet high, and as a result we had to do the best we could. So let him get his thinking straight in this matter. It was not a Crown Corporation. He is conditioned to the mentality of the Crown Corporation group over here, and that is where he goes wrong. He cannot understand that the Dominion Government, no matter what the colour of it was, I don't remember, and the Manitoba government and the Saskatchewan government, chipped in together a bunch of money for the benefit of western Canada; giving them an opportunity, and at the same time a source of cheap fuel. That is why they did that. They didn't mine one ton of coal; they never sold one ton of coal; and now he comes out here and compares this Research Lignite Board of 1912 with these Crown Corporations, these sink-holes of Crown Corporations which this Government has dug all over this province.

Now then, having said that, Mr. Speaker, to the member for Estevan, I want to say a few other things. We had a budget presented in this House a few days ago, and in his eloquent, well-read manner, the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) made a good job of reading his budget. It was the tamest budget he ever introduced into this House, and there is a very noticeable thing, and that is this, Mr. Speaker, that every year the budget gets bigger and bigger, but the crowds that come to listen to the hon. Provincial Treasurer get less and less and less; and this year there was not any crowd here. If it hadn't been for a few people who were here from outside of Regina — Boards of Trade, and representatives, and so on — sitting

along the wall here in the Chamber, there wasn't anybody in here. So his reputation as an orator and a financier is evidently fading away, as was pointed out by my friend just a few seats away. The bigger and more money he spends, the less and less interest there is. But he is a master at juggling figures; and I quite frankly admit that. He, of course, has used two different types of methods in the handling of the finances of this province; and next year, he said, he is going to give us a third one. He is going to start a new method, and that will be the third one since he started out.

The Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Mr. Speaker, — and I have it here — every year goes into every province in the Dominion of Canada with the very best brains and ability in Canada; and they go right into the Public Accounts of every province, and they ferret out and set out the true position of every province in the Dominion, as far as their financial position is concerned. And what do we find then? They have, as I said, and I want to repeat it, the ability and the skill and the knowledge at their command — it is far superior to anything you can pick up in this province of Saskatchewan. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics gives us certain figures.

On page 9 of this publication, they set out in the direct debt, that is the total direct debt less sinking fund, at \$228,375,000. That is correct. I have the figures here. The Provincial Treasurer's figures of not debt on December 31, 1956, \$63,375,000 — \$165 million less! The D.B.S. publication gives the per capita net debt, the net direct debt of the province of Saskatchewan at March 31, 1956, as \$260 per capita. The Provincial Treasurer's figures at December 31, 1956 is \$72.50 — \$187.50 less than what the D.B.S. figures show!

In the same D.B.S. Report, on page 12, gives the average interest rate on the bonds of each province, at March 31, 1956; and the rate for Saskatchewan was 3.68 — the highest of any province in Canada, except Newfoundland. Now what did he say? He said this — I am referring to page 13 of his Budget Speech; and he says the Funded Debt was \$285,538,580; Treasury Bills, \$24,436,000; the gross debt, therefore, Mr. Speaker, is \$315,514,000. Less Sinking Funds, \$31,796,000; and the net debt is then reduced to \$283,717,000. This was at March 31, 1956, that is the Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures. Their December 31 Report will probably not be available until about the end of April. The basis of calculation would show an increase of \$56,375,000 in the net debt in the past year \$56,375,000 increase in one year! An increase of \$139 million in the net debt from 1948! The net debt is nearly doubled today to what it was in 1948. The per capita net debt of \$223,000 is the highest of any province in Canada, except one. I am not including the contingent liabilities; and by

**March 11, 1958**

subtracting \$226,500,000 of what he calls loans and advances to Revenue Producing Enterprises, the Provincial Treasurer arrives at a net debt figure of just over \$51,500,000. Isn't that wonderful ability he has? Just by a stroke of the pen he reduces it from \$226 million to \$51 1/2 million.

Now then, on the opposite page, page 12, he has a Table showing — under a new form of Balance Sheet — this will be further reduced by \$31,375, 000 by next year. After all, as remarked by the member for Rosthern (Mr. Elias), Mr. Speaker, it is the absolute truth. All he needs to do is to hand out more money to the Crown Corporations and he reduces his net debt accordingly. There is more truth than poetry in what the member said. It is exactly the truth. That is the way we have it here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think there can only be one reason for juggling the debt figures in this province, and that is that he is trying to hide the tremendous rate at which the public debt of this province has increased. There can't be any other reason for it. And there is another thing here that creeps up that makes me wonder 'what is the policy of this Government'; is there any cohesion or is there any judgment, or any balance, on the whole? This Government is exerting every effort they can to string electric power over every place in the province of Saskatchewan. I am not complaining about that, but at the same time they are telling us and telling the people, through their Commission and through their henchmen that there has to be at least 14,000 to 18,000 more farmers move from the farms. What is going to happen to your network of electric power lines over the province; you have already reduced by about 14,000 the farm units in the last few years; and you are heartily in sympathy with the Baker Commission, which tells us, quite frankly, — and you talk to any C.C.F.'er out in the province, out in the country and he will tell you quite frankly that that has to be done. That is their policy. But your policy of extending expensive power connections all over the whole province and then your policy in regard to agriculture in this province are absolutely conflicting.

I want to take a look at this Crown Corporation funeral you had here sometime ago. If there is something I came across, Mr. Speaker, when I opened up an old, old file, away back in 1946; and by the way, this is out of 'Saskatchewan News' so there is no doubt about its authenticity, Mr. Speaker. It is absolutely the gospel truth. It says:

"Saskatchewan's five-year program for painting farm units, public buildings and government housing projects commenced last Thursday at Weyburn where the reconstruction department's spray outfit began . . ."



" . . . operations on the city's exhibition grounds. Three painting outfits were available last September, but shortage of equipment held up the program. At present one outfit is available, and the department hopes to have another crew on the road this summer.

"Four exhibition buildings at Weyburn are first on the schedule. From there the outfit will move to government housing projects and certain public buildings in the province. Later, work on 80,000 farm buildings over a five-year period will commence, said Mr. Sturdy."

He was the architect of that brilliant idea!

"A three-man crew is working at Weyburn. The outfit consists of the most modern equipment available, and two spray guns are being used, said the Minister.

"Our aim is to train as many men as possible in order to have a large number of trained painters who may later operate their own outfits or work for the Saskatchewan Government as the spray-painting program expands, said Mr. Sturdy.

"In charge of the program is E.R. Martens, a graduate agricultural engineer who has taken special training in the United States in farm-building design and construction."

You know, this is the craziest thing; it's a terrible thing; but after all, when you look at it from this distance and look back, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Sturdy had something, if he had carried it out and three, four or five million dollars on this thing were spent, there would have been a lot of farmers have their buildings painted. But, they have spent that much money now in their Crown Corporations, and they have just sunk it in a rat hole, and you don't see anything. It is absolutely gone. If my friend Mr. Sturdy had been strong-willed enough and got the money, there would have been something to show for this expenditure of money; but today there is nothing.

**Mr. Loptson:** — The trouble is the paint peeled off!

**March 11, 1958**

**Mr. Danielson:** — Now then, Mr. Speaker, I have something here, and this is about the Box Factory, March 22, 1956. It looks as though they have been losing money on that blamed box factory for a long time, Mr. Speaker. I don't know why they shut it off now, when there is unemployment, because they have been losing money on it for 12 or 13 years. I don't know why they get so economical, now, when there is unemployment; why don't they keep it going and give the people work. But it says here:

"Cumulative net losses of the Saskatchewan Wood Enterprise box factory at Prince Albert, since 1946, total more than \$216,000, Provincial Treasurer C.M. Fines said.

"Mr. Fines said the losses since the beginning of the box factory represented a sad story."

Well, the Premier used to call them the 'problem children'. He says they are a 'sad story', but before that, he said they were self-liquidating enterprises. They are self-liquidating, all right! We will never hear about them any more! And that is a fact.

Now then, the 'problem children' and the 'self-liquidating enterprises' are the same thing — they are all gone. But they have a method — they don't even bury the corpse when they are dead. They take all the meat off them and then include it in another Department. There is only one Crown Corporation that has been buried recently, Mr. Speaker, and that was the shoe factory, I think.

**Mr. McDonald:** — They burned it up.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, all right, they cremated it. And what happened then? Well, there was a little remnant there and they handed it over to the Social Welfare Department, if I remember correctly, for \$85,000 and then they sold it for \$40,000. That is the way this Government makes money, you see. But here, Mr. Speaker, after they admitted this loss of \$496,973 on the box factory, or half a million dollars within a few dollars, as the total advance but the interest on the advance that had been made to that Corporation was over \$203,000; and you have over \$700,000 loss. Well, that is a little money, too; but when we suggest that they might take a little money and set up a loan fund for helping young farmers get started on the farm and make a living, why they say it is crazy, it is ridiculous that is the expression here. So here we have another one to bury for good. And with regard to this box factory, Mr. Speaker, the information is being brought out that they lost money year after year after year, and if the record was kept straight, if the losses were disclosed, if they were not being absorbed by the Timber Board — and what the additional

results will be is that you will find, Mr. Speaker, the losses are really about \$1,000,000 on that little box factory in Prince Albert.

That shows the business ability of this cocky C.C.F. Why, they couldn't run a coffee mill, let alone a factory, Mr. Speaker. It is a disgrace, but the peculiar disgraceful thing, I think, is this — they are crying over the unemployment; they don't like Diefenbaker. They are looking both ways now, you see. They are cross-eyed. They are looking both ways because Diefenbaker is going to pick up a lot of these so-called C.C.F. votes; they never were C.C.F.'s. They were Conservatives, and they are worrying. But here they are, closing up these things at the height of unemployment. Why did they do that? What about your salt plant? What about your box factory? This is no new thing; as I said, for the last twelve years you have been seeping money into these rat holes or sink holes, and you never closed them. Two years ago Mr. Fines said it was a sad story. But now then, are you helping out unemployment; are you being fair to the people of the province of Saskatchewan? What about all your building you have been advertising? That is one thing that is needed now, but after all, with the C.C.F. philosophy they just can't get anywhere until they got a depression; and if they do these things to accentuate a depression, maybe they think they are going to get along much quicker, in a political sense.

Well, we will take a look at agriculture. That should be in flourishing condition, because, after all, you have, given us tremendous benefits and have been instrumental in bringing about many others. Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, is not in a very flourishing condition. Many of the obstacles in the way of having flourishing agriculture at the present are not only market prices, but marketing conditions in general; and insofar as this Government is concerned, their record of doing something for, or working to the ends of doing something towards helping agriculture in the province, is absolutely nil — absolutely nil. They have never done anything. Looking back over the years you will find that every time they could possibly aggravate, distort or make the pinch more hard, or do disservice to agriculture, it was done.

I just happened to look at a little note I have here. I remember, a few years ago, I think it was in 1951, the Agriculture Minister (Mr. Nollet) and Mr. Douglas; and in 1948 Mr. Douglas said this (August 1, 1948):

"If any farmer received any addition to the payment on coarse grains delivered before August 1, 1948, he would present him with a Cabinet Minister's head on a platter, stuffed with celery."

**March 11, 1958**

The only thing wrong with that was that he didn't need to stuff it; there was celery in there before. We find our friend, the Minister of Agriculture over here, in the fall of 1951, and he said the initial payment on the wheat crop was all that they would receive. You know, that was that frozen crop, and he said this: "You've had it". Well, he was pleased; it was a great source of satisfaction to that gentleman that conditions looked that way, but it didn't come out just the way he had figured on.

Now then, what is the C.C.F. policy in this province, in regard to the financing of agriculture, or the financing of a policy for agriculture? In 1958, the Premier said this: "The suggestion that had been made in regard to instituting a farm credit policy in this province was ridiculous."

The hon. Minister of Agriculture said that the institution of a Farm Loan Board, many years ago, was the most foolhardy thing that had ever been started or suggested by any agency. The member for Kelvington (Mr. Howe) the other day, said that anyone that did anything to assist any young men to get on a farm and build up a place for themselves as farmers, or assist them in any way financially, was doing those individuals a disservice.

A few years ago, in 1952, in the Crown Corporations Committee, when this Bodnoff loan was being discussed, the suggestion was made that that loan of \$75,000 might have been loaned to some farmers, young people who needed it in order to finance their operations. "Oh," he said, "that couldn't be done because there is a high interest rate of 10 to 15 per cent applied; and necessarily a farm risk would make it not feasible to do any such a thing." Well now, here you have the expression that it is not feasible, it is ridiculous, to do anything for the farmers. That, Mr. Speaker, is the C.C.F. policy for agricultural financing in this province. There you have it. You can't get it any more clearly than that. Now then, they gave \$500,000 to a gallivanting Commission here to go and find out what was wrong with the farmers of the province. Well, good gracious, Mr. Speaker, previous to 1944, you, the C.C.F. people, raced up and down this province, and they told you everything that was wrong with agriculture! They had the cure and they had the knowledge, and they were going to fix it up; and after about ten years it was getting worse all the time. Then they appointed a gallivanting Commission to find out what was wrong with the farmers; and they have lived on the fat of the land now for five years. It was previous to the 1952 election and this is 1958. They have used up enough stationery and paper to run a newspaper for about five years. I have a box as big as this desk, and there is more to come.

And what did they tell you? They said there are so many thousand farmers who have been forced off the farms now; and we have to force off another 15,000 to 18,000 farmers. That is their

policy for agriculture in this province — nothing else. Drive the farmers off the farm; they are no good anyhow. Bring them into the cities. That is the solution of this Government towards agricultural problems. That is their own appointed mouthpiece, that Commission. They are the ones that said that. You can go out and talk to any C.C.F.'er in the country and he is all hopped up, all for what Mr. Baker tells him, together with the rest of the brainy people that he had with him. I think Mr. Baker is a good man. I wish I could say that for the rest of them who were with him, that were drawing their paychecks out of the taxpayers' money in this province.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — Which one of the Commissioners are you objecting to?

**Mr. Danielson:** — All of them. Every one of them. You know as much about them as I do; of course that wouldn't make any difference to you because they are all C.C.F. — every mother's son of them. You've got one from my constituency.

**Mr. M.J. Willis (Elrose):** — One good man out of Arm River constituency!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Who is talking? Now then, sometimes even the Farmers' Union — I think there is hope for them in this province; but I notice, Mr. Speaker, in all these things, a more stable attitude, a more sensible and more rational approach to these problems is taking place. The Farmers' Union, today is not the Farmers' Union you had a few years ago — or even two years ago; they are now showing a greater sense of responsibility and these fellows here across the room cannot deny that.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Losing control, are they?

**Mr. Danielson:** — What does Manitoba do? The Farmers' Union says this: "Movement of people off the farm is greater than can be absorbed by industry and this is a contributing factor to the disturbing plight in unemployment." The Union said in a brief presented to the Provincial Government that the cost-price squeeze; I call it the 'tax-cost squeeze' and that is what it is. Anybody that lives in Saskatchewan — I could tell you the gentleman from Lumsden (Mr. Thurston) the other day — and I have all the respect in the world for the hon. gentleman; but he said that the taxes on a quarter-section of his farm were only \$50. Well, I talked to him afterwards and he explained why that was so. He has no school taxes. I don't have to go to anybody else; I can go right to my own farm. The taxes, last year, Mr. Speaker, on my farm were \$704; and by the time I pay fire insurance and so on on my buildings up there, I pay practically \$800 on a section. That isn't the highest in the province by a long, long way, but I will tell you when you pay taxes on a piece of farm land of over \$1.25 an acre, you are getting on very, very dangerous

**March 11, 1958**

ground. Say that you have a hail storm, or rust, or a dry year, and you miss two crops — which we will do again; we have missed five or six crops in years gone by — you will find that these fellows won't need to cry about a depression like they do now — they will have a depression.

But to go back to the Farmers' Union brief. The Union said in a brief presented to the Manitoba provincial government that "the cost-price squeeze, plus drought and the inability to sell grain are largely responsible for the Movement. The general depressed conditions are not eliminating the so-called 'inefficient' . . ." Well, you know that is a word that belongs in the C.C.F. dictionary, too, . . . "inefficient farmers."

**Mr. McDonald:** — Inefficient government!

**Mr. Danielson:** — They said they are not eliminating the so-called inefficient operators "but there must be farmers in these groups upon which the future welfare of the agricultural industry depend." That is what the Farmers' Union told the Manitoba government.

**Mr. Cameron:** — They are right.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Now, did you ever get that attitude into this Government, here. "No". They say, "get off the farms; we are going to drive you off." And their hireling, Mr. Baker, says the same thing. He goes out and tells them that. Well, these fellows got their pay-checks from the Government. They do the missionary work for them, because they haven't got the crust to go out and tell the farmers themselves; they have to hire people and pay them taxpayers' money to go out and tell these things to the farmers.

**Premier Douglas:** — You're getting sillier every year.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — So are you.

**Mr. Danielson:** — There is one thing, Mr. Speaker, if that is the case it certainly has a wholesome effect on that gentleman sitting over there, because I haven't heard him whisper, this afternoon.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — You don't believe that nonsense, yourself.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I live right among them, and the last one who should ever say anything about the farm conditions is the member for Kelvington (Mr. Howe). He is the last one — of course,

they haven't got any farmers over there anyhow; they haven't got any farmers over there; there was one only, and all the money he has, I think, he got from his dad. That is no disgrace to your dad; it is an honour to your dad. I think it is misplaced generosity, but that's all right.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — What about Mr. Gardiner, behind you?

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, that is the farm policy of the C.C.F. Government — established by your actions and eloquence; and after 14 years what have you found? The Minister says now he is going to hire more ag-reps and then you are going to hire a few more C.C.F.'ers to look at the farmers' machines, which is the most useless expenditure you could possibly make. There are responsible machine companies and the farmers do not buy any machinery, today, without their guarantee; and I have seen them come and take a machine away; they come there and test it out and they never get a dollar until they get the machine to work all right. There is a guarantee and you are just a fifth wheel on the machine, when you put that Bill through. But, after all, of course you will find some good C.C.F.'ers who will be glad to take this job; and it might help you a little bit, but it isn't going to help the farmers.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — No matter what we do it wouldn't help, according to you.

**Mr. Danielson:** — We hear a tremendous amount of talk, Mr. Speaker, about what this Government has done; and why didn't you do so and so? My friend, the Minister of Social Service (Hon. Mr. Bentley) spent half an hour on this; the member for Canora (Hon. Mr. Kuziak), and there are dozens of them over there who say the same thing — 'what did you do during the 'thirties'? I Well, Mr. Speaker, I am going to answer you and all the C.C.F. with Mr. Douglas', the Premier of Saskatchewan, own words. I am going to answer it, and if you haven't got a copy of this, you should get a copy and stick it on the side of your desks and then read it. You know, a few years ago, Mr. Speaker, he was confronted with giving some assistance to the city of Regina in regard to transmitting water from Buffalo Pound Lake into the city of Regina. That is highly commendable — but here is what he said: "Other provinces are able to borrow money at 3 per cent; Saskatchewan paid 4 per cent on their last loan." That is what the Premier said. And he said this:

"The original policy of this Government was that the municipal water supply is a matter of purely Federal and local responsibility."

Even there he had an answer so he could slip out.

**March 11, 1958**

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Oh, no.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Just wait till I got through. But here is what he said:

"The Provincial Government of Saskatchewan is prepared to assume the responsibility of repayment of one-third of the cost up to 62 million, provided the Federal Government is prepared to loan this amount to the province at an interest rate of no more than 3 per cent; and provided that this loan shall be liquidated out of the revenue received from the water."

Now then, listen:

"As you no doubt are aware . . . (this is to Mr. Menzies) . . . from 1932 to 1946 (that is 14 years, Mr. Speaker) . . .

Isn't that right?

**Mr. McDonald:** — They wouldn't know the difference.

**Mr. Danielson:** — It was a long time — I hope I don't forget any of it.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — You won't.

**Mr. Danielson:** — He said this:

"As you are no doubt aware from 1932 to 1946 the province of Saskatchewan was unable to borrow a single dollar for capital purposes, except for refunding. This situation was brought about by the economic conditions facing the province in the 'thirties.

"From this position Saskatchewan has not yet recovered. Other provinces are able to borrow money at 3 per cent — Saskatchewan, on the other hand, paid 4 per cent on the last loan."

And this was January 6, 1950, Mr. Speaker. And these C.C.F.ers here — that shows the mental status of their makeup. They harp on, day in and day out, about what we did during the 'thirties. Well, I will tell



you, Mr. Speaker, we handed out relief, in this province, in one year, to the amount of \$56 million. We didn't have the money . . .

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — And who paid it?

**Mr. Danielson:** — . . . we got most of it from the Federal Government and they cancelled \$44 million of it. You didn't pay it — the farmers paid the rest of it.

**Mr. Cameron:** — You didn't pay a nickel of it.

**Mr. Danielson:** — No, you never paid a nickel. You are not going to pull that stuff any more. No, Mr. Speaker, that is the situation. The Premier confesses, from 1932 to 1946, and he is right; it was in the 1930's when the depression set in, and for the first year or two we got along on our own resources; and we'll have to do it again if it comes. But when 1932 came along then public assistance became necessary, and it was given and freely given, not only by the Government of this province, and the Dominion Government, but by all the provinces shipping in here hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of food commodities to help the people and the families in this depression-stricken area. In one year, \$56 million for feed and fodder and seeding supplies was paid out in the province of Saskatchewan. The Minister of Social Services, I remember, two or three years ago here, made a statement. I am not complaining about what he said, but he said, "You know, one year we paid out \$76,000 relief in this province." Well, I don't doubt that — but that was a drop in the bucket. I give you credit for doing it, but how these gentlemen over here, who are supposed to have common ordinary sense, or considered as such, can forever — after 14 years, go over the old 'thirties when they know — and let me tell you, not until 1946 was the province able to borrow a dollar. Mr. Speaker, I was a member here in 1946, and we were honest. We told the truth when we were chastising them for not going ahead with electrical development fast enough — you said: "Not until this year have we been able to get supplies". That was a sensible reply to make; I accepted it as such and today — why they go back to 1912 . . .

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — Nineteen hundred and seven, Hermie!

**Mr. Danielson:** — It is so foolish and so silly that a full-grown person should hang his head in shame, with coming out with such silly nonsense.

**Mr. Brown:** — That's what we are getting now.

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

**Mr. Loftson:** — Well, the people will hang them pretty soon.

**March 11, 1958**

**Mr. Danielson:** — You know, I think that will happen. I have one or two clippings here I am going to read, but Mr. Coldwell, how well do I remember, Mr. Speaker, from 1933 to 1944 when we had the C.C.F. take over; every day and every day they were up, and they were telling us how terrible things were — but there was no chance for the C.C.F. to get elected until we got more depression. Mr. Coldwell, previous to the end of the last war, the second world war and even before — but previous to that time, he went all over the country of Canada and he predicted this terrible depression that was going to come, and he pleaded — no doubt he found it was effective — and not until that glorious day came was there any hope of the C.C.F. ever attaining the summit for which they were heading. I have here one of Coldwell's statements, dated December 21:

"M.J. Coldwell, C.C.F. leader, told a gathering, last night, it was the responsibility of the C.C.F. to work systematically at the job of making Canada democratic."

**Mr. Loftson:** — Social democrats!

**Mr. Danielson:** — He continued: "no matter how limited our resources may be."

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd:** — What are you reading from?

**Mr. Danielson:** — He said, in an address before the annual conference of the Co-operative Commonwealth University Federation:

"Thus, if perchance employment is maintained for a number of years in Canada through the economic effects of large expenditures on defence or European recovery, the best efforts of our movement may not catapult us into power overnight. But during such a period, if it should lie just ahead, we must build our movement solidly, recruiting Canadians in all walks of life to our cause, educating and organizing wherever possible, and carefully reviewing our policies in the light of changing domestic and foreign conditions.

"The University federation must be the recruiting force for the type of Canadian Socialist who will be called upon to give leadership in many important fields in the not-too-distant future."

That is what he said, And he said this:

**Hon. Mr. Brown:** — The only sensible thing he has said all afternoon.

**Mr. Danielson:** — And he said this:

"We cannot expect to get into power while conditions are as good as they are now, but we must be prepared to take over as soon as the depression comes."

That has been said on the floor of this House many times, between 1933 and 1944. That was their opportunity. You C.C.F. are over there. If you have any spark of gratitude, you should go out and vote for John Diefenbaker, because he is bringing that condition about.

The Attorney General (Hon. Mr. Walker), at a meeting in Saskatoon not long ago, called Mr. Diefenbaker 'the sawdust man'; and he was honest about it — he's an old Tory, himself, you see — and he said that a depression was coming — I have it here some place.

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd:** — Take your time.

**Hon. Mr. Willis:** — I'll send you over a 'Commonwealth'.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, I haven't got a copy. Will you send it to me? My subscription ran out. I would be glad if you would send me a copy. Oh yes. I have it here:

**Hon. Mr. Willis:** — You had us worried for a minute.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Here it is:

"Attorney General Robert Walker of Saskatchewan said, Saturday night, 'Prime Minister Diefenbaker is a 'sawdust man' . . ."

He should have called him 'sawdust Caesar' — but that's what he meant, anyway:

". . . who has deceived western voters. The man who came out as champion of the west in the recent election is already betraying us in Eastern Canada."

**Mr. Lopton:** — He should get together with the Premier.

**Mr. Cameron:** — They should vote Conservative — they want a depression.

**March 11, 1958**

**Mr. Gardiner:** — That is why they are all going Tory.

**Hon. Mr. Willis:** — You just pointed out that there was no difference.

**Mr. Danielson:** — If you want to ask a question just hop to it. After all, I said that you should be grateful to the Tory party now, because you know Diefenbaker is the one responsible for bringing on this depression for which you have been hoping and praying for the last sixteen years.

Mr. Speaker, I have a pamphlet here — you should buy the Winnipeg 'Free Press' of a few years ago. It enumerates every instance and every remark and every quotation and data and everything else where these statements were made. You are on record from morning to night on this thing. I say to you — you have been sitting here looking both ways. If these Tories go back and vote Tory, why you are out; there is no C.C.F. party any more; and the indications are that that is what you are going to do. I saw a man the other day; he lives in the city of Regina and he certainly isn't any friend of mine, but he said this, when I asked him if there was any chance of the Tories taking the city of Regina; I said there are too many C.C.F. Cabinet Ministers in here and they are going to make more. He said: "Oh, I have been out on the farm and they don't talk C.C.F. any more." Do you know that is true, Mr. Premier?

**Hon. Mr. J.T. Douglas:** — Who are you trying to kid?

**Mr. Danielson:** — If you should go out in the country, today, you wouldn't get enough members to sit around the table.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Who wrote that? You wouldn't think of that.

**Mr. Danielson:** — If an election was called at the present time you wouldn't win a table to eat on.

**Premier Douglas:** — None of us campaigned for Diefenbaker in 1949.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Do you remember that statement?

**Premier Douglas:** — None of us campaigned for Diefenbaker in 1949, like you did.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Do you remember that statement? "That if you went to the country you wouldn't win a table to eat on."

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — How about the budget?

**Mr. Danielson:** — And that was in November, last fall. But, after all, Mr. Speaker, I kind of enjoy this.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — I think he is going to vote for you.

**Mr. Danielson:** — These fellows have made a lot of what has taken place in the House of Commons. The Tories and the C.C.F. set up a trap for Mike Pearson — they had all kinds of time to do that before, but they waited until Mike Pearson was elected; he came into the House on a Monday morning, and going into Supply it was his duty, of course, to make a motion, and that motion was framed in a peculiar way . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — I will tell you why. The C.C.F., together with the Tories, thought they were going to lead him into a trap and frame it in such a way that the C.C.F. would vote for it, and then the blame for defeating the Government and starting an election would have been on the Liberals. That is why the motion was made that the Liberal party should be called upon to form a government; and that, of course, the C.C.F. would never vote for. But that is what they wanted to do, Mr. Speaker, throw the blame on the Liberal party for bringing on the election. Mike told John to get out and in a few days John got out.

**Hon. Mr. Brown:** — But Mike didn't get in!

**Mr. Cameron:** — John is out and Mike will be in.

**Mr. McDonald:** — The C.C.F. won't get in, anyway.

**Mr. Danielson:** — The C.C.F., Mr. Speaker, didn't have a look in; they didn't get any of the glory. I have a very great regard for Mr. Coldwell, because sometimes Coldwell is honest.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Not always, though.

**Mr. Danielson:** — In Halifax, the Canadian Press reports:

"Leader M.J. Coldwell said Tuesday night he thinks the Progressive Conservatives called an election for March 31 because they are afraid economic conditions will not improve. They think the upturn may not come this summer. He would not make a prediction on the outcome of the election. He said the Liberal party is not very good."

**March 11, 1958**

**Hon. Mr. Brown:** — You said it!

**Mr. Danielson:** — We couldn't expect the impossible, Mr. Speaker. Here is the rest of what he said:

"The Liberal Party is not very good but has a very good leader in Mr. Pearson."

That is why I say that sometimes he expresses an honest opinion.

**Hon. Mr. Brown:** — The first part, anyway.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I am sorry that this superman, the member for Hanley (Hon. Mr. Walker) is not in his seat, because I want to say a few words to him and to this House. Now there is a man, Mr. Speaker, who holds one of the most important positions in this Government. It is an honourable and highly respected position of trust in the province of Saskatchewan. Ever since he came into this House, on every occasion, in Crown Corporations Committee and in this House, whenever he could possibly throw in a word of insult and discredit the Opposition, he has done so. Every time he opens his mouth something insulting comes out.

In the Crown Corporations Committee, in 1956, he said this . . .

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — There is not much sense coming out of your mouth.

**Mr. Danielson:** — If you do as well maybe somebody will remember you.

**Hon. Mr. Brown:** — All you can do is read.

**Mr. McDonald:** — You can't even do that.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker in the Crown Corporations Committee, Ross McCarthy of Cannington was making three attempts to frame a question which he wanted to ask the Telephone Minister. Hon. Mr. Kuziak. Government members began making interjections which were returned in kind by Opposition members. Robert Walker, C.C.F., Hanley, said:

"If it were not for the vacuous inaneness of members on the opposite side who are always trying to put across something, there would be no need for us to make remarks. It is obvious members opposite are trying to stall proceedings. Their kind of jackal-like brains

irk those who are trying to do some work. I suggest they contain their animal-like tendencies."

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — I couldn't have said that.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, this same thing, practically, was said on the floor of this House this session.

The other day he called one of the members of the Committee, who was trying to get some information, a 'puppy' — a 'pup'. Who is this man? Who is this man who has the right to insult and criticize and belittle every member on this side of the House? Who is he? Well, Mr. Speaker, a little knowledge in some people is a dangerous thing; and do you know what I think, he is — and I would bet my shirt that I have the people of the province with me, particularly the legal profession — I think he is a third-class jackass. That is my estimation of that man.

**Hon. Mr. Brown:** — Come out of the barn, Hermie.

**Premier Douglas:** — We are satisfied with him and we . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — You haven't much choice.

**Mr. Gardiner:** — You're stuck with him.

**Premier Douglas:** — I didn't notice anybody on your side inviting you when they had the chance.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that the conditions wouldn't have been any worse.

You know, I have been sitting here for a long time. I have sat here for 14 years listening to these fellows across the way, but as we go along certain mysterious things have cleared up and I have come to the conclusion that the industrial elements have black-listed Saskatchewan. I say 'black-listed'; and I think I am safe in saying I can prove that to you. This Government has got to the stage now, Mr. Speaker, where they have to buy industry to come in here; they have to finance them to come in, to do anything in this province. In 1954 they started in and they offered the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool \$3 1/2 million to buy the Intercontinental Packing Plant. Well, I have to give credit to the Wheat Pool; they had too much sense to take them up on it; and they didn't do it.

That was the first one. Now we come to the Cement Company. Here is a group of men who had nothing at all . . .

**March 11, 1958**

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, what is my friend's authority for stating that we offered the Wheat Pool \$3 1/2 million?

**Mr. Danielson:** — I am glad you asked that question. I almost forgot about it. Here it is: (December 2, 1954)

"A \$3,500,000 deal to sell Intercontinental Packers Limited to the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool livestock division with provincial government financial backing was turned down by Pool delegates at their recent annual meeting. It was disclosed at the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union convention at Exhibition Auditorium Wednesday afternoon.

"A.I. Selby of Kelvington volunteered the information to the Saskatchewan Farmers Union meeting, scoring the Wheat Pool for not accepting the offer. The Farm Union will debate the resolution either Thursday or Friday.

"A pool delegate in the crowd, when questioned after the meeting, confirmed that such an offer had been made. The offer was made by Fred Mendel of Saskatoon, Intercontinental owner, who reportedly wishes to sell his two plants in Saskatoon and Regina, and retire.

"Premier T.C. Douglas was quoted as saying the Government would probably be willing to assist the pool in the purchase, using funds of the provincial industrial development branch.

"R.A. Robinson of Regina, a pool delegate, said delegates of his organization were opposed to any such plan for three reasons: (good reasons, too).

"1. The plants involved are not new and the \$3,500,000 would only be the start of expenditures involved. If we go into the meat-packing business we would be just as smart to get good new equipment.



"2. The livestock pool formerly had packing plants and lost money on them.

"3. The Pool has a resolution on its books not to undertake any more industrialization at this time. The text of the resolution is as follows:

"Whereas control of our livestock is lost when the animals reach market, and whereas a large percentage, of our legitimate profit is now lost to private meat packing industry; and whereas the owner of Intercontinental Packers Ltd., has offered to sell his plants to the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool for about \$3,500,000; and whereas Premier Douglas has indicated the probable willingness of his government to assist the pool in the purchase under the Industrial Development Branch . . .

There is no use in reading any more.

**Mr. Loftson:** — It sounds like a C.C.F. resolution.

**Mr. Danielson:** — So that is why I made the statement and I think I am on solid ground; and, as a matter of fact, I met some of those delegates two or three years ago on the train and I know those men, and I commend every one of them for turning an offer like that down.

But I was going to say — that is the first time to my mind (I may be wrong) but I am entitled to my opinion, that here was an offer, by using public money, to buy out and get a packing plant in the city of Regina.

Then we come to the Cement Company. They didn't have any money — of course, some of them had a million, but they wouldn't put it in the cement plant. This Government took the people's credit; signed a note in the amount of \$5 1/2 million — they have the pipeline skinned a mile. I have the whole thing. I have it all here. Then the pipe plant came in here. Nobody ever heard of them, but they got \$900,000 and then they have a wire plant at Weyburn. Of course, the Premier had to put that in there, or else his majority might be nil next time; it was only about 626 before.

**Premier Douglas:** — It was more than yours was, I think.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I had a 350 per cent increase in my majority.

**March 11, 1958**

**Hon. Mr. Brown:** — How about the 1944 election?

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Mr. Speaker, may I point out that in the Legislature last, year, the sum of \$900,000 was voted to the Government Finance Office for the Industrial Development Fund, and . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — It doesn't make any difference — don't be simple-minded. You sit down.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — You are saying that \$900,000 was given without any knowledge of the people of Saskatchewan. I am pointing out that that money was voted by the Legislature, last year, for that specific purpose. You were told it was for that purpose.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That's what you do; \$75,000 for the wire plant and then we have the arc welding, \$8,900. I just wonder how much this paper box plant has cost you. We don't know yet. We will probably know next year. But this pattern is persistent; you can go back five or six years and you can see it.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Why don't you ask a question, then?

**Mr. Danielson:** — This same thing — public money has been injected into these things; call it bribery if you want, or buy them, if you want, anything to induce them.

**Mr. Lopton:** — It's the only way they can get them in.

**Mr. Danielson:** — With this Cement Plant there was millions realized on the Government's credit, or the people's credit, the taxpayers' money, backing that thing for their friends.

**Premier Douglas:** — We don't have to finance racetracks, like they do in Manitoba.

**Mr. Danielson:** — I would sooner finance a racetrack than to finance . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — Drive-in theatres.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Yes, drive-in theatres. They got the land anyhow; they might plow that up and raise wheat on it, but with that thing you haven't got anything — less than nothing.

These things, Mr. Speaker, are significant and they cannot be laughed off. There is a pattern all through this thing, and that is that this Government, or this province, is blacklisted by the industrial

interests of this country; and the only way they can get them in here is by using the people's credit to induce them to come. They went to work, last year, and they took the expropriation clause out of the Crown Corporations. Why did you do that? Well, you know what you said — because the Liberals criticized it.

**Premier Douglas:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — They had it there since 1945 and now, in 1957, they take it out. Then they go down to Winnipeg and try to put a new look on the Regina Manifesto — a new look! Mr. Lewis says:

"Mr. Lewis, National Chairman of the C.C.F. said Thursday that the party's Winnipeg declaration, last July, represents no change in policy."

And yet, Mr. Speaker, the Premier would move heaven and earth to get this change made, to fool the people, to pull the wool over the eyes of the people of Saskatchewan, who have commenced to wake up.

**Mr. Loptson:** — What does the Premier, himself, say?

**Mr. Danielson:** — What does he say — I will tell you.

"Douglas says Manifesto still basic C.C.F. . . ."

**Mr. McFarlane:** — Shame!

**Mr. Danielson:** — There you are, Mr. Speaker, all these things are very significant, because there is public money involved and this Government is playing fast and loose with the people of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Kuziak:** —: Do you want the 'Commonwealth' now?

**Mr. Danielson:** — Well, you can send it over. I might find something in it. You know, we had a world-shaking event taking place here, last year. We had a debate between the champion socialist and one of these renegade Liberals — that's what they, the C.C.F., called him.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — You were right the first time.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Now he wishes he was a Tory.

**March 11, 1958**

**Mr. Danielson:** — I listened to the radio and I listened to every word; and never in all my 14 years that I have listened to the Premier have I heard his voice so distressed and he looked like he had been just pulled out of the river; he was cold and shaky; he was shivering, you see. But he had one thing with him; he didn't forget it, and that was his 'smearing brush'. He had the brush with him that he smears with, and the first thing, right off the bat, he starts to smear Mr. Thatcher. The Chairman had to sit on him two or three times, but he had never faced a Waterloo like that. His stock in the province of Saskatchewan went down 65 per cent that night. He is a man with feet of clay. And Thatcher didn't say anything . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — He didn't bring anything new in. He just took the auditor's statements of the Crown Corporations and he just killed that fellow; and he didn't even have a comeback when he had the opportunity. I never heard anything like it, or saw anything like it.

**Premier Douglas:** — You could see it on June 10th, couldn't you? The Liberal victory on June 10th didn't show it up very well.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That was the situation. And, today, with Casey to bat — well, you know, everybody has built up a reputation and anybody who has built up a reputation like that, and then meets his Waterloo in such a short space of time, in everything he said, he had one thing — he had the Crown Corporations statement — but he didn't say it was the auditor's statement; and then when Mr. Thatcher came out with the auditor's statement and showed him exactly what the position was, he didn't have a word to say. He wasted his time in rebuttal entirely. So there we have that.

**Premier Douglas:** — I didn't notice a big rush of Liberal votes on June 10th.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Fifteen thousand more than before.

**Premier Douglas:** — Eight Liberals left in four western provinces.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — How many C.C.F.?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — And there will be only half of that after March 31st.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — How many C.C.F. have you got in Canada?

**Mr. Cameron:** — Wait till your Tory friends go home.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — There is just one more thing, Mr. Speaker, that I want to say a few words about, and that is, that during the last few years, the C.C.F. has shouted around all over the province that we Liberals voted against and opposed the hospitalization scheme.

**Premier Douglas:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Danielson:** — That is a lie; it is a systematic lie. I heard it on the floor of the House, last year, and the junior member for Regina (Mrs. Cooper) together with all the rest of them, persistently say that; and I faced them with the fact, last year, and they had to admit it was a lie.

**Premier Douglas:** — Oh, nonsense.

**Mr. Danielson:** — You said . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — You said you . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Oh, you keep your mouth shut.

**Premier Douglas:** — I say something when I open it, anyway.

**Mr. Danielson:** — We don't want any more of your remarks, Mr. Speaker. There wasn't an opposition vote on that Bill.

**Premier Douglas:** — That's not true.

**Mr. Danielson:** — It is true, and when he says it's not true, well, that is a lie, too.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member must withdraw that statement. That my statement is a lie.

**Mr. Danielson:** — Everyone in this House . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Sit down for a moment — I am rising on a question of privilege. I have put on the records of this House the statement that Mr. Tucker who was leader at that time; and the statement of the member for Arm River . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — Who? Who?

**March 11, 1958**

**Premier Douglas:** — . . . both of whom criticized the Hospital Bill. There was no division, but there was opposition; and you are the gentleman most responsible for it.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Tucker wasn't even here.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That shows how confused he is.

**Mr. Loptson:** — He wasn't even here.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order!

**Mr. Danielson:** — Go back and look at the Votes and Proceedings and the records of this House and every vote, or division, in this House is recorded there; and there was not a vote taken on that Bill.

**Premier Douglas:** — That's right.

**Mr. Danielson:** — You admit that — that's right.

**Premier Douglas:** — But I say you criticized it, inside the House and out of the House.

**Mr. Danielson:** — That is just slander; downright slander. We put the Bill on the statute books that set up the hospital Commission in 1943, and, we voted \$20,000 to it. And you admit that yourself.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Every Liberal in the House . . .

**Mr. Danielson:** — One time in the House when I asked you a question, you said: "You should know; you passed the Bill". That was your reply. It is on the record. So that thing is a falsehood from beginning to end, Mr. Speaker, and it was proven. I produced the Votes and Proceedings on the floor of this House, last year, and he said, himself, that there was no division on that Bill. What then is he kicking about? Some of these new faithful say yet that this Bill was put through against strenuous opposition of the Liberal Opposition.

**Premier Douglas:** — That's right, too.

**Mr. Danielson:** — They are lying from beginning to end. Mr. Speaker, in view of what I have said, I don't think I need to tell you that I shall not vote for the motion.

**Mr. A.L.S. Brown (Bengough):** — Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to finish my remarks by 5:30. We were pretty well forewarned, this afternoon, as to what we could expect from the hon. member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson). When he first rose to his feet he said that the job of the Opposition was not to create or formulate policy. Well, he certainly did not undertake to do that. He suggested that their job was to oppose everything and to propose nothing. I do not know whether he succeeded in opposing everything, but he certainly succeeded in proposing nothing that was in any way constructive to meet the problems, which face us at the present time.

Every time that the members of the Opposition have got up in this debate, in particular; and it was more or less true in other debates, they have two main themes which they deal with. One is that the taxes are too high and that the Crown Corporations are not worth a darn.

It is true that our hon. friend from Arm River, this afternoon, had one or two side excursions from these two main themes, but nevertheless, in general, he dealt with them and suggested that on that basis they were opposing the Budget and as such were opposing the Government in the proposals which they were making through the Budget, as to means of solving the problems which face us at the present time.

I do not think that anyone on either side of the House will but admit that there has been a rise in dollar costs as far as taxes are concerned. I am assuming that the members in the Opposition, when they are dealing with taxes, are dealing primarily with land taxes in the province of Saskatchewan. I suggest that I, along with all others, will admit that there has been a dollar-cost increase insofar as taxes are concerned. I think it is interesting to note that the increase in taxes relative to other increases in farm costs have not been as great as they would suggest. As a matter of fact, in relationship to farm products, taxes have actually gone down in the past few years.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Tell the farmers, that!

**Mr. A.L.S. Brown:** — You do not have to take my word, but I suggest . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — We would not.

**Mr. Brown:** — . . . that you might take the word of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. I am quoting from the Royal Commission's report on Mechanization in Farm Costs. In it they have a table taken from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics in respect to the Handbook of Agricultural Statistics, and they indicate for a certain year, starting back in 1926 taxes represent eight per cent of the total operating cost for farm products. By 1931, this had increased to 11 per cent. By 1953 it had decreased and there had been a continual decrease

**March 11, 1958**

since 1931 up to 1953 and by 1953, it had decreased toward the point where it only represented six per cent of the total farm costs. So I say that anyone who will suggest that the taxes are a significant factor in the present farm price squeeze, that they are simply unaware of the facts, or are attempting to mislead either himself or the person to whom he is talking.

I realize that the farmers of this province are not in a position to pay their taxes, but I agree with the member from Lumsden when he stated that we could eliminate entirely the taxes which we are required to pay on our land, and it would have very little effect upon our farm costs.

And, secondly, they deal with the question of Crown Corporations, and in spite of the figures that have been given to them, in spite of the auditor's report which has been given to them, they still suggest that our experiments and our undertakings in respect to public ownership in the province have cost the people in the province of Saskatchewan money and that such has not been a financial success. Well, I do not know how many more figures they wanted placed before them, or what additional information they want placed before them in the Crown Corporation Committee, they have the opportunity to get this information and they have an opportunity to give an analysis to the financial statement and the financial operations of the Crown Corporations. And they have an opportunity, there, to study the results, the financial results of these Crown Corporations. But while I agree that the financial workers of the Crown Corporations are good, and they have been a financial asset to the province of Saskatchewan as I have stated on many previous occasions, my objective of the value of the Crown Corporations to the province of Saskatchewan should not be mainly or only in respect to the financial returns which they give to the people of the province of Saskatchewan.

The hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson), this afternoon made one particular reference to one of our Crown Corporations, and it is statements like this — and I suggest that the remarks made by the member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson), yesterday, were absolutely accurate when he suggested they adopted an irresponsible attitude; and the statements which he made in respect to the Wood Enterprise Corporation were certainly irresponsible. He said he had audited statements before him, the statement signed by the auditor appointed by this Legislature, which showed that the losses, as the result of the operations of the Wood Enterprises were some \$496,000; and yet the hon. member for Arm River stands up in this House and repeats the statements which have been made by the member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) in the Committee, where the member for Gravelbourg had to admit that he was wrong; the member for Arm River stands up in this House and says that the losses, as a result of the operations of the Wood Enterprises, was somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$1 million.



**Mr. McDonald:** — Sure they are; he is right.

**Mr. Brown:** — So he has proven beyond the question of a doubt that the statements of the member for Souris-Estevan were right.

**Mr. Danielson:** — He has completely misrepresented what I said. Here is what I said: I stated the admitted loss — interest on advance, \$203,000; and then the interest that was put into the Timber Board, and I said when all the audits came in, and the books were cleaned up, the cost would be close to \$1,000,000.

**Mr. McDonald:** — It's absolutely true, too.

**Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer):** — If the hon. member . . .

**Mr. Brown:** — I suggest that the hon. member is on a guessing campaign . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — You're still sleeping, Brown.

**Mr. Danielson:** — You come here and I will show it to you.

**Mr. Brown:** — I suggest that the hon. member for Arm River is going out on a guessing campaign and his guess in respect to that is no more accurate, I suggest, than his guess was as to the outcome of the Mossbank debate, when he said that the C.C.F. would lose 65 per cent of their support, as a result of that debate. Well, if we lost 63 per cent, the remaining 35 per cent was a mighty big per cent of the votes of the province of Saskatchewan.

**Mr. McDonald:** — You're still sleeping, Brown,

**Mr. Brown:** — I was not the one who was sleeping. It was the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson).

**Mr. McDonald:** — You certainly were — you never heard anything right.

**Mr. Brown:** — The hon. member for Arm River undertook to criticize the Royal Commission which was established here in 1952. He agreed that the Chairman of the Commission might not be too bad a fellow, but that all the rest — he was critical of all the rest, and when I asked him which member of the Commission to which he took particular objection to, he said every mother's son. He went even further, and said that one of them even came from his constituency. I don't know which one he was referring to that came from his constituency, but if these are the people that he is taking objection to. I think the House should be aware of whom they are, if they are not already aware. One was Mrs. Nancy Adams of Ethelton; Mr. T.H. Bourassa, who is now at

**March 11, 1958**

La Fleche, H.L. Fowler of Saskatoon, Charlie Gibbings of Rosetown, and J.L. Phelps.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Who is he?

**Mr. Brown:** — All of whom have had an admirable record of public service here in the province of Saskatchewan. Some with the Consumers' organization, and some with the Wheat Pool organization; some with the Farmers' Union; and some with the Credit Union organization, and if these people have sufficient confidence in them, then I suggest that the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan has equally a right to place confidence in them, and to give consideration to the views and conclusions and the recommendations which they bring forth, and to make suggestions that the reports of this Committee are necessarily government policy. It is something, I suggest, that has no basis of fact nor basis of foundation. Even he undertakes to misquote the report — or at least his interpretation of it can be nothing more than a misinterpretation of the report, because he suggested that it was the C.C.F. policy to drive farmers off the land, and as he said that it was the report — or the spokesman of the Government to that extent, and that these reports and the spokesman for these reports were saying that the farmers should be driven off the farm.

What the Commission was doing at that time was giving an analysis of a situation as it existed at present, and those factors which lead up to our present situation. This is the conclusion they arrived at, and a conclusion which I can agree with, based on my study of the situation, and the factors which lead up to the present situation:

"The grain farmer of the future will use new and better sources of power, including electricity. Machines will probably be larger, and farms will be larger. A continuing decline in the number of farm units can be expected. Extent of this decline will depend upon future public policy with respect to retaining the family size farms."

They go on in their recommendations to recommend to this Government and the people of the province of Saskatchewan, that public policy be enunciated and evolved, which will undertake to retain the family size farm. For the member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) to suggest that the policy of the C.C.F. or the recommendations of the Royal Commission, is one to drive farmers off the land, Mr. Speaker, is far from the truth . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — Nonsense.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Everybody knows that — every report said so.

**Mr. Brown:** — I see my friend from Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) has returned to her seat, so just for a moment I might, deal with one or two remarks which she made the other day. I do it in a kindly manner. She was undertaking to be rather critical about the poor backbenchers here; that we didn't undertake to make suggestions to the Government, and that because we didn't we were lacking in our responsibility, and failing to live up to the purposes for which we were elected. I would suggest that in the debate which has gone on in this Session and last year's Session, any constructive suggestions which the Government has received, they might not have been announced — but they have certainly come from this side of the House.

I don't want to lecture my friend in what might appear to be a pretty elementary political philosophy, but apparently she is not aware of the philosophy and means by which we, on the C.C.F. undertake to control our Government. We in the C.C.F. movement are attempting to work out techniques and means by which we can have an effective control of our Government. The Government's greatness lies not particularly in the men who sit in the treasury benches, but their effectiveness in the present and the future, depends how we, the little people within this movement, are able to control it, and I can assure you that we have a technique worked out within our movement by which we have an effective control. If that effective control is ever taken away from those common people within the C.C.F. movement, the C.C.F. as a political party, could degenerate to the point where the Liberal party finds itself at the present time. It is our responsibility as elected members, to see that that control does retain, and I think that we on this side of the House are doing our utmost to see that that control is retained.

**Mr. McCarthy:** — Have you got a written formula for that?

**Mr. Brown:** — We have a constitution, of which is something I'm afraid the Liberal Government has not.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Read it to us.

**Mr. Brown:** — A constitution which so far has worked, and I suggest can work effectively in the future. For my hon. friends may I suggest this, and I say this not necessarily with pride, but with humbleness, that we here in the C.C.F. movement are trying to enunciate a political theory that has been enunciated nowhere else in the world, to my knowledge.

**Mr. McDonald:** — That's right! That's for sure!

**March 11, 1958**

**Mr. Brown:** — Nowhere else in the world have the common people got the effective control that have the ordinary members of the C.C.F. movement, and I suggest that . . .

**Mrs. Batten (Humboldt):** — Would the hon. member permit a question?

**Mr. Brown:** — Certainly, I haven't much time left, however.

**Mrs. Batten:** — It's a very short question. What is the purpose of asking us to give you constructive criticism, if you and the hon. member from Souris-Estevan (Mr. Thorson) tell us in this House that you have to have a C.C.F. membership before you can be listened to by this Government?

**Mr. Brown:** — Mr. Speaker, I think I can answer the question in this respect. The duties of the members of the Opposition is this, to criticize if they so see fit. The fact that we don't accept their suggestions or their criticisms if they ever give any would not necessarily be a reflection on them, but what would be and is a reflection on them, is the fact that they have failed in this House to enunciate policies which would make them the alternative to the present Government.

**Mr. McDonald:** — You're nuts, Brown!

**Mr. Brown:** — I suggest that is their job, and if my hon. friend from Humboldt would place before the House the policies that her party and she believes in, and give the people of this province an opportunity to have them brought forward on the floor of this Legislature, I would say that she, along with other members of the Opposition, would be playing their part and their role as effective Opposition.

**Mr. McDonald:** — It's not up to us to solve your problems. You got yourself into this mess; now get yourself out.

**Premier Douglas:** — You tell the people if you've got any suggestions go ahead. Most of them suspect you haven't.

**Mr. McDonald:** — The Premier hasn't had a new thought for 20 years.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Mr. Brown:** — The hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) did suggest that if the C.C.F. Government of the province of Saskatchewan went to the country at the present time, it would be defeated. I don't know who it would be that would defeat it. It certainly couldn't be those who sit in the Official Opposition, and I doubt very

much if it could be the three who sit in the unofficial Opposition, if that is the term you might use; because in this election campaign and in the Federal field, at least, they don't appear to be putting up much of a battle.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Anybody would defeat it.

**Mr. Brown:** — The Liberal Party, as has been pointed out on many occasions in this House, is a 'dead horse' from the head of the Lakes to the Pacific Ocean, so if we were to be defeated I suggest it might have to be by a new party as yet unborn.

I was interested when the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) attempted to explain the motion moved by his now leader in the House of Commons, the phoney motion of non-confidence in which it was asked that 'John' move over to the Opposition side, and please let me sit in the Prime Minister's seat — without the endorsement of the people of the Dominion of Canada; without asking the people of Canada the Dominion of Canada if they endorsed a change of government. No explanation — not even by the member for Arm River . . .

I notice, Mr. Speaker, that it is almost 5:30, and I have about five or ten minutes more, so I would ask you to call it 5:30.

The House recessed at 5:30 o'clock p.m.

On resuming at 7:30 o'clock p.m.:

**Mr. A.L.S. Brown:** — Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate at 5:30, I was dealing with some remarks the hon. members of the Opposition had made. I had suggested I had just about completed dealing with all of the remarks which they had made, and was going to proceed to deal with one or two items which I wish to bring to the attention of the House. However, one of the remarks made by the hon. member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein) near the outset of his speech which he made here this afternoon — I want to associate myself with him in his congratulatory remarks to the people of the Assiniboia area in the efforts which they put forth in establishing what is considered to be one of the outstanding Pioneer Lodges in the province of Saskatchewan. Up until the time it was established, when it was in the stage of preparations and formulating of plans, it was at that time one of the largest projects undertaken by any community in this province. I think they are to be congratulated on their efforts and the work which the citizens of that area put forth in establishing that institution, and as he indicated here this afternoon, about two weeks ago the first of their citizens

**March 11, 1958**

moved into this Pioneer Lodge, and have become residents therein. As time progresses, I feel satisfied that the Pioneer Lodge will be accommodated to its fullest extent, and that possibly there will develop a waiting list.

However, there were some other remarks; I do not feel that he entirely informed the House as to the whole situation. I do not suggest in any way that he was attempting to mislead the House, but I do think that in projects such as this, this Government is indeed entitled to a lot of credit. As he indicated this afternoon, on projects such as this Government undertakes to pay 20 per cent of the capital cost, and in this instance, with a project that was in the neighbourhood of half a million dollars, it meant that this Government contributed somewhere over \$100,000 to the capital construction cost of that project. This left to be raised from other sources, some 80 per cent of that amount, and as the House is well aware (I don't think the hon. member was trying to mislead the House in this respect), but nevertheless . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — He did it, whether he intended to or not.

**Mr. Brown:** — . . . he left the impression, whether he intended to or not, that this other 80 per cent had to be raised on a local level. Well, as I say, all members of this House are aware that 90 per cent, or this 80 per cent that is remaining, is provided by a loan from the National Housing and Mortgage Corporation. It is true this loan has to be repaid, but the loan is made available from the National Housing and Mortgage Corporation. This left then 8 per cent of the total capital cost of a project, which is an asset to the community and which is established to be raised on the local level. The municipalities in and around Assiniboia were successful in raising this 8 per cent of this sum, \$500,000 which was required as capital construction costs.

But the fact that this Provincial Government has given the lead in this respect by undertaking to encourage the development, of a project such as this, by distributing 20 per cent of the capital cost, is indeed a credit to them, and it is a credit to them because they have given the lead in this respect over the province to the west of them — the province of Alberta. The province of Manitoba, which has a government of the same complex as my friends who sit opposite, has done absolutely nothing in this respect, and have made no steps towards establishing homes and lodges of the type that is being established here in Saskatchewan.

What has been the net result of the program that has been inaugurated by this Government in the province of Saskatchewan? The program was inaugurated in 1953 originally, and by today we have some 40 communities in the province of Saskatchewan which have established such projects and have established such homes. They have the capacity for caring for within those projects some 3,088 people who normally, under the conditions which had existed in this province, and which presently exist in the province of Manitoba and Alberta, on either side of us, have no homes they can go to. I say this Government has given, indeed, creditable leadership in that respect.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, these people who are going into these homes which originally established as low rental projects for elderly people; these people who are going into these homes are over the age of 70. They are drawing \$55 a month old-age security pension from the Federal Government (a pension, incidentally, which was raised by some \$9 after the people of Canada suggested that they no longer trusted the Liberal Party to conduct the affairs of Canada). With their old-age security of \$55 a month, plus a supplementary allowance of which this Government provides that assurance that no individual over the age of 70 in the Province of Saskatchewan will have less than \$65 a month. In addition to that, if it becomes necessary for these people to retain themselves in these homes, the Provincial Government is prepared and is paying 75 per cent of any of that amount over \$65 a month, which is required to keep these people in these homes.

So, if it is decided by local authorities that, in addition to the \$65 a month, which is provided by the old-age security plus the supplementary allowance by this Government — if an addition to that \$20 is required, this Government is prepared to pay \$15 out of that \$20. If it becomes necessary to maintain them at a cost of \$85 a month, all the local community is required to pay towards that \$85 is the sum of \$5. So I say in that respect — and the hon. member has failed to leave this impression in the House — this Government is making a creditable contribution in maintaining those people in that home, or in any other home or lodge established in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, while dealing with the Assiniboia area, I want to comment on a statement made by the Minister of Highways (Hon. J.T. Douglas) when he was outlining his Highway budget, and you will recall, Mr. Speaker, that he suggested to this House that he was going to do something which he had not previously done, and that is indicate his contracts which it might become necessary to let in the fall of 1958. I think the Minister of Highways is to be credited on the policy which he is following. The people of the province of Saskatchewan are entitled to know the program for 1958, and if there is

**March 11, 1958**

going to be any program which has to be announced in the fall, that they should be announced in this budget. I give the Minister of Highways credit for inaugurating that type of procedure — something which was not done before the present Minister of Highways assumed his responsibility. In that announcement he indicated he hoped that it might be possible to let the contract on the blacktopping or hard-surfacing of the road from Assiniboia to what he termed 'Conn's Corner' which is something like 20 miles south of Moose Jaw, and we in that area are indeed pleased to hear this. We welcome an improvement of our transportation system anywhere in the province, and particularly as respects our own area down there in the Assiniboia area, and the Bengough constituency in general.

I would like to point out the fact that in the Bengough constituency we have some 217 miles of highway and roads for which the Provincial Government has assumed full responsibility, and of that 217 miles during the period they have been in office, they have done construction and gravelling work on some 205 miles of that 217. I would like to point out to the Minister and this House that, of the amount of work (and we are certainly not being critical of the amount of work which was been done) we realize there is a limitation to their financial ability of this Government to undertake the large projects and large undertakings which they have assumed so far as providing a transportation system is concerned. But of that total amount of 217 miles which lie within the Bengough constituency, only 48 miles has been built up to the all-weather standard that the Government is presently building. Seventy-five miles of that 217 miles, in addition to the other 48 that I referred to, has been brought up to the standards of the grid road market system in this province.

I would point out that there is still 93 miles of road which the Government has assumed full responsibility for, and has not as yet been brought up to an all-weather standard, or even to the market road grid standard. While we welcome this hard surfacing of No. 2 Highway, I do feel that we have a right to expect, in the not-too-distant future, this other 93 miles which has yet to be brought up to the grid market road standard, at least conforming with standards at which highways are being built, should receive priority consideration.

As I suggested at the outset of my remarks in respect to this, the Minister has indicated that he hoped the contract will be let, may I assure this House there has been no pressure brought by myself nor anyone associated with me that the hard-surfacing of No. 2 Highway, should have priority over any other of these projects. I am simply suggesting to the House that if he sees his way clear to announce the hard surfacing of No. 2 Highway, that at the same time he undertakes, to the best of his ability, to see that these 93 miles as I suggest



be brought up to standard.

There are one or two other items I wish to deal with very briefly, and one is in respect to local governing bodies in this province. There has been a lot of discussion in this House in respect to local governing bodies, and I feel as a member of this Legislature, I have indeed a responsibility in respect to these local governing bodies. As we are all aware, these local governing bodies, whether they be school units, school districts, union hospitals, district municipalities, or whatever forms of local government you wish to refer, they operate under our legislation; they operate under the terms and conditions which we lay down in this Legislature, and it is our responsibility to see that these local governing bodies are set up in a manner by which they can most efficiently and effectively perform the duties which we delegate to them, and simply to suggest that we can solve their problems by putting money into their hands is a false impression, and one which I suggest that we, as responsible members of this Legislature, had no right to assume.

We must assure to ourselves in laying down laws, rules and regulations, giving them their jurisdiction, giving them their responsibility, that we set up the means by which they can fulfill those responsibilities and those jurisdictions and those duties which they have to perform. I suggest that any of the proposals that come before us, from whatever source, that we must look at them in that light and that after having made our decision, we have made them on the basis not of political expediency, but which in the final analysis and in the long-term will bring the best results, not only to the local governing bodies, but to the people who are taking part, and the people who receive the benefits, or who suffer the failures of these local governing bodies, if we do not create the conditions by which they can undertake their duties.

The last point I wish to touch on, Mr. Speaker, is something which has been raised in the House on several occasions. It was raised this afternoon by the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson), when he referred to the fact that industrial development in Saskatchewan had been placed upon the black list — in other words, that industrial development is by-passing the province of Saskatchewan. He is not the only one who has made such a suggestion. The Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. McDonald) has, on several occasions, made the same suggestion, that we in this province have to make some change in our attitude toward these industries, or industrialists, or they will not come into the Province of Saskatchewan. Just what do they mean by suggesting we have to make a change? I can recall another instance when it was suggested that a change would have to be made. I can recall a time that this Government entered into a farm-out deal with Consumer's Co-operative Refinery here in Saskatchewan, in which they undertook to make an arrangement with the Cooperative Consumer's Refinery of this province, to drill in the Smiley field. A statement was made at that

**March 11, 1958**

time that this would mean that the oil company would pull out of the province of Saskatchewan. I stated at that time that if there was any oil company which was doing development and exploration work in this province, and pulled out of it, they would pull out of it for one reason only, and that is, they wished then to retain the right to exploit the people of the province and to exploit the natural resources of this province for their own benefit.

I further stated at that time that any of the oil companies who were prepared to come in here to co-operate with the people of the Province of Saskatchewan in developing their natural resources, and in co-operating with them, be assured of the agreement which they entered into with the province — the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan, they would have nothing to fear. I say the same thing is equally true as far as the industrial development and the industries which come into this province. They are prepared to come in here for the purpose of developing this province, in co-operation with the people of the province, without undertaking to exploit them, and they would have absolutely nothing to fear from this Government, or absolutely nothing to fear from the C.C.F. movement in the Province of Saskatchewan.

We have shown in this province something which we maintained back in the 'thirties. We said at that time it was possible to develop our natural resources in this province on the basis of production for use, and not for profit. We have shown that in respect to the Smiley Field development, and we can show it in respect to other industrial development in this province. At the same time, this industrial development can take place in this province with outside risk capital coming in, provided they do not come in with the purpose of exploiting us, and by us I mean the members of the Opposition side, too.

Mr. Speaker, because the budget indicates that the Government has keen appreciation of the needs of the people of this province, and has a keen appreciation of the needs of further development, both of industries and natural resources; because it has a keen appreciation of the problems as they affect the little people of this province, I can assure you that I shall support the budget.

**Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in the budget debate, I first of all wish to extend my congratulations to all previous speakers, and especially my congratulations to the hon. member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron), our financial critic, and to the hon. member from Humboldt, (Mrs. Batten) for their very worthwhile contributions. I listened with interest to the hon. member opposite, and I recall one statement he made just before supper, which interest me. He said something like this:

"We, the C.C.F. are doing something here in Saskatchewan which is being done nowhere else in the world." I can't make up my mind whether he is bragging or complaining. However, I am convinced that he must think he is right and the rest of the world is wrong. I question the soundness or the wisdom of that philosophy.

I was very interested in the remarks of the hon. Minister of Health (Hon. Mr. Erb) when he spoke on the one side of the charming member from Humboldt and on the other side he questioned her integrity.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I think you've got the wrong Minister. It was the Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Bentley), Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Foley:** — I think that we in the Opposition are extremely fortunate to have a lady of Mrs. Batten's qualifications.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Bentley:** — I didn't question the lovely lady's integrity; just her intelligence.

**Mr. Foley:** — I may say, Mr. Speaker, that that is an insult not only to our hon. member from Humboldt; it is an insult to the ladies and the mothers of Saskatchewan, and I think the hon. Minister owes the women of this province an apology for that remark. I believe our hon. member has displayed her intelligence here on many occasions, and certainly we, in the Opposition, are very, very proud of her, regardless of how the members on your right, Mr. Speaker, try to belittle her remarks. I have listened carefully to all speeches on the budget, and I feel the hon. members on this side of the House have made a very substantial contribution to this debate.

The hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) this afternoon described some of the terms which the Government has used in the debate to try and belittle the intelligence on this side of the House, and I feel it ill behoves them as a government, to use either that type of language or that type of criticism in their remarks. We in the Opposition are here as 'watch-dogs' for the people of Saskatchewan. We are here to try and ensure that the Government will run the affairs of this country in an efficient way. As far as I am concerned, and I am sure many will share the opinion with me, the role of the opposition is not to tell the Government how it should run the Government. If the Government is not able to fulfil the role of governing the country, then I believe it should step aside and let someone else take over.

**March 11, 1958**

We have many instances of this, Mr. Speaker. We listened to the hon. Minister of Highways, the other day, moaning about the fact that he couldn't get brick contracts from the Federal Government.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Another mixture of ministry there.

**Mr. Foley:** — The hon. Minister of Mineral Resources left no doubt as to the origin of that statement, that we can't get brick contracts from the Federal Government. The hon. Minister of Highways says, "We can't get help for Federal highways".

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — That's right, too.

**Mr. Foley:** — He blames the Liberal Party for the stigma which is attached to the road system of today.

**Hon. Mr. Douglas:** — That's right.

**Mr. Foley:** — Well, it should be. I'm quoting, Mr. Speaker, from his remarks; there is nothing very outstanding about that. In other words, I think that the hon. Ministers, in making these statements, admit that they have been unable to promote good public relationships with two Federal Governments in the past 14 or 15 months. In other words, then, this Government has been a handicap to the province of Saskatchewan. If, because of their actions and their philosophy, we are unable to get Federal assistance in these matters, then I think it again points to the necessity of them either building up their public relationships with the Federal Government, or again I say, "Don't hold up the progress of this province any longer"!

I was very interested in the budget brought down by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) and interested in the fact that the taxpayers of Saskatchewan were able (or at least in the eyes of the Provincial Treasurer they were able) to raise \$131 million. It is the largest amount the taxpayers of this province have ever been called upon to contribute to the Provincial Treasury. I have detected, I believe, in the voices of some of the hon. members on your right, Mr. Speaker, a note of congratulation to the Provincial Treasurer for bringing down his budget. If they are proud of the fact that the taxpayers of this province are being called upon to raise a greater amount than ever before. I don't believe that is the basis upon which the budget should be judged, and I question that attitude. On the other hand, of course, I am sure all hon. members on both sides of the House are pleased that the province can raise this amount of money.

The fact remains, however, that the provincial debt is \$57 million, or, when the new accounting system goes into operation, about \$37 million. It is not my intention to question the change in the accounting system. I am sure there are few hon. members on either side of the House who understand all the implications of this change in accounting. But I have an article here I wish to refer to. The publication is the 'Voice of the Farmer', published in Minnedosa, Manitoba. It is the March 1 issue, in which the 'Tribune' Legislative reporter makes this comment:

'Manitoba Debt Free'

"Manitoba's position as one of Canada's two debt-free provinces looks better than ever. Despite a \$13 million increase in its public debt, last year, the province still had more than enough money tucked away in reserve funds to cover its whole deadweight debt."

I think that is a very significant fact. Of the 10 provinces in Canada, Manitoba under a Liberal Government is one of the two debt free provinces. There are no doubt many reasons for that, and there are no doubt many analogies which may be taken from this position, as I have quoted from this article. But regardless of that, it is the opinion of this article that Manitoba's financial position is very enviable, and I take the attitude, from reading it, that Manitoba is in a much more desirable position financially than we here in Saskatchewan are, with a provincial debt of many millions of dollars.

I, too, would like to join my colleague from Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein) with regard to senior citizens' residences in the province. I am pleased to see so many being built, and we naturally appreciate the financial assistance that is being given. I am pleased that, in my own constituency of Turtleford, two such projects are at present in the negotiation stage — one at St. Walberg and one at Spiritwood. I want to extend my congratulations to the people and the various organizations in those communities, who are bending their efforts to help our senior citizens who pioneered in this country, and who certainly deserve to spend their twilight years in peace and security.

We have heard a great deal in this Legislature about the reports of the Royal Commission, the Baker Commission. We have not only heard a great deal. We have received a great many articles, a great many booklets, covering the various recommendations of this Royal Commission. But, Mr. Speaker, I fail to see where this Government has made much use of those recommendations, today. I realize, of course, this report is recent; nevertheless we were amazed to find that the total cost of the Royal Commission on Agriculture, to the beginning of

**March 11, 1958**

last year, was somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$430,000. It may be that, at the time of speaking the cost of this Commission will have approached a half-million dollars.

It is difficult for us to judge the values of such a Commission, in terms of dollars and cents, and I don't propose to try and do that. I sincerely hope that, if a half-million dollars of the taxpayers' money of this province has been invested in such a Commission, they will receive the full value of that investment. However, I am sure that only time will decide that. I do feel, however, that with the farmers in their present precarious position, the Government might well have questioned very carefully the expenditure of such a large sum of money at this time. There are a great many things I believe the Government might have done to assist the farmer, beyond what has been done. I was interested in reading a brief put out by the Saskatchewan Farmers' Union, and I am happy to say I was able to agree with much of what went into that report. I certainly feel that setting up a crop insurance plan in this province would have been of assistance to agriculture. I mentioned, last year, and I am pleased to mention again, that the young farmer in this province needs some system of long and short-term credit to enable him to purchase and set up farming for himself.

On occasion I have seen the hon. Minister opposite smile at this suggestion, in this Session, and say, "Why should we extend money to young people when farm economy is dropping, when we are having difficulty selling our agricultural produce". I agree there may be some merit to that; nevertheless, when we lose young people from the farms, in many cases we lose them from the province of Saskatchewan. We have heard a great deal about the pulp mill 'myth' — as I would like to call it. As far as I am concerned, that is all it has even been to date — a myth.

**Premier Douglas:** — Does my hon. friend think that \$350,000 spent on it was a myth?

**Mr. Foley:** — Was that money spent by this Government, Mr. Speaker?

**Premier Douglas:** — It was spent by Mr. Campbell and his associates.

**Mr. Foley:** — I am not concerned about what Mr. Campbell spends. I am concerned about what is spent by this Government in the interests of this province.

**Mr. Brown (Bengough):** — Aren't you mistaken on that?

**Mr. Foley:** — The fact remains that, in my own particular area of northwest Saskatchewan a great number of young men have gone, this winter, to the province of Alberta, where they do

have a pulp mill, and have received employment. I believe that the economy of this province could have warranted the installation of a pulp mill some time ago, and I am sure that the people of the northern part of Saskatchewan, and particularly the Prince Alberta area, are sorely disappointed that this Government has seen fit to withhold the completion of an agreement for the building of a pulp mill for at least another year.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. That statement is completely contrary to the fact. We have not withheld any agreement with anybody. He had better stick to a subject about which he knows.

**Mr. Foley:** — I am only recalling a remark made by the hon. Minister of Natural Resources (Hon. Mr. Kuziak), Mr. Premier.

**Premier Douglas:** — At no time did the Minister say he was withholding an agreement with anybody.

**Mr. Foley:** — He stated that no pulp mill would be built for another year.

**Premier Douglas:** — No, he didn't.

**Mr. Foley:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, if I misunderstood the hon. Minister, I'm sorry. If the Minister would like to explain that to us now, I would be glad to let him.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is not talking about misunderstanding anybody: he's misquoting the Minister. The Minister at no time has said we had ever withheld an agreement from anybody. The agreement was signed and tabled . . .

**Mrs. Batten:** — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that a point of privilege?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Yes.

**Premier Douglas:** — Will the member just be seated. Mr. Speaker, I'm sure you can look after the affairs of this House without any assistance. The member invited me . . .

**Mrs. Batten:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — The member invited me and sat down. May I point that out to the hon. member! He asked for an explanation; I'm giving him an explanation. The agreement to which my friend referred was tabled in the last Session of the House. It is in the possession of the Clerk, and any member can see it. But to talk of withholding an agreement is sheer nonsense.

**March 11, 1958**

**Mr. McDonald:** — You never had an agreement.

**Premier Douglas:** — But the member just said that we had withheld an agreement. There was no withholding of any agreement.

**Mr. McDonald:** — You never had one to withhold.

**Mr. Foley:** — Mr. Speaker, I was hoping the hon. Premier, if he didn't agree with the word 'withhold' would have explained just what did happen, because I recall the headlines in the paper very vividly, and I was sure it could be procured in just a few moments. The Minister of Natural Resources says there will be no pulp mill for another year — in some form.

**Hon. Mr. McIntosh (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** — He didn't.

**Mrs. Batten:** — Not until after the next election!

**Mr. Foley:** — I'm just going to say this, I think he went on to say that one of the reasons was the fact that he seemed to feel that there was an economic depression coming on. Now, he may be right. I don't know.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — You're wrong again.

**Mr. Foley:** — But I want to suggest to this Government that they not wait until the eve of the next provincial election to promise this province another pulp mill . . .

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — We'll have it.

**Mr. Foley:** — . . . because I feel that such an action (to use words which the hon. Attorney General enjoys so much) 'absolutely despicable'.

In looking over the budget, and the estimates to be spent next year, I note that the Government is doubling the alliance for free text-books, and is looking after all text-books in Grades V to VIII. As a teacher I am pleased to see this being done. I feel this is a step in the right direction, since I believe the purchase of text-books by rural students is becoming an ever-mounting burden. Some of our students, particularly in the high schools, are forced to spend anywhere from \$40 to \$70 for text-books and school supplies, and with changing curricula and changing times (which I agree are often difficult to prevent) I do feel this is a step in the right direction. I would urge the Government, to consider continuing that policy until it takes in all texts purchased at school, because I do feel in these days when education is foremost in everyone's mind, that this is a small



way where encouragement can be given to people to assist them in sending our young people to school.

I notice in looking through the estimates that an amount of some \$85,000 or \$86,000 approaching \$100,000 is going to be spent this year, to set up a farm machinery testing laboratory of some form. This is a considerable amount of money and the question naturally arises in the minds of many of us, will this be money well spent? The hon. member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) this afternoon questioned the make-up of this organization. I don't profess to be an authority on farm machinery, but nevertheless, as a teacher, I have enjoyed, over the years, the efforts being made by many of the major machine companies to assist the farmers of this province in their purchase of farm machinery. I have been familiar with their efforts in the way of field demonstrations, showing motion pictures of farm machinery to local people, and a great many other ways in which I feel our major companies have attended to provide the farmers of this province with some idea of farm machinery.

There is no doubt, too, that our universities and our experimental farms have done valuable work. Not only have the efforts on the part of these major companies been helpful and educational, but they have been a means of social enjoyment in many of our smaller communities, and I hope, Mr. Speaker that this investment of \$85,000 which I notice in the estimates will be well spent.

The hon. Minister has said that it is more or less in the way of an experiment, and that he is not yet certain himself as to the value which may be derived from this service. However, I hope, if this is done, if this legislation is passed, and the estimates are voted, that it will not interfere with the service that the major companies have been giving the people of this province for a number of years, and that it will supplement it. I hope also that it will not be a means of raising the price of some of our farm machinery. I note that smaller companies, who may not at the moment have an agent in the province, will be required to put an agent in the province, and will be required to set up a parts depot. I hope, as I say, that it will not be an instrument for increasing the price of farm machinery to the farmers of this province.

I have here now the newspaper article to which I referred a few moments ago, and here are the headlines, Mr. Speaker: "No Saskatchewan Pulp Mill for a Year". Now, I think that is fairly clear, Mr. Speaker, and I'm going to quote . . .

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker on a question of privilege. If my hon. friend wants to go back to that, a headline hardly constitutes what the Minister said.

**March 11, 1958**

**Mr. Foley:** — All right. If you'll give me a moment, Mr. Premier, I'll quote. What does he say?

"Saskatchewan will not have a pulp mill for at least a year". Natural Resources Minister Kuziak told the Legislature, Tuesday."

**Premier Douglas:** — Yes, but where is the 'withholding' of an agreement?

**Mr. McDonald:** — You never had an agreement.

**Mr. Foley:** — Mr. Speaker, while there may be a number of explanations for this, which we on this side of the House are not aware of, I don't believe that you can have the Premier of this province, and other influential Ministers on the one side saying that capitalism and free enterprise should be done away with and on the other side, welcoming them in the back door quietly, so that we will not notice their confusion of philosophy. I don't believe they can succeed in that. I have here a copy of 'The Winnipeg Declaration of Principles' of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation. This document was printed in 1956, while the original Regina Manifesto (if I remember correctly) was printed in 1933, 23 years earlier, and the C.C.F. party have to accept that, after 23 years, they were not able to put anything in this document which changed it in one respect, because the hon. Premier himself has said that there is no change in the principles of the 'Winnipeg Declaration' over the 'Regina Manifesto'. In 23 years they have not learned their lesson, yet. Then they wonder or (shall we say) they object, to the Opposition reminding them that after 11 years of negotiation, they have not yet succeeded in persuading private enterprise to invest in a pulp mill in this province.

**Premier Douglas:** — Read us the Liberal declaration!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — They haven't got one. They're afraid to print one.

**Mr. Foley:** — The hon. Premier has asked me to read the Liberal declaration and I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, right now, that we have got everything they have got, and three times as much of it.

**Hon. Russ Brown:** — Then what are you kicking about?

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order!

**Hon. Mr. Kuziak:** — He has to get it out of a newspaper, eh?

**Mr. McDonald:** — You won't let the newspaper in to your conventions; you're ashamed of them.

**Mr. Foley:** — I was rather interested in a little remark in the official organ of the C.C.F. party, the other day, entitled, 'The Commonwealth'. I think their choice of names was rather unfortunate. When I think of the 'Commonwealth' it is only natural that I think of the British Commonwealth of Nations which has stood the test of time, which is the greatest Empire on the earth today; and when I try to associate my original feelings, regarding that word with this 'rag', really, Mr. Speaker, I wonder sometimes if it isn't a bad misnomer.

However, I will give them credit for one thing. They dubbed our hon. member from Humboldt (Mrs. Batten) the other day, "contrary Mary", and I want to congratulate them for it. I am very proud of our hon. member. The only reason they dubbed her as 'contrary', Mr. Speaker, is because she disagrees with the philosophy of the C.C.F. party on each and every occasion, and I congratulate her for it.

**Mr. McDonald:** — She uses good judgment.

**Mr. Foley:** — The hon. Premier asked me if I would say something about the Liberal declaration. Well, fortunately, the Liberal declaration is something we have had for a great number of years, long before the hon. gentleman opposite could read. It is not something that public pressure forced us to condense, or change, or disguise, as was the Winnipeg Declaration. But the Liberal declaration, Mr. Speaker, is a way of life. It is something that has grown with Canada. It is synonymous with success and prosperity in Canada.

The Liberal declaration pledges immediate 25 per cent tax cuts for the bulk of Canadians, and free education for 40,000 university students, if they are elected on March 31. The Liberal party is a Reform party which attends to the wishes of the majority of the people, which is more than I can say for the hon. members opposite.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Foley:** — The Liberals will reduce personal income taxes by 4 per cent on the first \$3,000 of taxable income.

**Hon. Mr. Brown:** — 'John' will top that!

**Mr. Foley:** — This will be a saving to the young people of Canada of a quarter of a billion dollars a year.

**Hon. Mr. Brown:** — John' will make it half a billion!

**March 11, 1958**

**Mr. Foley:** — That's the second clause in the Liberal declaration.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, could I ask my hon. friend, was this enunciated before June 10 last, or after?

**Mrs. Batten:** — We've never enunciated anything.

**Mr. McDonald:** — I thought you said it had never been changed.

**Mr. Foley:** — As I said before, the Liberal party is a reform party. I think the hon. members opposite are just jealous, because they have never given us anything new or different for the past 25 years; and all they can do after 25 years is lick postage stamps — pardon me, stickers, and put them on Government envelopes.

Clause 3 of the Liberal declaration: newly married couples would have their basic exemptions doubled to \$4,000 a year for the first three years of married life. Romantic as well as logical! The special 7 1/2 per cent excise tax on automobiles would be done away with. I'm sure the hon. members have heard enough of our Liberal declaration to recognize its superiority to anything they have offered.

**Mr. Johnson (Kerrobart-Kindersley):** — Give us the rest of it.

**Hon. Mr. Brown:** — 'John' will out promise you, don't worry.

**Mr. Foley:** — In fact, the hon. members opposite have become so bereft and so barren of thought and so concerned about their future, that they have done something unprecedented, I think, in a political party. Hoping to take care of the few C.C.F. supporters they will have after next March 31, hoping to give them something to encourage them in their twilight years, they have caused to be published a life insurance policy for the C.C.F. Party.

**Mr. McDonald:** — They need it!

**Mr. Gardiner:** — What a risk!

**Mr. Foley:** — Mr. Speaker, there's only one thing that disappoints me. I can't seem to find out if it is a Crown Corporation or not. I want to say that if it is a Crown Corporation, then I am afraid that the future of the people who invested in this policy is being badly jeopardized, and I would sincerely hope that their money will be refunded. However, I take this as a very serious comment, Mr. Speaker, but at the same time it also constitutes a threat, because I want to read you just a few things from this insurance policy.

I immediately looked, of course, for the signature of our own Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) at the bottom, but I note it isn't signed.

**Mr. McDonald:** — He's resigning!

**Mr. Foley:** — It seems to me that, if the C.C.F., Party of Canada is going to issue a life insurance policy for their supporters, and if it is to be valid, I think it should be signed. Obviously, the people who invested in this policy haven't got very much. But anyway, it states that the beneficiaries will be the people of Canada.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Agreed!

**Mr. Foley:** — . . . but only in the event of a timely and hopeful demise of the old-line parties, Mr. Speaker. I ask you, is that ethical? I can understand the hon. members opposite wanting to see the defeat of the old-line parties . . .

**Hon. Mr. McIntosh:** — Everybody's got to die!

**Mr. Foley:** — . . . but to use the word 'demise' — that is not even imaginative! I could go on, Mr. Speaker, but I know the hon. member from Saltcoats (Mr. Loftson) has a few remarks that he would like to make on this debate, this evening, if he is given the opportunity, and I want to suggest that, when the C.C.F. Insurance Company issues a policy, I believe this policy should be financially secure. I understand that the premium for this policy was a contribution to the C.C.F. party.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Oh no, take it away!

**Mr. Foley:** — But surely they could have had a signature on the policy. Otherwise, I don't feel that it was particularly good ethics. But there is one more thing, Mr. Speaker. This is the first insurance policy I have ever seen, bought and paid for, and having attached to it, very conveniently, a cheque form, a blank cheque.

It looks to me as if there is no end to how much the people supporting the C.C.F. party may have to pay in the next few years for this life insurance. I am sure, as far as we in the Liberal Party are concerned, will do our level best to make sure there isn't one C.C.F.'er in Canada ever collects five cents from this insurance policy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it has been, I note, rather stylish during this debate to refer to some type of poetic writings. The hon. member from Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) referred to the hon. Minister as "Toby or not-to-be", quoting the words of Shakespeare.

**March 11, 1958**

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Oh, if you haven't anything better to say, why don't you sit down?

**Mr. Foley:** — That is the question! The hon. Minister has replied in like vein, "Whether 'tis nobler to suffer the slings or arrows of outrageous fortune . . ." and, of course, that immediately gave the hon. member from Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein) the inspiration for the Dying Eagle, where we have the 'rain-drenched raven' pictured as the plight of our hon. Premier, and the 'arrow of outrageous fortune' was, of course, his honourable debating opponent of Mossbank, the Liberal candidate in the present Federal election.

So it has been poetical — and we have the hon. Minister of Health (Hon. Mr. Erb) referring to another well-known selection, suggesting that the Opposition members will go down "to the dust from whence they sprung". Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed this as a teacher, and I am sure that all our fellow teachers, past and present, enjoyed these references to the great authors of the day.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — I am afraid the House is in ill repute.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Don't try to kid us.

**Mr. Foley:** — I assure you I am not, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, you are a supreme authority on that, Mr. Attorney General. When I think of the blot which 25 years of Socialism has left on the history of Canada and Saskatchewan, I could not help but think of another reference from the 'immortal bard' when he said, in the person of Lady MacBeth: "All the perfumes of Arabia cannot wash that stain from this lily-white hand".

However, in closing my remarks, I was pleased to hear the hon. Minister of Telephones (Hon. Mr. Williams) the other day giving us some concrete advice about what to do in case of dire emergency. I believe that the financial picture in this province is one of dire emergency. I believe the tax burden, the arrears of taxation in the province, the unsold grain in the province, the general plight of industry in the province, can be considered one of crisis, and the hon. Minister of Telephones suggested to us that, in case of dire emergency, we dial 0, Mr. Speaker. That is the only constructive bit of advice I have heard from the Government at this Session — dial 0.

**Premier Douglas:** You could tune in on it.

**Mr. Foley:** — I have enjoyed myself very much, as I have enjoyed the hon. member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson) this afternoon. You know, I admire his white hair

and the wisdom of his years, and it is my hope that many hon. members on the other side of the House will have the opportunity to acquire his wisdom. However, I don't know just how much hope there is for many of them to remain around as long as the hon. member from Arm River. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, because of the handicap this Government has been to the progress of Saskatchewan, by their own admission, because of the fact they feel they are the only Government in the world that's right, I feel the time is rapidly approaching when the people of this province are becoming aware for the necessity for a change.

**Mr. Howe:** — They got, it last June!

**Mr. Foley:** — I was rather disappointed to note that the hon. Minister of Highways (Hon. J.T. Douglas) has given up any further plans for the Petrofka bridge this year. You know, the North Saskatchewan River reminds me somewhat of the old Chinese wall — it has been a big barrier to northern road development in Saskatchewan for a long time. Nevertheless, I sincerely hope the hon. Minister of Highways will see fit to recognize the plea which has been made to him from both sides of the House, regarding the importance of that bridge. While construction or regrading or gravelling in the constituency that I represent, I note, however, some road work in the surrounding area, and that I am pleased to see. I believe, however, the most urgent necessity in my seat is the continuation of Highway No. 55 west to the Alberta border, joining up with the link north of Lloydminster. I would like to urge the hon. Minister again to give this every consideration.

With those remarks then, Mr. Speaker, I am sure I have left no doubt I will not support the budget.

**March 11, 1958**

**Mr. J.W. Horsman (Wilkie):** — Mr. Speaker, in rising at this late date to take part in this debate, no doubt anyone doing so will be guilty of more or less repetition. We have heard a lot of it up until now; and not only late in the debate, but late in the afternoon and early in the evening. However, there are a few things that I would like to say.

I think it is the duty of everyone who is a member of this Legislature to stand up here and say a few words and express his own opinions, at least, on certain matters of importance.

Some things have been said today, about the duty of an Opposition in a Legislature. I think the Opposition is a very important part of any government. I do not believe in the one-party system; therefore, I think the Opposition is a very important group; and while we here, on this side of the house, who form the opposition, are a small group, yet I believe we are a fairly effective Opposition, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. J.T. Douglas (Minister of Highways):** — We need more like you, Jack.

**Mr. Horsman:** — There are some things we have advocated here since we have sat on this side of the House that have been adopted by the Government. I do not think it is the duty of the Opposition to tell the Government what to do; we are here to criticize things that we think are wrong. We did criticize the Public Revenue Tax here for a number of years. We finally brought in a resolution asking for its abolition, which was voted down by the members of the Government, and in the dying hours of the same session, an amendment was brought into the Act abolishing the Public Revenue Tax. Well, of course, we got no praise or credit for doing that. However, I do not believe it would have been done if it had not been for the pressure we brought on the Government.

Another thing that was mentioned in the House, today, if I remember correctly, was certain clauses taken out of the Crown Corporations Act. When the Government was asked why they did it, they said: "Because" (in common language) "the Liberals didn't like it." Now, I think we must have put some pressure on the Government or they would not have done that.



It is also usual, Mr. Speaker, to say a few words about your own constituency, which I intend to do, very briefly. I am very proud of my constituency. I suppose every member in this house is proud of the people he represents. We have many acres of good wheat land; we have good towns; we have some development in natural resources, but the greatest resource we have in my constituency, Mr. Speaker, are the people who live there, and I am very proud to represent them. I may say that the first major discovery of gas, and some other things made in this province, was made in the vicinity of my home town of Unity. The first gas field that was discovered here was discovered at Unity. It is not a big field, but the wells are very good producers. It is not a big field, but it has supplied our town and the power plant at Unity, and several other plants there with gas for a good number of years.

Salt and potash beds were also first discovered in that area, and the first development and the first salt plant in this province was at Unity. They produce in the neighbourhood of 200 tons of salt daily. They work seven days a week, day and night, and employ some 50 people. The potash plant there is still working not at full steam, but they are still going. They are down about 1,600 or 1,700 feet with their shaft. I might say that that company had a good deal of trouble there that the other companies have been able to overcome by the mistakes that Western Potash made when they started in at Unity. When they started in there, of course, they knew there was quicksand which they had to go through, but they thought it was possible to dig through that quicksand. They found, after several weeks of hard work and they dipped out quicksand until their head frame started to sink, and they found that they had to freeze the quicksand off, which they did at great expense. These other companies which have started recently have profited by the mistakes which were made there; but I believe they will go ahead and finish their job sometime.

We have heard a lot, too, since we came down here and before that, about the great industrial development which we have in Saskatchewan. I think everyone in this House is glad to see industrial development, whether it is big or small. The development of our natural resources is no small thing, I think; we are all more than happy to see these things done. We have had some industrial expansion; there isn't any question about that, and I say our discoveries and the development of natural gas and oil and our other

**March 11, 1958**

natural resources are considerable. I think that this development should create considerable work for the people, because there are times of year when work is slack and some people are out of work. I do not think, though, that this development is as great as some people would have us believe. It seems strange to me that in the midst of all this great industrial development, and the development of our natural resources which are considerable, that we should have more unemployed at this time than we have had for many years. The Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. Williams) told us, today, that 9 per cent of our Labour force in Saskatchewan is idle. Why is it, if this development is as great as we are told, that we have more men out of work then ever? It doesn't make sense to me. Now you cannot blame unemployment on increase in population, because our population has been remaining about static the last few years. It is not that. We haven't been able even to hold our natural increase; but if we had held our natural increase and also held our share of the immigrants who have come to Canada in recent years, I wonder how many unemployed we would have at this time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, and even today, when I saw the galleries up there full of young people, and when we had the students here from the University a couple of weeks ago — when I looked at those young people I couldn't help but wonder how many of them would stay in this province after they had completed their education. I can take my own family. We had just an ordinary family; we raised seven children, and one out of seven stayed in Saskatchewan. I wonder why that was. There is some reason for these things, Mr. Speaker, and I could tell you of many other families like ours, who have drifted away from this province.

I was sort of amused — not really amused, but impressed to some extent when the member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) was speaking in the House, the other day, about population. I don't know whether he was criticizing the Government or not, but he thought that our population should be increasing faster than it is. I should just like to say, Mr. Speaker, that if our population is not increasing fast enough you cannot blame 'Wilf' Gardiner; you can't blame 'Hammy' McDonald; and you can't blame my hon. friend from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer). Those young men are certainly doing their share — but will their families remain here when they grow up? That is what bothers me.

I will repeat that I think industrial development should make work for men; it should create employment. I have heard, Mr. Speaker, of no manufacturing companies in recent years who have gone out of business in this province, and many have started up anew, and yet unemployment is one of our greatest problems. I think conditions must sure speak for themselves. There is no unemployment

on the farm; it is just in the cities and in the towns. Of course, our cities are increasing in population and the farm population is dropping. Many Saskatchewan farmers are in bad shape; they are in a bad position. No one in this House will deny that; it is a very obvious fact. I do not intend to blame the Government of Saskatchewan for all this trouble that the farmers find themselves in, but I do think, Mr. Speaker, that this Government must take their fair share of the responsibility for farm conditions as they exist here. Most things in the province are under the jurisdiction of the Provincial Government — property and everything of that nature is under provincial jurisdiction. So it is senseless, to me, to hear people blaming the Federal Government for all the ills that befall the people of a province.

I cannot see that this Government has done very much in a direct way to help agriculture since they came into office, many years ago now. I think there are things they could do, or at least promote, that would ease the situation to some extent. I think that, if this Government, for instance, had had the best interests of the farmers at heart, they would not be using margarine instead of butter in their public institutions. It is all right to say that this is a small thing. Maybe it is a comparatively small thing; but if butter was used instead of margarine, it would help the dairy farmers of this province, at least to some extent. You must admit that.

I think that the land policy of the Provincial Government shows in itself how much sympathy this Government has for farm people. You cannot buy Crown land in this province; you cannot homestead it. All you can do is take it under lease and for your whole life, if you live on that land, you are always a tenant of the Government. You will never own the land in your own right; and you will not be able to pass the deed on to your family, or sell your land, if you want to leave. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, how many people would have come to this country from foreign lands if, in the early days of this province, this Act had been in force. If the best deal they could have got was a Government lease, do you think they would have come here from Europe, from the East, from the States or anywhere else, and taken up land under a Government lease? It has always been the ambition of every person, as far as I know, to own some property and to own it in their own right; to look out over your farm or your holdings, whatever they might be, and be able to say, "this belongs to me". Or he might quote the words of Alexander Selkirk, "I am monarch of all I survey; my right there is none to dispute." But as long as you are on a Government lease it is not your land, and someone can dispute your right.

I think another thing that doesn't amount, probably, to too much — the Minister of Highways (Hon. J.T. Douglas) is sit-

**March 11, 1958**

ting there, and I am going to mention this), is the way that highways cut through people's farms. It is done at the request of the farmer. Don't ever think that, it does make a little better road and shortens the mileage up to some but what about the man who has his farm cut corner-ways, Mr. Speaker? What about him? Why isn't there some consideration for him? Sure, they will pay him for his land, but that doesn't amount to much. If you went along the edge of his land and built a good road he would give you the land. He would think nothing of it, and would be glad to do it; but to cut through his farm leaves a damage that will stay there forever, not only for a year or ten years. It will always be there, and he will be forced to farm his land in triangles. Any farmer knows what that means, or should.

I think one thing that is taking people off the farms is the school system that we now have. I have never been too critical of the Larger School Units, because I can see some virtues in that plan; but the way it works out now, our country schools are being closed all the time. In a few years, if this system keeps up, there will be no more country schools; they will they will be a thing of the past. School children are being transported by bus to school in most areas now. That system works out very well as long as the roads are good; but the roads in this province have a habit of getting blocked up with snow in the winter, and clay roads get muddy and impassable in the summertime. We can recall two years ago — we don't need too long a memory to remember that, when roads were blocked for months at a time, and it was impossible for school buses to run. The only thing that people living in the rural areas could do then was to take their children to town by some means, leave them there, get some place for them to board, and pay the shot while they were there, and leave them there on their own. Now people, farmers included, do not want to do things like that. They want to be with their children and with their families, because they think, when children are growing up, in their formative years, it is very important that they must be with their parents. And that is another thing that has made people move to town. They go to the town and build or buy a house, and live there, because they can send their children to school and educate them and be sure that the children will be at school every day; and have someone to look after them when they are not in school.

What happens then? The farmer has moved to town and what happens to his livestock? He drives back and forth and farms his land. That is no difficulty at all, but instead of a farmer then he is just a grain grower and nothing else. I doubt if you could classify a grain grower as a farmer.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Horsman:** — I don't think it is good business to be a grower of grain only, and every time a farmer moves to town and farms from town you have another sowless, cowless, henless farm, and it is no good for the agricultural economy of this country.

People sometimes, of course, are fortunate enough to live close to a good highway and can get children to school without too much difficulty. Another of course, children have to be taken to a certain place where the school bus passes. Many times they have to haul them three or four miles to get them there, and sometimes when they get there they find that the bus cannot arrive on account of the roads. There's no fault attached to the bus driver or anything like that; but in order to run buses here the year around, the first thing you have to have is better roads, and they should have been built first. I think that the grid road system is a step in the right direction. I think I advocated a system something like that in this House a good many years ago, but in this instance we have put the cart before the horse. We should have had the roads before we had the school buses, to make the thing really successful.

I think, too, that a larger percentage of the cost of the grid system should be carried by the Government. I have no fault to find with the system except the cost. Many municipalities find it, I think, almost impossible to go into this road grid system without burdening themselves with debt that they cannot afford to handle. There is only one source of revenue in a rural municipality. They have taxes on the land and that is all; and I think that land taxes are at the saturation point right now, and I do not think they can go any higher. There is one thing I think everybody must realize and it is that you cannot tax people beyond their ability to pay, and when we see tax arrears piling up year after year, we must realize that taxes are beginning to be a burden. Some people say taxes are no factor. I have a list here of the school districts and the larger school units, and there are hundreds of thousands of dollars of arrears of taxes. Maybe they are no problem; but if they aren't, why aren't they paid? Here is my own area right here — \$208,761 arrears of taxes, and that is school taxes alone.

Something was said in this House, today, about the preservation of a family farm — I forget who was talking about it. I think that is one of the most important things there is, and, just as I said a moment ago, when people move off the farm, whether it is to have their children educated or for any other reason, there is another family farm gone. Conditions must be created so that farmers will stay on the land and not just grow grain. They should be able to

**March 11, 1958**

keep livestock and have a real farm instead of just a grain farm.

Farm credit has been mentioned, too, in this House, many times during this Session; credit for the farmers. Some of the provinces have a system under which they loan money to farmers to buy land and other things. We have in this province an Industrial Development Fund. I am not critical of that, Mr. Speaker; I think it has probably done some good. But why couldn't some system similar to that be applied to agriculture?

**Mr. McDonald:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Horsman:** — If we can loan money to people to build a factory or anything else — it might be a good investment; the factory might be a good thing for the province or the city; but what about the farmers? Are they important, or are they not? Are we going to let our young people slip away on us to the other provinces and do nothing to try and hold them here? We can guarantee bonds for industrial corporations, loan them money; but what happens about agriculture? Why couldn't the same thing be applied some way? Or has this Government, Mr. Speaker, lost faith in the basic industry of this province? I sometimes wonder, when you want to build a million-dollar building there is always lots of money for that; we see it done every day. The Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Willis) spoke here, yesterday. I think it was, and he told us about all the money that was going to be spent on Public Works during this year. These things are no doubt necessary, but I think that some assistance to agriculture is also very, very necessary.

There are other things that the Government could have done during the last few years to help agriculture, too. We remember here when the farmers had no way to store their grain; they couldn't sell it, and it was piled up on the ground. We have a Timber Board here in this province. All the timber produced in Saskatchewan, practically every stick, is under the Timber Board. They buy from the producers what they don't produce themselves, and they sell it to the public and export it to the United States and to the other provinces. Why couldn't they have supplied lumber to farmers at a somewhat reduced rate — about cost or not too far above cost — to have helped them over those difficulties? Why couldn't they have built some public storage, so that the grain could have been taken off the farms and the farmers could have got the initial payment? Someone else do it — but not us! It is not our responsibility! Well, I just cannot see it that way, Mr. Speaker.

As I said, there would be some repetition. I am going to say a word about farm electrification — not too much. It

is a great thing for the farms to have power. There is no question about that. It is a great thing for the cities and towns, too, Mr. Speaker, to have electric power; and it was something they had in the towns and cities many years before it was extended to the farms. It costs little or nothing to hook up a house or a home in town with electric power, but when you get out in the country it is "\$500 please", or you don't get hooked up. No one needs to tell me that it costs more to put power into a farm than it does for a house in town — I know that, but we have another thing that is being done here in this province, and that is the distribution of natural gas. Natural gas is piped across this province from city to city, and most of the principal towns, and the rate is equalized, (almost equal) across the province. I think, Mr. Speaker, that is the way it should be. I think that is the only way it can be done; but no one can tell me that you can take natural gas from Brock or Coleville and pipe it up to the city of Prince Albert for the same price that you can pipe it into the town of Kindersley. I say that farm electrification costs more than it does to put power into a house in town. We have to admit that; but why not pool the whole thing, the same as you are doing with the gas? Why wasn't it done that way? It is the only fair way.

I think it is time that the farmers in this province did get a break, even if it does cost more. I have often said, and I am going to repeat it, that if the farmers of this province stopped producing grain and stopped farming for three years, there would be grass growing up in the street, in every street in Regina, in three years.

**Mr. McFarlane:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Horsman:** — If the towns and cities are so important that they must get the breaks, why weren't they built here before the farms were developed at all? Why weren't they? Do you think we would ever have had a city or a town here if farmers hadn't come in from everywhere and made a country out of this Province? Do you think so? The farmers came in first, and the towns were built later to service the farmers on the farms. What other excuse is there for a town in this province? They were only built to service the agricultural industry. There is no other excuse for them.

With regard to the gas that they are distributing throughout Saskatchewan, I think it is a fine thing, and I am not critical of it all — except as to the price. We have had gas in our town for many years. It costs us, to heat the average house, about 50 cents per thousand cubic feet; in Saskatoon, I believe the

**March 11, 1958**

cost is around 80 cents under the Power Corporation. That is quite a difference.

I read a little article, the other day, in a magazine entitled "Taxation — the Hidden Tyrant". It was written by General Douglas MacArthur, and it is a very revealing article. I believe it applies with equal force to this country here. Now this does not apply only to provincial taxes. It applies to all taxes, and I believe the people of this province are being taxed to death. General MacArthur said that in the United States one-third of your income goes for taxation to the Government. I do not suppose the percentage would be much different here.

When we talk about taxes, I have here a financial statement from my municipality. People say that school taxes are not a factor, that they are not too high. Now this municipality is just an average one, with an assessment of less than \$3,000,000. It is not the municipality I live in; this is Rural Municipality No. 410, and it joins mine. The general municipal levy for that municipality is \$41,839. The school tax levy is \$59,023; the hospital tax \$3,229. The school taxes, Mr. Speaker, are considerably more than all the other taxes combined in that municipality. My own municipality is the same, No. 381. We have complete health services, have had for many years, and yet our school taxes are more half of our total taxes in the municipality in which I live.

Does it seem reasonable that these taxes should go any higher, although they are going up two mills this year? Where is the thing going to end? We have farmers there who are paying more than \$100 a quarter-section in school taxes alone. Has that got nothing to do with the cost-price squeeze, Mr. Speaker? That is an expense that has gone up and up and up. I haven't got the answer to it, but the only thing I can see is some system such as was recommended by a resolution which was brought into this House, a few days ago — some sort of a foundation program for education so that we would have an equalized tax rate across the province.

As far as my area is concerned, we didn't ask to get into the Larger School Unit. We were put in there by Ministerial order; we didn't vote on it or anything else. We were just put in. Why is it that certain parts of this province are not in Larger School Units yet? And why hasn't an equalized tax rate been spread across the whole province? I think that is the only fair way. Right where we live, our municipality is assessed twice as high as some of the other municipalities that are in that school district. Now I am not complaining that we pay a larger share of the tax than any other municipality there. I am not complaining about that; but that is a system that should be applied right across the country.



I think anyone should see that, should know it.

When we talk, about taxation I think everyone agrees that we are being taxed too high, not one provincial tax, but everything we buy we pay taxes on — the food we eat, the machinery we use, when we buy a car and so on; and yet, on 31st March, just a few days now, we will have a chance to get a tax if we do the right and the sensible thing, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Pearson, in his program, has offered us a \$400 million tax cut.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Do you believe it?

**Mr. Horsman:** — We will also have the opportunity, at that time, Mr. Speaker, of supporting a man who, in my opinion, and I think in the opinion of every man in this House, has had more to do with the preservation of the peace of the world than any other man now living. We hear a good deal of talk about this recession that we are in now. Business has slipped considerably in the last year, less than a year. I doubt that there is much to this recession. It is just a case, Mr. Speaker, of history repeating itself. I saw the same thing happen in 1911. I saw the same thing happen again in 1930. Here we have it again right after June 10th last. Does it mean anything? Does it ring a bell in anybody's head? I wonder!

Now, of course, we have a problem here in the west peculiar to the west, and that is our grain surplus. And we talk about how we are going to get rid of this grain — bonus payments to farmers to keep their grain on the farms, and all this sort of thing; parity prices supported by the Government; give away the wheat and the Government pay the farmer for it. Well, it could be a very poor system if we tried it. Nothing but a temporary relief — it could never be anything else. We can talk about wheat from now until doomsday, and when we got all through, we will just come back to one thing, and that is international trade — nothing else. We must sell it. That is the only way to get rid of our surplus. We must sell on the open market in competition with every wheat grower in the world. If everyone else was put on the same basis, I think we would get along all right. I think tariffs could be reduced considerably, to cause the trade of the world to flow a little freer into Canada; and I don't think we would have any trouble selling our wheat.

Tariff, to my mind, is a subsidy to many of our manufacturers. I can remember, when I was still pretty young, hearing them talk about tariffs in Canada to protect Canada's infant industry. That is a good many years ago. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that by this time Canada's industries should have outlived the diaper stage, and be pretty well grown up by now. If they are not, the ones that cannot

**March 11, 1958**

compete I think had better go out of business, just the same as the farmer does when he can't get along; he has to go out of business, too.

Trade with Britain and Asia — freer trade is a possibility; I don't think there is any doubt about it. I think it could be done and would help the situation very much. Cheap foreign goods on our market might cause some of our industries to suffer, but let them go at something, else and produce something that they can, where they can compete with the rest of the world. Industries that cannot survive without a subsidy should go out of business and try some other line. I am sure that the Government of Saskatchewan will agree with me there, Mr. Speaker, because they have had lots of experience along this line. They have had business after business go out of business as soon as they found they couldn't make them pay. They were losing money; they couldn't compete with others in the same line — so they did the right thing — they went out of business. That is what they had to do. And the last one that has gone out of business was just recently — the Prince Albert Box Factory.

Trade must be a two-way street. We cannot expect to sell to people forever for cash and take nothing from them in return. We can do almost anything else in this age; we even have new moons up in the sky, now. Men have succeeded in doing that. The advances in science in recent years have been simply wonderful, the advances in medical science, too. Many diseases that were dreaded, a few years ago, are nothing now. People know how to cure them. I think it would be a bold man, today, that would say that he knew the end of human ingenuity. How far the world will go is anybody's guess; but what places man above the other animals, of course, is that man has the power to think. He is a thinking animal, and he has thought these things out. One thought leads to another, and so on; and education and experimentation, and so on, have put men where they are, today.

We learned how to split the atom a few years ago, and when we discovered that, Mr. Speaker, we unleashed a power on the world that is so great, and in many ways so terrible, that it staggers the imagination. When we think of the power of the atom we think of it, now, in terms of atomic bombs, and weapons of destruction; but we know, too, that atomic power could be and, I think will be, the greatest blessing that mankind has had up to the present time. I think that these things will be applied to peaceful purposes, and that men will find out how to resolve their differences without armed conflict.

In my opinion, sir, the atomic bomb and the hydrogen bomb — the terrible weapons that men have today that could destroy the world and destroy mankind — are the one thing, perhaps, that is keeping us out of war now. We may think that men rule the world. I don't think they do. I think there is a power greater than man that

rules the world.

I am just going to say a word about the women in politics. We have two women in our Legislature here, and we are very proud of them. I think they make a real contribution to the affairs of this House. In my opinion, we should have many more women in politics. They take a different attitude towards many things from what men do. The men think they are the great powerful he-animals; he rules the universe, he is the big boss. He may run that bluff when he is away from home, but he doesn't get away with it too much at home, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether we would ever have a war if half of our members of parliament were women. I just wonder whether we would or not. We don't realize what we are indebted to women for: we are indebted to them for our homes and our families, and we must remember that they are the mothers of the nation. Don't forget those things.

We have four political parties in Canada today. We have the two major parties and the two 'splinter' groups, I might say. First we have the great, glorious old Liberal party.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Horsman:** — I am getting hoarse, Mr. Speaker; I have had a cold, the last few days, and a sore throat and it is hard for me to talk. When I take this drink of water it reminds me of a story I heard, one time, about Sir John A. MacDonald. Some of you may have heard it. He was speaking at some big political meeting and he got hoarse, like I am now. There was no water on the table, and he turned and asked the Chairman if he couldn't get him a drink; and the Chairman said: "Well we have no water here, but I will get you a drink of milk." Sir John said, "That will be fine." So they brought him in a glass, but it wasn't milk, it was whiskey, and he downed it, and then turned to the Chairman and said; "Well, Mr. Chairman, God bless the cow that gave that milk."

So we have these two splinter parties. I suppose they have their place in public affairs . . .

**Mr. McDonald:** — I doubt it.

**Mr. Horsman:** — . . . and we have the great Conservatives, and the great Liberal party. Now they are all at it. I remember reading a little piece in the paper out at Vancouver, the Vancouver 'Sun'. My hon. friends in the corner there will be

**March 11, 1958**

interested in this. It was written by some lumber operator out there, and he said:

"The Social Credit Government of B.C. have not yet killed the goose that laid the golden egg; but they did come along and take the eggs."

I cannot say very much more tonight, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry. I wish I could speak a little longer, but I want to say a few words about Socialism and the 'Regina Manifesto' and things of that nature — not too much; but I think that the group to your right, sir, are Socialists. They always say there are, anyway.

**Mr. McDonald:** — I don't hear any applauding.

**Mr. Horsman:** — It is very easy to sit down with a piece of paper and pencil and figure out a system and make it look good. You can do that with almost anything. Our Provincial Treasurer here can make a pretty good job even with that budget he brought down, the other day. I want to congratulate him on the able manner in which he presented that budget, and the good job he made, considering the material that he had to work with, but it just shows you what people can do.

Before this Government went into office in the first place, they told us they were going to go into Crown businesses and that this was where they were going to get all the money for social services. We would be supplied with hospitalization and medical services and everything else "without money and without price". These Crown Corporations were going to roll millions of dollars into the treasury, a golden stream of dollars, and all our troubles would be over and we would be happy forever after. We would almost have a new heaven and a new earth. Well, I don't need to go into the history of the Crown Corporations at all, except to say that the only place they have been successful is where they have had a monopoly, or almost a monopoly. Socialism to me, Mr. Speaker, is just a dream, just a fine, intellectual dream, and it will have to be paid for by the sweat of every person who works. We see that by the losses of our Crown Corporations. Who pays it? The people of Saskatchewan must make up the loss.

Now it is all right to dream. Everybody dreams; but it reminds me of a verse in Kipling's 'If'. I am going to quote this verse:

"If you can dream  
And not make dreams your master;  
If you can think  
And not make thoughts your aim;  
If you can meet both triumph and disaster,  
And treat both these impostors just the same;"

I will quote you another line.

"If you can bear to hear the truth you have spoken,  
Twisted by knaves to make a trap for fools,  
And watch the things you gave your life to broken,  
And stoop and build them up with worn-out tools."

Now I am going to say a word about the equality of men. People say that all men are equal. I cannot see it. Abraham Lincoln made a great speech one time, a long time ago in the United States, at Gettysburg. I want to quote the first few lines of his speech. He started like this:

"Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth upon this continent, a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

Now I think I could go that far with him. I believe men are created equal. I don't suppose one baby an hour old is much different from another baby an hour old; but when they grow up there is a difference between people. They have mental differences, physical differences, and most important of all is the moral difference. One man has the physical strength to do a lot of heavy work, while another person might be weak physically, with great mental powers. In my opinion, the power that is most important of all is moral strength. Anyone can have that. So I think that people are not all equal; but I do think, as I said a moment ago, we do not run this Universe. We are just beginning to learn a few of the things that we see, and we are finding out how to use them.

Benjamin Franklin was another great American and, in speaking to a political group one time, he said this (He was an old man then, probably older than I am):

"Gentlemen, I have lived a long time and the longer I live the more convinced I become that God governs in the affairs of men; and if a sparrow can't fall without his notice, is it possible that an empire can rise without his aid."

I think these are things that people should think about to some extent, anyway.

I do think, Mr. Speaker, that it is the duty of a government to create conditions under which people will have a chance

**March 11, 1958**

to work for a living, to raise a family and to be good citizens, and to carry on that great tradition of honesty and independence which is such a great and important feature of Canadian life. I don't think anyone should get the idea that the country or the state owes him a living. I am not a believer Mr. Speaker, in the welfare state. I think it is fine, and it is our duty to look after the aged, the weak, the sick or the crippled, but I do not think that we should get the idea at any time that the state owes us a living without our own effort.

You know, sometimes it is rather amusing to sit in this House. We see a guy sitting here by the name of McDonald — a great old Scottish name. We see another fellow over there by the name of Douglas, another great Scottish name; and they fight and they chew and they throw stuff at one another all the time. They must be descendants of some great Scottish clan somewhere, sometime. I suppose that is just a throwback to the old Scottish clan, maybe a thousand years ago — you know how they used to fight with one another. The Highlanders would come down out of the hills and steal all the Lowlanders' cattle and sheep and drive them back into the mountains. This is probably just a throwback to that, and to those times.

I cannot help but think that governments, like men are made to die. No government ever stayed in office forever. No man ever did unless he died before his time was up; but it is an acknowledged fact that no government stays in office forever. This Government that we have here has held office for quite a long time. They have been successful, but, you know, to quote Abraham Lincoln again, he said: "You can fool part of the people all the time; you can fool all the people part of the time; but you can't fool all the people all the time." My opinion is that this Government is getting pretty well to the end of their rope. I believe that the Premier is beginning to feel the hot breath of 'Hammy' McDonald on the back of his neck.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Horsman:** — Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I have said enough for a man who has a sore throat, a sore mouth and can't wear my false teeth, and I am in pretty bad shape. I thank you for your kind consideration in listening to me so long and so patiently; but you may have gathered from my few halting sentences here, that I will not support the motion.

**Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats):** — Mr. Speaker, I think I am safe in assuring you that this will be the shortest speech that has been made in this House. In view of the fact that almost everything has been said on both sides of the house that can be said, I am going to confine myself to correcting some statements that have been made by previous speakers. The time it will take will probably depend on the docility of my hon. friends over there.

**Hon. Mr. Fines (Provincial Treasurer):** — That's an awful threat, and no threats are allowed!

**Mr. Loptson:** — There are many things I could straighten up, but it's getting late, when the hon. Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Bentley) made the statement when he was referring to the reason for the Government developing the sodium-sulphate plant at Chaplin was because there was no private enterprise interested in it. If you will recall a few years ago, I was one of the members of the Crown Corporations Committee, and the now Attorney General, because I had indicated that the cost of developing that plant had been very much more than it should have been, said that if I didn't have the proof right there on my desk, I should be kicked out of the Committee. I endeavoured to bring the proof into this House the next day, but of course I was denied that privilege. Tonight I am going to bring that proof forward for the satisfaction of the hon. Minister of Social Welfare. That plant or that project apparently was started through negotiations, way back in 1945. It is just possible my hon. friend doesn't know the history of that plant.

A man by the name of Holland who, was a chemical engineer, and had been working for the Bishopric people, was sent out to locate some more supplies of salt. It wasn't hard to find at Chaplin Lake, because it was already recorded in the Dominion records of Mines and Minerals, indicating that that lake was a fair-weather lake. There were periods during some winters and some summers when you could get a lot of salt; other summers you wouldn't get very much. But anyway, according to the story, Mr. Holland thought there was a pretty good chance to make a little money out of this thing. So apparently he gets a lease on it, or he may have received title for it, and he goes to Toronto to sell the project to a private enterprise. This record would indicate that he had been negotiating with the Central Engineering Company of Canada, and they went so far as to send an engineer all the way from Toronto to evaluate the proposition. Holland had given them a story that the lake was a good proposition and that the plant to be erected would cost about \$250,000. He also had suggested that an additional \$100,000 would be required for working capital. The report of this engineer comes back — this engineer reports to his clients. The client, as a matter of fact, was Mr. Miller Ross & Co.,

**March 11, 1958**

and the investigator of the engineering company — the General Engineering Company of Canada. In his report he states that he had found the report of Mr. Holland substantially correct, that the plant should not cost any more than \$250,000 and that his estimates of production was pretty well the same. Then, after the report had been made, it appeared that Mr. Holland placed the report before this Government, who then, hungry for creating Crown Corporations and getting into business, the proposition looked pretty good to them. If it was good enough for a private enterprise from Toronto, then it should be good enough for the Government.

What was the outcome of it? They made a deal with Mr. Holland. They hired him at some \$750 a month as being the engineer for building this plant, which was originally estimated to cost \$250,000 and we end up with a bill of \$1,100,000, and because I suggested there was something wrong and should be investigated, I was going to be thrown out of the House by the Attorney General (Hon. Mr. Walker).

I still maintain, Mr. Speaker, that this Government is shielding something until they investigate why this plant should cost four times as much as it was estimated to cost by private enterprise. That is the history of the sodium sulphate plant. If my hon. friend wants to know the facts, he can look up his own record and chances are he will find a copy of this report.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Affairs):** — How would the hon. member like to table that report?

**Mr. Loptson:** — I'm not tabling it; you've got it — you got it when you made the deal. I might say something about the brick plant, too. You know, when this Government came into power in 1944, if you size up their performance, you would see a group of men imbued with impudence and ego, and crowned with a desire for business of which they know nothing about. Consequently, they were lambs in the hands of promoters. Let us take the brick plant. I happen to know something about the brick plant in Estevan, because when I was here in 1937-38, I had salesmen come to me, thinking I was a man of money, and they wanted me to buy that brick plant very badly. Do you know what they asked for it? \$35,000 and I could get all the terms I wanted on it. Later, I understand it was offered for \$25,000. What did these wise men pay for it? They never asked the owners how much they wanted for it. They said, "Now, we're not going to pay you more than \$150,000 for it". That's how that thing came about. They said, "Don't ask for any more, because that's all we're going to pay you for it". And they were on their knees, trying to sell it for \$25,000 before.



**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Did that hurt private enterprisers a lot?

**Mr. Loptson:** — Now they're complaining they're not able to sell the bricks. They're blaming the Federal Government for this because they are not giving instructions to the contractors that they should use Estevan bricks in Government building. I would just like to ask them, why don't they use Estevan bricks in their own buildings?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I did not complain because the Government did not give instructions to the contractors or the architects to use Estevan bricks. I complained because they were giving them instructions to prevent them from using them.

**Mr. Loptson:** — That's not true. Because I do know where Estevan bricks were used in a government building, only about two or three years ago — not because the Government told them to, or didn't tell them to, but simply because the contractors choose to. But, if they are so critical of the Federal Government not using Estevan brick, I would ask them, why don't they use Estevan brick in their own buildings?

**Govt. Members:** — They do!

**Mr. Loptson:** — I understand that the Telephone Building here in Regina is built of imported brick, and I don't know whether there is any Estevan brick in it at all or not, and I venture to say that there are other buildings that this Government has built and have used other than Estevan brick. I am not blaming them for that, because it is their duty to put the best material into these buildings that they can get, and if they can import better bricks than there are in Estevan, well then, it is their duty to do so.

Having dealt with that, Mr. Speaker, I have another matter I want to deal with, and it won't take very long. I am sorry the Premier is not in his seat, but I am going to ask the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) to convey my remarks to him. I noticed an article released by the Premier in 'The Leader-Post' on the third page, March 6, 1958.

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — What year?

**Mr. Loptson:** — This year — not very long ago. It states:

"Premier Douglas Thursday poked fun at the former Liberal Health Minister, Paul Martin, for his comment that the Provincial leader had mellowed from the Fabian socialist to a quiet and respectable Tory."

**March 11, 1958**

Well now, I would be very happy if that were true, because the hon. Premier would have seen the light and the error of his ways in the past.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Oh, you're a Tory, are you?

**Mr. Loptson:** — True, we have beard of him preferring the Tories back in Ottawa to the Liberals, but if we are going to judge that desire on the past performance of the hon. Premier, then it is not because he has turned a Tory. It's because that he figures the conditions that they have been praying for for the last 10 years, yes, ever since the end of the last war, that great depression that is so necessary for then to have in order that the C.C.F. Party may build themselves up again — and they figure that if the Tories get back to power in Ottawa, that this depression is more likely to come about than if they put in the Liberals. That is why the Premier is so anxious to see a Tory Government, and the other C.C.F. leaders are anxious too. Why, haven't we heard at the various conventions that have been held both provincially and federally, leaders of the C.C.F. Party saying that the C.C.F. Party will never get anywhere as long as people are prosperous. And why not the desire for a depression? I would say what I have said to this House before, that the C.C.F. Party in Canada has been working toward bringing about this depression at least since 1950, by their infiltration into labour and the understanding of marketing of our agricultural products. Now, having said that he goes on further and says:

" . . . Martin should get in touch with his colleagues, Ross Thatcher and the member from Saltcoats, who has in effect, called me a 'Communist'."

Well now, I have never heard Mr. Thatcher refer to the Premier of Saskatchewan as a 'Communist', but I would say this, that I know of no man on outside the C.C.F. Party that knows better the political leanings of the hon. Premier since they shared the same political camp for 10 years. And Mr. Thatcher saw fit to forfeit that \$10,000 a year job rather than to be a colleague of his in that camp! He says that I also have called him a Communist. Well now, I am going to tell the hon. Premier that I have never at any time, either inside our outside this House, called the Premier of Saskatchewan a Communist. I have read to the public many extracts of statements reported in the press that he is reported to have made all across Canada, and even across the line, and I left it at that for the public to judge for themselves. The Premier has just come in, and I want, just for the satisfaction of the hon. Premier, to tell him that I have never called him a 'Communist' either in this House, or outside it.

**Premier Douglas:** — I'm certainly obliged.

**Mr. Loptson:** — I'm just going to confine myself to a few remarks he has made. I don't think you would want me to read all of this file. Here is a Canadian Press report, reporting the Premier of Saskatchewan, speaking in New York, November 18, 1948, saying in effect that there are two great political ideologies in the world today; one is Communism and the other is Capitalism. He has never said a truer word in his life — not even from the House.

**Premier Douglas:** — But that's not what I said.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Then I quote, again in Montreal, April 27, 1950, he said in effect, the same thing — that there are two political ideologies — Communism on one side; capitalism on the other.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I don't want to interfere with my friend's fun, but he can't quote me in effect; he must either quote what I said, or not quote at all.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Okay, I will read it all.

"Two great ideologies exist in the world today — communism, which offers security in return for freedom, and capitalism which says that to retain our freedom, we must forego a great measure of social security."

That's the part — now, isn't that in effect? Now then, the thing I want to draw your attention to is which camp does the hon. Premier belong to?

**Premier Douglas:** — If you read the rest of it, it will tell you.

**Mr. Loptson:** — In the first place, I want to say that he has been a leader of a Party whose fundamental policies have been directed by a Manifesto or a Platform set out in 1933, which states specifically that their aim is to eradicate capitalism. Well, that certainly isn't being in the capitalist camp. Then I have a statement here: The Premier speaking in this House this Legislature, in 1945; speaking on an Insurance Act which apparently was being put through the House:

"T.C. Douglas said, "Let not those who sit in high places lull themselves into security. This Government is pledged to eradicate capitalism in this province, and the establishment of a Co-operative Commonwealth and will do so first, or perish in the attempt."

**March 11, 1958**

**Hon. Mr. Lloyd (Minister of Education):** — Where were you then?

**Mr. Loptson:** — Surely that isn't being a capitalist. Then coming a little bit closer to home, it is not very long since the hon. Premier stated a year after they mellowed the Manifesto by the Declaration in Winnipeg at their convention in 1956, which, if they were going to carry that out, they, the C.C.F. might just as well be eradicated, because they are adopting the Liberal policy and because, of that many of the C.C.F.'ers who are believers in the old Manifesto said that if that is going to be the policy of the C.C.F. Party, then they might just as well write themselves off and go in with the Liberals, because the Liberals believe in capitalism. Liberals have always believed in co-operation; they've always believed in private or public ownership. I believe that the Tories have much the same Platform. Why then bother with the C.C.F. if that is the platform they are going to adopt?

**Hon. Mr. Brockelbank:** — I never thought I'd see the day . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — So, Mr. Coldwell said after this great convention that there is no fundamental principle changed the C.C.F. Manifesto is the same as it always has been. Premier Douglas says here, as reported in 'The Leader-Post' of June 12, 1956: "The Manifesto is still the basic belief of the C.C.F. Carl Winch in Vancouver said the other day, "If there is one item taken out of that Manifesto, I will leave the C.C.F."

But then we see another confession of the Premier; it was only a little while ago where the Premier is reported in this way:

"At a C.C.F. Federal nominating convention in Regina on November 26, 1957, Premier Douglas, head of the C.C.F. Government of Saskatchewan, attacked Canadian industry and business with characteristic violence. He declared that Canada is completely dominated and motivated by profiteering principles, the quick-buck artists and hucksters."

He went on:

"There is no economic salvation for ordinary people like us, without a planned economy as is offered by the Co-operative Commonwealth."

Now, would you think that that would be favouring capitalism? Where does the Premier belong? With all these declarations and condemnation of capitalism, and he says there are only two political philosophies why should I have to call him a Communist? I think he himself is convincing you that he is one — I think he has put the name on to himself.

Another thing I would like to draw to my hon. friend's attention, why is the Premier so jittery every time we hear the 'McCarthy' name mentioned? Does he feel guilty, that he might be called up on suspicion? Why is he continuously saying that we should do so and so to stop this spread of Communism? It puts me in mind of a fellow who used to come to my store, and the first thing he did when he came inside the door was to try to convince me of how honest he was. He continued to talk about his honesty, and yet by the time he had got out of the door., he had filled all his pockets with as many trinkets as they could hold.

Now, I think I have cleared this point up. Since the Premier thought it wise to bring my name into this thing, I thought it was necessary that I brought this up here. Then I have another item here; it reads as follows:

"Mr. Douglas also made plain his Party's position on the Labour-Progressive offer to set up joint candidates in the coming election, our position is quite clear. We will have nothing to do with these people, said the Premier, it is the same thing year after year — either they put up a candidate themselves, or they try to give us a 'kiss of death' by offering to join us."

Well, that trick is as old as politics are. Who does he think that he is fooling. This is the most natural thing for the Communists who are detested in this country — to offer their help to the C.C.F. so as to give them a chance to refuse them. That's why they're doing it, and they do it every year.

**Premier Douglas:** — They offered it to the Liberals, and the Liberals accepted it.

**Mr. Loptson:** — The Liberals don't have to take it. That is an old political trick, and where they see it possible to put up a candidate because he'll only get 200 or 300 votes, they'll probably get 1,000 extra votes for the C.C.F. by making it appear that they are two opposing parties.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — You joined forces with them in 1945.

**Mr. Loptson:** — What a fraud! Talk about them being something different! Well, there are a lot of things that have happened to the C.C.F. just lately. You know, the C.C.F. have been in existence for 25 years and I'm not going into the history, but I mentioned here before in this House that they reached the peak of their aspirations on June 10. Many people have been working hard

**March 11, 1958**

and contributing money to the C.C.F. Party in the hope that the time might come when they would have balance of power in Ottawa. Well, it came about. I've already told you how important they were when they got to Ottawa, so now it looks today as if this is the end of the road for them. Out in the country they are failing to get the usual contributions from their former supporters, so what have they done? As a last resort, I have in my hand a document which, if put out by an individual, he would be put in gaol just as soon as the document came out; it is the greatest political swindle that has ever been perpetrated on an honest population.

**Opposition Members:** — Hear! Hear!

**Mr. Loptson:** — Talk about them being dishonest and getting votes from the public. Up to now, they have used every device. They have made extorted statements; made untrue statements . . .

**Opposition Members:** — No honour!

**Mr. Loptson:** — They're almost politically dishonest in getting votes to keep them in power, but now they see that it's not going to work any more so they do it this way. I'm just going to ask you Mr. Speaker, if in a civilized country would any individual be allowed to issue a document of this kind. This C.C.F. Life Insurance Company should be subject to a security commission prosecution.

**Hon. Mr. Fines:** — Read it.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Read nothing! You can go out and sell that without anybody reading it. They'll hand you \$10, \$50, or \$100 and take this for granted as life insurance coming into effect the 31st of March. You talk about racketeering and racketeers being prosecuted for taking oil leases and saying these people have signed documents without reading them. The C.C.F. Party have plenty of people in the country that they think are dishonest. They wouldn't question this thing for one moment. They would just write out the \$10, \$50 and \$100 cheque and say, "I've got life insurance coming into effect on the 31st of March".

**Mr. Speaker:** — Order! Order! May I draw to the hon. member's attention that it is now 10 o'clock.

**Mr. Loptson:** — Well, it will take me about five minutes to finish this. I'm on the floor, Mr. Speaker. We're on a debate, sure. I want to deal with this very important document. I never heard of such a thing in a civilized country. Any political party issuing such a fraudulent document.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, there is an order of speaking which has been arranged, and to which members have agreed, and in order to get on radio time tomorrow the two members who have been allocated to be on, we will have to adjourn, tonight. If the hon. member wants to go beyond the time and the House will give him permission, there is no reason why the hon. member cannot go beyond 10 o'clock, with the consent of the House.

(Agreed)

**Mr. Loptson:** — Mr. Speaker, I will adjourn the debate. It's 10 o'clock.

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, many questions have taken place in this House in this and last session, and the suggestion has come from your right that there is no closure in this House. I would suggest we have a form of closure here this evening. Either the member has the — Mr. Speaker, the normal adjournment of this House is 10 o'clock. It is now 10 o'clock, and I want to suggest to you that, unless closure is being imposed in this House at this moment, then the member has the absolute right to adjourn this debate. We have divided radio time in this House, yes — by a vote of the Government members or the Government members of a Committee, and there is no rule of this House that says that a member on this side of the House cannot adjourn the debate at this time.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Motion of adjournment has to carry.

**Mr. Speaker:** — Shall we go on with the question, to leave the hon. gentleman to adjourn the debate.

**Govt. Members:** — No.

**Premier Douglas:** — Mr. Speaker, I think if the House is unanimously agreed that he be allowed to continue so that we can keep the radio portion of the time that has been agreed upon tomorrow — if the House is prepared to let him go on . . .

**Mr. Loptson:** — If we're going to adjourn — we only have 15 minutes of air time. Mr. Speaker, I will agree that I won't take more than five minutes of air time tomorrow.

**Premier Douglas:** — The hon. member was only going to take 10 minutes tonight — the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) has been waiting to get on. This is a very old trick, and a very despicable one.

**March 11, 1958**

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, this is certainly not a despicable trick. We have every right to stand in our place in this House and speak at any time, and the Government of this Province, nor any one else is going to take that right away from us.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** — Your word is not good.

**Hon. Mr. Nollet:** — Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, it is my understanding that in this House, in order to get some order, the Speaker lists the order of speakers in the order of agreement. My understanding was, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Loftson and Mr. Horsman were to go on, and I was to follow. But Mr. Foley gets up, and this gentleman from Saltcoats was going to take 10 minutes — you see what he did. Here are people who have five speakers up today against two of ours, and they talk about closure!

**Mr. McDonald:** — Mr. Speaker, on this very point, what about a year ago, when the member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) was to introduce his remarks with regard to the budget. What happened? The Minister of Mineral Resources (Hon. Mr. Brockelbank) got up, and took part of his air time, making some ridiculous announcement — on air time! We have just as much right to air time as the Government members have, and we're going to get it.

**Mr. Speaker:** — If there is no agreement that the member do now speak, I have no alternative but to declare it 10 o'clock, and the House will adjourn until tomorrow at 2:30 p.m.

The House adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m.