

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

Tuesday, February 17, 1959

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

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The House resumed from Monday, February 16, 1959, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Brown (Bengough), for the Address-in-Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition): - Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to say a few words of welcome to the students of the University of Saskatchewan who are in attendance here, this afternoon. As all members are aware, this has become an annual affair, and I am sure that all members of the Legislature appreciate the students of the University taking time off from their studies to spend one or two days with us during the Sessions of the Legislature. We certainly enjoy their visit with us, and we sincerely hope that they will enjoy their stay here. It is unfortunate that they are going to have to listen to myself this afternoon; however, those who remain over tomorrow will have an even more unfortunate stay, for they will have to listen to the Premier.

Opposition Members: - Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: - However, we do welcome you to the Assembly and I understand that we are going to have the opportunity of dining with you again this evening, and I expect we will have the opportunity of meeting as many of you, personally, as we can at that time.

I would also like to say that I believe all the people of Saskatchewan are looking forward to the forthcoming visit of Her Gracious Majesty the Queen, and His Royal Highness Prince Philip to this province later in the year. I am sure that the previous visits of royal families to our province has done much to enhance the feeling between this country and this continent and the old land, and I am sure that this visit can have no other effect than that upon the people of Saskatchewan, the people of Canada, indeed, all the people of this continent.

Yesterday, before I adjourned the debate, I had congratulated the mover and the seconder with respect to their addresses yesterday in this Assembly. I had commented on some of the remarks of the mover and the seconder and endeavoured to point out from the figures that are available to anyone who want to use them – that is from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics

February 17, 1959

and other sources of authentic figures – that some of the statements made by the hon. gentleman opposite were at variance with the true situations as indicated by these official figures.

Yesterday, I dealt with the value of factory shipments of products in the province of Saskatchewan in comparison to the value of similar products for the provinces of Manitoba and Alberta, and, of course, we are not in a very good position when we compare ourselves to our two neighbouring provinces. The selling value of factory shipments in Saskatchewan have amounted to some \$303,000,000 last year – that is for the year 1957 which is the last year for which figures are available – compared to a figure of some \$673,000,000 in Manitoba and \$762,000,000 in the province of Alberta.

Now I wouldn't want anyone to think that I am an individual who goes around with my eyes shut and cannot think that we have some industrial growth in the province of Saskatchewan. We have industrial growth, and I want to give credit to all those people concerned, including the Provincial Government, for having done what they have so far in their endeavours to attract industry to our province. But what I do want to point out is the fact that we are not keeping pace with Canada as a whole, and what is even worse, we are not keeping pace with our neighbouring provinces. Perhaps there re reasons why we cannot keep pace with the great industrial provinces of Canada such as British Columbia, Ontario and Quebec; but I cannot see any reason, other than a political reason and the attitude of the present provincial administration in this province, keeping us from maintaining a position that is at least equal to the activities going on in our two neighbouring provinces, namely Alberta and Manitoba.

Yesterday, I gave you the figures concerning the number of people employed in the manufacturing industry in our province compared with the numbers of people employed in similar industries in our neighbouring provinces, and we have about 1/3 of the number of people employed by the manufacturing industries in Alberta or Manitoba. The same thing holds true if you include all of the industries, as I pointed out yesterday.

Then in addition to this information, we can look at the population figures for the province of Saskatchewan and compare those figures to our neighbouring provinces of Canada as a whole. From June, 1944 (which is the date when the present administration came into power) until June, 1958, Saskatchewan had an increase in her population of about 52,000 people. In the same period, Saskatchewan's natural increase (that is birth-rate over death-rate) should have increased our population in that same period by 221,000 people. In the same period approximately 52,000 people entered Saskatchewan as immigrants. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that in that period from June, 1944, until June, 1958, we have lost the entire natural increase of our population – 221,000 people. This is equal to the populations of the cities of Regina, Moose Jaw and Prince Alberta, and Saskatoon. These have moved out of this province over the period of time that this administration has been in office. I suggest to you that there are reasons why these people have been compelled, or have found it necessary, to move out of Saskatchewan. The reasons, as I see them, are

that this province is not keeping pace with the growth of our neighbouring provinces, of other provinces of Canada, and of our neighbouring country to the south of us, the United States, and it is necessary, especially for young people, to move to other parts of Canada or to our neighbour to the south in order to find gainful employment.

Now in this same period, namely 1944 to 1958, we had an increase in the population of Canada of about 42.7 per cent. Had we had the same increase, or our share of that increase, in the province of Saskatchewan, then our population should be about 1,190,000 people. Rather than that we have a population of about 880,000 people, or 310,000 people less than we should have if we were keeping pace with Canada as a whole.

I mentioned a moment ago that we were having some activity, and that there was some increase in the industrial development in our province. I also mentioned that we are not keeping pace with our neighbouring provinces – and is it any wonder that we are not keeping pace with our neighbouring provinces when we have a Government in office with the attitude toward people who are prepared to invest money in industry such as is the attitude of the Government opposite?

I have in my hand an editorial which was written on December 4th, 1958. This editorial concerns the visits of the Premier of this province and the Premier of one of our neighbouring provinces, namely Manitoba, to Eastern Canada. The respective Premiers had been asked to address gatherings, one in the city of Toronto (which was the Premier of Saskatchewan) and one in the city of Montreal (which was the Premier of Manitoba), and what a difference there was in the attitudes of the two Premiers with respect to industrial development, what a mixed reception those people in Eastern Canada, who have the necessary resources to develop the natural resources of this province, must have given to the two respective Premiers!

The Premier of the province of Saskatchewan said that free enterprise was neither free nor enterprising. He inferred that the industrial concerns of this country are owned, controlled and operated by a few individuals, those people he refers to as ‘hucksters’, ‘quick buck artists’, while at the same time the Premier of Manitoba was in Montreal inviting those people with money in that area of Canada to come to the province of Manitoba to invest their money in the developing of the natural resources of that province. With what result? Look at the development that is going on in Manitoba. In the mining industry alone, hundreds of millions of dollars have been poured into that province over the last two or three years to develop mines that are apparently unthought of by the Government that sits opposite.

Now is it any wonder that we have found it necessary in Saskatchewan to take the resources of the people of this province and use them to entice industry into our province? I can refer to no better an example than that of the proposed steel mill to be built here in the city of Regina. As a matter of fact it is under construction at the moment.

February 17, 1959

I want to make it abundantly clear that if this Government have placed themselves and placed this province in such a position that it is impossible to have the people who have the necessary funds at their disposal to come into Saskatchewan and develop our natural resources, if we have chased them out, told them that they are 'quick buck artists', and a 'disgrace to humanity', then if we have to take the resources of this province and pledge them to develop industry, I'll have to support it, because I think it is imperative that we support industry in this province even if the loans that are made become a contingent liability to the province of Saskatchewan.

What has happened in respect to the steel mill? This proposed steel mill is under construction and is to cost something in the neighbourhood of \$15,000,000. The Government has backed the notes at the bank for some \$10,000,000 of that particular \$15,000,000, and that will become a contingent liability of the people of this province and of the Government. Then the so-called 'quick buck artists' – mind you I am not calling this that, I am just using the Premier's words – but the 'quick buck artists' who are financing part of this mill, and who are supporting it, were issued shares at 60 cents apiece. The Provincial Government got some 180,000 of those shares for 60 cents apiece in return for handing over \$10,000,000 of your money and mine to build a steel mill. Then the shares went on the market for the common people to buy – now that's you and I as well as the C.C.F. But the common people can buy their shares not at 60 cents apiece, but at \$6.00 apiece! Now I suggest to you that, if anybody would give me shares at 60 cents, why should they be made available to the common people at six bucks! The Provincial Treasurer has said that he doesn't mind if they create a few millionaires in Saskatchewan. I don't suppose he does, because I think he's one of them.

What has placed this province in that position? Manitoba haven't found it necessary to put millions of the Provincial Government's money into the development of the resources of their province. Alberta haven't found it necessary. The financial houses of this country have been prepared to put up the necessary capital in our neighbouring provinces, but not here.

This steel mill is the first basic industry to be started in the province of Saskatchewan since this Government came into power. With the natural resources that are available in the province of Saskatchewan, there are three basic industries that we need before we can even think or talk about the general industrialization of our province. Three basic industries: one is steel – we've made a start; two, would be pulp – we've made about 75 starts, but we haven't got any place. Do you know why, Mr. Speaker, we haven't got any place?

Mr. Loptson (Saltcoats): - There will be one coming next election.

Mr. McDonald: - Because of the fact that those people with the necessary money to invest are not prepared to invest in this province, and you are not going to build a pulp industry for a mere \$15,000,000.

In order to build the pulp industry which this province warrants, we should have three mills or four mills that would cost in the neighbourhood of \$50,000,000 apiece. That would be a total of \$200,000,000 if we are to have four mills in Saskatchewan: give us three mills - \$150,000,000. Now are we, the people of the province of Saskatchewan, going to be asked to put up 2/3 of that \$150,000,000? Do you see where this policy this Government has adopted could lead us? Mr. Speaker, it is fantastic.

We were told only a year ago by the Premier himself that the reasons we did not have a pulp industry was because we were too far from the market. Well! There is a new pulp industry today being built in the province of Alberta – not the first one, but another pulp industry being built in Alberta this very moment, and it was further from Alberta to the main market for pulp and paper, which would be the eastern states in the Union and the eastern provinces of Canada than it is from Saskatchewan.

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): - Hundreds of miles further.

Mr. McDonald: - Hundreds of miles further! Well the other basic industry would be petro-chemical. We haven't any petro-chemical industry in Saskatchewan. All our chemical engineers have to go to either Manitoba or Alberta; so if the students of our University here today are going to graduate as chemical engineers, I suppose they'll have to go to our neighbouring provinces, unless they could be fortunate enough that this Government.

Opposition Members: - Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: - Again, we were told a year ago . . .

Mr. Lopton: - I think that's for sure . . .

Mr. McDonald: - . . . that the reason we didn't have a petro-chemical industry was because it was too far to bring the natural product. Lo and behold! What has happened? The largest petro-chemical plant on the North American continent is at this very moment being built I Sarnia, Ontario. Where will the natural product come from? It will come from Alberta and Saskatchewan and other parts as well, but a good portion of the natural product will come from Western Canada.

There is only one reason why we have been unable to attract a petro-chemical industry, and all of those subsidiary industries that would come with it, into the province of Saskatchewan, and that reason sits on your right, Mr. Speaker. These are industries that require huge sums of capital to build, and I suggest that, at least for the moment if the private citizens of this country were given the assurances that they have from other provinces of Canada, then they would be prepared to come into Saskatchewan and develop those resources here, the same as they are doing in our two neighbouring provinces and the other provinces of Canada.

February 17, 1959

I would like to turn for a moment to the farm problem that confronts essentially the province of Saskatchewan.

Recently we have had several statements from the Provincial Treasurer and the Premier concerning the amount of money that is derived from non-farm production within the province of Saskatchewan, and both the Premier and the Provincial Treasurer have indicated to us that, for the last fiscal year, the agriculture production in this province amounts to about \$500,000,000, and the non-agricultural industry amounted to about \$900,000,000. They claim that the non-agricultural industries are quickly replacing agriculture as the main contributor to the wealth of this province. I would like to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and to this House, that in compiling the \$900,000,000 figure which is credited to non-agriculture industry, there are many farm products which are included in that particular figure. I am of the opinion that, for instance, the processing of animals produced on the farm is included in this \$900,000,000 figure. I would suggest that the processing of our minerals, our forest products, our fish and our fur is included in this \$900,000,000, and I do not think for one moment that this is a fair comparison to make. I think we should go back and take a look at the value of primary products for the province of Saskatchewan, and the figures that I am going to use for agriculture and for the other products are for the fiscal year 1956-57.

Agricultural income in Saskatchewan (that is farm cash income) in 1957 was \$538,857,000. Minerals, which include gas and oil, amounted to \$122,722,000; forest products amounted to \$8,894,000; commercial fish, \$1,766,000 and furs, \$2,143,000, making up a total of \$674,382,000. But the agricultural portion of that was \$538,000,000 and still remains 79.9 per cent of the total. In other words, agriculture is still providing 79.9 per cent of the value of primary products produced in the province of Saskatchewan.

So, in spite of the fact that farm prices are not what most of us would like to see them (that is, some farm prices) and in spite of the fact that we have not been enjoying as large crops in the last two years as we did previously for several years, agriculture, is still playing a very major role in providing the resources for this province, its people and its Government to conduct the affairs of the people of this province.

I want for a moment to turn to what I consider to be one of the great reasons why agriculture is in difficulty today, one of the great reasons why, in my opinion, the farmers are marching to Ottawa within a short period of time, and the reason why I think that they have every right to march to Ottawa. In order to do that I think it is necessary for me or someone (and I am one of the first to take part in this debate) to endeavour to review what has happened in Canada, over the past several months, that has made it impossible for the farmer to carry on, and has made it necessary for him to have a petition signed which is to be delivered to the Government

in Ottawa.

Mr. Loptson: - He should march on Regina too.

Mr. McDonald: - What has happened since the election of the Conservative Government in Canada? I know that all members, if they will bear with me for a moment, will agree with me when I make the following statement. The Conservative Party of Canada are committed to high protection. They are committed, and have been for generations, to high tariffs and protection.

What was the first move that was made or announced by the now Prime Minister of Canada? The first announcement he made was that he was going to divert 15 per cent of Canada's trade from the United States to Great Britain. What was the result of that announcement? You will recall that the United States immediately followed that announcement by placing rigid restrictions on the exportation of Canadian oil. That hurt the province of Saskatchewan. It hurt the province of Alberta a lot more, because it is my understanding that we can ship oil out of Saskatchewan and lay it down in Eastern Canada for about six cents a barrel less than our friends in Alberta can. But, the fact that the American Government retaliated by placing embargoes on Canadian oil, hurt this province and it hurt our neighbouring provinces as well.

The next move was in August 1958, when the Conservative Government raised the tariff on British woollens. What happened immediately following that? We had the conference in Canada with the Commonwealth countries to discuss trade. Well, I suggest it was a poor note to open the Trade Conference on – by announcing an increase in the tariffs on British wool at a time when we were searching and praying for bigger markets for agricultural products and especially wheat. There was very little, if any, raise in the imports of British woollens prior to this new increase in the tariffs, but there had been an increase in the importation of woollen goods into Canada from Japan and from Italy; but the Government of Canada cannot raise the tariff against Italy or Japan in the same manner as they can raise the tariff against Great Britain because of G.A.T.T., and before there can be any increase in the tariffs on woollen products from those countries, there must be negotiations through G.A.T.T. which is, as you know, the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs. I suggest to you that the increase in tariffs on British wool was only the beginning, that this has already been accomplished, and that sooner or later we will have increases on similar products from Italy and Japan.

Mr. Loptson: - We already got them.

Mr. McDonald: - This was followed of course, by the famous anti-dumping legislation.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: - Aren't you glad you aren't Conservative any more?

Mr. McDonald: - I sure am, aren't you? At least I know why I am not. I don't think you do. Of course, we have had anti-dumping legislation in Canada for many years; but there have been some changes made in the anti-dumping legislation which I think are detrimental to

February 17, 1959

Canada as a whole, but even more detrimental to Western Canada than perhaps other parts of Canada. Under the old anti-dumping legislation, you will recall that the value for duty purchases was fixed on the fair market value of the commodity in the country where it was produced. When the Conservatives brought in their new legislation, they changed the method of putting a valuation on these particular products. The new legislation bases the value on the cost of production plus a reasonable gross profit, and they can be set by the Minister or by the Cabinet. It is no longer necessary to take this before the House of Commons; but now we have given a Minister, or Ministers of the Government of Canada the right to tax. This is not a right that a Minister ought to have or that a Cabinet ought to have. Taxation is a right of Legislatures and of the House of Commons and in my opinion, diverting from this procedure in past, we have gone a long way in making it possible for the Cabinet Ministers themselves to levy taxation on the Canadian people.

You will recall that this is almost identical to the method that was adopted by the late R.B. Bennett when he was in power in Canada. Some of you will no doubt recall what some great professional people had to say about anti-dumping legislation and similar protective legislation at that particular time.

Professor Anderson, in his book 'Tariff Procedures and Trade Barriers', has this to say:

“This sort of administrative provision was Canada’s distinctive contribution to the trade barriers of the great depression.”

I think that is true, and I think that every Canadian ought to recognize that, especially the people in Western Canada.

What was the result of this trade restriction policy? I am sure most people are familiar that the same thing is happening today as happened at the beginning of the so-called 'dirty thirties'. Retaliation was placed by other countries against Canada. There was a great period of trade restriction, the greatest period of restriction that had been known up until that time. Trade practically froze in its channels. The depression tightened its grip, not only about this country, but about the whole civilized world. What happened to this country? The Conservative Party was consigned to oblivion for a quarter of a century.

Now it is inconceivable to me that any Party could repeat the mistake they made 25 years ago, and it is more inconceivable to see how the Canadian people would allow a political party to put this stranglehold on this nation of Canada.

Hon. Mr. Walker: - Hear, hear! So have the Liberals.

Mr. McDonald: - Anti-dumping legislation is often defended by saying, 'Well, it's necessary in order to protect the labourers in this country against the products of cheap labour in some other parts of the world.'

Well, perhaps if we went only that far, that would be bad enough; but the normal procedure is that when you have anti-dumping legislation in effect in your country, general application is given to that policy and it affects some of our best customers, on some of those customers we, the people of Saskatchewan, depend upon in order to make a living.

You will recall that the United States, immediately upon the instrumentation of this anti-dumping legislation, protested officially. In a note to the Government of Canada, the United States protested that the new anti-dumping provisions were “a dangerous extension of administrative latitude” . . . “contrary to the provisions of GATT” . . . “would create a damaging precedent for international trade in agricultural products and seriously weaken the ability of the United States government to withstand strong pressures from domestic growers for measures of a similarly restrictive intent.”

What could this mean to the province of Saskatchewan? What has kept these prices up to the high level they have been over the past several months? The only thing that has given our Saskatchewan farmer a good price for his cattle is the fact that we have been able to drain off the surplus cattle produced in this province and other provinces of Western Canada to the American market. What would have happened if the Americans were to retaliate as they say they are being pressed to do by people in their own country? It would mean that the floor would fall completely out of the cattle market here in Western Canada.

Some people have indicated that there are more currencies that can be used in the trading world. Some say that we should be receiving soft currencies in Canada. Well, I don't know, Mr. Speaker. I am one of those who believe that you can only pay for exports with imports. I believe that if you are going to export to other nations huge quantities of those products that are produced in your country, then you must be prepared to take huge quantities from that customer of those products which they can produce chiefly within their country. What has happened? The Conservative policy has been a rebuff to our greatest wheat customer, namely, Britain. When it increased the tariff on trade, it must have had a detrimental effect on Great Britain buying the quantities of wheat that she has bought from Canada over the past few years. The United States say they are under pressure now to put an embargo against Canadian agricultural products. Look what the effect of that would be, as I mentioned a moment ago, on Saskatchewan and Alberta and other western provinces! Japan is one of the third largest customers for wheat from Canada today, but we have told her that we are not prepared to allow her products into this country. How can we expect to sell huge quantities of wheat to Japan, if we are not prepared to take some Japanese products in return? The cost of protection through tariffs and other policies prior to the Conservative Government coming into power, amounted to a billion dollars a year in this country. How much is this going to amount to now? I say it was too much before they came into power, let alone what it is going to be now, after the new tariffs and protection has been given to part of the people of Canada – and this protection goes chiefly to the manufacturing industries and the employees, naturally, who work with those

February 17, 1959

industries. This is nothing but a subsidy paid to that segment of the Canadian population. I say, and I want to repeat what I mentioned a moment ago, that if we are going to continue to enforce higher tariffs and pay subsidies, thus increasing the farmers' costs, then the farmer is entitled to the same treatment. He is entitled to his deficiency payments; he is entitled to parity prices; he is entitled to get the same treatment as other segments of the Canadian population.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: - Praise the Lord!

Hon. Mr. Walker: - Who is Diefenbaker, anyway?

Mr. McDonald: - But, Mr. Speaker, I don't agree with that policy. I do not agree in giving protection and subsidy, no matter in what manner it may be paid. I believe in freedom of trade with all of the nations of the world. The more free trade that we can have, the better we can prosper here in Western Canada, and especially in the province of Saskatchewan. I have hopes that Canada might see her way clear to extend free trade among all of the countries of the world.

I want to turn now for a moment to the economic condition of agriculture, as I see it. In my opinion there have been a lot of statements made that do not point out the true picture as far as agriculture is concerned, especially in the province of Saskatchewan. One can even go to D.B.S. and take the figures for all of Canada for the year 1958, and you will find that agricultural income is up 8.3 per cent over 1957. That would indicate that agriculture must be in a pretty healthy state. That is the first thing you would think. According to D.B.S. it must be, and as a matter of fact we are up about 5½ per cent above the level of 1956. The agricultural income of Canada for the year 1958 was only about 1.8 per cent below the all-time high for the year 1952. I suggest to you that that is not the situation in the province of Saskatchewan. I am not going to argue that those figures are not correct for the Dominion of Canada as a whole, but they do not portray the picture which exists within the province of Saskatchewan because, in the province of Saskatchewan, out of the total agricultural productivity of this province, 76 per cent of the value comes from cereal grains. There is no other province in Canada where 76 per cent of total agricultural production comes from cereal grains. As a matter of fact, there is no other province in Western Canada in the same position as we in Saskatchewan. In Manitoba only 50 per cent of their total agricultural production comes from cereal grains. In Alberta, it is only 45½ per cent. So we in Saskatchewan are even more dependent upon export trade and overseas markets than our two neighbouring provinces, let alone the rest of Canada. That is another reason in my opinion, why the farmers have had more success in organizing their march in Saskatchewan than they have had in the two neighbouring provinces, because there is a greater problem here. It affects 76 per cent of the total income, but only 50 per cent in Manitoba, and 45 per cent in Alberta. We are in a unique position here, in the province of Saskatchewan, as compared with any other province in Canada.

As I mentioned a moment ago, yields have been down over the last two years, and net farm income has been down in the province of

Saskatchewan. If we take that period 1948-1956, the net farm income in the province of Saskatchewan, or the average farm net income for that period (which is a nine-year period) amounted to \$3,962 per farmer. But during that period we had one almost complete crop failure, that was in the year 1954 – the year we were rusted out. If we take that year out then the average net farm income for the remaining eight years would be \$4,280 per farmer. I am using the census figure on the number of farms in my calculations, which is 103,391, which might be a bit high at the moment. But the net farm income for 1957 was not \$4,280; it wasn't \$3,960 – it was \$1,810. The net farm income has dropped to Saskatchewan farmers in 1957 to \$1,810, and I suggest it will be almost identical for the year 1958.

Another reason it was down – not only have costs gone up and the crops have been smaller, but grain prices have gone down during this period. If we take the usual standard grades, basis Fort William, we will find that for the period 1950-51 to 1956-57, wheat has fallen from \$1.85½ to \$1.36 – down 16½ cents a bushel. Rye has gone down 78½ a bushel; flax has gone down \$1.38 a bushel. Those are the problems which are confronting the farmer: smaller crops, increased costs, and less for the product he is able to put on the market.

I would like to turn for a moment to the yield over the past several years. For the nine-year period 1948-1956, we had an average crop of all grains in Saskatchewan of 491 million bushels per year, and if we take out that one poor crop of 1954, that average would go up to 514 million. Those are tremendous crops, Mr. Speaker, and we all realize that. But over the last two years we have not been producing these big crops. In 1957 our production dropped to 385 million bushels, and in 1958 it went down still further to 339 million bushels. The same thing can be said with regard to farmers' deliveries. The farmer has not been able to deliver the same quantity of grain over the last few years. In the present crop year to January 28, 1959, western farmers had delivered, to country elevators and interior and private mill elevators, about 24½ million bushels of all grains, less than in the corresponding period in 1957, and 58½ million bushels less than in the corresponding period in 1956.

I want to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that we have two problems facing agriculture. Some people are confusing the issue by endeavouring to point out that there is only one problem confronting agriculture so far as our national government is concerned. Some people have said that a deficiency payment would be of no use to the farmer who has no wheat, or any other kind of grain. Deficiency payments were never designed to take care of the farmer who hasn't any grain; but we do have policies, and I hope we will have additional policies that will take care of that particular individual. We sincerely hope that through the extension of P.F.A.A. and crop insurance that individual can be taken care of. In addition to crop insurance we need some system of adequate farm credit. I want to suggest that even the farmer who has an abundance of grain is still in financial difficulty. That

February 17, 1959

is the second problem, and his problem can only be met by parity prices and deficiency payments.

The Federal Minister of Trade and Commerce has stated that if we can export some 300 million bushels of wheat this year, all of the grain will be delivered from our farms. Well, I don't know. I haven't any authentic figures on that; but I do sincerely hope that we will be able to export that amount of grain. I still doubt if it will take all the grain off the farms that is in existence today.

I just want to close this particular subject by saying that the Prime Minister has said that he does not support, or that he hasn't promised, deficiency payments. I say that he is quibbling. He is about as big a quibbler as our own Premier. He has repeatedly promised exactly the same thing, only he used different words.

Mr. Lopton (Saltcoats): - He'll never catch up to our Premier!

Mr. McDonald: - The difference between parity and deficiency payments is merely a matter of words. Each involves setting some base period prices for comparison purposes, and calculating payments to be made out of the treasury to make up a deficiency. Now, what were some of the phrases that the Prime Minister has used? I want to quote: "An adequate parity" – that is one of his phrases. To me that means deficiency payments as well. If you're going to have parity, how are you going to have it without added payments? Another phrase: "A parity of prices as between agriculture and other products." That is exactly what we want. Another phrase: "Prices resulting in agriculture receiving its reasonable share of the national income." We'll settle for that, too. Let him put the title or the handle on it; I don't care what he calls it; but just fulfil any one of these promises, and I am sure agriculture will be in a far healthier state that it is at the moment.

I have spend some time in dealing with what I think our national government ought to do, if they are going to be fair to all the people of Canada, and if they are going to fulfil all the promises they made to the Canadian people. All responsibility for this problem cannot be laid on the doorstep of Ottawa. Yesterday the mover of the Address in Reply said that he felt that the Speech from the Throne went as far as Canada's constitution would allow the province of Saskatchewan to go, and as far as the resources of this province would allow them to go. I cannot agree with that. Practically every move concerning our farmers that this Government has made in the 14 years that they have been in power has increased their costs of operation.

Opposition Members: - Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: - This Government is responsible for that; not Ottawa. If we are going to ask the Government of Canada to give Saskatchewan and Western Canada their fair share, then I think we should first start by setting an example here. I think we should be judged by our actions, and not by our

words, and if you judge this Government by their actions, then Ottawa have every right in not paying deficiency payments, or paying anything else, because this Government has set a dreadful example to the rest of the people of Canada.

What has their treatment been to the farmers of this province? What has happened? I could list off tax increases here until seven o'clock tonight, and never repeat myself, that have been brought in by this Government. I'll give you a few – sheer discrimination against one segment of our population, namely the farmer. What has happened to the poor old gasoline tax? It has taken a boost of 71 per cent since they came into power. What happened last year? Was it last year when they took off the Education and Hospitalization provincial tax on purple gas? My, that was a wonderful help. Then they increased the provincial tax on gasoline one cent a gallon.

Mr. Cameron: - And made more!

Mr. McDonald: - They made twice what they lost. They lost a few pennies, and they were reaping in buckets of money in the meantime. Well, that was a great move. That must have benefited every farmer in Saskatchewan all right. What about farm truck licences? Farmers used to buy their farm truck licences for \$10, but now they pay anywhere up to \$40, and many of them are the same old trucks for which they used to get their licence for \$10. Ottawa had nothing to do with that. You people are responsible, and nobody else. One can go on. What about this mineral tax? They just sat up one day when the Provincial Treasurer (Hon. Mr. Fines) was counting his money; he happened to be a little short, so he said: "Boys, a new tax; three cents an acre on minerals." He doesn't know to this day what he taxed, and the person who is paying the tax is even more confused than he is. In many instances, instead of collecting the three cents, they are collecting six for every acre. Three cents an acre amounts to \$19.20 per section per year.

What about the increased royalties on lumber and forest products? The index for lumber products today stands at 411. The Saskatchewan Timber Board are not selling their lumber any cheaper than their competitors. They are not giving the poor old Saskatchewan farmer any benefits in providing him with lumber a little cheaper. Oh, no! Just charge him all you can get, and look for more! And give him the knots, and the sappy end of the stick.

The Hospitalization and Education Tax has been increased from two to three per cent. In 1943-44, this particular tax brought in \$4¼ million to the provincial treasury, but in 1957-58 it brought in \$20 million. They seem quite happy. Let them pay it! What has happened to rural municipal taxes? When this Government came into power, the per capita tax for rural municipal purpose amount to about \$29 per capita, but in 1957 it had gone up to \$99. This is an average in 1957 of \$362 per farmer. I have two tax receipts in my hand for the same piece of land – the same half-section of land. This one, the total taxes are \$35.20. This is exactly the same half-section of land. Last year they were not \$35.20; they were \$242.86. This is not an increase of 2 per cent, 3 per cent or 50 per cent, or 100 per cent. This is an increase of 700 per cent in land tax.

February 17, 1959

Mr. Cameron: - Friends of the farmer!

Mr. Loptson: - Yes, friends of the farmer!

Mr. McDonald: - What are the School Trustees saying? They have said this . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: - Tell us how . . .

Mr. McDonald: - What's the matter, "Toby?"

Hon. Mr. Nollet: - What other tax did the province put on? Tell us how the province put more taxes on the municipalities.

Mr. McDonald: - I'm going to; I'm coming to that; you're just getting a little bit ahead of me. Just wait a minute. Here is what the School Trustees have to say about taxation. They say that, on a per capita basis, the Saskatchewan local governments spent more on education in 1955 than local governments in any other province in Canada. In Saskatchewan, local governments spent on education per capita \$31.42 as compared with the Canadian average of \$20.13. There's what you have done by not fulfilling the promises that you made to the people of this province to take the sole responsibility for education. You are leaving a far greater share of the cost of education to the municipalities and local governments than any other province in the Dominion of Canada.

Let us turn to what has happened to the grid road system. You know, the 'holier than thou' attitude – 'why we're going to help to build 12,000 miles of the grid road system for the farmers!' Well, what happened? To all intents and purposes and to any reasonable thinking individual, a secondary highway system, grid road system, or whatever name you might tack on it, which belongs to the people of this province, ought to be paid for by the people of this province. But the great 'friends of the farmers' – what are they doing? They said to the farmers: "Now, you pay for half of it. We'll give you that privilege. You pay 50 per cent of the cost. Then you, along with the rest of the people of Saskatchewan can pay the other half." I suggest to you that this grid road system is serving all the people of this province, not only the farmers, and it is nothing more than sheer discrimination to stuff down the necks of the rural municipalities the burden of paying 50 per cent of the cost of this grid road system. And, in addition to that, they have to maintain these roads.

What about your program with regard to rural electrification? Haven' you discriminated against the farmer? Haven't you?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: - How stupid can you get?

Mr. McDonald: - Well, here is how stupid you are. I don't like using the word, Mr. Speaker, but I am just quoting the hon. member. Here is something that I read – and do you know what paper I read it in?

Hon. Mr. Walker: - 'The Commonwealth'.

Mr. McDonald: - Oh no. This is 'Saskatchewan News.' It says: "By 1961, 98 per cent of Saskatchewan farms will be electrified.

Hon. Russ Brown: - That's wrong.

Mr. McDonald: - Sure it's wrong. Did you ever read anything in there in your life that was right? Mr. Speaker, that would be over 100,000 farms. Now, the farmer has paid on the average \$500 per farm to get rural electrification. That will mean that, if this is fulfilled, the farmer will have contributed 50 million to the capital cost of bringing power to the farms. This is not the policy with regard to urban users. This is not the policy with regard to the distribution of gas by the same Corporation. What is the policy with regard to the distribution of gas? They bring it up to your door, and it doesn't cost you anything. It is a service of the Power Corporation. The people of Saskatchewan are paying for taking power, plus gas, to the urban user, but the poor old farmer is told: "You pay 50 per cent, or you don't get it." Mr. Speaker, this is nothing but the worst discrimination against one segment of our people.

Opposition Members: - Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: - I don't want to see special privileges given to farmers. I don't think the farmers want special privileges. All they are asking is the same treatment as other citizens within the province of Saskatchewan. I can think of no better example than my own to show the difference in the policy of the Saskatchewan Power Corporation with regard to the distribution of electrical energy and natural gas. It cost me \$1,000 to take power to my two farms - \$500 per farm. Then I moved into Regina, and the mortgage company and I bought a house in here, and I live here. In that home I have been discussing whether I should put in natural gas, or whether I should not. Then I went off out to the country somewhere, and we hadn't decided whether we were going to put the gas in or not. But I came home a few days later, and the gas was in the basement. I said to my wife: "Oh, you put the gas in." "Well, she said, "didn't you tell them to?" I said "No." She said, "I didn't." So they just came in and put the gas in anyway – whether you want it, or whether you don't . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: - But look who you are!

Mr. McDonald: - . . . without any cost. It didn't cost a nickel. But when I lived at Fleming, then I was a poor old farmer, and I had to pay \$1,000 to get electricity on my farms. When I came into Regina, the only way I could prevent myself from getting natural gas would have been to have stayed home and beat them off!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: - Use an axe!

February 17, 1959

Mr. McDonald: - Mr. Speaker, if that isn't discrimination against one segment of our population, treating one part of our population fairly and respectably, I would say, but on the other hand saying to the farmer, who is caught in the cost-price squeeze: "Give him the gears, boys. Put on the squeeze. We'll force them into larger units and then we'll have them where we want them."

Let's take a look for a moment at the position in which the Provincial Government has placed our municipalities. The Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Nollet) asked a question. I only partly answered it a moment ago, and I want to finish it now. In 1957, the municipalities raised in municipal taxes, about \$68½ million. For the fiscal year 1956-57, the Provincial Government revenues totalled about \$104¼ million. Of this amount, Ottawa supplied about \$35¾ million; so the Provincial Government, in the fiscal year 1956-57 collected the same amount of money from all of the sources of revenue they possess, that the municipalities had to collect out of property and business taxation - \$68½ million in both cases.

Now, the Province has several large sources of revenue. To list only a few, we have the Hospitalization and Education Tax, which has been increased from two to three per cent by this Government, after a sound pledge to the electorate that they would take it off in its entirety. One of the members sitting opposite said: "We'll take it off within 12 months." Fourteen years later it is 50 per cent greater, and yielding \$20 million a year, instead of \$4¼ million. That's great progress!

Then they have the gasoline tax, another huge source of revenue, the rate for which has been increased 71 per cent by the present administration. Then you have the motor vehicle licence, another source of revenue which has been increasing every year. We have the revenue from the development of oil and natural gas. We have the revenue from the development of minerals. We have revenues from our forests, and countless other minor sources of revenue.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: - I thought you said there was no mineral development.

Mr. McDonald: - Well, 'Brock', the only metal development you know anything about are those metals that the Federal Government found for you and developed, and that is uranium. Apart from that the only thing you have to show for any metal activity is a lot of claims which were staked, and nothing has ever happened to them.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: - There was a 'socialistic' enterprise up there.

Mr. McDonald: - Let us take a look at what is happening to, and what the treatment by this Government is, of local governments. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that in 1956 there was a so-called conference held - a Provincial-Local Government Conference. We as members of the Legislature were invited to sit in and observe occupying a similar position to the people in the galleries today.

Hon. Mr. Walker: - What people?

Mr. McDonald: - The members of the Legislature occupied that position, and the representatives of local government were invited to attend what I had hoped would be really and truly a conference, something where the powers that be, namely the Cabinet Ministers in the Provincial Government, would sit down and keep their eyes and their ears open and another part of their head closed, and listen and learn. That was not the case. The representatives of local government were brought in here; they were presented with a barrage of printed propaganda, and hours upon hours of propaganda emanating from members of the Government. This was some conference! It was more like an indoctrination centre than a conference.

This conference was to discuss some of the reports of the Royal Commission on Agriculture. This Royal Commission was set up and continued for some time, but finally produced a report, the cost of which I think was in the neighbourhood of half a million. The Provincial-Local Government Conference was to discuss the recommendations of the Royal Commission. Well, I would have thought, if the Royal Commission meant anything to Saskatchewan, that we would have legislation here, not this Session but in the past Session, bringing into being the recommendations of the Royal Commission. But what happened? At this conference that was held it was decided to set up a Continuing Committee, and that Continuing Committee is still continuing. I don't know how long it is going to continue, but I would suggest that, if it continues much longer, we will need another Royal Commission to give us the material up-to-date, and suitable to make recommendations on it.

Mr. Danielson: - . . . after the next election.

Mr. McDonald: - I think probably the one thing that is holding up any action is the next provincial election. Some of these suggestions in this Report of the Royal Commission were not too well received by the majority of the people in Saskatchewan. So here we have a Royal Commission, a Conference, a Continuing Committee – but we haven't solved any of the problems that existed in 1956.

I understand that recently negotiations have been going on between the Provincial Government, or Departments of the Provincial Government, and our urban and rural municipalities with regard to a new policy which was forecast in the Speech from the Throne, to take care of the welfare and health problems throughout the province. But here again we have a typical example of the ineptitude of this administration. This administration cannot even recognize the problems which face this province, let alone deal with them. What was their attitude to the urban and rural municipalities with regard to welfare? I understand there has been a suggestion made that there should be a per capita tax levied on the people who reside within the municipality. This per capita tax would pay the bills for social aid of people throughout Saskatchewan. I have no complaint with that policy. I think that would mean (if that is the case) that people who are in need of some aid will get similar treatment, no matter what part of the province they may live in. I think that is as it ought to be. But what was the attitude of the Government when it came to health services? Here the show is on the other foot. The Provincial Government said: "We'll give you so much a head, and you pay the bills." That being the case

February 17, 1959

there is going to be no schedule or uniformity of health services throughout the province. IS it right to have the Provincial Government provide the services, and the municipalities pay a per capita tax for welfare services? If so, then that is the proper procedure to follow for health services as well. In the one instance you are doing exactly what you should be doing, and in the other instances you are doing exactly the opposite.

Recently we have had some speculation in the press, and I hope it isn't true, because it certainly shouldn't be. There is a possibility that we may be faced with a deficit or increased taxes during this Session of the Legislature. As I say, it is only (as far as I am concerned) speculation in the press. There is no need of this Provincial Government being in any financial difficulty, Mr. Speaker. The revenues have never been more buoyant in the life or the history of this province than they have in the period that this particular Government has been in power. The old sources of revenue have produced greatly increased yields or money to the Provincial Government. Many new taxes have been imposed. Provincial Government spending, however, has gone to an all-time high. The waste and extravagance has never been more rampant anywhere in the western world that I know of, than it has been here. If we are in a position where we are either faced with a deficit or an increase in taxes, then again that indicates to me, and I am sure it must indicate to most people, that we have had a very inefficient administration at Regina.

The estimate for the fiscal year just concluded provides for expenditures of \$208¼ million. That is a lot of money: \$208¼ million!

That compares with \$26 million just 14 years ago. The \$208¼ million is not all of the money that these people have been diddling away, because you must add to that about another \$35 million, which includes reimbursements from the Federal Government, national health grants, hospital tax, and what have you. So, in grand total, this Government in the last fiscal year spent about \$243½ million.

Mr. Loptson: - Where did it go?

Mr. McDonald: - I'd like to know. That compares with 14 years ago when total expenditures amount to, not \$243 million but \$31 million. If this Government is in financial difficulty after spending \$243 million and like sums for several years, they have nobody to blame but themselves, and I don't think they would dare come into this House either with a deficit budget or with new taxes.

Opposition Members: - Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: - An efficient government policy could do much to assist all of the province of Saskatchewan, and especially our farmers, in combating the effects of higher operating costs.

I would like to refer to one or two of the items that are mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, towards the close of the Speech.

Here there is a reference to the fact that poliomyelitis has certainly been under control in the province of Saskatchewan, and here I think the Government is entitled to a good deal of credit in seeing that all those people – I think it was 40 years of age and under – who wanted to avail themselves of it, could receive serum that would immunize them against this dreadful disease. I happen to have a very close and personal friend who is just my own age, who was struck down with this disease some years ago, and I think if there is any manner or means at our disposal of controlling such diseases, then we should certainly do everything within our power to bring such diseases under control. I do feel that the policy of the Government in this concern has been the right policy, and that they have had the success which they are entitled to.

There is a need in Saskatchewan for further accommodation for people who need help either because of some disease or old age. I find that our hospitals throughout the province, practically without exception, are crowded to the doors. I believe we have many people in our hospitals who should not be in a hospital.

Mr. Kramer: - Ask the doctors.

Mr. McDonald: - I am not blaming anyone for the situation, and I think if my hon. friend will hear me out, he will agree with me. I do not believe a hospital is a place to keep a patient unless the medical profession are able to do something for that patient. But I find – and I am not blaming the doctors – that in many of our hospitals today the bed occupancy is taken up by older people who have no place else to go. I don't think a hospital is the proper place for them.

It is true that the Government, together with the citizens of our municipalities, are endeavouring to build what are commonly known as a Senior Citizens' Homes throughout the province. Again that is a noble step and a great relief to many senior citizens of our province. However, I do not think that in itself is the answer to our problem. I think that what is needed is some type of an institution between a hospital and a senior citizen's home. We have some of these institutions now in Saskatchewan, but not nearly enough, because I believe we could build an institution that would be far cheaper to support than a general hospital which would provide the facilities that I have in mind, and that is a type of home where the patient could have probably daily nursing care and the services of a doctor, we'll say, once a week. I'm only using those figures as an argument. But I believe there is a great need for an expansion of that type of accommodation for people within the province of Saskatchewan, and I hope the Minister of Public Health (Hon. Mr. Erb) and his colleagues in the Government will take under consideration immediately the advisability of endeavouring to provide more of that accommodation. I am sure he is not going to have the support of his colleagues, but he would have the support of this side of the House and the general public in doing so.

February 17, 1959

The Speech from the Throne refers to legislation dealing with certain mineral transactions. Well, talk about shutting the barn door after the horse was stolen! This horse has died of old age! Not only did somebody steal it, but he died of old age after he was stolen. This Government, had it been worth its salt, would have given the protection to the farmers of this province to which they were entitled before the horse was stolen, not many years afterwards. What has happened in the province of Saskatchewan? A great majority of the farms who at one time owned minerals rights in Saskatchewan have been swindled out of them by 'quick-buck artists and hucksters' – to borrow a phrase which is used by the Premier with respect to some other people that I would not put in that category. These people ought to have been protected at that time. Sure, legislation now will be better than no legislation at all, but it is just about six years late. The Government cannot say that they were not told at that time that this should have been done.

Mr. Lopton: - That's for sure.

Mr. McDonald: - I can go back and quote from speeches made from this side of the House telling the Government of the day that this is what they should be doing. But oh, no!

Now, let us turn to the reference to The Farm Security Act. Under The Farm Security Act, the Speech from the Throne says there is going to be a two-year extension. I recall reading some accounts of the Premier's speeches when he was down in Springfield taking part in the by-election there, a short time ago, and he referred to this Farm Security legislation. I wish somebody at that meeting had asked the Premier how many people had been evicted, despite the Farm Security legislation, since he became Premier. You will recall what he promised the people of Saskatchewan before he became Premier, when he was talking about farm security legislation. He said this, at Gull Lake, May 24, 1944:

“I make a definite promise that if it could be proved that a single farm family lost title to its home under a C.C.F. administration headed by myself, then that administration will resign.”

Those were noble words, but they certainly weren't honest words.

Last year, a Sessional Paper No. 30 was tabled in this House where (I believe it was the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley) asked for the figures with regard to foreclosures, cancellations of agreements and evictions from 1944 to 1956. Now, in that period of time there have been 2,221 foreclosures, so you and your Cabinet should have resigned 2, 221 times. In addition to that there are 658 cancellations of agreements – there's another 658 resignations. There were 534 evictions, where people were kicked out by a gentleman who was going to resign himself, and his Government, if it could be proven that one person lost his home. I think now that you have this Farm Security legislation in the House, you had better do a little more with it if you intend to fulfil your promises of a few years back. These figures are quoted from the records

of this House; they are not my figures. I think this is ample proof even for the Premier that it is right when it came from his Government.

We'll turn for a moment to The Saskatchewan Election Act – I see it is up for amendment though I don't know what the amendment will be. Again, if we want to go by what has appeared in the daily press we can assume there is going to be further representation given to our two major cities . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: - Pardon me, that The Legislative Assembly Act, not The Election Act.

Mr. McDonald: - Thank you for your correction. That's the first time you've been right today. I stand corrected.

I hope that when the Government is giving consideration to this amendment, they will give what, in my opinion, would be more adequate representation to our larger cities. I do believe that our larger cities are entitled to representation in this House, because of the fantastic growth of the cities at the expense (to a large extent) of the rural areas. But I also believe that, if they are going to do this, then they must introduce a ward system. To me it is fantastic that we have today a three-member constituency here in the city of Regina, where you have three members endeavouring to represent 100,000 people. The average Regina citizen doesn't even know who his member is.

Mr. Lopton: - Mulligan stew!

Mr. McDonald: - Mulligan stew is right! I think that the city could be far better represented if it was divided into the ward system, and I think the members could give better representation and personal care to a smaller area of this city.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: - Are you in favour of the ward system for city governments, too?

Mr. McDonald: - What control have we got over city government? This is the Act before us, and I am in favour of the ward system so far as the representation in this Legislature is concerned.

I want now to turn to the Time question. We have been discussing this Time question (something like the municipal question) for so long that I hate to even remind the members how long it has been. If my memory serves me right, the now Attorney General was the hen that laid this egg in the first place, and I think he brought it into the House when he first came in as a member, and we've been kicking it around ever since. It got too hot for him to handle when he became Attorney General, so he gave it to my poor friend, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. McIntosh). Now it's got too hot to handle for him, and he doesn't want anything to do with it. I don't know whose department they're going to put it in next.

Hon. Mr. Brown: - I'll take it.

Mr. McDonald: - But the Speech from the Throne suggests that we should set up another Committee to look into uniform time. I have said before, and I want to say again – I tried to point out a few of the things that this Government do not understand; for example, they have admitted that they don't even understand what time it is in Saskatchewan. They don't seem to realize that there is a natural time barrier, some place in Saskatchewan, between east and west. They don't seem to realize that the people on the east side of the province want nothing to do with Mountain Standard Time at any time of the year. I represent one of those constituencies. We don't want any part of Mountain Standard Time during any time of the year, and I don't think there are half a dozen people, other than some C.C.F.ers in my constituency, who wouldn't agree with me, and I am not interested in what they think.

You go to the west side of the province, and you have a different situation. People over there with whom I have talked say, "Why don't they leave us alone? We like Mountain Standard Time the year around. For goodness sakes, are these Socialists now trying to socialize the time? Just leave us alone; that's all."

Lat year we even passed legislation in this House saying that we should have uniform time. I didn't know what time it was until I went down to the depot and looked at the clock, and it said 'Saskatchewan Time.' Well, I suppose that was a good name for it; it was Saskatchewan time. After making and passing legislation in the House amending about 18 or 20 Acts, the people kicked up their heels and said, "We don't want anything to do with this time you have put us under." Then the Premier, the Minister of Education, the Attorney General, the Minister of Municipal Affairs said: "Oh well, don't pay any attention; we were just fooling when we passed that legislation. You don't have to obey that; it's just on trial. Why, if you want to go on some other time, that's okay with us." Did you ever in your life see such a disregard of this Legislature? We passed legislation here, last Session, saying that this time was the official time of the province of Saskatchewan. We amended, as I say, 18 or 20 Acts, and the Ministers have the audacity to say: "Well, it's just an experiment. If you don't like it, it's okay with us."

I suggested that a special Session should be called. I think it would have only taken about 15 minutes of the members' time to have dealt with this matter – if they were considering the wish of the majority of the people in the province of Saskatchewan, that is. After designing several ballots (and I don't know who the engineer was – probably the Attorney General; it looked like his designing) and taking the plebiscite among the people, then he and his colleagues couldn't even agree what the people meant when they voted for or against the proposals on the ballot. I have never seen such incompetence, such disrespect of the Legislature, such disrespect of Statutes of this province as was demonstrated on this Time question by the Premier and his colleagues.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. McDonald: - And now we're going to set up another Committee. I don't know who is going to be on the Committee. I hope to goodness I don't have to go on it; I don't want any part of it. I am sick and tired of trying to deal with the Time question, trying to force everybody into uniformity. First, we want larger units for this and that and the other thing, and now they've gone so far in this uniform idea that they want everybody on the same time. For goodness sakes, give the people the responsibility and give them the authority to run on the time that suits them best within their local communities! If we do that, I feel we can satisfy at least the majority of people within the province.

There is one other little thing I want to bring to your attention. There is some talk in Canada today of a third party. I think any third party would be an improvement over the one that is in third position at the moment. You know, when they talk about how they are going to finance this particular party . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: - Are you talking about Saskatchewan?

Mr. McDonald: - . . .I happened to come across some minutes that were taken at a meeting of the Canadian Labour Congress, and it was a report from the Ontario Federation of Labour. This is what they say. This is something I have always suspected, and now I know it is true:

“Ontario Federation of Labour actively supported the C.C.F. Party, and spent \$70,000 in advertising and paying the deposits of every C.C.F. candidate.”

Now, would that be a wonder party for a farmer to get mixed up with – with the Canadian Labour Congress . . .

Mr. Danielson: - He'll have to do the paying!

Mr. McDonald: - . . . paying for the advertising and the deposits of every C.C.F. candidate! Gracious me! How many of your people have your deposits paid (don't answer me, because I wouldn't believe you anyway) by some labour organization. How many? I suspect an awful lot. Who is paying for the propaganda that is going out over the air waves today by the C.C.F. Party? Who is paying for this TV that is being sponsored by my friends opposite? I suggest there is a strange source of money there as well, Mr. Speaker.

In conclusion I would like to move, seconded by the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron): -

That the following words be added to the Address

February 17, 1959

“We respectfully submit that, in the opinion of this Assembly, Your Honour’s advisers have failed to take action to lower farmers’ production costs, or to provide urgently needed financial assistance to local governments.”

Mr. Speaker: - The debate is now on the proposed amendment.

Hon. T.C. Douglas (Premier): - Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with the hon. Leader of the Opposition in extending the most sincere words of welcome to the university students who have graced our Chamber today, and to say how delighted we always are to have them come to spend a couple of days attending the debate in the Legislature. We get a great deal of pleasure out of seeing you here. We hope that you get some benefit from listening to the debate. Tomorrow we are to have another group who are to listen to me replying to the Leader of the Opposition and if you meet anyone on the campus who tells you how terrible it is, you say: “That’s nothing, bub; you should have been there yesterday!”

I would like to extend a word of congratulations to both the mover, the member for Bengough (Mr. A.L.S. Brown) and the member for Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Johnson), the seconder, on the very able presentation which they made, yesterday in moving and seconding the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I am sure that both these gentlemen represented the views of the constituents whom they represent, and ably presented the speeches which open the debate on this Speech from the Throne.

I should like also, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all members on this side of the House to extend our congratulations to the member from Arm River (Mr. Danielson), who, as was said by the Leader of the Opposition, is this year celebrating 25 years of having sat in this Legislature as the Dean of the House, and all of us who know him, know that, in spite of 25 years of service, he is still very active, his mind is still very agile and he can still give us a pretty rough time. A few years ago, he was somewhat indisposed and his health was indifferent, and I think we are all delighted to see that his health is improved. He makes a very valuable member in the Opposition. We hope he will stay there for a long time.

Mr. Lopton: - That wish will be something like your promises.

Premier Douglas: - You leave me to take care of the promises.

I would also like to compliment the Leader of the Opposition on the very agile and acrobatic performance which he has put on both yesterday and today. On both occasions his speeches were very forceful and forthright, and I want to compliment him on his very able presentation.

I was very interested in that part of his speech which dealt with the performance of the Progressive Conservative Party in Ottawa. It

is always a sad thing, Mr. Speaker, to see a child throwing stones at its parents.

Mr. McDonald: - How about you?

Premier Douglas: - Even though the Leader of the Opposition has adopted the Liberal Party as his step-father, it's rather too bad to hear him making rude noises at his natural parent.

Mr. McDonald: - At least I have one.

Premier Douglas: - I very much enjoyed listening to the speech by the hon. Leader of the Opposition regarding the failures and foibles of the Federal Government. I thought that this was somewhat of a departure because, in previous sessions, we were the ones who have been accused of bringing Federal issues into the Provincial Legislature. But now, of course, there being no longer a Liberal Government in Ottawa, I presume that this is now to be the practice in the House. But it is somewhat interesting that the Liberal Party in Opposition is always very different from the Liberal Party in office.

Mr. McDonald: - So is the C.C.F.

Premier Douglas: - When they are in Opposition they are in favour, first of all, of free trade. Mr. Speaker, today I listened to a 'free trade' speech from a Liberal for the first time since 1935.

Mr. McDonald: - Hear! Hear!

Premier Douglas: - We haven't heard a bleat for 22 years about free trade, from either the gentlemen opposite or their colleagues in Ottawa. But now they are out of office – free trade; tear down the tariff barriers!

Mr. McDonald: - Hear! Hear!

Premier Douglas: - I agree with that. But the gentlemen opposite and their party were in office from 1935 to 1957 and, at the end of that period of time, a Royal Commission appointed by them, called the Gordon Commission, brought in a report in which they said that the tariff structure of Canada was costing the people of this country, in 1956, \$1,075,000,000. This was the result of 22 years of a party which preached free trade out of office, and practised high tariffs when they were in office.

Mr. McDonald: - I told you that.

Premier Douglas: - Of course, out of office now, they are in favour of parity prices, they are in favour of deficiency payments. Of course, Mr. Studer apparently, judging by the diatribe in yesterday's paper, does not agree with my friends opposite. We will find out whether or not Mr. Studer is speaking for the Liberal Party or just for himself. But the Leader of the Opposition is now in favour of deficiency payments and parity prices. But this was not the story when a Liberal Government was

February 17, 1959

in Ottawa. They weren't in favour of deficiency payments then; they weren't talking parity prices then. You couldn't have those things.

Mr. Loptson: - Who said so?

Premier Douglas: - If the member for Saltcoats will just keep quiet . . .

Mr. Loptson: - I was just correcting you.

Premier Douglas: - He is one of the oldest members of the House and one of the least courteous. If he wants to ask a question he can get to his feet and ask it, and I will be willing to try to answer it.

Mr. Loptson: - I was just trying to correct you.

Premier Douglas: - But he sits down on one side of him and keeps comfortable and warm, and makes silly little interruptions that don't add anything to the debate or to the dignity of this House.

Mr. McDonald: - He is just repeating exactly what you were doing yesterday.

Mr. McCarthy (Cannington): - That's just what you were doing.

Mr. McDonald: - If you don't like it, set the example yourself.

Premier Douglas: - I rose any time I wanted to ask my hon. friend a question.

Mr. McDonald: - You can't tell the difference between when you're standing up or sitting down.

Premier Douglas: - I didn't interrupt my friend a single time today.

Mr. Loptson: - You interrupted plenty yesterday.

Premier Douglas: - If I may go on, Mr. Speaker, in spite of these rather childish and puerile interruptions.

We've watched the usual tactics of the Liberal Party. Out of office they're for free trade; in office, protection. Out of office the farmer's friend – deficiency payments, parity prices, more help for the farmer. In office, the plight of the western farmer and the Canadian farmer steadily degenerated while they were in office. Again, out of office – too many taxes, take off the taxes. Then the latter part of his speech he called for more geriatric centres, more roads, more power, more help to schools, more help to municipalities. But take off the taxes!

This is characteristic of a group who while they were in office, Mr. Speaker, not only did we have taxes, but we had no roads, very few good schools, no electric power, very few hospitals, no organized hospital plan and a standard of health and social welfare services that was one of the very poorest in the Dominion of Canada.

I want to deal with just one or two points that my friend has mentioned. He made some comment with reference to the Provincial-Local Government Conference which was held, and the Continuing Committee which was set up. I would like to remind the House that that Continuing Committee which was set up has on it a few members from the Government, but the great majority of the membership of that Continuing Committee are representatives from the Association of Rural Municipalities, the Association of Urban Municipalities, the Trustees' Association, the Hospital Association, Health Regions, Teachers' Federation, Municipal Secretaries and so on. For the Leader of the Opposition to stand up in this Legislature and say the Continuing Committee is "continuing to continue" – that may cause guffaws from some of the less seriously minded members who sit behind him, but it will not be taken kindly by the organizations whose representatives have been sitting on this Committee and who have been working diligently producing reports and seeking to improve the lot of local governments in this province.

Mr. McDonald: - Balderdash!

Mr. Gardiner (Melville): - Why don't they report then?

Premier Douglas: - The member from Melville says: "Why don't they report?" They have not yet reported because they have been doing their work. I know that the member from Melville, of course, could solve all their problems. They are tremendous problems dealing with a host of matters – with financial responsibilities – matters of jurisdiction – the matters of boundaries – the matter of getting some coordination of boundaries and functions. This is a tremendous undertaking. They have made great progress. They will be reporting this year, to the respective organizations who named them to the Continuing Committee. I want to take this opportunity of paying tribute to all the representatives on that Committee. I want to say that they have worked hard and intelligently and co-operatively. I think that when their report is presented to their respective associations and ultimately presented to this House, that it will be a monumental piece of work, and I think it ill behaved a public man and the Leader of the Opposition in this province to be sneering at this group of people who are rendering a great public service to Saskatchewan.

Mr. McDonald: - On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I haven't sneered at the personnel that are on this Committee today or on any other occasion. There are a number of Cabinet Ministers on this Continuing Committee . . .

Premier Douglas: - That is not a question of privilege.

February 17, 1959

Mr. McDonald: - Well, it certainly is . . .

Mr. Speaker: - Order! Order!

Mr. McDonald: - You're not putting words in my mouth. I have not sneered at them, and I don't intend to, Mr. Speaker, pardon me . . .

Premier Douglas: - Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman said: "The Continuing Committee continues to continue."

Mr. McDonald: - Right!

Premier Douglas: - This can be nothing but a reflection on the membership of that Committee.

Mr. McDonald: - Mr. Speaker, that is not true.

Premier Douglas: - He is expressing the opinion . . .

Mr. McDonald: - I ask the Premier to withdraw the statement.

Premier Douglas: - He is expressing the opinion that they are dilatory and inept in the performance of their duty, and I say that that will not be welcomed by the members of that Committee. I want to go on further . . .

Mr. Danielson (Arm River): - You're getting right down in the gutter now, boy.

Premier Douglas: - The Leader of the Opposition says that there are Cabinet Ministers on this Committee. The Cabinet Ministers represent about 25 per cent of the membership of the Committee. Is he suggesting that we force down their throats the particular view which the Government holds?

Mr. McDonald: - I suggest you get out of the road, and let them continue.

Premier Douglas: - I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that when this Conference met, I made it abundantly clear that, in the opinion of the Government, some type of reorganization, some type of reallocation of finances and responsibilities, would be of tremendous value in improving the effectiveness of local government. But I said the Government had no intention of forcing any type of reorganization or reallocation upon local governments. I said this was the type of program which could only be done when all parties concerned were agreed on the program which should be followed. I want to say that we have no intention of forcing this Committee to come to conclusions. We will present the data to this Committee; we will work with them in reaching conclusions in which all of them can concur. Now, of course, the gentlemen opposite like to work both sides of the street. Out in the country they are telling people that the Government has got a plan to force larger units and that the Government's got it all the way, and that the moment the election is over and they are back in office, "they are going to put it on you whether you like it or not." This is on the one hand. On the other hand, they come into the Legislature and say . . .

Mr. Danielson: - It's time you were telling the truth.

Premier Douglas: - "What are you waiting for? Why don't you get on with it? Why don't you get on with it? Why don't you bring this thing down? Why don't you force it on people?"

Mr. Danielson: - Show your colours.

Premier Douglas: - Well I want to tell these people, Mr. Speaker, that neither of their stories are true. We are not going to force any reorganization plan on local governments, and we are not going to bring down some program until the local governing bodies themselves, and the associations which represent them, have come to a program with which all of them are in agreement and which can be put in harmoniously in this province.

I don't think I need to spend any time on my friend's talk about The Farm Security Act; we have gone all over this before. My hon. friend knows that, in 1944, his Party were going up and down – well it wasn't his Party then, but the Party he is with now, were going up and down the length and breadth of this province saying the C.C.F. would socialize all the land. I told the people at Gull Lake, as I told them at a score of other places, if the C.C.F. socialized any land we would resign.

Mr. McDonald: - That's not what you told them.

Premier Douglas: - We have not socialized anybody's land.

Mr. Loptson: - You tried to.

Premier Douglas: - And I want to say, once more, that The Farm Security Act gives these people protection, except in such cases where they voluntarily agree or where, after looking into it, the Mediation Board decides that protection is not warranted. I want to point out to the member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson) who is waving his arms, that when The Farm Security Act came into this House he and some of his colleagues voted against it.

Mr. Danielson: - Mr. Speaker, that is an absolute lie.

Premier Douglas: - My friend can look up the records.

Mr. Danielson: - That's a lie.

Mr. Speaker: - Order!

Mr. Danielson: - He picked up our legislation from the different Acts and put into one Act, and every word of that Act is our legislation.

Premier Douglas: - If we go to the records we will find that the Opposition voted against The Farm Security Act. That is in the records of 1943 . . .

February 17, 1959

Mr. Danielson: - . . . the Supreme Court threw it out.

Mr. Cameron: - That's right.

Premier Douglas: - They voted against The Farm Security Act and they did something worse. Their colleagues in Ottawa joined with the Mortgage Companies' Association of Canada to take that legislation to the Supreme Court to get the power or moratorium taken away from the Province, so that we couldn't protect the farmers who were in danger of losing their farms.

Mr. McDonald: - That's not true and you know it.

Premier Douglas: — And the member for Arm River. . .

Mr. Danielson: - And your Attorney General stated on the floor of this House that he hoped it would be taken to the Privy Council.

Mr. Speaker: - Order! Order!

Mr. McDonald: - Your own Attorney General!

Mr. Speaker: - Order!

Premier Douglas: - The fact is, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Danielson: - You couldn't tell the truth . . .

Premier Douglas: - . . . that the Mortgage Companies' Association could have taken this to the Supreme Court without the Federal Government and a Liberal Minister of Justice at Ottawa aligning themselves with those representations. That Minister sent his representatives there to make the plea against the legislation – legislation which was designed to protect the farmers of this country. The Liberal Party is not going to be allowed to forget that, and the people of this province are not going to be allowed to forget it.

Mr. McDonald: - May I ask the Premier a question? Is it not true that the Attorney General of this province, at that time, said that he hoped this would be taken to the Supreme Court of Canada?

Mr. Danielson: - Sure he did.

Premier Douglas: - The Attorney General said he hoped that it was always possible for anyone who questioned the constitutionality to take it to the Supreme Court; but this does not excuse a Liberal Government taking it to the Court.

Mr. McDonald: - Did he not say he was hopeful that it would be taken to the Supreme Court?

Premier Douglas: - I don't recall him ever saying he was 'hopeful' and I doubt that he ever did.

Mr. Danielson: - You see, they . . .

Premier Douglas: - If my friend could coach the Leader of the Opposition afterwards, it would be much better.

Mr. Danielson: - We will deal with this before this Session is over. We'll educate you before you get out of here.

Premier Douglas: - Another policy on which the Liberal Party has played two sides of the street s on this matter of the Time question. The Opposition talked a great deal about the fact that the people are saying, "Leave us alone"; that here we are trying to thrust some time system on them. I am sure most of the members of this House know, if the Leader of the Opposition does not, that almost every year there appears before the Government representatives of the Association of Rural Municipalities, farm organizations and other province-wide organizations, asking the Government to see if we couldn't do something about all the inconveniences which are caused by the fact that there are different time zones in the province. It is not enough to say 'leave us alone'. The fact is that farm organizations kept on pointing out that when their people went into the neighbouring town, they found the town on a different time from the farm; and when they began to take children in on business to a school in town, it was very inconvenient to have the school on one time and the farm homes, from which the children came, on a different time. We had representations from many organizations asking that we try to get a uniform time. Some of them even went so far as to say that we should pass legislation forbidding towns and cities from going on Daylight Saving Time in the summer time.

In the light of this, hon. members know the matter was referred to Legislative Committees and, on at least two occasions, representations were heard from scores of organizations. A plebiscite was taken, but there was no clear-cut indication of what the people wanted. Roughly two-thirds of the people in the western part of the province, which would comprise about two-thirds of the province, wanted Mountain Time; the eastern third of the province wanted Central Time, and the people in the cities wanted Mountain Time for part of the year and Central Time for part of the year.

It is rather interesting – if I recollect correctly – that when this Committee was about to make its report I believe a couple of members from the Opposition moved that there should be a uniform time and the Government should decide what it should be! This is how they accepted the responsibility!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: - What courage!

Premier Douglas: - They said there should be uniform time, but the Government should decide what it should be. They didn't want to accept the responsibility . . .

February 17, 1959

Mr. McCarthy: - You are the Government . . .

Premier Douglas: - This was going to be perfect because, if the Government picked Central Time, then of course they would go to the people in the western part of the province and say: "We are in favour of Mountain Time"; and they would go to the eastern part of the province and say: "We were in favour of Central Time."

Mr. Danielson: - The Government decided now.

Premier Douglas: - This puts the Liberal Party back in the position where it loves to be – on the fence. They have sat on the fence so long that iron has entered into their souls. This is a beautiful position for them.

My friend now complains that, this fall, when some communities decided they were not going to conform to the legislation, that they were going to go on Central Time irrespective of the fact that Mountain Time has been designated as the time for the winter months; he complains, "The Government should have done something about this."

If was made perfectly clear to the people of this province, when the Legislature met last winter, that there were no penalties, and some members opposite criticized the fact that there were no penalties We had no intention of putting in penalties. When you are dealing with a matter of Time, you are not dealing with something of a criminal nature; you are not dealing with some civic right or property; you are simply dealing with a convenience by which it is easier for people to live together as a community. In Manitoba they are all on Central Time, despite the fact that, if they followed Sun Time part of their province would be on Mountain Time. Alberta follows Mountain Time; if they followed Sun Time actually part of their province would be on Pacific Time. They are fortunate in that they have the same time. I think there is a great advantage in having the same time. It is better for the communities. People have the same time and they can do the same shopping and listen to the same programs, and there are advantages to it. But it is not the kind of thing you can force on people; you cannot compel people to do it. As a matter of fact, the people who stood to benefit most by having uniformity of time were the merchants of the province and the Chambers of Commerce, because it would make the people of Saskatchewan have a sense of belonging, and there would be less tendency for people on the borders to go over the border and buy in other provinces. But strange to say, it was, in two or three communities, local Chamber of Commerce groups who felt that this change in time wasn't very satisfactory, and they decided not to follow the law in these two or three communities.

We certainly have no intention of trying to punish communities. If they are not ready to co-operate and give this a fair trial, then it seems to me that this Legislature has very little recourse left but to say, if uniform time won't work, and the great majority of the people are not prepared to accept this time, it may leave us no alternative but to go back and say the communities can set their own time. But if we do that, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that you have to solve a problem, because back again you will have the delegations to the Legislature, as we have had in days

gone by, talking about the inconvenience of going from one community to another, finding that the time is different, and that it upsets their program.

I would like to make a reference to my hon. friend's last remark when he talked about some report (I am not familiar with it) that, in Ontario, the Labour Federation had contributed, I think he said \$70,000 or something, to the campaign of the C.C.F., and had paid their election deposits. I don't know whether that is accurate or not. He said: "This would be a bad Party for the farmer to belong to, with the Labour people paying the deposits." What does he think it would be for the farmers with the Manufacturers' Association paying the campaign costs?

Mr. McDonald: - The Tory Party?

Premier Douglas: - Or the Insurance Underwriters Association, or the Mortgage Companies' Association?

Mr. Gardiner: - Or the Saskatchewan Government Insurance?

Mr. McDonald: - That's why I left that Party.

Premier Douglas: - In 1948, when the Canadian Underwriters Association took up almost a floor of the Saskatchewan Hotel and took over the publicity in campaigning for the Liberal Party in this province, that is certainly not very good for the farmer. As a matter of fact, the day is coming and the day must come when the farmers and the workers of this country will be prepared to put up the money to help each other elect a Government in Canada to make good laws for the people who live by the sweat of their brow. All the attempts of the gentlemen opposite to drive a wedge between farmer and labour by making the kind of statements the Leader of the Opposition made, are going to fall on deaf ears.

Mr. McDonald: - They aren't my statements.

Premier Douglas: - If the Leader of the Opposition and his Party want to start publishing lists of the contributions to campaign funds, I can assure him that we will be glad to do so at any time, providing he will do the same.

Mr. McDonald: - Let's go! We accept your challenge.

Mr. Loptson: - The Ontario C.C.F. campaign was paid for by labour.

Premier Douglas: - My friends are still mumbling over there.

Mr. Loptson: - We're telling you the truth.

Mr. Danielson: - We are not mumbling. We are telling you the truth; you fact up to it now.

February 17, 1959

Premier Douglas: - I want to comment on a couple of other items, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition, being somewhat desperate, apparently, for something with which to make a case, started to go back to 1942 or 1943 and dig out old newspaper reports, and he quoted one in which I am alleged to have said, at Chaplin, that health services would be provided at \$8 per person. Well, of course, Mr. Speaker, I cannot be responsible for what newspaper reporters take down. The fact remains that, if hon. members will take the trouble to check any speeches I made at that time, they will find that I was commenting on the House of Commons Committee on Health Insurance, of which I was a member. That Committee had brought down a report in which they said that, at that time, in their opinion, complete health insurance could be provided in Canada at a cost of \$21.96 per person. It was broken down into \$5 per person for hospitalization; \$8 per person for general medical care; and I think it was \$2.50 for surgery and referred work, and \$1 for medical care and as much for dental care and so on. That is probably the \$8 to which reference was made.

I have replied before to his statement about our accepting our constitutional responsibility for education. At no time have I, or anyone also representing the C.C.F., made the statement that we would accept responsibility for 100 per cent of the cost of education.

Mr. McDonald: - You certain did.

Premier Douglas: - What my hon. friend quoted, yesterday, does not say that. It says that the responsibility for education under our Constitution lies with the Province, and the Province must accept that responsibility squarely. The Province must accept the responsibility of giving leadership, and this we have done by going out and organizing larger units, by providing equalization grants so that those communities who are only able (as some of them are) to raise 20 per cent of the cost of providing education may obtain the other 80 per cent from the Government. We have made our contribution have some relationship to the residual burden which is less than the capacity of that community to accept.

Mr. McDonald: - Not a word of truth in it.

Premier Douglas: - Well, my hon. friend's idea of truth is not something that has impressed me very greatly. After listening to him yesterday and today, I doubt if he and the truth are on very good speaking terms.

Mr. McDonald: - You wouldn't recognize it if you heard it.

Mr. Danielson: - You said they were going to have it all 'without money and without price.'

Premier Douglas: - Oh, just pipe down! I don't want these university students to think that 225 years in the Legislature has done this to you.

Mr. Danielson: - They don't have to come to me; all they have to do is listen to you.

Premier Douglas: - As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it is rather significant that, yesterday, my hon. friend said we are not moving fast enough on more health services, more welfare programs, more education programs, and yet it is only a few years ago that the Liberal financial critic stood up in his place in this House and said we were spending too much on education, too much on welfare, too much on health.

Mr. Cameron (Maple Creek): - Oh, no!

Premier Douglas: - Does my friend deny it?

Mr. McDonald: - Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege . . .

Premier Douglas: - I am not talking about the present financial critic.

Mr. McDonald: - Let us keep to the facts. The Premier said . . .

Premier Douglas: - Sit down, sit down!

Mr. McDonald: - I won't sit down. On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker . . .

Premier Douglas: - You have no point of privilege.

Mr. McDonald: - My point of privilege is that the Premier is putting words in my mouth when he is saying that I said things, yesterday, that I didn't say; and if he is going to persist in telling something other than the truth, then I am going to persist that the truth shall be told. What the Premier quoted here, a few minutes ago, is not what I said yesterday, and I challenge him to either produce it or withdraw – he can take his choice.

Mr. Speaker: - Order! What is the gentleman's point of privilege?

Mr. Lopton: - He stated his privilege.

Mr. McDonald: - The statement that he just made with regard to health and welfare services.

Premier Douglas: - If I misunderstood my friend I am sorry. I certainly took it yesterday, that he was complaining that we hadn't put in complete health insurance, that we had only gone so far and hadn't carried out the promise that he alleged I made in 1944.

Mr. McDonald: - That is not what I said at all.

Premier Douglas: - Certainly, today, he was telling us that we hadn't gone far enough with old people's homes, and that we hadn't paid enough for education. It was said repeatedly today that we hadn't paid enough for education. But the financial critic for the Liberal Party, in the Session in 1949, said that too large a part of our budget was going for health, welfare and education, and that this province couldn't bear it. I see the member for

February 17, 1959

Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) shaking his head, but it is in the concluding sentence of what he said. He said: "When we look over the whole picture we come to the conclusion that this Government has now established a standard of expenditures and services that cannot be sustained by this province." He was dealing with health, welfare and educational services.

Mr. Lopton: - He was talking about your other expenditures that you were spending so much money on.

Premier Douglas: - I want to deal with just one more point, Mr. Speaker; the rest I can leave until tomorrow. I want to deal with the issue which my friend took with the member for Bengough (Mr. A.L.S. Brown) regarding employment in manufacturing. He said that the member for Bengough was giving wrong figures, and he produced some figures which he had on a sheet of paper which he said came from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. When I asked him a question about it, he said his figures were from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and asked if I had read it. I do read them from time to time, Mr. Speaker. I not only read them, but sometimes I think I understand them.

Mr. McDonald: - That's doubtful.

Premier Douglas: - What the hon. member did was to quote, I take it, from this document issued by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Labour Division - 'Employment and Payrolls,' November 1958. I presume this is what he was quoting from, because there are the exact figures that he quoted: that is, the number of people in Saskatchewan (Page 22) engaged in manufacturing - 10,448. That is the figure he quoted. Therefore I am assuming this is the document from which he quoted. However, he didn't quote the Title which says: "Employment and Payrolls with average weekly earnings, November 1958, as reported by employers having 15 or more employees."

Mr. McDonald: - I quoted that yesterday, Mr. Premier.

Premier Douglas: - Well, if you did, I missed it. What I am wondering is why he didn't give the figures including the employers who have less than 15 employees, because that was equally available to my hon. friend. As a matter of fact, he quoted another figure which, I think, came from this same page, and so it is very difficult to see . . .

Mr. McDonald: - May I ask what book . . .

Premier Douglas: - . . . how he could have missed it. This is the 'Preliminary Statement of Manufacturers, 1957', issued by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Industry and Merchandising Division.

On Page 11 of this report it gives the number of employees - not just of those employers having more than 15 employees, because, as my hon. friend knows, we have many small operations in Saskatchewan which operate a dozen men.

Mr. Lopton: - That's all you have got.

Premier Douglas: - Those, of course, would be left out. The figure there is 12,018, which is the figure the member for Bengough (Mr. A.L.S. Brown) was quoting. What the member for Bengough went on to say was that the preliminary estimates which we have show that, whereas every other province in Canada, in 1958, either had a reduction in the number of persons employed in manufacturing or were static, ours showed an increase of 7½ cents for each month. That is, we get the monthly data which then is compiled at the end of the year. We haven't got the final report for the end of the year, but we have each month and we have been running, for every month in 1958, 7½ per cent above this figure for 1957. Therefore, I think when the annual figures comes out, which is only a matter of adding up the twelve monthly figures, it will show about 13,000 persons employed. We will be the only one in Canada which will show an increase – that is an increase over the previous year; and those are the figures to which the member for Bengough was referring.

Mr. McDonald: - I agree entirely with the figures the Premier has given us, but if he goes back to 1944, he will find that that is still smaller than it was in 1944.

Premier Douglas: - Oh no, it is not smaller than 1944.

Mr. McDonald: - It certainly is.

Premier Douglas: - I have the figures here for 1944.

Mr. McDonald: - Well give us the figures for 1944.

Premier Douglas: - They were 11,000.

Mr. McDonald: - No they weren't.

Premier Douglas: - Oh yes, they were.

Mr. McDonald: - Out of the same document?

Premier Douglas: - They aren't in this document. These are the figures for 1957, and you wouldn't expect the figures to be in here.

The other point that my hon. friend took exception to in the address of the member for Bengough was when he gave the figure for the value of manufacturing products of \$311 million for 1957 and \$326 million for 1958. He quoted figures to show that it was \$303 million for 1957, and I presume he took it from this book. That is correct. On Page 11 it gives the figure of \$303 million. But there was a little slip came with the book and it is headed "Erratum". My hon. friend should take note of that word because he is going to get more and more familiar with it as the years go by.

Mr. McDonald: - Who inserted that?

Premier Douglas: - It is inserted by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, and it says: (giving the Page and the Table) "Saskatchewan - \$303,268,000, should read \$311,268,000" So, if my hon. friend would just read the "Erratum"

February 17, 1959

as well as the Report which he got, I think his figure would come to exactly the same as the member for Bengough gave.

Mr. McDonald: - You're only half-way there now; the hon. member used \$326 million.

Premier Douglas: - Just a minute; I am coming to that. The hon. member used that for 1957, and my hon. friend across the way said it wasn't \$311 million, it was \$303 million. I am now proving to my friend that, according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, my hon. friend from Bengough was right. It wasn't \$303 million because the 'erratum' points out that it was \$311 million or \$31,268,000.

Mr. McDonald: - You're still away in the bush.

Premier Douglas: - I am just trying to get my hon. friend correct so that he will start to quote the Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures properly.

Mr. McDonald: - You are really mixing them up.

Premier Douglas: - In 1958, the member from Bengough pointed out that we went up from \$311 million the year before to, last year, \$326 million. Again the final figures are not published but we have the monthly figures, and the monthly figures show an increase of 4.8 per cent each month over the previous year and, on that basis, there isn't any doubt that the total figures for 1958 will be \$326 million. My hon. friends needn't laugh and display a rather . . .

Mr. McDonald: - You missed the whole point.

Mr. Speaker: - Order!

Premier Douglas: - I think one could easily miss the point, Mr. Speaker. There were so few of them in the whole meanderings of my hon. friend over the arid desert of his intellectual pastime that I think anyone could be pardoned for missing the point.

I want simply to state again that the figures used by the member for Bengough are correct. In 1957, the manufacturing production was \$311 million. Our preliminary estimates, on the basis of a 4.8 per cent increase, show \$326 million for 1958.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say just one word about promises and then I am going to sit down. My hon. friends across the way have talked about promises, and they have spent a good deal of time digging into some newspaper report where somebody has reported figures that are not always taken down accurately, or some interpretation of something which they would like to put on a statement that was made. I want to say that I have in my hand here the official programs on which the C.C.F. have gone to the people of this province at each succeeding election. I have here the program for 1944 – a nine-point program on which the Government was elected. I have the program for 1948, the program for 1952, and the program for 1956. On the

first three programs – 1944, 1948 and 1952 – I am prepared to discuss with my hon. friends or anybody else in this House or in any part of this province the fact that this Government has complied completely with these programs on which we were elected in each succeeding election . . .

Govt. Members: - Hear! Hear!

Premier Douglas: - Not on some far-fetched story of what my hon. friend said somebody else said, but on the printed program of the commitments which we made to the people of Saskatchewan, which were passed out in hundreds of thousands to the electorate.

Mr. McDonald: - I believe what I say.

Premier Douglas: - And I believe the best proof that we kept each of these three platforms is the fact that, when we went back to the people, they re-elected us on them.

With reference to the 1956 program, I took it as something of a compliment, the other day, when I read in the paper that when a newspaper man asked the Leader of the Opposition if he thought there would be an election this year he said: “No, I don’t think so, because the Government hasn’t completed the program on which it was elected.” I thought that was a real compliment. I would like to tell him, what is more, that it is being performed and completed on schedule, and that I haven’t any doubts at all that, when we have completed this, and take it back to the people of the province, they will be glad to give us a vote of confidence and send us back to continue with the fine program that we have carried out in the past.

Mr. McDonald: - Take the halo off, it’s pinching!

Premier Douglas: - Mr. Speaker, I have some other things I want to discuss tomorrow and therefore, I would beg leave to move the adjournment of the debate.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:20 o’clock p.m.